Forward

There has been a long-term debate on the term “citizen of the United States”. The purpose of this article is to explore the types of citizenship present in the union called The United States of America. When you read the contents herein, undoubtedly you will see the term citizen is used in a vague manner. It is ventured that there is a specified purpose for this measure.¹

American Citizen

To get an understanding of this infamous term in question, citizen of the United States, we should first ascertain what a “citizen” is considered in affiliation with American law. In regard to this, look at the common definition from the online encyclopedia, Wikipedia:

- **Citizenship.** Citizenship is membership in a political community (originally a city but now usually a state), and carries with it rights to political participation; a person having such membership is a citizen.

To further illustrate what the term “citizen” represents in the scheme of American law, look at the following definition that was of the period prior to the so-called Civil War:

- **Persons.** This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, &c. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. Persons are also divided into citizens (q.v.), and aliens (q.v.), when viewed with regard to their political rights. —Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856

Hence, a man — or woman — is considered a human being, however they are not considered a person unless they are a member of a society, e.g., a body politic or nation. Accordingly, the term person then takes on many different meanings. In American law, and generally, the term citizen relates to a “person” with political rights. An alien² lacks political rights.³ A person is

¹ In the Law of Nations by Emer de Vattel, Vattel set-up that a man was a citizen of a country. As a rule, a citizen is subject to the laws of a municipality. What the premise of Vattel did is set-up he legal fiction that people are citizens of a country instead of being members of a nation (i.e., nationals) of any such country; this making them subject to “the State” and all of its laws under presumption. See the article, Citizen as a Legal Fiction, found at: www.pacinlaw.us/citizen

² Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(3). Definitions. As used in this chapter – [chapter 12 of Title 8]. The term “alien” means any person not a citizen or national of the United States.

³ ALIEN. Owing political allegiance to another country or government; foreign. alien residents. An unnaturalized foreign resident of a country; also called noncitizen. —American Heritage Dictionary
a member of a society. 4 A man or woman that is a member of the nation has a nationality. 5 If one is not a person, he or she is deemed to be stateless, hence has no protections or rights under a state or government. Furthermore, a person that is a citizen is also deemed a subject. 6

He is subject to the general laws of any particular municipality which he is a citizen of. In other words, as recognized under the American system of law, a man really would not be considered a “citizen” until the office (a societal rank) is engaged within a political sphere. When engaged he becomes a subject, i.e., subject to the laws of the state or local government. (see footnote 1)

Thus, it is important to grasp that person and citizen are not used interchangeably; hence one could infer that a man or woman may be part of a society without having the citizen status attached to him or herself at all times. In more likelihood, the subject (or a nationality) status would allow one to have privileges and immunities under a constitution, not his citizenship. In application of such premise, examine these two definitions that may define a non-citizen:

- **PERSONS.** Persons are sometimes divided into free persons and slaves.

  Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. —Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856

- **FREEMAN.** One who is in the enjoyment of the right to do whatever he pleases, not forbidden by law. —Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856

Note that the term “citizen”, used in describing a “freeman”, was not employed in the above definitions; however note the term “person” was employed. To add, observe a freeman can do whatever he pleases that is not forbidden by the law. A broad proclamation, as it is noting the Civil Law. The original societal law – or more accurately —the law that governed societies in America – was noted as the Common Law. This is understood to mean customs and usages of a particular society. In American law, a society may be broken down into the different counties or republics 7 of the federal republic. 8 We will go into these matters in more detail later.

---

4 **SOCIETY.** A society is a number of persons united together by mutual consent, in order to deliberate, determine, and act jointly for some common purpose. 2. Societies are either incorporated and known to the law, or unincorporated, of which the law does not generally take notice. 3. By civil society is usually understood a state, (q.v.) a nation, (q.v.) or a body politic. —Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856

5 **NATIONALITY.** The state of a person in relation to the nation in which he was born. A man retains his nationality of origin during his minority, but, as in the case of his domicil of origin, he may change his nationality upon attaining full age; he cannot, however, renounce his allegiance without permission of the government. —Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856

6 **SUBJECT.** A citizen. Ballentine's Law Dictionary. Also see this from the 14th state that was of the Union: Vermont: “Every person, of good character, who comes to settle in this State, having first taken an oath or affirmation of allegiance to the same, may purchase, or by other just means acquire, hold and transfer land, or other real estate; and after one year's residence, shall be deemed a free denizen thereof, and entitled to all rights of a natural born subject of this State…” —Vermont constitution, section 39

7 **REPUBLIC.** A commonwealth; form of government in which the administration of affairs is open to all the citizens. In another sense, it signifies the state, independently of its form of government. —Black's Law, Sixth Edition

8 **NATIONS IN CONFEDERATION.** Emer de Vattel noted that every nation that governs itself, under what form so-ever, without dependence on any foreign power, is a sovereign state, its rights are naturally the same as those of any other state. Such are the moral persons who live together in a natural society, subject to the law of nations. To give a nation a right to make an immediate figure in this grand society, it is sufficient that it be really sovereign and independent, that is, that it govern itself by its own authority and laws. Vattel, Book I, Chapter I § 4. The Law of Nations recognizes that several sovereign and independent states may unite themselves together by a perpetual confederacy, without ceasing to be, each individually, a perfect state. They will together constitute a federal republic: their joint deliberations
**IN SUMMARY:** In sense, a national is a member of a nation and the state or government is to afford such national protection in relation to international law; and the term citizen applies to inherent political right of a person who belongs to a specific nation. Such right is applied in degrees depending on the participation of such person in a particular political sphere.

**CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES**

Now, to clear up some misguided theories on the term “citizen of the United States”.10

As it is used in the Constitution for the United States, the term “citizen of the United States” is not accurately defined. However as the term appears in the original Constitution several times it may be defined by its contextual use. If one looks at the term as it is used in the body of the original Constitution, he would note that it refers to a person that was not natural born in one of the several states that make-up the Union.11 That means the term citizen of the United States is someone who was naturalized to be a citizen by process of law. This principle can be further referenced in the naturalization acts enacted in the early 1800’s. Here is sample language:

- “Be it enacted, &c, That any alien, being a free white person, may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States, or any of them…” 12

Note the authority states: “may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States, or ANY OF THEM…” By using that specific language in the act, it appears that a federal citizenship or “citizen of the United States” status is “desired” to be existent by Federalists. But it is clear the states (the several states) each had a separate and distinct citizenship. Another thing noted is that only white (Protestant)55 people were allowed to be members of the United States. 

To further assist us in deciphering the term in question, Justice Marshall of the United States Supreme Court had established this about the existence of the United States:

- “The United States of America are a corporation endowed with the capacity to sue and be sued, to convey and receive property.” —From Marshall’s commentaries

One may say that was bad grammar; however, what Justice Marshall was simply stating is that the corporation of the [U]nited States exists due to the incorporators: the several states. The incorporator principle can also be seen in the ‘new’ Thirteenth Amendment.14 It fundamentally states that the United States is the corporate entity of the several American states by using the word “their”, i.e., any place subject to their jurisdiction. What these things establish is that the

---

9 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), December 10, 1948, Article 15. Everyone has the right to a nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality. [This is agreed to by the United States under treaty.]

10 See the article, The term Citizen of the United States, found at: www.pacinlaw.us/game

11 Constitution Article II, Section 1: “No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States...”

12 An act to establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and to repeal the acts heretofore passed on that subject. Approved April 14, 1802. Section 1.

13 Federal Citizenship. Rights and obligations accruing by reason of being a citizen of the United States. State or status of being a citizen of the United States. A person born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof is a citizen of the United States and of the State wherein he resides. Fourteenth Amendment, United States Constitution. —Black’s Law Deluxe, sixth edition

14 Amendment XIII - Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. [note: the de facto United States refers to itself as IT in most acts of law.]
United States was always considered a corporation and the *incorporators* were all the states (or their *governments*) in the Union.\(^{15}\) The style or name of the corporation — which is *The United States of America* — was created under the Articles of Confederation.\(^{16}\) This *name* was carried on through to the Constitution *for* the United States of America after its adoption.

Accordingly, unknown to most people the United States of America *is not* a nation nor is it a country.\(^{17}\) This corporate *entity* is only *loosely* referred to as such things. The United States, when referenced in the *collective* sense, is a *confederation* of countries and/or nations.\(^{18}\)

To further explore the term “citizen of the United States”, in the California case that is known as Ex Parte-Frank Knowles —(*California Supreme Court, July term 1855*) — the court stated that there was no such thing as a “citizen of the United States” in relation to a state. There were only state citizens; such citizens being *separate* political members of the *several* states in the Union. However, another issue that was not covered in that instant case was: if a person that, in example, was a governor of one of the *Territories* of the United States (*i.e.*, territories or lands that were either acquired by purchase or conquest by the United States), what exact *status* or *citizenship* did such *person* have. Furthermore, what was the status of others who lived in these territories or lands? Would they all be considered to be a *citizens of the United States*? This is just one *conflict* that is caused by the *federation* under the United States Constitution. There are several more that existed prior to the *Fourteenth Amendment* governmental system.

As explored earlier, when one was *naturalized* he became a *citizen of the United States*, or a *citizen of one of the several states*. Again, it appears the *citizen of the United States* status was presumed under the original constitutional system, *or* at least attempting to be established.

And, in a final note — there have been several myths that the capital ‘C’ as used in the original Constitution *for* the United States has some specific meaning. This is a myth that has little or no merit.\(^{19}\) However, there is a legal premise behind the myth.\(^{20}\) The issues are purely that of *common law* and *politically based* principles (*that were noted herein*). Such issues are more involved than most people understand and are going to be covered in parts to come.

**THE NEW CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES**

With the aforementioned particulars of the “citizen of the United States” set forth, we can now go over the *new paradigm* that encompasses the ‘new’ *citizen of the United States* created after the *so-called* Civil War.\(^{21}\) This is what we could refer to as the *convenient conversion*.

After the *so-called* Civil War, an *amendment* to the United States Constitution was added that changed the term. The language of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, is as follows:

- “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.”

