

What is Strawman?

from StarNet

TARA



2012

Reclaim Your Lost Freedoms and Liberties Through State Citizenship

White Paper on State Citizenship

T. Collins -- 10/04/94

Introduction

I was born a first class citizen. I entered into contracts that, without my knowledge, made me a second class citizen. I am working on the legal process of restoring my first class citizenship status.

I was surprised to find that the United States government recognized two distinct classes of citizens, let alone that my citizenship status had changed. At first I did not believe it. It was not until I learned how to use the law library in the county court house that I was able to confirm my status. I am not an attorney so this paper should not be considered as legal advice. It may be used for the basis of your own research. This paper does not have a copyright, so you can copy all or part of it. This paper borrows research from other papers without copyrights written by people across the nation. I will describe the big picture first, then I will substantiate the claims made and give a more detailed picture later.

You may find the ideas presented here conflict with the model of government that you have been taught. You may also find these ideas impossible to believe. This is understandable. The further you read, the more you may change the way you filter information about what the government is doing. If you cannot believe any of this, please set this paper aside. Sometime in the future, you may come back to this paper and it may make more sense. I believe that the concepts described here are true. But, you should not! If you accepted the ideas in this paper without confirming them from other sources, then you are a fool! If I can change your model of reality in one paper then someone else might be able to fill your head with nonsense. Please be skeptical. Even if you do not agree with the central premise, you may agree with some of the research. If so, you will still get something out of this paper. There are many Citizens doing research on the topics described in this paper. Some will sell the results of their research while others will practically give it away. This paper does not discuss some of the more advanced topics (Citizen militia, commercial liens, common law liens, common law trusts). At the end of this paper, I will supply you with the names of books, magazines, newspapers, computer bulletin boards that fill in some of the details that I have excluded.

The big picture

The United States of America is a unique nation. It was the first constitutional republic in the world. Before the American Revolution, the King of England owned all the land in his colonies. The inhabitants of the colonies were his subjects. When the war was over, the King signed the Treaty of Peace. In that treaty he said that all the land in the former colonies was owned by the people and all of his sovereign powers that he held in the colonies were transferred, not to the government of the colonies but, to the People of the colonies. This made all of the Citizens of the colonies sovereigns. This has never happened before or since in any other country. In other countries, the government is sovereign. It

makes laws for its subject-citizens and it gives them their rights. In the United States, the People were sovereigns. The People were endowed, by their creator, with certain rights and the government was instituted to secure those rights. We the People, gave a portion of our sovereignty to the state government, and the states gave a small portion of the sovereignty we gave to them, to the federal government so that it would be strong enough to defend the People. The Constitution for the United States of America describes the powers that the states gave to the federal government.

If the federal government is defined by the Constitution, and the Constitution says that I am a sovereign, why do I feel like a subject? I own my house. If I don't pay my property tax the government will go to a court and remove me from it just as the courts would remove me from an apartment if I did not pay the rent. Do I really own the land if someone can take it away from me simply because I don't pay them for the use of it? Could the King of England have the land taken away from him if he did not pay a tax? So long as I don't cause injury to someones person or property or defraud them shouldn't I, as a sovereign, have the right to do anything I want? Today there are so many rules and regulations that the government has that I think nearly everything I do is against some law. What has happened to my sovereignty? Isn't the government sovereign over me? Are there any sovereign People left in the United States of America?

There are hundreds of thousands of sovereigns in the United States of America but I am not one of them. The sovereigns own their land in "allodium." That is, the government does not have a financial interest in the their land. Because of this they do not need to pay property tax (school tax, real estate tax). Only the powers granted to the federal government in the Constitution for the United States of America define the laws that they have to follow. This is a very small subset of the laws most of us have to follow. Unless they accept benefits from or contract with the federal government, they do not have to pay Social Security tax, federal income tax, or resident individual state income tax. They do not need to register their cars or get a driver's license unless they drive commercially. They will not have to get a Health Security Card. They can own any kind of gun without a license or permit. They do not have to use the same court system that normal people do. I am sure that most people reading this are saying to themselves that this can not be true. I know I did when I first heard of it.

