



THE ESTABLISHMENT © Authored by LB Bork lb@pacinlaw.org

THE INSURGENCY / REBELLION ¹

To have an *understanding* where this matter is coming from, one has to comprehend that the several States were replaced with an alternate State—or *government* if you will—after the *so-called* Civil War (it was really *The War Between the States*). The rightful states of each American republic were subverted by *force* and the *operations of law* that are established by the *insidious* 14th Amendment² of the U.S. Constitution.

Pursuant to the operations of the Fourteenth Amendment, the people that are participating in this new political/governmental system are *citizens of the United States*—or *U.S.* or *federal citizens*.³ Because of the operations of the amendment, the only ones that are generally subject to this system are participants; the major liability is set forth under Section 2 of the infamous amendment.⁴ Understand that the original constitutional system of law is still somewhat existent, but there has been a *bifurcation*, so to speak. . . in other words there are two systems of constitutional law present at once.⁵ (*also see footnote 1 & 3*)

To best explain this, first we evidence the definition of *government de facto* that is taken from the law dictionary that judges use, *Ballentine's Law Dictionary*:

- **de facto government.** A new government which exercises undisputed sway over the entire country, the former established government having been nullified by successful rebellion or having lost the support of the people. A de facto government arises where the established government has been subverted by rebellion, so that the new government exercises undisputed sway for the time being over the entire country, or where the people of any portion of a country subject to the same government throw off their allegiance to that government and establish one of their own, and show not only that they have established a government, but also their ability to maintain it.

Am J Rev ed Internat L § 12 (International Law)

1 See article *Treason by Design*: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Treason_by_Design.php

2 Which was originated in the Reconstruction Acts of March 2, 1867

3 See *The Red Amendment* by LB Bork: <http://www.redamendment.net>

4 Note that a *government de facto* has been established by a rebellion. Look at this definition from Webster's Dictionary of 1828: **REBEL.** One that has the purpose of turning the sovereignty of his country over to a foreign power. *Definition reference: INSURGENT*
Section 2 of the 14th Amendment establishes a rebellion which only allows "citizens of the United States" to vote. These people in rebellion are giving the *political sovereignty* of their *rightful states* over to the United States, a foreign state with limited powers set forth by the Constitution, *i.e.* a power the United States did/does not have. The state—or his government—is no longer sovereign to him; he is looking to the "United States—a king of sorts—to protect him and provide him his political rights, not his state/country.

5 See article *Dual System of Law*: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Dual_System.php

One must understand that in International Law—in which the Constitution is grounded in—each state in the Union is a republic or country. From this you must understand that the states are primary and the United States can only exist due to the states—or people of the states. That means that a man owes his fidelity to his nation or country, not the United States, *per se*. The operations of the Fourteenth Amendment—along with brainwashing measures—make everyone believe that they owe allegiance to the “federal” government, in which they do not. By the operations of the infamous amendment, the lawful state borders have in sense been eliminated and the *several States* are considered one state or country. Again, this legally can only apply to the ones that claim to be *United States citizens*. Under International Law, a state—or nation—has the ultimate control over its land. In American law, people of each state in the Union have the control over the land. However, because the majority of American people in the United States of America are participating in this *insurgent* governmental system, such land is considered to be held by the rebellious, collective group, *i.e.* citizens and nationals of the United States (or *communists*).³

Such fact notwithstanding, the people of their respective states who are not participating in the *insurgent* governmental system under the Fourteenth Amendment have the absolute right of control of the land or territory in their respective countries. This *possession of territory* or land by this collective-rebellious group that are known as *citizens of the United States* is considered to be an *adverse possession* in law.

To explain this matter as pursuant to law, you must look at the general definition of the term “possession” from a common dictionary, *American Heritage Dictionary*:

- **possession.** Law. Actual holding or occupancy with or without rightful ownership. A territory subject to foreign control.

