



## I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS © Authored by LB Bork [lb@pacinlaw.org](mailto:lb@pacinlaw.org)

*"Educate and inform the whole mass of the people... They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty." —Thomas Jefferson*

### INTRODUCTION

THE FOLLOWING information poses a series of questions to those people who believe that the "*Relinquishment of United States Nationality*" is not the proper legal operation to remove oneself from under the *general jurisdiction* of the state and federal governments.

The following questions are addressed to those that do not agree with such status rectification. Furthermore, the questions also address and point out the *multiple flaws* of people claiming to be *[C]itizens, state [c]itizens, citizens of the United States of America, or Sovereigns*.

I have found that no one will or can address the questions with any satisfaction.

Herein I also briefly explain the *Expatriation Act* and its application.

*/s/ LB Bork, People's Awareness Coalition*

### THE QUESTIONS

Some people in the "Freedom Movement" believe that they are capital 'C' *Citizens, state citizens, citizens of the United States of America*, or claim to be a so-called *Sovereign*. They believe that they are these 'things' *without making any record* that they are such *persons*, as pursuant to law. Furthermore, it seems that some people have a problem understanding the Act of the 40th Congress, Stat 15, Chapter 249, pps 223-224 (*see herein evidenced below*).

In regard to these issues my questions are as follows:

1) Section 1 of the 14th Amendment states: "*All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.*" This language denotes or sets forth a *dual citizenship*.

**QUESTION:** How can you claim to be a *state citizen* and not be a United States citizen if this amendment only allows you to be both?

2) It is evidenced (or *defined*) in Ballentine's Law Dictionary that a *citizen of a state* is a *citizen of the United States* residing in any state of the Union.

**QUESTION:** How can you be a *state citizen* without being a *citizen of the United States* as the above legal reference sets forth?

3) The Supreme Court of Utah stated in *Dyett v Turner (20 Utah 2d 403)* that people of the several states were disfranchised by the 14th Amendment, see also Congressional Record-House, June 13, 1967, pp 15641-15646.

**QUESTION:** A "citizen" has political rights, how do you vote in elections?

4) Black's Law Dictionary defines *Constitutional Liberty or Freedom* as a fundamental right of a citizen which affords him the right to participate in the government of his state or country, which includes voting for any federal, state and local public officers.

**QUESTION:** If you are a *state citizen*, how do you vote if you have to be a US citizen?

5) So, you are calling yourself a *state citizen* or a citizen of the United States of America.

**QUESTION:** When is the election held that elects the officers of the state government that you are part of if you have political rights?

6) Anyone that is calling himself a *state citizen* is stating that he has political rights.

**QUESTION:** Are you not committing an act of sedition against the suffrage laws (*of right*) that the republic of your birth had prior to the 14th Amendment?

7) It is my understanding that in order to participate in a body politic or be a member of a civil society that one is not born into that one has to be naturalized into it; hence the women and the blacks—or ex-slaves—must have been given a form of ‘denizenship’ by the federal government (*see* relevant post-14th Amendment amendments).<sup>1</sup>

**QUESTION:** Are you participating in a different state body politic than the ex-slaves and the women that were not allowed to vote prior to the 14th Amendment?

8) People that claim to be *state citizens* must have representation in the state and federal governments because citizens are due representation in American law.

**QUESTION:** How can any state and federal officers represent you if you cannot vote for any such officers because you have to be a US citizen to vote?

9) In the Dred Scott decision—which was a pre-14th Amendment case—the Supreme Court stated that the United States could not impose law on the people that lived in the Territories of the United States, let alone the states.

**QUESTION:** Being that you are a *state citizen* and tacitly claiming that the governments represent you, as Congress is now imposing law on the people in the several states are you saying that all state and federal law applies to you?

10) There are people that claim to be *sovereign*.<sup>2</sup> In law, a *sovereign* can declare war on another nation and also mandate laws on people it or he (*or she*) governs.

