

This can be found at: [http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/3.NaturalBornCitizen\(SomethingExtraordinaryHappeningParts1&2-byDevyKidd\).pdf](http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/3.NaturalBornCitizen(SomethingExtraordinaryHappeningParts1&2-byDevyKidd).pdf)
Other related: <http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/2.NaturalBornCitizen-HowDefinedByTheFoundingFathers-ORIGINAL-INTENT.pdf>
<http://Anderson4TheConstitution.com/1.DicksFairlyCompleteExplanationWithDefinitionOfNaturalBornCitizen.pdf>

Source: <http://www.newswithviews.com/Devy/kidd703.htm>

TED CRUZ ELIGIBILITY - SOMETHING EXTRAORDINARY HAPPENING

PART 1 of 2

By: Devvy
January 10, 2016
NewsWithViews.com

My, my, how things have changed since the first volley of lawsuits to keep the criminal impostor in the White House, Barry Soetoro aka Barack Obama [fictitious, made up name] off the ballot. Immediately shrill squawking came from the ethically bankrupt Democrat/Communist Party USA. Why, to challenge the constitutional eligibility of a candidate was racist pure and simple. The object of scrutiny has black skin, therefore, any attempts to uphold the Constitution were being done by kooks, racists, Kool-Aid drinkers and as Yule Brenner said in the 1956 movie, *The King And I*, et cetera, et cetera .

'Conservative' biggies were just as outraged as the left that anyone should question Barry's eligibility:

[Obama Citizenship Crisis & Industrial Strength Stupidity](#)

"David Horowitz, much admired by conservatives, makes an astonishing and completely anti American statement on the issue of the law: Obama Derangement Syndrome

"The continuing efforts of a fringe group of conservatives to deny Obama his victory and to lay the basis for the claim that he is not a legitimate president are embarrassing and destructive...What difference does it make to the future of this country whether Obama was born on U.S. soil? Advocates of this destructive campaign will argue that the constitutional principle regarding the qualifications for president trumps all others. But how viable will our Constitution be if five Supreme Court justices should decide to void 64 million ballots?"

"What difference does it make whether Obama was "born on U.S. soil?" That's not the issue and it's a shame someone like Horowitz shoots off the pie hole in his face without even knowing the correct legal argument. How viable would it be if the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the supreme law of the land? Shame on you, Mr. Horowitz, for your cavalier attitude about the law." Since Barry Obama was not eligible no one had the 'right' to vote for him, period.

The very dangerous Mark Levine (his book promoting a constitutional convention) is [going ballistic](#) over anyone challenging Ted Cruz's eligibility:

"He added that the birther issue with both Cruz and President Obama is "stupid," no one has standing to challenge it, no court would take it up, and is "just not true." Levin continued that "the liberals love this stuff."...

"Levin then said anyone who is born to a US citizen can run for president, regardless of where they were born. He then read the 5th clause of Article II, Section I of the US Constitution, and argued that children born to US citizens abroad are natural born US citizens under US law.

"He continued by pointing to arguments that child born in the US are not automatically natural born citizens under the 14th Amendment, that he and other conservatives have embraced, contrary to the "amnesty crowd, the establishment Republicans, [and] dummies on TV"...Levin then declared that Cruz's eligibility was "resolved," and questions over Cruz's eligibility are "for the kooks."

Well, Mark, liberals didn't "love this stuff" when their boy, Barry, was in the spotlight back in 2008. Levin's comment "read the 5th clause of Article II, Section I of the US Constitution, and argued that children born to US citizens abroad are natural born US citizens under US law" is completely disingenuous:

No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President;

neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen Years a resident within the United States.

No where in that clause does it say children born to US citizens abroad are natural born citizens under US law. His comment regarding no one having standing to challenge eligibility deliberately skips over two things:

1. When Leo Donofrio filed his lawsuit in NJ to keep Barry Obama, Juan McCain and Róger Calero (born in Nicaragua) off the ballot, standing was not challenged although that [judicial hallucination](#) was used in most of the other lawsuits to get rid of them. There was a great deal of confusion regarding McCain because everyone assumed the hospital he was born in was on a military installation. Not so and I do encourage you to take the time to read this entire piece: [A Congressional Natural Born Citizen Parts I, II & III: Who Knew What & For How Long?](#)

"According to the birth certificate and COLB of John McCain, McCain was born in Colon Hospital, city of Colon, Panama. While the BC states at the top that it is from the "Canal Zone", the document also states that McCain was born in Colon Hospital, city of Colon. The city of Colon and the hospital were not in the Canal Zone. The common story you hear is that McCain was born in the Canal Zone, but these documents posted online do not testify to that. Furthermore, there is no official document that has ever surfaced which states that McCain was born in the Canal Zone."

