



THE TERM CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES ©

Authored by LB Bork lb@pacinlaw.org

INTRODUCTION

There has been an obscure term throughout the history of the America Union that most people fail to understand: that term is “*citizen of the United States*”.

FORWARD

The purpose of this writing is to clear up any questions that you may have in regard to the term; and it will be brief in regard to its explanation and content. You will find that there is apparent vagueness of the term which appears to form a progressive plot.

REFERENCE I

Before the Constitution for the United States of America there was *The Articles of Confederation*.¹ The Articles did not contain the term in question. As a matter of fact, the word or term “citizen” only appears *once* in the Articles. Moving ahead to the year 1789, the Constitution for the United States of America² was the first time the term in question appears. As to the places in the document that it appears are as follows:

- **Article I, Section 2.** No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a *Citizen of the United States*, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.
- **Article I, Section 3.** No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a *Citizen of the United States*, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.
- **Article II, Section 1.** No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a *Citizen of the United States*, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

1 Agreed to by Congress November 15, 1777; ratified and in force, March 1, 1781.

2 The United States Constitution is the supreme law of the United States of America. It was adopted in its original form on September 17, 1787 by the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and later ratified by state-selected delegates representing the people of the several states. When delegates in nine of the then thirteen states ratified the document, it marked the creation of a union of sovereign states, and a federal government to administer that union. It took effect on March 4, 1789, replacing the weaker, non-centralized union that existed under the Articles of Confederation. *Taken from Wikipedia*

The first two references in regard to Representatives and Senators above are simple in their usage. Using the implementation of the rules of sentence structure fundamentally establishes that these references are in pursuance to people that were not born in one of the several states in the Union, but had to be accepted, or naturalized, to be a *citizen* of one of the several states for seven (7) years, to be a Representative; and nine (9) years to be a Senator. In other words one could not be a Representative or a Senator unless he was naturalized citizen of one of the several states in the Union for seven (7) and nine (9) years respectively. The term *Citizen of the United States*³ was just a way of stating a citizen of one of the several United States as the membership of the person to a state or body politic was not known. In other words, it is not feasible to list all the several state citizenships. And, as another note, the capitalization of the term citizen in the body of the original constitution means nothing. There are several other words that are capitalized in the original body of the Constitution that follow the same style; it was just a form of writing for that period of time and/or the writing style of the drafter.⁴

Now, in regard to the third article that references the President, we see the usage of *natural born citizen* in regard to this reference. The other language is: “*at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution...*” This simply states that the *first President* of the United States under the general rules of the Constitution could be a naturalized citizen; all other Presidents had to be born in one of the several states to be President thereafter. In other words: a man could have been born in England, and a subject thereof, who then having terminated such status/fidelity by becoming a naturalized American citizen could be the *first President*; but any President thereafter had to be born in an American state.⁵

For those who do not know what *naturalized* means, it is acquiring the nationality and citizenship of a country that one *is not* born into, which is set by legal stipulations.

So, in review of the above references in the body of the original Constitution, by the use of the term “citizen of the United States” renders one a naturalized citizen. In the parts to follow you will see how this takes a progressive turn towards something different.

REFERENCE II

The next stop on the chronological evaluation brings us to an act of Congress from 1802. Here is where we start to see some funny business in regard to the terminology *citizen of the United States*. You will see that the federal government is starting to claim *its* own citizens. This is the start of the slippery slope to what is in place today.

3 UNITED STATES. This term has several meanings. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in family of nations, it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends, or it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. *Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt, U.S. Ohio, 324 U.S. 652, 65 S. Ct. 870, 870, 880, 89 L. Ed. 1252. Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition Deluxe* [Author's note: These principals are taken from the multiple term's usage in the body of the original United States Constitution.]

4 This author has consulted with a linguistics scholar that had stated that the style of writing that is found in the Constitution was believed to be of German origin.

5 This author has always had a problem with the usage of living in or being born in a 'state'. The term “state” is in reference to a government. People are born in the *country* and not the state; although they are presumed to be part of the body politic which does makeup the state under a republican form of government. This difference will become more apparent to the separation of the state and body politic toward the end of this paper.

The below public law of the United States congress was actually an early naturalization act under delegated constitutional authority.⁶ Below is the act referenced from the year 1802 as found in Bouvier's Law Dictionary from the year 1856:

- 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. 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,...