---

15 The international rule used; but the United States is actually a private enterprise: [www.pacinlaw.us/servants](http://www.pacinlaw.us/servants)
16 Articles of Confederation, Article I: The Stile of this Confederacy shall be “The United States of America”.
17 COUNTRY. By country is meant the state of which one is a member. Every man’s country is in general the state in which he happens to have been born. –Bouvier’s Law Dictionary
18 A fundamental principle of international law, see VATTÉL, BOOK I, CHAPTER I § 4 AND § 10
19 There are many words that had started with an uppercase letter in the drafted Constitution. This discounts any specific meaning to the capital ‘C’ citizen premise.
20 The premise is purely political. The ones that refer to themselves as a “Citizen” are lacking the knowledge that the political system changed under the Fourteenth Amendment.
21 As the United States is a confederation, the *so-called* Civil War was an international war.
By design, the infamous amendment causes the term “citizen of the United States” to take-on a whole different meaning. Now we see there is a so-called dual citizenship:

- **dual citizenship.** Citizenship in two different countries. Status of “citizens of United States” who reside within a state, *i.e.*, persons who are born or naturalized in the United States are “citizen of the United States” *and* the state wherein they reside, *see* Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

In further understanding the ‘new’ citizen, let us see what a *state citizen* is under the political system of this amendment using definitions from Ballentine’s Law Dictionary, 3rd edition:

- **citizen of a state.** A citizen of the United States residing in *any* state of the Union; Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.
- **subject.** A citizen. An inhabitant. *See* subject to.
- **subject to.** Words of qualification.

American Heritage Dictionary simply defines the word “qualification” as follows:

* A quality, an accomplishment that makes a person suitable for a particular position.

All people living in a particular *country* are not actually qualified to be a “citizen”, per se; but if one is *qualified* to be a “citizen” and states that *he* is a citizen, or does anything that would deem him a citizen, by *operation of law* would qualify him to be “subject to” a government.

With the above set forth, contrary to popular belief, there is no such thing as a *state citizen* under the Fourteenth Amendment governmental/political system. Why is this, you ask? No one can participate in the *political system* under the amendment without being a ‘new’ styled *citizen of the United States*. If you recall, the definition of *citizenship* above stated that the main issue of such *status* maintains the right to participate in the *political* process. If one participates in the system under the Fourteenth Amendment, by an *operation of law*, he is *ipso facto* a ‘new’ *citizen of the United States*. Accordingly — especially after 140+ years of the existence of the amendment — everyone is *in fact a citizen and subject* thereof; or — as found in the basic language of the amendment — “subject to the jurisdiction thereof (or of IT)”. These ‘new’ *citizens of the United States* are also of a *naturalized* variety. As the Fourteenth Amendment is fundamentally *private law*, a *natural born citizen* of one of the several states

---

**22 The Intent of the 14th Amendment**: “We intend to make citizenship National. Heretofore, a man has been a *citizen of the United States* because he was a citizen of some-one of the States: now, we propose to reverse that, and make him a citizen of any State where he chooses to reside, by defining in advance his National citizenship — and our Amendment declares that “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the States wherein they reside.” —Page 64, The Reconstruction Problem, speech of James Blaine, Skowhegan, Maine (August 29, 1866)

**23 Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe**

**24 Two examples of qualifications: IDAHO. 34-402. Qualifications of Electors. Every male or female *citizen of the United States*, 18 years old...; MAINE. 21A § 111. General qualifications. A person who meets the following requirements may vote in any election in a municipality. 1. Citizenship. He must be a *citizen of the United States*.**

**25 Additionally, there are some “theories” that say citizen is a pronoun as used in the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution; however if you would take time to reference any dictionary, the term or word carries no such grammatical attachment; the term or word is strictly a noun, not a pronoun. Such premise is surely a stretch of the imagination.**

Also, the United States regards “citizen of the United States” and “American citizen” as being synonymous, *e.g.*, reference: Code of Federal Regulations (1949), Title 8, Part 176, Section 176.101(w), Definitions.
would have to be naturalized to be a federal citizen or citizen of the United States. The lawful citizens of the several states were given denizenship by the federal government.26

These facts aside, people in the “movement” believe the Fourteenth Amendment does not affect them because they think they are not within the jurisdiction of the “United States”. This is due to beliefs that they live in one of the states, or they are not of African descent. These beliefs are not correct. Everyone born within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, i.e., in one of the several states, is naturalized by the Fourteenth Amendment at birth, except for Indians.27 In view of this, see this definition from Black’s Law Dictionary, sixth edition:

- NATURALIZATION CLAUSE. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section 1, provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside.

It says, “all persons born or naturalized” are citizens thereof. What a convenient conversion.

The 14th Amendment States

There are two states within a “State” that now exist. The United States Congress created a state within a state — actually a new status within a country — with the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States Constitution grants permission as to the following found in Article 4:

- United States Constitution, Article IV - The States. Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The term “state” actually means three different things.28 They are as follows:

1. The “State” may be the (a) people (or body politic) of a country or nation.
2. The “State” may be the government of a people (or body politic).
3. The “State” may be the territory (or country)16 a people (or nation) occupies.

