



Constitutional Representation in Congress

Authored by LB Bork, Jurist –lb@pacinlaw.us

Introduction

The *War Between the States* brought on a consideration that made major alterations to the Constitution called “*Reconstruction*”. What this exercise will prove out is similar to the famous principle noted in the founding of this Union. Such being, “*Taxation without Representation*”. With respect to this issue, we are looking at similar type principles that would apply to a duly elected “*representative government*”.

The purpose of this exercise is simply to determine the *proper persons* represented in what is referred to as the *Government of Reconstruction*. This particular discourse is not to go into matters that would be considered *adverse* or *detrimental* to those of the American Union. Although such matters are of major concern, this exercise will set a foundation for *de jure rights* of *lawful citizens* and their *damages*.

Alteration in Question

It is important to understand the terms of *de jure* and *de facto* and the “*consent of the governed*”. Simply, Americans are consenting to be represented by an alternate system that is not of right and is criminal.

A primary concern here is the alteration of the *operation of law* that is found in Article 1, Section 2, found in the body of the *Constitution proper*. It encompasses how congressional representation is calculated:

“Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other Persons.”

Its alteration changed the way state representation is calculated for Congress. It can be found in the infamous 14th Amendment of the Constitution. It should be noted that such alteration had not repealed the noted text; but rather an *emergency* for the alteration had been declared: a ploy for usurpation. Of course, the 15th Amendment was the bogus excuse: such being the granting of “*ex-slaves*” their “*rights*”.

That noted, this *Red amendment* altered the way the American Union operates. It creates a fair amount of confusion to the average person as to what transpired. These matters of alteration actually created a *dual system* of constitutional law. This new system operates in stealth with an intended deception.

14th Amendment Section 2

The above noted authority was changed by operations in Section 2 of the 14th Amendment. Please keep in mind Section 1 of the amendment had created the *new citizens* for purposes of this section:

“Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President

of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.” **–Original Text of the 14th Amendment Section 2**

Over the years, due to “progressivism” there have been several alterations to that text. To clarify this exercise, the modernized version is formulated below. There is really no need to go into detail as to why and how the changes were made. This distillment is for expediency and simplification of this exercise. The modern text will not be found anywhere. Yes. It is a *well-kept secret* of the usurpation government.

The below version of altered text incorporates the proper reconstruction and emergency measures of the following that altered the original language— being: Amendments 19 and 26, and the Snyder Act. Simply stated, the 19th Amendment prunes all “male” language. The 26th Amendment then omits the “age” language. Adding Indian Tribes into the *New Red Political Body* omits the “Indians not taxed” language:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the inhabitants of such State, being citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens shall bear to the whole number of citizens in such State. **–The Modern or Current Text of Section 2**

That is what a reengineered version would look like to the courts when the *question of reduction* was presented. Also, that *cast of characters* of electors of a “State” and the others are *rebels* of a “new body politic”. They may be divided into two categories: **1)** those of a “lawful” nature; and, **2)** those who depart from the *lawful*. A nice look at what the “Communist Association” resembles being years in the making.

Reduction of Representation

There are several things to consider in the alteration. What is considered to be most important in this calculation is whom is to be *represented* in Congress. The most important phrase which determines this may be found in Section 2 of the 14th Amendment: It being “*shall be reduced in the proportion*”.

Firstly, the phrase “*reduce proportionally*” is correct and usable as seen in written English. It can be used to describe when something is decreased in relation to another amount or factor. Looking at the word or term “*proportionally*” is basically defining, a way of corresponding to size or amount to something else.

Oxford Languages defines “*reduce*” as: **1)** make smaller or less in amount, degree, or size; **2)** bring someone or something to a lower or weaker state, condition, or role. For the purposes of this exercise, both of those principles apply. The latter is the one of primary interest; although such concern is more relevant to other particulars within the language and stealthy operations of the infamous 14th Amendment.

Simplification of Section 2

Before we go further into an analysis of how to dissect and interpret the language found in this intentional mess, below is a simplification of the language and what it actually achieves. The double-negative aspect is removed. Simply, this is what Section 2 relates without complex and confusing language.

PRE NOTES: The "*new citizen*" is a "person (or *legal entity*)" that has been given a "*denizenship*" by the federal government, *i.e.*, the "United States". It is developed per the *naturalization effects* under Section 1 of the 14th Amendment. Such person being a "federal citizen", *a.k.a.*, a "citizen of the United States".

The "*whole number of citizens*" refers to any and all citizens being *new* and *old* that are found in a state. An '*old citizen*' would be a *de jure* or *lawful* state citizen who has been *disenfranchised* by the amendment:

Representatives are apportioned among the *several states* according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state.

The right to vote is granted to the "*new citizens*" of such state if they participate in rebellion (*being a criminal act against de jure citizens*), which reduces the representation therein in the proportion which the number of such "*new citizens*" bears to the whole number of citizens in such state.