[Why Senator John McCain Cannot Be President: Eleven Months and a Hundred Yards Short of Citizenship](#) by Gabriel J. Chin, University of California, Davis - School of Law, August 13, 2008

Abstract:

"Senator McCain was born in 1936 in the Canal Zone to U.S. citizen parents. The Canal Zone was territory controlled by the United States, but it was not incorporated into the Union. As requested by Senator McCain's campaign, distinguished constitutional lawyers Laurence Tribe and Theodore Olson examined the law and issued a detailed opinion offering two reasons that Senator McCain was a natural born citizen. Neither is sound under current law.

"The Tribe-Olson Opinion suggests that the Canal Zone, then under exclusive U.S. jurisdiction, may have been covered by the Fourteenth Amendment's grant of citizenship to "all persons born . . . in the United States." However, in the Insular Cases, the Supreme Court held that "unincorporated territories" were not part of the United States for constitutional purposes. Accordingly, many decisions hold that persons born in unincorporated territories are not Fourteenth Amendment citizens. The Tribe-Olson Opinion also suggests that Senator McCain obtained citizenship by statute. However, the only statute in effect in 1936 did not cover the Canal Zone. Recognizing the gap, in 1937, Congress passed a citizenship law applicable only to the Canal Zone, granting Senator McCain citizenship, but eleven months too late for him to be a citizen at birth. Because Senator John McCain was not a citizen at birth, he is not a "natural born Citizen" and thus is not "eligible to the Office of President" under the Constitution.

Because of the flap in 2008 over Juan McCain, the Senate passed a resolution to accommodate a presidential candidate. [S.Res.511 - A resolution recognizing that John Sidney McCain, III, is a natural born citizen](#). It certainly pays to have friends in high places.

I deliberately decided to make a Part II to this column because it is historical FACTS regarding the Fourteenth Amendment and natural born as written by Leo Donofrio.

2. Mark Levin knows not a single lawsuit was decided on merits of the argument regarding what constitutes a natural born citizen. Not one single court allowed a true legal discussion of what constitutes natural born.

Cruz, naturally has come out saying it's 'settled law'. Yes, it is and you, Ted Cruz are ineligible. Cruz knew this was going to become an issue which is why he began legal proceedings to give up his dual citizenship finalized in 2014. If he didn't think his dual citizenship would be a problem, why go to all the trouble to renounce his Canadian citizenship?

"News" media giants, including FOX led the charge to discredit anyone questioning Barry's eligibility. Haaavard grad and telly clown, Bill O'Reilly, has proclaimed over the years that a birth announcement in a Hawaii newspaper was proof positive Barry was a natural born citizen. And, so all these years, Barry Obama has gotten away with usurping the office of president aided and abetted by the left and the right. And now they're deliberately doing it all over again using the same talking points from 2008 & 2012 to protect Ted Cruz.

Rep. [Alan Grayson: I Will File Lawsuit Over Ted Cruz's Citizenship If He's Elected President](#), November 27, 2015. Grayson is a stupid, rabid Democrat. His proclamation is baloney. I can tell you exactly what a judge will say: Mr. Grayson, if you had a problem with Cruz's citizenship, you should have filed before the election. Grayson's comments in that article demonstrates he's a run of the mill dummy on the issue of natural born citizen.

[Nancy Pelosi Wades Into Cruz Eligibility Dispute, Jan. 7, 2016](#)

Like Barry Obama, Cruz has one parent who was a U.S. citizen at the time of his birth - his mother. A plethora of hot articles have flooded the Internet over the past few days. This one is a prime example of ignorance:

[Why Ted Cruz Is Vulnerable on Canadian Birth Issue](#): "That is not because Cruz is ineligible for the presidency. In an article in the Harvard Law Review in March 2015, former Solicitors General Neal Katyal and Paul Clement made a compelling argument that the Framers of the Constitution intended "natural-born citizen"—a requirement for the presidency—to include those born to U.S. citizens abroad."

