

"The idea prevails with some, indeed it has expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country substantially **two national governments**; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to...I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism...It will be an evil day for American Liberty if the theory of a government outside the Supreme Law of the Land finds lodgment in our Constitutional Jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution."

Honorable Supreme Court Justice **John Harlan** in the 1901 case of *Downes v. Bidwell*.

"No white person born within the limits of the United States and subject to THEIR jurisdiction...or born without those limits, and subsequently naturalized under THEIR laws, owes his status of citizenship to the recent amendments to the Federal Constitution. The purpose of the 14th Amendment...was to confer the status of citizenship upon a numerous class of persons domiciled within the limits of the United States who could not be brought within operation of the naturalization laws because native born, and whose birth, though native, at the same time left them without citizenship. Such persons were not white persons but in the main were of African blood, who had been held in slavery in this country..."

Van Valkenburg v Brown 43 Cal 43. 47 (1872)

"The **privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights** because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; It does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."

Jones v. Temmer 829 F. Supp. 1226

Blair v. Ridgely, 97 D. 218,249, S.P.

"Prior to the adoption of the federal Constitution, states possessed unlimited and unrestricted sovereignty and retained the same ever afterward. Upon entering the Union, they retained all their original power and sovereignty..."

"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."

U. S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875).