**QUESTION:** As you claim to be a sovereign, can you do the above listed things?

11) Some general questions addressed to people that claim to be *state citizens*:

**QUESTION:** What is your nationality?

**QUESTION:** Are you an American? “*America*” *relates to land mass, it is not a country.*

**QUESTION:** What is the name of your country?

**QUESTION:** Are you an inhabitant or a state citizen?

**QUESTION:** Do you owe allegiance to the United States?

---

1 **15th Amendment.** The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. **19th Amendment.** The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

2 See this information, *Sovereigns Without Subjects*, at : [www.pacinelaw.org/sovereigns](http://www.pacinelaw.org/sovereigns)

12) Looking at Section 2 of the 14th Amendment, it sets forth that *so-called* “state citizens” are *persons* or *inhabitants* in its long and detailed language.

**QUESTION:** Where is *state citizen* referenced in the section above mentioned?

13) In international law: a *citizen* is also deemed a *subject*. This is also defined in Ballentine’s Law Dictionary; reference definition: subject. citizen.

**QUESTION:** As you are a *state citizen*, are you a subject of the governments?

14) In international law, a child carries the citizenship of his father.

**QUESTION:** As your father was presumed to have voted and only US citizens may vote in elections, how can you be a *state citizen* and not a citizen of the United States or claim to be a citizen of the United States of America?

15) Ballentine’s Law Dictionary defines “expatriation” as: A voluntary change of allegiance from one country to another, effecting an absolute termination of all civil and political rights as of the date of such act.

**QUESTION:** As you are claiming to be a *state citizen* and you are tacitly stating that you have political rights, do you have the same (civil) rights as an ex-slave?

16) In Webster’s Dictionary of 1828 under the definition of “Insurgent,” a “Rebel” is defined as being part of a faction that has of main purpose of turning the sovereignty (*e.g.* political sovereignty) of his country over to another power.

**QUESTION:** As you are claiming to be a *state citizen* with the 14th Amendment political system in place, are you not turning the political sovereignty (which *is not* delegated by the Constitution of the United States) of your country (*state*) over to the United States which would make you a rebel?

17) There are some people that state that the Preamble of the so-called “Expatriation Act” (Stat 15, Chapter 249) is in reference to governments that are foreign to America.

**QUESTION:** In reference to the language of the preamble, if the United States invested such immigrants with citizenship, who are required when such citizenship is granted to forever give up their allegiance to every foreign state, prince, sovereignty, etc. when they were granted American citizenship, how does this apply as some people believe? That is, that the allegiance that is to be forever disavowed is to the foreign countries of which these immigrants came from; hence, there was no reason for them to give up their allegiance as it had already been done when they were granted American citizenship; moreover, how would that action be settling the “public peace” as stated by Congress?

18) American Heritage Dictionary defines “expatriate” as: To renounce allegiance to one’s homeland; and further Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856, defines “country” as: By country is meant the state of which one is a member.

**QUESTION:** As it appears that Congress has its own citizens and possesses land that it is not constitutionally authorized to control, as you claim to be a *state citizen*, are you saying that the whole United States of America is your homeland?

19) Karl Marx’s Communist Manifesto had the plan that the Communists (*so-called*) were going to abolish countries and nationality.

**QUESTION:** As you are claiming to be a *state citizen* and not claiming the nationality of your country, are you a Communist?

## QUESTION SUMMARY

I could ask many more questions, but it seems to me that no one is *a citizen* unless he chooses to accept *state citizenship* under the Fourteenth Amendment; if one does he is fundamentally stating that he has the same standing as a *federal citizen*.<sup>3</sup>

It is obvious that the states are not operating under the same political system as they did prior to the Fourteenth Amendment; this is clear by reading case law and using common sense. And in order to implement a new political system that some people were not part of all had to be naturalized into the new one, *i.e.*, granted citizenship into *the new political system* that no one is born into (under *original constitutional premise* that followed the *law of nations*).

You may stand on the grounds that the Fourteenth Amendment was not *lawfully* ratified, thus you believe the current governmental system is a fraud. If you prescribe to such thinking, here are a few questions: 1) Are you voting?; 2) Are you taking any benefits from this Fourteenth Amendment system, which can only apply to “citizens of the United States”?; 3) Have you remained *silent* and not said anything or protested that of what you claim to be unlawful?

