Most people in America value the term citizen, however most fail to understand that a citizen is also a subject i.e. subject to the sovereign. /1\ To set the premise on this term in question, we first should establish what a citizen is. A bit of history and legal evaluation: For one to be a citizen, he first has to be a member of a nation, which is referred to as nationality or one being that of a national e.g. Cherokee national, Florida national, Iowa national, etc.

We should ask ourselves why does one have to be a citizen if he is a national?

The answer: It is a scheme that was set up by the World Elite under the doctrines established by the work of Vattel. The scheme was to set-up the legal fiction or presumption that a man or woman of a nation agrees with everything that the government of the nation does; accordingly this then set forth that all men and women were subject to the general laws of the State. Pursuant to these factors, there is a general misconception that government officials are servants, however they are regarded as rulers or sovereign i.e. King. /2\

Now to show the premise established by American law.

The federal constitution utilized the principle of Vattel and established the premise or legal fiction that everyone born in the [U]nited States of America (i.e. several states) was a citizen at birth. This is the presumption anyway.

Now to prove this assertion, look at the following definition that was of the period prior to the so-called Civil War as set forth by Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856:

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.

Hence, a man—or woman—is a human being, however they are not a "person" unless they are a member a civil society i.e. a state, body politic or nation.

Accordingly, the term person then takes on many different meanings: In American law, the term "citizen" relates to a person with political rights; an alien does not have political rights. A person is a member of a nation. A man or woman that is a member of the nation

has a nationality. If one is not a person, he or she is looked at as stateless, hence any such man or woman has no protections under his people (nation) or government.

Therefore, as established under the American system of republican government (a misconception by most people in the freedom movement), a man is not truly considered a "citizen" until the right is engaged by participation; when engaged he becomes a subject i.e. subject to the laws of the state as he is: 1) agreeing to legislation for his participation by voting, or not setting forth that he is not a citizen: state and/or federal; or 2) subject to the law for taking government office.

Now look at the term "subject" as defined by Ballentine's Law Dictionary:

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 (or state) are not truly qualified to be a "citizen" per se; but if one is qualified to be a citizen and states that he is a citizen qualifies him to be "subject to" a government.

As to these matters, now view these two definitions of which define a non-citizen that are taken from Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856:

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. FREEMAN. One who is in the enjoyment of the right to do whatever he pleases, not forbidden by law.

Note that "citizen" in describing a "free man" was not utilized, however note that the term "person" was utilized. Also note that a freeman can do what ever he pleases that is not forbidden by law. This is a broad and open statement, but as the original civil law in America was the common law, this is construed to mean under the custom and usage of a particular society i.e. the Common Law. This law was generally based on the smallest political subdivision of the state or republic, which is each individual county (or parish).

One may define a "citizen" as: one that engages such privilege and/or right in a specific State or venue or in any given political sphere, which is to include exercising suffrage or running for any state or federal public office.

In summary: one is a national (person), but not necessarily a citizen.

Referring to oneself as a citizen establishes the nexus to being subject to the general laws of the state. This is even more dangerous under the fourteenth amendment, as the "state citizenship" prior to the fourteenth was eliminated i.e. the state governments are not the same state governments i.e. not de jure. Therefore as there is technically no more state citizenship, by referring to oneself as a citizen in this political system is stating that you are a United States citizen, hence you are also subject to federal law. Today, generally everyone is or at minimum presumed to be a citizen and subject; or as found in the language of the fourteenth amendment: "subject to the jurisdiction thereof (or of it)". To rectify this problem one must officially establish his rightful status as pursuant to law.

-----

To learn more, see these terms and pages:

Jus Publicum and Jus Privatum Sui Juris Nationality American Slave Inhabitant vs Resident Fourteenth Amendment

------

## **Footnotes**

/1\ In example, below note that the Vermont Constitution—which was existent prior to the Federal Constitution—utilized the term "subject" and not "citizen" like the Federal Constitution. Also it should be noted that since day one of the birth of the union of American states, one can find the terms "this State" and "the State" utilized in constitutions and statutes. The former is in reference to the presumed consent of law of the State (or legislature), and the latter is in reference to the republic. In American law it is noted that a republic is a state absent of its form of government (Black's Law) i.e. the land and nation (i.e. country) without a government. The usage of "this state" is another artifice that is used to implement presumed consent or legal fiction. There are many factors that will induce the "subject" status e.g. voting.

