



# EMPLOY

(the acceptable word)

Vs.

# Enslave

(the unacceptable word)

*Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth. (Genesis 11:7-9)*

Babble is defined in Webster's as, "to say indistinctly or incoherently," or "to talk thoughtlessly." While the word understand is defined "to apprehend or comprehend; to know or grasp the meaning, import, intention, or motive of; to perceive or discern the meaning of; as, to understand a problem, an argument, an oracle, a secret sign, indistinct speech, etc." So, let us try to apprehend the motive of words like employment in order to understand the problem and maybe even the secret sign of what now may only be thoughtless and indistinct speech.

*"We are ignorant of many things which would not be hidden from us if the reading of old authors was familiar to us."*<sup>158</sup>

If we continue with Webster's we find employ to be defined, "1. to occupy the time, attention, and labor of; to keep busy or at work; as, we employ our hands in labor. 2. to use; to make use of;... 3. to provide work and pay for; as, public works employ thousands of men. 4. to engage in one's service; to hire; as, the president employed an envoy to negotiate a treaty... Syn.. -- use, hire, occupy, devote, busy, engage, commission."<sup>159</sup>

The synonyms listed here give a greater insight into the meaning of the word employ. The first synonym we should note is the word use which as a verb is defined, "To make use of, to convert to ones service, to avail one's self of, to employ."<sup>160</sup> To employ as a verb then denotes the idea of conversion. As a noun it is defined as, "A confidence reposed in another..."<sup>161</sup> A use is further described as a "A right in a person, called the cestui que use, to take the profits of land of which another has legal title and possession, together with the duty of defending the same and of making estates therefore according to the direction of the cestui que use."<sup>162</sup> A use by nature is a trust. "Uses and trusts are not so much different things as different aspects of the same subject."<sup>163</sup>

**"American labor, which is the capital of our workingmen."**<sup>164</sup>

Hire on the other hand is, "A bailment in which compensation is to be given for the use of a thing, or for labor and services about it. This contract arises from the principles of natural law: it is voluntary, and founded in consent: it involves mutual and reciprocal obligations; and it is for mutual benefit ... in hiring, the use of the thing is the object."<sup>165</sup> The contract to hire arises from the natural law and by itself is not a subject of equity. Hiring for an immediate and equal exchange should be considered

<sup>158</sup> Multa ignoramus quæ nobis non laterent si veterum lectio nobis fuit familiaris. 10 Coke, 73.

<sup>159</sup> Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary Unabridged (2nd Ed.).

<sup>160</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787.

<sup>161</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787. 2 Bl. Comm. 328.

<sup>162</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787. Bouvier's.

<sup>163</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787p.Mozele and Whitely.

<sup>164</sup> Grover Cleveland *Annual Message* Dec., 1885.

<sup>165</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p 895. and Bouvier's.

different than hiring for the purposes of profit and gain at a future time for that would imply an interest or usury.

**“All government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery!”**<sup>166</sup>

“There is a clear distinction between profit and wages or compensation for labour.”<sup>167</sup> Compensation for labor is distinguished from profit. Wages are, “A compensation given to a hired person for his or her services. As to servants’ wages...”<sup>168</sup> But at another time, “Compensation for labor can not be regarded as profit within the meaning of the law. The word profit, as ordinarily used, means the gain made upon any business or investments. It is a different thing altogether from compensation for labour.”<sup>169</sup> Is the compensation for labor a business? “Labor, business, and work are not synonyms. Labor may be business but it is not necessarily so; and business is not always labor. Labor implies toil; exertion producing weariness; manual exertion of a toilsome nature.”<sup>170</sup> Labor is the expenditure of ourselves when it is not a matter of business. “The early Christian writer looked upon business as a peril to the soul.”<sup>171</sup> Business today is synonymized with the words, “occupation, employment, employ.”<sup>172</sup> “Employment is a business relation, if not itself a business.”<sup>173</sup> “It is easy to escape business, if you will only despise the rewards of business.”<sup>174</sup> When does the compensation for labor become a business and therefore a profit or gain? And does the word business need to be defined or redefined in our own minds?

**“ the modern philosophy of law is that a man may sell his services but not himself, as was pointed out in Kadis v. Britt, 224, NC 154, 29 SE2d 543...”**<sup>175</sup>

To employ is also defined as, “to give occupation to: n. occupation. Syn. EMPLOY, use. We ‘employ’ whatever we take into our service, or make subservient to our convenience for a time; we ‘use’ whatever we entirely devote to our purpose.”<sup>176</sup> The synonym occupy should include occupation. Occupy comes from the Latin occupare meaning, “to take possession of, to possess, to employ.” While, OCCUPATION means, “Possession; control; tenure; use... The word ‘occupation’ must be held to have reference to the vocation, profession, trade or calling which the assured is engaged in for hire or for profit.”<sup>177</sup> The word ‘profession’ comes from the Latin word professio, meaning a “declaration; public register; profession,” which is defined as “the declaring ... the avowal of belief in ... the body of persons in a particular calling or occupation.” A professional is “a person belonging to one of the professions” or “a person who makes some activity not usually followed for gain... the source of his livelihood.” Such as a doctor who cares for the sick for money rather than as an act of mercy or a lawyer who fights not for justice but as a mercenary for hire. And an occupation of course is a “use” which is a trust (a confidence reposed in another) where the beneficial interest (rights to the profits or gain) is regarded. While, an assured is, “A person who has been insured by some insurance company, or underwriter, against losses or perils mentioned in the policy of insurance.”<sup>178</sup>

**“Protection draws to it subjection; subjection protection”**<sup>179</sup>

The term employ can be defined “to equitably convert.” The employer occupies and possesses the use of the employee. But who is the employer and master of your labor?