The right to vote may be abridged to "*new citizens*" of such state for committing a crime.

Section 2 is simply a *disenfranchisement* and *enfranchisement* formula that creates a federal body politic. And most important, it should be recognized that "*bear*" is a term of force or a criminal action... [more](#)

Analysis of Terms

There are many words and phrases incorporated into the complexity of Section 2. To understand the formula for representation they must be observed and defined. Herein the more complex or vague terms will be examined and defined for clarification. Such terms are relevant to constitutional law and also are found in the *Law of Nations*. Also, they represent a *political affiliation* to this new governmental system. Also, we must remember the list of characters of the "*State*" noted in *Section 1 and 2* are not of the *several States*, but are those in *rebellion* as *denizens* that are "*residents*" of an Article IV, Section 3, *State*. This is a *special jurisdiction* to handle the *Communist body politic* that is *denied access* to "*The Republic*".

Accordingly, the amendment being added to the Constitution – effectually creating a different citizenship and alternate political system – inherently creates a duality in observing words, phrases, and clauses. In simple sense, there is a *de jure* set of terms and a *de facto* set of terms. The most essential ones are:

Sentence 1

several States: A *de jure* reference terminology. However, current "*States*" are *de facto*. This is just one reference of deceptive duality to justify the questionable existence of *Reconstruction*.

State: A vague term that is asserted to depart from the "*several States*". A constitutional proper *republic-state* is guaranteed a "*republican form of government*" under Article IV, Section 4, of the *Constitution proper*. Such state is politically overwritten by the 14th Amendment. A *jurisdiction* conferred by Article IV, Section 3, of the Constitution.

Persons: An odd use of terms. In proper form, it should be *citizens*. Foreigners and things are

not to be represented: *citizens* are. Nonetheless, it is what has to be dealt with. Those things referred to as *slaves* represented as three-fifths is ventured why the “*persons*” language was implemented; a ridiculous notion in itself. The language had laid the groundwork for falsely representing *aliens* in the latest Census: borders essentially eliminated by Marxist types.

respective numbers: Such “persons” must be bonafide *Americans* of the soil.

Sentence 2

But when: A simple phrase to illustrate that there will be a *reduction* of *persons* noted in the first sentence. A series of stipulations follow it that govern how reduction is calculated.

inhabitants: Another vaguely used term. Vattel defined “inhabitants” as those in a country not their own. This perversion is in-line with the use of the term “persons” as in the first sentence. An accurate count could not be had with the use of such language. The citizens (*de facto*) *reside* in the same “*State*” as described in sentence one. So do the *de jure* citizens.

citizens of the United States: This term is the new or *de facto* United States citizens. This term has always meant to be someone that has been *naturalized* into the Union. Before the 14th Amendment, there were *citizens* of the republic-states, as per the *Law of Nations*. This definitional principle is evident in its use in the body of the *Constitution proper*.

such citizens: Grammatically, simply this phrase refers to noted “citizens of the United States”.

whole number of citizens: In essence, it works in unison with Section 1: by operation of law, all persons are naturalized and/or denizenized into the Article IV, Section 3, State (or *jurisdiction*). The reference complements disenfranchisement of all *de jure* citizens. It also completes the general replacement action of new representation. It may aptly be defined as follows:

It takes the *de jure* citizens and puts them in a lesser degree and a destroyed condition and/or role. As the section language relates, *de facto* “citizens of the United States” *bear* down on them. Simply put, *de jure* or *rightful* citizenship has been eliminated by the amendment. Political power is now of American *inhabitants* (denizens), not injured *lawful* citizens.

Proper Reading and Calculation

Above, it is briefly laid out who is represented by the *de facto* or *rump* Congress. This list now incorporates all persons (or *people*) living in the Article IV, Section 3, *States*. As the language of the modern version stipulates, all “persons” in such “*States*” are now represented, thus *reduction* is needed.

The *rebellion* against the *Constitution proper* is what creates the damage. The *persons* who live in or inhabit such “*States*” are defined by *Title 8 USC Section 1401* as, “*nationals and citizens of the United States*”. These are the “*persons*” who are counted for representation. Like in the original *Article 1 formula*, the proper *representation* being difficult to assess due to a select number of *persons* being transient.

It is obvious that all “*persons*” or so-called “*inhabitants*” are included in representation as to the first sentence. But what are some of the particulars of the reduction? These particulars being found in the second sentence. This is in addition to what is found in the analysis of terms.

To understand a proper reading and calculation, these pertinent parameters are addressed:

What status are the noted electors for president and vice-president, judicial officers, state legislatures, judicial, and executive officers? Are they *de jure* or *de facto* citizens? Is the president a *de jure* citizen or a *de facto* citizen? Seriously. How many *conflicts of law* are here?

