



14TH AMENDMENT, SECTION 2 © Authored by LB Bork lb@pacinlaw.org

The following is an alternate explanation regarding the language and intent of Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment¹ as explained in *The Red Amendment*, by LB Bork:

First, the relevant part of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment:

Section 1. 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.

That establishes the *legal fiction* that all people born in the United States are “citizens of the United States” at birth. Also it establishes *dual citizenship*; this is a legal principle and/or status that did not exist prior to the Fourteenth Amendment.

Second, now Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment:

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

The two sections noted above make-up a complex formula. What they do are:

- 1) Sets forth that all people are “citizens of the United States” under legal fiction;
- 2) Establish new apportionment for the ‘inhabitants’ of each of the several States;
- 3) Enfranchise the new “citizens of the United States”;
- 4) Disenfranchise the state citizens.

In short, this formula is creating a new *Body Politic*. The “state citizens” that are the members of the several States under the original constitutional system *need to be tricked into participating*. This is the main or general purpose of Section 2 of the amendment.

Now, note that it was set forth by Noah Webster that an insurgent is one that breaks the law of his country or government. Here is the definition as set forth in the 1820’s:

- **INSURGENT.** A person who rises in opposition to civil or political authority; one who openly and actively resists the execution of laws. [See insurrection.] An

1 If you think that the 14th Amendment only applies to blacks due to some insane or incompetent court stating such nonsense, see the Endnotes in this paper.

insurgent differs from a rebel. The insurgent opposes the execution of a particular law or laws; a rebel attempts to overthrow or change government, or he revolts and attempts to place his country under another authority. All rebels are insurgents, but all insurgents are not rebels.

The original—or *de jure*—political power of each state in the American union was held by each state in the original constitutional premise. This was not a power of the United States, *i.e.* the Federal Government. Each State could set-up its own parameters on how elections were to be held, *i.e.* who could vote for whatever reasons set forth. In example, the federal government had no power to mandate that women vote in any election. This was a state right held by the states prior to the Fourteenth Amendment. The premise is usurped by the 19th Amendment of the *new constitutional system*.

The political power of each state is the ultimate power which governs a country (or *nation*). In other words, without the consent of “people”² or the body politic of any given country, there can be no government; and wherefore no law can be forced on people.

With that said, you should know that each state in the Union is deemed a country:

- **COUNTRY.** By country is meant the state of which one is a member.

That was taken from Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856.

Now back in reference to the term *insurgent* above: note that a *rebel* is of mind to put *his country* under new authority. Again, the *political power* of a country is held as the ultimate power. This is inherent in the states *via* the people, not the federal government. Again, no people, no consent; hence no law can be enforced by a government. Voting is that ultimate consent. If you vote for officers... you *agree* to the actions of such officers.

Moreover, it should be noted that the Confederate Forces in the so-called *Civil War* were not actually *rebels* as ignorant historians and the “Federalist faction” referred to them as. This fact exists because the United States had no authority to force any state to remain in the Union, nor the authority to conquer any state.³ This is evidenced in this authority:

- **REBELS.** A term loosely but incorrectly applied to the Confederate Forces engaged in the Civil War. *30 Am J Rev ed Insurr § 2*

Remember, rebels have of the primary purpose of turning the sovereignty of their country over to another power. The Confederate States in the *War Between the States*⁴ were not doing this at all... They—the *states*—are the power, not the United States.

Now to evidence the stealthy language that is ingeniously buried into Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment that shows how the *inhabitants* (or *de jure* state citizens) of the several States are tricked into turning over their lawful political power to a new-*insurgent governmental system* under the legal operations of the Fourteenth Amendment:

“...*the right to vote at any election... is denied... except for participation in rebellion, or other crime...*”

That is the pertinent language which is buried in the formula.