**“EMPLOYEES See Master and Servant (this index)”**<sup>180</sup>

<sup>166</sup> Jonathon Swift.

<sup>167</sup> Oliver vs Halstead. 96 SE 21 858.859. Black’s Law Dictionary

<sup>168</sup> Bouvier’s.

<sup>169</sup> Commercial League Asso. of Am. v. People ex net Needles Aud. 90 Ill. 166.

<sup>170</sup> Bloom v. richards, 2 Ohio St. 387 Black’s 3rd p.260.

<sup>171</sup> Walter Lipman.

<sup>172</sup> Roget’s International Thesaurus 625. BUSINESS 1. n. business,...

<sup>173</sup> Steward Machine Co. vs Davis 301 U.S. 548 1937.

<sup>174</sup> Seneca.

<sup>175</sup> Calhoun v. Everman, 242 SW2d 100, 103 (Ky) (1951)

<sup>176</sup> The Volume Library (1924)

<sup>177</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd. p 1280.

<sup>178</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd. p 161.

<sup>179</sup> Protectio trahit subjectionem, subjectio protectionem. Coke, Littl. 65.

<sup>180</sup> Summary of American Law George L. Clark p 635 (only entry for employ or employee in the index}.

If Edward Everyman is hired by the Willard Widgetmaker, we call Ed an employee and Willard an employer. Ed has earlier gone down to his local social security Administration office and obtained an “employee identification number.”<sup>181</sup> Ed is employed. Is Ed’s employer Willard or someone else? Is Willard acting as an agent or taskmaster for a third entity? Willard has an “employee identification number,” and he also has an additional number known as an “employer identification number.” Ed stands ready to serve his new master but Ed and Willard have undergone conversions. If Willard mistreats Ed who does he answer too? Isn’t it Willard who is vested with the responsibility to collect and deliver a portion of Ed’s labor in the form of tax to Willard’s and Ed’s true master? If Ed gives notice to Willard and quits his job is he unemployed or non-employed? If Willard is only an agent or an employed taskmaster himself then is Ed simply applying for a different taskmaster while he is unused and unemployed but still converted and subject? Can Ed undergo reconversion back to his original free status?

**The people never give up their liberties except under some dilution.**<sup>182</sup>

Some have believed that the income tax on labor of individuals is a direct tax due to the Sixteenth Amendment and then they claim that particular amendment was never legally ratified. Even though that may be true it has nothing to do with individual income tax.

“By the previous ruling [Brushaber Case] it was settled that the Sixteenth Amendment conferred no new power of taxation but simply prohibited the previous complete and plenary power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning from being taken out of the category of indirect taxation to which it inherently belonged....”<sup>183</sup>

“In the matter of taxation, the Constitution recognizes the two great classes of direct and indirect taxes, and lays down two rules by which their imposition must be governed, namely: The rule of apportionment as to direct taxes, and the rule of uniformity as to duties, imposts and excises.”

Is the graduated income tax a direct tax or an indirect tax? “The contention that the Amendment treats a tax on income as a direct tax ... is ... wholly without foundation.”<sup>184</sup> An indirect tax can be, “A tax laid upon the happening of an event, as distinguished from its tangible fruits, is an indirect tax.”<sup>185</sup>

*Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. (Ex 1:11)*

The word Income can mean, “the return in money from one’s business, labor, or capital invested. Income is the gain which proceeds from labor ... its usual synonyms being ‘gain,’ ‘profit,’ ‘revenue.’ ... Income is the gain derived from capital, from labor, or both combined...”<sup>186</sup> “The general term income is not defined in the Internal Revenue Code.”<sup>187</sup> Their “description of income” originally was the, “Total amount derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service of whatever kind and in whatever form paid,”<sup>188</sup> and, “income derived from a source is taxable without apportionment.”<sup>189</sup>

“Income” now is described as the total, “Wages, salaries, tips, etc...”<sup>190</sup> Yet we find elsewhere that, “Wages, salaries and first time commissions are not ‘income’ (profit or gain)... but an even exchange of labor for money. Such money is a ‘source,’ not ‘income,’ and not taxable.”<sup>191</sup>

“The conclusion reached in the Pollock Case did not in any degree involve holding that income taxes generically and necessarily came within the class of direct taxes on property, but on the contrary

<sup>181</sup> Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), Social Security Number.

<sup>182</sup> Edmund Burke 1784 Speech.

<sup>183</sup> Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co., 240 U.S. 103, 112 (1916)

<sup>184</sup> Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 240 U.S. 1, 13 (1916).

<sup>185</sup> Tyler v. United States, 281 U.S. 497, 502 (1930).

<sup>186</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.

<sup>187</sup> U.S. vs Ballard, 535 F2d 400 (1967).

<sup>188</sup> Form 1040. “For the year 1913.from March 1, to December 31.”

<sup>189</sup> Pollock vs Farmer’s Loan & Trust Co.

<sup>190</sup> Form 1040 U.S.Individual Income Tax Return.1988.

