

Citizenship: by Destiny or by Destiny Event

About 99% of Americans go about their lives without a thought as to how or why they were born being Americans because they assume that there is no question that their nationality was determined by where they were born. And yet that 99% is wrong.

Not being lawyers, that is understandable. The problem is that lawyers and judges and government officials are also among the 99% and don't understand the truth of the matter. That is understandable because it is not a matter of legal determination but of natural determination.

They all are believers in a falsehood enacted as the policy of the nation back in 1898 by the U.S. Attorney General when he mistakenly or deliberately expanded in a major way a ruling of the Supreme Court (U.S. v Wong Kim Ark). That expansion took root big time but it applied to essentially no one at the time because in that era there was no such thing as a flood of illegal aliens entering our country.

Also, there was no such thing as airplanes that could fly pregnant foreign women into the U.S. so they could secure American citizenship for a baby that would then be brought to the mother's homeland and raised there as a citizen of her country but with an American birth certificate which could be mistakenly assumed to be proof of United States citizenship when that assumption is totally false and even asinine.

It's asinine because it's assumed to be based on the 14th Amendment, or on the Supreme Court's interpretation of its citizenship clause, but in fact it is based on neither. It's actually based on nothing but sheer ignorance resulting from a lack of understanding of the principles involved in determining citizenship.

There are only two principles involved in determining citizenship and they are: a natural principle, and a legal policy made law. By the first you are what your parents are, -what your political inheritance makes you. By the other you are what your parents are not, but what the law makes you.

By the first your destiny is determined by your parentage. By the second it's determined by an event contingent on the existence of certain factors simulta-

neous to the event. By the first the law of natural membership is in effect, -while by the second the mandate and machination of human law is in effect.

By the first your nationality is determined by blood connection while by the second it is determined by your birth location being what I'll call THE DESTINY EVENT of your life.

By the first you would be an American by birth, but by the second you would merely be an American *from* birth. The difference is not only significant but is also enormous (although that fact is unknown to the legal community since it is only aware of citizenship by the false presumption created back in 1898 which evolved into a national institutionalized error).

The factor that distinguishes which group one was born into is their parentage. Those who are born of Americans are Americans by birth, but those who are born of foreigners are U.S. citizens *from* birth by constitutional amendment, -*not* by birth.

Their citizenship is wholly dependent on the destiny event occurring within United States borders, -along with their parents' relationship to the United States government. If their relationship to the American government is non-existent, or does not involve full subjection, then their child is not a U.S. citizen per the 14th Amendment because it requires more than mere birth on U.S. soil. The error from 1898 is that it requires nothing else.

In fact it requires full subjection to the authority of the national government (which is no longer understood), but people who are present in the United States illegally are not subject to the American government or else they would be facing and experiencing deportation. Neither are people who are merely temporary guests who've come to visit or conduct business.

They are subject to their own homeland and not American sovereignty because the American government does not exercise sovereignty over members of foreign nations even when they are within U.S. borders, -unless they are not guests but permanent resident members of American society in possession of a United States government issued Green Card or are the minor child of such parents.

The stark difference in the children of Americans and the children of foreigners is in their origin and the influence it has on their nationality; -not in the nature of their nationality but in the classification of its source. That classification is irrelevant to almost every American alive, but is enormously relevant to a handful who intend to seek the office of the President of the United States. Then it makes all the difference in the world.

At least it is constitutionally required that it must, but we are living in a constitutionally apostate age, and people ignore it without a second thought, -adrift without any constant anchor or bedrock foundation of inviolable law. In other words, the Constitution's requirement that the America President be no one "except a natural born citizen" is ignored and rejected like it doesn't even exist, -by Leftist political hacks and legal scholars alike. That is made quite easy to do since few understand what it means. But *you* can understand it very easily by looking under the hood, so to speak, and dissecting the facts of the matter to reveal the truth of the matter. So let the dissection begin.

