

# The **TRUTH** About the 14TH AMENDMENT or Who Are YOU, REALLY?

This chapter is about the best kept secret in America. The government knows about the information in this chapter, but they will not admit it.

As we have learned , every individual **born** in one of the 50 sovereign states was born an individual American sovereign, **with inalienable rights**. Those inalienable rights included life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The pursuit of happiness included the right to engage in a common occupation or business without a license, to travel freely from one place to another without permission from the state (driver's license), the inalienable right to acquire and possess property without paying property tax, etc.

Before the Declaration of Independence, there were no Americans Citizens, because there was no America, as a country. The people were subjects of the British Crown. After the Declaration, each state was its own sovereign state, and the citizens were state Citizens. State Citizens had inalienable rights secured by each state's constitution. But I have a problem with the word "citizen". Can you be a citizen and a sovereign at the same time? Is a king a citizen of his own country? Or is he a sovereign and not a citizen? I believe that a 'citizen' is the same as a 'subject', and a subject always has a superior power over him. So, you are either a sovereign, OR a citizen/subject. You cannot be both at the same time.

This is confirmed by an early Supreme Court decision.

**Chisholm v. Georgia 2 Dall (U.S.) 419, 456-480 (1793)** (p.470) *All the country now possessed by the United States was then a part of the dominions appertaining to the crown of Great Britain. Every acre of land in this country was then held mediately or immediately from that crown. All the people of this country were then, subjects of the King of Great Britain, and owed allegiance to him; . . . From the crown of Great Britain, the sovereignty of their country passed to the people of it; . . . Here we see the people acting as sovereigns of the whole country; . . .*

(p.471) *At the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty.*

(p.458) *But in the case of the King, the sovereignty had a double operation. While it vested him with jurisdiction over others, it excluded all others from jurisdiction over him. The law, says Sir William Blackstone, ascribes to the King the attribute of sovereignty: he is sovereign and independent within his own dominions; and owes no kind of subjection to any other potentate upon earth. Hence it is, that no suit or action can be brought against the King, even in civil matters; because no court can have jurisdiction over him: **for all jurisdiction implies superiority of power.** The*

*principle is, that all human law must be prescribed by a superior.*

*(p.455) As the State has claimed precedence of the people; so in the same inverted course of things, the Government has often claimed precedence of the State; and to this perversion in the second degree, many of the volumes of confusion concerning sovereignty owe their existence. By a State I mean, a complete body of free persons united together for their common benefit, to enjoy peaceably what is their own, and to do justice to others. It is an artificial person. It has its affairs and its interests: It has its rules: It has its rights: And it has its obligations. **It may acquire property distinct from that of its members: It may incur debts to be discharged out of the public stock, not out the private fortunes of individuals.***

*(p. 456) The only reason, I believe, why a free man is bound by human laws, it that he binds himself. Upon the same principles, upon which he becomes bound by the laws, he becomes amenable to the Courts of Justice, which are formed and authorized by those laws. If one free man, an original sovereign, may do all this, why may not an aggregate of free men, a collection of original sovereigns, do likewise? . . . In one sense, the term sovereignty has for its correlative, subject. In this sense, the term can receive no application; for it has no object in the Constitution of the United States,. Under that Constitution there are citizens, but no subjects.*

"**ALL jurisdiction implies superiority of power**"! So if you are under the jurisdiction of a government, they have the superior power! You are bound by the laws only because you choose to be! When you pledge allegiance to any country, you become a subject of that country, and you waive your sovereignty. But, if you pledge allegiance only to YOUR creator, then you are the superior power, and no human government is over you. After the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, American sovereigns acquired citizenship status, called Citizen of the united States of America. Also known as American Citizen, with a capital "C".

**DeLima v. Bidwell 182 U.S. 179 (1900)** *The Constitution is not a physical substance. It is in the nature of a grant or power, or what would be termed in private law a power of attorney. **A real constitution is a grant of rights or powers by a sovereign.** The sovereign cannot be limited, for he is the source of all law. **Yick Wo v. Hopkins 118 U.S. 370***

In another Supreme Court case they ruled:

**Graves v. Schmidlapp 315 U.S. 657-665 (1941)** *The power to tax is an incident of sovereignty and is coextensive with that to which it is an incident. All **subjects over which the sovereign power of a state extends are objects of taxation.***

Are the American people sovereigns OVER the government? Or are they subjects of the government, UNDER the government's jurisdiction and power?

