

SEDITION BY SYNTAX

by Ralph B. Schwan

Are you a United States Citizen? Be careful; I'll tell you something that the United States Government never will: That's a trick question. But then the United States Government is a "trick" government and it will ask you that trick question quite often.

Better to put the question like this: Are you a United States citizen or a Citizen of the United States? Do you think they are the same thing? Your education via government schools serves you poorly. Recall some fourth grade grammar; then check the Constitution.

Let's use a simple example: "...the house of Mr. Jones." We'll rewrite it, "Mr. Jones' house. See the apostrophe? The relationship between Mr. Jones and his house. In most words you'd add both an apostrophe and an "s", but when a word ends in "s" you needn't add another. Ah yes, you do remember that rule. Then a Citizen of the United States could be rewritten as United States' Citizen, but never United States Citizen. Right? Right! You graduate to fifth grade!

More grammar. Examine the term "United States." Is it singular (one thing) or plural (more than one thing)? By the Constitution it is plural! We know that because the terms "their" and "them" were used as pronouns referring to the United States, i.e. Treason against the "United States" is "adhering to their enemies", "levying war against them". You probably memorized the names of the united States ('states united' or 'states in union' or 'Union states') in fifth grade – boring!

But the term "United States" is also used in the singular sense. It is one nation. (...indivisible with Liberty and Justice for all.)

A nation is a natural thing. This one exists because of the boundaries of the states.

It is never defined in other terms. The term "United States" is a geographical name - one thing, one nation. The United States are one union; the united States in one nation.

Confused? You isn't? I are!

Because "United States" is a noun ending in "s" it can be either singular or plural. "Jones' house could mean the house of one person (Mr. Jones) or many persons (Mr. & Mrs. Jones and their 12 kids). But in either case, as we learned in fourth grade, the apostrophe must follow the "s".

Were you born in the United States? The preposition "in" shows that "United States" in that question is a place, a geographical place named "United States". It's singular. You can only be born in one place; so United States is one place. When "United States" is singular it refers to a natural place, a nation, a land.

(Bonus question: Where you born in the United States or within the united States?)

When "United States" is plural it refers to the "union" of the states. Unions are things "Un-natural", they are things, not places. Unions, as *WE the People* said, need to be perfected, nations can't be perfected. Unions, all unions, exist by agreement. Nations exist naturally.

The only requisite for citizenship is "place" of birth. Every person is a natural born citizen of some nation. Nature is so important to citizenship, that persons wishing to change citizenship must be NATURALized. For those who appreciate 2000 year old terms, "naturalized" means "born again". But that's not important. Just remember that original citizenship exist because of places, not agreements.

If you were born in the United States (singular) you are automatically a citizen of the United States, the United States, one place, one nation. Would you also like to join the "Union", the United States (plural), "them"? Sorry, only states can join this Union. People can't join.

At least that's the way it was to be. In 1867, "United States" was either the name of a geographical place or the name of a union of states. In 1868 a new meaning was created – a third meaning – the fourteenth amendment accomplished this feat. It begins like this: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside."

The problem is that the amendment used the term "United States", first in the singular, geographic, national sense (in the United States) and then in the plural, union agreement sense (jurisdiction thereof)–but it didn't make the word "jurisdictions thereof". But that would have been quite illogical, for places don't possess jurisdiction. The Union had jurisdiction over the states, but not over people and *We the People* had jurisdiction over the Union - or so we said. Under 1867 definitions of the term "United States" the amendment made no sense.

Rather than admit to the foolishness of the amendment, a new meaning was given to the "United States". It became a TITLE. This meaning was unimagined by the founders of the original constitution. They took great care in it to grant no title (title of nobility) to the government of the United States. It used no Titles. The best example of that fact is that the "supreme" Court is described with a small "s". The Constitution "entitled" nothing. "*We the People*" is the only title used in the document! *We the People* had had our fill of kings and nobles of kings. You and I were going to be the [only] nobility of this nation. Our title was our birthright, it was not granted by the government. It is not a privilege – it is a right!