And now the definition pursuant to the rule of conquest as to International Law:

- **POSSESSION**, international law. By possession is meant a country which is held by no other title than mere conquest. *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856*

And now the definition of possession as to the use of property:

- **POSSESSION**, property. The detention or enjoyment of a thing which a man holds or exercises by himself or by another who keeps or exercises it in his name. *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856*

Now the definition of adverse possession from *Ballentine’s Law Dictionary*:

- **adverse possession.** An actual and visible appropriation of property commenced and continued under for a claim of right inconsistent with and hostile to the claim of another. An open and notorious possession and occupation of real property under an evident claim or color of right; a possession in opposition to the true title and real owner—a possession which is commenced in wrong and maintained in right. *3 Am J2d Adv P § 1*

In a sense, the several American republics were conquered after the *War Between the States*; however, in a large sense this is not true. The simple fact of the matter is the land of the several American republics is being held or utilized by the United States and *ITS* States (governments) created under the Fourteenth Amendment. We of the Coalition refer to such States as: *the Fourteenth Amendment States*. These states—which their officers are elected or *inserted* by 14th Amendment citizens—are using the land for the collective sum of

United States citizens. Such land is used by the *United States* for uses other than constitutionally authorized. These “States” are instituting legislation for taxation, which includes pledges of the federal government. Another thing to consider in relation to *adverse possessions* are the *so-called* National Parks held by the Federal government; please note the conflict in the terms: National Park—Federal Government. Such parks are in regard to the approval of United States citizens and/or *nationals* of the United States;⁶ the parks are property of *state nationals*, not the United States and *ITS* citizens.

ENTER, THE ESTABLISHMENT

With the above established now we can explain “The Establishment”. To do this let us use an act of the *insurgent* congress entitled the Buck Act. This Act solidifies and also explains the *possession premise* of which will illustrate the Federal area overlay that is created in the stealthy language in the Internal Revenue Code (IRC); these areas of which generally only apply to *citizens of the United States*. As tax protestor groups generally and overtly fail to mention the Buck Act—to save people grief and loss of property—we must explain how it works. Said act created *so-called* federal areas that are within the 14th Amendment States to deal with taxable *persons*; accordingly, these created *federal areas* only exist in relation to U.S. citizens or aliens that are permitted residence, *see* Title 26 USC § 7701(30)(A) which defines a *citizen* or *resident* of the United States.

Understand that these Federal areas existed due to Fourteenth Amendment operations of law; and if not by express law, under legal fictions, *i.e.* presumptions. The Buck Act was an express statement or law made by the *de facto* Congress that solidified it. Directly below is how the *so-called* federal area—that again existed under the 14th Amendment political system anyway—is illustrated under Title 4 of the United States Code:

- Title 4 USC § 110. Same; definitions.
 - (d) The term “State” includes any possession of the United States.⁷
 - (e) The term “Federal area” means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency, of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State.

Firstly, you must understand that the term “State” is not truly defined by the Internal Revenue Code, nor—for that matter—is it clearly defined anywhere else in the US Code. Sometimes the term “State” is defined in the US Code, but in the list of states defined the term “*includes*” is used. This is a deceptive trick that is used in the code and is found in the *Definitions* section. In example, note the use of the term *includes* as follows:

- Title 26 USC § 7701(c). Definitions - *includes* and *including*.

The terms “includes” and “including” when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined. (*cited from the IRC*)

6 These persons (insurgents/rebels) are defined by Title 8 USC §§ 1401(a) & 1101(a)(22)(A).

7 The term “Territories” (capital ‘T’) has been removed from Title 4 USC § 110(d) as there are no longer any Territories, which are lands that are federally owned, or managed, that are actually not considered sovereign “States”.

The above trickery allows the agency or judge to have “free license” to add what may not be included on the list in question, *i.e.* the section of the code enlarges the scope.⁸

Now back to the issue of the States: Sometimes the 50 states are referred to as the several States in the United States Code, but not in the case of the Internal Revenue Code. This is irrefutable, as almost all the 50 states have implemented a state income tax; that is to say: the term “State” *includes* the several States. Accordingly, in reference to these matters, please note that in Title 4 USC § 110(d) that ‘State’ includes the verbiage of “possession of the United States”. In regard to the term ‘possession’ as it is used in the United States Code, the term is only found defined in two places of said code:

- 1) Title 26 USC § 7701(d) Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof, references in this title to possessions of the United States shall be treated as also referring to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
- 2) Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(29) The term “outlying possessions of the United States” means American Samoa and Swains Island.

