# See for yourself,
# Two citizens in the country of the United States



The author has been asked if there is another way to show that there is in the country of the United States two citizens; a citizen of the United States and a citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States.

To begin, it is generally known if one is in the waters surrounding the United States of America, the first three (3) miles are under the jurisdiction of the particular State of the United States of America, the next 97 miles are under the jurisdiction of the United States government Which means that each individual State of the United States of America is a sovereign, just as the United States government is a sovereign:

"If the United States may control the conduct of its citizens upon the high seas, we see no reason why the State of Florida may not likewise govern the conduct of its citizens upon the high seas with respect to matters in which the State has a legitimate interest and where there is no conflict with acts of Congress. ***Save for the powers committed by the Constitution to the Union, the State of Florida has retained the status of a sovereign***" Skiriotes v. State of Florida: 313 U.S. 69, at 77 (1941). **[Footnote 1]**

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=9757650854292938204

Since both an individual State and the United States government are sovereign, then both have citizens of their own:

" . . . When its action does not conflict with federal legislation, the sovereign authority of the State over the conduct of its citizens upon the high seas is analogous to the sovereign authority of the United States over its citizens in like circumstances." Skiriotes v. State of Florida: 313 U.S. 69, at 78 thru 79 (1941).

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=9757650854292938204

" . . . As in case of the authority of the United States over its absent citizens (*Blackmer v. United States*, 284 U.S. 421), the authority of a State over one of its citizens is not terminated by the mere fact of his absence from the state." Milliken v. Meyer: 311 U.S. 457, at 463 (1940).

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=17349706952628716804

"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." United States v. Cruikshank: 92 U.S. 542, at 549 (1875).

http://books.google.com/books?id=PGwUAAAAYAAJ&pg=RA2-PA549#v=onepage&q=&f=false

"As a man may be a citizen of a State without being a citizen of the United States, and as Section 1428, Revised Statutes, requires all officers of all United States vessels to be citizens of the United States, all officers of the Naval Militia must be male citizens of the United States as well as of the respective States, Territories, of the District of Columbia, of more than 18 and less than 45 years of age." General Orders of Navy Department (Series of 1913); Orders remaining in force up to January 29, 1918; **General Order No. 153**, Page 17, Para 73. **[Footnote 2]**

http://books.google.com/books?id=zYEtAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA17#v=onepage&q&f=false

It is to be noted, however, that a citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States is not recognized under international law (law of nations).. This is because an individual State. though sovereign, is not an independent nation. **[Footnote 3]**

---

**Footnotes:**

**1.** There is also the following:

" . . . [I]t is certain that the Constitution of the United States confers no power whatever upon the government of the United States to regulate marriage in the States or its dissolution." Andrews v. Andrews: 188 U.S. 14, at 32 (1903).

http://books.google.com/books?id=Gd4GAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA32#v=onepage&q&f=false

"In applying the dual sovereignty doctrine, then, the crucial determination is whether the two entities that seek successively to prosecute a defendant for the same course of conduct can be termed separate sovereigns. . . . Thus, ***the Court has uniformly held that the States are separate sovereigns with respect to the Federal Government.*** . . . .

***The States are no less sovereign with respect to each other than they are with respect to the Federal Government.*** The powers to undertake criminal prosecutions

derive from separate and independent sources of power and authority originally belonging to them before admission to the Union and preserved to them by the Tenth Amendment." Heath v State of Alabama: 474 U.S. 82, at 88 thru 89 (1985).

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=13502780088763338920

**2.** To see that a citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States is recognized under Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America, refer to my work "Yes it is true, there are two citizens" (online).

To see that a citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States is a citizen of the several States when abroad, refer to my work "A Citizen of a State is a Citizen of the several States when abroad" (online).

A citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States is a citizen of the several States when on the high seas:

"Action to have a certain marriage between plaintiff and defendant declared valid and binding upon the parties. A second amended complaint alleged: That on August 2, 1897, defendant was a minor of the age of 15 years and 10 months, and that her father, one A. C. Thomson, was her natural and only guardian. Plaintiff was of the age of 21 years and 10 months, and ***both plaintiff and defendant were citizens and residents of Los Angeles county, Cal***. On said day plaintiff and defendant, at Long Beach, on the coast of California, boarded a certain fishing and pleasure schooner, of 17 tons burden, called the 'J. Willey,' duly licensed under the laws of the United States, of which W. L. Pierson was captain, and was enrolled as master thereof, and had full charge of said vessel. Said vessel proceeded to a point on the high seas about nine miles from the nearest point from the boundary of the state and of the United States. The parties then and there agreed, in the presence of said Pierson, to become husband and wife, and the said Pierson performed the ceremony of marriage, and, among other things, they promised in his presence to take each other for husband and wife, and he pronounced them husband and wife. Neither party had the consent of the father or mother or guardian of defendant to said marriage. . . .

Appellant contends (1) that the marriage is valid because performed upon the high seas; and (2) that it would have been valid if performed within this state, because there is no law expressly declaring it to be void. Respondent presents the case upon two propositions, claiming (1) that no valid marriage can be contracted in this state, except in compliance with the prescribed forms of the laws of this state, and contract a valid marriage.

Sections 4082, 4290, 722, Rev. St. U.S., are cited by appellant as recognizing marriages at sea and before foreign consuls, and that section 722 declares the common law as to marriage to be in force on the high seas on board American vessels. We have

carefully examined the statutes referred to, and do not find that they give the slightest support to appellant's claim. The law of the sea, as it may relate to the marriage of citizens of the United States domiciled in California, cannot be referred to the common law of England, any more than it can to the law of France or Spain, or any other foreign county. ***We can find no law of congress, and none has been pointed out by appellant, in which the general government has undertaken or assumed to legislate generally upon the subject of marriage on the sea. Nor, indeed, can we find in the grant of powers to the general government by the several states, as expressed in the national constitution, any provision by which congress is empowered to declare what shall constitute a valid marriage between citizens of the several states upon the sea***, either within or without the conventional three-mile limit of the shore of any state; and clearly does no such power rest in congress to regulate marriages on land, except in the District of Columbia and the territories of the United States, or where is power of exclusive jurisdiction. We must look elsewhere than to the acts of congress for the law governing the case in hand." Norman v. Norman: 54 Pac. Rep. 143, 143 thru 144 (1898).

http://books.google.com/books?id=-QwLAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA143#v=onepage&q&f=false

**3.** In *Pennoyer v. Neff* (95 U.S. 714, at 722 [1878]), it states:

"The several States of the Union are not , it is true, in every respect ***independent***, many of the rights and powers which originally belonged to them being now vested in the government created by the Constitution. But, except as restrained and limited by that instrument, they possess and exercise the authority of independent States." *Overruled, on other grounds*.

http://books.google.com/books?id=z78GAAAAYAAJ&p=RA5-PA722#v=onepage&q=&f=false

"Every nation that governs itself, under what form soever, without dependence on any foreign power, is a *Sovereign State*, Its rights are naturally the same as those of any other state. Such are the moral persons who live together in a natural society, subject to the law of nations. To give a nation a right to make an immediate figure in this grand society, it is sufficient that it be really ***sovereign and independent***, that is, that it govern itself by its own authority and laws." § 4, Chap. 1, Book 1, "Of Nations Considered in Themselves" Vattel.

http://constitution.org/vattel/vattel_01.htm