In this particular case the state within a state is a 14th Amendment State, i.e., the United States citizen status, within the states, i.e., the several countries or republics in the Union. After some time Congress decided to right its wrong by separating ITS citizens of the United States from the lawful citizens (i.e., the disenfranchised) in the Immigration and Nationality Acts. Now you can distinguish the two states, or statuses, within each “State” in the Union. They are:

1) citizen and nationals of the United States;29 and, 2) nationals of the states.30

You may say that the 14th Amendment “state within a state” premise is a stretch due to the fact the context of the clause of “new states” seemingly appears to relate to states; however the use of the language “jurisdiction” therein in conjunction with the multiple definitions of “state”

---

26 DENIZEN: American law. A dweller; a stranger admitted to certain rights in a foreign country or as one who lives habitually in a country but is not a native born citizen. –Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe

27 However American aborigines can be United States citizens if they want; and all other citizenship exceptions, see Title 8 USC § 1401 for such exceptions.

28 See article that goes over the usage of state in 14th Amendment, Section 2: www.pacinlaw.us/usage

29 See Title 8 USC § 1401 and Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(22)(A).

30 See Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(21).
allows it to expand into such a seemingly “broad brushed” principle. Many people may think this assertion of a “state within a state” is farfetched? It is really not, due to the fact that they are referring to corporations as “citizens” under the Fourteenth Amendment system. As the term “state” has different meanings, why not make-up other things to fit your needs?

And how do the legislatures of the states consent? The ‘new’ States’ 14th Amendment officers participate. The de jure (i.e., lawful, original) law system is still there, the political system has just changed. In other words, the system has gone de facto along with most Americans.

DUAL CITIZENSHIP

Now to explain the aspect of the so-called dual-citizenship: There is none — It is a FRAUD!

One should understand that the “United States” did not have the absolute authority to create its own political system and nation. Therefore, to cover-up this fact there have been a plethora of fraudulent acts committed by the insurgent courts and insurgent officers of this system. They created this concept so they could pick and choose what jurisdiction someone was in.

Consider this, just as a man could be a citizen of a ‘state’, a ‘county’, or a ‘city’ in the original form of the constitutional system (i.e., one could participate in any/all those political levels), could he not also participate in all levels under the Fourteenth Amendment? Why would there have to be a so-called dual citizenship? How can he be a member of two states or countries? Were people of the states actually drug into the control of Congress by this situation?

In further explanation: Again, the United States of America is not a country nor is it a nation; it is only considered such in relation to certain matters which are found in the Constitution. The political control of the several states was transferred over to the United States; hence under the Fourteenth Amendment political system the states in the Union would now considered to be as political subdivisions (quasi-political subdivisions) of the ‘new’ United States. One could say that they are the counties of the United States (of sorts). They are not sovereign states with a clipped sovereignty as they were prior to when the amendment was installed.

Under the Fourteenth Amendment, NOW the United States of America is considered a nation internally. As a matter of law, one is either a member of one nation (a state/nation) or the other. He cannot be a citizen member of both without breaching the general principles of a federation entity. To cover-up this fraud, the courts have made bogus rulings that one may be a citizen of a state without being a citizen of the United States. But common sense dictates that this is not a possibility. All ‘new’ (de facto) state officers are installed by ‘new’ citizens.

---

31 Title 28 USC § 1332. Diversity of citizenship. (c) For the purposes of this section and section 1441 of this title- (1) a corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of any State by which it has been incorporated and of the State where it has its principal place of business...

32 See the book, The Red Amendment, an in law Exposé on the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

33 Title 1 USC § 2 - “County” as including “parish”, and so forth. The word “county” includes a parish, or any other equivalent subdivision of a State or Territory of the United States.

34 See the article, Treason by Design, at : www.pacinlaw.us/treason

35 Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections, 221 A.2d 431 (07/21/1966) State has right to extend qualifications for state office to its citizens, even though they are not citizens of the United States. Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state. United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 549 (1875); Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36, 73-74, 21 L.Ed. 394 (1873); and see Short v. State, 80 Md. 392, 401-402, 31 A. 322 (1895). See also Spear, State Citizenship 16 Albany L.J. 24 (1877).

36 See the legal term Conflict of Laws: PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW. A name used by some writers to indicate that branch of law which is now more commonly called “Conflict of Laws”.

---
of the United States (see footnote 24 to see who is allowed to vote in elections). Therefore, one could only surmise that such officers are also citizens of the United States due to such fact; not to mention all other operations of law that tie them into such status just like all ‘new’ citizens.

A NIFTY TRICK AND CON

Again, the so-called dual citizenship was instituted to cover-up the legal fraud of the system forced under the Fourteenth Amendment. In somewhat of a retraction, the system is not forced, it is set-up so one volunteers to participate in it. This allows both the United States and any given State to pick and choose what system of law one is subject to by using legal fictions.

Depending on the circumstances of a particular case, a judge might say to himself:

‘Well now... Am I going to take notice that this guy is a person under this new political system and subject to its laws, or am I going to look at this matter as if he were a person under the original constitutional system?’

In example, if he knew you voted to put him in his office — which means you agree to the new citizenship, and accordingly you agree to the laws of both state and federal governments — he will surely subject you to his jurisdiction. Due to this fact, that is just ONE of the factors that removes the principle of legal fictions and solidifies the phrase that is found in Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment that establishes: “...and subject to the jurisdiction thereof...”

You may ask: How can this be? Are you asking, are there two law systems? You are simply asked? Was anything repealed in the original Constitution? Answer: NO.

It is truly a nifty game that has been instituted. It keeps people confused and continually sucks money out of them via the attorneys that argue both sides of the CONstitution as it exists.