If you are doing any of the above, this would negate your claim on the fraud. And, did your father vote in this governmental system? Under presumption, and international law, this would make you a *citizen and national of the United States* (under *operations of law*). How about the rule of *possession is nine tenths of law*? Who maintains the governments under the Fourteenth Amendment, state citizens (*de jure*), or the 'new' federal citizens? Furthermore, under doctrine if someone does not protest something he will be lumped into the whole of the people that do agree with it.<sup>4</sup> Due to the fact that the *de facto political system* continues to be in operation, and has been for the past 140 plus years, it is ventured that everyone is naturalized into it.

Although the *de jure*—or *state citizenship*—is referenced in the end part of *Section 2* of the Fourteenth Amendment, technically there is NO STATE CITIZENSHIP.<sup>5</sup> Under certain principles citizenship may be taken away, but nationality remains intact.<sup>6</sup> Anyone that is claiming to be a state citizen in this political climate is going to be basically saying that he has representation in these *de facto governments* that have been created under the Fourteenth Amendment.

Moreover, because most Americans refer to America as their “country”, by expatriating, or terminating the inflicted “*national of the United States*”<sup>7</sup> status, would it not fitting that one is *quitting the communist country and citizenship* that United States citizens have?

### PART SUMMARY:

When in Rome, you are going to be *considered* a Roman, *or* in this instant case a *United States citizen*. In other words, everyone is deemed a United States citizen, *or* citizen of the United States, unless an individual terminates the citizenship (under proper legal format). And most importantly, there is no *state citizen* that is not *considered* a federal citizen.

---

3 See the article, *Citizen as a Legal Fiction*, at : [www.pacinelaw.org/citizen](http://www.pacinelaw.org/citizen)

4 No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. But if he does not dissent he will be considered as assenting. *{Invito beneficium non datur}* He who is silent appears to consent. *{Qui tacet consentire videtur}*

5 See the article, *Historical Error*, at : [www.pacinelaw.org/error](http://www.pacinelaw.org/error)

6 Article 15. Everyone has the right to a nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality. *This is a principle of the United Nations and declared in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948.*

7 See Title 8 USC § 1401(a). Nationals and citizens of United States at birth.

## THE EXPATiation ACT

There have been a lot of *off-base theories* about the Expatriation Act. Many think that it has no relevance in terminating the Fourteenth Amendment status. This belief will be debunked below using logic and legal terminology. The *Expatriation Act* is referenced as Public Law, 15 United States Statutes at Large, Chapter 249, pages 223-224 (1868), and is as follows:

**CHAP. CCXLIX.** An Act concerning the Rights of American Citizens in foreign States.

**PREAMBLE.** RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN FOREIGN STATES. WHEREAS the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas in the recognition of this principle this government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship; and whereas it is claimed that such American citizens, with their descendants, are subjects of foreign states, owing allegiance to the governments thereof; and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed.

**SECTION I. Right of expatriation declared.** THEREFORE, *Be it enacted by the Senate of the and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government.

**SECTION II. Protection to naturalized citizens in foreign states.** *And it is further enacted,* That all naturalized citizens of the United States, while in foreign states, shall be entitled to, and shall receive from this government, the same protection of persons and property that is accorded to native born citizens in like situations and circumstances.

**SECTION III. Release of citizens imprisoned by foreign governments to be demanded.** *And it is further enacted,* That whenever it shall be made known to the President that any citizen of the United States has been unjustly deprived of his liberty by or under the authority of any foreign government, it shall be the duty of the President forthwith to demand of that government the reasons for such imprisonment, and if it appears to be wrongful and in the violation of the rights of American citizenship, the President shall forthwith demand the release of such citizen, and if the release so demanded is unreasonably delayed or refused, it shall be the duty of the President to use such means, not amounting to acts of war, as he may think necessary and proper to obtain or effectuate such release, and all the facts and proceedings relative thereto shall as soon as practicable be communicated by the President to Congress. *Approved, July 27, 1868*

A good example of proving that the *several states* are regarded *foreign* to the United States is:

- **FOREIGN RELATIONS AND INTERCOURSE. Title 22 USC § 2659.** State statutes to be procured. The Secretary of State shall procure from time to time such of the statutes of the several States as may not be in his office.

