



The Covenants of the gods

The book [*The Covenants of the gods*](#) is an iconoclastic explication that shatters the delusions of a deceived world. **History, law** and the **Bible** are melded together in a unique eye opening exegesis that answers the burning question that has haunted men since the beginning of time.

Here are descriptions of the contents of each chapters.
It is recommended that you study them in order.

[**Holy Matrimony vs. Marriage**](#) discusses the difference between Holy Matrimony, an Ecclesiastical ceremony with no legal significance, and that legally binding covenant with the state called Marriage that is in opposition to the God given relationship of man and woman as Husband and Wife.

[**Law vs. Legal**](#) touches on some of the fundamental opposing principles of these two different sources of righteous authority, bondage and jurisdiction in past and present established societies.

[**Citizen vs. Citizen**](#) discusses at least two distinct and different types of citizenship in America today.

[**Employ vs. Enslave**](#) explains the fundamental differences between man's inalienable right to the sweat of his brow granted him by his Creator and his legal right to labor for another master, ruler or god.

[**God vs. Government**](#) speaks of the principle conflict between God's way and man's foolishness.

Heaven vs. Heaven discusses the nature of God's Kingdom in Heaven and on Earth.

Republic vs. Democracy talks of the differences between these dissimilar and opposing forms of government.

Democracy vs. Demagogue touches on the fallacies, foolishness and dangers of democracy.

The System vs. The System references the system established by man in opposition to the system established by God the Father.

Conversion vs. Reconversion discusses the significance of equitable conversion, being born again, in reference to land and labor and living in God's Kingdom.

Money vs. Mammon references the fallacies and foolishness and the fiat character of the present money systems as well as its origins and nature and why it has delivered you into destitution and bondage.

Trust vs. Faith expresses the importance of faith in The LORD God and the traps, seductions and dangers of trusting in lesser gods.

Deported vs. Departed references excommunication from the world systems and why it has been desired throughout history even unto this day.

The Charagma vs. The Card touches on the concepts of the beast and the image of the beast as well as the so called mark of the beast as it was used then and now. [What is the mark and why you have it].

The Body of Christ Vs. The Body of the State looks at the Church, the State established by Jesus the Christ, manditorially exempt from the control of man's government and churches established under the State with strict operational restrictions.

This information was condensed from [the book Covenants of the gods](#).

Information about Setting a record that you are married at [Holy Matrimony](#)

Establishing a [Church](#)

Holy Matrimony
(by the authority of God.)

vs.

MARRIAGE
(by the authority of the State.)



There are many ways in which a legal system increases its limited authority, but it is most complete through the consent of the individual. In China, they have “the one child contract.” If you sign it, you will become eligible for many of the benefits offered by the government, such as free medical care, schooling, and better paying jobs. If later the mother becomes pregnant and refuses to abort the child, the family becomes responsible for paying for all the expense of the second child, paying back all the benefits they received for the first child, and often suffer the loss of their present employed position and pay scale. In America, the pressure to abort a child is often much more subtle.

“The same dealt subtly with our kindred, and evil entreated our fathers, so that they cast out their young children [fetus],¹ to the end they might not live.”² (Acts 7:19)

If children survive the financial and social pressure to be aborted, they must still overcome the strain of the mental, spiritual, and contractual pressures society shall place upon them.

Unfortunately, society as a whole is continuously degrading the family as a unit, even though the family is the foundation from which the society is built.

“If we want better people to make a better world, then we will have to begin where people are made in the family.”³

Economic pressures may burden and exhaust the parents. Social Security often removes the grandparents from the family unit. School systems distance the parents from the mental development of the children as they are molded outside the family unit. The media and socially applied peer pressures add their own unique and varied distortions to the child’s development.

“When the foundation fails all fails.”⁴

The few parents, who feel compelled to protect their children from exposure to these pressures or simply feel a sense of responsibility to raise their children directly, often find their way blocked by a legal system that seems to be usurping the authority of the parents by assuming custody of children in the name of “The Law”. Yet, is it usurpation or have we unwittingly waived custody of our children by some previous legal contract or consensual agreement?

In Bouvier’s definition of law we find stated that:

“3. An analysis of the science of law presents a view, first, of the rights of persons, distinguishing them as natural persons and artificial person, or body politic or corporations. These rights are deemed either absolute, as relating to the enjoyment of personal security, liberty, and of private property or, on the other hand, as relative, - that is, arising out of the relation in which several persons stand. These relations are either, first, public or political, viz.: the relation of magistrate and people; or, second, are private, as the relations of master and servant, husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, to which might be added relations arising out private contracts, such as partnerships, principal and agent, and the like.”

“8. Law, as distinguished from equity, denotes the doctrine and the procedure of the common law of England and America, from which equity is a departure. In

respect to the ground of the authority of law, it is divided as natural law, or the law of nature or of God, and positive law.”⁵

“The union of a man and a woman is of the law of nature.”⁶

By these definitions and maxims, we see that the union of a man and woman is a relative, yet, private and natural relationship; and, as a natural relationship, is subject to “natural law,” natural law being “divine will... in contradistinction to positive law,” positive law being that law “established, under human sanctions.” The natural relation of Husband and Wife and its products, such as children, should be relatively free of any interference by others, and so it should be, for “Matrimony ought to be free.”⁷

“The laws of nature are unchangeable.”⁸

The word, “marriage, as distinguished from the agreement to marry and from the act of becoming married.” It “is the civil status of one man and one woman united in law for the discharge to each other and the community of duties legally incumbent on those whose association is found on the distinction of sex.”⁹

First, it is clear that marriage is distinguished, essentially different, from both the “agreement to marry” and the “act of becoming married.” Secondly, marriage is a civil status. “Civil” is a word used in “contradistinction to *military, ecclesiastical, natural, or foreign*; thus, we speak of a civil station, as opposed to ... an ecclesiastical station”¹⁰ It also explains that the obligations of the man and woman are not merely to each other, but also to the “community”, and that these civil duties are “legally incumbent.” An “incumbent” is then defined as, “A person who is in present possession of an office; one who is legally authorized to discharge the duties of an office.”¹¹ The words “**person**” and “**individual**” are not synonymous. “Person” being defined as, “a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the right to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes.”¹² The word “individual” in the book “Language,” found in the Volume Library, is treated as a word “frequently misused” and clarifies its meaning with the statement, “The word (individual) should not be used in the mere sense of person. The word is correctly used in ‘Changes both in individuals and communities.’”

