

“The People” does not include U.S. Citizens. (*Barrow v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 32 U.S. 243).

Posted on September 23, 2016 by David Robinson -  
<https://mainerepublicemailalert.com/2016/09/23/the-people-does-not-include-u-s-citizens-barrow-v-mayor-and-city-council-of-baltimore-32-u-s-243/comment-page-1/#comment-15116>

**The “American People” and “U.S. citizens” are two different things.**

A US citizen does not have any rights.

“...the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal constitution against the powers of the Federal government.” — *Maxwell v Dow*, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 455;

“The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States,” — *US vs. Valentine* 288 F. Supp. 957.

“Therefore, the U.S. citizens [citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as “individual entities.” — *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773.

“A “US Citizen” upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in “interstate commerce”, for 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)

**A US citizen is a corporation.**

“...it might be correctly said that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States. .... 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.” — *Ex Parte Frank Knowles*, 5 Cal. Rep. 300.

This can also be confirmed in the definitions section of Title 5 USC, Title 26 USC, and Title 1 USC.

Therefore a US citizen is a piece of property. If you read any of those old court cases prior to the civil war where slavery was the issue, the debate was ALWAYS over property rights, therefore a US citizen is a SLAVE.

**The Fourteenth Amendment defines what a US citizen is;**

“Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction

thereof, are citizens of the United States,.....”

The so-called Fourteenth Amendment criminally converts US citizenship completely upside down from what the founding fathers intended it to be.

“The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by their ‘citizenship’ to the agencies of government.” — *City of Dallas v Mitchell*, 245 S.W. 944

“Civil rights under the 14th amendment are for Federal citizens and not State Citizens; Federal citizens, as parents, have no right to the custody of their infant children except subject to the paramount right of the State.” — *Wadleigh v. Newhall*, Circuit Court N. Dist. Cal., Mar 13, 1905

And “US citizens” can even murder their unborn children by committing the common law crime of infanticide, because the unborn are NOT “persons”, they are by definition State Citizens, which means the BAR members (foreign agents of the Crown) in the so-called courts are engaged in genocide against the American sovereignty, and this is proof that it has nothing to do with race, and has everything to do with slavery; “The unborn are not included within the definition of “person” as used in the 14th Amendment.” — *Roe v. Wade*, US Supreme Court, 410 US 13, 35L. Ed. 2d 147, 1973.

“The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States,” — *US vs. Valentine* 288 F. Supp. 957.

“...it is evident that they [US citizens] have not the political rights which are vested in citizens of the States. They are not constituents of any community in which is vested any sovereign power of government. Their position partakes more of the character of subjects than of citizens. They are subject to the laws of the United States but have no voice in its management. If they are allowed to make laws, the validity of these laws is derived from the sanction of a Government in which they are not represented. Mere citizenship they may have, but the political rights of citizens they cannot enjoy...” — *People v. De La Guerra*, 40 Cal. 311, 342 (A.D. 1870) [emphasis added]

“SUBJECT. SUBJECT may imply a state of subjection to a person, such as a monarch, without much sense of membership in a political community or sharing in political rights ... It may on the other hand simply indicate membership in a political community with a personal sovereign to whom allegiance is owed.” — *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*, MERRIAM-WEBSTER INC., Publishers 1986

“[T]he term “citizen,” in the United States, is analogous to the term “subject” in the common law.” — *State vs Manual* 20 NC 122, 14 C.J.S. 4, p 430.

and a “US citizen” is a fictitious entity, and has no rights;

“Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as “individual entities.” — *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L. Ed. 1143, 56 S. Ct. 773.

