

Fiction or Natural Law

Nobody asked but ...

We are seeing the term “birthright citizenship” bruited about these days (Surprise! During election season ...).

Politicians have discovered that you can send up a trial balloon on any topic, absurd or mundane.

But more on the case at hand, POTUS claims that he can suspend “birthright citizenship” by Executive Order. Just for the sake of argument, I suppose he can. Such an order would be a fiction, and a fiction applied to a fiction. The only thing that government can do is apply fictions to fictions.

The word “citizenship” is a fiction, since all territories are fictions. The word “birthright” is a concrete noun describing a natural occurrence, and note, dear reader, that the terms in the first clause of this sentence are synonymic to “fact.”

A fiction can be addressed by an executive order or any other instrument of fiction. Things that are natural, however, cannot be altered by fiction — that would be a lie.

The phrase “birthright citizenship” attempts to establish natural law by fictional declaration. As such, the entire phrase is a fiction. This is a simple calculus, adding a fiction makes all resulting phrases fictional. Only when it stands alone or with only other facts, can a fact survive as such.

Politicians and states cannot declare, and thus make, facts. A right is the natural outcome of natural law. A “birthright” is a redundant recognition of a “right.” A right is an abstraction, but also a fact.

Freedom is the absence of fictional constraints on natural conditions.

POTUS can refictionalize a fiction, but he cannot factualize a fact or a fiction. If a birthright exists, naturally, it does not need a declaration of legitimacy. If it doesn't exist, it cannot be substantiated by any sleight of word, deed, or hand.

— Kilgore Forelle