“Every person is a man, but not every man a person,”¹³

A person, by definition, is legally bound and connected to the community, while the individual seems to be equal to, or on a separate footing, from the community.

The individual is apparently not obligated to the bureaucratic administration in the same degree as those in the legal community. The administrative system has coined the phrase “an *individual* person” or “*natural* person.” As usual, their attempt to alleviate confusion seems to have done more to add to the chaos.

“Man is a term of nature; person, of the civil law”¹⁴

Today’s Relationship of Marriage is neither natural, remembering that the law of nature is “divine will,” nor is it ecclesiastical, which is “distinguished from ‘civil’ or ‘secular,’”¹⁵ but it is civil.

As spoken of earlier in Bouvier’s, the “private” relationships of “husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward” are not the same as the “*legal*” relationship granted by a Marriage license, which is clearly “public”, such as “the relation of the magistrate and people.”

“The laws of nature are most perfect and immutable; but the condition of human law is an unending succession, and there is nothing in it which can continue perpetually.

Human laws are born, live, and die.”¹⁶

A “Marriage license” is “A license or permission granted by public authority to persons who intend to intermarry,... By statute it is made an essential prerequisite to the lawful solemnization of the marriage”¹⁷, as opposed to ecclesiastical solemnization.

It should be becoming clear that there are at least two types of marriages and, therefore, at least two types of husband-and-wife relationships.

*****“Marriage is a civil contract to which there are three parties - the husband, the wife and the state.”¹⁸*****

“Marriage is often referred to as a civil contract, but the emphasis in such a reference is not on the word ‘contract’ but upon the word ‘civil’ as distinguished from ecclesiastical; since there is religious freedom in this country a religious ceremony, and rules of ecclesiastical organizations with regard to marriage have no legal significance.

Though mutual assent is necessary to enter into a marriage the marriage itself is a status or relationship rather than a contract, the rights and obligations of the parties

thereto being fixed by the law instead of by the parties themselves. Hence marriages are not within the provision of the United States Constitution forbidding a state to impair the obligation of contracts.”¹⁹

In the first paragraph, we see again that at least one type of marriage is “civil” or “public”, as distinguished from another, which may be “private,” “ecclesiastical,” or “natural.” Ecclesiastical organizations have “no legal significance” and, therefore, no civil effect.

This statement made by Clark sets a distinct division between religious freedom and the absence of it. On the one side, he mentions religious freedom in relation to ecclesiastical marriage, but it seems a simple step to realize the reciprocal conclusion. If the ecclesiastical authority to marry has no influence in the realm of legal marriages, then a legal marriage would then have no influence in the realm of ecclesiastical matrimony. This principle applies also to the marriage between the legal churches and the state and the state which established it. The legal church is not operating under the religious freedom aspect of Law in America.

Religious freedom means freedom from dominion over religious practices, which should include the law established by religious belief, as well as rituals, ceremonies, and customs. Religious practices are not merely incantations, sprinkling of water, and smoky rituals. Religious practices includes almost every aspect of life itself.

However, a marriage performed by an “ecclesiastical organization” should not be confused with a marriage performed by today’s churches, which are incorporated entities²⁰ of the state, performing civil marriages as state agents. In most cases, churches will not marry any couple who has not obtained permission to marry, through the purchase of a license from the state, prior to the ceremony. Almost all marriages performed in these churches are performed by the authority vested in those churches and ministers by the state in which they have agreed to act as an agent. This makes the minister an officer of the state carrying out the official duties of that state. Those marriages are not ecclesiastical because they do have *legal significance*.

The word “**Church**” in the New Testament is translated from the Greek word “ekklesia”, which comes from two words “ek”, meaning “out” and “kaleo”, meaning “to call”. Today’s incorporated churches are not marrying couples ecclesiastically, but are calling their people into an unequal civil relationship with the state.

Clark states that this *civil marriage* contract is a “mutual assent.” As is the case with all contracts, there must be mutual consent and valid consideration. In a natural joining of a man and a woman as Husband and Wife, there is a mutual consent and consideration, but if one or both are **persons** and have a “legal status” and are obligated to another, then there cannot be a valid consideration without the permission of the one to whom the party is subject.

In old English law, “Marriage is used in the sense of ‘maritagium,’ (qv) or the feudal right enjoyed by the lord or guardian in chivalry of disposing of his ward in marriage.”²¹ This is also, in principal, how the word is used today. To clarify this relationship of ‘lord and ward’, we may consider Clark’s statement, “the rights and obligations of the parties thereto being fixed by law instead of by the parties themselves,” to show that it is the third party, known as the state, that has the right to fix the extent of the privileges and duties by law, which is a larger position to hold in that three-party relationship. The word “law” here refers to the legal system which has already obtained, or at least assumed that it has obtained, a jurisdictional authority over the parties by their consent, either before their application for license (permission) or at the time of its public solemnization.

Marriage is also defined as that which “signifies the act, ceremony or formal proceeding by which persons take each other for husband and wife.”²² Note the use of the word “persons” and the lack of capitalization of the words “Husband and Wife.” In the same law dictionary, the word “for” is defined as “instead of” or “in place of.”²³ So, the legal status of marriage by civil authority is where you take each other, assenting into a civil relationship with the state, not as Husband and Wife, but “instead of” Husband and Wife, or in other words, “for” husband and wife, and children, who become wards of the state.

“Wife and son are names of nature.”²⁴

In 1906, the Supreme Court of Nebraska stated that: “It (marriage) differs from all other contracts²⁵ in its far-reaching consequences to the body politic itself, and for that reason, in dealing with it or the status resulting therefrom, the state never stands indifferent, but is always a party whose interest must be taken into account.”²⁶

*****“Each child belongs to the state.”²⁷*****

The state can and will always consider itself a party in a civil marriage performed by its officers in accordance with the duties and obligations imposed by the permitting authority, but it has no jurisdictional authority over the natural

matrimony by “divine will” between two free and natural individuals. It is the previous connecting contractual commitments to the legal society that binds a person’s obedience to the commands of that legal society.

Note that a “common law marriage” is simply when the state assumes and recognizes what did appear, at first, to be a “Husband and Wife” relationship At Law, which becomes, in fact, a solemnized civil marriage of ‘husband and wife’ and ‘state’ in equity.