But the fourteenth amendment, while it established a title, did not eliminate or change the prior meanings of the term "United States" as it was used in the original constitution.

Hence, since the year 1868, the term "United States" has three meanings:

- 1) the geographical name of a nation,
- 2) the name of a union of states, which in turn define the nation, and
- 3) a title of nobility.

The first is singular and natural; the second, plural and created by agreement; the third, singular and granted.

But wait. The government may grant no title of nobility. True, True.

The government of the United States may not, but you can!

As a nobleman you can grant title – only you. Plus you can abdicate your title; you can trade it for a new one. But you can only trade downward as the title you're born with is the highest. You can trade your high title for a low one, that's a right you possess.

It's easy to do. Far too easy!

All you need do is claim that your new title is "United States Citizen" (no apostrophe). Do that and you'll instantly show that you are a person "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States. You'll use "United States" as a title preceding the word "citizen" and prove that you believe that the "United States" is something (someone) other than a geographical description or the name of a union of states. In claiming that, it has jurisdiction greater than your own, you grant it TITLE. A "person" who holds the highest title of a nation and subjects people to his/her jurisdiction is a KING / QUEEN / SOVEREIGN.

Have you ever claimed the title "United States Citizen"? Got a Social Security card?

You did it. How about a passport? Same title. Passports and social security are entitlements (en-TITLE-ments). They are granted by the high noble, to the lesser nobles. Entitlements are granted by the "United States Citizens" (no apostrophe). This government is a government of title. It exists side-by-side with the constitutionally described "government of the United States".

Want proof? Take a look at anything possessed by this government. On the object you find a label or sign. It says: Property of United States Government. It owns more property than any feudal king ever dreamed of possessing, but then it has more subjects than any feudal king.

As a person of low title under the United States Government, you are bound to obey, not only law, but a code as well. Remember how feudal knights had to obey a code — a code of chivalry? Well, the "code" a United States citizen is bound to is called (entitled) "United States Code" (notice, no apostrophe.) Originally this was called the "Code of Law of the United States", but it quickly was filled with so much non-law that the name was changed, so that persons claiming low title would know that it was for them to obey.

You didn't realize that? Maybe you don't deserve your title!

At the same time, another problem arose. The courts described in the Constitution had jurisdiction (judicial power) in matters arising under the Constitution, treaties and laws of the United States, made under THEIR authority. Plural – "Union." If violators of the code were to be punished by the courts, or if the courts were to hear any matter under the "code", a new court system needed to be established. A court system for persons of low title; these would be Courts of Title.

The titles of the Courts? "United States District Court", "United States Court of Appeals". The courts described by the Constitution would be "district Courts of the United States"; "appeals Court of the United States"; "supreme Court of the United States."

It would appear that since both titled courts and constitutional courts must now exist, the judges must sit in either. They hold two jobs.

You determine which court by addressing your petition to one or the other. You pick. The titled courts are no place for a freeman, a Citizen of the United States'. These courts have a zillion rules (published in the "code"), right down to the kind of paper and the style of typewriter you must use. The courts of the United States' are quite the opposite, having no published rules. These courts are of Law and for Justice. Trivial things like paper and type style have no bearing on either.

If you are a United States Citizen, you'll have to appear before a court of title, at least in civil matters under the code. Jurisdiction in criminal matters is properly still left to "district Courts of the United States". Lucky criminals. Counterfeiters and pirates fare far better than persons of low title! Well, they should, for their court follows Law and pursues Justice, while a United States District Court only follows "code."

Titled courts are harsh in their administration of the code for they are bound to nothing else. These courts will gladly take the word of a United States Attorney over the word of a petty United States citizen.

In courts of title rank has its privileges. These courts owe no allegiance to the Constitution as they need not rule by the Laws of the United States of America. They follow a Code; they obey their master, the United States Government. These courts, as did the infamous Crown Courts of England, exist only for the benefit of the peerage, and, unfortunately, often to the detriment of the freemen of the land.