Going back to JB Williams [column regarding Ted Cruz being ineligible](#) to run for the senate, he provides copies of critical legal documents:

"The above Canadian document is proof of Canadian Citizenship at birth for Senator Ted Cruz. The next piece of authenticated evidence released by Ted Cruz is a Canadian document proving that he remained a legal citizen of Canada until renouncing that citizenship in May of 2014, which means, he was still a legal citizen of Canada in 2012 when he ran for, was elected and took the oath of office for the US Senate.

"Again, the above authenticated evidence proves that Ted Cruz was born Canadian in 1970 and remained a legal citizen of Canada until renouncing his Canadian citizenship in May of 2014. These official documents also prove that Ted Cruz was a legal citizen of Canada in 2012, when he sought and claimed a seat in the U.S. Senate as a legal US citizen....

"Ted's parents were at no time serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, employed by the U.S. Government or by any of the certain international organizations, during their eight years in Canada, between 1966 and 1974. Further, Ted's father Rafael, was at no time a legal citizen of the United States prior to naturalizing in 2005, from Canada. Rafael's known legal citizenship status as of 1970 was Cuban, not American.

"This is an EXAMPLE of a US CRBA Form (Consular Report of Birth Abroad)

"Unfortunately, there is no evidence to suggest that the parent or parents of Ted Cruz ever filed a CRBA form with the U.S. Government in or around 1970, which is why Ted Cruz released a copy of his Canadian citizenship records and not any U.S. citizenship records. At present, all FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requests filed in search of any U.S. citizenship documents to confirm the true official U.S. citizenship status of Ted Cruz have been denied access. All citizenship records for Ted Cruz are sealed unless and until Ted Cruz agrees to allow any such records to be released by either U.S. or Canadian agencies.

"As a result, there remains no authentic evidence to support the claims that Ted Cruz is either a "natural born" or "naturalized" citizen of the United States."

Shall we look at that Harvard Law Review? [A Response to Neil Katyal and Paul Clement on the Meaning of a Natural Born Citizen](#) By Mario Apuzzo, Esq. Take the time to read Mario's response because he quite succinctly proves the authors of the aforementioned 'law review' piece are wrong.

As I mentioned in [my last column](#), Mario is the attorney for a ballot eligibility case in Vermont assisted the plaintiff in preparing his filing. A lawsuit has been filed to keep ineligible candidates off the primary ballot in Florida: [Michael Voeltz, registered Republican Party voter of Broward County Florida v. Senator Ted Cruz, of Texas, Senator Marco Rubio, of Florida, Secretary of State of Florida, Republican Party of Florida Executive Committee. A challenge has also been made in Illinois.](#)

[1974 Canadian Electors' List Named Ted Cruz's Parents](#)

"Canadian immigration authorities declined a request by Breitbart News for additional documents, citing Canadian privacy laws. Under U.S. law, Cruz would have inherited his citizenship at birth in 1970 from his mother, provided she remained a U.S. citizen. She likely would have retained her U.S. citizenship even if she had become a naturalized Canadian citizen, though Canadian law required naturalized citizens formally to renounce all foreign allegiances until 1973."

There's that nasty thing again: privacy laws. This is Barry Obama and the Hawaiian birth certificate all over again. I wonder if Ted will spend, as did the fraud in the White House, more than a million dollars to keep official records under wraps? The article above ends with the boiler plate stupidity about what constitutes a natural born citizen.

It's not Barry or Cruz or Rubio's birthplace, it's the citizenship of the parents at the time of the child's birth. The key word being parents, not parent. Every single article or commentary written since Donald Trump brought up the issue last week always ends with Cruz's mother is a U.S. citizen therefore Ted Cruz is a natural born citizen. Intellectual laziness or political bias does not erase historical facts.

There was a reason the 'natural born citizen' clause was grandfathered into the Constitution: To keep any president that might have foreign interests he would use to betray this country. Think Barack Hussein Obama. I don't doubt Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio love this country, but in the future do we want another Barry Obama? Since 2008, there have been a lot of articles by individuals, mostly foreign born, who want to get rid of the natural born citizen clause in the Constitution to suit their own agenda, but we can not let that happen.