“A wife is not her own mistress, but is under the power of her husband.”²⁸

According to the natural law and the common law, “All things which are the wife’s belong to the husband.”²⁹ Not because of any misguided assumption that she is inferior, but because she is one with her husband. It is understood in the natural law that the “Husband and Wife are considered one person in law.”³⁰ Even in the definition of Husband and Wife, it is called, “One of the great domestic relationships.” That relationship, “being that of a man and a woman lawfully joined in marriage, by which, at common law, the legal existence of the wife is incorporated with that of her husband.”³¹ In other words, it is a lawful joining of the woman’s status to the man.

“And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.” (Mr. 10:8.)

This authority that a man holds at law over his wife is not a problem to a good woman, as long as the husband truly loves, honors, and cherishes her, and she is as willing to humble herself to his will as he is willing to humble himself to God’s divine will. As with all contracts, there must be mutual assent and valid consideration.

“Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.... Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;” (Ephesians 5:22, 25)

Despite the fact that the husband is to have custody of his children by God’s law, the individual state governments and bureaucracies are constantly claiming regulatory right and custody. Are these claims of the state usurpation without any basis in law, or is there an aspect to the relationship of a husband and wife that is shared by the state? Blackstones opinion saw the women more under the authority of her husband than the state:

"By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law: that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs every thing; and is therefore called ... a feme-covert...."³²

A feme covert may not have had legal rights and obligations distinct from those of her husband in most respects because her existence was incorporated into that of her Husband as a Wife. She did not lose her identity as much as, with her Husband, she became an intricate part of a divine corporation of God.

"And he lifted up his eyes, and saw the women and the children; and said, Who [are] those with thee? And he said, The children which God hath graciously given thy servant." (Ge. 33:5)

Before the Brits became subjects of kings, as it was in Israel, the Husband of a house was king and his Wife sat upon that throne as queen. The products of their union fell under their dominion and no other but God. But today the women and the wife has become a member of a new larger family. This new family, with a new "father", steadily incorporated her existence into the State.

"The statutory word 'person' did not in these circumstances include women."
British voting rights case, 1909.

It was the custom that, if a man and a woman were married as Husband and Wife, then the Husband had custody of the children and held the Wife's right to contract in a domestic trust.³³ The common law also agrees with the natural law, for "at the common law the father had an almost absolute right to the custody of his children."³⁴ A child could be manumitted from this bond in ancient times by Novation,³⁵ Tutor, and Qurban.

"So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church:" (Ephesians 5: 28, 29)

When a daughter wished to marry, she would obtain her father's permission and he, in turn, gave her in marriage. The son would also gain permission from his father if he wished to continue to take his father's name as his own. If the husband and wife are wards of the state, then their children must obtain permission to marry from their parent's master, unless they become adopted by a *father* who is not subject to the jurisdiction of their parent's master. In this there is a great *mystery*.

Why do men of the United States Government think that “Fundamental, Bible believing people do not have the right to indoctrinate their children in their religious beliefs, because we, the state, are preparing them for the year 2000, when America will be part of a one-world global society and their children will not fit in.”³⁶ When men like Daniel Webster believed that “All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible.” Then, “If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering, but if we neglect its instruction and authority, no man can tell how soon a catastrophe may overcome us, and bury all our glory in profound obscurity.” Even Roosevelt said, “I hope that you have reread the Constitution of the United States. Like the Bible, it ought to be read again and again.”³⁷

Who is the father from whom permission should be obtained? By and under whose authority should a man and woman be joined together in the ceremony of Holy Matrimony?

“And what concord hath the Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that beleiveth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God: as God hath said, I will dwell in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”

“Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean (thing); and I will receive you. And I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.” (II Corinthian 6:15-18)

It is, more often than not, the remedy and will of the public magistrates³⁸ that husbands and wives under their jurisdiction divorce. It is the magistrate that decides the fate of the children in his custody, in contradistinction to the law of nature and the common law.

“Jesus said, ...For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” (Mr. 10:5,9)

The implications of all this can seem to create confusion. We should see that neither a bride nor groom can obtain clear permission³⁹ to marry from a father who has assented to the same restrictive legal civil status that they are trying to avoid.

And the state, by its very nature, cannot offer permission to the God-fearing couple to marry as a Natural Husband and Wife. These problems can seem to compound as we discover that no minister or priest is available to conduct a purely ecclesiastical ceremony, which would exclude the state and its authoritarian and bureaucratic legal controls.

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?” (II Corinthian 6:14)

Why should we give authority to the state over that which God has ordained? If we have faith in the Lord’s blessing and authority, why do we also ask for the government’s blessing and authority?

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.” (Romans 13:1)

This is probably one of the most frequently misused quotes from the King James Bible. The word “power” in the Greek is also translated “liberty” and “right”⁴⁰. In fact, the word *exousia*⁴¹ is the strongest word in the Greek language for liberty, surpassing the Greek *eleutheria* in its declaration of individual liberty.⁴² If there is no *power* or liberty but of God and it is He that ordains the powers or rights of men, then when men grant their right of choice to other men they are rejecting God. Even Aristotle exemplifies the meaning of the word *exousia* as, "The right (exousia) to do anything one wishes..."⁴³

If other men have our right to choose then we are not freemen under God, but under the authority of other men. Did God give us our rights so that we may give them away to others? What criteria does God use to establish the “higher powers”?

Are we subject to a higher power or are we making the state a higher power by applying for and obtaining a marriage license? If matrimony, through the Law of Nature and the Common Law of the Land, is the domain of God and our children are His gifts, then why would we turn our family and ourselves over to the civil authority of the State? Is that not like rendering unto Caesar the things that are God’s?

*****The Bible mentions the word “covenant” over 300 times. It tells us many stories of the binding of man to man and man to God. It is made very clear that God requires the fulfillment of our agreements and compliance with our words.**

Jesus has told us to let our yes be yes and our no be no (Matt 5:37). Does he want us to enter into covenants, even quasi-covenants, with those who do not follow the spirit of God and His Laws?

Why should we ask another for permission to do that which God has ordained?

“For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are sons of God. For you have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.” (Ro.8:14.)

Does God want us to give custody of our children to the State? Does He want you to put your Husband and Wife relationship under the authority of a system that prefers and compels divorce as the most common solution to marital strife?

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.” (Ro 13:8)

If God has given us the Holy Relationship of Matrimony, He therefore has dominion and authority over that relationship. Why should we render unto the state a legal authority over that relationship which rightfully belongs to God? The state only requires you to get a license to become bound and protected by the State.

“Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” (Mt 22:21; Mr 12:17 ; Lu 20:25)

If you are married in Florida, England, or Kuwait, you are considered married in Oregon and everywhere else in the world, so why is not the Kingdom of God acceptable? In fact, it is. An ecclesiastical marriage is a lawful marriage that offers no equitable or legal benefits, obligations, nor jurisdiction.

It would seem that in this life we may choose in many ways who we would have over us. Is the choice not ours? And what choice should we make? Who should be the *ruling judge* of our marriage?

“Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king.” (John18:37)

If we have been joined together in the name of God and by His authority, then why must we call on any other name or authority?

“Those who educate are more to be honored than those who bear the children. The latter give them only life; the former teach them the art of living.”⁴⁴

Should you call upon another just to gain the financial and worldly benefits of a legal marriage?

And it shall come to pass, [that] whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. (Ac 2:21)

Should we turn over the custody of the children that the LORD God has given us to a civil authority that does not follow Christ?

“What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” (Matthew 19:6).

Are there other ways that we are going under authorities of men by making covenants?

“And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that [were] round about them, [concerning] whom the LORD had charged them, that they should not do like them.” (2Ki 17:15)

Have we returned to the bondage of Egypt and the covenants of Rome and the spirit of Babylon? And if we have entered into covenants with strange gods, can we return to the LORD God?

“But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God: I [am] the LORD.” (Le 26:45)

Footnotes:

¹Strong’s No. 1025 brephos {bref’-os} of uncertain affin.; n n AV - babe (5) - child (1) - infant (1) - young child (1) [8]1a) an unborn child, embryo, a fetus 1b) a new-born child, an infant, a babe

²Strong’s No. 2225 zoogoneo {dzo-og-on-eh’-o} from the same as 2226 and a derivative of 1096; vb AV - preserve (1) - live (1) [2]1) to bring forth alive 2) to give life 3) to preserve alive

[3](#)Braud's 2nd Enc. by J.M Braud.

[4](#)Maxims of Law from 1856 Bouvier's Law Dictionary

[5](#)Bouvier's vol II.

[6](#)Conjunctio mariti et femina est de jure naturæ.

[7](#)Matrimonia debent esse libra. Halkers, Max. 86; 2 Kent, Comm. 102.

[8](#)Jura naturæ sunt immutabilia. Branch, Princ.; Oliver Forms, 56.

[9](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 1163.

[10](#)Civil. Black's 3rd ed. p.331.

[11](#)State v McCollister, 11 Ohio, 50; State v. Blackmore, 104 Mo. 340, 15 S.W. 960. Black's 3rd Ed. p.947.

[12](#)Black's 3rd. Ed. p. 1355.

[13](#)Omnis persona est homo, sed non vicissim.

[14](#)Homo vocabulum est; persona juris civilitis. Calvinus, Lex.

[15](#)Ecclesiastical. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 640.

[16](#)Leges naturæ perfectissimæ sunt et immutaviles; humani vero juris conditio semper in infinitum decurrit, et nihil est in eo quod perpetuo stare possit. Leges humanæ nascuntur, vivunt, moriuntur.⁷ Coke, 25.

[17](#)Black's 5th Ed.

[18](#)Van Koten v. Van Koten. 154 N.E. 146.

[19](#)Clark's Summary of American Law. Chapt I §2. The marriage status or relationship. pp. 140.

[20](#)Incorporation...the formation of a legal or political body... In civil law. The union of one domain to another. Black's 3rd p. 946. And what concord hath Christ with Belial?...2Co 6:15

[21](#)Black's 3rd. Ed. p. 1164.

[22](#)Black's 3rd. Ed. p. 1164.

[23](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 795.

[24](#)Uxor et filius sunt nomina naturæ. 4 Broom, Works. 350.

[25](#)Sample bill passed in order to comply with US Code 42, Section 666. “Bill 532 1997/6/10 Part I Documents Requiring Social Security Numbers for Use in Child Support Enforcement SEC. 4.- “Section 20-1-220. No marriage license may be issued unless a written application shall have been filed with the probate judge, or in Darlington and Georgetown Counties the clerk of court who issues the license, at least twenty-four hours before its issuance. The application must be signed by both of the contracting parties and shall contain the same information as required for the issuing of the license including the social security numbers of the contracting parties.” As a consequence, In South Carolina, a couple cannot (“contract to”) get married without supplying a Social Security number.

[26](#)Willits v. Willits, 107 N.W.379,380.

[27](#)William H. Seawell, professor of education at the University of Virginia

[28](#)Uxor non est sui Juris, sed sub potestate viri. Coke, 3d Inst. 108.

[29](#)Omnia quæ sunt uxoris sunt ipsius viri. Coke, Litt. 299.

[30](#)Vir et uxor consentur in lege una persona. Coke, Litt. 112; Jenk. Cent. Cas. 27.

[31](#)Black’s 3rd.Ed.p.910.

[32](#) Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England

[33](#)In law he may also have custody of his domestic servants.

[34](#)Clark’s Summary of American Law, Domestic Relations and Persons Chapt.IV, Sec. 26.

[35](#)“the remodeling of an old obligation.” Webster’s Dictionary

[36](#)Peter Hoagland, Nebraska State Senator and Humanist said in 1983:

[37](#)Franklin Delano Roosevelt March 9,1937. Document of American History by Commager.

[38](#)The New Testament word *God* is translated from the Greek word *theos* which figuratively means “a magistrate” or literally *judge* or *ruling judge*.

[39](#)That which bars those who have contracted will bar their successors also. Quod ipsis, qui contraxerunt, abstat; et successoribus eorum obstat. Dig. 50.17.29.

[40](#) Strong’s No. 1849 exousia, exousia from 1832 (in the sense of ability); also translated right (Hebrews 13:10, Revelation 22:14) and liberty (1 Corinthians 8:9) and defined 1) power of choice, liberty of doing as one pleases.

[41](#)“The Greek Glossary of Aristotelian Terms” defines exousia as "right" specifically of the citizen from which all power to govern comes. See Aristotle's Political Theory, First published Jul 1, 1998; substantive revision Jul 19, 2002. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

[42](#)Bryn Mawr's Classical Review states, "Enomaos maintained that we are absolutely masters of the most necessary things (52-53). Brancacci notices that the term used by Enomaos to refer to human freedom is not the typical Cynic one (eleutheria), but exousia, which expresses 'the new concept of freedom in opposition to the already defunct and unhelpful eleutheria'."