<sup>191</sup> Murdock vs PA., 318 US 105.

recognized the fact that taxation on income was in its nature an excise entitled to be enforced as such.”<sup>192</sup>

**All men are freemen or slaves.** <sup>193</sup>

If wages were the *source* from which income could have been derived and now wages are the income itself then something has changed or been converted. If labor is the source from which wages are derived then it must be the nature of the individual who labors which has undergone a conversion.

To be employed is to convert the use of one’s labor and service to the use or service of another in the hope of some future benefit and assurance. It is the conversion of a natural right by an act of mutual consent. It involves a relationship of trust and an investment of substance (sweat, effort and time) in the form of managed service in order to be enriched. It is the subjection of oneself to another in hope of gain and benefit. If liberty is the, “State or fact of being a free person; exemption from subjection to the will of another claiming ownership of the person or services; freedom;”<sup>194</sup> then a portion of our liberty and freedom is sacrificed or at least offered up at the moment of our *legal employment*.

*Every man also to whom God hath given riches and wealth, and hath given him power to eat thereof, and to take his portion, and to rejoice in his labour; this [is] the gift of God. ( Ec 5:19)*

It should be clear that a man’s labor is a gift from God as life itself is also His gift to us. In other words our labor is a privilege granted by our God and therefore taxable by him from the moment of our birth if not our conception. God’s endowment of privilege, being the creator of mankind, is the definition of unalienable rights and “to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”<sup>195</sup> Please note, “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude ... shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to its jurisdiction.”<sup>196</sup>

**“When people have to obey other people’s orders, equality is out of the question.”**<sup>197</sup>

Once upon a time, a young boy asked his father, an attorney, “Who do you work for?”

The Lawyer, being accustomed to speaking distinctly and accurately, comprehending points of law and being in a fifty percent income tax bracket, answered, “Well, until July 1st, I work for the government. After that, I work for myself.”

**Whatever day makes man a slave, takes half his worth away.** <sup>198</sup>

Income tax is, “a tax on the yearly profits arising from property, professions, trades and offices. An income tax is not levied upon property, funds, or profits, but upon the right of an individual or corporation to receive income or profits. Under various constitutional and statutory provisions, a tax on income is said to be an excise tax and not a tax on property, nor on business, but a tax on the proceeds arising therefrom. But in other cases an income tax is said to be a property and not a personal or excise tax.”<sup>199</sup> Income tax is said to be an excise tax but in other cases it is said not to be an excise tax. Under one condition it is not a property but in another condition it may have been converted to a property. Wages are said not to be income but are listed as income in other places. Confusion would seem to be justified. There must be a point in time when a significant change or conversion takes place. So, what are we missing? One thing to note in the search for truth is when these different statements are made.

**“one could look into a caldron in which the Government and the people of the United States were moving around in response to a new idea,...”** <sup>200</sup>

Maybe there is a clue in the fact that, “An ‘excise tax’ is an indirect charge for the privilege of following an occupation or trade, or carrying on a business; while an ‘income tax’ is a direct tax

---

<sup>192</sup> Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 240 U.S. 1, 16-17 (1916).

<sup>193</sup> Omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi.Inst. 1.3. pr; Fleta. 1.1.c.1,§2.

<sup>194</sup> Webster’s New International dictionary 1938 Second Ed.

<sup>195</sup> Declaration of Independence.

<sup>196</sup> Article XIII Constitution for the United States.

<sup>197</sup> Sir John Thomas Gilbert.

<sup>198</sup> Homer - Odyssey. Bk.XVII. L.392. Pope’s trans.

<sup>199</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.

<sup>200</sup> Forward by Frank Perkins, Sec of Labor 1933-45. The Development of the Social Security Act by Edwin E. Witte

imposed upon income, and is as directly imposed as is a tax on land.”<sup>201</sup> In other words income taxes paid by corporations that have no inalienable rights could be an excise tax. But a laborer paid by the day with no other interest would simply exchange one dollar labor for one dollar pay unless he converted his inalienable right to his God given labor into the property of another in hope of a benefit.

**“Labour was the first price, the original purchase-money that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labour, that all wealth of the world was originally purchased.”**<sup>202</sup>

“First: The tax which is described in statute as an excise, is laid with uniformity throughout the United States as a duty an impost or an excise upon the relation of employment”<sup>203</sup> Is the act of employment the act of selling oneself into servitude for the hope of security in society?

**“This was a new type of legislation--- nothing of the sort had ever come before the congress of the United States before, it took much explaining and much patience.”**<sup>204</sup>

Let us digress one more time in order to bring these thoughts together. In colonial America, “The ordinary citizen, living on his farm, owned in fee simple, untroubled by any relics of Feudalism, untaxed save by himself, saying his say to all the world in townmeetings, had gained a new self-reliance. Wrestling with his soul and plow on week days, and the innumerable points of the minister’s sermon on Sundays and meeting days, he was becoming a tough nut for any imperial system to crack.”<sup>205</sup> On the other hand citizens of the United States do not own their own land today. They have at best only a legal title which does not include “ownership of an estate” since it carries “no beneficial interest.”<sup>206</sup>

In the original American Republics, citizenship of the individual freeman depended upon his ownership of land in fee-simple as an estate, but “in the United States ‘it is a political obligation’ depending not on ownership of land, but on the enjoyment of the protection of government; and it ‘binds the citizen to the observance of all laws’ of his sovereign.”<sup>207</sup>

“For as labor cannot produce without the use of land, the denial of the equal right to the use of land is necessarily the denial of the right of labor to its own produce.”<sup>208</sup>