Vermont Constitution, Section 39th.

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, except that he shall not be capable of being elected Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Treasurer, Councillor or Representative in Assembly, until after two years residence.

/2\ Ruler. n. One, such as a monarch or dictator, that rules or governs.

American Heritage Dictionary

The corrected halos are talled for the Followski at Process.

The segments below are taken from the Federalist Papers.

The Federalist Papers were a series of articles outlining the Ruling Elitists' plan to control the commerce of the American peoples under the document known as the Constitution for the United States. They were a Public Notice posted in the state known as the "Empire State".

\_\_\_\_\_

If, on the other hand, they find us either destitute of an effectual government (each State doing right or wrong, as to its rulers may seem convenient), or split into three or four independent and probably discordant republics or confederacies, one inclining to Britain, another to France, and a third to Spain, and perhaps played off against each other by the three, what a poor, pitiful figure will America make in their eyes!

FEDERALIST No. 4 -- John Jay

The rulers of the respective members, whether they have a constitutional right to do it or not, will undertake to judge of the propriety of the measures themselves.

FEDERALIST. No. 15 -- Alexander Hamilton

Independent of parties in the national legislature itself, as often as the period of discussion arrived, the State legislatures, who will always be not only vigilant but suspicious and jealous guardians of the rights of the citizens against encroachments from the federal government, will constantly have their attention awake to the conduct of the national rulers, and will be ready enough, if any thing improper appears, to sound the alarm to the people, and not only to be the voice, but, if necessary, the arm of their discontent.
FEDERALIST. No. 26 Alexander Hamilton
But though the adversaries of the proposed Constitution should presume that the national rulers would be insensible to the motives of public good, or to the obligations of duty, I would still ask them how the interests of ambition, or the views of encroachment, can be promoted by such a conduct?
FEDERALIST. No. 27 Alexander Hamilton
If the representatives of the people betray their constituents, there is then no resource left but in the exertion of that original right of self-defense which is paramount to all positive forms of government, and which against the usurpations of the national rulers, may be exerted with infinitely better prospect of success than against those of the rulers.
FEDERALIST No. 28 Alexander Hamilton
If we were even to suppose the national rulers actuated by the most ungovernable ambition, it is impossible to believe that they would employ such preposterous means to accomplish their designs.
FEDERALIST. No. 29 Alexander Hamilton

\_\_\_\_\_

It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens.

FEDERALIST. No. 51 -- Alexander Hamilton/James Madison

------
If foreign gold could so easily corrupt our federal rulers and enable them to ensnare and betray their constituents, how has it happened that we are at this time a free and independent nation?

FEDERALIST. No. 55 -- Alexander Hamilton/James Madison

\_\_\_\_\_

But the security will not be considered as complete, by those who attend to the force of an obvious distinction between the interest of the people in the public felicity, and the interest of their local rulers in the power and consequence of their offices.

FEDERALIST. No. 59 -- Alexander Hamilton/James Madison

\_\_\_\_\_

As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought, in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers; so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people, stimulated by some irregular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by the artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn.

FEDERALIST. No. 63 -- Alexander Hamilton/James Madison

-----

The different views taken of the subject in the two preceding papers must be sufficient to satisfy all dispassionate and discerning men, that if the public liberty should ever be the victim of the ambition of the national rulers, the power under examination, at least, will be guiltless of the sacrifice.

FEDERALIST. No.61 -	- Alex	ander	Hamilton
---------------------	--------	-------	----------

\_\_\_\_\_

Let it, however, be admitted, for argument sake, that the expedient suggested might be successful; and let it at the same time be equally taken for granted that all the scruples which a sense of duty or an apprehension of the danger of the experiment might inspire, were overcome in the breasts of the national rulers, still I imagine it will hardly be pretended that they could ever hope to carry such an enterprise into execution without the aid of a military force sufficient to subdue the resistance of the great body of the people.

FEDERALIST. No. 60 -- Alexander Hamilton

-----

The intrinsic difficulty of governing thirteen States at any rate, independent of calculations upon an ordinary degree of public spirit and integrity, will, in my opinion constantly impose on the national rulers the necessity of a spirit of accommodation to the reasonable expectations of their constituents.

FEDERALIST. No. 85 -- Alexander Hamilton

## **Web Source**

https://web.archive.org/web/20050209143747/http://www.worldnewsstand.net:80/law/citizen.htm