[43](#)Lawmakers and Ordinary People in Aristotle, by Paul Bullen (1996, VI. 4.1318b38-1319a4)

[44](#)- Carolyn Warner, former Superintendent of Public Instruction in Arizona

Law
(The legal system of God)
VS.
LEGAL
(The lawful system of man)



To investigate is the way to know what things are really lawful.¹

“Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what only appears to be a law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance.”²

In the above statement, the Supreme Court talks of “what only appears to be law” “on the surface.” Of what are we so ignorant that we would mistake something for law that is not law? We have grown up hearing phrases like, “The law is the law,” and “Ignorance of the law is no excuse.” What is law and what makes something law?

Since, “The origin of a thing ought to be inquired into,”³ then it would follow that we should look into the origin of the word “law” to give us some idea of its meaning today.

Unlike many of the terms used in the legal system of the United States, the word “law” does not come from the Latin, but from the Anglo-Saxon word *lagu* and the Middle English *lawe*, *laghe* meaning “just, right and fair”. In Latin, “law” would be translated *jus (juris)*, from which we take the word “justice”. The Romans had another word, *lex (legis)*, from which we get the word “legal”, meaning “statute, bill, principle, rule; contract, condition...” What is legal (connected by contract) becomes lawful (just) by consent.

A legal system based upon freedom has no lawful power to “command” until an individual binds himself to it “for *lex* (law) is derived from *ligare* (to bind), because it binds one to act.”⁴

“All government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery!”⁵

If the Romans, from whom we take much of the principles upon which the present legal system relies, saw fit and necessary to use two separate and distinct words, one *lex* and the other *jus*, then why do we often use them interchangeably. It is in the distinction between these two words that much of our honest confusion lies.

While, “The law (*jus*) is the rule of right; and whatever is contrary to the rule of right is an injury,”⁶ we find that “human laws (*lex, leges*) are born, live, and die.”⁷ “That which bars those who have contracted will bar their successors also.”⁸ Therefore, “The contract makes the law”⁹ for our children, as well as for ourselves.

“We shall have world government whether or not we like it.

The question is, whether world government will be achieved by conquest or consent.”¹⁰

In the maxim “Consent makes the law,” it is evident that it is our authorization that makes a man-made rule, such as a statute, into a law. It is not the arbitrary proclamation of a remote group of men, be it parliament or congress, that binds men to obedience and subjection. Could this mean that a person can simply disregard all legislation against which he himself arbitrarily disagrees for one reason or another? No, can only be the answer, or else all government would be anarchy.

“A contract is law between the parties having received their consent.”¹¹

How does government receive consent? When does an act of consent truly become binding? “In every contract, whether nominate or innominate, there is implied an exchange, i.e. a consideration.”¹² Nodding the head, raising your right hand, or signing a piece of paper are all evidences that you have given consent, but the taking of “sufficient consideration” is an act that adds force and authority to consent; for either you have consented to an exchange of consideration or you are a thief. A contract is “an agreement, upon sufficient consideration, to do or not to do a particular thing.”¹³ What is a benefit but consideration.

“Nothing is so contrary to consent as force and fear.”¹⁴

There are countless ways in which the state works its craft of expanding its power and presence in the world, and one way is by consent. It should be realized that, even though coercion through force and fear are often used, the only real binding and lawful consent is voluntary.

“What is mine cannot be taken away without consent.”¹⁵

If it is consent that makes the legal system a lawful system, then it is at the point of our consent that we become bound to obey a legal rule. It does not matter that those legal rules are changed regularly, as long as those rules are changed in accordance with the system that was set down at the origin of the legal system and the individual’s assent. All this, despite the fact that consent maybe acquired by appealing to the slothful greed and coveting selfishness of the individual.

“The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute.” (Pr 12:24)

“The laws of England are threefold: common law, customs, and decrees of parliament.”¹⁶ There was law in England long before a parliament was convened. Then, “new states of facts arising out of changed economic and social conditions” brought the desire for, if not a need for, a strong central government.

If “Pacta sunt servanda.”¹⁷ then “Non Pacta, non servanda”

“Before the Norman conquest of England in 1066 the people were the fountainhead of justice. The Anglo-Saxon courts of those days were composed of large numbers of freemen and the law which they administered, was that which had been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation. In

competition with these non professional courts the Norman king, who insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice, set up his own tribunals. The judges who presided over these royal courts were agents or representatives of the king, not of the people; but they were professional lawyers who devoted most of their time and energy to the administration of justice, and the courts over which they presided were so efficient that they gradually all but displaced the popular, nonprofessional courts.”¹⁸

“But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD.” (1 Samuel 8:6)

William of Normandy came to England to collect a disputed debt owed to him by Harold. He did not conquer and seize all of England, but only Harold and his properties, duties, and obligations (and those hereditaments of the freemen who had fought along side Harold in his attempt to avoid payment to William). Also, from his assumed position, William “insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice” and began to consolidate and expand his position and authority by waging war against all who opposed his claim to Harold’s limited kingly dominion.¹⁹ Many changes were brought about as a result of William's strong presence. He opened the door to customs and forms of law that had no foothold in the land of the Anglos since the fall of the Roman Empire. He instituted a survey of all the land that fell under his sword by right of trial by conquest. This was done for the purpose of collecting an excise or tribute tax on the land of those defeated landowners who were then forced to take an oath of fealty and bind their allegiance and lands to William. The people of England called the book that included these subject lands the “Doomsday Book” and it is still called that to this day.

“Wherefore say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Ye eat with the blood, and lift up your eyes toward your idols, and shed blood: and shall ye possess the land?” (Ezekiel 33:25)

With this growing loss of freehold titles in land, the “large numbers of freemen”, who were so necessary for the administration of the Common Law of Land, were no longer available.

Ye stand upon your sword, ye work abomination, and ye defile every one his neighbour’s wife: and shall ye possess the land? (Ezekiel 33:26)

A legal title is not a freehold, lawful, or a fee simple title. Were the remaining freehold titles in land lost by conquest or by other means?

“Towns and boroughs act as if persons.”²⁰

Many followed William, establishing the concepts of towns and cities, which had been traditionally shunned by the Anglos, along with other customs of business, and a loyalty to their homeland that opened a freer avenue for the establishment of commerce.