A STEALTHY TOOL OF ILLUSION

To further reiterate that there is a new political system, as many believe, the so-called Civil War — which was really a national or international war — was over the freedom of the slaves of the Southern States in the Union. The Fifteenth Amendment of the revamped United States Constitution gave such people the right to vote. But wait a minute... Such people (ex-slaves) are deemed citizens of the United States under the Fourteenth Amendment. Political rights are granted under the citizen premise, so why the amendment? If you look at the language in the amendment it is not creating citizenship; it just states their right to vote cannot be denied.

So, the question is: Are there actually two political systems under the Fourteenth Amendment? One that the original citizens participate in, and one that the ex-slaves participate in?

---

**CONFLICT OF LAWS.** Inconsistency or difference between the laws of different states or countries, arising in the case of persons who have acquired rights, incurred obligation, injuries or damages, or made contracts, within the territory of two or more jurisdictions. – *Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe*

37 This is the nature of federal citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States: “It is the natural consequence of a citizenship [92 U.S. 542, 551] which owes allegiance to two sovereignties, and claims protection from both. The citizen cannot complain, because he has voluntarily submitted himself to such a form of government. He owes allegiance to the two departments, so to speak, and within their respective spheres must pay the penalties which each exacts for disobedience to its laws.” U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875) [http://laws.findlaw.com/us/92/542.html]

38 See the article, *Dual System of Law Effectuated by the 14th Amendment*, at: [www.pacinlaw.us/dual](http://www.pacinlaw.us/dual)

39 See the article, *Constitution Dissected*, at: [www.pacinlaw.us/conjob](http://www.pacinlaw.us/conjob)
The answer is simply: NO. There is only ONE political system.

Simply put: The Fourteenth Amendment installed a different political system under an alternate constitutional system; and anyone that chooses to participate in this new system is a citizen of the United States ipso facto. It is unambiguous that under the Fourteenth Amendment there is no longer a de jure “state citizenship”. The question is: Does one really have to “participate” to be deemed a citizen of the United States? The answer: NO. Most people that is born in any one of the several states of America are assumed to be citizens of the United States. Why you ask? Because such persons did not formally establish they were not such persons. Moreover, at one time in the life of any such person he may have done something that was in the benefit of the private/special law that has been established by these new governments, e.g., get food stamps. Furthermore, under common law doctrine a child carries the citizenship of his father. As only a citizen of the United States can vote, did the father of such child ever vote?

Simply: If it looks like a Duck, and quacks like a Duck... It must be a Duck. 

The so-called Straw Man Premise

There are some people that believe that the corporation that is entitled the United States has established and controls some fictional character which is referred to as a “straw man”. This is an entity that resembles the name of a man (or a woman) and may be denoted by uppercase letters. People that subscribe to this theory believe that the government arbitrarily created it; and they — the real flesh and blood man — are not responsible for it. Nonetheless, some of these types who buy into this think they can use this entity without recourse... A silly notion.

With that established we can now explain where people have developed the infamous straw man premise. In review, the United States of America is not an actual country nor is it a nation, but it is an incorporation of countries and nations. Accordingly, the following is evidenced:

- **BODY POLITIC, government, corporations.** When applied to the government this phrase signifies the state.
  2. As to the persons who compose the body politic, they take collectively the name, of people, or nation; and individually they are citizens, when considered in relation to their political rights, and subjects as being submitted to the laws of the state.
  3. When it refers to corporations, the term body politic means that the members of such corporations shall be considered as an artificial person.

Note the difference between a body politic government and corporate; the collective members of a corporation are a person (or legal entities). When you couple that fact with the United States citizen, one can estimate that such a citizen is deemed an entity of law. However this is only partially true; the real flesh and blood man is the one that is openly participating in the

---

40 There are many people that like to think that they are not “subject to the jurisdiction thereof”, but there are too many fictions of law that may apply; moreover, this is what the Supreme Court stated about said clause: Statement by Justice Fuller in U.S. v Wong Kim Ark: “Mr. Justice Miller, indeed, while discussing the causes which led to the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, made this remark: “The phrase ‘subject to its jurisdiction’ was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states, born within the United States.” 16 Wall. 73.

[ In other words, everyone in the several states is deemed a “citizen of the United States” at birth. ]

41 See Title 8 USC §1481. The legal notations on expatriation.

42 See The Duck Rule, at: www.pacalliance.us/duck
body politic under the Fourteenth Amendment. Accordingly, although they are entities, the government sees people considered “citizens of the United States” as being living persons:

- 401.25. Terms defined. Individual when used in connection with the Privacy Act or for disclosure of nonprogram records, means a living person who is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.\(^{43}\)

So you see, the straw man premise is a dangerous thing to invoke in any particular instance. A man or woman is acting in the capacity as a natural person, under the Law of Persons or the Roman Civil Law. The truth of the matter is, Americans are simply regarded as United States persons, see Title 26 USC §7701(a)(30). The federal government has control over such people as one being a member of a body politic under the premise of nationality/citizenship.\(^{44}\) In this instance, the one the United States created with the Fourteenth Amendment which creates a false nation. Therefore, the actual legal premise is the fact—or legal fiction\(^ {45}\)—that a man or woman is a de facto status, i.e., a citizen of the United States. Such status is actually grounded in established facts; mainly by examining the actions of any specific individual.

