

State Citizen or US Citizen?

On the face, this discussion might seem to be a matter of semantics, but upon closer inspection of the law, the distinction is quite clear. The term "citizen of the united states" was not defined in the original U.S. constitution, as that term was commonly understood to mean a "citizen of one of the several states of the union.. See **Ex Parte Frank Knowles**, 5 Cal. 300 wherein it states:

By metaphysical refinement, in examining our form of government, it might be correctly said that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States. But constant usage - arising from convenience, and perhaps necessity, and dating from the formation of the Confederacy - has given substantial existence to the idea which the term conveys. A citizen of any one of the States of the Union, is held to be, and called a citizen of the United States, although technically and abstractly there is no such thing. To conceive a citizen of the United States who is not a citizen of some one of the states, is totally foreign to the idea, and inconsistent with the proper construction and common understanding of the expression as used in the constitution, which must be deduced from its various other provisions. The object then to be obtained, by the exercise of the power of naturalization, was to make citizens of the respective states.
Ex parte Knowles, 5 Ca. 300, 302 (1855)

Therefore, prior to the alleged ratification of the 14th Amendment, there was no legal definition of a "citizen of the United States", as everyone had primary citizenship in one of the several states. The Constitution referred to the sovereign state citizen, and no one else. Those who went to Washington, D.C. or outside the several states were commonly called "citizens of the United States." In the Constitution for the United States, the term was used to identify state citizens who were eligible under the suffrage laws to hold office, and they were required under the Constitution to have primary allegiance to one of the several states.

Since that term was not specifically defined in the U.S. Constitution, Congress in 1868 took advantage of this term and utilized it in the so-called 14th Amendment to describe a **NEW** type of "citizen" whose primary allegiance was to the federal government, i.e. Washington, D.C. and not to one of the several states of the union. Thus, using the term as used in the U.S. Constitution to mislead and confuse the people as to the true intent and meaning of the Constitution.

Many people have mistaken the citizen as denominated in the 14th Amendment to mean the same one in the original constitution, this is in error. The "citizen of the united states" as used in the constitution is not the same as the citizen of the United States used after the 14th Amendment. So all the elected officials are **NOT** sitting in the office constitutionally, they are merely impostors created by the 14th Amendment. The current President Clinton, is a U.S. citizen, and therefore not the "citizen of the united states" defined in the Constitution for the United States, neither the federal senators nor any congressmen are seated constitutionally. These facts being true, then all the federal laws are invalid for want of constitutionality.

The 14th Amendment creates and defines citizenship of the United States. It had long been contended, and had been held by many learned authorities, and had never been judicially decided to the

contrary, that there was no such thing as a citizen of the United States, except by first becoming a citizen of some state.

United States v. Anthony (1874), 24 Fed. Cas. 829 (No. 14,459), 830.

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 who owe it allegiance, and whose rights, within its jurisdiction, it must protect. The same person may be at the same time a citizen of the United States and a citizen of a state, but his rights of citizenship under one of these governments will be different from those he has under the other.

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

In other words, you do not have to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a state citizen. This was held to be true by the Maryland Supreme Court in 1966 wherein the state:

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.

Crosse v. Bd. of Supvr,s of Elections, 221 A.2d. 431 (1966)

The federal government was never given any authority to encroach upon the private affairs of the citizens in the several states of the union, unless they were involved in import or export activity, neither were they given authority to reach a citizen of Germany living in Germany. In fact, the states could refuse to enforce any act of congress, that they felt was outside the intent of the granting of limited powers to the federal government. This is called interposition or nullification. Several state supreme courts have in the past refused to uphold federal laws within their states.

In fact, in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 54 (c) shows us that Congress knows and understands that federal laws do not apply within anyone of the several states of the union, but do apply in the Federal State (federal enclave) created by the [Buck Act](#).

(c) Application of Terms. As used in these rules the following terms have the designated meanings.

"Act of Congress" includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in force in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, in a territory or in an insular possession.

"State" includes District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, territory and insular possession"

The Buck Act Title 4 U.S.C.S. § 110 (d) and (e) created this federal State within the boundaries of any state. IF Congress wanted to apply the Acts to all the sovereign states, they would only have to include the statement "the 50 sovereign states of the union of several states." But, this they did not do, as to do so would be in clear violation of the intended restrictions of the Constitution for the United States of America.

by,

Richard McDonald,

-- [Richard McDonald's state Citizen BBS](#) --

[Back to Freedom Stuff / Back Home](#)

Disclaimer: *The purpose of this site is not to attack or degrade our public servants but to educate the public about rights that are being taken away from them! We **STRONGLY** advise our readers to confirm all information in their local law libraries when and if you choose to use it! Remember we're not suppose to know this and they will do anything to prevent it. Please [read](#) a judges comments on our legal system*

Sources: *The above information has been collected from various websites.*

Please Note: *We are not anti-government or any extremist group.*