In my column last week I provided links to legal analysis by two individuals who have been heavily involved in this issue that Americans should read if they want to fully understand why Cruz and Rubio are not natural born citizens:

- [Leo Donofrio's Amicus Brief](#)
- [A Citizen is One Thing, But a Natural Born Citizen is Another](#)

Something is happening that is quite extraordinary. When the issue was Democrat Barry Obama, FOX and other powerful 'conservative' mouth pieces bent over backwards to help an ineligible candidate. Now the issue is a popular GOP senator ([who usurped that office](#)), Ted Cruz, and his eligibility and those same media mouthpieces and 'conservative' legal geniuses are again bending over backwards to make sure another ineligible candidate can run for president.

Why hasn't Marco Rubio's ineligibility been brought up in all this frenzy? If the argument being put forth by all the above is that a natural born citizen means one parent is a U.S. citizen at the time of the child's birth, that sure as hell eliminates Marco Rubio. He was born in May 1971 in Miami, Florida. His parents did not become U.S. citizens until November 1975 - four years after his birth. Since neither of his parents were U.S. citizens at the time of his birth, he's out.

Why this screeching from all of the above to protect Cruz's candidacy? Because the top four GOP candidates are Trump, Cruz, Rubio and Carson. If you knock out Cruz and Rubio that leaves Donald Trump and Dr. Ben Carson - unless one figures Paul, Fiorina, Bush and the rest of the single digit candidates can be resurrected from the dead. Democrats and their lackeys in the media don't want Trump. The GOP establishment and their lackeys in the media don't want Trump. Can the jury make the inference that both sides are working feverishly to keep Cruz and Rubio in the contest hoping Donald Trump will flame out or lose the early primaries? I submit to you that's exactly what's going on.

Everything possible is being done by the GOP, with help from Megyn Kelly over at FOX, to keep Donald Trump from securing the GOP nomination: [GOP Planning 'Firewall' to Stop Trump in South Carolina](#). A pathetic attempt to bolster the pathetic Jeb! Bush's chances: "GOP leaders increasingly see South Carolina as their last best chance to stop Donald Trump's populist political juggernaut. On Wednesday, influential South Carolina Republican Katon Dawson issued a plea for former President George W. Bush to step into the ring in the Palmetto State's Feb. 20 primary. Bush is quite popular among South Carolina Republicans, and Dawson called his involvement a potential "game changer."

GOP "leaders" are so far out of touch with voters it defies imagination. As for a game changer, dream on. If voters wanted Jeb! he would be leading the pack.

So, what happens now? Well, we have Barry Obama who usurped the office of president and has gotten away with it. His mother was a natural born citizen, but his father was a foreign national who never applied for citizenship. Barry Obama was born with dual citizenship and ineligible to be president.

Marco Rubio was four years old when his parents became citizens. Rubio is hardly a natural BORN citizen and therefore, clearly ineligible.

Ted Cruz's mother's birth certificate shows she is a natural born citizen, but Cruz's father was a foreign national and not a U.S. citizen at the time Ted was born. Cruz believes because he renounced his Canadian citizenship at age 44 and his mother being a U.S. citizen he can be a natural born citizen.

Likely more lawsuits will be filed. Donald Trump could file a lawsuit; 'standing' would not be an issue; or shouldn't be. But, make no mistake: The stakes are as high as they can get because if Ted Cruz is not eligible then neither was the criminal fraudster in the White House in 2008 and 2012. *If anyone thinks the shadow government is going to let this new challenge regarding Ted Cruz blow that whole thing out of the water, they are sadly mistaken.* Ted can continue to 'cruz' along hoping he would be Trump's pick for VP. But, since he's ineligible for the presidency he's also ineligible to be VP.

Should Donald Trump dive in or continue steamrolling his competition? Baring some catastrophe, if he stays on course and doesn't fall into the trap of filing a lawsuit, he will be the nominee regardless of what GOP "leaders" want. As I said in a past column, big hay is being made Cruz is ahead in Iowa.

So what? Santorum won in 2012 and Mike Huckabee in 2008. Both flamed out and never made it to the White House. The same fate was dished out to John Kerry, Al Gore[bechev] and others. Predictions are Trump will take New Hampshire and South Carolina. If that happens, Cruz will likely continue spending millions to catch Trump for the next set of primaries.