Note the language in Title 26 USC § 7701(d) wherein it sets forth that possessions of the United States also refers to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In sense, this establishes a principle that there may be other “possessions” that are not defined anywhere in the United States Code; as in the other language of the definition: we would refer you to the loose term of “State” as defined by the Internal Revenue Code. Also note that *possessions* may be found in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) defining some sections. These are matters that are taken under silent notice and then applying law and its rules.

With that established, now here are the several States—or the *adverse possessions* of the United States’ *Fourteenth Amendment States*—defined as to income taxation imposed by one of the “several States” *de facto* as to the legal operations of the Buck Act:

- Title 4 USC § 106. Same; income tax. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for any income tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, by reason of his residing within a Federal area or receiving income from transactions occurring or services performed in such area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

What this is describing is: Congress exercising its special/private law on *ITS* citizens—or aliens admitted residence—that are “residents” in the *Fourteenth Amendment States*.

Now to explain the complexity of the above definitions so that they make some sense: We must apply syntax and remove the unneeded verbiage of Title 4 USC § 110(e). After this is done we come up with this two pronged synopsis of the description:

- 1) The term “Federal area” means any lands held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or establishment of the United States. [*Please verify the Syntax*]
- 2) The term “Federal area” means any Federal area which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State. [*Please verify the Syntax*]

8 McKinley v. United States, 1992 WL 330407 (S.D. Ohio, Sept.3 1992)

If we look at Part 2 above we find that it is cleverly establishing that ANYWHERE in the State—*i.e.* a 14th Amendment State—is considered to be a “Federal area”.

Now to explain Part 1 which is a bit more complex: to help in this explanation we have to turn again to *American Heritage Dictionary*, and look at the word “establishment”. This term or word is very broad and encompassing and is defined as follows:

- **establishment**, n. 1.a. The act of establishing. b. The condition or fact of being established. 2. Something established, as: a. An arranged order or system, especially a legal code. b. A permanent civil, political, or military organization. *American Heritage Dictionary*

As you can plainly see an *establishment* is considered a permanent civil, political, or military organization. The *insurgent* political system that is created under the Fourteenth Amendment fits the statement conveying the fundamental characteristics of the word or term ‘establishment’ perfectly. Such establishment was *unlawfully* created by the *thing* that is entitled the *United States*; hence the land *or* territory—in the sense of the word territory meaning an area—the *territories* within these *Federal areas* are being used for the Fourteenth Amendment governmental or *political establishment*.

Now, you are requested to review the definition of “possession”, it states:

- “A territory subject to foreign control.”

One must understand that the *United States* is deemed “foreign” or is a “foreign state” to the several States (*see* Title 22 USC § 2659 for proof), except not in the absolute sense as to “ITS” self-created political Fourteenth Amendment *establishment*, but in the original sense of the Union under pre-14th Amendment constitutional principles.

IN SUMMARY: It is an obvious case of: Which came first, the chicken or the egg? In other words, the states in the Union make-up the United States, hence they are superior. The Fourteenth Amendment reversed the operations of the way the Union politically operates. The fact of this *new* political “establishment” notwithstanding, it is still deemed to be *quasi-foreign* as to the United States. One must understand that this *unlawful* establishment is “private” as if one participates he is *tacitly agreeing* to be governed by the *governments de facto*. This is all setup under the Fourteenth Amendment political system, which includes some very *evil* operations of law. And, note that the following maxim of law applies to the ones benefiting from the *Marxist* system:

- ***Invito beneficium non datur.*** *No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. But if he does not dissent, he will be considered as assenting.*

