

State vs. Federal Citizenship

By Moses G. Washington

revised on 6/1/2003

Disclaimer

The material in this essay is for educational purposes only and not to be construed as legal advice about what you should or should not do. The information herein is to assist you in performing your own due diligence before implementing any strategy. Formal notice is hereby given that:

You have 10 days after reviewing any material on this web site to notify Truth Sets Us Free (TSUF) in writing of any word, phrase, reference or statement which is inaccurate, incorrect, misleading or not in full compliance with state and federal law and to give TSUF 30 days to correct and cure any alleged potential flaw. TSUF's intent is to be in strict compliance with the law.

Introduction

In this essay, we will explore the concept of State Citizen (American National) as compared to being a United States [federal] citizen. It may seem to you that they are the same thing. So, you may be very surprised that there is a distinction between these two things. But in fact they are very different. You will see that they are concepts that have separate origins and that they have distinct rights. You will discover that it is far better to be a State Citizen. We will begin with a historical perspective on the concept of citizenship in America.

Historical Background

Our forefathers had the idea that a hierarchy of authority existed. They believed that the Creator (some believed in the Christian God of the bible and others were deists) had all authority and that He had a set of requirements for living that were recorded in the Bible. The founders usually called this “natural law” which is defined in Black’s Law Dictionary (5th edition) [hereafter called Black’s] as “a system of rules and principles for the guidance of human conduct which, independently of enacted law or of the systems peculiar to any one people, might be discovered by the rational intelligence of man ... These express necessary and obligatory rules of human conduct which have been established by the author of human nature as essential to the divine purposes in the universe and have been promulgated by God solely through human reason.”

The Founders also believed that the Creator made man so that man had authority under Him. They understood that men needed to have laws to resolve conflicts between themselves. They turned to the laws in Bible to resolve many conflicts. But they also saw that the Bible did not contain all of the guidance that was needed to resolve complex

issues. So, they recognized the common law which was a body of law that derived from legal cases (case law) from the British legal system over hundreds of years. This law was largely based upon common sense and as such it was law that any man could understand. The next level of authority was government, specifically the State governments and their constitutions. The States came together and delegated certain authority to the national government in the form of the Constitution for the United States of America. They recognized that the central government would have to have limited authority over state governments in order to resolve conflicts between the states. They also recognized that statutes created by legislative bodies were below the constitution (State or federal) in authority and could not override the constitution.

Inherent in the ideas of the founders was that man was a sovereign under God. Black's (5th Edition) defines sovereign: "a person, body, or state in which independence and supreme authority is vested." The Founders recognized that in a state of nature, man was not under any government or any ruler. They believed that man had certain unalienable (or inalienable) rights given by God. Black's defines unalienable as "not transferable or assignable". Flowing from these God given rights was the authority to create government which will have limited authority. This is recognized in the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America which says "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union". In other words, the authority to form the United States came from the authority inherent within the people. The people were seen as sovereign (under the Creator). Further evidence of this idea is seen in the 9th Amendment which recognizes that the Constitution does not list all of the right of the people and that just because a right is not listed does not mean that it is not a right which is retained by the people.

The concept of government held by the Fathers was different from any other in history. They believed that the constitution is subject to the will of the people, not the legislature. They believed that a constitution is first created and then a government is created from it. You might say that the Constitution is a contract that the government is founded upon. They also believed that the people retain their rights, which are protected, at least in part, by government. All three of these beliefs were a radical departure from all previous attempts to form governments in the history of the world. These ideas are a major reason that sets America apart from all the other nations in the world.

The Preamble of the Constitution makes it clear that each person was considered sovereign and that based upon that sovereignty, they formed a government. It says:

["We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."](#)

Here we see that it was the power of "We the People" that established the constitution. The Constitution did not grant the people their rights. We also see that it was the States that granted the creation of the Constitution because it was established "for the United States of America" not "by the United States of America". If it had been "by" then the federal government would have always had preeminence over the States. But

what the Founders had in mind was that the federal government had limited powers granted by the States.