We shall see if the lawsuits that have been filed move forward like Leo Donofrio's did only to be kicked to the curb by a deceitful batch of disgraceful "justices" on the U.S. Supreme Court. I sincerely hope they do and that there is just one judge, one, who believes in the supreme law of the land.

As for the darling of the right, Mark Levin, referring to people like me as kooks, shame on you. Questioning the constitutional eligibility for president or even members of Congress is not kooky. It's our duty and obligation to make sure the Constitution is upheld. For part two click below.

TED CRUZ ELIGIBILITY - SOMETHING EXTRAORDINARY HAPPENING

PART 2 of 2

By: Devvy

January 10, 2016

NewsWithViews.com

The following was written by Leo Donofrio. [It is an excerpt from his longer analysis here.](#)

NATURAL BORN CITIZEN DEFINED THROUGH HISTORY

I could understand rabid attacks if the legal theory I was relying upon had been thoroughly discredited by a Supreme Court decision or by statute, or even by historical texts, but it's quite the opposite. Beside 200 years of Presidential precedent, the great weight of authority supports the argument that Obama is not a natural born Citizen.

I understand the countering argument and I've welcomed debate of both sides of the issue in comments to this blog. But most of the published arguments on the natural born Citizen issue are recently published law review articles which haven't done a very good job of presenting the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

THE FRAMERS OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Despite popular belief, the 14th Amendment does not convey the status of "natural born Citizen" in its text. It just conveys the status of "Citizen". And it's very clear that in the pre-amendment Constitution, the Framers made a distinction between a "Citizen" and a "natural born Citizen". The requirement to be a Senator or Representative is "Citizen", but the requirement to be President is "natural born Citizen".

From the 14th Amendment:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside."

But even as to this conveyance of citizenship, those who were responsible for drafting the 14th Amendment made it clear that - to them - the meaning of "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" meant subject only to the jurisdiction thereof.

Dr. John Fonte, Senior Fellow of The Hudson Institute had this to say about the issue at a Congressional hearing on dual citizenship from September 29, 2005:

The authors in the legislative history, the authors of that language, Senator Lyman Trumbull said, "When we talk about 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States,' it means complete jurisdiction, not owing allegiance to anybody else." Senator Jacob Howard said that it's "a full and complete jurisdiction."

This illustrates that Congress recently discussed the issue, and they can't claim they were unaware. But we don't have to take Dr. Fonte's word for it. The following discussion by the various 14th Amendment Framers took place on the Senate floor. I took it from P.A.

Madison's research at <http://www.14thamendment.us>(use his link for footnotes):

It is clear the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment had no intention of freely giving away American citizenship to just anyone simply because they may have been born on American soil. Again, we are fortunate enough to have on the record the highest authority tell us, Sen. Lyman Trumbull, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee... and the one who inserted the phrase:

[T]he provision is, that 'all persons born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens.' That means 'subject to the complete jurisdiction thereof.' What do we mean by 'complete jurisdiction thereof?' Not owing allegiance to anybody else. That is what it means.

Then Madison quotes Sen. Howard, another Framers, concurring with Trumbull:

Sen. Howard concurs with Trumbull's construction:

Mr. HOWARD: I concur entirely with the honorable Senator from Illinois [Trumbull], in holding that the word "jurisdiction," as here employed, ought to be construed so as to imply a full and complete jurisdiction on the part of the United States, whether exercised by Congress, by the executive, or by the judicial department; that is to say, the same jurisdiction in extent and quality as applies to every citizen of the United States now.[3]

Mr. Madison continues with even more proof of what the 14th Amendment Framers meant:

Sen. Johnson, speaking on the Senate floor, offers his comments and understanding of the proposed new amendment to the constitution:

[Now], all this amendment [citizenship clause] provides is, that all persons born in the United States and not subject to some foreign Power—for that, no doubt, is the meaning of the committee who have brought the matter before us—shall be considered as citizens of the United States. That would seem to be not only a wise but a necessary provision. If there are to be citizens of the United States there should be some certain definition of what citizenship is, what has created the character of citizen as between himself and the United States, and the amendment says that citizenship may depend upon birth, and I know of no better way to give rise to citizenship than the fact of birth within the territory of the United States, born to parents who at the time were subject to the authority of the United States.[4]