An *alien* is a member of another country or body politic.⁷ What the above sets forth establishes something different from the first references that were analyzed: 1) due to the construction of the sentence, as to the structure from the original use in the Constitution the term *citizen of the United States* appears to mean *not* a naturalized citizen, but sets forth that one may be deemed a citizen of the federal government; 2) the language of "*or any of them*" establishes that there are still "state citizens".

Why was this written this way? To clarify, the word "either" could have been inserted:

That any alien, being a free white person, may be admitted to become
either a citizen of the United States, or any of them,...

The above would have been blatantly clear though. If games were not being played, the simple way to state it would be something to the effect of the following:

*That any alien, being a free white person, may be admitted to
become a citizen of one of the several States...*

Of course that clarity would not lend to games of different interpretations to come about. Common sense dictates that these games with the term *United States* should serve as prima facie evidence that the federal government was attempting to create its own citizenship. This establishes the *legal fiction*⁸ that anyone that who becomes a naturalized citizen may be deemed a subject to the law that is established by Congress.

REFERENCE III

If you have done some constitutional research you will have found that there was an alternate 13th Amendment that strangely disappeared after the *so-called* Civil War. The term *citizen of the United States* appeared in this amendment.

Extensive research has been done on this missing amendment by a Mr. David Dodge. His research has confirmed that this particular amendment was proposed in January, 1810, by

6 From the constitutional authority found at Article I, Section 8: "*The Congress shall have Power to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.*" [Author's note: This clause is evidence that there are several nations or nationalities in the American union.]

7 Also see the term *alien* as defined by the United States code: Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(3). The term "alien" means any person *not* a citizen or national of the United States.

8 NOTE: A "Legal Fiction" is also referred to as a "presumption". See this authority: "A presumption is a deduction which the law expressly directs to be made from particular facts." (Code Civ. Proc., sec. 1959 [Note: now Evidence Code, § 600.]) And "a presumption (unless declared by law to be conclusive) may be controverted by other evidence, direct or indirect: but unless controverted, the jury is bound to find according to the presumption." (Code Civ. Proc., sec. 1961 [Note: now Evid. Cd, § 602 et seq.]) (bracketed information added.) In re Bauer (1889), 79 Cal. 304, 307.

Senator Reed. On April 27, of that same year, the Senate passed the 13th Amendment; the House resolved in the affirmative. The following resolve was sent to the States for ratification. The language amendment is as follows:

- If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.

The purpose of this reference is not to go over the general content of the amendment, but rather to evidence what unethical members of Congress of the United States were doing in regard to firming up a federal citizenship. It is noted that there is some questionable tactics in regard to the original language noted as *United States* in the original body of the Constitution (*see footnote 3*). Although sentence construction generally sets forth the meaning of the infamous term noted as *United States*, alternate language could have been implemented as to avoid terminology that could have been misconstrued in the future. As to this, the drafters of the Constitution appear to be creating this confusion on purpose. This to lay the groundwork to do what is gone over in this paper. To further study the concern of these issues read the Federalist Papers⁹ and Antifederalist Papers.¹⁰ Also understand why the first Ten Articles in Amendment to the Constitution were installed.

Now back in reference to the term as used in this amendment. The use of *citizen of the United States* appears to be that of meaning a citizen of any of the states. But remember what we have discussed by evidencing that Congress was attempting to create a federal citizenship with the naturalization act of 1802. This is infringing on states rights by attempting to impose a citizen status on any *state citizen* under legal fiction as to attempt to control them with federal law. Not that this author disagrees with the premise of this amendment, but it appears that this is a backdoor attempt to create *legal fictions*⁸ to control the people in the states. Note the other language of the amendment:

“...shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”

The noted language is referencing both state and federal governments. Moreover, again the language of *citizen of the United States* had now taken on a generic type meaning. To state again, *legal fictions*⁸ are created with the language. Furthermore, there are places in several of the constitutions of the states that were granted statehood by the United States of America that maintain generic use of *citizens of the United States* in their language.¹¹ It further shows the digression of the terminology into apparent vagueness.

REFERENCE IV

Now we go into what is believed to be the final planned stage of the term *citizen of the United States*. The people with subversive motives are now finalizing pulling all people in the American states under the control of the federal government.

