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The wise know their weakness too well to assume infallibility; and he who knows most, knows best how little he knows.” — Thomas Jefferson

The purpose of this commentary is to clear-up some misconceptions of some people.

There are many people out there in the freedom movement who believe that people (i.e., men) are considered “individually” sovereign or think that they are “sovereigns without subjects”. Under the Creator we are considered of being such status; however in the real world, under the existence of “THE STATE”, there is no such thing, as a matter of law.

The belief that many think that each individual man is a “sovereign” with “THE STATE” in existence is believed to come from the case of Chisholm v. Georgia. This instant case ruled on by the United States Supreme Court was ruled on just after the installation of the United States Constitution. Some of the language in the case included some dictum which reads “sovereigns without subjects”. Accordingly, this is a phrase that is used by many people in error.

We must first establish why that noted phrase does not apply to you as one of the citizens who is a member of a [U]nited State. Let us lay some foundation based on history and law.

Appropriately, Sir William Blackstone — who was of England — can be quoted as stating the following about the phrase “the people” in his many commentaries:

The popular leaders, who in all ages have called themselves “the people.”

Keep in mind that the original population of the [U]nited States of America was British. The judge in Chisholm v. Georgia was undoubtedly familiar with the commentaries of Sir William Blackstone, hence undoubtedly incorporated such principles of law in his decisions. Also, keep in mind that the people loyal to England were referred to as subjects, not citizens.

With that foundation set forth, below is the citation which was taken from Chisholm v. Georgia that people in “the movement” have taken this instant misconception from:

“In the United States, sovereignty resides in the people, who act through the organs established by the Constitution (cites omitted). Besides, the Prince having all the Executive powers, the judgment of the Courts would, in fact, be only monitory, not mandatory to him, and a capacity to be advised, is a distinct thing from a capacity to be sued. The same feudal ideas run through all their jurisprudence, and constantly remind us of the distinction between the Prince and the subject. No such ideas obtain here; at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without

1 Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419, 2 Dall. 440 (1793) www.laws.findlaw.com/us/2/419.html
2 Since the contract of Articles of Confederation, there is no such thing as the “united[adj] States”.
4 Blackstone’s Commentaries, 438
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Subjects (unless the African [2 U.S. 419, 472] slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty.” ¹

Let us now go through the misconstrued verbiage below:

*In the United States*
I.E., “United States” meaning: the several states (unincorporated). ⁵

*sovereignty resides in the people*
I.E., “the people” - FIRST ENTITIES DESCRIBED meaning: “the rulers” ⁶ or the “popular representatives” via “the citizens”.

*who act through the organs established by the Constitution*
I.E., this clause means: “the rulers” ⁶ (or the people) work through provisions that are set forth in the United States Constitution.

*CONTENT CLIPPED DUE TO NONE SUBSTANCE*

*at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people*
I.E., “the people” means: “the rulers”. ⁶ “Devolved” imports the meaning of sovereignty passed on from England to “the rulers” via “the citizens”.

*and they*
I.E., “they” meaning: “the rulers” ⁶

*are truly the sovereigns of the country*
I.E., “sovereigns” meaning: “they”, the people or “the rulers” ⁶ of the [U]nited States’ (unified and separate) that ruled the several ex-British colonies which were then regarded as sovereign states and self-governing (autonomous).

*but they are*
I.E., “they” meaning: “the rulers” acting as “the State”. ⁶

*sovereigns without subjects* (unless African slaves among us may be so called)*
I.E., “sovereigns without subjects” means: they, “the rulers” are not governing British type subjects. ⁶ (slaves were ‘possibly’ subjects as in English law)

*and have none to govern but themselves*
I.E., “have none to govern but themselves” meaning: They, “the rulers” ⁶ acting in a collective mode in each state, are acting as the sovereign of each of the several states that were to govern their people (bodies politic) independently.

*the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens*
I.E., “citizens” - SECOND ENTITIES DESCRIBED. NOTE: It should be noted that it does not say ‘the people of America are equal as fellow citizens.’

*and as joint tenants in the sovereignty*
I.E., the citizens collectively give “the rulers” of each of the several states the authority to exist, i.e., governments are instituted by the consent of the governed.