The government recognizes two distinct classes of citizens: a state Citizen and a federal citizen.

A state Citizen, also called a de jure Citizen, is an individual whose inalienable natural rights are recognized, secured, and protected by his/her state Constitution against State actions and against federal intrusion by the Constitution for the United States of America.

A federal citizen, also called: a 14th Amendment citizen, a citizen of the United States, a US citizen, a citizen of the District of Columbia, has civil rights that are almost equal to the natural rights that state Citizens have. I say almost because civil rights are created by Congress and can be taken away by Congress. Federal citizens are subjects of Congress, under their protection as a "resident" of a State, a person enfranchised to the federal government (the incorporated United States defined in Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution). The individual States may not deny to these persons any federal privileges or immunities that Congress has granted them. This specific class of citizen is a federal citizen under admiralty law (International Law). As such they do not have inalienable common rights recognized, secured and protected in the Constitutions of the States, or of the Constitution for the United States of America, such as "allodial" (absolute) rights to property, the rights to inheritance, the rights to work and contract, and the right to travel among others.

A federal citizen is a taxable entity like a corporation, and is subject to pay an excise tax for the privileges that Congress has granted him/her.

The rights that most people believe they have are not natural rights but civil rights which are actually privileges granted by Congress. Some of these civil rights parallel the protection of the Bill of Rights (the first 10 Amendments to the Constitution), but by researching the civil rights act along with case law decisions involving those rights, it can be shown that these so-called civil rights do not include the Ninth or Tenth Amendments and have only limited application with regard to Amendments One through Eight.

If you accept any benefit from the federal government or you claim any civil right, you are making an "adhesion contract" with the federal government. You may not be aware of any adhesion contracts but the courts are. The other aspect of such a contract is that you will obey every statute that Congress passes.

State Citizens cannot be subjected to any jurisdiction of law outside the Common Law without their knowing and willing consent after full disclosure of the terms and conditions, and such consent must be under agreement/contract sealed by signature. This is because the Constitution is a compact/contract created and existing in the jurisdiction of the Common Law, therefore, any rights secured thereunder or disabilities limiting the powers of government also exist in the Common Law, and in no other jurisdiction provided for in that compact!

Federal citizens are presumed to be operating in the jurisdiction of commercial law because that is the jurisdiction of their creator -- Congress. This is evidenced by the existence of various contracts and the use of negotiable instruments. All are products of international law or commercial law[Uniform Commercial Code]. Under Common Law your intent is important; in a court of contract (commercial law) the only thing that matters is that you live up to the letter of the contract. Because you have adhesion contracts with Congress, you can not use the Constitution or Bill of Rights as a defense because it is irrelevant to the contract. As stated previously, the contract says you will obey every statute passed by Congress. A federal citizen does not have access to Common Law.

To restate: state Citizens are bound and protected by the Constitution, like the founding fathers intended and like we are taught in school what citizenship means. Federal citizens have made further agreements with the federal government and are bound by these contracts.

The Constitution empowers the Federal Government to;

Operate on behalf of the several States in dealing with foreign relations and matters of treaties, trade agreements, etc., under the purview of International Law.

Exercise limited constitutional jurisdiction to interact with the several States in regulating trade, commerce, etc., between the States to insure equitable continuance of the compact.

Exercise exclusive jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, the Territories, and enclaves, in the same manner that a state exercises jurisdiction within its boundaries.

Rights are considered gifts from the Creator, and not to be disturbed by acts of man. Some of these rights were considered important enough to be specifically stated to be secured from Federal

encroachment in the Bill of Rights, upon the theory that these rights existed long antecedent to the creation of the nation, and the theory that a government, left to its own devices without restriction, could and would use man made law to defeat the liberty that this Republic was intended to represent.