The properly relationship between States and the federal government is largely misunderstood today. Thomas Jefferson provides insight into the properly relationship:

“With respect to our state and federal governments, I do not think their relations correctly understood by foreigners. They generally suppose the former subordinate to the latter. But this is not the case. They are co-ordinate departments of one simple and integral whole. To the state governments are reserved all legislation administration, in affairs which concern their own citizens only; and to the federal government is given whatever concerns foreigners and citizens of other states; these functions alone being made federal. The one is the domestic, the other the foreign branch of the same government - neither having control over the other, but within its own department.” from Thomas Jefferson’s letter to Major John Cartwright, of June 5th, 1824 (vol. 4, p. 396)

There is additional evidence that the sovereignty was a central issue of the Revolutionary War. There was a treaty signed between each State and Britain after the war. Article I of the treaty states: “His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz. New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign and independent States”.

This separation of powers between the states continues today. It is a well established legal principle that the 50 states are “foreign” with respect to each other (In re Merriam’s Estate, 36 NE 505 (1894)). The status of being foreign is the same as “belonging to” or being “attached to” another state or another jurisdiction. Evidence of this foreign status can be seen in the fact that when a someone is capture in one state but wanted for a crime in another state, the state where the crime was committed initiates extradition proceedings with the state that capture the person charged with the crime.

Today the government acts as if it is sovereign. They tell us how much tax we are going to pay for the privilege of working, how much tax we will pay on our property, how fast we can drive, what we can and cannot do with our land, etc. So how did we get from the people being sovereign to where we are today? In the remainder of this essay, I will attempt to answer this question by reviewing the history of what happened to our sovereignty.

Citizen of the United States

As stated before, at the time of the Revolutionary War it was recognized that “We the People” (each person) was sovereign. Notice that no constitution [State or federal] every provided the people with any rights. The people possessed these rights before the Constitution was formed. And in fact it was the existence of these rights that gave the people the authority to form a constitution [state or federal]. The existence and recognition of preexistence rights can be found in The Magna Carta (June 15, 1215); the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at New York (October 19, 1765); the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at Philadelphia (October 14, 1774); the Declaration of Independence

(July 4, 1776); the Articles of Confederation (November 15, 1777); and the Bill of Rights inclusive of the 9th and 10th Amendments (December 15, 1791), etc. Throughout these documents, it can be seen that the people are not subservient to the government but rather that the government is subservient to the people.

The Constitution for the United States of America uses the word “Citizens” five times: article 1 section 2 clause 2 (A1.S2.2), article 1 section 3 clause 3 (A1.S2.3), article 2 section 1 clause 5 (A2.S1.5), article 3 section 2 clause 1 (A3.S2.1), article 4 section 2 clause 1 (A4.S2.1), and the 11th Amendment (11th). All five instances contain the quote “Citizen of the United States”. You will notice below that Citizens is capitalized and it signifies the sovereignty of the people.

The first three occurrences of “Citizen of the United States” deal with qualifications for U. S. Representative, Senator and President, respectively. Since these provisions have never been amended, their meaning remains the same as it was on the day the Constitution was ratified.

A3.S2.1 deals with the jurisdiction of the federal courts. It grants federal courts authority in cases “between a State and Citizens of another State; - between Citizens of different States; - between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens, or Subjects.” Notice the limitation of authority that federal courts have. Any authority besides those specifically mentioned is not granted to the federal courts.

A4.S2 deals with the privileges and immunities of Citizens. It states “The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.” This clause gives the Citizens of each State the same rights as every other State. The fact that “State” is capitalized is in recognition of the Sovereignty of each state. That is, each State has sovereign authority over its own territory. This means the following:

“A citizen of one state is to be considered as a citizen of every other state in the union.” *Butler v. Farnsworth*, Federal Cases, Vol. 4, page 902 (1821)

So, prior the passage of the 14th Amendment, this is the only sense in which a natural born American was a citizen of the entire United States.

The 11th Amendment deals with protection of States’ right against Federal judicial power. It says “The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.”

What we can concluded thus far can be summarized by the following quote:

“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.” [Ex parte. - Frank Knowles, California Reports, Vol. 5, page 302 (1855)]

So we can see that by being a Citizen of a single State, we are Citizens of every State and thus a Citizen of the United States. So it is correct to say that we are Citizens of the several united States. The framers of the Constitution did not recognize the concept of being a citizen of the federal government.

Based upon this, we may ask what are our rights as Citizens of the United States. The Declaration of Independence gives a very concise answer to this question:

“We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” [Declaration of Independence paragraph 2].