Citizenship by Destiny Event

Every creature and person that ever lived was born being what it was because it was formed by a life process that repeats the nature of the parents, -and the parents are always of the same nature although not always of the same appearance. A white sheep may mate with a black sheep and a poodle with a cocker spaniel, but turkeys don't mate with ducks and dogs don't mate with cats, -so some lines are not crossed and can never produce off-spring.

Off-spring are a repeat of the parents though their parents may be of a different "strain" or race or breed or nationality. Crossing of different strains produces hybrids that are different from their parents and are not natural members of their groups, including their national groups, resulting in unnatural dual citizenship.

But let's examine the pure-blood off-spring because they reveal the stark truth about the most fundamental differences in citizenship origin.

From conception, the destiny of every nascent being is pre-determined as far as what its nature will be. That nature is not alterable. No event can change it. It

will be born being what it was pre-destined to be from conception. That is true biologically but is also true politically.

We all know about the concept and reality of biological DNA but are unfamiliar with the concept of political DNA which is its counterpart in every way. Our family DNA is more than merely biological because that which is biological is accompanied by that which is culturally primal. The national identity designation of what we are is determined on a primal level that underlies all government law, being from the realm of NATURE, -the realm of Natural Law (-the source of UNALIENABLE RIGHTS).

Two of those rights are the right of BELONGING and the right of OWNERSHIP. No one has a right to own someone else's child, and every child has a right to belong to its own mother (and father). That is because of a biological bond and a psychological bond, in addition to a familial bond felt by the close kin of the mother. It's all tied to a blood connection and the bond that it creates.

That bond does not end at the family level. The child has another right, another right of belonging, and that is the right to belong to the clan, -the tribe, and the country of its origin, -of its parents. It has a natural right of membership in the group into which it was born, -having been born as a new member. That is because of its political DNA inherited from its parents via its blood connection.

It is *organic* membership in a country, and that membership is acknowledged by government when a country becomes organized into a nation which *has* a government. That recognition may not be in the form of a written law and yet nevertheless exists as a fundamental assumption of the society that formed a nation, such as is the case in the United States of America.

If the government is a monarch or a dictatorship, then the member is a subject. If the government is a free republic owned and operated by its members, then the members are known as CITIZENS.

When the members have children, they are born as members also, and that membership in their parents' country is recognized by the government of the country as natural citizenship. It is natural because it is the result of a natural connection and not a result of a

legal action or event or policy or statute or constitutional amendment or court opinion.

None of those avenues of legal citizenship are involved because the parents are not foreigners who require the permission of the government to be considered *not* outsiders but insiders. Those who require permission to be considered as *members* and fellow citizens are those who are of another country and another nation.

Neither they nor any child born to them within the borders of the United States have a natural right to be viewed as insiders because they have a foreign blood connection to another society and nation. But being considerate of their wish to be Americans, they are granted the privilege of American membership by our naturalization laws so that they can make America their new home and that of their children.

If they are only immigrants and not citizens, their children, who are born within U.S. borders, do not have a blood connection to America because the blood connection they have is to their parents' foreign homeland, but they do have a constitutional right to be Americans and that is just as good as a blood connection, although it is not the same thing. Rather, it is a dependent right, -whereas a blood connection is not dependent on anything, -including any law since it is not of the legal realm but of the natural realm.

Natives give birth to natives. Outsiders give birth to outsiders even if they are born on the natives' land, -unless the outsiders are there to stay and live as members of the natives' country. Then the natives have a means by which their children will be born as natives also, -not as natural natives but as legal natives; -as insiders also but not as natural insiders, -rather, as legal insiders who are in effect outsider insiders or alien natives since they are also natural members of their parents' foreign land through the inheritance of their nationality. *

Such is the duality of dual citizenship. The founders of our nation despised the idea of dual citizenship, viewing it as a form of bigamy but that was when the whole of the rest of the world was ruled by Kings and Emperors and Czars and Sultans, etc. One could not possibly be loyal to America and her values and also loyal to a foreign despot.