I was born in one of the several states, the Pennsylvania Commonwealth, so why am I not a state Citizen? The answer is that I was born a state Citizen but, I unknowingly gave it up to become a federal citizen so that I could receive benefits from the federal government. Some of the benefits that I received were: a Social Security Number, receiving mail sent to the state of PA, receiving mail with ZIP Codes, having FDIC insurance on the money left in a bank, and using Federal Reserve Notes (dollar bills) without protest. This sounds crazy. Would you give away sovereign powers for benefits like these?

If you have a Social Security Number (SSN), you are not a state Citizen. In the near future, I will send papers into the District of Columbia stating that I am recinding my application for a SSN. If I had known that applying for a SSN would affect my citizenship status, I would not have applied. I found out that Social Security is voluntary and that I can work without a SSN.

The Pennsylvania Commonwealth is one of the "several states" described in the Constitution. The "several states" were severed from each other. The law treats the several states as independent countries. The Buck Act in 1940 created federal areas inside the states. If you live in a federal area, you are subject to federal territorial laws and the municipal laws of the District of Columbia. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is internal to the District of Columbia. The Pennsylvania Commonwealth is not part of the District of Columbia, but the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is. PA is the name that the post office recognizes for mail sent into the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is a federal area. Pa., Penna., and Pennsylvania are the names that the post office uses for mail sent into the Pennsylvania Commonwealth, which is not a federal area. If I accept mail sent to PA, I am saying that I live in part of the District of Columbia. The same situation exists in the other states.

Your ZIP Code determines which ZIP Code region you live in. ZIP Code regions are federal areas. The IRS has adopted the ZIP Code regions as IRS regions. If you accept mail that has a ZIP Code on it, you are in a federal territory and thus subject to the IRS and all other municipal laws of the District of Columbia.

I find the most offensive trick to get me to lose my sovereignty was that if I do not protest using the only legal tender in America, the Federal Reserve Notes (FRN), also know as U.S. Dollars, I am receiving a benefit. This is a complicated trick that I will explain in detail later.

Of course there are many other benefits that many people use that the sovereigns cannot. Among these are Social Security checks, welfare checks, food stamps, federally insured bank accounts, Medicaid, Medicare, and sending children to publicly funded schools.

I am not trying to get everybody to give up government benefits. If you wish to support and be supported by the federal government, much like people in other countries do, then by all means, go ahead and do so. But, if you wish to be a sovereign protected by the Bill of Rights and not pay many of the taxes that you are paying now but also not receive benefits, then there is an alternative. It is not an easy alternative. The law makers want control over you. They have made the legal system complex. It takes years for attorneys to learn the language and procedures of our legal system. Fortunately you do not need to know everything an attorney needs to know. You do need to have a basic understanding of

how our legal system works. You may be surprised that it bears little resemblance to television courtroom dramas.

I also must warn you that reclaiming your state Citizenship status may have negative effects on your life. Besides the lack of benefits, such as unemployment checks, you are treated more harshly if you get convicted of a common law crime if you are a state Citizen. If you get convicted of rape and you are a federal citizen, you may get five years in an air conditioned prison with cable TV and three meals a day. If a state Citizen gets convicted, by a common law jury, of rape, he could be put to death.

All of the information describing how the United States really works and how it is supposed to work was so spread out that few people could see the big picture. The communication revolution has changed this. Computer bulletin boards across the country provided a means to share research. Tax protesters, ranchers, religious people, historians, gun owners, and others have all found pieces of the puzzle. Perhaps there are more pieces to find.

These researchers started on different legal threads. They followed and untangled the threads until they reached the source; The Constitution for the United States of America. The surprising thing is that the researchers did not know about each other but they each came to similar conclusions. Some of the minor details are being debated by researchers. The overall conclusions are described in this paper. Some of their research is not described here. The longer this paper is, the more unlikely it is that people unfamiliar with this subject will even attempt to read it.

