

## Comparing Opposite Forms of Citizenship

Life is confusing enough, but language makes it even more confusing because of ambiguity and logical inconsistency.

The opposite of life is...? Death.

The opposite of birth is...? Death.

Therefore life = birth?, -and birth = life?

The opposite of an indentured servant (or serf) is a freeman.

The opposite of a slave is a freeman.

Therefore a slave is an indentured servant?

The opposite of a native-born natural citizen is a foreign-born natural citizen. False, they're not opposites.

The opposite of a native-born legal citizen (with immigrant parents) is a native-born natural citizen. False also.

The opposite of a native-born legal citizen is a foreign-born natural citizen. True

The opposite of a native-born natural citizen is a foreign born legal citizen (1 US citizen parent). Almost True

The opposite of a natural citizen is a naturalized citizen. True.

The opposite of a naturalized citizen is a natural citizen. True

The opposite of a domestically-raised citizen is a foreign-raised citizen. True.

The opposite of a foreign-born natural citizen is a foreign-born naturalized citizen? Not fully true.

The opposite of a foreign-born-&-raised natural citizen is a domestically raised naturalized citizen. Almost completely true. Foreign birth location is what they have in common.

The opposite of a domestically born-&-raised legal citizen (with immigrant parents) is a domestically raised natural citizen or naturalized citizen. False. All are raised in America.

The opposite of a domestically-born but foreign-raised legal citizen (with immigrant parents who returned to their homeland) is a foreign-born but American-raised natural citizen. True. Nothing in common but citizenship.

How does a half-American, half-Kenyan United States citizen who was mostly-raised in a quasi-American environment far, far, far out in the middle of the Pacific ocean, in the most socialistic state in the union (with welfare benefits for non-workers totaling the highest of all at about \$60,000 per year) and a history as an independent sovereign nation and people who were crushed by American power, -how does such an individual fit into the picture of being born and raised as an American-loving patriot son of American soil and upbringing? What "American values" were ever inculcated into his psyche when he was raised by socialists and mentored by a Communist, and steeped in reverence for a religion which basically wants all Americans to either surrender or die? (The word "Islam" means submission) You can claim that he is a U.S. citizen. You can claim that he is an American. You can claim that he was born in Hawaii, but you cannot prove any of those things because of the truth about actual legitimate document certification, -the nature of his mind-set, -his upbringing and college indoctrination, and the fine-points of American law and Supreme Court rulings. The "Devil" truly is in the details of his life and background, and he and his ilk do not want those details made public.

Why not? Because Americans have been deluded for a very long time by the belief that the basis of their citizenship is the location of their birth. We've all grown up feeling that we were blessed to have been born in America as American citizens and not in some horrible third world country. But in fact, we are not Americans because we were born in America, but because we were born of Americans. It didn't matter where we were born. It only mattered to whom we were born. If we were born of American parents anywhere in the world, then we were born as Americans, -as natural born citizens of our nation. That is our law and yet it is recognized by very few because of the conceptual delusions that are ingrained in our culture and thinking.

We also think that slavery and indentured servitude are outlawed in the United States, and yet that is equally false. They are still perfectly legal and that fact is made clear as day by the actual words of the 13th Amendment. They are merely restricted to certain conditions, namely as punishment for crimes for which one has been duly convicted. Even that limitation is not applicable to the federal government and its territories, -only the States are limited. How can that be? Simple, sloppy construction of thought and language resulting in misconceptions and/ or ambiguity.

Who is a natural born citizen? A. Any native-born citizen whether a legal citizen or a natural citizen. B. A native-born natural citizen only. C. Any natural citizen.

What does the word "born" relate to? Everyone is "born" but not everyone is born a citizen.

What does the word "natural" relate to? Everyone is "natural" since they are not mechanical, but not everyone is a citizen naturally since some are a citizen by law and not natural inheritance. In addition, all citizens are natural citizens by the American fiction of law known as the doctrine of citizenship equivalency. By it, in the eyes of the government, all citizens are equal because all citizens are natural citizens, including those who have been natural-ized.

So how do you go about excluding those who were made into natural citizens after having been born and possibly raised in a foreign land? You have to require something more than simply saying that any natural citizen can be President (as long as they're male, white, educated, of good moral character, and northern European descent and mature enough, besides being a resident of the United States for 14 years).

You have to require that they be born as a natural citizen and not merely made a natural citizen by a fiction of law.

~ ~ ~ js wrote: you must be enjoying your right to post nonsense, eh?

Your lack of comprehension is not indicative of incomprehensibility, but mere your failure to grasp what has been shared. When something isn't immediately clear to your thinking, you declare a parsing of particulars as nonsense when to others it is as clear as day. It's all due to how the mind works, or doesn't work.

Mario's manner of thinking falsely assumes that because all citizens who fit a certain criteria are natural born citizens, therefore all natural born citizens must fit that criteria as if it is what defines them, when it is NOT what defines them. The co-incidental location of one's birth is not an element of the principle by which a child is born as a natural citizen. It is as unnecessary as requiring that all natural Scandinavians, having been born with blue eyes, are therefore defined as Scandinavians because they have blue eyes and were born in Scandinavia, -as if there are no other Scandinavians who do not have blue eyes.

Mario makes an enormously erroneous assumption defying logic when he claims: "being born within the jurisdiction to citizen parents are necessary and sufficient conditions of being a "natural born citizen."

The lazy and indoctrinated mind reads right through that statement without noticing what should not be included in it, namely: "necessary".

Without the addition of "necessary" the statement would be true because those were *sufficient* conditions, but they were not the *only* conditions because they were not the **fundamental** condition, which was having a father who was an American (as the sole criteria which E. Vattel repeatedly mentioned).