Two State citizens under the Constitution of the United States of America

©2011 Dan Goodman

Since the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, there are now two citizens under the Constitution of the United States. The first is a citizen of the United States. The second is a citizen of a State who is not a citizen of the United States. Both have privileges and immunities of their own:

"Of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the State, and what they respective are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause (Section 1, Clause 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment) 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: 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36, at 74 (1873). [Footnote 1]

http://books.google.com/books?id=DkgFAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA74#v=onepage&q&f=false And:

"... There is no inherent right in a citizen to thus sell intoxicating liquors by retail. *It is not a privilege of a citizen of the State or of a citizen of the United States.*" Crowley v. Christensen: 137 U.S. 86, at 91 (1890).

http://books.google.com/books?id=htIGAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA91#v=onepage&q&f=false

"... In the Constitution and laws of the United States, the word 'citizen' is generally, if not always, 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." <u>Baldwin v. Franks</u>: 120 U.S. 678, at 690 (1887).

http://books.google.com/books?id=c04GAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA690#v=onepage&q&f=false

A citizen of the United States can become also a citizen of a State, under Section 1, Clause 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment:

"The question is presented in this case, whether, since the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, a woman, who is a citizen of the United States **AND** the State of Missouri, is a voter in that State, notwithstanding the provision of the constitution and laws of the State, which confine the right of suffrage to men alone.

There is no doubt that women may be citizens. They are persons, and by the fourteenth amendment 'all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof 'are expressly declared to be 'citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.' "Minor v. Happersett: 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162, at 165 (1874).

http://books.google.com/books?id=IEsGAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA165#v=onepage&q&f=false

"The Fourteenth Amendment declares that citizens of the United States are citizens of the state within they reside; therefore the plaintiff was at the time of making her application, a citizen of the United States **AND** a citizen of the State of Illinois.

We do not here mean to say that there may not be a temporary residence in one State, with intent to return to another, which will not create citizenship in the former. But the plaintiff states nothing to take her case out of the definition of citizenship of a State as defined by the first section of the fourteenth amendment." Bradwell v. the State of Illinois: 83 U.S. 130, at 138 (1873).

http://books.google.com/books?id=DkgFAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA138#v=onepage&q=&f=false

In such case then there would be a citizen of a State, under Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution and also a citizen of the United States and a citizen of a State, under Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment:

"... There is no inherent right in a citizen to thus sell intoxicating liquors by retail. It is not a privilege of a *citizen of the State or of a citizen of the United States*." Crowley v. Christensen: 137 U.S. 86, at 91 (1890).

http://books.google.com/books?id=htIGAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA91#v=onepage&q&f=false

"Another objection to the act is that it is in violation of section 2, art. 4, of the constitution of the United States, and of the fourteenth amendment, in that this act discriminates both as to persons and products. Section 2, art. 4, declares that the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several states; and the fourteenth amendment declares that no state

shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. But we have seen that the supreme court, in *Crowley v. Christensen*, 137 U.S. 91, 11 Sup. Ct. Rep. 15, has declared that there is no inherent right in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail. It is not a privilege of *a citizen of a state or of a citizen of the United States*." Cantini v. Tillman: 54 Fed. Rep. 969, at 973 (1893).

http://books.google.com/books?id=Ehg4AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA973#v=onepage&q&f=false

Therefore, in any State of the Union, there are two State citizens, a citizen of a State, under Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution, and also a citizen of a State (and a citizen of the United States), under Section 1, Clause 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. [Footnote 2]

Footnotes:

1. It is to be noted that privileges and immunities of a citizen of a State are in the constitution and laws of a particular State:

"... Whatever may be the scope of section 2 of article IV -- and we need not, in this case enter upon a consideration of the general question -- the Constitution of the United States does not make the privileges and immunities enjoyed by the citizens of one State under the constitution and laws of that State, the measure of the privileges and immunities to be enjoyed, as of right, by a citizen of another State under its constitution and laws." McKane v. Durston: 153 U.S. 684, at 687 (1894).

http://books.google.com/books?id=mmkUAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA687#v=onepage&q=&f=false

2. "The Constitution forbids the abridging of the privileges of a citizen of the United States, but does not forbid the state from abridging the privileges of its own citizens.

The rights which a person has as a citizen of the United States are those which the Constitution and laws of the United States confer upon a citizen as a citizen of the United States. For instance, a man is a *citizen of a state* by virtue of his being resident there; but, if he moves into another state, he becomes at once a citizen there by operation of the Constitution (Section 1, Clause 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment) making him a citizen there; and needs no special naturalization, which, but for the Constitution, he would need.

On the other hand, the rights and privileges which a *citizen of a state* has are those which pertain to him as a member of society, and which would be his if his state were not a member of the Union. Over these the states have the usual power belonging to government, subject to the proviso that they shall not deny to any person within the jurisdiction (i.e., to their own citizens, the citizens of other states, or aliens) the equal protection of the laws. These powers extend to all objects, which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, privileges, and properties of people, and of the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the state. *Federalist, No. 45*" Hopkins v. City of Richmond: 86 S. E. Rep. 139, at 145; 117 Va. 692; Ann. Cas. 1917D, 1114 (1915), citing the entire opinion of *Town of Ashland v. Coleman*, in its opinion (*per curiam*); overruled on other grounds, *Irvine v. City of Clifton Forge*: 97 S. E. Rep. 310, 310; 124 Va. 781 (1918), citing the Supreme Court of the United States case of *Buchanan v. Warley*, 245 U.S. 60; 38 Sup. Ct. 16, 62 L. Ed. 149.

http://books.google.com/books?id=oDY8AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA145#v=onepage&q&f=false

Town of Ashland v. Coleman:

http://books.google.com/books?id=1SoZAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA427#v=onepage&q&f=false

"... It is contended that the 1st section of the Fourteenth Amendment has been violated? That section declares that 'all persons born in the United States are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside,' and provides that 'no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.' This section, after declaring that all persons born in the United States shall be citizens (1) of the United States and (2) of the State wherein they reside, goes on in the same sentence to provide that no State shall abridge the privileges of citizens of the United States; but does not go on to forbid a State from abridging the privileges of its own citizens. Leaving the matter of abridging the privileges of its own citizens to the discretion of each State, the section proceeds, in regard to the latter, only to provide that no State 'shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. ...

The rights which a person has a *citizen of a State* are those which pertain to him as a member of society, and which would belong to him if his State were not a member of the American Union. Over these the States have the usual powers belonging to government, and these powers 'extend to all objects, which, in the

ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, (privileges), and properties of people; and of the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State. *Federalist, No. 45.* . . .

On the other hand, the rights which a person has as a citizen of the United States are such as he has by virtue of his State being a member of the American Union under the provisions of our National Constitution. For instance, a man is a *citizen of a State* by virtue of his being native and resident there; but, if he emigrates into another State he becomes at once a citizen there by operation of the provision of the Constitution (Section 1, Clause 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment) making him a citizen there; and needs no special naturalization, which, but for the Constitution, he would need to become a citizen." Ex Parte Edmund Kinney: 3 Hughes 9, at 12 thru 14 (1879) [4th cir ct Va.].

http://books.google.com/books?id=pB0TAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA12#v=onepage&q&f=false
