

## CITIZENSHIP BY LIFE, versus CITIZENSHIP BY LAW CITIZEN BY BIRTH & CITIZEN BY DEATH

If someone asks you where you were born, you will tell them what others told you, meaning essentially, your mother because there's no way she doesn't know the correct answer. You also have what the government calls proof in the form of a certified birth certificate, assuming you were not adopted. Most people can assume that they weren't adopted but many can't know for sure because they are an only child, or just one of two or three, and the oldest of them at that. They have to take it on faith because birth certificates will not tell the truth if one is adopted. In fact they will present flat-out lies as being the truth in order to protect the identity of the real mother. So it's evident that the assumed truth is not the same as the actual truth. The same situation applies to the issue of citizenship.

Do you know what your nationality was at birth? You assume that you do because you assume that you were not adopted from a mother who was a foreigner and that you were not born in a foreign nation. But how do you know for sure that you weren't? You have no memory of the event and circumstances of your parentage and birth so you have to just take the facts you were told on faith.

That faith is almost always based on reality, but when it isn't, the person doing the assuming is unaware that it isn't because the story of your origins are one thing but the facts may be something quite different, whether they be related to your parentage or to your nationality.

Everyone knows the probable truth about their natural connection to their actual parents, but few know that that same connection applies to their nationality as well, even though it does, and always has. You are the product of those who gave you life. Your nature and your nationality are what theirs was when you were born. It can't be different by nature, but can be different by law (as an added bonus [from a foreign government] to that which you inherited from them), otherwise it is naturally the same because you are an apple from the same tree, genetically speaking and politically speaking. What you are is what you inherit. You are the output of the ingredients that went into your make-up, including your political make-up, i.e., your nationality. You are a mem-

ber of their country by your life connection to them. You are a citizen of their nation by the national membership you inherited from them. You are a citizen of your nation via your origin, your blood connect to parents who were members of that country and citizens of that nation. So you can be called a citizen by life, or a citizen by nature, or a natural citizen, or, as the Constitution phrases it, "a natural born citizen".

The only other class of citizen is that of the "legal citizen". They are made citizens by the laws of the nation or the policy of the administration that governs it. Legal citizenship is essentially the same as natural citizenship except when it comes to its origin and its permanence. Since it is man-made, it can be altered, -meaning it can be granted and rescinded by law, amendment, judicial opinion, and administrative policy, but citizenship by nature cannot be rescinded except by conduct akin to treason or renunciation, -both of which are by one's own choice, -requiring recognition by the government.

Most people erroneously assume that their nationality is the result of where they were born, -not the result of their inherited political nature, nor the result of law or policy. They assume that it is a tradition that one is a citizen of the nation in which they exit the womb, (unless it's not the parents' nation). But birth location, like the truthfulness of birth certificates, isn't infallible evidence of nor the determinant of one's actual nationality just as a birth certificate is not the determinant of who your parents' actually were.

Appearances may reflect reality, or they may be deceiving. But birth location is only coincidental to the nature of one's national membership, it's not the determinant (unless one's parents were immigrants). The determinant is the membership inherited from one's father and the household into which one was born. All of a father's children inherit his name, and his nationality, along with his status in society. Even his wife takes after him (in the historical and traditional sense) since if she was a foreigner, she no longer was a foreigner as soon as he married her. Then she

took on his nationality, and would be, along with their children, all of one nation; a family united under one roof, with one head, -not two. With one nationality, not two. With one history and political system, not two. With one set of national values, -not two. With allegiance and obligation toward only one nation, society, and government, -not two.

That was the natural political order of things throughout most of human history, until that is, American women obtained the right to vote via the 19th Amendment. Then a whole lot of things had to change, and thus slowly or quickly began to change. Clear and simple historical traditions were set aside and replaced by complexity and some confusion, but gender fairness & equality had become a higher national priority.

Is the place of one's birth the determinant of one's nationality? In the United States, with its colonial history, the answer is yes, and no, and assumedly so. It is yes if one is the child of foreign immigrants. The Supreme Court gave an opinion over a century ago which asserted that the 14th Amendment made it so. But immigrants, and their children, are only a tiny percentage of the population. All of the others are natural citizens and where they are born is immaterial to their nationality because they are Americans by nature, -not by a government gift of citizenship. So the answer for them is "no". Place of birth is irrelevant.

Then there are those rare individuals for whom the answer is "assumedly so" because they are not citizens by the actual meaning of the 14th Amendment, nor by statutory law, nor by nature, but are merely assumed to be citizens by a bastardized administrative policy which was the result of an Attorney General's misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's 14th Amendment opinion.

That policy dates back to the turn of the previous century, so it is universally, though illegitimately, assumed to also be United States law, but in fact it is nothing more than policy. A new and correct interpretation could overturn a century of error over night. No court opinion or Congressional law would be needed.