Independent Citizenship vs. Dependent Citizenship

The natural members of a country are the natural citizens of the nation that they form. Their membership pre-dates the existence of the nation and its laws, -as such, it is independent of those laws because they came first, -like the hen that produces the egg of government. Their independent natural citizenship does not need the permission of the government anymore than the hen needs the permission of the egg for it to be its maker.

Being natural members of their country, their citizenship in their nation is independent of and supercedes the authority of government since that authority is only extended to foreigners, outsiders, and their children. Their citizenship is like the water on which the ship of state is suspended. Without them there is no government, no country and no nation because the number of outsiders within their midst is infinitesimal in comparison to their numbers.

Legal citizenship via a *dependent* right is not the same as natural citizenship via a natural right. Instead it is dependent on meeting the requirements that the right demands. The right is only in effect if the requirements are met, otherwise everyone on Earth could be an American citizen. The most obvious requirement is the location of one's birth. Another element is a factor in that event and it is the element of TIME.

The 14th Amendment citizenship clause requires the event of birth to take place on U.S. soil. That event takes place in Time, in minutes, and then stops and is over. The child is then in the world and no longer in the womb. The event of its transition from the womb to the world is a destiny event because that brief fleeting event absolutely must occur within U.S. borders or no citizenship is conferred.

If you change the location of that event to outside of U.S. borders, (whether two feet or twelve thousand miles) no citizenship is conferred.

If you could erase those minutes of TIME during which the transfer from the womb to the world occurs then no citizenship is conferred because it is completely dependent on that brief moment having happened.

Without it you have nothing more than a child of unknown geographical origin but not unknown parentage. Without them you have only a child who is a citizen of its own parents' nation and not of the United States. It all hinges on the known existence of the destiny event, -of it having occurred as required and where required. Without it occurring as required, or with it occurring without it being known by unrelated credible witnesses then U.S. citizenship is not conferred.

No foreign mother will enter an American Consulate or U.S. State Department or CIS building and claim that her baby was born on American soil but she returned home without any documentation of that fact, yet she demands that her child to be recognized as an American anyway. Being born within U.S. borders is not enough if there are no acceptable witnesses. All of the several factors must be present before citizenship is conferred via the 14th Amendment, and they are:

- The adoption of the 14th Amendment by 3/4^{ths} of the States.
- Birth taking place within American jurisdiction.
- The parents being legally sanctioned immigrants fully subject to federal jurisdiction.
- The birth being witnessed by credible unrelated adults.

And there is one more that no one has ever considered but which just came to mind, and it is the means of exit from the womb. The word "born" has always meant one thing and one thing only. It means natural vaginal birth. It has never meant surgical extraction. That would imply that Caesarian section would not technically qualify as fitting the requirement of the 14th Amendment.

Would that make sense? Well, would it make sense if hundreds or thousands of foreign women were allowed to fly into the U.S. with a one or two week Visa while being eight months pregnant, who then all had Caesarian section deliveries in order for their unborn to enter the world within American borders? Would that be considered what the authors of the amendment had in mind when they used the word "born"? Clearly not.

That kind of manipulation is illustrative of the manipulative nature of citizenship by U.S. law based on

native-birth. It is utterly unrelated to anything natural. Natural citizenship is not dependent on circumstances while that which is not natural it totally dependent on circumstances because there is no blood connection providing citizenship by predetermination.

The children of Americans are predetermined from conception to also be Americans, while the children of foreigners have no right to American citizenship unless they meet all of the requirements of the law. If they do, then by *legal* right they are Americans, but not by natural right.

If the place of their birth, the moment of their birth, the witnesses to their birth, and the means of their birth are unacceptable or missing, then their legal right of citizenship does not exist. None of those things negates natural citizenship since children of Americans are Americans just like their mother and father regardless of where or how they are born.

