

US Citizens are PROPERTY; US Nationals/State Citizens ARE NOT...Which DO YOU Want to Be?

COURT CASE LAW:

U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873) "The term resident and citizen of the United States (this means a 14th amendment citizen) is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by Congress."

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of it's own..."

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"...he was not a citizen of the United States, (again 14th amendment citizen) he was a citizen and voter of the State,..." "One may be a citizen of a State an yet not a citizen of the United States".

McDonel v. The State, 90 Ind. 320 (1883)

"That there is a citizenship of the United States (again a 14th amendment citizen) and citizenship of a state,..."

Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236 (1927)

"A citizen of the United States is a citizen (14th amendment citizen) of the federal government ..."

Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383

"Taxpayers are not [de jure] State Citizens." Belmont v. Town of Gulfport, 122 So. 10.

State v. Manuel, 20 NC 122: "the term 'citizen' in the United States, (means United States citizen or legal fiction) is analogous to the term 'subject' in common law; the change of phrase has resulted from the change in government."

Supreme Court: Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226:

"The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."

Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957:

"The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States." (This is the legal fiction citizen of the federal corporation)

The Amendment (14th) recognized that "an individual can be a Citizen of one of the several states without being a citizen of the United States," (U.S. v. Anthony, 24 Fed. Cas. 829, 830), or, "a citizen of the United States without being a Citizen of a state." (Slaughter-House Cases, supra; cf. U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 US 542, 549 (1875)). (Again talking about a 14th amendment citizen)

A more recent case is Crosse v. Bd. of Supervisors, 221 A.2d 431 (1966) which says:

"Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state." Citing U.S. v. Cruikshank, supra. (confusing, but recognizes State citizenship)

The courts presume you to be a federal citizen, without even telling you that there are different classes of citizens. It is up to you dispute this. Use your passport and the actual birth certificate. See...

"Unless the defendant can prove he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS has the right to inquire and determine a tax liability." U.S. v. Slater, 545 Fed. Supp. 179,182 (1982). (This one is misusing the term citizen of the United States for the purpose of confusion. It is a little tongue in cheek to say, a citizen who is a United States citizen)

"There are, then, under our republican form of government, two classes of citizens, one of the United States and one of the state". (Again making a distinction between a 14th amendment citizen and a State Citizen)

Gardina v. Board of Registrars of Jefferson County, 160 Ala. 155; 48 So. 788 (1909)

"The governments of the United States and of each state of the several states are distinct from one another. The rights of a citizen under one may be quite different from those which he has under the other".

Colgate v. Harvey, 296 U.S. 404; 56 S.Ct. 252 (1935)

"...rights of national citizenship as distinct from the fundamental or natural rights inherent in state citizenship".

Madden v. Kentucky, 309 U.S. 83: 84 L.Ed. 590 (1940)

"There is a difference between privileges and immunities belonging to the citizens of the United States (14th amendment citizen) as such, and those belonging to the citizens of each state as such".

Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41 (1900)

"Therefore, the U.S. citizens (citizen of the federal corporation) residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity"", Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773

"...the first eight amendments have uniformly been held not to be protected from state action by the privilege and immunities clause [of the 14th Amendment]."
Hague v. CIO, 307 US 496, 520

"The right to trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment...and the right to bear arms guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment...have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the 14th Amendment...and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment of a grand jury, contained in the 5th Amendment...and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the 6th Amendment...it was held that the indictment, made indispensable by the 5th Amendment, and trial by jury guaranteed by the 6th Amendment, were not privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, as those words were used in the 14th Amendment. We conclude, therefore, that the exemption from compulsory self-incrimination is not a privilege or immunity of National [Federal] citizenship guaranteed by this clause of the 14th Amendment."

Twining v. New Jersey, 211 US 78, 98-99

"The acceptance of a license, in whatever form, will not impose upon the licensee an obligation to respect or to comply with any provision of the statute or with the regulations prescribed that are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States." W. W. CARGILL CO. v. STATE OF MINNESOTA, 180 U.S. 452 (1901) 180 U.S. 452

"A "US Citizen" (citizen of the federal corporation) upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in "interstate commerce", as a "resident" does not have the common-law right to travel, of a Citizen of one of the several states." Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter's Rd. 610-625. (1914)