



CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES EXAMINED ©

Authored by LB Bork lb@pacinlaw.org

FORWARD

As some people may understand who have been in the “freedom movement”, there has been a long-term debate on the term “citizen of the United States”.

This article is of purpose to expand on the various types of citizenship that are present in the union that is named *The United States of America*. When you set out to read the contents herein, you will undoubtedly note that the term *citizen* is used in somewhat of a vague manner. It is ventured that there is a specified purpose for this measure.¹

AMERICAN CITIZEN

To set the premise on this infamous term in question—*citizen of the United States*—we should first ascertain what a citizen is in affiliation to American law. In regard, see this 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 explain what the term *citizen* means in 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 deemed a *person* unless they are a member of a society, *i.e.* a body politic or nation.

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 the legal fiction that people are citizens of a country instead of being members of a nation or nationals of any such country; this making them *subject to* the State.

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 does not have political rights.³ A person is 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 looked at as being stateless, hence has no protections 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 established under the American system of law, a man is not considered a “citizen” until the right is engaged by participation as such a person; when engaged he becomes a subject, *i.e.* subject to the laws of the state or local government. It is important to note that *person* and *citizen* are not always used interchangeably; hence, one could infer or say that a person may be part of a society without having the *citizen status* attached to him or herself at times.

In pursuance of such premise, view these two definitions of which 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 “citizen” in describing a “freeman” *was not* employed in the above definitions; however, the term “person” was employed. Also note that a freeman can do whatever he pleases that is not forbidden by law. Admittedly, this is a broad and open proclamation; but, in America, the original civil law—or more accurately, the law that governed societies in America—was the *common law*, this is understood to mean the custom and

2 **ALIEN.** Owing political allegiance to another country or government; foreign. *alien residents.* An unnaturalized foreign resident of a country; also called noncitizen. *American Heritage*

3 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.

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 domicile 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*

usage of a specific society. A society, in American law, may be broken down into the different *counties* of the republic.⁷ We will go into these matters in more detail later.

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;⁸ and the term *citizen* applies to the *political rights* of a person of a specific country or nation which is applied in degrees depending on the participation of such person in a political sphere.

CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

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

As used in the Constitution for the United States, the term “citizen of the United States” is a term that was never really defined. The term in question appears in the original United States Constitution several times. If one looks at the term closely 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 states that make-up the American Union. This can be further referenced in the naturalization acts that were enacted in the early 1800’s:

- “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...”⁹

Note that it states. . . “*may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States, or any of them...*” By the use of this specific language in the act, it overtly appears that a federal citizenship¹⁰ is being established, or a “citizen of the United States” status. One thing noted, only people of the *white race* were allowed to be members of the [U]nited States.

To further assist 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 United States exists due to the incorporators, which were the several American republics. This same language can be seen in the current Thirteenth Amendment. Simply, it states that the United States is the entity of the several American

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 Dictionary, sixth edition*

8 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.]

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

10 **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*

states by the use of the word “their” (*any place subject to their jurisdiction*).¹¹ What this information establishes is that the United States was always considered a corporation and the *incorporators* were all the *state governments* in the Union. The style or name of the corporation—which is *The United States of America*—was established under the Articles of Confederation¹² and was carried on through to the Constitution.

With that set forth, we are now able to ascertain what the United States is in relation to international law. Unknown to most people it should be noted that the United States of America *is not* a nation nor is it a country;¹³ this corporate entity is only loosely referred to as such. As a matter of international law, the United States—when referenced to in the internal and collective sense—is a confederation of countries or nations.

To further expand on 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 really 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 this instant case was: if a person that—in example—was a governor of one of the U.S. government's territories (*i.e.*, territories or lands that were either acquired by purchase or conquest by the United States), what *national status* or *citizenship* did such person have that lived in these territories or lands? Was he considered a “citizen and national of the United States? This is just one *conflict* that is caused by the federation under the United States Constitution. There are several more. For this instant query, as earlier stated, when one was naturalized, he became a citizen of the United States, or a citizen of one of the several states. Again, it appears that the *citizen of the United States* status was developed under the original constitutional system even though it may have been *unspoken*.