“An absolute or fee-simple estate is one in which the owner is entitled to the entire property, with unconditional power of disposition during his life, and descending to his heirs and legal representatives upon his death intestate.”<sup>209</sup> In contrast a legal title is “the apparent right of ownership and possession, but which carries no beneficial interest in the property, another person being equitably entitled thereto; in either case, the antithesis of ‘equitable title.’”<sup>210</sup>

If a legal title does not include a right to the beneficial interest then a legal right to work as an employee does not include a right to the “profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract,” nor does it include “the ownership of an estate.” After all, a beneficial interest is “distinct from the legal ownership.”<sup>211</sup>

By definition, a legal title is the opposite or at least the antithesis of an “equitable title.” An equitable title as opposed to a legal title “is a right in the party” rather than only appearing to be a right. More important it is “the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another.”<sup>212</sup>

This dividing of true title into a legal title on one hand verses an equitable title on the other is called equitable conversion. Equitable conversion is a “Conversion” or a “Constructive conversion.” It may

<sup>201</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.

<sup>202</sup> Adam Smith (1723-1790)

<sup>203</sup> Steward Machine Co. vs. Davis 301 U.S. 548 1937. Involving the tax imposed by the Social Security Act of 1935.

<sup>204</sup> Forward by Frank Perkins, Sec of Labor 1933-45. The Development of the Social Security Act by Edwin E. Witte

<sup>205</sup> History of the U.S. Vol.1 James Truslow Adams, p. 176.

<sup>206</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd Ed. p. 1734.(“Legal” & “Equitable” titles.)

<sup>207</sup> Wallace v. Harmstad, 44 Pa. 492; etc. Black’s 3rd Ed. p. 95.

<sup>208</sup> Henry George - Progress and Poverty. Bk. VII. Ch. I.

<sup>209</sup> Black’s 3rd Ed. p. 761.

<sup>210</sup> Black’s 3rd “legal title” p 1734.

<sup>211</sup> Black’s 3rd “beneficial Interest” p 206.

<sup>212</sup> Black’s 3rd “Equitable Title” p 1734.

be, “An implied or virtual conversion, which takes place where a person does such acts in reference to the goods of another as amount in law to the appropriation of the property to himself.”<sup>213</sup>

CONVERSION is an, “alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction...” While, RECONVERSION as a noun is a “change, change over, ... rebirth...”<sup>214</sup>

*Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. (John 3:3)*

The word legal originates in the idea of being connected to a legal system by contract. The connection is created by consent. What is to be legal becomes law by that consent and one of the essential ingredients of that consent is mutual consideration whether by application or indulgence. A person may waive certain rights naturally inherent in an individual and become obligated to abide by the administration of another authority. Covenants, contracts, compacts are of the same order.

*Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: (Exodus 34, 12.)*

“Quasi contracts are lawful and purely voluntary acts of a man, from which there results any obligation whatever to a third person, and sometimes a reciprocal obligation between the parties. Persons who have not contracted with each other are often regarded by Roman law, under a certain state of facts, as if they had actually concluded a convention between themselves. The legal relation which then takes place between these persons, which has always a similarity to a contract obligation, is therefore termed ‘obligatio quasi ex contractu.’ Such a relation arises from the conducting of affairs without authority, (negotiorum,) from the payment of what was not due, (solutio indebiti,) from tutorship and curatorship, and from taking possession of an inheritance. A ‘quasi contract’ is what was formerly known as the contract implied in law; it has no reference to the intentions or expressions of the parties. The obligation is imposed despite, and frequently in frustration of their intention. A ‘quasi or constructive contract’ rests upon the equitable principle that a person shall not be allowed to enrich himself unjustly at the expense of another, and is not in fact a contract, but an obligation, which the law creates in the absence of any agreement, when and because the acts of the parties or others have placed in the possession of one person money, or its equivalent, under such circumstance that in equity and good conscience he ought not to retain it. A ‘quasi’ or constructive contract is an application of law. An ‘implied’ contract is an implication of fact. In the former the contract is mere fiction, imposed in order to adapt the case to a given remedy. In the latter, the contract is a fact legitimately inferred. In one, the duty defines the contract; in the other, the contract defines the duty.”<sup>215</sup>

If you take what is not yours you have a constructive contract to repay or you are a thief. If you take something from someone that owes you nothing then you are creating an obligation to pay back. If you apply for benefits you bind yourself to reciprocating obligations. There is little, if anything, government gives without strings attached. These strings bind you on earth and in God’s eyes as well.

*And it was told the king of Egypt that the people fled: and the heart of Pharaoh and of his servants was turned against the people, and they said, Why have we done this, that we have let Israel go from serving us? (Ex 14:5)*

Were the Israelites slaves or servants? One subscribed to difference is that slavery is by compulsion and servitude is by agreement. In fact and law, servitude by consent is often the more binding.

**Those captured by pirates and robbers remain free.**<sup>216</sup>

The same could be said for land or any other property. If something is stolen has the ownership changed. But if something is sold, given away or abandoned the ownership is considered to have been transferred.

**Things captured by pirates and robbers do not change ownership.**<sup>217</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> Black’s 3rd p 430.

<sup>214</sup> LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition

<sup>215</sup> Blacks 3rd p 425.

<sup>216</sup> A pirates et latronibus capti libera permanent.Dig.49. 15. 19. 2.