In an expanded or whimsical sense, the straw man premise has some validity. But pursuing the straw man premise is an act of tomfoolery as it is not proper law usage; in law the term noted as straw man is actually a real person who is another party.\(^ {46}\) The fact is that a man is deemed the so-called “straw man” for acting in the capacity as a ‘new’ citizen of the United States. This is due to the fact that he is under private law under the Law of Persons law form.

**THE NEW LAW GOVERNING PEOPLES**

So what kind of citizen is the ‘new’ citizen of the United States? That is to say, what system of law is such a person really under? To assist in answering this particular query, below is some dictum taken from the famous landmark court case known as Roe v Wade:

> In this country, the law in effect in all but a few States until mid-19th century was the pre-existing English common law... It was not until after the War Between the States that legislation began generally to replace the common law.

—Roe v. Wade, 410 US 113

Before the War Between the States — the right way to depict this war — America was under a law system that was grounded in Scripture, i.e., the Law of God. However, after that war a new system of law that governed societies was introduced. As noted herein above that system is the Roman Civil Law. As stated by the Roe v Wade court, before the War the law that governed the several societies throughout the Union was the common law. Such societal law was diverse in each country in the Union. It was based on the custom and usage of the societies of each state.

---


\(^{44}\) Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(22). As used in this chapter [chapter 12 of Title 8]. The term “national of the United States” means a citizen of the United States.

\(^{45}\) FICTION OF LAW. The assumption that a certain thing is true, and which gives to a person or thing, a quality which is not natural to it, and establishes, consequently, a certain disposition, which, without the fiction, would be repugnant to reason and to truth. It is an order of things which does not exist, but which the law prescribe; or authorizes it differs from presumption, because it establishes as true, something which is false; whereas presumption supplies the proof of something true. –Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe

\(^{46}\) STRAW MAN. An irresponsible bondsman or surety. One made to appear as the owner of record who in fact holds title for another. –Ballentine’s Law Dictionary, Third Edition
Accordingly, as America was founded by God fearing people, they lived in reverence of God; hence the *common law* mirrored the guidance of Scripture under *custom and usage*.

With that established, below are two definitions that are taken from Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition; the definitions differentiate the *two law systems* in their language:

- **common law.** As distinguished from statutory law created government, the common law comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from the judgments and decrees of the courts recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usages and customs. It consists of those principles, usage and rules of action applicable to government and security of persons and property which do not rest for their authority upon any express and positive declaration of the will of the legislature.

- **constitutional liberty or freedom.** The aggregate of those personal, civil, and political rights of the individual which are guaranteed by the Constitution and secured against invasion by government or any of its agencies.

By looking at these two definitions one can see that:

1) The legislature is not to govern the people; and
2) That all agencies of government are to totally stay out of one’s life.

That is, there has to be constitutional authority for any intrusion.

As most know and understand, they are commonly governed by *statutory law*; hence the above definitions provide prima facie evidence — *that is sufficient on its face* — that America is now generally under a system of *Roman Civil Law*. Such law replaced the original societal law for the several states, the *Common Law*. Under the original system of law, a case like *Roe v. Wade* would have never made it to the *Supreme Court* to be used as precedence. The people of each society in the Union decide what is good and proper under their practices. Government is not to be acting as a god as Rome did for its people. In view of that, here is a *person* of Rome:

- **civis.** (Roman law.) A citizen.

The point of this is, the Roman Empire had conquered many countries and extended its *civil law system* into areas that it did not belong. The “United States” has done the exact same thing with its *citizen of the United States* status. Accordingly, with the United States acting in place of God and people accepting the *de facto* status of the new governmental system, do people who act in defiance of the *Word of God* really believe that He will bless America?

When in Rome, or should we say, *in the United States*. . . .

Do you really want to do what the *neoRomans* do?

**POLITICAL MATTERS INVOLVED**

Now to delve into *political issues* of the Fourteenth Amendment governmental system:

So what is this ‘new’ citizenship all about, besides *Roman Civil Law*? Answer: COMMUNISM.

47 See this article about the dangers of the *Civil Law* system: [www.pacinlaw.us/civil](http://www.pacinlaw.us/civil)

48 Ballentine’s Law Dictionary, Third Edition

49 **DE FACTO.** In fact, as distinguished from “de jure”, by right. –Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe
You may be asking: What is the true definition for Communism? Well, it is not what you have heard in school or television that pegs the systems of government of Cuba, China and the Soviet Union as such. Applying facts, these were/are just “bogeymen” to cover-up the world scheme that is being implemented right under your nose: The New World Order. This Order is essentially an economic scheme of the world elite to enslave people through private law.

The public schools and media — that are the crux of the problem — have everyone thinking that communism is based on an open and notorious dictatorship and not democracy. However, this is not true. The true litmus test for communism is the Communist Manifesto. This political manifesto was written in 1848 just prior to the so-called Civil War. The primary drafter — who was Karl Marx — had a list in the document named Planks. These Planks are a true litmus test to establish whether or not a people is communist. If most or all the Planks are implemented in any given country or political arena A PEOPLE IS DEEMED COMMUNIST!