ERGO: The several states are “foreign” to the United States. Hence, *foreign state* as used in the *preamble of this act* can be *easily* construed to mean the several states in the Union; and in the other sections can mean any *foreign state* in the world, or the *several states*. Note that the *ex-slaves* are protected by the United States and carry *United States nationality*. The United States can go, *and has gone*, into the *several States* of the Union and protected them.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> EG, see Title 42 USC § 1981. Equal rights under the law. (a) Statement of equal rights. All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

## THE EXPATRIATION ACT EXPLAINED

**FIRST**, the Preamble of the above act is explained:

Because Congress can only control what it has constitutional control of: The Preamble of the so-called “Expatriation Act” is simply stating: Because the ‘United States’ gave immigrants the right of citizenship, in order to keep *public peace*, such people (that were not *natural born* Americans) should—NOT MUST—give-up their allegiance (*political allegiance*) to the several state governments of their countries (or “states”) of *national domicile*.

Due to the fact Congress did not have the authority over people before the Constitution was enacted, *or after for that matter*: Could Congress make this statement about any American that was natural born into a country of the Union, which would include all his descendants?

Answer: NO... It has no authority to do so.

Could the people who were *natural born*—along with all the other people that were not of pre-Constitution descendent of natural born Americans—be tricked into giving up their *de jure* or *rightful* political allegiance by participating in an alternate body politic that is set forth by an operation of law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States?

Answer: YES

Any other people that are not voting—or *registered to vote*—are set-up under Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to be *citizens of the United States*. Of course this is under fact, *legal fiction*, i.e., *presumptions*. Accordingly the evidence is *stacked against* such people. Hence, a man or woman that attempts to argue this will be defeated due to such factors.

The preamble of the act in question is fundamentally stating that the state governments of the Union (that were *not overthrown* as were the Confederate states) were going to be usurped by the Fourteenth Amendment *political mandates*. Mind you that the Fourteenth Amendment was installed the *day after* said Act was passed: Is this timing a coincidence? One would think not. The reason or *excuse* for this act was to keep “peace” under the *totalitarian governmental system* that has been in place since the Civil War. This is the “Public Peace” that is mentioned in the Preamble. Also understand that the Preamble has no force of law, *but* shows intent.

**SECOND**, Section 1 is explained:

Section 1 of the *Expatriation Act* is simply stating that one can remove himself from any body politic, country or nation, as it is a natural right of every man (*and* woman).

An interesting note about this section: When this section was codified in the Revised Statutes of the United States, the language at the end that states: “*is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government.*” was changed to the following language: “*is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic.*”<sup>9</sup> This was done as it was a *new government* when the Fourteenth Amendment took effect; it could no longer be referred to as “*this government.*” It shows the *new government* is to uphold the ideology of the old governmental system (or *republican principles*)<sup>10</sup> in regard to *nationals of the states*.

**THIRD**, Section 2 and 3 are explained:

---

9 United States Revised Statutes, Section 1999.

10 The chief enemies of republican freedom are mental sloth, conformity, bigotry, superstition, credulity, monopoly in the market of ideas, and utter benighted ignorance. —*Justice Black in Adderley v. State of Florida (1967)*

The other 2 sections are just congressional babbling that set forth that the *new* “citizens of the United States” are going to be protected as if they were natural born or of a *de jure* character. However, this Act does not point out that such citizens are going to be subject to the law of Congress and that all their *natural rights* are going to be taken away for acting *in rebellion* to the law inherent in the *real* (or *original*) constitutional system. If you do not understand how people are in rebellion you may want to read the article *Treason by Design*<sup>11</sup> on the PAC Site.

People that believe the full body of Congress totally understood what the *Expatriation Act* was all about are fooling themselves. The *Congress* is filled with opinionated puppets that vote on proposals that some group of lawyers prepared (who are generally agents of money interest or are agents of the New World Order), or law that some faction wants implemented. Sometimes this law gets passed by “putting the sugar on it” and making it look like something it really *is not*. In some cases it can be seen that the congressional record does not serve any purpose as it fails to show intent. The congressional members themselves do not even know what they are passing in most cases. A case-in-point: The recent “Patriot Acts” that were passed.