Another quote also states these rights and recognizes that by living in an orderly fashion with other men with men we must restrain our rights somewhat:

“When men entered into a State they yielded a part of their absolute rights, or natural liberty, for political or civil liberty, which is no other than natural liberty restrained by human laws, so far as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public. The rights of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring and protecting reputation and property, - and, in general, of attaining objects suitable to their condition, without injury to another, are the rights of a citizen; and all men by nature have them.” [Douglass, Adm’r., v. Stephens, Delaware Chancery, Vol. 1, Page 470 (1821)]

So our study thus far leaves us in a desirable condition of being sovereign Citizens of our respective States and of the united States. This condition was well summarized by Senator John Calhoun:

“The Senator from Delaware (Mr. Clayton), as well as others, has relied with great emphasis on the fact that we are citizens of the United States. I do not object to the expression, nor shall I detract from the proud and elevated feelings with which it is associated; but I trust that I may be permitted to raise the inquiry, In what manner are we citizens of the United States? without weakening the patriotic feeling with which, I trust, it will ever be uttered. If by citizen of the United States he means a citizen at large, one whose citizenship extends to the entire geographical limits of the country, without having a local citizenship in some State or territory, a sort of citizen of the world, all I have to say is, that such a citizen would be a perfect nondescript; that not a single individual of this description can be found in the entire mass of our population. Notwithstanding all the pomp and display of eloquence on the occasion, every citizen is a citizen of some State or territory, and, as such, under and express provision of the constitution, is entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States; and it is in this, and in no other sense, that we are citizens of the United States.” [Speech by Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina on the Force Bill, February 16, 1833, reprinted in “Union and Liberty, The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun,” edited by Ross M. Lence, Liberty Fund, 1992, Pg. 443-4]

One of the earliest Supreme Court decisions to explore the issue of citizenship was the Dred Scott case. The high court sought to define what a citizen was as compared to

“people of the United State”. Their conclusion was that they were the same thing. They also affirmed that the people formed the sovereign body that is the real source of power in this nation.

“The words ‘people of the United States’ and ‘citizens’ are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the ‘sovereign people,’ and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty.

“We have the language of the Declaration of Independence and of the Articles of Confederation, in addition to the plain words of the Constitution itself; we have the legislation of the different states, before, about the time, and since the Constitution was adopted; we have the legislation of Congress, from the time of its adoption to a recent period; and we have the constant and uniform action of the Executive Department, all concurring together, and leading to the same result. And if anything in relation to the construction of the Constitution can be regarded as settled, it is that which we now give to the word ‘citizen’ and the word ‘people.’”
[Dred Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393 (1856)]

So we conclude that the source of all sovereignty in a constitutional Republic such as the 50 States, which are united under the Constitution for the United States of America, is the People themselves. The States, and the federal government are both bound by the terms of a contract known as the U.S. Constitution. This contract contains a set of delegated powers which ultimately originate in the sovereignty of the Creator, who endowed individual people like you and me, with sovereignty in that likeness of the Creator. I think it is fair to say that the Supreme Court of the United States was never more eloquent when it described the source of sovereignty as follows:

“Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is indeed, quite true, that there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration the responsibility is purely political, no appeal except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts Bill of Rights, the government of the commonwealth “may be a government of laws and not of men.” For, the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself.” [Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886)]

A more recent case reiterates the same point in terse and precise language.

“In the United States, sovereignty resides in the people who act through the organs established by the Constitution. [case cites omitted] The Congress as the instrumentality of sovereignty is endowed with certain powers to be exerted on behalf of the people in the manner and with the effect the Constitution ordains. The Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the people to override their will as thus declared.” [Perry v. United States, 294 U.S. 330, 353 (1935)]

Republic vs. Democracy

Before continuing with exploration of the word “citizen” in the U. S. Constitution, it would be helpful to divert for a moment to consider the fact that we have a Republic rather than a Democracy. In fact the constitution guarantees each state a Republican form of government.

“The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion...” [U. S. Constitution, A4.S4.1]

You may not have been aware that that a democracy and a republic were different. Black’s [6th edition] defines “republican government” as follows:

“One in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people, either directly, or through representatives chosen by the people, to whom those powers are specially delegated.” [In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 35 L.Ed. 219; Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162, 22 L.Ed. 627.]

Some people believe that the use of the two terms is just a matter of semantics. But perhaps the following table will help clarify the difference between these two forms of government. It shows the chain of command from the top down in each form of government.