Below are the main elements of communism enumerated that are set forth by the Communist Manifesto. However, before reading them it should be noted that Marx also stated:

“These measures will, of course, be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.”

Ergo, all the Planks will be installed by any means possible, e.g., through law. Below are the Ten Planks of Marx. Some American parallels are portrayed in the copy below the Plank:

1) ABOLITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AND APPLICATION OF ALL RENT TO PUBLIC PURPOSE. The Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (1868), and various zoning, school & property taxes, so-called national parks, lands, etc. Also the Bureau of Land Management.

2) A HEAVY PROGRESSIVE OR GRADUATED INCOME TAX. Misapplication of the 16th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, 1913 as it is taxing wages, not income; The Social Security Act of 1936; Joint House Resolution 192 of 1933; Federal Income Tax and various State Income Taxes. We have been conditioned to call it “paying your fair share.”

3) ABOLITION OF RIGHT TO INHERITANCE. We call it Federal & State estate Taxes (1916), via the Federal Internal Revenue Code; or reformed Probate Laws, and limited inheritance via arbitrary inheritance income tax statutes implemented by the foreign State: the United States.

4) CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF ALL EMIGRANTS AND REBELS. We call it government seizures, tax liens, Public “law” 99-570 (1986); Executive Order 11490, sections 1205 and 2002 which gives private land to the Department of Urban Development. Punishment for participating in the new political system as orchestrated through the operations of law set forth by the Fourteenth Amendment.

5) CENTRALIZATION OF CREDIT IN THE HANDS OF THE STATE, BY MEANS OF A NATIONAL BANK WITH STATE CAPITAL AND AN EXCLUSIVE MONOPOLY. We call it the Federal Reserve which is a credit/debt system nationally organized by the Federal Reserve act of 1913. All local banks are members of the Fed System, and are regulated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC).
6) CENTRALIZATION OF THE MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPORTATION IN THE HANDS OF THE STATE. We call it the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the Department of Transportation (DOT) mandated through the ICC act of 1887, the Commissions Act of 1934, The Interstate Commerce Commission established in 1938, The Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and Executive Orders 11490, 10999, as well as State mandated driver’s licenses and Department of Transportation regulations. Also the most blatant one, Amtrak: Strangely established May 1st-May Day, \textit{i.e.} World Socialist Day.

7) EXTENSION OF FACTORIES AND INSTRUMENTS OF PRODUCTION OWNED BY THE STATE, THE BRINGING INTO CULTIVATION OF WASTE LANDS, AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOIL GENERALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMMON PLAN. We call it corporate capacity, The Desert Entry Act and The Department of Agriculture. As well as the Department of Commerce and Labor (OSHA), Department of Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and the Internal Revenue Service control of business through corporate—\textit{i.e.} creature of the state—regulations. Government involvement in the Stock Market which portrays the old definition of a fascist state.

8) EQUAL LIABILITY OF ALL TO LABOR. ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ARMIES, ESPECIALLY FOR AGRICULTURE. We call it the Social Security Administration and The Department of Labor. The so-called national debt and inflation caused by the communal bank has caused the need for a two “income” family of which both “individual” “entities” are paying Income Tax. Woman in the workplace since the 1920’s due to mind control, the 19th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, assorted Socialist Unions, affirmative action, the Federal Public Works Program and of course Executive Order 11000. Mass movement of Americans from family farmlands to cities in the creation of corporate farms under control of the U.S. government no less.

9) COMBINATION OF AGRICULTURE WITH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES; GRADUAL ABOLITION OF THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN TOWN AND COUNTRY BY A MORE EQUABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION OVER THE COUNTRY. We Americans call it the Planning Reorganization act of 1949, zoning (Title 17 USC 1910-1990), as well as Executive Orders 11647 and 11731 (ten regions) and Public “Law” 89-136; the main plank for reduction of town and country; the Fourteenth Amendment accomplished this. Non-city land is now subject to Property Tax.

10) FREE EDUCATION FOR ALL CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ABOLITION OF CHILDREN’S FACTORY LABOR IN ITS PRESENT FORM. COMBINATION OF EDUCATION WITH INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION, ETC. People are being taxed to support what we call ‘public’ schools, which train the young to work for the perpetual communal debt system that enriches the World Bank (IMF). Also, we call it the Department of Education of which controls all states, the NEA and Outcome Based “Education.”
In review, the main driving force behind communism is: A Central Bank. What is the name of the implemented central bank in the United States: The Federal Reserve Bank, which is owned by private investors. The second factor is: The elimination of countries and nationalities, or the unification of many into one, see E Pluribus Unum. Are things becoming more clear to you now? Fittingly, in its applied dogma, this is also stated in the Communist Manifesto:

“The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.”

Marx further established that, “The working men have no country.” In other words, they can go wherever they want to work; thus diminishing the work available to local people.