**Important points.** Sovereign Americans are above the governments they delegated management powers to. Governments are artificial persons, legal fictions. Governments, as artificial persons, can own property and incur debts on their own, separate from the sovereign

people. The personal fortunes of the sovereign people are not to be used to discharge the government's debts. Governments have complete power over their OWN property and **subjects**. All jurisdiction implies superiority of power. **All subjects UNDER** the jurisdictional power of a government, are objects of taxation. As the Supreme Court stated above, a free man is subject to human laws only because he binds himself. You, as one of the joint owners of this country, have agreed to abide by certain laws, that you have agreed to. These laws are designated in the Constitution. **Remember these concepts. They are critical to the understanding of freedom from taxation.**

The Supreme Court of Colorado has ruled:

**Colorado Anti-Discrimination Commission v. Case 380 P.2d 34** (1962) *Natural rights - inherent rights and liberties are not the creatures of constitutional provisions either at the national or state level. The inherent human freedoms with which mankind is endowed are "antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."*

You become subject to the human laws because you bind yourself to them as an artificial person. You waive your sovereign status, to become a subject. How do you do that? By contracting with the government and accepting benefits. **The only way the government will contract with you, is if you waive your inalienable rights and agree to be UNDER their jurisdiction.**

Before the 14th Amendment was ratified in 1868, Americans were called Citizens (with a capital "C") of the united States of America. (American Citizen, or American, for short) If you were born in America, you were born a sovereign with inalienable rights. It was a common understanding among the people. Up until then, slavery was still accepted in America. Slaves were not Citizens, state or national, but were merely considered the personal 'property' of the slave holders. The 13th Amendment was ratified in 1865, just 3 years before the 14th. **The 13th amendment abolished slavery. But that created a new problem.** The newly freed slaves were not citizens of any state or country, because they were just property, and property did not have citizenship. **To solve the problem, the 14th amendment was passed. This amendment created a new class of citizenship.** This new class was legally called: 'United States citizen', (with a small "c"). NOT 'United States of America Citizen', but just 'United States citizen'. Notice that the U.S. citizen is spelled with a lower case 'c'. This is to show a lower class of citizenship. This class of citizen (U.S. citizen) is a privilege granted by the federal government, and not a sovereign inalienable right.

From Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition:

**Fourteenth Amendment.** *The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, ratified in 1868, creates or at least recognizes for the first time a citizenship of the United States, as distinct from that of the states;*

The Civil War was fought from 1861-1865. The significance of this will be seen later.

Let's see just what the 14th Amendment really does say.

### **Constitution of the United States of America**

**14th Amendment (1868). 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. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the **privileges and immunities** of citizens of the United States; nor shall any States deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

Notice the wording of this amendment carefully. If they were talking about Citizens of the 50 states, then it would read "*and subject to the jurisdiction(s) thereof*". Jurisdictions would be plural if it applied to more than one entity. But since it applies only to the United States government, singular, is also shows the jurisdiction to be singular. Jurisdiction, not jurisdictions.

Several other things to notice here. This section 1 of the amendment has two parts.

The first part has to do with the citizenship of 'persons', subjects.

The second part has to do with the states being required to protect the privileges and immunities of the United States citizen. We will look at the first part first.

The first part of this amendment says that '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. We just learned that jurisdiction implies superiority of power, so is a United States citizen superior to the government? NO! The roles are reversed. Notice this does not say they are citizens of the United States 'of America'. Just the 'United States'. Is there a difference? Let's check it out.

First, what is a 'person'? There are legally two kinds of 'persons'. First there is the 'natural person' with inalienable rights. This is a flesh and blood human being, the sovereign individual. Second, there is just the term 'person'. When just the term 'person' is used, and not 'natural person', it means an artificial person, such as a corporation, trust, government, etc. A human being can be both a natural person and an artificial person at the same time. How do you tell the difference? It is as simple as whether you spell your name in all capital letters or not. More on this in a bit. The important thing to remember at this point is that artificial persons are property. **Property in Latin is res**. Property located in a certain territory, would be its place of *residence*. So property (res) belonging to and located in the State of Colorado, would be '*resident*' of the state. Are you a resident of a state or of the United States?

**Important point.** Since a government is an artificial person, according to the Supreme Court,

does an artificial person have jurisdiction over the sovereign that created the artificial person? No. Does the artificial person (government) have jurisdiction over any new artificial persons, or property, created by the government? Yes. A government has complete power over its subjects and its own property. Remember, the Constitution is just a power of attorney from the sovereign people to the government. That power of attorney extends to anything the government, as an artificial person, creates or owns.