Democracy (Majority Rule)	Constitutional Republic
Mr. X	Creator
Majority	Individual
Government	Constitution
Public Servants	Government
Case & Statue Law	Public Servants
Corporations	Statute Law
individuals	Corporations

A democracy is ruled by the majority and an unknown elite, Mr. X, at the top. The rights of the individual are at the bottom of the chain. The majority elects a government to hire public servants who write laws primarily for the benefit of corporations. The corporations are either owned or controlled by Mr. X through a clique of the ultra-wealthy. These ultra-wealthy seek to restore a “feudal” society where they control everything and all the individuals are “serfs”. The rights of individuals often vanish over

time, because democracies usually self-destruct. The enforcement of laws within this scheme is done by administrative tribunals, who specialize in holding individuals to the letter of all rules and regulations of the state. In fact, it is common for there to be so many rules that everyone can be charged with something. We are very close to this situation in the U.S. today and in fact may already be there.

The constitutional Republic is significantly different. The rights of individuals are supreme. Individuals delegate some of their sovereignty to a written contract, called a constitution, which empowers government to hire public servants who write laws primarily to protect individual. Corporations occupy the lowest priority in this chain of command, since their primary objectives are to maximize the enjoyment of individual rights, and to facilitate the fulfillment of individual responsibilities. The enforcement of laws within this scheme is the responsibility of sovereign individuals, who exercise their power in three ways: the voting booth, the trial jury, and the grand jury. For a more thorough the importance of being a member of jury, see Citizens Rule Book – Jury Handbook [available at <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/7006/rulebook.html>]. No law can be enforced and no penalty exacted without a jury verdict of “guilty.” In fact, someone cannot even be tried for a crime without the action of a grand jury. The power of public servants is restrained by the terms of the contract, as found in the written Constitution. Statutes and case law are created to limit and define the scope and extent of public servant power.

citizen of the United States

Now, let’s return to our study of the term “citizen” in the Constitution. The next mention of “citizen” in the Constitution is a clear departure from previous occurrences and represents when things began to go terribly wrong. This occurrence appears in the 14th Amendment and it is the first time that the word is not capitalized. Section 1 says in 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. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the **privileges or immunities** of citizens of the United States ...”.

This amendment was (supposedly) adopted during the reconstruction period following the Civil War.

The change from “Citizen” to “citizen” signifies that a second class of citizenship was created. A “Citizen of each State” is a sovereign person. A “citizen of the United States” is a subject of the federal government which has sovereignty over him. There were several important legal cases after the 14th Amendment which recognized two classes of citizens.

“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.” [[United States v. Cruikshank](#), 92 U.S. 542 (1875)]

“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 in the individual.” [[Slaughter House Cases](#), 83 U.S. 36, 16 Wall. 36; 21 L.Ed. 394 (1873)]

“That there is a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of a state, and the privileges and immunities of one are not the same as the other is well established by the decisions of the courts of this country. The leading cases upon the subjects are those decided by the Supreme Court of the United States and reported in 16 Wall. 36, 21 L. Ed. 394, and known as the Slaughter House Cases.” [[K. Tashiro v. Jordan](#), 256 P. 545, 549 (1927); affirmed 278 U.S. 123 (1928)]

Before discussing the 14th Amendment in detail, it might be helpful to discover who the author was and a little about his background. The 14th Amendment was introduced into U.S. House by Thaddeus Stevens, congressman from Pennsylvania and into the Senate by William Pitt Fessenden. But the language for the amendment was written by Robert Dale Owen who was a naturalized citizen from England. Robert Dale Owen’s father, Robert Owen, was the acknowledged father of British socialism. The two men that introduced the proposed amendment had both worked for Robert Owen’s communistic Harmony Society. In 1827, Robert Dale Owen founded [The Free Inquirer](#), which was said to be a socialistic publication. He was later elected to the Illinois legislature, served as ambassador to Italy and spent the end of his life devoted to abolitionism, socialism and spiritualism (talking with the dead).

After the amendment was proposed by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the US Congress, it was passed on to the States for a vote. Debate on the 14th Amendment in several state legislatures (Indiana, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Maryland) made it clear that the representative understood the affect the amendment would have upon the country. They understood that it was socialist in nature and that it would shift the balance of power away from the States toward the federal government.

Following the alleged ratification of the 14th Amendment by the States, the formal practice of birth registration was begun. It was done under the guise of conducting a census every ten years. Births were recorded in the Bureau Of The Census which is in the Department of Commerce. Prior to this time, birth certificates were only issued to the children of slaves (who obviously were not sovereigns). These birth certificates recorded the births of “citizens of the United States”, the newly created class of citizens.