Those who are merely assumed to be citizens are the ones with unusual parentage. Their parents are neither both Americans nor both immigrants, but something else. It might be that they are an American *and* a non-immigrant alien, -or might be a multiplicity of parental nationalities (born to parents with dual-citizenship) or their parents might be foreigners who were not immigrants nor citizens but merely foreign visitors, students, or foreign government employees. Or, it could also be a variety of combinations.

The policy of the U.S. government (not the law) is that essentially everyone born within the United States is a citizen, but neither the government nor the 14th Amendment have any stated reason why they are citizens. It's merely presumed to be so based on ignorance of history. So the idea that place of birth determines everyone's citizenship is now firmly entrenched in the American psyche, along with the presumption that U.S. citizenship from birth makes one eligible to be President, but an imaginative hypothetical scenario will serve to illustrate why that is not an accurate legal viewpoint.

Imagine a fictional time in U.S. history before the Civil War and the 14th Amendment, when the economy was booming in both manufacturing and agriculture. The States were in competition for workers because there were not enough, and so they sought to increase the immigration of foreign workers, (immigrants) in order to fill the unfilled jobs. To get the better of other states, they began offering incentives to prospective immigrants, beginning with the offer of citizenship for their children. The first state to offer incentives passed a law that decreed that when the foreign-born children of immigrant workers turned 18 years of age, they would be automatically granted United States citizenship without having to complete the state's naturalization process. To compete with that, another state passes a law that lowers the age to 13 years old. To compete with that, another states lowers it even further to 5 years old. In addition, all of them grant automatic citizenship to the children of their foreign workers who are born in-state. They can become citizens at birth.

What do all of those offers have in common? Two things; human law and the calendar, -not place of birth. Without the law there would be no citizenship. Without the calendar, there would be no law because the laws were all based on the calendar. At one extreme, a child received the gift of United States citizenship at 18 years of age, while at the other extreme a child received citizenship at zero years of age, obtaining it on the calendar date synonymous with the first day of life.

Those gifts of citizenship are connected to the calendar, -including the citizenship of the domestically born children whose citizenship was not connected solely and wholly to their place of birth. Place-of-birth as a factor was a consequence of human choice and not a natural factor, just as the Time Factor was a human choice, with the day of one's birth anniversary or delivery selected as the date on which citizenship would begin. That choice is tied to the calendar, -a human contrivance

Natural members of all groups, whether animal, or human, -racial or ethnic, don't become something that's based on either the calendar or the location where birth takes place. They are what they are due to Life and natural inheritance, not irrelevant factors of time and space, or national borders.

Whatever a human is, if it's not the result of natural inheritance, then it's something that's artificially acquired, not natural acquired. Just as man-made fingernails, eyelashes, -man-made teeth, and man-made hair are not natural even though they seem perfectly natural, so also man-made citizenship is not natural either, even though it is practically indistinguishable from natural citizenship. But it can be differentiated by the nature of its origin. One is natural while the other is not, being instead man-made citizenship by legal statute.

The President of the United States is constitutionally required to be one who is born with natural citizenship and not artificial man-made citizenship, including constitutional amendment citizenship. The President's citizenship must be acquired via life, not law, via parents not permission, -via natural inheritance, not human contriv-

ance, via birth, -not borders, and his place of birth is not a factor with any connection to life or nature.

Another scenario that illustrates the fallacy of connecting place-of-birth citizenship with presidential eligibility involves not citizenship-by-life, but citizenship-by-death.

Suppose that one of the competing states had a dangerous occupation with fairly high fatalities, and they wanted to encourage immigrants to settle in the state and work in that occupation, but prospective immigrants were concerned about dying and leaving their family bereft, -without the benefits and assistance reserved for citizens.

To allay their fears, the state might pass a law that would make the immigrant a U.S. citizen upon death, which would automatically naturalize all his foreign-born children, thereby providing them derivative citizenship through him. They then would be cared for properly.

Of course the father's death had to occur within state borders or citizenship would not be conveyed to his children. Death was the factor that triggered the gift of citizenship to them. Time was the factor that determined when they acquired it. So time & place were critical, but neither of those two factors have anything to do with what's natural since calendars and man-made borders are man-made factors, -legal factors, and not natural factors.

Citizenship by death within state borders is just as unnatural as citizenship by birth within national borders. Both are legal citizenship and do not in any way fall within the category of natural citizenship. And to describe both accurately one has to phrase them as "citizenship *at* death, and citizenship *at* birth", -not *by* birth. Only natural citizens are citizens *by* birth because it is only conveyed by those to whom one is born.

The President must be born as a natural citizen, not a legal citizen, -not a constitutional citizen, -a statutory citizen, nor a provisional citizen. Barack Obama was not born as any of those and therefore is not constitutionally qualified to be the President of the United States.