If every Citizen in the colonies became a sovereign, how could any Citizen lose their sovereignty? The Citizens of each of the several states in the Union were sovereigns. But the people in a territory or in the District of Columbia were not because the territories and the District of Columbia were not in the Union. Congress had/has exclusive legislative control over these areas. The states were governed by a "constitutional republic" while the territories were ruled by a "legislative democracy". In a legislative democracy the citizens have no rights except what Congress gives them. In the constitutional republics, the Citizens have rights given to them by their Creator and Congress is the Citizens servant. This is why Citizens, having left a state to buy or conquer land from the native Americans, would apply for statehood as soon as possible.

How is it that someone who was born in and has lived in a state all his/her life can be treated like a citizen of the District of Columbia? There has been a series of steps that Congress has made to convert the state Citizens into federal citizens. Over the years, our laws have been made unreadable by the average intelligent person. The 14th Amendment was illegally passed creating a federal citizen who can not question the federal debt. The Federal Reserve Act of 1913 turned over our money to a private banking cartel. Social Security created Social Security Districts (or territories) in which people with SSN lived. The Buck Act created federal areas inside the states. Let's describe each of these steps in detail.

Reasons I believe this

To show that Congress has made the laws unreadable by the average person, an objective method of measuring the readability of English text must be discussed. English scholars use a scale known as the "Flesch Index" that measures the level of understanding necessary for an individual to comprehend the written English language. Newspapers are written at an average comprehension level of 7. The average high school graduate reads and understands at a level of 10. The average law school graduate reads and

comprehends at a level of 15. The Internal Revenue Code ranks on this index at an average level of 31, with some specific provisions as high as 55. And the words that are used in the law have specific legal definitions that are different from the common English definitions. If the laws that we are supposed to obey are written at a level that an individual of reasonable intelligence cannot understand then perhaps we should be highly suspect of the law writer's motives. My word processor's grammar checker tells me that this paper is written at level 11.5. People in this country cannot understand at this level. How many people have the time, energy, and ability to go into a law library and piece this together? By making the law so difficult to read, Congress has effectively removed our access to it.

To show how the government uses common English words in such a way that they have meanings that are different from what you might think, I will show how the word 'state' is redefined. In the IRS code, it says you are subject to the income tax if you live in: one of the states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the northern Mariana Islands. From this definition it sounds as if I need to pay income tax. But, if you look at how the IRS defines the word state you probably will be confused. In the definition of the word state, it uses the word state. If you check this definition in years back you will see it has been modified several times. Before Alaska was admitted into the Union, it was in this list of states. After it became one of the states of the Union, it was not listed in the IRS definition of a state. The same thing happened to Hawaii. What does this mean? The definition that is used in the IRS code for the word state, is not a state like Texas but a state like Guam, that is a federal territory. The Federal Zone is a book listed in the other source's section of this paper describes this and other words that have specific legal definitions that are, sometimes, the opposite of the common definition.

So far I have stated some unconventional ideas. To substantiate them I will cite standing decisions made by the courts and statutes passed by Congress. Unless the decision or statute is in quotation marks, it has been paraphrased. Please look up the decision or statutes to verify my paraphrase. At the end of this paper, I will give the names of books and publications that give more information on the subject. One of the books will teach you how to find and understand the law.

"People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the king by his prerogative."
Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89.

"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." Chisholm Exp v. Georgia (US) 2 Dale 419, 454; 1 L Ed 440, 445 @DALL 1793 pp 471-472.

"as general rule men have natural right to do anything which their inclinations may suggest, if it be not evil in itself, and in no way impairs the rights of others." In Re Newman (1925), 71 C.A. 386, 235 P. 664.

"The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state." In re Merriam, 36 N.E. 505, 141 N.Y. 479, affirmed 16 S.Ct. 1073, 163 U.S. 625, 41 L.Ed. 287; 20 C.J.S., Section 1785. Title 28, United States Code, Section 297 defines the several States of the union as being "freely associated compact states" in subsection (a), and then refers to these freely associated compact states as being "countries" in subsection(b). Did you know that the individual states were considered to be foreign countries to the United States and to each other?