9 The Federalist Papers: http://www.pacinelaw.org/political/federalist/federalist_opener.shtml

10 The Antifederalist Papers: http://www.pacinelaw.org/political/antifederalist/antifederalist_opener.shtml

11 In example, study the original Florida constitution.

For those who have read the other writings of this author you have the insight that the Fourteenth Amendment has been strictly scrutinized. Simply, the amendment establishes an *insurgent* de facto political system.¹² Accordingly this part does not need to be set-up to any great extent. Below is the section that contains the language:

- **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.

The sentence structure with the use of the word *AND* establishes that one is a citizen of the United States¹³ and a State. As you can plainly see the language sets forth a definite duality. That is to say, there is a *dual citizenship*. This is something that is inherent to the citizenship that is held under the 14th Amendment system; see it defined below:

- **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.¹⁴

It appears that the wish of the Federalists was complete. The progressive plot which was established to create the federal citizen was no longer vague. The Fourteenth Amendment ended it. People in the countries of the American union were now *all* pulled into the jurisdiction of the federal government (*i.e.* the United States) to be controlled by the law of Congress. It is truly unfortunate that few understand this important issue.

CLOSING

In closing, be sure you go over the *End Notes* of this writing. There are some telling authorities in regard to the Fourteenth Amendment political system.

To learn more, also read the article *Citizen of the United States Examined*. The PDF file may be downloaded at: www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/US_Citizen_Examined.pdf

To further examine this scam, you should read *The Dual System of Law Effectuated by the Fourteenth Amendment* at: www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Dual_System.pdf

Also, the book *The Red Amendment* goes over the issues in detail. You may check out the overview of the book at: www.pacinlaw.org/index/red_amendment.php

~~~~~

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)

---

12 Fourteenth Amendment, Section 2: [http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/14th\\_Section\\_2.pdf](http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/14th_Section_2.pdf)

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 Black’s Law Dictionary, 6th Edition Deluxe

## END NOTES:

The United States started to tear apart the several nations of the world by instituting the rule of *jus soli* over the rule of *jus sanguinis*. The former is of *feudal origin*<sup>15</sup> of which claims a man to be a citizen of a kingdom even though he lacks any ties to the nation; the latter sets forth that a man has the nationality of his father (or parents) no matter where he is born. The reason that any government does this is to claim bodies for taxation and service. You might say that it is a stealthy way to create *Human Resources*.

Here is the *twisted authority* that is found in a United States government publication:

- GN 00303.100 U.S. Citizenship. SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES. Individuals under the purview of the Fourteenth Amendment (which states that all individuals born in the U.S. and to whom U.S. laws apply are U.S. citizens). Acquisition of citizenship is not affected by the fact that the alien parents are only temporarily in the U.S. at the time of the child's birth. Under international law, children born in the U.S. to foreign sovereigns or foreign diplomatic officers listed on the State Department Diplomatic List are not subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S.

This authority was established by the case UNITED STATES v. WONG KIM ARK.<sup>16</sup> The dissenting opinion was the correct one and in part went like this:

Below are some of Mr. Chief Justice FULLER's comments of a *dissenting opinion*, with Mr. Justice HARLAN concurring, in the case of Wong Kim Ark:

*"...the views of the publicists had been thus put by Vattel: "The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens. As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to his children the right of becoming members of it. The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent." "*

*"The framers of the constitution were familiar with the distinctions between the Roman law and the feudal law, between obligations based on territoriality and those based on the personal and invisible character of origin; and there is nothing to show that in the matter of nationality they intended to adhere to principles derived from regal government, which they had just assisted in overthrowing."*

*"Manifestly, when the sovereignty of the crown was thrown off, and an independent government established, every rule of the common law, and every statute of England obtaining in the colonies, in derogation of the principles on which the new government was founded, was abrogated."*

*"In other words, the fourteenth amendment does not exclude from citizenship by birth children born in the United States of parents permanently located therein, and who might themselves become citizens; nor, on the other hand, does it arbitrarily make citizens of children born in the United States of parents who, according to the will of their native government and of this government, are and must remain aliens."*

*"Was it intended by this amendment to tear up parental relations by the roots?"*

---

<sup>15</sup> Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition

<sup>16</sup> 169 U.S. 649 (March 25, 1898)

And, for those people that believe that the 14th Amendment only applies to blacks (*i.e.* ex-slaves) due to an *opinion* of some *incompetent* 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>17</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>18</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 to the state?<sup>19</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

---

17 Research provided by John Ainsworth [tigerja@bellsouth.net](mailto:tigerja@bellsouth.net)

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

19 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.”*