#### **OVERALL SUMMARY:**

Therefore it is my position based on the aforesaid issues that:

1. The Preamble of the so-called Expatriation Act stealthily shows the intent of Congress in installing different state governments in the several American countries.
2. The so-called Expatriation Act has for one of its purposes to remove oneself from the Fourteenth Amendment “body politic” as it is not lawful.<sup>12</sup>
3. A citizen is a subject—no matter what political setting—as he is tacitly agreeing to be part of some governmental body. As the legislatures are empowered by “citizens of the United States” any “citizen” is going to be subject to their law.<sup>13</sup>
4. There are not “state citizens” under the premise of the so-called “original jurisdiction”—which is another misuse of terms used by many people—as any such citizen types have been disfranchised by the Fourteenth Amendment.
5. As nothing in the original Constitution was eliminated, a judge that knows the facts herein set forth (*e.g.*, 14th Amendment being *an offer*) may take notice that if one has not removed himself from the 14th Amendment body politic that such a person is agreeing with its political system. And because said amendment is foreign to a *de jure* state any such judge may deem a “state citizen” in rebellion to the *de jure* system.<sup>14</sup>
6. The ones that are participating in this system, or the ones who do not remove themselves out of it, are—at minimum—in sedition to the *de jure* political law of their state and are also subject to all state and federal law.

---

11 See the article, *Treason by Design*, at : [www.pacinlaw.org/treason](http://www.pacinlaw.org/treason)

12 Pre-14th Amendment the term “bodies politic” was proper as they were all separate.

13 Note some evidence taken from the 14th State inducted into the American Union. The below section is actually a naturalization authority found in the Vermont Constitution:

“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*

This principle is valid throughout the Union. If one just moves to a different state—a *14th Amendment State*—he will be deemed a “citizen of the United States” and a resident (*state citizen*) of the State of which he resides. A *de jure naturalization process* must be executed in order not to be deemed a “citizen of the United States”.

14 See the article, *Dual System of Law*, at : [www.pacinlaw.org/dual](http://www.pacinlaw.org/dual)

7. Anyone claiming to be any kind of “citizen” is going to be subject to the law of Congress and therefore has no natural land rights; hence the federal lands that are held by the “United States” are generally that of a *feudal tenure* in regard to anyone that is acting as if the United States of America is his country.
8. Nationality—the people’s choice of a society—is a God given right and it cannot be taken away, if it is this is referred to as “Genocide”.
9. Congress has no power to set-up its own body politic and therefore the political system and/or country it has created is a fraud (as the states, *i.e.*, de jure peoples) still exist); however due to doctrines of international law its *fraudulent nation* stands.
10. Citizenship can be taken away only by one’s nation; Congress is an international organization and has not the authority to do so, nor the authority to create a nation.
11. The Fourteenth Amendment is an offer, and unless it is “properly denounced” in a proper administrative manner you are a “citizen” under it.
12. In applying the international rules of the law of nations: The ones that are participating in the Fourteenth Amendment system are *in rebellion*; not the ones that claim de jure status/nationality—one reason being the amendment was not lawfully ratified, see Congressional Record-House, June 13, 1967, pp 15641-15646.
13. The premise of expatriation, or terminating the national of the United States status, is valid due to the contrived Fourteenth Amendment.

So, in my final opinion: Until the Congress of the United States stops being a “congress” and the borders of all the states in the Union and their constitutions are done away with, the premise of the states of America still exists, *i.e.*, they are all *sovereign countries* under the *law of nations*.

An American can choose to participate in the *political rebellion* that is caused by the Fourteenth Amendment, or *NOT* participate in it. The people who *denounce expatriation* may understand it; however they may be afraid that they will not be able to continually assist people and charging for services. Hence, anyone that denounces the premise should be held in question.

Any comments, other explanations and rebuttals are welcome.

Sincerely, *LB Bork, Illinois national*<sup>15</sup>

❖ Also see this information in addition : [www.pacinlaw.org/expatriation](http://www.pacinlaw.org/expatriation)

## PEOPLE'S AWARENESS COALITION WELCOMES YOU!

**The Coalition has been *separating the wheat from the chaff* since 1998.**

Please join us in appropriating education and freedom that the republics provide!



Visit People's Awareness Coalition at : [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)



Join us at the *Not My Government* forum :  
[www.notmygovernment.us/forum](http://www.notmygovernment.us/forum)

---

<sup>15</sup> Recognized by U.S. Style Manual, chap 5.23, and by various Acts of the *insurgent* Congress.