

# **Why US citizenship is so arbitrary and phony, it should be legally abolished, or you should be permitted to renounce your citizenship as soon as possible, and become stateless**

*You really don't need your US citizenship, but the US government keeps acting like it's doing you a favour by making you a hostage to US laws. I want out as soon as possible. The whole concept of US citizenship is ultimately enslavement to a global tax-seeking government, enslavement to tax-evading but unemployment-ensuring corporations, and even enslavement to your kitten.*

**By Hon. Most Rev. Dr. Cesidio Tallini**

I was born in Jamaica, of the borough of Queens, of the city of New York, of the state of New York, of the country of the United States of America in May 1962. According to the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section 1, “All persons born or naturali(s)ed 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 or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State 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.”<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to note that while I was born in the United States, and thus I am a legal and native born citizen of the United States, I am not a “natural born” citizen of the United States, and I am thus ineligible to become President or Vice-President of the United States because

1. I was born after 24 December 1952, and before 14 November 1986;
2. I was born to a US citizen and an (Italian) alien; and
3. My US citizen parent has resided at best only 6 years continuously in the US — between May 1956, when he was in Italy, where he got married, and May 1962, when I was born — before I was born, and about 11 years altogether, non-continuously.<sup>2</sup>

Yes, it is unbelievable but true: I was born in the United States, in one of the first 13 States of the United States, and to a US citizen father, and yet I could not become President or Vice-President of the United States!

This is not the only thing that practically invalidates US citizenship, and makes it so ill-defined and arbitrary, that you actually have good reason to renounce your citizenship.

Another thing is what the US government calls all human beings born or naturalised in the United States: they call you a *person*.

Prior to the Fourteenth Amendment, citizens of the United States were strictly defined as citizens of the US states, not *persons*, so the word itself introduces relativity into an area where relativity should not exist.<sup>3</sup>

The problem of relativity is exacerbated today. If in the past the word *person* came into being in order to place men of colour on a more equal footing with those of the Anglo-Saxon race, today, depending on the context, theory or definition, the category of *person* may be taken to include such non-human entities as animals, corporations, artificial intelligences, or extraterrestrial life; and may exclude some human entities in prenatal development, or those with extreme mental impairments or injuries.<sup>4</sup>

So as a US citizen you are pretty much equal to multinational corporations, and you are equal to your cat too, yet you do not have the number of citizenships, privileges and wealth of a multinational corporation, and instead of purring all day, you only get fed if you go to work and make enough to support yourself, and everything and everybody else, including the very same government that has the gall to call you something less than a *divine being*, made in the image of another *divine being*, and thus whose rights should be naturally superior to corporations and felines.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a document of fundamental importance. Many international lawyers believe that the UDHR forms part of customary international law, which makes consideration of it almost a moral obligation on the part of any state or wannabe state. Yet for some strange reason, Article 23 of the UDHR practically doesn't exist in the United States, and any remaining legal influence of Article 23 in US jurisprudence is largely in the form of a *privilege*, not a right, so it is well on its way to being revoked altogether:

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.<sup>5</sup>

However, the death blow to US citizenship and its inherent value as a human rights instrument is given by the federal government itself. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section 1, does impede US states from enforcing any law which abridges the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, and the Tenth Amendment limits the national government's powers to those expressly listed in the Constitution, and gives US states, unless otherwise restricted, all the remaining or residual powers of government, but there is actually no law that prevents the federal government from abridging the privileges or immunities granted by the states themselves. You cannot be a citizen of the United States without being born in any state of the United States, yet nobody has understood that under this system of dysfunctional polycentric law the national government's powers are so unrestricted, that it often behaves as something more than a suzerain, and US states often have to behave as something a lot less than states, and closer to fiefdoms.

While the federal government during the Civil War often acted and justified itself as if it was morally superior to US states, which back then supported slavery, today the federal government is the one more likely to be morally inferior, and it treats US states like Fourth World powers.

Some individual states today recognise same-sex marriage. Such licenses are granted by five states — Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont — plus Washington, DC and the Coquille Indian Tribe in Oregon. Issuance of marriage licenses to same-sex couples in New York state is set to begin on 24 July 2011. Yet despite all the hoopla, despite all the apparent newly-found freedom for same-sex couples, the federal government does not recognise same-sex marriage in the United States. The lack of federal recognition was codified in 1996 by the so-called Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which was enacted before Massachusetts became the first state to grant marriage licenses to same-sex couples in 2004.<sup>6</sup>

The net effect is that these people may be viewed as legally married in five states, and in New York and Maryland, which at the moment I write recognise same-sex marriages, but do not grant same-sex marriage licenses, yet there are 1,000 or so benefits gay couples can't get because of the federal DOMA, from joint federal tax returns, to federal health plans for spouses, to access to the spouses' federal pensions. The federal government today defends the DOMA with the rationale that marriage is a union between a man and a woman, and repealing the federal law would violate the views of most Americans. Most Americans also supported slavery during Civil War times, but the federal government paid no heed to such rationale back then.