---

⁵ The several states in the Union are limited in sovereignty under the United States Constitution. The State of the Union defined: The United States of America are a corporation endowed with the capacity to sue and be sued, to convey and receive property. — ¹ Marsh. Dec. 177, 181

⁶ See this information at: www.pacinlaw.us/sup/rulers.html
The important thing to understand is that the court was illustrating two entities in its statement, which are: 1) the people; and 2) the citizens. If the citizens individually were the sovereigns the court would have not separated them into two separate categories. The purpose of this was to stealthily establish that citizens give government its sovereignty. Furthermore, understand that non-government “citizens” DO NOT act through the organs of the Constitution; “the people” that are holding the offices do, i.e., the officers (private law)\(^7\) that are “The State”.

The court was simply just stating that they – the rulers who are “the State” – do not have the same subjects (except perhaps slaves) — as compared to the ones (subjects) that were beholden to England, i.e., the “citizens” are not their subjects in the same sovereign capacity.

In total, what the court somewhat cleverly stated is that “the people” or “the state” was the true sovereign and the citizens give such entities their power to exist. Such entities act through the organs (i.e., the offices) in the Constitution, and state constitutions. However, the thing that the court did not disclose to you is that such citizens are subjects of the State.\(^8\) In other words, “the people” does not mean “the subjects”, but “the citizens” are “the subjects”.

Aside such matters, looking at things in a slightly positive sense, the court was also stating – by its use of the word tenant\(^9\) in regard to the citizens of America, the land (or country) was actually theirs as bodies politic; the rulers – or the State or States – are trustees for them.

Furthermore, one must keep in mind that the general principle is that citizens are subjects when they submit themselves to the state,\(^8\) which is a principle that few people grasp. Moreover, with the measures that are established by the Fourteenth Amendment, and many having a belief they are sovereigns, the “inhabitants”\(^10\) or persons of the states in the Union – who embrace calling themselves “citizens” – are unwittingly subjects of both state and federal governments.\(^11\)

So, what is the purpose of this stealthy language? Simply put: This is just an elitist attitude buried in language that few people understand. But it appears that was the intent, otherwise things would have been written in a clear fashion. By the way, Chisholm v. Georgia was the tool that installed the 11th Amendment, which limited “citizens” from suing The States.

All-in-all, individual citizens are not deemed to be sovereign, “THE STATE” is. And the only possible way “THE STATE” can exist is by the consent of the governed, i.e., the citizens.

---

\(^7\) The term “officer” may be used to define government elected people in their private law capacity, while the term “official” may be used to refer to the same people in their public law capacity. Yes, ‘tis the art of law.

\(^8\) SUBJECT. A citizen. —Ballentine’s Law Dictionary. Also see this from the constitution of the fourteenth state that was admitted into the Union: Vermont:  
“Every person, of good character, who comes to settle in this State, having first taken an oath or affirmation of allegiance to the same, may purchase, or by other just means acquire, hold and transfer land, or other real estate; and after one year’s residence, shall be deemed a free denizen thereof, and entitled to all rights of a natural born subject of this State…” —Vermont constitution, section 39

\(^9\) TENANT. Law. One who holds or possesses lands, tenements, or sometimes personal property by any kind of title. —American Heritage Dictionary ...any way one looks at it, tenancy of land is not wholly positive.

\(^10\) Citizens of the States are termed “residents”. Statutorily, Wisconsin states resident and inhabitant are the same, technically they are not. See this paper to understand state and inhabitant: www.pacinlaw.us/usage

\(^11\) This is the nature of federal citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States:

“It is the natural consequence of a citizenship which owes allegiance to two sovereignties, and claims protection from both. The citizen cannot complain, because he has voluntarily submitted himself to such a form of government. He owes allegiance to the two departments, so to speak, and within their respective spheres must pay the penalties which each exacts for disobedience to its laws.”

With that established – and keeping such principles in mind – the phrase which appears in the Preamble of the United States Constitution which states “We the People” are not you and me. This is another misconception that people in the movement seem to embrace. You should understand that such people were the ones who signed the Constitution. Such people are the actual men who have obligations to their contracts. One of the purposes of the document was to make all “citizens” in the [U]nited States of America their constitutors.