<sup>217</sup> A piratis et latronibus capta dominium non mutant.1 Kent, Comm. 108, 184; 2 Wooddesen, Lect. 258,259.

There may be other distinction between a slave and a servant but the distinction is less important to the subject than the Master. The fact is the Israelites were not slaves in Egypt in the strictest sense of the word. Yet, their burden was just as if not more disagreeable and their chains were just as real.

“Slaves never became an important ingredient of Egyptian civilization. The large subject population and enforceable corvee’ system - by which serfs had to work temporarily as slaves - made a permanent force of slaves unnecessary.”<sup>218</sup>

**The man who gives me employment, which I must have or suffer, that man is my master, let me call him what I will.**<sup>219</sup>

Slavery in Rome, although accomplished often by conquest, was much like that system used in Egypt at the time of Moses. “The state of the slave varied. Some were impressed into gangs that worked the fields and mines. Others were highly skilled workers and trusted administrators. Frequently slaves were far better off than free laborers. Roman laws were passed to protect slaves and to allow rights, even of private possessions, which were sometimes used to ransom the slave and his family (Acts 22:27-28).”<sup>220</sup> “Other forms of servitude related to slavery, and sometimes indistinguishable from it, are serfdom, debt bondage, indentured service, peonage, and corvée (also called statute labor).”<sup>221</sup>

**“Are men the property of the state? Or are they free souls under God? This same battle continues throughout the world.”**<sup>222</sup>

“The corvée<sup>223</sup> was different from other forced labor arrangements because it was labor performed for the government, involuntarily, on large public works projects. (The word corvée meant ‘contribution,’ signifying one’s obligation to the state.) In some cases the corvée meant a specified amount of time given to the state every year, as prescribed by law. Another name for it was, therefore, statute labor. It was used by the Romans for the upkeep of roads, bridges, and dikes but got its name in France early in the 18th century.”<sup>224</sup>

**Servitude. A term which indicates the subjection of one person to another person, or of a person to a thing, or of a thing to a person, or of a thing to a thing. Bouvier’s 8th 1859**

We often hear an income tax obligation called a *contribution*. In Pharaoh’s Egypt in the days of their captivity the tribute tax paid by his subjects was equivalent to two and a half months, all the gold and silver was in the government treasury instead of the hands of the people and everyone only had a legal title to their land, their stock and their lives.<sup>225</sup> To pay off the average corvée tax liability in 1995 for employees in the United States required four months and five days. A citizen of the United States Government who has legal title to what appears to be his property (land, vehicles, labor etc.) has no right to its beneficial interest or use and therefore no right to the profits they produce.

*... and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it... and there thou shalt serve other gods,.. shalt thou find no ease... shalt have none assurance of thy life: (Deuteronomy 28:63, 66) How doth the city sit solitary, [that was] full of people! [how] is she become as a widow! she [that was] great among the nations, [and] princess among the provinces, [how] is she become tributary ! (La 1:1)*

<sup>218</sup> History of Slavery, Susan Everett

<sup>219</sup> Henry George - Social Problems, Ch. V.

<sup>220</sup> Slavery Collection Elwell Evangelical Dictionary

<sup>221</sup> SLAVERY AND SERFDOM Compton’s Encyclopedia.

<sup>222</sup> Cecil B. DeMille in “The Ten Commandments.”

<sup>223</sup> CORVEE’ In French Law. Gratuitous labor exacted from villages or communities, especially for repairing roads, constructing bridges, etc. Black’s 3rd p445. In Latin it would be covata from corrogare meaning “to gather by request”. Webster says it is an “obligation on the inhabitants of a district to perform services” or “forced labor exacted by government”. The Romans had a Corvee system in their provinces and eventually throughout the empire. The Jews opposed this because they had been taken out of Egypt and were to serve the Lord only. They were granted exemption because of the religious freedom clause of Roman law and specifically because they would not work on the Sabbath. Early Christians being “a viable republic in the heart of the Roman Empire” were also exempt. This encouraged laws that would make men criminals and then criminals were required to work in forced work gangs.

<sup>224</sup> SLAVERY AND SERFDOM Compton’s Encyclopedia

<sup>225</sup> Genesis 47:15,26.

Here tributary was translated from the Hebrew word “mac” (mas) meaning “gang/body of forced labourers, task-workers, labour band/gang, forced service, task-work, serfdom, tributary, tribute, levy, taskmasters, discomfited ... forced service, serfdom, tribute, enforced payment.”<sup>226</sup> “Of the twenty-three uses of this term, all but three (Isa 31:8; Lam1:1; Est 10:1) occur early in the literature. The institution of tribute or corvee<sup>227</sup> involves involuntary, unpaid labour or other service for superior power—a feudal lord, a king, or a foreign ruler (Ex 1:11; Est 10:1; Lam 1:1). in Gen. 49:15, Jacob’s blessing on Issachar identifies him as bowing to ‘tribute.’ In Egypt, the Israelites find themselves in that position (Ex 1:11). This unpopular measure, and Rehoboam’s refusal to moderate it, was the immediate cause of the secession of the ten tribes and the establishment of the northern kingdom.”<sup>228</sup>

*The same dealt subtilly with our kindred, and evil entreated our fathers, so that they cast out their young children, to the end they might not live. (Acts 7: 19)*

Have the American people been dealt with subtly? Does subtly mean fraud or does it mean, as it does with Arab camel dealers or western horse traders, that the rule of thumb is caveat emptor, let the buyer beware? The entire tax liability in the United States exceeds six months of labor yet many call it freedom.