“...they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top [may reach] unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. (Ge. 11:4)

And as for the people, he removed them to cities from [one] end of the borders of Egypt even to the end thereof.” (Ge. 47:21)

The law of the Anglo-Saxons still remained intact, but not for those who fell subject to William and his successors. The two systems lived side by side in a manner similar to the two jurisdictional systems of law used in the Roman Empire following their own Roman civil war.

The “common law” is “distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures,” and it “comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity...” And “as concerns its force and authority in the United States, the phrase designates that portion of the common law of England which had been adopted and was in force here at the time of the Revolution”²¹

“Liberi. In Saxon Law - Freeman; the possessors of allodial lands.”²²

The common law is dependent upon “large numbers of freemen” who can decide both fact and law, as distinguished from the jurors of the United States today, who have lost their allodial land through neglect and ignorance. Today’s jurors as U.S. citizens are subject to the *administration of government*. They are almost always sworn to abide by the decrees of the legislature before they take to their seat as jurors, which allows them to judge only the facts of a case, leaving the determination of law in the hands of the legislature and the administering professional judges. Is this the way it was in the beginning?

“Liber homo. A free man; a freeman lawfully competent to act as juror.²³ An allodial proprietor, as distinguished from a vassal or feudatory.”²⁴

The original settlers and founders of this republic called the Americas, had come here fleeing the *king's justice* saying, 'Farewell, Rome. Farewell, Babylon'. Here, the individual had access to a free-dominion by the relinquishment, in charter, of the right of the king to make law without consent. In the case of the American colonies, which were republics and were guaranteed by contract with the king that no law could be made "except by the consent of the freeman," there was a clear consideration, as there was with Harold, the last Anglo-Saxon king in England. The king of England was to give the colonies the benefit of his protection from "foreign invasion" and, in exchange, he could impose only excise (*use*) taxes and tariffs (*taxes on foreign trade*), as well as regulate the equitable practice of business, for which there were no remedies at the common law.

The extent of the legal authority of the king of Britain in the Americas was limited. It was his usurpation (*seizing a use*) of rights that were not his that led to the Declaration of Independence, whereby the colonial governments became totally independent states at any dissolution of the charter. As history tells, a dissolution was caused by the king's breaking of the contract and violating the terms of the agreement. The limited authority and responsibility of the king was then assumed by the colonial governments, who eventually bound themselves together by Articles of Confederation, and later by a constitution which created a legal society with certain limited obligations and privileges to the general populus of the republics.

"The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits."²⁵

The United States Federal government, which exists within the given jurisdiction of the original republics, is a limited jurisdiction within itself. It grew, not by decree, but by government offers and individual acceptance. In other words, the limited authority of government grew by expanding the offer of benefits and obligations to the individual citizens in the republic, including membership in the government itself. The more desired, the more offered, and the more that was accepted, all the more was required. A guarantee of an entitlement grants a reciprocating entitlement to the Benefactor.

"The desire of the slothful killeth him; for his hands refuse to labour."
(Proverbs 21:25)

These benefits were not part of the original obligations of the state governments or the United States Federal Government. The average citizen cannot in justice accept them without offering at least some seemingly equal consideration.

“My son, if sinners entice thee, consent not.” (Proverbs 1, 10)

Each time we accept or apply for new bounties, donations, and benefits, we are consenting by deed or word to the legal authority of that government or body politic. We grant power.

“Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with [his] hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.” (Ephesians 4:28)

To take what is not a gift and is not owed, with no intention of returning equal consideration, is the essence of stealing. To accept without consenting to pay the price is the essence of theft. Ignorance of this fundamental principle is the “ignorance of law”. That the law does not excuse.

“I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding;... I looked upon [it, and] received instruction. Then I saw, [and] considered [it] well: I looked upon [it, and] received instruction. [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.” (Pr. 24:30, 34)

“In respect to the ground of the authority of law, it is divided as natural law, or the law of nature or of God, and positive law.” Positive Law is, “Law actually ordained or established, under human sanctions, as distinguished from the law of nature or natural law, which comprises those considerations of justice, right, and universal expediency that are announced by the voice of reason or of revelation...”²⁶

“Law governs men and reason the law.”²⁷

The Law of Nature or Natural Law is, “The divine will, or the dictate of right reason, showing the moral deformity or moral necessity that there is in any act, according to its suitableness or unsuitableness to a reasonable nature. Sometimes used of the law of human reason, in contradistinction to the revealed law, and sometimes of both, in contradistinction to positive law.”²⁸

The Natural Law is divine will; not merely the will of men, who, by their own reason, have determined it. If the reason is not *right reason*, then the law or rule is not truly Natural Law. Natural law, as a term, may have several uses and should be clarified whenever it is used.

“They [natural laws] are independent of any artificial connections, and differ from mere presumptions of law in this essential respect, that the latter depend on and are a branch of the peculiar system of jurisprudence to which they belong; but mere natural presumptions are derived wholly by means of the common experience of mankind, without the aid or control of any particular rule of law, but simply from the course of nature and the habits of society. These presumptions fall within the exclusive province of the jury, who are to pass upon the facts.”²⁹

Jury Nullification “...jury shall be judges of the law and the facts.”³⁰

The natural law being “divine will” and “right reason” are not connected to mere “presumptions of law”. Presumptions of law are dependent upon “peculiar systems of jurisprudence”.

Jurisprudence “is but the philosophy of law or the science which treats of the principles of positive law and legal relationships”.³¹ The term, jurisprudence, “is wrongly applied to actual systems of law”.³² To say that these presumptions fall within the exclusive province of the jury, who are to pass upon the facts, does not mean that the jury is to pass upon the facts of the case and not the law. It means that a jury is to decide upon the presumption of law based on their own common experience and God-given conscience.

“Nothing against reason is lawful.”³³

The word legal itself is defined in Black’s 3rd as:

1. Conforming to law; according to law; required or permitted by law...
2. Proper or sufficient to be recognized by law; cognizable in the courts...
3. Cognizable in courts of law, as distinguished from courts of equity; construed or governed by the rules and principles of law...
4. Posited [assumed] by courts as the inference or imputation of the law, as a matter of construction, rather than established by actual proof.

5. Created by law.

Legal systems may “conform to law”, they may be “permitted by law”, they may even be created by law, but they are not law in themselves. They may become law by consent and constructions of law. What is legal is “cognizable in courts of law; as distinguished from courts of equity” which are not “governed by rules of law”.

It should be clear that any legal system is subject to the prior and essential principles of law. Law that is basic, fundamental, and well-established over thousands of years of recorded history. It must be understood that it is consent that makes what is only legally proclaimed to be lawfully established. Also, it should be apparent that binding oneself to a legal system that is constantly under the process of change is at least dangerous, if not inevitably disastrous.