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.¹⁴ However, there is a legal premise behind the myth;¹⁵ the issues are more involved than most people understand. The main issue is purely that of common law and political, of which were somewhat aforementioned herein above.¹⁶

11 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: notice the usage of their instead of ITS in the authority. The De facto United States refers to itself as IT in most acts of law.]

12 Article I: The Stile of this Confederacy shall be "The United States of America".

13 **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*

14 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.

15 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.

16 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. Moreover, it should be noted that the United States government 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.

THE NEW CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

With the aforementioned “citizen of the United States” set forth, we can now go over the new paradigm that encompasses the term “citizen of the United States” created after the *so-called* Civil War.¹⁷ This is what we refer to as the *convenient conversion*.

After the *so-called* Civil War an amendment to the United States Constitution was added. 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.”

Accordingly, the infamous amendment has caused the term “citizen of the United States” to take on a whole different meaning. . . there is now 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 US Constitution.¹⁸

To further illustrate this term, let us look at what a *state citizen* is considered to be under the 14th Amendment, as defined by 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: 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 aforesaid 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? No one can participate in the political system under the Fourteenth Amendment without being a “citizen of the United States”.¹⁹ If you remember, 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 he is *ipso facto* a *citizen of the United States* by an *operation of law*. Accordingly, generally, everyone is presumed to be a *citizen* and *subject*; or as found in the basic language of the Fourteenth Amendment: “subject to the jurisdiction thereof (or of IT)”.

17 As the United States is a confederation, the *so-called* Civil War was an international war.

18 Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition Deluxe

19 Two examples of such qualifications: IDAHO. 34-402. Qualifications Of Electors. Every male or female *citizen of the United States*, eighteen (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*.

THE SO-CALLED STRAW MAN PREMISE

There are some people that believe that the *corporation* entitled the “United States” has established and controls some fictional character which is referred to as a “straw man”. Such entity resembles the name of a man or woman and is generally noted or spelled in all *uppercase letters*. People that subscribe to this theory believe that government created it, and they—the real flesh and blood man—are not responsible for it; although some of these people 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. Remember, the United States of America is not an actual country nor is it a nation, but it is a corporation. Now the following is evidenced:

Firstly, again, the United States is not a nation; now, the difference is as follows:

- **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 that the primary difference between a *body politic government* and a *body politic corporate* is that members of a corporation are *persons* or legal entities. When you couple this with the United States one can *presume* that a U.S. citizen is 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 *body politic* under the 14th Amendment. Moreover, the government looks at ones who are considered “citizens of the United States” as living persons:

- TITLE 20—EMPLOYEES’ BENEFITS
CHAPTER III—SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
PART 401—PRIVACY & DISCLOSURE OF OFFICIAL RECORDS AND INFO
Subpart A—General
Section 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.

So you see, the *straw man premise* is a dangerous thing to implement in any particular instance. A man or woman is acting in the *capacity* as such a *person* under the *Law of Persons*, i.e. *Roman Civil Law*. The simple fact is: Americans are just regarded as U.S. persons—e.g. see Title 26 USC § 7701(a)(30)—of which government has control over under the general premise of nationality/citizenship²⁰ as one being a member of a nation: the *false nation* that the United States has created under the Fourteenth Amendment.

²⁰ 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.

Therefore, the factual premise is that of a legal fiction,²¹ which is a man or woman being of the de facto status of a “citizen of the United States”. Such status is actually grounded in established facts, mainly examining *the actions* of any specific *individual*.

In an expanded sense the straw man premise has some validity, but pursuing the “straw man premise” is an act of futility and is truly tomfoolery. Moreover, in law, the term noted as straw man is actually a real person that is another party.²² The simple fact is you are the “straw man” for acting in the capacity as a *new* “citizen of the United States”.

DUAL CITIZENSHIP

Now, to explain the aspect of the *so-called* dual-citizenship:

There is none—It is a FRAUD!