Per language of Section 2, there are three stipulations for voting. It denotes it may be denied or abridged to the inhabitants – *foreigners* – of such “State”. Firstly: **1)** A voter must be a “*citizen of the United States*” or shall be *denied* the right to vote; **2)** Unless citizens participate in rebellion the right to vote is *denied*; and, **3)** A citizen may not vote for committing crimes in the new system thus the right may be *abridged*. And modernization: a voter no longer must be male and now is 18 years old.

As a matter of law, it is understood that such “persons” are *inhabitants* of the “several States”. They are *foreigners* of The Republic, *i.e.*, of the republic-states. Actually, this satisfies the principles of *Vattel*. This would cure the issue of why the language of “persons” was utilized in the first sentence over *citizens*. Inhabitants are not “citizens”. Denizens of D.C. *reside* in these “States”, not *de jure* or *lawful* citizens.

Between the analysis of terms and the above, sufficient tools are available to figure the reduction details of the *de facto* governmental system. The *de facto* citizens may now be assessed properly. Moreover, disenfranchised *de jure* persons – having their *citizenship* cancelled/destroyed – may also *lawfully* preclude themselves if they so choose... allowing them to have access to true *constitutional* freedoms.

Reduction Results

Proper *reduction* reflects the citizen disenfranchisement and enfranchisement; it also can omit *de jure* citizens who reject to *be in rebellion* against their *lawful state-nations* and be represented by *foreigners*.

Effectively, *The Republic* has been unjustly overridden. However, a constitutional proper *republic-state* is guaranteed a “*republican form of government*” per Article IV, Section 4, of the *Constitution proper*. Such *state* is *politically* overwritten by the 14th Amendment. A jurisdiction conferred by Article IV, Section 3, of the Constitution. However, as a matter of law, the lawful or constitutionally *de jure* people still exist. Such *lawful* people defined by pre-14th Amendment naturalization laws that have grandfathered rights. Those who are of “*white*” or Anglo makeup pursuant to such noted law that has never been repealed.

The constitutional result would be a lawful separation of *de jure* and *de facto* persons and nationalities. Moreover, the clarification would clean-up *voting issues* and *illegal alien* problems we have seen.

Conclusion and Remedy

A certain number of *cabalists* knows the *secrets of this formula* that is being used against the *Red Public*. That is how the Constitution has been effectively usurped by the *Consent of The Governed*. These actions impose *Legislation with Representation* which fulfills the mandates of *World Communism* on America.

Simply put: Lawful Americans aren’t represented. *De facto* Americans are. This is the formula that creates the “*One Nation Under Fraud*”. In simple terms, the *national government* of *de facto* citizens is the United States. The actual national governments of *lawful Americans* are the *republic-states* which are under an insurgency (or an *emergency*) due to those who are acting in *rebellion* against the *Constitution proper*. An action Justice Black had once defined as being those who are the “*enemies of republican freedom*”.

The new (*de facto*) and the old (*de jure*) jurisdictions must be clarified and separated. This is the remedy for those who are of a *de jure* or *lawful* character. Along with that, the 14th Amendment system must stay intact to *govern* those that are of a *foreign* nature, which includes *private* corporate structure. Also, it is impressed that those of a *foreign* nature that have been inducted into “America” since the installment of the 14th Amendment are not of a *de jure constitutional status* pursuant to factors of natural law.

This is where proper *reduction of representation* comes into being a necessity. This will eliminate the *gray area* the government now operates under. An orchestrated confusion that allows for the governments and the elite to get richer. All maintained by *Politicians, Lawyers, and the Judiciary*. Simply, criminals.

It is elementary: One does not have to be involved in rebellion nor be in association with criminals. The 13th Amendment of *Reconstruction* prevents that servitude. However, most every “American” is tied into an imposed *slavery* of the 14th Amendment system contingent on their actions of– *Voting - Doles - Silence*. Legal action is imperative in order to separate all law unjustly imposed on those not in *the rebellion(s)*.

Please Contact Us

People’s Awareness Coalition requests that you join us to make sure this *correction* happens.

Please contact us at the following: www.pacalliance.us/contact

Or, you may email LB Bork at: lb@pacinlaw.us

THE RING : A PAC EDUCATIONAL TOOL

By The Consent of The Governed

- Import immigrants from 1960 to 2000+
- Immigrants aren’t expected to assimilate
- Begin dumbing down population in 1970’s
- Test Americans patriotism with Waco attack
- Attack Twin Towers then blame it on Muslims
- Soften Americans with Socialist Black President
- Make America Great with a Populist President
- De jure rights hindered via 14th Amendment
- Largest lot of voters in history takes place



Join Us : www.pacalliance.us/ring

PEOPLE’S AWARENESS COALITION WELCOMES YOU!

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



Visit People’s Awareness Coalition at : www.pacalliance.us



Join us at the *PAC Open Forum* :
www.pacgroups.us/register