“And if the question relate to any point of public liberty, or if it be one of those in which the judges may be suspected of bias, the jury undertake to decide both law and fact.”³⁴

“He was a mighty provider before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty provider before the LORD.” (Genesis 10:9)

“The jurisdiction of equity court, gradually developed by the chancellor, was limited only by the chancellor himself. There were two important limitations, both adopted to avoid any clash with the common-law courts. One was that equity would not interfere where there was an adequate remedy at common law; the other was that equity would act merely against the person of the common law plaintiff or defendant and therefore affect the legal right only in that indirect fashion.”³⁵ Equity was dealing with legal rights of a person, not lawful rights of an individual freeman. Equity’s courts administered the king’s justice in the king’s dominion.

“A person is a man considered in reference to a certain status.”³⁶

So, when the term “common law” is used, there is the common law of the individual freeman and the common law of the legislature. The courts of equity were used to fulfill a need for remedies, but, for which the common law, by tradition and custom, did not provide, such as acts outside the realm of its reasoning jurisdiction, as in the case of “trusts and uses.”

“Law, as distinguished from equity, denotes the doctrine and the procedure of the common law of England and America, from which equity is a departure.”

³⁷

Equity is a “body of rules existing by the side of the original civil law, founded on distinct principles, and claiming incidentally to supersede the civil law in virtue of a superior sanctity inherent in those principles.”³⁸

First, “equity” is not law in itself, but it only exists “by the side of” the law, and the civil law, at that. The “‘Civil Law,’ ‘Roman Law’ and ‘Roman Civil Law’ are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence.”³⁹ Second, it should be noted that it only claims to supersede the civil law.

“As old rules become too narrow, or are felt to be out of harmony with advancing civilization, a machinery is needed for their gradual enlargement and adaptation to new views of society. One mode of accomplishing this object on a large scale, without appearing to disregard existing law, is the introduction, by the prerogative of some high functionary, of a more perfect body of rules, discoverable in his judicial conscience, which is to stand side by side with the law of the land, overriding it in case of conflict, as on some title of inherent superiority, but not purporting to repeal it. Such a body of rules has been called **Equity**.”⁴⁰

America was settled by men who came to this new land to escape the arbitrary bonds of civil and equitable systems, which were often no more than the will of despotic tyrants, and sought to be, at least in principle, ruled by Divine Will.

“The jury has the Right to judge both the law and the facts.”⁴¹

Even the United States Government, in establishing its own legal system, was forced by custom and reason “that suits in equity shall not be sustained in either of the courts of the United States, in any case where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may be had at law.”⁴²

Equity is not law either in the sense of the common law or the civil legal system. Equity is designed and used to enlarge the system of laws without appearing to disregard the laws themselves; overriding them, but not repealing them. It is that “part of the law which, having power to enforce discovery, (1) administers trusts, mortgages, and other fiduciary obligations; (2) administers and adjusts common-law rights where the courts of common law have no machinery; (3) supplies a specific and preventive remedy for common law wrongs where courts of common law only give subsequent damages.”⁴³

Equity is important because, in a civil society such as the one created by the Constitution, it is the instrument used to remedy conflicts that arise from certain

relations, where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may not be had at law. Equity is used to administer trusts and uses.

The phrase “legal tender” is found on the paper currencies of the world, including those used by the United States. Blue-sealed certificates, red-sealed United States notes, or green-sealed Federal Reserve notes all state that they are “legal tender for all debts public and private.” For decades, these notes also stated that they were “redeemable in lawful money.” If they were redeemable in lawful money then it should be clear that they are not lawful money. Gold and silver are lawful money, which is used as “payment of debt.”⁴⁴ Legal tender is a legal offer in place of payment of debt and does not lawfully pay a debt. Although it may legally discharge debt, the tender or offer does not pay the debt at law. “There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist...”⁴⁵

Where does this debt continue?

It goes on to say, “...which may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be a consideration for a new promise to pay, so as to make an otherwise worthless promise a legal obligation, makes it the subject of transfer by assignment.”⁴⁶

“The first farmer was the first man, and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land.” Emerson.

A “legal title” is “one cognizable... in a court of law.”⁴⁷ “Judicial cognizance” being “judicial notice, or knowledge upon which a judge is bound to act without having it proved in evidence.”⁴⁸ Even more importantly, a legal title is “one which is complete and perfect so far as regards 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.’”⁴⁹

“And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you:” (II Pe. 2, 2-3.)

First, we see that a legal title, although it may appear to be a “right of ownership”, “carries no beneficial interest.” If a legal title does not include a right to the

beneficial interest, then it 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.”⁵⁰ In the simplest of terms, a legal title only appears to be a right to ownership, but it is not the “ownership of an estate.”

“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.)

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. It is “the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another.”⁵¹

Even though you may discharge a debt and obtain legal titles, you still do not have clear and good titles, which “are synonymous; ‘clear title’ meaning that the land is free from incumbrances, ‘good title’ being one free from litigation, palpable defects, and grave doubts, comprising both legal and equitable titles and fairly deducible of record.”⁵²

“Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit: but the upright shall have good [things] in possession.” (Proverbs 28:10)

This division 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 “Constructive conversion.”

CONVERSION is an, "alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction...."⁵³

BENEFICIAL INTEREST is the, “Profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract, or the ownership of an estate as distinct from the legal ownership or control.”⁵⁴

BENEFICIAL USE is, “the right to use and enjoy property according to one’s own liking or so as to derive a profit or benefit from it...”⁵⁵

Is it any wonder that you are required to get a permit to build on what you think is your land? You have to get permission, i.e., a license, to operate what you believe is your car. If you do not pay the use, tribute, or excise tax on your land, auto, or

labor, you will lose them all. Haven't you lost them already if you do not own them or, at the very least, own the use of them? If you lack the right to the benefit or profit of a thing can you say you own it at all? Does anyone have a lawful title? And who has the true title and for what purpose do they have it?

You have a legal right to work, only if you have applied for and obtained an employee identification number and then are you allowed to labor for an employer who has an employer identification number.

The word "legal" originates in the idea of being connected to a legal system by contract. The connection is most often created by consent and acceptance. 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.