There is a name for such nationality determination, and it is "Jus Sanguinis", meaning "by right of blood" and it is older than the Latin of the Roman Empire with which it is labeled. It is group membership by natural connection rather than by legal permission. It is membership, subject-ship, or citizenship by predestination rather than by the right of Kings and their royal prerogative of human ownership (which ties one's off-spring to the owner of the land on which they were born), or by the magnanimous gift of the natural members of a nation of free people.

Such membership is no more natural than a perverse rule that if a strange woman were to give birth under your roof, -in your parents' bed, then her child would be your brother or sister. Would such a rule make such a child your natural sibling or merely your legal sibling?

I think the answer is now obvious. Citizenship by predestination is quite different in its source from citizenship by legal allowance. One is without dependencies while the other is totally contingent on meeting legal requirements because of a lack of a blood connection, -not having an American "pedigree" as part of one's political DNA.

Many folks misapply an important word and concept regarding citizenship and that word is

“birthright”. They think that if you have “birthright citizenship” then you are eligible to be President. That is true but their idea of what it means is false. In their thinking, LAW is the only thing they are aware of, and so it is supreme and viewed as universally determinant of fundamental things including citizenship via a native-birth location.

They erroneously refer to the legal right of citizenship based on the allowance of the 14th Amendment as “birthright citizenship” when it is quite the opposite. A birthright is only a right that one is born with via a blood connection.

The first born of the British royal family possesses a birthright that none other has, -that being the right to be monarch. The right of the firstborn of those with significant wealth (primogeniture) is the only source of the term “birthright” or “right of birth”, and by it the firstborn carries on the family “corporation” via its name, its estate, its standing, its heritage and its titles. The right descends by blood, not by being born on the estate of the landowner.

So if anyone talks about native-birth jus soli citizenship (by right of soil) being a birthright, then you need to disabuse them of their misconception. The only historical right involved in jus soli is the right of the soil owner to claim as his property all life born on it.

I read recently about an English ancestor of Trisha Yearwood who was sentenced to death for “poaching” a deer in the King’s forest. [-he was reprieved via a sentence of servitude in the American colonies] That illustrates how all life was the King’s life if born on his property, including human life.

That *is* a “right” of sorts, -a *property* right, but not a birthright. Actual birthright citizenship is via the DNA of a blood connection, -via political predestination. If a child of Americans is born without any acceptable witnesses, it doesn’t matter because both paternity and maternity can be proven via a blood test, and that connection is all that matters, -not birth location.

Whereas hybrid citizens, including Barack Obama, are not born with natural birthright citizenship and are thus constitutionally ineligible to serve as the President of the United States since they are not “a natural born citizen” as it requires.

For everyone else, the importance of the difference between legal citizenship and natural citizenship is essentially non-existent. Hardly any reference to it can be found in American history except in regard to the office of the President and Commander-in-Chief. But none of those references are from a Supreme Court holding, so consequently the error and misconception continues, -as it did even in the face of the election of an unconstitutional President, -twice no less!

by Adrien Nash Sept. 2013
<http://obama--nation.com>

* To be a member of a native group, including a nation, one first must be a member of the native country that forms the nation, just as to be a natural member of a clan one must first be a member of a family that is a part of the clan. For most nations on Earth, that is a fairly simple and straight forward thing because none of the nations in the world today are a part of an empire.

The only major vestige of empire left in the world is the British Commonwealth of Nations. But most individual nations are single unitary entities, -excluding island nations which may be composed of many islands, such as Indonesia with its 18,000 islands, but most are unitary continental landmasses with the exception of the United States. It’s an unnatural nation because it has the far, far away lands of Hawaii and Alaska as part of it.

When one speaks of natives, the United States is a terrible example to use even if speaking strictly of the contiguous states, because Hawaii and Alaska have their own native populations, as did the contiguous American landmass when Europeans first arrived and created a new endemic native class of predominantly English settlers, -not forgetting to mention the indigenous Spanish-American population of the South-West who had been there for a several centuries.