One must understand that the “United States” did not have the authority to create its own political system; therefore, to cover-up this fact there has been a plethora of fraudulent acts committed by the *insurgent* courts and other *insurgent* officers of this system.²³

Just as a man was a citizen of a ‘state’ and a ‘county’ or ‘city’ in the original form of the constitutional system—*i.e.* a man could participate in any or all of the aforementioned levels of government—under the operations of the Fourteenth Amendment a man is a *citizen of the United States* and may participate—in levels—in all forms of government under the *new political system* created under the Fourteenth Amendment.

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, the states in the Union under the Fourteenth Amendment political system are now to be regarded as *political subdivisions* (quasi-political subdivisions) of the new United States; they are the counties of the United States (of sorts), they are not sovereign states with a *clipped sovereignty* as they were prior to said amendment.²⁴

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—not both. 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*;²⁵ but common

21 **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, 6th Edition Deluxe*

22 **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*

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

24 See the article *Treason by Design*, by LB Bork

25 *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*

sense dictates that this is a non-possibility.²⁶ All *de facto* state officers are elected by *citizens of the United States* (see footnote 19 in regard to who may vote). 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.

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 14th Amendment; in somewhat of a retraction, the system is not forced, it is *set-up* so one volunteers.²³ This allows both the United States and any given state to pick and choose what system of law one is subject to.²⁷

In example: Depending on the circumstances of a case in question, 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 or am I going to look at this matter as if he were a person under the original constitutional system?*” If he knows that you voted to put him in office—which means you agree to the *new citizenship*, and accordingly you agree to the laws of both the federal and state governments—one is then *subject to* his jurisdiction. This is just ONE of the factors that incorporates the phrase found in the 14th Amendment, section one, wherein it is set forth: “. . . *and subject to the jurisdiction thereof. . .*”

You ask: How can this be? How can there be two systems of law? We simply ask you? Was anything formally 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”.

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 as a matter of law—was over the freedom of the slaves of the Southern States in the Union. The Fifteenth Amendment of the new 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, which gave them the right according to the premise of the term. Why the amendment? If you look at the language in the Fifteenth it is not creating the citizenship, just stating they can vote.

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).

26 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”. 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, sixth edition*

27 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>

The question is: Are there two political systems under the Fourteenth Amendment? One that the *original citizens* participated in and one that the *ex-slaves* to participated in?

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 main question is: Does one really have to “participate” to be deemed a citizen of the United States?

The answer: NO. Anyone that is born in the any one of the [U]nited States of America is assumed to be a “citizen of the United States” or “United States citizen”.²⁸

Why you ask? Because any such person did not formally establish he was not such a person (*see* Title 8 USC § 1481); 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 (*see footnote 19 & ‘straw man premise’ for an example*). Furthermore, under international doctrine, a child carries the citizenship of his father. As only a *citizen of the United States* can vote, did his father vote?

In conclusion: If it looks like a Duck and quacks like a Duck. . . It must be a Duck.

THE NEW LAW GOVERNING PEOPLES

So what kind of citizen is the *new* citizen of the United States? That is to say, what kind of law system is such a person really under? To help answer this query, below is a summation from the famous landmark court case *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

In this landmark case the United States allowed women in America to kill their babies by abortion. And under the original system of common law abortion is murder:

Qui in utero est, pro jam nato habetur quoties de ejus commodo quaeritur. He who is in the womb, is considered as born, whenever it is for his benefit.

Simply put: Every child that is conceived has the right to live as it is a child of God.

Before the *War Between the States*—the correct way to depict this war—America was under a law system that was grounded in Scripture, *i.e.* the Law of God. However, after such war a new system of law that governed societies was introduced; that system of law

28 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.]

is the *Roman Civil Law*. As stated by the Roe court, before the war the law that governed the several societies throughout the Union was the *common law*. Such society law was diverse in each country in the Union because it was based on the customs and usages of each society. Accordingly, as America was founded by God fearing people, they lived in reverence of God; hence the *common law* mirrored the guidance of Scripture.

With that established, below are two definitions taken from Black's Law Dictionary, 6th edition. Such definitions will evidence the difference between the two systems:

- **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—which is evidence on the face of what is presented—that America is generally under a system of *Roman Civil Law*.²⁹ Such law replaced the original societal law for the several states, the *Common Law*. Under the original system of societal law, a case like *Roe v. Wade* would have never made it to the Supreme Court to stand as precedence. The “people” of each society in the Union decide what is right under their Scriptural practice, not the government acting as a god.

