

Double Meanings for Different Things

By Anna Von Reitz



My Readers are no strangers to the kinds of deceitful games the rats play with words and names, so it should come as no surprise that the same applies to entire phrases and definitions.

Let me offer some helpful guidance through this morass of misspeak and run through an example that is currently causing a lot of problems.

David Straight has encouraged millions of people, especially U.S. Citizens, to "correct" their political status to that of an "American State National". He has done this on the basis of Federal Code found in Title 8--- 8 USC 1101 (a) (21) --(I think) but regardless of the exact citation, the point is that--- Number One, he has justified this on the basis of Federal Code.

Now, other people, also citing Federal Codes have come forward and said, "No, no, no! You can get in trouble making a claim to be an American State National....and they then cite their Federal Code sources, saying, the term "American State National" only applies to American Samoans, etc.

It's a typical Federal Code Ballywhump, where nobody is reading the Code correctly and where people are not being helped, because they don't have the tools to sort out the verbiage.

And both parties are right --- to an extent.

Let's begin with the fact that Federal Code does not apply to Joe Average in any broad way.

You, American, eating your lunch beside a railroad track, may have unknowingly come into physical Federal jurisdiction, or maybe you knowingly entered Federal jurisdiction

by going to the Post Office, and therefore need to obey the Federal Codes attached to those environs.

You might actually be engaged in interstate commerce, though that is unlikely and an unnecessary supposition.

You might be engaged in the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcohol, tobacco, or firearms across state lines.

You might be operating a boat or ship or barge.

You might be licensed as a Uniformed Officer, like a Medical Doctor or Registered Nurse.

But, the point is, aside from such special occupations and locations, the vast majority of you are not "generally subject" to Federal Code.

Federal Code applies to Federal employees and their direct dependents -- either military or Federal Civil Service.

Now doesn't that make sense? Federal Code applies to Federal Employees. Just like Federal Income means profits derived from Federal employment.

So that is the first issue: the use of Federal Code when talking about or to Joe Average American is generally speaking not appropriate. Patriots constantly make this mistake and it is a Big Mistake.

Ask yourself: why reference Federal Code if it does not apply to you?

The only reason that a member of our General Public would have to reference Federal Code is to convince Public Employees that they are in violation of their own Code, and if that is what you are doing, you must make that very explicit.

"Yes, you are a Public Employee, and here is the pertinent Federal Code you need to obey...."

Estimates are that 92-95% of all Federal Code has no application related to Joe Average American, so, unless your are a Public Employee, please stop this pernicious habit of trying to justify everything according to Federal Code.

I repeat: unless you are engaged in a federally regulated activity or know that you are physically in a federally regulated location -- an army base, a post office, a railroad corridor, etc. -- Federal Code does not apply to you.

David Straight is trying to help people like himself who have, for one reason or another, a compelling reason to adopt British Territorial United States (U.S.) Citizenship. They typically adopt this political status because of their employment and lose their Constitutional Guarantees as a result.

He is trying to show them a way that they can reclaim their guarantees and make use of their ability to adopt Dual Citizenship/Nationality.

So David is trying to help Federal Employees and the use of Federal Code could be appropriate, but in this case, it isn't. Why? Because his critics are right, the phrase "American State National" as used in Federal Code only applies to American Samoans.

Please notice the words "as used in Federal Code".

When these same words "American State National" are applied outside of Federal Code, in the world where actual people speak plain English, they apply to anyone born or naturalized within the physical borders of an actual State of the Union.

So in Federal-ese, the words "American State National" refer to the political status of American Samoans. In Common Parlance, the same words, "American State National" mean anyone born or naturalized within the physical borders of an actual State of the Union.

How do you tell the difference between the two?

When the words are written on paper, they look identical, and when they are spoken, they sound the same.

Hints are provided from context, but the only sure way to tell the difference is to know the definition you are using and say it or write it out.

The bureaucrats resort to using Latin conventions--- and use "American State National" to refer to American Samoans' political status, and American "state national" to refer to those born or naturalized in the States of the Union.

Even though English is our official language, the use of Latin style conventions has been allowed as an exception since 1851.

This just adds to the confusion for Joe Average American, who according to English, assumes that he is an American State National, when in the Federal System he is an American state national.

Obviously, there are considerable communications obstacles embedded in this situation, obstacles that can be overcome by tediously expressing the definitions you are using, or, by adopting Latin style conventions, or both.

Such differences can also be exploited by unscrupulous persons.

When you are claiming your birthright political status and you are obligated to maintain U.S. Citizenship for some reason, it's necessary to establish what you mean by "American State National" versus what they mean by "American State National" --- and because your meaning comes from Common Usage, it's inappropriate to reference Federal Code which assigns a totally different meaning to the same words.

There. Does that help?

See this article and over 4300 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.