“In our opinion, it was not the intent of the legislature to restrict the operation of the statute to those only who were subjects of the United States government ...” — *Prowd v. Gore* (1922) 57 Cal. App. 458, 459-461 [emphasis added]

“Upon the other hand, the 14th Amendment, upon the subject of citizenship, Declares only that “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.” Here there is a limitation to a person born or naturalized in the United States, which is not extended to a person born in any place “subject to their jurisdiction.”” — *Downes v. Bidwell* (1900) 182 U.S. 244, 249-251, 45 L. Ed. 1088, 1092, [emphasis added]

A “US Citizen” 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)

“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 abridgement 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 technical niceties of the common law are not regarded. . . .”, 1 R.C.L. 31, p. 422. “A jury does not figure, ordinarily, in the trial of an admiralty suit. . . the verdict of the jury merely advisory, and may be disregarded by the court.” 1 R.C.L. 40, p. 432. “[The] rules of practice may be altered whenever found to be inconvenient or likely to embarrass the business of the court.” 1 R.C.L. 32, p. 423. “A court of admiralty. . . acts upon equitable principles.” 1 R.C.L. 17, p. 416. “A libel of information [accusation] does not require all the technical precision of an indictment at common law. If the allegations describe the offense, it is all that is necessary; and if it is founded upon a statute, it is sufficient if it pursues the words of the law.” — *The Emily v. The Caroline*, 9 Wheat. 381.

“...that there was a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of the states, which were distinct from each other, depending upon different characteristics and circumstances in the individual; that it was only privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States that were placed by the amendment under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and that the privileges and immunities of a citizen of a state, whatever they might be, were not intended to have any

additional protection by the paragraph in question, but they must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested.” — Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 451;

“...the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal constitution against the powers of the Federal government.” — Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 455; — Timeline Photos

### **There have always been 2 classes of citizens in America.**

The Constitution for the United States of America talks about 2 classes of citizens.

Article IV, Section 2 Clause 1 says; “The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.”

The courts have talked about the two classes of citizens as shown below.

“there is in our Political System, a government of each of the several states and a government of the United States. Each is distinct from the other and has citizens of its own.” — US vs. Cruikshank, 92 US 542.

The Fourteenth Amendment, “...creates or at least recognizes for the first time a citizenship of the United States, as distinct from a citizenship of the States.” — Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Edition at pg 591;

“One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States. — Thomasson v State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (17 Am. R. 738); — McCarthy v. Froelke, 63 Ind. 507; In Re Wehlitz, 16 Wis. 443.” — Mc Donel v State, 90 Ind. Rep. 320 at pg 323.

“Both before and after the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the U.S. in order to be a citizen of his State” — Crosse v. Board of Supervisors, Baltimore, Md., 1966, 221 A. 2d 431 citing US Supreme Court Slaughter-House Cases and U.S. v. Cruikshank 92 US 542, 549, 23 L. Ed 588 1875.

“There are two classes of citizens, citizens of the United States and of the State. And one may be a citizen of the former without being a citizen of the latter” — Gardina v. Board of Registers 48 So. 788, 169 Ala. 155 (1909).

“Citizenship of the United States does not entitle citizens to privileges and immunities of Citizens of the State since privileges of one are not the same as the other” — Tashiro v. Jordan, 255 P. 545 California Supreme Court.

The United States Supreme Court quite thoroughly expanded on the two classes of citizenship in the case Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, where it said:

“...that there was a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of the states, which were distinct from each other, depending upon different characteristics and circumstances in the individual; that it was only privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States that were placed by the amendment under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and that the privileges and immunities of a citizen of a state, whatever they might be, were not intended to have any additional protection by the paragraph in question, but they must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested.” — Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 451.

These two classes of citizenship continue to this day, “Privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship. 14,§ 1.” — Jones v Temmer, 829 F.Supp. 1226 (D.Colo. 1993);

Because there are 2 classes of citizens, and also because of circumstances that will become known below, it is necessary to assert your sovereignty. In order to understand how and why you assert your sovereignty, we need to have some background knowledge.

A state citizen is one of “We the People” found in the preamble to the constitution. You can be in a state without being in the United States. In fact, if you read their codes, the United States in the United States Code is the District of Columbia and the Territories. The Puerto Rico website even talks about it.