So a 'resident' would be an artificial 'person' (property) located within the jurisdiction of a certain government. Almost all state and federal statutes apply to 'persons' who are citizens and residents, and are subject to the jurisdiction thereof. They rarely apply to 'natural persons'.

**Now to the second part of the 14th Amendment.** It applies to all persons "born or naturalized in the United States **and** subject to the jurisdiction thereof." This could only mean the territorial jurisdiction of the federal government. As stated in the Supreme Court case of *Chisholm v. Georgia* quoted earlier, all jurisdiction implies superiority of power. So if you are subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government, that implies their power is superior to your sovereign power, or the sovereign power of your state. In other words, you are not a sovereign, but a subject, if you are a U.S. citizen, name spelled in all caps.

A 'U.S. citizen' is a subject of the federal government, subject to its jurisdiction. An 'American Citizen' is a sovereign individual, and the government is subject to him, and no court has jurisdiction over him, without his permission. When you present yourself to a court, you give them temporary jurisdiction for a certain issue to be settled. Once it is settled, then that jurisdiction ceases. That is why plaintiffs must prove jurisdiction before courts can hear a case.

An important distinction needs to be understood here. The sovereign technically has inalienable rights, NOT constitutional rights. We all call them constitutional rights, but they are not. They are inalienable rights SECURED by constitutions, state and federal. The basis of any inalienable right is established in the Declaration of Independence. This document very clearly states that "*We hold these Truths to be self evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed **by their Creator** with certain unalienable rights.*" Look for the mention of God, or inalienable rights, in the Constitution, and you will not find them.

Many patriots are making constitutional arguments, when they should be making inalienable rights arguments. There is no basis for inalienable rights of property under the constitution, but there IS under the Declaration of Independence! **We are using the wrong document to claim our rights under!**

For example, the way to state a constitutional argument would be to state that you have the inalienable right to bear arms, stated in the Declaration of Independence, and 'secured' by the Bill of Rights, in the 2nd Amendment. You have the inalienable right to not be a witness

against yourself, 'secured' by the 5th Amendment. This gives your argument a much stronger legal basis and is much harder to dismiss, if you ever did go to court. The Bill of Rights, means the Bill of Inalienable Rights, based on the Declaration of Independence, and secured by the Constitution!

## **If you are a citizen of the United States, then JUST WHERE and WHAT IS THE 'UNITED STATES'?**

Is there a territorial difference between the United States of America, (the 50 sovereign states) and the United States government (10 miles square, plus possessions)?

What is the legal definition of United States?

### **Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition.**

**United States.** *This term has several meanings. (1) It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations, (2) it may designate territory over which sovereignty of the United states extends, (3) or it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution.* from *Hooven & Allison v. Evatt* 324 U.S. 652

The first definition (1) only applies to other countries in their relationship to America. It doesn't apply to us.

The third definition (3) applies only to the 50 states united under the Constitution. That does apply to us.

The second definition (2) is the one we are primarily concerned about. This definition applies to the geographical territory over which the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the **United States** extends, pertaining to the 14th Amendment jurisdiction over citizens. Again, we must go the the Constitution to see where that territory is. The United States has exclusive jurisdiction only over certain areas. Since each of the 50 states were separate sovereign states, the sovereignty of the United States did not extend to these 50 states, unless they incorporated. What's left? The Constitution tells us.

**U.S. Constitution Article 1 Section 8 Clause 17:** *To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of Particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the States in which the same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards and other needful buildings;*

According to the Constitution, the territory of the United States of America includes the 50 sovereign states, each of which have their own constitution and jurisdiction. **The geographical territory of sovereign jurisdictions do not overlap.**

The territory of the United States 'of America' is different from the territory of the United States 'government'.

The territorial jurisdiction of the United States government only extends to tens miles square, to places purchased, **and to property owned**. This would include territories and possessions, temporarily acquired through treaties, that are not part of the 50 states. Persons who are under this exclusive jurisdiction, are citizens of the United States 'government', and of the state where they reside. This is a little confusing because Washington, D.C. is considered a state, and the possessions, like Puerto Rico, are considered states. They are political states, but are not part of the 50 sovereign states.

What does the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) say? IRC 7701 is a section devoted to definitions. What is their definition of the United States?

*IRC 7701(9) **United States**. The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense **includes only** the States and the District of Columbia.*

The States? ONLY the States? Does that mean the 50 states, or just U.S.possessions, which are also called states? The use of the word "only" would indicate that this is a restrictive definition. Back to the definitions.