This "dual Court" system is probably the only reason for what, at first glance, appears to be contradictory "case law." While a reasonable mind can understand the potential for divergent court holdings from state to state, the contradictions in "federal" court holdings is quite troubling. Ever wonder how the "supreme" Court can overturn itself?

It likely does not.

But one can quickly see that the decisions of courts of title or "United States Courts", would oft times conflict with the rulings made by Constitutional "courts of the United States". One would hear only matters brought by titled Citizens, the other by freemen. Since the decisions are published in one volume, with no distinction made between the courts, case law seems to contradict itself.

Should you find this "dual court" concept a bit far fetched, examine the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), Sections 7402(b) and 7604(a). You'll find these sections grant the authority to two different courts to enforce summons. The sections are identical, word-for-word, in every respect except one — one gives the authority to "United States District Courts" and the other to "district courts of the United States".

Why both? Income taxes are excise taxes. They are an excise / occupation tax on a privilege. The privilege is your title, United States citizen. A "first party" summons is made upon a titled person. But a "third party" summons might be made upon anyone, titled or not. Thus, one court must enforce the one; the other court must enforce the other.

Since a titled individual is required by code to keep books, records, and papers, the court of title can demand the delivery of those documents, without particularly describing them, without describing the place to be searched, without the presentment of accusation by a party under oath or affirmation. Should a titled person fail to deliver up such documents, he'll find himself in jail for contempt--not contempt of court--contempt of code.

A court of title may jail him for failing to produce records which no one has even claimed exist! He'll be released from jail when he "creates" the documents which a titled person is required to possess.

No where is the dual court / dual government system more apparent than in tax matters. At common law, titled individuals (but not the king) are bound by an oath of allegiance in order to be entitled. Thus, income tax forms must be signed only by persons under oath, persons who are subject to the "penalties of perjury". Signing such a form is a confession that you hold title. The form is to be signed by "United States citizen".

Hence, a signed tax-form is always introduced as evidence in a "criminal" tax prosecution to show that the defendant has claimed a title.

Perhaps you've heard that tax deductions are granted by the "grace" of the United States Government. It's true. Grace is a favor or privilege. Kings dispense grace. Kings may deny grace. What is given in grace may be denied. IRS will often deny tax deductions. Look as we might, it is impossible to discover where in the Constitution the government was authorized to dispense or deny "grace."

But the government of the United States of America doesn't dispense or deny grace - the United States Government does. It dispenses and denies grace to its subjects the United States citizens. This king wears no crown for it has no head. It can't be killed; it can't be harmed. It can't even be sued, unless it first "grants" its permission. It's hardly the same government which *we* demanded would always allow us to petition for redress of grievances!

This government-king has existed for over 100 years. At first it was quite innocuous, for it had very few subjects. But when it tricked *We the People* into signing away our birthright via reams of forms its powers became immense. Today this government of title is so powerful that the original, constitutional government of the United States of America becomes lost in its shadow.

There are still two governments. One asks that you should serve it – the other only seeks to serve you. The government of title will entice you with promises of grants and entitlements: welfare, social security, low interest loans, grants of exemption, and grants of deductions. But it can give you nothing. It exists only by your authority, your consent. (See Declaration of Independence, 1776) It can't give you anything that you didn't already possess. Try as it might to deceive you, it exists by your grace—not the other way around.

Do us both a favor — withdraw and deny your grace. Be a Citizen of the United States of America again. Stop trying to serve two masters - you can't do it. Stop pretending that you are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. You won't be unless you choose to be. Even the greatest king is only a king by the consent of his subjects. Stop being a subject. Be a free man!

Refuse to claim that you are a "United States citizen." Deny jurisdiction to titled courts. And by all means, stop calling this king by his title --"United States Government."

Ralph Schwan
A.D. 2004