**“Many a man thinks he is buying pleasure,  
when he is really selling himself a slave to it.” Ben Franklin.**

Has our deception been the result of their lies or our apathetic ignorance and/or our covetous appetite for the benefits, gratuities and grants?

“If men, through fear, fraud, or mistake, should in terms renounce or give up any natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right to freedom being a gift of ALMIGHTY GOD, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave.”<sup>229</sup> But a recompense may need to be paid and equity satisfied.

Was the fear created by your own cowardliness, avarice or lack of faith? Was their fraud do to lies or were you to ignorant, incompetent or lazy to find out what kind of a deal you were making? Now mistake is the most reasonable assumption. Yet, once the mistake is discovered it should be acted upon, otherwise, by your lack of renunciation consent is considered given.

*For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.*

*For having overcome the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, ‘The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.’ (II Peter 2, 18-22).*

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, August 14, 1935, TITLE VIII---TAXES WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT, INCOME TAX ON EMPLOYEES, SEC. 801. In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of wages (as defined in section 811)

Sec. 811. When used in this title... (b) The Term “employment” means any service, of whatever nature, performed within the United States by an employee for his employer except---<sup>230</sup>

---

<sup>226</sup> On line Bible & Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

<sup>227</sup> “I (i.e., the suffering servant) gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to them that ‘tore’ at my beard.” In connection with these passages we may note the use of the same verb to describe the condition of baldness (Lev 13, 4041) in the context of leprosy diagnosis. Ezekiel 29:18 says that the heads of the people of Tyre were “made bald” by Nebuchadnezzar. This does not mean he tore out their hair; rather, the baldness was the result of carrying loads on their heads as corvee labor gangs. From R. Laird Harris’ ‘Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament’

<sup>228</sup> From R. Laird Harris’ ‘Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament’

<sup>229</sup> Samuel Adams, 1772

<sup>230</sup> Employee. The term “employee” means an individual employed by an employer. With respect to employment in a foreign country: such term includes an individual who is a citizen of the United States. TITLE 42 § 12111.

**“The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits.”** <sup>231</sup>

*A man void of understanding striketh hands, [and] becometh surety .... Pr 17:18*

Did or does congress have the authority or power to establish a retirement scheme? Even with its formidable power to control interstate commerce the congress was never given the duty to become an insurance company for every ill that might fall the inhabitants of this land.

“The catalogue of means and actions which might be imposed upon an employer in any business, tending to the satisfaction and comfort of his employees, seems endless. Provision for free medical attendance and nursing, for clothing, for food, for housing, for the education of children, and a hundred other matters might with equal propriety be proposed as tending to relieve the employee of mental strain and worry. Can it fairly be said that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce extends to the prescription of any or all of these things? Is it not apparent that they are really and essentially related solely to the social welfare of the worker, and therefore remote from any regulation of commerce as such? We think the answer is plain. These matters obviously lie outside the orbit of congressional power.” <sup>232</sup>

If Congress did not have the power to establish an insurance system who wanted it?

“The President wanted everybody covered for every contingency in life---‘cradle to the grave,’ he called it---under the social insurance<sup>233</sup> system... But the Government of the United States is not an insurance company and so it could be done.”<sup>234</sup>

Neither the President nor the congress had the power to compel the free people of America to begin to labor without pay. They could not force the entire population into becoming tax collectors and surfs, taskmasters and statute laborers.

How could an entire nation be bound into slavery?

20 C.F.R. § 422.1(ii) Any person who wishes to file an application for an account number may do so by filing Form SS-5.<sup>235</sup>

*Not so: go now ye [that are] men, and serve the LORD; for that ye did desire. And they were driven out from Pharaoh’s presence. (Ex 10:11)*

20 C.F.R. § 422.103 (b) Applying for a number - (1) Form SS-5. An individual needing a social security number may apply for one by filing a signed form SS-5, “Application for A Social Security Number Card,” at any social security office and submitting the required evidence.<sup>236</sup>

*For thou, Lord, [art] good, and ready to forgive; and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon thee. Give ear, O LORD, unto my prayer; and attend to the voice of my supplications. In the day of my trouble I will call upon thee: for thou wilt answer me. (Psalms 86:5,7)*

Is it not the “Social Security Number” or “Employee Identification Number” or “Tax Identification Number,” being all one in the same, that is given as the sign of your eligibility for the benefit of legal employment, legal conversion? Whether you hand your card to your prospective licensed employer/taskmaster or simply give him your diligently memorized numerical identifier it is still that number that marks you for service. Your enforced payment or contribution will be collected before you even see it and you will toil without pay.

**“Art thou less a slave because thy master loves and caresses thee?” Pascal.**

There are many benefits you shall receive besides your wages. Banks shall welcome you, schools, public assistance, unemployment, workmen’s compensation, credit cards, of course social security, medical aid, government assistance, loans and grants and finally the deductibility of the children

---

<sup>231</sup> Plutarch, 2000 years ago.

<sup>232</sup> Railroad Retirement Board, supra, 295 U.S., at 368

<sup>233</sup> On page 936 through page 946 of the Ways and Means hearings the originator stated that the “sold as if it were insurance” was a mistake and should not have been published as such. So it wasn’t until 1953 did they pin the originator down that it is not insurance as published in 1936. To be like insurance is not being insurance.