*IRC 7701(10) **State**. The term "State" shall be construed to **include** the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.*

When definition statutes are issued with the word "includes" it means that only the items or categories listed in the definition are included, everything else is excluded. The District of Columbia is a political state of the United States. It is property of the federal government, just like the U.S. possessions like Guam and the Virgin Islands are. Since the 50 states are not mentioned in the definition of state, they are not included. Why? Because the jurisdiction of the United States government, for income tax purposes, includes only areas under its jurisdiction, as stated in the Constitution. The 50 states are separate sovereign states, according to the state constitutions, and therefore would not come under the geographical jurisdiction of the United States federal government, a corporation. As you saw above, **the 14th amendment created citizens who WERE under the jurisdiction of the federal government!** The IRC defines United States person for us.

*IRC 7701(30) **United States person**. The term "United States person" means - (A) A citizen or resident of the United States.*

So if you were a U.S. citizen, you would be in that jurisdiction **subject to** the federal income tax. And you would be defined as a "Taxpayer".

*IRC 7701(14) **Taxpayer**. The term "taxpayer" means any person **subject to** any internal revenue tax.*

So if the 50 states were not under the jurisdiction of the United States government, how come they are NOW subject to all the laws handed down by Congress? We know that states can voluntarily give up their sovereignty to the federal government, just the same as we can. They have not done that, have they? Or have they? When the Civil War was fought, all states were not admitted back into the union until their constitutions were approved by Congress. Why was this approval needed? When the southern states seceded from the union, were they then sovereign states, separate from the United States of America, or U.S. territories? When these states, and all future states, were admitted to the new union, were they conquered states, through an act of war? Were they new territory acquired by the federal government, and now under their jurisdiction? Are the 50 states now just political states of the federal government, just like D.C.?

What about territory, or states, acquired through conquest (war)? This territory is not purchased. Is this territory under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States government? Yes. Temporarily. Any territory acquired by war, or treaty, is acquired for the sovereign people, and this territory is held, in trust, for the people until they decide to make the territory into sovereign states and add them to the Union.

Let's check with the Supreme Court again.

**Hooven & Allison Co. v Evatt 324 U.S. 675 (1945)** *That our dependencies, (possessions) acquired as the result of our war with Spain, are territories belonging to, but not a part of the Union of states under the Constitution, was long since established by a series of decisions in this court . . . This status has ever since been maintained in the practical construction of the Constitution by all the agencies of our government in dealing with our insular possessions. It is no longer doubted that the United States may acquire territory **by conquest or by treaty, and may govern it through the exercise of power of Congress conferred by Sec. 3 of Article IV of the Constitution "to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States."** In exercising this power, Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations as when it is legislating for the United States. (the 50 united States)*

When Congress passes laws for the territories of the United States they are not limited by the Constitution. When they pass laws for the 50 states they must follow the limitations of the Constitution, because the 50 states only delegated certain powers to Congress. Powers not delegated were reserved to the states or to the people. (10th Amendment) The 50 states are superior to the federal government. So how does the federal government get the power to make laws for the 50 states?

**DeLima v. Bidwell 182 U.S. 179 (1900)** *If the law or treaty making power enacts **that the territory over which the military arm of the government has extended shall come under the permanent absolute sovereign jurisdiction of the United States, a new and different status arises. The former sovereign then***

**loses all right of reverter, and the territorial limits of the United States are in so far enlarged.**

Ponder this thought. If the federal government acquired ALL the states, after the Civil War, through the military arm of the government, OR, even today just through a declared national emergency by the Commander in Chief, and instituted martial law, would the 50 states lose their sovereign status and come under the sovereign jurisdiction of the federal government, by conquest? Yes they would. Then the President, as commander in chief, would rule the country by presidential order. This is exactly our status today. The government pretends that you still have inalienable rights secured by the constitutional, because if they let on what the truth was, there would be a revolution. As we will see in the next chapter, in 1933, the United States declared a national emergency that is still in force today.

This doesn't sound like what they taught us in school, does it? Maybe we should check out another authority. In 1956 -1957, President Eisenhower commissioned a study of this very issue. There were problems with the jurisdictional status of federal lands located within the 50 states. He wanted to clarify the jurisdictional limits of the federal government.

The study was called:

## **JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN THE STATES**

It was a 2 part report and I will quote from it below:

### **Part II**

**Letter of Acknowledgement.** *It is my understanding that the report is to be published and distributed, for the purpose of making available to Federal administrators of real property, Federal and States legislators, the legal profession, and others, this text of law of legislative jurisdiction in these areas.* The Honorable Herbert Brownwell, Jr. Attorney General, Washington, D.C.