2 See this information at: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Sovereigns_without_Subjects.php

3 See this info: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/sup/Congressional_Record_14th_Amend_1967.pdf

4 In actuality, the War between the American nations.

The above position has been criticized by many people as to deleting words; however there have been many grammarians that have agreed that words can be deleted without destroying the meaning. Moreover, they have all agreed that what is set forth above in simple terms is what is stated above in the sentence construction.

Now, here is Section 2 broken down for a more complete explanation:

- Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.

That is setting forth that all people (or *persons*) in the state are going to be represented by the new state and federal (Congress) legislatures. Indians are precluded as their tribes are considered separate sovereign nations and they are not party to the Constitution.

Now on to the next sentence:

- But when...

The words “But when” is simply establishing that something is going to change from the first sentence. Now the next part of the sentence:

- ...the right to vote at any election...

In summary it is saying: “But when the right to vote at any election”.

Now the next part of the second sentence:

- ...for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof,...

That language can effectually be eliminated; however, it should be noted that these are considered an *insurgent* set of state and federal officers that are in agreement that the new U.S. citizenship (*i.e.* dual and/or federal citizenship) is okay. In other words, they are all advocating the *new political system* installed under the Fourteenth Amendment.

Now, here is the next part:

- ...is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States,...

That sets forth the following:

- 1) It is denying something. What? The right to vote.
- 2) The right to vote to who? Male inhabitants (the ones that are the new type “*citizens of the United States*” and 21 years of age).

Remember, Section 1 states that all “persons” born in the United States are *citizens of the United States*. If you check the voting regulations in the states you will find that everyone must be a “citizen of the United States” to vote. Nonetheless, most of what was stated in the last bullet part can be eliminated *precluding* “is denied”.

In summary to this point we have: “But when the right to vote at any election is denied”.

Now the next part:

- ...or in any way abridged,...

That part can effectually be eliminated. It just means that the right to vote is curtailed. For what reason is it abridged? One reason is: You cannot vote unless you are a *citizen of the United States*. It is generally *double-talk* to cover-up what is really going on. The words noted as “is denied” are sufficient in describing the action of not being able to vote.

Now, let us go over the action of why there is the denial to vote; in other words, the right to vote is denied or curtailed unless what happens:

- ...except for participation in rebellion, or other crime,...

The right to vote is denied or curtailed for these two reasons: 1) For anyone not participating in the rebellion; 2) For anyone that is committing crimes.

That is the main part which portrays the *state citizens*—that are now deemed *citizens of the United States*—turning over the inherent political power of their states to the federal government. See the definition of “insurgent” above which portrays the definition of a rebel. Also, the right to vote is also denied to anyone that commits other crimes. In other words: Anyone that commits a felony under the *new system* cannot vote; however is still represented for presuming to be *in rebellion*. The state citizens involved in rebellion are also represented for turning over the political law of their countries over to Congress.

In actuality, the last bullet point text has a hidden, dual purpose: 1) It denies anyone the right to vote EXCEPT FOR participation in rebellion; 2) It denies the right to vote (or curtails it) for committing a felony in the new governmental system, *i.e.* people who have a felony record today cannot vote. Understand that this last bulleted phrase is buried in verbiage and is somewhat stated under the breath as not to be detected.

In summary to this point we have: “But when the right to vote at any election is denied except for participation in rebellion”. Now let us remove “But when” because it is the factoring phrase that establishes the representation is going to be reduced for the reason set forth (which will be explained in the next bullet point). Again this gives us:

“the right to vote at any election... is denied... except for participation in rebellion”

Again, imagine “except for participation in rebellion” being said under ones breath. Most people believe it states this: “...the right to vote is denied for participation in rebellion.” They conveniently—or unwittingly—leave out the word “except”. This is due to the brainwashing they have had in regard to matters that were around that period of time, *i.e.* the *so-called* rebels could not participate in elections of the puppet governments that were put in the Southern states, by the United States. But remember, this amendment affects all the states. It should be noted that President Johnson vetoed the *Reconstruction Acts* as they were unconstitutional. The Fourteenth Amendment is how the unlawful, insurgent, evil, rump Congress fixed things. They got the people to unwittingly turn-over the full political power of their countries to Congress, *i.e.* the federal government.

