

## The Origins of U.S. Citizenship:

*~What the Supreme Court Should Know But Doesn't*

Maybe in an unforeseeable future the U.S. Supreme Court will accept for adjudication a case requiring establishing the meaning of the phrase "natural born citizen" as found in the presidential eligibility clause of the U.S. Constitution. If that ever happens, the outcome may prove to be completely wrong if the following facts are not presented and accepted. A true and correct presentation should go something like this:

Your honors,

The question before us is "who is a natural born citizen and who is not?" For answering that question allow me to pose a question to you:

What is the legal basis of your authority to find someone in contempt and violate their constitutional rights by throwing them in jail for an unlimited period of time without trial or conviction of anything? By what law do judges possess such authority?

Answer: by no law whatsoever. So then what is the source of such authority if not law? It is a source more ancient and fundamental than any law ever written because it is a necessary element of the nature of all societies, -even the barbaric, and that element is the need for respect.

No family or society or nation can exist in a state of order without respect. It's influence must be present or chaos and anarchy result.

It began with respect for fathers, and alpha males, -extending to respect for leaders of clans and tribes and eventually kings and high priests. Respect for leadership was and is the glue that holds groups together. It binds the elements of the foundation to each other. But there is an even more fundamental element that glues groups together, and that is "blood".

**Blood connection** is the largest and most central block in the foundations of all natural groups, -from families, flocks, herds, prides, tribes, -all the way up to nations. Nations are structures built atop of countries which are their foundation.

Countries pre-date all nations and are more organic than structural and it's because their composition is essentially the land of a group and the people of the group, including their leadership.

But nations are something else. They are composed of the country and the government legal structure built atop of it, -which is the floor of the nation.

The government and its laws are not organic or natural. They are man-made and changeable, but countries only change by war, and great natural cataclysm.

Nations include in their floor of law a means by which outsiders may be allowed to become members of the country and thus be recognized as citizens of the nation. To become members of a country, outsiders must first be given permission to dwell within it. Nations give that permission in the form of granting permanent residence. With that grant, the outsiders are not compelled to leave the country by a certain date, but instead are allowed to stay indefinitely.

After they have stayed for several years and been law-abiding members of the society, they are allowed to petition to become more than just members of the society and country but also citizens of the nation.

If they fulfill the requirements for citizenship, they then become a part of the floor of the nation via its naturalization law. But if they become a citizen of the United States in particular, while they were once perceived as being a plank in the floor of the nation, in fact they became more than that.

Planks can be removed and tossed out, but the foundation stones cannot. In America new citizens

do not become planks in the floor but stones in the foundation. They cannot be removed and tossed out because they are equal in all regards to the natural members of the country who are the natural citizens of the nation.

They are not equal like fraternal twins are equal, -the same but separate and distinct. Rather, they are indistinguishable in every way because they are identical in essence. They are one and the same as the natives of the country by the American doctrine of *Citizenship Equality*.

By it all citizens are of the same nature. That nature is not a legal nature but a natural nature. All natural citizens are organic members via blood connection. That is what makes them all citizens by nature.

How can foreigners become natural citizens? By natural-ization. They are made natural, -or natural-ized; *-not* citizen-ized.

By our widely unknown fundamental American Natural Rights philosophy, they are not made into a member of a second class of citizens but are adopted into the only class of citizens existing, -which is the natural class. And then the fact of their adoption is essentially buried and banished from thought and recognition. They are accepted as new members of the national family as though they were and are such from-&-by birth.

That view of them is a pretense of **egalitarian democracy**. [egalitarian; e·gal·i·tar·i·an, adjective:

1. of, relating to, or believing in the principle that **all people are equal** and deserve equal rights and opportunities. ~ "a fairer, more egalitarian society"

Egalitarian democracy embraces, practices and follows a blind-folded view of the nature of all Americans. By its fiction of law all Americans are not just brothers by name, or by adoption, but by blood. They are blood brothers and blood citizens.

In a civic-political sense they are all identical twins or clones. Those who were born as foreigners via birth to foreigners have been separated from that past and that fact and have become new natural citizens like their native brethren.

That legal fiction is what protects their equality and equal treatment under the law. By it there is only one form of citizenship [natural citizenship] and only one form of American, not two.

If there were two, then one of them (the original, native, citizen-born members of the nation) would be seen as having greater natural rights than those made into citizens though having been born of alien outsiders or even born *as* aliens.

Not all nations embrace our American fiction of law, including at one time the former United States of America.

Do you understand what has just been explained to you (excluding the last sentence)? Is it not fairly simple to comprehend? Could a child not understand it? A simple, fair, innocent mind can understand it, but self-important, elite, privileged, top-of-the-pyramid wealthy & powerful alpha-males in government were incapable of understanding it in America for nearly a century of Congressional law-making, executive branch administering, and judicial branch adjudicating.