**Letter of Transmittal.** *Together, the two parts of this Committee's report and the full implementation of its recommendations will provide a basis for reversing in many areas the swing of "the pendulum of power \* \* \* from our states to the central government" to which you referred in your address to the Conference of State Governors on June 25, 1957.* Attorney General.

Pg. 45. *Since Congress has the power to create States out of Territories and to prescribe the boundaries of the new States, the retention of exclusive legislative jurisdiction over a federally owned area within the States at the time the State is admitted into the Union would not appear to pose any serious constitutional difficulties.*

**No Federal legislative jurisdiction without consent, cession, or reservation.** -- *It scarcely needs to be said that unless there has been a transfer of jurisdiction (1) pursuant to clause 17 by a Federal acquisition of land with State consent, or (2) by*

cession from the State to the Federal government, or unless the Federal Government has reserved jurisdiction upon the admission of the State, **the Federal Government possess no legislative jurisdiction over any area within a State, such jurisdiction being for exercise entirely by the States, subject to non-interference by the State with Federal functions, and subject to the free exercise by the Federal Government of rights with respect to the use, protection, and disposition of its property.**

**Necessity of State Assent to Transfer of Jurisdiction to Federal Government:** Constitutional consent. -- **The Federal Government cannot, by unilateral action on its part, acquire legislative jurisdiction over any area within the exterior boundaries of a State.**

**Pg. 66 LIMITATIONS ON AREAS OVER WHICH JURISDICTION MAY BE ACQUIRED BY CONSENT OF STATE UNDER CLAUSE 17: *In general.-- Article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, provides that Congress shall have the power to exercise exclusive legislation over "Places" which have been "purchased" by the Federal Government, with the consent of the legislature of the States, "for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings."* The quoted words serve to limit the scope of clause 17. They exclude from its purview places which were not "purchased" by the Federal Government, . . .**

*Chapter VII (pg 169) Relation of States to Federal Enclaves. Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction: States basically without authority. --***When the Federal Government has acquired exclusive legislative jurisdiction over an area, by any of the three methods of acquiring such jurisdiction, it is clear that the State in which the area is located is without authority to legislate for the area or enforce any of its laws within the area. All the powers of government with respect to the area are vested in the United States.**

That is just a small sampling, but as you can see, the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal government does NOT extend to the geographical territory of the 50 states, except with their consent, **or by conquest (like declaring a national emergency)**. This was a government report done by the Attorney General for the President. But, hey, what does he know? So, for the federal government to have jurisdiction over you, in one of the 50 states, it must own you as property. That property, or artificial person, is called 'U.S. citizen'.

The distinction that I make here, is, either you are a Citizen of the United States of America (American Citizen), or a United States citizen (federal citizen).

An American citizen lives in one of the 50 states and has inalienable rights secured by the state and national constitutions. He spells his name in upper and lower case letters.

A United States citizen may also live in one of the 50 states, as a resident, but has only privileges and immunities, with no constitutional protections. He spells his name with all capital letters.

Check all your licenses, bills, mortgages, deeds, credit cards, etc and see which one you are claiming to be!

You will notice that the 14th Amendment says that the States shall uphold the 'privileges and immunities' of United States citizens. What about their 'rights'? United States citizens, subject to the government, do not have a constitution, or inalienable rights. You cannot get that FROM a government. Property (artificial persons) can only have civil rights, privileges and immunities granted by the government. They are people that have been slightly upgraded from property (slaves) to having the privilege of being a citizen/subject of the United States government. It sounds much nicer! Remember that the amendment says U.S. citizens are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the government. And you just read how far that exclusive jurisdiction extends.

But don't rely on this Attorney General's report, or the Supreme Court decisions in court. The IRS and the courts consider it a frivolous argument!

The 14th Amendment says "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof".

What does "subject to" mean?

**Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition** says;  
**Subject to. *Liabile, subordinate, subservient, inferior, obedient to; governed or affected by; provided that; provided; answerable for.***"

Part 2 of the 14th amendment also says that the states: *shall not make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States;* . Why does it make that statement? Didn't the first ten amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) already secure the inalienable rights of the American people? They sure did. Then why a second prohibition?

Legal scholars have argued that the Constitution only limited the powers of the federal government, not the state governments, so this was added in the 14th amendment to restrict the power of the states. Sounds good, doesn't it? But don't the constitutions of the 50 states already protect the inalienable rights of the state Citizens? They sure do! Do they need a national constitutional amendment to make them uphold their own state constitutions? Only if the state constitutions were no longer valid. Is your state constitution still valid? Yes. **But, the truth is, state constitutions do NOT apply to federal 'property' (U.S. citizens).**

The governments, state and federal, are not OVER the sovereign people and their sovereign territory. Both governments have been delegated powers to secure the rights of the people, and their jurisdiction in exercising that power, is limited to the property they actually own or control. This property is known as 'persons' or 'residents'.