In 1818, the Supreme Court stated that "In the United States of America, there are two (2) separated and distinct jurisdictions, such being the jurisdiction of the states within their own state boundaries, and the other being federal jurisdiction (United States), which is limited to the District of Columbia, the U.S. Territories, and federal enclaves within the states, under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17." U.S. v. Bevans, 16 U.S. (3 WHEAT) 336 (1818), reaff. 19 U.S.C.A., section 1401(h).

When Congress is operating in its exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, the Territories, and enclaves, it is important to remember that it has full authority to enact legislation as private acts pertaining to its boundaries, and it is not a state of the union of States because it exists solely by virtue of the compact/constitution that created it. The constitution does not say that the District of Columbia must guarantee a Republican form of Government to its own subject citizens within its territories. (See Hepburn & Dundas v. Ellzey, 6 US. 445(1805); Glaeser v. Acacia Mut. Life Ass'n., 55 F. Supp., 925 (1944); Long v. District of Columbia, 820 F.2d 409 (D.C. Cir. 1987); Americana of Puerto Rico, Inc. v. Kaplus, 368 F.2d 431 (1966), among others).

"The idea prevails with some -- indeed, it found expression in arguments at the bar -- that we have in this country substantially or practically two national governments; one, to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to exercise." Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, supra.

The Constitution provides limited powers to federal government over the state Citizens. The federal government has unlimited powers over federal citizens because it is acting outside of the Constitution. Administrative laws are private acts and are not applicable to state Citizens. The Internal Revenue Code is administrative law.

"We are a republic. Real liberty is never found in despotism or in the extremes of democracy." - Alexander Hamilton.

The origin of the federal citizen

So far I have not given any proof that the government actually recognizes two distinct classes of citizens. I will give that evidence now by describing the 13th and 14th Amendments.

In 1865, the 13th Amendment abolished slavery and involuntary servitude except as punishment for a crime. The Supreme Court ruled that the 13th Amendment operated to free former slaves and prohibit slavery, but it in no way conferred citizenship to the former slaves, or to those of races other than white, because the founders of the Constitution were all of the white race.

The federal government did not have the authority to determine if former slaves could become a Citizen of one of the several states because the 9th and 10th Amendments said that powers not granted specifically to the federal government by the Constitution are reserved to the states or to the People. History shows that the Pennsylvania Commonwealth and New York State were nationalizing blacks as State Citizens. In other states blacks were not Citizens and therefore did not have standing in any court. The answer to this problem was the 14th Amendment.

The 14th Amendment used the term "citizen of the United States." The courts have ruled that this means federal citizenship which is similar to a citizen of the District of Columbia. Since the federal government

didn't step in and tell Pennsylvania or New York that it couldn't make State Citizens out of former black slaves, an argument could be made that the 14th Amendment was written primarily to afford [voluntary] citizenship to those of the black race that were recently freed by the 13th Amendment (Slaughter-House Cases, 16 Wall. 36, 71); and did not include Indians and others NOT born in and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (McKay v. Cambell, 2 Sawy. 129), Thus, the Amendment 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)).

To restate: In the Slaughter-House Cases, supra the Court said: "It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of a state, which are distinct from each other and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances of the individual. . . . Of the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the state, and what they respectfully are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment."

The court has also ruled that "The term United States is a metaphor [a figure of speech]". *Cunard S.S. Co. V. Mellon*, 262 US 100, 122; and that "The term 'United States' may be used in one of several senses. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of sovereign in a family of nations. It may designate territory over which sovereignty of the United States extends, or it may be a collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution." *Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt*, 324 US 652, 672-73.

Did the Courts really say that someone could be a Citizen of a State without being a citizen of the United States? Yes, they did. It's true that the cases cited above are old, some over 100 years old. None of these cases have ever been overturned by a more recent decision, so they are valid. 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.

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. "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).

In 1866, Congress passed the first civil rights act which only applied to the District of Columbia and other federal territories. In 1868, the 14th Amendment was proclaimed to be passed. At this point the number of subjects that the federal government had exclusive jurisdiction over increased to all of the former slaves that had not become state Citizens.

There are many reasons why I do not like the 14th Amendment. The first is that it was never ratified!