You ask, what is THIS system ultimately about? The below definition will assist that query:

- fascism..... any system of government in which property is privately owned, but all industry and business is regulated by a strong national government.50

Understand that the United States Constitution has always mandated the control of commerce under the United States… In other words, it is a progressive plot. All these elements exposed herein are part and parcel of the end result desired by the orchestrators of the system. It should be added that the Fourteenth Amendment also gave corporations due process of law that gave them a legal edge to improve their chances for expansion via the court system. The system as established provides the corporations’ protection. That allows the larger corporations to control the legislatures which destroys smaller businesses. Further, such corporations enjoy the benefit of not having to take care of their employees via insurances, thus expenses are shifted to the masses which expands their profits. That is to say, corporations do not have to be as concerned about their workers; they are taken care of via pooled monies that come from all businesses. As any worthy employee is going to want benefits, one method is the social security system. This system allows the government, through the Federal Reserve, to create accounts via an issued number that is stealing Americans’ labor via income tax. The scheme is actually of purpose to make Americans pay the “Public Debt” which benefits the owners of the Federal Reserve.

An intelligent person would say to himself (in applying the principles of the law of nations), the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution — under its various operations of law — fundamentally does away with the fifty countries and nationalities of the several states. The matters that have been brought to your attention are measures to achieve the plot.

In short: To get away with this program on a large scale, all Americans had to be pulled into the jurisdiction of the “United States” to be controlled by ITS laws in the benefit of a few.

SYLLABUS

One might say the so-called Civil War that took place between 1861-1865 was a fight against fascism. But at the time people of America just did not understand it, nor do they today.

Suitably, below is a sample of some communist based propaganda from 1906. It was written by a man named Wise: undoubtedly a Synagogue of Satan member. The text herein illustrated has been taken from a book that was widely distributed throughout America. The book was

50 Thorndike Century Senior Dictionary, 1941. But wait, here is the new definition that fits the progressive world communism agenda: Fascism.... A system of government marked by centralization of authority under a dictator, stringent socioeconomic controls, suppression of the opposition through terror and censorship, and typically a policy of belligerent nationalism and racism. –American Heritage Dictionary, 1998
simply entitled: Citizenship.\textsuperscript{51} Its purpose was to condition all Americans to be good patriotic citizens under the governmental system established under the Fourteenth Amendment:

“...the spirit in the citizen that, originating in love of country, results in obedience to its laws, the support and defense... such a citizen is called a patriot... it is the citizen who yields the legitimate share of his property, as well as the proper services of his person, to the lawful demands of his country for support, who is the real patriot.”

Pardon... A patriot is defined as one who appears to joyfully give his property to the state?\textsuperscript{52}

The truth of the matter is, the maintainers\textsuperscript{53} have implemented several questionable methods to swindle Americans into supporting this ‘new’ system under the Fourteenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{54} As you can see there are a plethora of factors to consider in the matter of the New America. Any person that claims to be a United States citizen — i.e., citizen of the United States — who has not formally established that he is not is essentially a COMMUNIST. And understand that...

“Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.” —William Penn\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Additional credit} given to Gregory Williams, Joseph Rorie and John Ainsworth for their research. It has provided insight in understanding some of the crucial details surrounding the usurpation.\textsuperscript{56}

\textbf{NOTICE}

Please see these articles on the issue of citizenship in American law:
- \texttt{www.pacinlaw.us/citizen}
- \texttt{www.pacinlaw.us/game}
- \texttt{www.pacinlaw.us/criminal}

\textbf{PEOPLE’S AWARENESS COALITION WELCOMES YOU!}

The Coalition has been separating the wheat from the chaff since 1998.

Please join us in appropriating education and freedom that the republics provide!

Visit People’s Awareness Coalition at: \texttt{www.pacalliance.us}

Join us at the PAC Open Forum:
\texttt{www.pacgroups.us/register}

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{STUDIES IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, A Treatise On American Citizenship By John S. Wise, Edward Thompson Company Northport, Long Island, N.Y. (1906)}

\textsuperscript{52} Senate Document # 43; \textit{SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 62 (Page 9, Paragraph 2) April 17, 1933. “The ultimate ownership of all property is in the State; individual so-called “ownership” is only by virtue of government, i.e., law, amounting to mere user; and use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State.”}

\textsuperscript{53} \textbf{MAINTAINERS.} Individuals and organizations of numerous kinds that use various methods to maintain control of America through the 14th Amendment political and legal system. Such entities are generally beneficiaries of what the system produces, hence have a pecuniary (profit) interest as motivation. —\textit{Island Maker’s Project}

\textsuperscript{54} \textbf{KLEPTOCRACY}, alternatively cleptocracy or kleptarchy, from Ancient Greek: κλέπτης (thief) and κράτος (rule), is a term applied to a government subject to control fraud that takes advantage of governmental corruption to extend the personal wealth and political power of government officials and the ruling class (collectively, kleptocrats), via the embezzlement of state funds at the expense of the wider population, sometimes without even the pretense of honest service. The term means "rule by thieves". Not an official form of government such as a democracy, republic, monarchy, or theocracy; a kleptocracy is rather a pejorative for a government perceived to have a particularly severe and systemic problem with the selfish misappropriation of public funds by those in power. —\textit{Wikipedia}

\textsuperscript{55} The original state/colonies were Protestant Christians. The Illuminati set out to destroy this with progressivism.

\textsuperscript{56} Although I like to give credit to those who assist in educating others, I no longer work with this list of three due to the fact I feel they are either misguided and/or perhaps distracters/disinformation agents, i.e., \textit{Operatives}.