So in the land of the free and the home of the brave, the portion of it called New York state, in a few days you'll be able to legally get married even if your partner is of your same sex, but the federal government will still not provide Social Security survivor benefits and other rights. If you add your new spouse in your family health plan at work, the federal government won't treat him or her like they would treat a legal spouse, and your New York spouse's health coverage will be taxed. The federal government will treat your legal New York state spouse like a total stranger. And since the federal government will also not allow you and your new New York state same-sex spouse joint federal tax returns, you will also pay more than heterosexual couples for the right — or is it really a privilege? — to marry.<sup>7</sup>

And what about polygynous marriages? Are these possible in the land of the free and the home of the brave? *Nein*. It would practically be the end of the discussion, were it not for the fact that polygynous marriages were extensive among Mormons, but the practice was largely phased out during the 19th century. Today, polygyny appears to be confined to small Fundamentalist Mormon groups that have been excommunicated by the main Mormon Church, or the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Tens of thousands of polygynous couples live in Utah, Arizona, and in other states where their illegal marriages are largely ignored by police, so their situation is not better than the status of same-sex couples.<sup>8</sup>

Polygyny was banned in the United States in 1890 because of laws passed concerning Mormon polygyny. It was allowed in the early Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church), but was ended in 1890 under government coercion prohibiting Utah from becoming a state as long as they allowed polygyny. Since 1904, members of the LDS Church may face excommunication for being polygynous, though several sects of fundamentalist Mormons still actively practice polygyny.<sup>8</sup>

No state seems willing to grant marriage licenses to polygynous groups either. The New York state same-sex marriage law is seen as a boon to the ceremonial marriage business, but nobody is rushing to provide some of the same, largely psychological benefits, for polyamorous folks.

You can be a native citizen of the United States, and still not be a “natural born” citizen of the United States. You can bust your rear end for years to get a degree or the right training, and you still don't have a right to work anyway, even though international law suggests that you do. You can be legally married to a same-sex member in New York state soon, and you will still not enjoy all the benefits that the “interstate commerce” heterosexual couples enjoy. Despite all the spiritual innuendo, with a 50% divorce rate, aren't most heterosexual families little more than infomercials anyway?

Come on! What is the point of US citizenship anyway? Why do the Fourth World states and federal agencies matter so much, and real people, real men and women so little? And isn't a US passport little more than a US government travel permit also, so what's the point in having US citizenship anyway? It's not like you can't live without it, and its utility is highly questionable.

## References

1. Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. (2011, July 21). *Wikipedia*, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteenth\\_Amendment\\_to\\_the\\_United\\_States\\_Constitution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteenth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution)
2. Tallini, Cesidio. (n.d.). Information about the HMRD Cesidio Tallini citizenship(s). Hon Most Rev Dr Cesidio Tallini Biographical Website. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://cesidio.org/links.html>
3. Williams, Arlen (Unspun). (2008, 7 November). What “Subject to the Jurisdiction Thereof” Really Means. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2139082/posts>
4. Person. (2011, July 22). *Wikipedia*, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Person>
5. UDHR: Article 23. (1948, 10 December). Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://www.udhr.org/udhr/ART23.HTM>
6. Same-sex marriage in the United States. (2011, 17 July). *Wikipedia*, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex\\_marriage\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage_in_the_United_States)
7. Lavoie, Denise. (2011, 22 July). Mass. Gay Couples to NY: DOMA Denies You Benefits. *Long Island Press*. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://www.longislandpress.com/2011/07/22/mass-gay-couples-to-ny-doma-denies-you-benefits/>
8. Tallini, Cesidio. (2007, 19 November). Why marital law is a total failure. Retrieved 22 July 2011, from <http://mntzion.com/marital-law.pdf>

All Rights Reserved *Sui Juris* — Tutti i diritti riservati *sui iuris* — Tote le derectos reservate *sui juris*  
Print Monopoly (PM) 2011 HMRD Cesidio Tallini (0050001)