<sup>234</sup> Forward by Frances Perkins Sec of Labor 1933-45 The Development of the Social Security Act by Edwin E. Witte, ppVII

<sup>235</sup> 20 C.F.R. § 422.1(ii) publ. at 11 F.R. 177A-568, Sept. 11, 1946.

<sup>236</sup> 20 C.F.R. § 422.103

entrusted to you. The list goes on under these new covenants and contracts offered the American people and the world. Who will repent and turn away from benefits and privileges, even though in fact he burdens his neighbor and creates an obligation by choosing to “enrich himself unjustly at the expense of another”?

*My son, if thou be surety for thy friend, [if] thou hast stricken thy hand with a stranger, with the words of thy mouth... How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard? when wilt thou arise out of thy sleep? [Yet] a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep: So shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth, and thy want as an armed man. (Proverbs 6:1,11)*

"In *Flemming v. Nestor*, decided in 1960, the Supreme Court ruled that Social Security is an umbrella term for two schemes that are legally unrelated. One is a taxation scheme, the other a welfare scheme. Workers and their families have no legal claim on the tax payments that they make into the U.S. Treasury or that are made on their behalf. Those funds are gone, commingled with the general assets of the U.S. government. This decision rested on a previous case, *Helvering v. Davis*, in which the Court ruled that Social Security was not an insurance program."<sup>237</sup>

You have a legal entitlement to work and the equitable title or true or lawful owner of your labor is another. You are given into a trust at the moment of your conversion. The trust in turn holds that ownership of your labor as a surety for the debts of the trust. Your sweat, labor and blood is incorporated.

**42 U.S.C. section 666**, reflects the amendments made by “The Welfare Reform Act of 1996” “§ 666(a) In order to satisfy section 654(20)(A) of this title, each State must have in effect laws requiring the use of the following... “(13) Procedures requiring that the social security number of - “(A) any applicant for a professional license, driver’s license, occupational license, or marriage license be recorded on the application...” etc., etc., etc...

The list goes on and on and on, 42 U.S.C. section 666 (Public Law 104-193) and “The Balanced Budget Act of 1997” (Public Law: 105-33). Additionally, a sister law, Public Law 104-208, contains information for National ID cards using State driver’s licenses.

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, a.k.a. Public Law 104-191 - 104th Congress, An Act, begins, “To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery, to promote the use of medical savings accounts, to improve access to long-term care services and coverage, to simplify the administration of health insurance, and for other purposes. (NOTE: Aug. 21, 1996 - (H.R. 3103))” So, what do they mean other purposes?

Way down at the bottom of this book size bill we find section 511 through 513 which provides for the forfeiture of property of anyone who losses his/her United States Citizenship (within the meaning of section 877 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986). “nonresident aliens individuals.”

Also, section 403 of H.R. 3103 will amend Title 42 US. Code section 405c(2)c(i) by changing the word “MAY” to the word “SHALL” which will require a SSN on all state or county (*a political subdivision*) documents. This will in affect nullify the Privacy Act as the local governments bow down to federal funding. H.R. 3130 also establishes a national “instant check” employee/employer database system. Employment is a privilege/benefit. No number, no work. Also county deeds, courts agencies as well as state licenses, permits and documents will no longer be available without the card in your hand or the number in your head for computer verification.

**Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still, Slavery! said I, still thou art a bitter draught<sup>238</sup>**

Why are forfeiture laws for a citizenship change found buried in an act about insurance?

How have we been so deceived to believe slavery is freedom and bondage is security?

“For 140 years this nation has tried to impose objectives downward from a lofty command center made up of ‘experts,’ a central elite of social engineers,... It hasn’t worked. It won’t work.... It doesn’t work because its fundamental premises are mechanical, anti-human, and hostile to family life. Lives can be

---

<sup>237</sup> *Helvering v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 619 (1937). Property Rights The Hidden Issue of Social Security Reform by Charles E. Rounds Jr.

<sup>238</sup> Laurence Sterne - Sentimental Journey. The Passport. The Hotel Paris.

controlled by machine education but they will always fight back with weapons of social pathology: drugs, violence, self-destruction, indifference, and the symptoms I see in the children I teach.”

“It destroys communities by relegating the training of children to the hands of certified experts - and by doing so it ensures our children cannot grow up fully human ...- becoming instead mindless automatons programmed by the state’s change agents. Rather than instilling in youngsters an appreciation for individual liberty, the system has brought to life the ancient pharaonic dream of Egypt: compulsory subordination for all.... Schools teach exactly what they are intended to teach and they do it well: how to be a good Egyptian and remain in your place in the pyramid.”<sup>239</sup>

*If a ruler hearken to lies, all his servants [are] wicked. (Pr 29:12)*

“The future of education, and of America as a free society, depends on the liberation of the American family from the grip of the public school... Regardless of motives, the people who foisted state education on us have committed a grave offense.... Using a variety of strategies, we must reclaim the right to raise our children and to help them educate themselves. In a fundamental sense, that is the American way.”<sup>240</sup>

*Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, (Ezekiel 39:25 )*

When the 1787 Constitution was ready to be submitted to the Governors of the states for ratification, Patrick Henry, the immortal voice for Liberty, lectured against it in the Virginia State House for three weeks, criticizing the Constitution, warning that it had been written “as if good men will take office!” He asked “what they would do when evil men took office!” “When evil men take office, the whole gang will be in collusion,” he declared, “and they will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambuscade!” He further warned that the new federal government had too much money and too much power and it would consolidate power unto itself, converting us “into one solid empire.” And the President with the treaty power would “lead in the treason.”

