

The Montana Question



By Anna Von Reitz

One of the people in Montana who has worked hard to help build the State Assembly there was forced to leave Montana seven months ago. She has continued to try to help organizing efforts there, but, because she no longer lives in the State (despite still owning land and property there) and has no set plan for returning, there is no basis for her to act as Coordinator for Montana nor to retain State Citizenship there beyond the limits of the State residency requirements.

When we move from one State to another, we have to establish "residency" in the new State. "Residency" is a temporary status and does not imply that you are settling down forever and ever in that State. Ironically, most of us have unknowingly been living as "residents" in our own home States because we didn't know we had to record our being born there, or because we failed to actually adopt a new State when we moved.

Most States have published standards for how long you can be out of State before you are no longer considered to be living in that State, and for how long you can be a visitor in a new State before declaring residency there. The key words to look for in the General Session Laws are "living" and "homestead" and "residency".

I don't off-hand know the Montana laws for this, but I know that in Alaska, if you are gone more than 180 days out of the year, you no longer qualify to be considered an Alaskan.

The States of the Union have never allowed Dual Citizenship, and that includes Citizenship in any two States as well as State-Federal combinations.

The Founders considered Dual Citizenship to be a potential conflict of interest and against the Biblical injunction that "No man can serve two Masters" so none of the soil and land jurisdiction States allow it.

If you think about it briefly, you will see that State Citizens by definition need to be living in the State where they claim State Citizenship.

Otherwise, you could have people who were actually living in California, for example, but claiming to be Nevada Citizens, and then deciding the fate of people and assets in Nevada.

Nobody on the receiving end of such an arrangement would consider that fair or equitable, so it is not allowed, nor should it be.

For some reason, our friend in Montana is struggling over these facts and claiming that people outside of Montana are deciding things "for" Montana and "meddling" in Montana's affairs and so on and so forth in her struggle to remain active in Montana and not establish new State Citizenship where she is living now-- but it has always been this way and it has nothing to do with anyone meddling with anything.

We can't be two places at once, though sometimes we all wish we could.

State Coordinators are volunteer State Citizens who have taken on the job of helping others get their political status declarations done and recorded, and who are spearheading the effort to organize their State Assembly. This isn't any official "office" of the State Assembly. It's just another job that needs to get done.

It wouldn't be fair to have people who are living in other States acting as your State Coordinator(s), just like it wouldn't be right to have people from other States voting in your State elections.

So, no, you can't be living in California for most of the year and claiming to be a State Citizen of Montana. It just doesn't work that way.

Please note: you have to live and make your permanent home in the State where you claim your State Citizenship, but your State National status travels with you.

In other words, I will always be a State National of Wisconsin because I was born in Wisconsin, but unless I actually live in Wisconsin, I can't be a State Citizen of Wisconsin.

See this article and over 2100 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the PayPal buttons on this website.