One must understand the *rightful owners* are the ones that *are not claiming* United States citizenship and *have secured* state nationality. To somewhat recant what was stated about the land of each state being in adverse possession, such land is a legal fiction based on this premise; the rules of ignorance and/or fraud apply in this case, not *factual* conquest. It is not under conquest when people of right—*i.e.* state nationals—challenge it.⁹

~~~~~

The People’s Awareness Coalition – POB 313–Kieler, Wisconsin [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)

---

9 There are statutes in Title 28 for these challenges. If the United States failed to provide remedy, government officers could be held for treason against their respective states.

## ENDNOTES:

For those people that believe that the Fourteenth Amendment only applies to blacks (*i.e.* ex-slaves) due to an *opinion* of some *conspirator* court, the following evidence shows the intent of said amendment as stated by one of the proponents of the amendment:

QUOTE FROM: *POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS, LEGISLATIVE, DIPLOMATIC, AND POPULAR, 1856-1886, JAMES G. BLAINE, NORWICH, CONN. THE HENRY BILL PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1887*<sup>10</sup>

### Page 64. The Reconstruction Problem, *speech of James Blaine, Skowhegan, Maine (August 29, 1866)*

*“In the first place, we ask that they will agree to certain changes in the Constitution of the United States; and, to begin with, we want them to unite with us in broadening the citizenship of the Republic. The slaves recently emancipated by proclamation, and subsequently by Constitutional Amendment, have no civil status. They should be made citizens. We do not, by making them citizens, make them voters,—we do not, in this Constitutional Amendment, attempt to force them upon Southern white men as equals at the ballot-box; but we do intend that they shall be admitted to citizenship, that they shall have the protection of the laws, that they shall not, any more than the rebels<sup>11</sup> shall, be deprived of life, of liberty, of property, without due process of law, and that “they shall not be denied the equal protection of the law.” And in making this extension of citizenship, we are not confining the breadth and scope of our efforts to the negro. It is for the white man as well. We intend to make citizenship National. Heretofore, a man has been a citizen of the United States because he was a citizen of some-one of the States: now, we propose to reverse that, and make him a citizen of any State where he chooses to reside, by defining in advance his National citizenship—and our Amendment declares that “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the States wherein they reside.” This Amendment will prove a great beneficence to this generation, and to all who shall succeed us in the rights of American citizenship; and we ask the people of the revolted States to consent to this condition as an antecedent step to their re-admission to Congress with Senators and Representatives.”*

ERGO: All people in the United States are deemed *citizens of the United States*.<sup>12</sup> And below is an example of what “The Establishment” expects out of its *citizens*... it is evidence of propaganda of the *new political system* from the year 1906. The copy illustrated below is from a book distributed in America; the title: *Citizenship*.<sup>13</sup> Its purpose was to condition Americans to be good *patriotic citizens* under the *new governmental system*:

*“. . . the spirit in the citizen that, originating in love of country, results in obedience to its laws, the support and defense. . . such a citizen is called a patriot. . . it is the citizen who yields the legitimate share of his property, as well as the proper services of his person, to the lawful demands of his country for support, who is the real patriot.”*

Excuse me! A *patriot* is defined as one who gives his property to the state?<sup>14</sup> The truth of the matter is the *controllers* have incorporated several methods to *con* all Americans into supporting this governmental system under the 14th Amendment. Accordingly, as you can see, there are a lot of factors to consider in the matter of the *New America*.

*“Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.”* –William Penn

---

10 Research provided by John Ainsworth [tigerja@bellsouth.net](mailto:tigerja@bellsouth.net)

11 **REBELS.** A term loosely but incorrectly applied to the Confederate Forces engaged in the Civil War. 30 Am J Rev ed Insurr § 2. [This is a case where a *conspirator* misused the term.]

12 See this article that shows such fact: [http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Historical\\_Error.php](http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Historical_Error.php)

13 *STUDIES IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, A Treatise On American Citizenship* By John S. Wise, Edward Thompson Company Northport, Long Island, N.Y. (1906)

14 Senate Document # 43; SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 62 (Page 9, Paragraph 2) April 17, 1933: “The ultimate ownership of all property is in the State; individual so-called “ownership” is only by virtue of government, *i.e.* law, amounting to mere user; and use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State.”