The United States 'government' has jurisdiction only over areas delegated to it by the states and over property acquired by conquest. The state governments also, only have jurisdiction

over the areas delegated to them by the state Citizens. Do the people control the government or does the government control the people? Can the government exercise powers not delegated to them? No. The problem is that you DID give them the power, when you waived your inalienable rights and claimed to be a U.S. citizen, subject to their jurisdiction. They just dangled a few carrots (federal benefits, ie: Social Security) over your nose and you grabbed them and asked to be a subject, so you could get MORE benefits. The states did the same thing, so they could get subsidies also.

**There is an old saying: "If you give the average person a choice between freedom and a free lunch, he will choose the free lunch". Which did you choose?**

So the only logical conclusion is, that the newly created "United States citizens" (former slaves) were no longer the property of individuals, and they were not American Citizens. And they still didn't have a constitution to protect them since the Constitution 'of the United States of America' did not apply to the federal possessions (property) and territories. The U.S. Constitution only applied to the federal government, and delegated and limited its powers. The federal government was created BY the states. And since U.S. citizens were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, the state constitutions did not cover them. U.S. citizens are just federal property, artificial 'persons' or 'residents', in one of the 50 states. And this also placed them squarely within the legal definition of U.S. jurisdiction.

The states each had their own constitutions. But the jurisdictional powers delegated in these state constitutions also only applied to 'government' property in the states, not to the sovereign 'territory' of the states. So the 'United States citizens' were also citizens of the corporate state governments, (not of the sovereign states themselves) and were not protected by the state constitutions. They technically became dual 'property'. They were property (persons - residents) of the state government and of the federal government. Today, all state governments are corporations, not sovereign states. They are just sub-corporations of the federal government, and therefore are under the jurisdiction of the federal government. They have traded their sovereignty for federal subsidies, just like you have traded your sovereignty for the privileges and immunities of U.S. citizenship under the 14th Amendment!

For proof: If you claim constitutional rights in court, the judge will tell you that if you mention constitutional rights again, he will find you in contempt of court, and throw you in jail. He could do that ONLY if you were resident (property) of the state. Because then you would not have inalienable rights, secured by the state constitution. To find out if you have rights, look at how your name is spelled in the heading of the court case. By the way, this principle also applies to local property tax and driver's license and registration, but that is 2 other books.

Inalienable rights are flagrantly violated on a daily basis by all levels of government, because most people have waived these rights and traded them for privileges. The problem is that so few people claim their inalienable rights anymore that they are no longer recognized by the

government. The people would rather have privileges from the government. You can't claim to be a sovereign over the government, and at the same time claim benefits handed out by the government for their subjects. Does the King or Queen (you) apply for their own government's benefits, thereby becoming subjects of their own government?

Since both the state and federal governments are now just corporations, can you be the citizen of a corporation? Yes. The corporation is an artificial 'person'. But, artificial persons can ONLY create new artificial persons (property) that they control. Remember, the United States federal government is just a corporation! So if you are a U.S. citizen, you are a corporate citizen.

These new United States citizens, created by the 14th Amendment, had no one to protect their new status and rights. Worse yet, they had no rights to protect, just privileges and immunities (civil rights) granted by the federal government. The privilege was, being 'subject' to the federal government, instead of to a foreign nation, and the immunities were to be added later. And they were.

One by one, the courts gradually added, to U.S. citizens, each of the rights that American citizens had under the first 10 amendments. But they were not inalienable rights, they were only civil rights. Civil rights are rights given to you by the government. Governments cannot give you inalienable rights. You already have those. But civil rights can also be taken away by the government. Since the federal possessions and territories (federal states) had their own governments, just like the 50 states, this amendment prevented both the 50 state governments, and the federal states, from making laws that violated the civil rights of these United States citizen subjects.

**And this is where the controversy comes in.** The government wants you to believe that a citizen of the United States, is the same as a Citizen of the United States of America. In a court case, if you make this argument, that you are not a resident of the United States, and therefore not a U.S. citizen, because you live in Colorado, the courts will call this a frivolous argument and fine you. And they are right, if you look at how your name is spelled in the heading of that case.

But think about this. If United States citizens are not protected by the U.S. Constitution, then they also lose the Constitutional limitation that all direct taxes be apportioned. That means that they COULD be taxed on their incomes, from whatever source, directly, without apportionment. United States citizens are not protected by the Constitution. Scary, isn't it?