We like to believe that we live in a free country, not like the poor unfortunate citizens of the former Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic, a communist government within a republic. What is the key difference between the United States and mother Russia?

#### **A SUMMARY OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO**

1. Abolition of private property. [Legal title does not include the beneficial use of the property.]
2. Heavy progressive income tax. [An employee has only a legal title to his labor.]
3. Abolition to all rights of inheritance. [Inheritance tax on property with a legal title.]
4. Confiscation of property of all emigrants and rebels. [Forfeiture laws.]
5. A Central bank [Federal Reserve. The Bankers Bank.]
6. Government control of Communications and Transportation. [F.C.C., F.A.A. etc..]
7. Government ownership of factories and agriculture. [Corporations are entities of the State, forfeiture laws, executive orders and mere legal title.]
8. Government control of labor. [Social Security, income tax and incorporation.]
9. Corporate farms, regional planning. [Land planning, biospheres, endangered species, etc..]
10. Free education for all children in government controlled schools. [Public schools, 501c3 corporate private schools, controlled by federal regulations.]

**“Maybe we ought to see that every person who gets a tax return receives a copy of the Communist Manifesto with it so he can see what’s happening to him”<sup>241</sup>**

Has the ‘use’ of your labor been bought and sold like flesh on the slaver’s block? Have you become a surety to pay a debt? Have you returned to Egypt entered the Roman Empire, born again in the hearts of men, devoid of the wisdom of God? Is there more than one way that has brought you to the loss ‘use’ of your labor, your land and your loved ones?

USE n. 11. Law. That enjoyment of property that consists in its employment, occupation, exercise, or practice; specif., Roman and Civil Law, a personal servitude consisting in a jus intendi, or right to make use of a thing, as distinguished from the usufruct. The usuary had only a personal right that was limited by his own necessities or those of his family. He was not entitled to the use and profits of the subject of the use. ... advantage; benefit; profit; specif., the benefit or profit of lands and tenements the legal title to which is given to a person other than the one entitled to the occupation or use( in sense 11); a trust

<sup>239</sup> John Taylor Gatto told the New York State Senate in 1991 after being named that state’s Teacher of the Year.

<sup>240</sup> Sheldon Richman.

<sup>241</sup> T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of IRS, May 25, 1956 in U.S. News & World Report

of real estate. Deeds of land made to one person to, or for, the use of another." [see doctrine of the law of uses, Statute of Mortmain]<sup>242</sup>

*Also, the traveling merchants of the earth... , full stock of gold and silver and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen,... and all manner vessels... and iron, and marble, And cinnamon, ... and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots and slaves and human souls. (Rev.18:11,13.)*

Have you been manipulated into applying for conversion into servitude, to a mystery government of control, because of the lack of knowledge concerning words like use, employ and occupy? Have you been utilized, exploited, consecrated to a task? Have you been devoured, swallowed up, drained into a common vat of labor. Are you a human resource? And if you are in the service of another, then who is that mysterious master of this legal tower of babble? What doctrines and ordinances does he propagate?

mystery ... 677. USE 1. n. use, employment, employ; exercise, ... application... administration service... usufruct, enjoyment of property, right of using, user [all Law]; consumption ... usefulness, benefit etc. 644. 3. n. utilization, conversion to use, employment, employing etc. v. 4. n. user, employer... profit by, exploit, turn to account, convert to one's service, convert or turn to use... press or enlist into service... call or draw forth. dispose of, assign to a use, dedicate, devote, consecrate; task, tax, put to task;... reap the benefits of. 6. v. use up, devour, swallow up... drain of resources.<sup>243</sup>

Just to get the benefit of a passport allegiance now required and presumed.

"No passport shall be granted or issued to or verified for any other persons than those owing allegiance, whether citizens or not, to the United States." 22 U.S.C., Section 212. Persons entitled to passport

Title 8, CFR PART 337 establishes what the Allegiance to the United States is. You are bound under the agreement that states under oath, affirmation or by application and deed that, "I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen".

Jesus Christ preached a kingdom, was called a Savior or Soter in the Greek which means ruler. Even Christ means anointed, as in anointed King like David. He was the "highest Son of David. Are you denouncing Christ by such allegiance. Early Christians thought so and died for their refusal.

This allegiance goes on to say "that I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God." This allegiance requires that you must submit to laboring for the government under the direction of civilian taskmasters. Have we agreed to bow down and serve these other masters?

Is there another way to do things?

What is the song of Moses? What is the song of the Lamb? Is our sin the fact that we serve another god other than the God, our Father, who created us? Is our sin the sin of Cain, Nimrod and Core? Or is our error merely a lack of knowledge? Is not all sin a lack of the knowledge of God? To know God is to have a relationship with God. Are those who say they believe in God, trust in God, pray and serve God alone really just taking His name in vain while their true faith is in the governments they create with their own hands? Are we covenanting, contracting and binding ourselves to strangers?

*And I saw... them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, [and] over the number of his name... And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb...(Rev.15:2,3)*

Do you know the song of Moses and the Song of the Lamb? Have you taught it to your children? Do you sing it in your Churches and in your lives?

---

<sup>242</sup> LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition

<sup>243</sup> Roget's International Thesaurus