These citizens were and remain subjects of the federal government and are not sovereigns. You will recall that the 14th Amendment refers to “privileges or immunities”. This is not the same the Bill of Rights granted to the citizens of the various states. Here are some quotes that provide proof of this loss of sovereignty:

“A person is born subject to the jurisdiction of the United States...if his birth occurs in territory over which the United States is sovereign, even though another country

provides all governmental services within the territory and the territory is subsequently ceded to the other country.” [3Am Jur 2d, section 141]

“The word ‘citizen’ as used in the 14th Amendment is used in a political sense to designate one who has the rights and privileges of a citizen of a state, or of the United States and does not mean the same things as a resident, inhabitant or person.” [3Am Jur 2d, section 1412, pg 659]

“Of the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the state, ... it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the federal Constitution, and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment.” [Slaughterhouse Cases, (1862) 16 Wall 72, 83 U.S. 407.]

“Privileges and immunities clause of Fourteenth Amendment protects only those rights peculiar to being citizen of federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship.” [Jones v. Temmer, Federal Supplement, Vol. 829, Page 1227 (1993)]

“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 Board of Supervisors of Elections, 221 A. 2d 433.]

“Citizenship is a political status, and may be defined and privilege limited by Congress.” [Ex Parte (NG) Fung Sing, Federal Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 6, Page 670 (1925)]

Several things are obvious from these quotes:

- there are two classes of citizens
- everyone born after the 14th Amendment passed was a “citizen of the United States”,
- the federal government can grant and therefore take away privileges to “citizens of the United States”
- the 14th Amendment only protects the rights of “citizens of the United States” (federal citizens)
- “Citizens of each State” (State Citizens) have different rights (meaning superior Sovereign rights) than federal citizens.

A person’s citizenship is the basis of their relationship with the government. Everything about the relationship is built upon their citizenship status. Since the 14th Amendment created a new class of citizenship as a privilege (rather than unalienable rights), there is the potential to regulate every aspect of the citizen’s life. The most startling fact of all is that this new class of citizen does not have the right to invoke the protections of the Bill of Rights, as explained in the following Supreme Court case:

“We have cited these cases for the purpose of showing that 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. They were decided subsequently to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment...” [Maxwell v. Dow, 176 US 598 (1900)]

Well, if federal citizens only have enjoy the Bill of Rights, what “privileges and immunities” do they enjoy? The following court cases will answer this question:

“Privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, on the other hand, are only such as arise out of the nature and essential character of the national government, or are specifically granted or secured to all citizens or persons by the Constitution for the United States. Slaughter-House Cases, supra, p.79; Re Kemmler, 136 U.S. 436, 448, 34 L.ed. 519, 524, 10 Sup. Ct.Rep. 930; Duncan v. Missouri, 152 U.S. 377, 382, 38 L.ed. 485, 487, 14 Sup.Ct.Rep. 570. Thus, among the rights and privileges of national citizenship recognized by this court are the right to pass freely from state to state (Crandall v. Nevada, 6 Wall. 35, 18 L.ed. 75); the right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances (United States v. Cruikshank, supra); the right to vote for national officers (Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U.S. 651, 28 L.ed. 274, 4 Sup.Ct.Rep. 152; Wiley v. Sinkler, 179 U.S. 58, 45 L.ed. 84, 21 Sup.Ct. Rep. 17); the right to be protected against violence while in the lawful custody of a United States marshal (Logan v. United States, 144 U.S. 263, 36 L.ed. 429, 12 Sup.Ct. Rep. 617); and the right to inform the United States authorities of violation of its laws (Re Quark, 158 U.S. 532, 39 L.ed. 1080, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 959). Twining v. New Jersey, 211 US 78 (1908)

Conclusion

It should be obvious from this list that the rights of a federal citizen are far less than those of an State Citizen. The rights of a State Citizen are wide open and are only restricted by the limited powers of the federal government. But, the rights of a federal citizen are few and specifically listed.

The most important thing to note about the 14th Amendment is that it did not have any effect on sovereign State Citizens. This means that you have the opportunity to reclaim your right to be a sovereign State Citizen. You can remain as you are, a federal citizen with limited rights, or you can choose to reclaim you sovereignty. We would suggest that you begin to act as if you are a sovereign.