In closing, under the American judiciary – which has always had a Masonic base – one has to be very careful as to what is being stated in reference to the context of law. That is, words in law sometimes are not as they appear. Between that issue and these people in control having a way in speaking in double-talk creates a seemingly intentional puzzlement.

So, the next time you see the phrase “the people” it just may mean “The State” or your Rulers.

Oh, one last thing... Sorry if you bought into somebody selling you some bad religion that you are a sovereign. That is what “the people” behind the curtain want you to believe.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Authored by LB Bork of the People’s Awareness Coalition

END NOTES:

The exercise of this discourse is of purpose to make you aware that there is deception in the language that is used. One should understand that even though people (or inhabitants, i.e., people) who lived in the several states were deemed subjects, the government had little or nothing to do with such people as it unfortunately does today. This is due to the scheme of the Fourteenth Amendment.

People that call themselves “sovereigns” fail epically in understanding who they are. As it appears, such individuals think they are stateless and/or look like anarchists, i.e., they want no government. It is ventured that most do not what this, but nonetheless they still insist that they are sovereigns.

You need to understand that Americans who are participating in the current de facto governmental

12 Look at this telling statement by justice Marshall in Barron v. Baltimore using the phrase “the people” in reference to the popular leaders:

“The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States for themselves, for their own government, and not for the government of individual States. Each State established a constitution for itself, and in that constitution provided such limitations and restrictions on the powers of its particular government as its judgment dictated. The people of the United States framed such a government for the United States as they supposed best adapted to their situation, and best calculated to promote their interests.” — Barron v. City of Baltimore, 32 U.S. 243 (1833) www.laws.findlaw.com/us/32/243.html

13 See the writing of Lysander Spooner, No Treason www.lysanderspooner.org

14 CONSTITUTOR. In civil law. One who, by a simple agreement, becomes responsible for the payment of another’s debts. — Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition

15 In Morals and Dogma (circa 1871), Albert Pike wrote:

“Masonry, like all the Religions, all the Mysteries, Hermeticism and Alchemy, conceals its secrets from all except the Adepts and Sages, or the Elect, and uses false explanations and misinterpretations of its symbols to mislead those who deserve only to be misled; to conceal the Truth, which it calls Light, from them, and to draw them away from it. Truth is not for those who are unworthy or unable to receive it, or would pervert it.... The truth must be kept secret, and the masses need a teaching proportioned to their imperfect reason. . . .”

16 More dictum from the court in Chisholm v. Georgia. Note the use of ‘the people therein’ and ‘a people’:

“Let us now turn to the Constitution. The people therein declare, that their design in establishing it... to render a people prosperous and happy on the present occasion such disquisitions would be unseasonable.”

17 It is the benefit of those in control to keep everyone divided through self-importance and self-centeredness. This way they can maintain control of what they have orchestrated, more at: www.islandmakers.us/lexicon

18 Understand the truth behind the 14th Amendment governmental system: www.pacinlaw.us/doj
system as U.S. citizens are in rebellion to the original constitutional system (see the statement of the court in footnote 11). Accordingly, the people who willfully participate do not actually have right of title to “federal land” in their state held outside the provisions of the United States Constitution. Such people are to be equated to the same subjects which were of the feudal ideas of the English system that was referenced by the court in Chisholm v. Georgia. Hey, thanks 14th Amendment!

The Men Behind the Curtain

The FEDERALIST Papers were a rhetorical draft of a private enterprise that outlined the revered document known as The Constitution for the United States of America. The writings were a series of articles outlining the Ruling Elitists’ plan to have dominion over the international commerce of the American peoples. Such commerce not only encompasses trade between the United States to outside countries, but also from state to state. The papers (sales job) were posted in newspapers in New York, which is referred to as the “Empire State”. The main question is: Whose Empire is this anyway?

Ruler, n. One, such as a monarch or dictator, that rules or governs.

