



] Expatriation Statute

Sunday, February 7, 2010 3:23 PM

From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, February 07, 2010 7:05 AM

Subject: Expatriation Statute

On July 27, 1868, one day before the 14th Amendment took effect, an "Act" of Congress was passed. This Act was 15 United States Statute at Large, known as the "Expatriation Statute." Though this Statute is no longer included in the United States Code, it has not been repealed and is still in effect. This Statute is extremely important because it is the public municipal law the individual can use for private purposes to remove him/herself from the private trust law operating in the public sector. That is, a private individual, who has found himself or herself bound by private law that is being used in the public sector to promote public policy of compelled performance which he did not have a choice in, can access the public positive statute law to move back under the liberty and protection of the Republic and its separation of powers.

The preamble of 15 United States Statute at Large is unique in that Congress laid the legal discussions to rest before the Statute took effect to assure it would not be tampered with legally in any way. It stands as written and is there for the citizens to use as Public Law for the private purpose of moving themselves from one political or territorial jurisdiction to another. This means there is a way out at anytime of any United States government policy or law, including those of its political subdivisions, that is based on private law. Whenever you find yourself bound by any compelled performance you had no choice in, you are operating in the jurisdiction of the United States government and its political subdivisions where there is no republican form of government and its separation of powers. By applying Public Laws for your private benefit, you can break that dictatorial jurisdiction anytime you choose.

The insidiousness of the 14th Amendment is that even though it is private contract law of a trust, it is not a bilateral contract where both parties sign the document after a meeting of the minds. The 14th Amendment is "quasi contractual." That is, it is not a true contract as recognized in the general common law, rather it is called an "adhesion" or "unilateral" contract where only one party binds himself. In this case, a person agrees to the private trust law merely by his silence. If a person does not speak up to let his choice be known, the trust will assume he or she is a part of and beneficiary of it. They will assume that you have gifted your life to the trust for the benefits they have to offer.

Under the 14th Amendment, the citizen [who does not make his choice known for or against the trust relationship], is assumed to be a beneficiary because he or she has not stated otherwise. As a beneficiary, you are an outlaw as far as the Constitution is concerned. You are operating outside of the Constitution. While operating outside the Constitution you only have relative rights under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution because private contract law takes priority over constitutional law.

Public Policy And The Democracy

As long as you are under **private trust law** operating as **public policy**, you are under the conscience of the few who influence and make the **public policy** of the **trust** for the benefit of its members. These groups are known as "*special interest*" or "*political action*" groups. This is why the news reports almost daily that some poll has been done to see how the people feel. Under the **14th Amendment public trust**, majority rules. This is why you hear the word: "*democracy*" all the time. It refers to the **14th Amendment public trust** that everyone is a part of because of their silence. It tells you that "*mob rule*" and "*communalism*" are the order of the day; it tells you that if a special interest group can create enough waves of influence, the **trust** will be compelled by popular demand to accept the new policy the special interest group has been promoting. If you are a part of the **democratic trust**, you have to go along if you do not know your options.

Private law is conscience, ecclesiastical and religious law. They are equal to each other. Under the **14th Amendment trust**, there is no true religious liberty because the individual is part of the conscience of the **trust** and the few that make its rules called "*Codes.*" In fact, there are no true freedoms at all as listed under the **Bill of Rights**. Try publicly saying much against the IRS and their prima donna attitude and see how absolute your liberty of speech is. As alluded to earlier, the free citizen of the soil of each "*state in this union*" is not affected by the **private law** of another individual or **group trust** unless they choose to bind themselves by silence. Silence is slavery under **Roman civil law** principles. Unless one stands to claim his sovereign rights, he does not have any. Each person must exercise a choice to be free or enslaved. The **public municipal law** will uphold your right of choice, but you must make a choice the law can uphold.

Yes, if you are a **beneficiary of the trust** you are living under an **administrative democracy** (*parliamentary democracy*) - a communal association - where there is no separation of powers and your private rights are subject to the will of the majority. You have no absolute rights, only relative rights. The Codes and revised Statutes are for the general good of the association. Few citizens of the (u)nited States realize the "*Republic for which it stands*" is a house with no one living in it.

With or without the check of a dictator, power has been passing from the legislature to the civil service or bureaucracy, which alone feels competent to manage the complex and technical business of the state.^{/57} Anglo-Saxon countries are taking a place alongside of the countries of continental Europe with a body of **administrative law** and its **administrative courts**, at least in embryo. The popular conception of *liberalism* is undergoing a great change. Liberty lingers on as a name, but a name used to designate almost the opposite of nineteenth century liberalism; for the new liberty consists mainly in legislative restrictions which keep one man from exploiting another while the state exploits both.^{/58}

Now take a look at how your own federal government defines the difference between a **republic** and **democracy**. The following was taken from **U.S. Government Training Manual, No. 2000-25 dated WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, November 30, 1928** and prepared under direction of the **Chief of Staff**. Under which do you live?

DEMOCRACY: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic- negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

REPUBLIC: Authority is derived through the election by the people of public officials best fitted to represent them. Attitude toward property is respect for laws and individual rights, and a sensible economic procedure. Attitude toward law is the administration of justice in accord with fixed principals and established evidence, with a strict regard to consequences. A greater number of citizens and extent of territory may be brought within its compass. Avoids the dangerous extreme of either tyranny or mobocracy. Results in statesmanship, liberty, reason, justice, contentment, and progress. Is the "standard form" of government throughout the world. A republic is a form of government under a Constitution which provides for the election of an executive, and a legislative body, who working together in a representative capacity, have all the power of appointment, all power of legislation, all power to raise revenue and appropriate expenditures, and are required to create a judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental Acts, and to recognize certain inherent individual rights.

Take away any one or more of those four elements and you are drifting into autocracy. Add one or more to those four elements and your are drifting into democracy. Superior to all others. **Autocracy** declares the divine right of kings; its authority can not be questioned; its powers are arbitrarily or unjustly administered. **Democracy** is the "*direct*" rule of the people and has been repeatedly tried without success. Our constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They "*made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had founded a republic.*"

A French diplomat, politician and statesman by the name of **Alexis de Torqueville** made the following observation about the **democracy** of the **United States** when he visited here in the early part of the eighteen hundreds:

"The tyranny of public opinion," de Torqueville argued, "could prove more burdensome than the tyranny of any monarch. Democracy (communalism) does not guarantee efficient government; it does provide freedom for the pursuit of one's own interest, subject always to the tyranny that comes from the majority insisting that its values (religious conscience) and ideas should be safeguarded."

Torqueville saw the new state power as rather like that of the parent, except that the parent prepared the child for manhood; the democratic state was interested in perpetuating childhood in man. It would provide for his necessities, facilitate his pleasures, and direct his industry.

"What remains," Torqueville asked, "but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living."/59