Accordingly, here is the definition of a person of Rome:

- **civis.** (Roman law.) A citizen.³⁰

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 excepting this *de facto*³¹ status, do people that act in defiance of the Word of God really believe that He will bless America?

29 See the piece: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Civil_Law_v_Common_Law.php

30 Ballentine's Law Dictionary, 3rd edition

31 **DE FACTO.** In fact, as distinguished from “de jure,” by right. *Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed.*

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

Do you really want to do what the Romans do?

POLITICAL MATTERS INVOLVED

Now to delve into political issues of the Fourteenth Amendment:

So what is this new citizenship all about, besides Roman Civil Law?

Answer: COMMUNISM.

You may be asking: What is the true definition for communism?

Well, it is not what you have heard in school or on the television that pegs Cuba, China and the Ex-Soviet Union as being such. These were/are just “bogeymen” to cover-up the world scheme that is being implemented right under your nose: The New World Order. This *New World Order* is fundamentally a scheme of the world elite.

The schools and the media—who are the crux of the problem—have everyone thinking that communism is based on dictatorship, not a 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 COMMUNIST!

Below is a list of the main elements of communism which are set forth by the Communist Manifesto. However, before reading them one should note that Marx stated:

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

In other words: All the Planks will be installed by any means possible or they will do the best they can to apply them through law. Below are the 10 Planks; the American parallels are portrayed in the copy below the plank; such descriptions establish the applications in America through acts of the *insurgent* Congress and the *new* President:

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. Read The RED Amendment, by LB Bork, to understand this one better.

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, *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—*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*). Accordingly, this is further stated in the Communist Manifesto in its applied dogma:

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

An intelligent person would say—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 fifty countries and nationalities. The matters that have been brought to your attention herein are just measures to deal with the plot.

In short: To get away with this plot on a large scale, all Americans had to be pulled into the jurisdiction of the “United States” to be controlled by *its* laws to establish this. You ask, what is THIS, ultimately? The below definition will explain this question:

- **fascism....** any system of government in which property is privately owned, but all industry and business is regulated by a strong national government.³²

It should be understood that the United States Constitution always mandated the control of commerce under the United States... In other words, it is a very progressive plot. All these elements exposed herein are part and parcel of the end result desired.

In essence, the system as established gives corporations protections and allows the larger corporations to control the legislatures which destroys smaller businesses. Furthermore, larger corporations enjoy the benefits of not having to take care of their employees via

32 Thorndike Century Senior Dictionary, 1941. The new definition: 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*

insurances that are shifted to the masses which in turn expands their profits: that is to say, corporations do not have to be concerned about their workers; they are taken care of via pooled monies that come from all businesses. Moreover, the system as established allows the government—*i.e.*, Federal Reserve—to create false accounts in a pyramid scheme that is actually stealing Americans labor; this perpetuates the “Public Debt” which benefits the owners of the Federal Reserve.

SYLLABUS

IN SUMMARY: One might say the *so-called* Civil War (1861-1865) was a fight against fascism; but at the time people of America just did not understand it, nor do they today. Any person that claims to be a U.S. citizen—*i.e.* a citizen of the United States—which includes not formally establishing that he is not, is fundamentally a COMMUNIST.

And in a final note, below is an example of propaganda from the year 1906. The copy that is illustrated is from a book that was widely distributed in America; the book was entitled simply: *Citizenship*.³³ Its estimated purpose was to condition all 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 to the state?³⁴ The truth of the matter is the *controllers* have incorporated several methods to con all Americans into supporting this governmental system under the Fourteenth 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

~~~~~

Authored by LB Bork of the People’s Awareness Coalition

POB 313 – Kieler, Wisconsin [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)

LB may be reached via email at: [lb@pacinlaw.org](mailto:lb@pacinlaw.org)

~~~~~



For a complete understanding of the issues discussed in this paper you may want to acquire a copy of *The Red Amendment*. For information on how to receive a personal copy, go to the website at : <http://www.redamendment.net>

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

34 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.”