

**US Citizens are PROPERTY. 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."

*United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542 (1875) "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 its own...**"

*McDonel v. The State*, 90 Ind. 320 (1883) "...he was not a citizen of the United States (**14th Amendment citizen**), he was a citizen and voter of the State, ..." [...] "One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States"

*Tashiro v. Jordan*, 201 Cal. 236 (1927) "That there is a citizenship of the United States (**again a 14th Amendment citizen**) and citizenship of a state, ..."

"*Kitchens v. Steele*, 112 F.Supp 383 (1953) "A citizen of the United States is a (**14th Amendment**) citizen of the federal government..."

*Belmont v. Town of Gulfport*, 122 So. 10. (1929) "Taxpayers are not [**de jure**] State Citizens."

*State v. Manuel*, 20 NC 122: "the term 'citizen' in the United States, 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 (1993) "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 (1968) "The only absolute and unqualified right of [United States] citizenship is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States."**

*U.S. v. Anthony*, 24 Fed. Cas. 829, 830 (1873) "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" --and-- *Slaughter-House Cases*, supra; cf. *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 US 542, 549 (1875) "a citizen of the United States without being a Citizen of a state." (**both cases talking about a 14th Amendment citizen**)

*Crosse v. Board of Supervisors*, 221 A.2d 431 (1966) "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 to dispute this.**

*U.S. v. Slater*, 545 Fed. Supp. 179,182 (1982) "Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability." (It is a little tongue in cheek to say "prove he is not a citizen of the United States" without talking about state citizenship)

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

Supreme Court: *Colgate v. Harvey*, 296 U.S. 404; 56 S.Ct. 252 (1935) "The governments of the United States and of each 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."

Supreme Court: *Madden v. Kentucky*, 309 U.S. 83; 84 L.Ed. 590 (1940) "...rights of national citizenship, as distinct from the fundamental or natural rights inherent in state citizenship".

*Ruhstrat v. People*, 57 N.E. 41 (1900) "There is a difference between privileges and immunities belonging to the citizens of the United States (14th Amendment citizens) as such, and those belonging to the citizens of each state as such"

*Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 (1936) "Therefore, the U.S. citizens (14th Amendment) residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity"

"...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

*Twining v. New Jersey*, 211 US 78, 98-99 (1908) "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 [read: Federal] citizenship guaranteed by this clause of the 14th Amendment [...]"

*W. W. CARGILL CO. v. STATE OF MINNESOTA*, 180 U.S. 452 (1901) "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."

*Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter's Rd.* 610-625. (1914) "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."