Now the formula completed:

- ...the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

The words "such male citizens" are the old or *de jure* state citizens who are new *citizens of the United States* that are participating in rebellion. Does it include the ex-slaves? That is questionable: such "persons" were given the right to vote by the 15th Amendment, yes? The *de jure*—rightful—*state citizens*—that are now agreeing to be *federal citizens* by voting in this system—*bear*—or *force their will on*—all *state citizens* that originally had the political power. This last part is completing the reduction of representation in respect to the ones that are voting, *i.e.* the "citizens" participating in the *orchestrated* rebellion that overthrows the original bodies politic of the several American states.

Be advised that this is why the current system makes sure that everyone is involved in elections. Have you noted the importance on voting today? The only justification this insurgent-usurpation governmental system has any support is to have people vote for it. All others are technically *not represented*; however the ones not voting are presumed to be United States citizens and are silently going along with the rebellion[s].

In summary, we should note there are actually two different people noted in Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment (shown in order of position in the sentence):

- 1) Persons: (counting the whole number of PERSONS in each State)
- 2) Inhabitants: (is denied to any of the male INHABITANTS of such State)
- 3) Citizens of the United States: (being 21 years of age & CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES)
- 4) Citizens: (the whole number of male CITIZENS [that have been disenfranchised])

Again, this is a complex formula. A gray area is created using the language persons; this includes different many personalities and shows what occurs to the *de jure* bodies politic at the end of the sentence. There is where the state citizens—*de jure* citizens—or persons are disenfranchised. In sense, the use of PERSON is nimble. A person can be either a *citizen of the United States* or a *state citizen* (as noted at the end). It is not until we get to the word or term INHABITANT that we see that the sentence construction makes the persons aforementioned into "citizens of the United States" by their action of voting. This is referred to as an "operation of law". The end of the formula where CITIZENS is used is where we can see that all persons may possibly not be citizens of the United States, *i.e.* federal citizens; but due to Section 1 there is a very strong *presumption* that they are such citizens; especially after taking benefits and acting as if they were "citizens of the United States" by signing state and federal government forms, etc. In reality such citizens are not represented by the federal government though. It should be strongly noted that measures must be taken to separate any connection to the *14th Amendment Rebels*.⁵

In view of what has been gone over above...

Question: Are you affected by the body politic⁶ named General Motors? Answer: NO. You are not *part of* that corporation. In a parallel: So, how can the corporation named the United States⁷ have power over you if you are not a member of *ITS* body politic?

5 See this information at: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Nationality_Premise.php

6 **BODY POLITIC**, government, corporations.

1. 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. (*note part 3*)

Also, as the United States—in the internal sense—is not a nation: it breaches the *law of nations*, hence, the members of the falsely created nation cannot be under a *body politic government*, but are under a *body politic corporate* (see “body politic” in Footnote 6).

IN SUMMARY: The purpose of Section 1 & 2 of the 14th Amendment does these things:

- 1) Section 1 makes all people in the United States (*the several states*) citizens of the United States, *i.e.* federal citizens (see federal citizenship).
- 2) Section 2 sets up a legal fiction that all persons (*or inhabitants*) are represented by Congress. This includes all people living in the several states, including ex-slaves.
- 3) Section 2 enfranchises the new “citizens of the United States,” and also the ex-slaves; the 15th Amendment is justifiably more subterfuge.⁸
- 4) Section 2 gets “state citizens” to participate in rebellion which in turn gives consent to a *new political system* that is installed by Congress (the *United States*).
- 5) Section 2 disenfranchises *state citizens* of the several States.
- 6) Section 2 ultimately sets forth that only the ones represented in this new government are the ones voting and committing crimes (under the presumption that the ones committing crimes are *U.S. citizens*).