"I cannot believe that any court in full possession of all its faculties, would ever rule that the (14th) Amendment was properly approved and adopted." *State v. Phillips*, 540 P.2d. 936; *Dyett v. Turner*, 439 P.2d. 266. (The court in this case was the Utah Supreme Court.)

Further, in 1967, Congress tried to repeal the 14th Amendment on the ground that it is invalid, void, and unconstitutional. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE, June 13, 1967, pg. 15641. The nine pages of argument that are recorded here detail the infirmities that prove that the 14th Amendment was never properly ratified, and thus is no law!

The 14th Amendment reads in pertinent part, "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....The validity of the public debt of the United States...shall not be questioned."

There is a wealth of deception in the above wording, because of sheer number of words that have specific or multiple meanings in law depending upon how they are used.

Go the part "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The word the is used in a singular form, not the plural, as is the word jurisdiction. If Congress meant the several States, rather than the District of Columbia, it would have been more correct to say "and subject to their jurisdictions."

In addition, a new pecking order is established with the phrase. "are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

If you research the terms "resident" and "legal residence", you find that it is the nexus that binds us all to the State and federal enforcement of commercial law statutes today. "Resident" is the short form of "Resident Alien" and is used in State statutes to mean someone who exhibits actual presence in an area belonging to one nation while retaining a domicile/citizenship status within another foreign nation [The United States/District of Columbia]. The term "legal residence" further indicates that these two terms may be applied either to a geographical jurisdiction, or, a political jurisdiction. An individual may reside in one or the other, or in both at the same time. In California, Government Code, section 126, sets forth the essential elements of a compact between this State and the federal government allowing reciprocal taxation of certain entities, and provide for concurrent jurisdiction within geographical boundaries.

Both state Citizens and federal citizens are Americans. US citizens are "domiciled" in the District of Columbia and are privileged alien to the state wherein they reside and state Citizens are domiciled in their state and not aliens in their state. They also do not reside in their state; they are Citizens of the state. The distinction may seem insignificant to you but it is not to the court. A state Citizen has the right to travel in each of the 50 states. He/she can file papers at any county courthouse in any state and become a Citizen of that state.

Most of the federal statute laws do not apply to Citizens of a state. If the authority for the statute can be found in the organic Constitution, then the statute is of a National character, as it applies to both state Citizens and aliens.

"Upon introducing the provisions which eventually became 18 U.S.C. 242, its sponsor, Senator Stewart, explicitly stated that the bill protected all 'persons'... He noted that the bill 'simply extends to foreigners, not citizens, the protection of our laws.'" United States v. Otherson, 480 F.Supp. 1369, 1373 (1979). What could this mean? Well, it implies that Citizens of a state already had the protections introduced by this statute, but it extended to foreigners this protection also. What is a "foreigner" if they are not also an "alien"?

Privileges granted by the sovereign (governments) in their capacity to license (condone) what might otherwise be illegal are always taxable and regulatable. Rights such as those envisioned by the founding fathers are not taxable or regulatable because they are exercises of the common right that could be completely destroyed by government through taxation and/or regulation. These are maxims of law so well established that they are irrefutable. For example, look to *Frost & Frost Trucking v. Railroad Commission of California*, 271 U.S. 583, 70 L.Ed. 1101 (1925).

Now, in 1868, we have a class of citizenship created [14th Amendment] which is "subject" by grant of privilege from a sovereign power [federal Congress] exercising exclusive authority to govern its territory under Article I, sect. 8, cl. 17 of the Constitution. Federal citizens are created by Congress. It is self-evident that all state Citizens are created equal; that they are endowed, by their creator, with certain inalienable rights, and that governments are instituted to secure these rights.