They had no idea of the truth that has just been explained. They thought that (-like other nations) America was not so egalitarian in its fundamental philosophy and that they had the power and authority to treat naturalized citizens differently, -as though they were merely planks of the floor of national law and not stones of the foundation. They thought that naturalized citizens were second-class citizens created by law-makers and thus still subject to their whims and preferences. They thought wrong.

They felt that just as they had the power to give citizenship, they also had the power to take it away.

They failed to grasp the fact that America does not create new naturalized citizens. It only creates new *natural* citizens and they are all stones in the foundation of the nation. They are considered Americans by nature, and not by mere permission.

But eventually they were put in their place by the Supreme Court. It only took four generations of bastardized laws, regulations, and court opinions before fundamental American values were finally acknowledged and given preeminence over the matter.

How did that come about? By striking down the basis of the so-called Bancroft treaties which allowed the governments of treaty nations to strike the citizenship from their naturalized citizens if they returned to their homeland and lived there again for two full years.

Other nations had that authority but the high-and-mighty leaders of the United States did *not* possess that authority because of the American doctrine of **CITIZENSHIP EQUALITY**.

By it, naturalized citizens were natural citizens, -citizens by blood, by birth, and were not in a second-class category that gave the government the power to treat them differently and discriminate against them.

That discrimination was manifested when a naturalized citizen sued the United States government for discrimination when his or her citizenship was revoked for living abroad when no such authority existed for doing the same to those born as Americans. Only in the face of that discrimination did the doctrine of citizenship equality once again come to light.

I'm not sure but I suspect that the court's members may have viewed the situation in a different light, -in the light of the equal treatment guaranteed by the 14th Amendment. In other words, they looked at it as they look at almost everything, -in a legal light. I doubt they even got past the legal justification for overturn-

ing discrimination and looked at the underlying reason why that ban on discrimination exists, (-the fundamental reason that is not a part of the floor of the nation but is a part of its very foundation).

That foundation is built of Natural Rights and natural members. The first tenant of Natural Rights governing a nation is and must be based on the belief that all men are created equal, with no superior and inferior classes.

A confusion exists because of conceptual ambiguity surrounding the nature of citizenship and citizenship terms. The one regarding the nature of American citizenship has been cleared up, but there remains another one which normally would be irrelevant, or, as in dictatorships, non-existent since they do not have an office of a freely elected President who commands all military forces.

In America it has always been non-existent as an issue because no President in U.S. History (until Obama) was someone who ran for office as the son of an alien and thus the subject of a foreign power.

Those who are ignorant of the truth and cling to the faith that Barack Obama is a legitimate President do so on the false basis that all "born citizens" are natural citizens, -embracing the fiction that citizenship-from-birth is all that is required to fit their false definition of what a natural citizen is. But they are ignorantly playing with ambiguous words.

A perfect analogy is the word "**twins**". When we hear the word we immediately have a concept of what it implies. If we hold fast to that concept then we are holding fast to a delusion because, like "born citizen", it is also ambiguous since there is more to it than a single simplistic definition. There are in fact *two* completely different forms of both twins and born citizens. What is the difference? **ORIGIN!**

**Identical** twins have the same origin, -one single fertilized egg, but *fraternal* twins are the result of two

fertilized eggs. They have different origins. It's the same with born citizens. One type is born of an American egg, -having American parents, while the other is born of an alien egg, -having one or two foreign parents, and only becomes American by the allowance of American law.

Two Americans who were born of Americans are American identical citizen twins, but one born of aliens is only a fraternal twin in a real-world sense. But all are considered to be identical citizen twins except in regard to the power of the Commander-in-Chief.

Only in regard to the issue of who is given Chief Command of the American military is the hair split and a distinction drawn between fictional "identical" U.S. citizen twins and actual ones.

Then the ambiguity of "born citizen" must be parsed because the United States Constitution requires that it be parsed since its authors stepped outside of the fundamental legal fiction of equal citizenship to delineate a real-world difference based on ORIGIN.

They went "there", -outside of the legal system that they were constructing and they had to do so because of the fundamental fiction that was an inherent part of it. They had to make it clear that the legal fiction did not reach all of the way into the post of ultimate power over all military forces which the President, as Commander-in-Chief, would occupy.

So to make that point unmistakably clear, they had to employ language which would have no other application in American life. They had to resort to language dealing with blood inheritance, patrilineal descent, hereditary birthright, natural transmission, and unalienable rights and thereby shove egalitarianism aside regarding one single matter for the sake of national security and possibly national survival.

They had to restrict the office to only those who were of the class of Americans who were the citizen equivalent of identical twins and reject all who were only native-born fraternal twins, -or not twins at all (the naturalized, -born as foreigners). The origin of the citizenship of candidates for President was singled out as either qualifying or disqualifying. That was not the case for any other office in the nation. Only for the presidency.

Article II, Section I, U.S. Constitution:

"NO PERSON (meaning no born citizen) SHALL... BE... ELIGIBLE... to the office of the President, *-except... a natural born citizen;*"

The U.S. President must be an American citizen not only *from* birth but *by* birth, ...by birth to Americans.