### **American Sovereign OR United States citizen? Which are YOU?**

You have the right to choose your status as a sovereign in America. But, not as a citizen in the United States. The 50 united States of America are republics, guaranteed a republican form of

government. The United States government is a democracy. You must learn the difference! If you choose to be an American Citizen with inalienable rights secured by the constitution, then the constitution says that direct taxes must be apportioned among the states.

**On the other hand, if you are a United States citizen, then you have no constitution to protect you, only your civil rights.** And those civil rights do not prevent the federal government from taxing your income directly, without apportionment. This is possible because states CAN directly tax their citizens property. So if you are a U.S. citizen, you are in effect the citizen of the state of Washington D.C. And that state can tax its citizen's property directly. Remember the definition of "State" above, from the Internal Revenue Code? A state is the District of Columbia. The IRC applies to this state and not to the 50 states.

If you live in one of the 50 sovereign states, then you cannot also live in one of the federal states. Their jurisdictions do not overlap. But, can you create an artificial entity, (like a corporation or trust is an artificial entity) and call yourself a United States citizen? Yes you can. How? You may not be aware of it, but it has already been done for you. The way to tell is to look at your name. When an artificial person is named (such as a corporation), proper English grammar says that the name will be spelled in all capital letters. So if your name is Joseph John Smith, the spelling indicates that you are a real live flesh and blood natural human (natural person). But if you spell your name in all capitals, JOSEPH JOHN SMITH, then that indicates that you are an artificial entity (person). There are really two entities with your name! The real person (you) and the fictional corporate U.S. citizen. The problem arises when the natural person contracts to be an artificial person. Which one are you claiming to be?

The 14th Amendment essentially opened the door to classify everyone as a corporate citizen/employee. Let me ask you this. Since the United States is a corporation, how many employees can there be in a corporation? Would it be possible for every U.S. citizen to be unofficially classified as an employee of this corporation United States, as one of the privileges of U.S. citizenship? And as an employee of the federal government, you would be liable for federal income tax. That is why their name is "Internal" Revenue. It is only collected internally, from its own employees, who are exercising a taxable privilege, government employment! And as a corporate employee, you would be "presumed" to have corporate income!

Since all United States citizens are creations and subjects of the federal government (a public corporation), they are still property. For property (ie: corporations) to have legal existence, with civil rights, it must be done as an artificial entity, just like a corporation is legally considered a person with civil rights, but not inalienable rights. Since the federal government is also an artificial person (a corporation), it can only have jurisdiction over other artificial persons it has created. It has created the artificial person "U.S. citizen", subject to its jurisdiction. You can contract for this corporate privilege and be protected by their corporate

laws as one of your privileges as an employee of the corporation United States. And you will probably get lots of other free lunches (benefits) to boot!

Property cannot have inalienable rights. So all United States citizens are property (artificial 'persons'), with their names spelled in all capital letters. These artificial entities are subject to different laws than you, their sovereign representative, and if they mess up, you do the time, or pay the fine, for them! Just like you can't put a corporation in jail, but you can put their representatives, the corporate officers, in jail in their place.

Can you claim that you are NOT a sovereign American, so that you can collect some of the benefits of the subjects of the federal government's U.S. citizens? Yes you can. And you already have.

Now let's see which status you claim. First look at the spelling of your name on your driver's license. Is it spelled in all caps, indicating an artificial corporate person? Then look at your social security card. Then look at your check book. Then look at your credit cards. Then look at the deed to your real estate if you own some. Then look at the title to your vehicle. Then look at your name in the heading of any court case you may have been in. Check the sworn statement you signed with your voter registration, or your gun registration. Look at ANY correspondence from the government. Look at your bills. These documents will tell you for sure who you really are. When you applied for Social Security, this artificial person U.S. citizen was created. Unknowingly, you contracted to be an artificial corporate person, not realizing that you created a new government employee. This is known as voluntary slavery. Involuntary slavery was forbidden by the 13th Amendment, but you agreed, by contract, to give up American Citizenship and inalienable rights, for U.S. citizenship with civil rights. Remember, the income tax is a corporate tax, so if you are a U.S. corporate citizen, then you are subject to a corporate excise tax on your income.

Do you get my point?

Now look at the mailing label for your tax return. Are you the artificial entity, United States citizen? If not, prove it. Make believe you are in court. Where is your identification that you are a sovereign American with inalienable rights? Can you show that you are an American, and not a U.S. citizen? What documents would you use? The only possible one is your birth certificate, and you used that to show that you are the representative/agent of the person on the SS card. But even those are now issued with the name spelled in all caps, indicating an artificial person. In that case, who are you?