It is also a self-evident truth that the sovereign creator can never create an entity (government) and assign it more power than what the creator possesses to begin with. Further, the Constitution for the United States of America did not repeal the Articles of Confederation, it was only intended "to make a more perfect union." Therefore, it logically follows that the creator did not purposely intend to alter their status as MASTER to accept a role as SERVANT to its own creation. This is plainly shown throughout the Constitution, but especially set forth in the Tenth Amendment. (cf. *United States v. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 124 (1941); *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958))

"The right to tax and regulate the national citizenship is an inherent right under the rule of the Law of Nations, which is part of the law of the United States, as described in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17." *The Luisitania*, 251 F.715, 732. And, "This jurisdiction extends to citizens of the United States, wherever resident, for the exercise of the privileges and immunities and protections of [federal] citizenship." *Cook v. Tait*, (1924) 265 U.S. 37,44 S.Ct 447, 11 Virginia Law Review, 607."

The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment (*walker v. Sauvinet*, 92 U.S. 90), and the right to bear arms, guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment (*presser v. Illinois*, 116 U.S. 252), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the 14th Amendment against abridgment by the states, 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 (*Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the 6th Amendment." *West v. Louisiana*, 194 U.S. 258.

The privileges and immunities [civil rights] of the 14th Amendment citizens were derived [taken] from....the Constitution, but are not identical to those referred to in Article IV, sect. 2 of the Constitution [which recognizes the existence of state Citizens who were not citizens of the United States because there was no such animal in 1787]. Plainly spoken, RIGHTS considered to be grants from our creator are clearly different from the "civil rights" that were granted by Congress to its own brand of franchised citizen in the 14th Amendment.

"A 'civil right' is a right given and protected by law [man's law], and a person's enjoyment thereof is regulated entirely by law that creates it." *Nickell v. Rosenfield*, (1927) 82 CA 369, 375, 255 P. 760.

Title 42 of the USC contains the Civil Rights laws. It says "Rights under 42 USCS section 1983 are for citizens of the United States and not of state. *Wadleigh v. Newhall* (1905, CC Cal) 136 F 941."

In summary, what we are talking about here is a Master-Servant relationship. Prior to the 14th Amendment, there were state Citizens and non-citizens. State Citizens were the masters in the relationship to government. After the 14th Amendment was declared to be passed, a new class of citizenship was created, which is both privileged and servant [subject] to the creator [the federal government].

How state Citizens were converted into federal citizens

In order for the federal government to tax a Citizen of one of the several states, it had to create some sort of contractual nexus. This contractual nexus is the Social Security Number (SSN).

In 1935, the federal government instituted Social Security. The Social Security Board then created 10 Social Security "Districts." The combination of these "Districts" resulted in a "Federal Area", a fictional jurisdiction, which covered all of the several states like a clear plastic overlay.

In 1939, the federal government instituted the "Public Salary Tax Act of 1939." This Act is a municipal law of the District of Columbia for taxing all federal government employees and those who live and work in any "Federal Area." Now the government knows it cannot tax those state Citizens who live and work outside the territorial jurisdiction of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2 in the Constitution for the United States of America; also known as the ten square miles of the District of Columbia and territories and enclaves. So, in 1940, Congress passed the "Buck Act" now found in 4 U.S.C. Sections 105-113. In Section 110(e), this Act authorized any department of the federal government to create a "Federal Area" for imposition of the "Public Salary Tax Act of 1939." This tax is imposed at 4 U.S.C. Section 111. The rest of the taxing law is found in the Internal Revenue Code. The Social Security Board had already created a "Federal Area" overlay. U.S.C. Title 4 is as follows:

Sec. 110(d): The term "State" includes any territory or possession of the United States.

Sec. 110(e): The term "Federal Area" means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United states or any department, establishment, or agency of the United states; and any federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a federal area located within such State.

Under the Provisions of Title 4, Section 105, the federal "State" (also known as, "The State of...") is imposing an excise tax. That section states, in pertinent part:

Sec. 105: State, and so forth, taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax.

(a) No person shall be relieved from the liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such tax, on the ground that the sales or use, with respect to which such tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a Federal area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction to levy such a tax, by reason of his residing within a Federal area or receiving income from transactions occurring or services performed in such area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect such tax in any Federal area within such a State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

shh!!!
don't let them know
you know,
THEY LIVE!