No doubt in the Senate as to what the citizenship clause means as further evidenced by Sen. W. Williams:

In one sense, all persons born within the geographical limits of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States...All persons living within a judicial district may be said, in one sense, to be subject to the jurisdiction of the court in that district, but they are not in every sense subject to the jurisdiction of the court until they are brought, by proper process, within the reach of the power of the court. I understand the words here, 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States,' to mean fully and completely subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.[5]

Madison saves for last the greatest authority on the issue:

Rep. John Bingham of Ohio, considered the father of the Fourteenth Amendment, confirms the understanding and construction the framers used in regards to birthright and jurisdiction while speaking on civil rights of citizens in the House on March 9, 1866:

[I] find no fault with the introductory clause [S 61 Bill], which is simply declaratory of what is written in the Constitution, that every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen...[6]

It's important to note this statement was issued by Bingham only months before the 14th Amendment was proposed.

In conclusion, I would like to thank reader "John Boy" for pointing to Justice Scalia's opinion in *District of Columbia Et Al. v. Heller*. In that case, Justice Scalia took into consideration a certain historical legal reference:

The common references to those “fit to bear arms” in congressional discussions about the militia are matched by use of the same phrase in the few nonmilitary federal contexts where the concept would be relevant... Other legal sources frequently used “bear arms” in nonmilitary contexts.[10]

Now look at “footnote 10?”:

E. de Vattel, *The Law of Nations, or, Principles of the Law of Nature* 144 (1792) (“Since custom has allowed persons of rank and gentlemen of the army to bear arms in time of peace, strict care should be taken that none but these should be allowed to wear swords”);

Since Justice Scalia cited to this legal textbook in March of 2008, it’s not outrageous to think he might also refer to “The Laws of Nations” on the natural born Citizen issue?

I’ll leave you now with the relevant textbook definition of natural born citizen. The following was published in 1758. This definition, added to all of the above, certainly establishes a rational legal basis to hold that Barack Obama is not a natural born Citizen. And more than that, it puts the burden on those who deny it to don the tin foil hat of despair and bring forthwith to the table of honest debate their own bed of authority to lie in:

§ 212. Citizens and natives.

The citizens are the members of the civil society; bound to this society by certain duties, and subject to its authority, they equally participate in its advantages. The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens.

As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to his children the right of becoming members of it. The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent. We shall soon see whether, on their coming to the years of discretion, they may renounce their right, and what they owe to the society in which they were born. I say, that, in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen; for, if he is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country. For part one click below.

[**Just a short note about 9/11 and Smart Electric Meeters.** The cost of America's undeclared "war" (invasion) in Afghanistan has now reached \$1 trillion borrowed dollars - massive debt heaped on us all based on what happened on 9/11. Regular readers of my column know I continue to press for the truth about the events of 9/11. Military grade nanothermite is not a conspiracy theory. It was found and tested from the rubble at the twin towers. A new, powerful film has been released: [The Anatomy of a Great Deception](#). For full disclosure I receive no compensation, but I want you to get a copy (or a few) and share it with others or give a copy as a present. I've purchased half a dozen copies and given them to individuals I believe seek the truth. It's very powerful simply because it's one 'ordinary' man's story who ask a simple question that led him to a not so simple journey. There is factual information in this film that many have never heard about but everyone should. Just a suggestion, order more than one and give one to a friend. Also, must see video on the dangers of Smart Meeters on your home, titled: [Take Back Your Power](#).]

© 2016 - NewsWithViews.com and Devvy - All Rights Reserved

Click here to visit [NewsWithViews.com home page](#).

Devyv Kidd authored the booklets, Why A Bankrupt America and Blind Loyalty; 2 million copies

sold. Devvy appears on radio shows all over the country. She left the Republican Party in 1996 and has been an independent voter ever since. Devvy isn't left, right or in the middle; she is a constitutionalist who believes in the supreme law of the land, not some political party. Devvy is a member of the Society of Professional Journalists.

Devvy's regularly posted new columns are on her site at: www.devvy.com. You can also sign up for her free email alerts.

E-mail is: devvyk@npr.net