—American Heritage Dictionary

Below is the telling rhetorical evidence, or the sales job. The segments are taken from the blueprint of the Constitution, the FEDERALIST Papers. Note “We the People” refer to themselves as RULERS:

If, on the other hand, they find us either destitute of an effectual government (each State doing right or wrong, as to its RULERS may seem convenient), or split into three or four independent and probably discordant republics or confederacies, one inclining to Britain, another to France, and a third to Spain, and perhaps played off against each other by the three, what a poor, pitiful figure will America make in their eyes!

—FEDERALIST No. 4 -- John Jay

The RULERS of the respective members, whether they have a constitutional right to do it or not, will undertake to judge of the propriety of the measures themselves.

—FEDERALIST No. 15 -- Alexander Hamilton

Independent of parties in the national legislature itself, as often as the period of discussion arrived, the State legislatures, who will always be not only vigilant but suspicious and jealous guardians of the rights of the citizens against encroachments from the federal government, will constantly have their attention awake to the conduct of the national RULERS, and will be ready enough, if anything improper appears, to sound the alarm to the people, and not only to be the voice, but, if necessary, the arm of their discontent.

—FEDERALIST No. 26 -- Alexander Hamilton

But though the adversaries of the proposed Constitution should presume that the national RULERS would be insensible to the motives of public good, or to the obligations of duty, I would still ask them how the interests of ambition, or the views of encroachment, can be promoted by such a conduct?

—FEDERALIST No. 27 -- Alexander Hamilton

If the representatives of the people betray their constituents, there is then no resource left but in the exertion of that original right of self-defense which is paramount to all positive forms of government, and which against the usurpations of the national rulers, may be exerted with infinitely better prospect of success than against those of the RULERS of an individual state.

—FEDERALIST No. 28 -- Alexander Hamilton

If we were even to suppose the national RULERS actuated by the most ungovernable ambition, it is impossible to believe that they would employ such preposterous means to accomplish their designs.

—FEDERALIST No. 29 -- Alexander Hamilton
It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. Different interests necessarily exist in different classes of citizens.

—FEDERALIST No. 51 -- Alexander Hamilton or James Madison

If foreign gold could so easily corrupt our federal rulers and enable them to ensnare and betray their constituents, how has it happened that we are at this time a free and independent nation?

—FEDERALIST No. 55 -- Alexander Hamilton or James Madison

But the security will not be considered as complete, by those who attend to the force of an obvious distinction between the interest of the people in the public felicity, and the interest of their local rulers in the power and consequence of their offices.

—FEDERALIST No. 59 -- Alexander Hamilton or James Madison

As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought, in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers; so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people, stimulated by some irregular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by the artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn.

—FEDERALIST No. 63 -- Alexander Hamilton or James Madison

The different views taken of the subject in the two preceding papers must be sufficient to satisfy all dispassionate and discerning men, that if the public liberty should ever be the victim of the ambition of the national rulers, the power under examination, at least, will be guiltless of the sacrifice.

—FEDERALIST No. 61 -- Alexander Hamilton

Let it, however, be admitted, for argument sake, that the expedient suggested might be successful; and let it at the same time be equally taken for granted that all the scruples which a sense of duty or an apprehension of the danger of the experiment might inspire, were overcome in the breasts of the national rulers, still I imagine it will hardly be pretended that they could ever hope to carry such an enterprise into execution without the aid of a military force sufficient to subdue the resistance of the great body of the people.

—FEDERALIST No. 60 -- Alexander Hamilton

The intrinsic difficulty of governing thirteen States at any rate, independent of calculations upon an ordinary degree of public spirit and integrity, will, in my opinion constantly impose on the national rulers the necessity of a spirit of accommodation to the reasonable expectations of their constituents.

—FEDERALIST No. 85 -- Alexander Hamilton

YOU SEE, “We the People” are not who you think they are.

• The popular leaders, who in all ages have called themselves “the people”.

—Blackstone’s Commentaries 438 / Ballentine’s Law Dictionary

Qui Vult Decipi, Decipiatur. Let him who wishes to be deceived, be deceived.

Qui non libere veritatem pronunciat, proditor est verilatis. He who does not willingly speak the truth, is a betrayer of the truth.

Learn more truth. PAC Perspectives, found at: www.pacalliance.us/perspectives