Pretty scary, huh?

When you are in court, would any judge tell you that you that you are NOT an 'American' Citizen and that the Constitution is not valid for you? No, they cannot let the truth out. But then they don't have to because you are claiming to be a U.S. citizen. Because the TRUTH is:

As a sovereign, you have no legal standing in the corporate courts of this country, so you would not be in court in the first place! Why is that? Because you, as a sovereign, are above the laws issued by the corporate federal government to regulate its own property. ALL courts in this country are statutory non-constitutional courts. ONLY the corporate employee can claim any corporate privileges in these courts. More on this in the "court" chapter.

So now go back to the last chapter and look again at the 16th Amendment. Did they really need to pass a whole amendment, just to clarify the existing Constitution? Or was it really passed to apply to these new United States citizens? Let's let the Treasury regulations tell us.

**26 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 1.1-1 "Income tax on individuals. (a) General rule. (1) Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on the income of every individual who is a **citizen or resident of the United States** . . . The tax imposed is upon taxable income . . ."**

This Treasury Regulation explains who the income tax applies to. Does it apply to Citizens of the United States of America? No. Just to U.S. citizens, who are corporate employees, and their property.

## **ARE YOU BORN AN AMERICAN, OR A UNITED STATES CITIZEN?**

I believe that when you are born, you are born a sovereign American with inalienable rights. A lot of birth certificates have the spelling of your name correct, in upper and lower case, so the birth certificate is NOT the document that creates the U.S. citizen. All the birth certificate does, is provide proof that a real live sovereign was born. A corporation cannot have a live birth. Only a real sovereign can be born live.

So then what does create the U.S. citizen, if it is not the birth certificate? I believe the U.S. citizen is born by commercial contract. And that contract is your Social Security application, among others. You cannot get a social security number without the birth certificate of someone who is contracting, to be this new entity U.S. citizen. The U.S. citizen status is created along with your social security number, and it is this number that identifies the corporate government employee. If the government is the beast that enslaves you, then this truly would be the mark of the beast. You waive your inalienable rights when you contract to have a social security number. When someone asks you for a Social Security number, then are just ,making sure that they are dealing with the U.S. citizen.

The entity you are applying to, for this number, is an artificial person, a government corporation, a fiction. Can a fiction create a real person? No. A fiction can only create another fiction. So when you get your social security number, it is the number of a brand new person, a corporate U.S. citizen. Since a corporation created the number, they can only apply that number to their property. Which they did.

Many birth certificates today have your name in all caps. I believe this is just the government's attempt to usurp your sovereign status, long before you apply for a social security card. Maybe that is why the IRS wants every newborn to be assigned a SS# at birth. So they can attempt to eliminate your presumption of sovereignty right from your birth and start right out as a U.S. citizen.

I have run into attorneys and government officials that say, "It doesn't make any difference if you spell your name in all caps or not. You are not a corporate citizen." Is this true? Is there a difference between an artificial person and a natural person? How can you prove it? For those who need proof, I have compiled some facts that you can use to show the difference. Check it out! [American Citizen , or U.S. citizen?](#)

Another interesting observation is that the 14th Amendment was certified on July 28, 1868. The day *BEFORE*, on July 27, Congress passed an Act called the Right of Expatriation. If Congress was going to create a new corporate citizen, then they also had to create a remedy to get out of it if you didn't want to be a U.S. citizen. This was the way!

## SUMMARY

The 14th Amendment created a new class of citizenship, the United States citizen. This citizenship applies only to '**persons** subject to the jurisdiction' of the federal government. All jurisdiction implies superiority of power. A 'person' is always an artificial corporate entity with it's name spelled in all caps.

YOU are "presumed" to be a U.S. citizen, unless and until you can prove otherwise.

A **Sovereign/Citizen** of the United States of America (American Citizen), lives in one of the 50 sovereign states, and has inalienable rights secured by state and national constitutions.

The **artificial person, U.S. citizen**, is a legal fiction that has been created by the federal government, via the social security application, and is a corporate employee of the United States by virtue of being a U.S. citizen. He is subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government and of the state government and subject to the corporate income tax.

The U.S. citizen is created property, created to raise revenue for the government, your employer. You have essentially contracted to be liable for the debts of your master, the federal government

Web Source(s): [http://www.trulu.20m.com/rich\\_text\\_1.html](http://www.trulu.20m.com/rich_text_1.html)