The current governmental system is unlawful and a fraud. The only way it has authority is through the legal operations of the *usurpers’* Fourteenth Amendment. The government can only represent people that support it by voting; and the *de facto-insurgent states* can only regulate *ITS* citizens by *private* statutory law. These people are *in rebellion* against the republican system that was in place prior to the *War Between the States*. Accordingly, this is why the de facto Supreme Court says things like this:

“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

You see, sadly people of the United States of America are not under the principles of the original constitutional system; however, they fail to understand that fact.

It is hoped that this explains the evil *embedded* in Section 2 of the 14th! And also note the dangers of being a *citizen*: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Citizen_Legal_Fiction.php

Again, it should be noted that the *Congress* did not have the authority to create its own political system. Below is documentation that supports what was stated herein:

- http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Nature_of_Federal.php

~~~~~  
The People’s Awareness Coalition – POB 313 – Kieler, Wisconsin [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)

---

3. When it refers to corporations, the term body politic means that the members of such corporations shall be considered as an artificial person. *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856*

7 **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.** The United States of America are a corporation endowed with the capacity to sue and be sued, to convey and receive property.

1 Marsh. Dec. 177, 181. *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856*

8 The term ‘citizen’ engages political rights. Language in the 15th Amendment does nothing but state blacks shall not be denied the right to vote. The 14th provides the *citizen* status to them.

## ENDNOTES:

For those people that believe that the Fourteenth Amendment only applies to blacks (*i.e.* the ex-slaves)—due to an *opinion* of some *conspirator* court—the following evidence shows the intent of said amendment as stated by one of the proponents of the amendment:

QUOTE FROM: *POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS, LEGISLATIVE, DIPLOMATIC, AND POPULAR, 1856-1886, JAMES G. BLAINE, NORWICH, CONN. THE HENRY BILL PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1887*<sup>9</sup>

**Page 64. The Reconstruction Problem, speech of James Blaine, Skowhegan, Maine (August 29, 1866)**

*“In the first place, we ask that they will agree to certain changes in the Constitution of the United States; and, to begin with, we want them to unite with us in broadening the citizenship of the Republic. The slaves recently emancipated by proclamation, and subsequently by Constitutional Amendment, have no civil status. They should be made citizens. We do not, by making them citizens, make them voters,—we do not, in this Constitutional Amendment, attempt to force them upon Southern white men as equals at the ballot-box; but we do intend that they shall be admitted to citizenship, that they shall have the protection of the laws, that they shall not, any more than the rebels shall, be deprived of life, of liberty, of property, without due process of law, and that “they shall not be denied the equal protection of the law.” And in making this extension of citizenship, we are not confining the breadth and scope of our efforts to the negro. It is for the white man as well. 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.” This Amendment will prove a great beneficence to this generation, and to all who shall succeed us in the rights of American citizenship; and we ask the people of the revolted States to consent to this condition as an antecedent step to their re-admission to Congress with Senators and Representatives.”*

ERGO: All people in the United States are deemed *citizens of the United States*. And below is an example of what “The Establishment” expects out of its *citizens*... it is evidence of propaganda of the *new political system* from the year 1906. The copy illustrated below is from a book that was distributed in America; the book title: *Citizenship*.<sup>10</sup> Its purpose was to condition Americans to be good *patriotic citizens* under the *new governmental system*:

*“. . .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.”*

Excuse me! A *patriot* is defined as one who gives his property away?<sup>11</sup> The truth of the matter is the *controllers* have incorporated several methods to *con* all Americans into supporting this governmental system under the 14th Amendment. Accordingly, as you can see, there are a lot of factors to consider in the matter of the *New America*.

*“Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.”* –William Penn

---

<sup>9</sup> Research provided by John Ainsworth [tigerja@bellsouth.net](mailto:tigerja@bellsouth.net)

<sup>10</sup> *STUDIES IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, A Treatise On American Citizenship* By John S. Wise, Edward Thompson Company Northport, Long Island, N.Y. (1906)

<sup>11</sup> Senate Document # 43; 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.”*