As we saw in the first chapter in a British voting rights case at the turn of the century, "The statutory word 'person' did not in these circumstances include women." This is the same reason that before the 14th Amendment, "In the eyes of the law... the slave is not a person."⁵⁶ But afterwards he is brought under a new master.

At one time "An Indian [was] not a person within the meaning of the Constitution."⁵⁷ Not being a "person" may exclude an individual from legal protection, but because an extended protection includes aspects of subjection, a non person may be considered free of the protector.

The status of "person" may reduce an individual to little more than a "human resource" because as we will see on *entering into society individuals will give up a share of liberty* whether *cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance* or because we apply for benefits from benefactors who exercise authority.

"The word 'person,' as used in the 14th Amendment, does not include the unborn."⁵⁸

Therefore, upon entering into a legal society, a person waives certain rights naturally inherent in an individual and becomes obligated to abide by the administration of the legally established laws and rules of that civil society. Those rules can include such systems as Equity, as well as general constructions of law. In Equity, the extent of contractual participation may vary.

It is by an indulging consent that these mere constructions of law divide a clear and good title into a legal title on one hand and the equitable title on the other.

A legal title may appear to be a right of ownership, but it is not. Legal title provides no beneficial interest and, therefore, no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage in the property. If you do not pay the legally prescribed use tax, they, the administrators of the trust holding the equitable title, may summarily take the property away from you. Somewhere, someone or something holding the equitable title is the actual owner, in the eyes of the Natural law, of your land, your home, your car, your cattle, your legal right to work and much, much more. You have no rights since your conversion, alteration, or rebirth. You have no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage of such things, but only an apparent legal ownership.

If things have been equitably converted, can they be equitably reconverted? Can things be turned around from what they have become? Can you make a legal title a lawful, good, and complete title again?⁵⁹

Can you now apply this idea that someone else may hold the true and lawful title to everything that you only appear to own, but do not? Has it been kept a secret, a mystery, how everything that the LORD God has given you is owned by another, who the law considers the *true owner* of the property?

“Standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen,... and wheat, and beasts... and slaves, and souls of men.”
(Revelation 18:10, 13)

Have you been seduced with vain offers and the seduction of a covetous heart or is it through ignorance and lack of knowledge that you have been sold into slavery, yoked with unbelievers and entangled by contractual relationships?

“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 if after they have escaped the pollution’s 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 the 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.” (2 Peter 2:18, 22)

If we have followed the ways of men can we return to the ways of the LORD?
Who has deceived us? Who has devised this plan of confusion and deceit?

“Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.” (Lu 11:52)

“Who shall we seek to know the truth? Who shall we cry out to, man or the LORD God? The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity. For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he [is] the messenger of the LORD of hosts. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law. Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?” (Malachi 2:6, 10)

ABBA! FATHER!

Footnotes:

1Quærere dat sapere quæ sunt legitima verè. Littleton,§443.

2US vs. Minker. 350 US,179 p187.

3Origin rei inspici debet. 1Coke,99.

4Summa Theologica 1st of 2nd Part Treaties on Law Ques. 90 of the Essence of Law. Thomas Aquinas.

5Jonathon Swift

6Jus est norma recti; et quicquid est contra normam recti est injuria. 3 Bulstr.313.

[7](#)Leges humanæ nascuntur, vivuntet moriuntur.

[8](#)Quod ipsis, qui cotraxerunt, abstat; et successoribus eorum obstabit. Di.50.17.29.

[9](#)Legem enim contractus dat. 22 Wend. N.Y. 215,223.

[10](#)James Warburg to U.S. Senate, February 17, 1950.

[11](#)Consensus facit legem. Consent makes the law... Branch. Prine. Black's.

[12](#)In omnibus contractivus, sive nominatis sive innominatis sive, permutatio continetur.

[13](#)Blacks 3rd "contract" p421.

[14](#)Nihil consensui tam contrarium est quam vis atque metus. Dig. 50. 17.116.

[15](#)Quod meum est sine me auferri non potest. Jenk. Cent. Cas. 251.

[16](#)Leges Angliæ sunt tripartitæ: Jus commune, consuetudines, ac decreta comitiiorum.

[17](#)"agreements must be kept.". General Principles of International Commercial Law, Jus Gentium.

[18](#)Clark's Summary of American Law. p 530.

[19](#)See: The History of the Common Law of England by Matthew Hale 1713

[20](#)Personæ vice fungitur municipium et decuria. Warner v. Beers, 23 Wend. N.Y. 103,144.

[21](#)Black's Law Dict. (3rd ed.)

[22](#)Black's Law Dict. (3rd Ed.) p.1106.

[23](#)Ld. Raym. 417; Kebl. 563.

[24](#)Black's 3rd Ed. page 1105.

[25](#)Plutarch.

[26](#)Bouvier's.

[27](#)Fuller

[28](#)1.3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064; Greanleaf, Ev. É 44.

[29](#)3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064;

[30](#)See Art. 1, Sec. 1 of Georgia's. Art. 1, Sec. 19, of Indiana's and Tennessee, Constitution Alabama (Article I, Sec. 12); Colorado (Article II, Sec. 10); Connecticut (Article First, Sec. 6); Delaware (Article I, Sec. 5); Kentucky (Bill of Rights, Sec. 9); Maine (Article I, Sec. 4); Maryland (Art. XXIII); Mississippi (Article 3, Sec. 13); Missouri (Article I, Sec. 8); Montana (Article II, Sec. 7); New Jersey (Article I, Sec. 6); New York (Article I, Sec. 8); North Dakota (Article I, Sec. 4); Oregon (Art. I, sec. 16), Pennsylvania (Article I, Sec. 7); South Carolina (Article I, Sec. 16); South Dakota (Article VI, Sec. 5); Texas (Article 1, Sec. 8); Utah (Article I, Sec. 15); Wisconsin (Article I, Sec. 3); Wyoming (Article 1, Sec. 20)

[31](#)Blacks Law Dict. 3rd p1039

[32](#)Blacks Law Dict. 3rd

[33](#)Nihil quod est contra rationem edt licitum. Coke, litt. 97.

[34](#)Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Va., 1782. Q.XIV

[35](#)Clark's Summary of American Law. Equity, p 233.

[36](#)Persona est homo cum statu quandom cosideratus. Heinecc.Elem. 1.1, tit.3, §75.

[37](#)Bouvier's.

[38](#)Maine, Anc. Law, 27.

[39](#)Black's 3rd p 332.

[40](#)Holl. Jur. 59.

[41](#)1804, Samuel Chase, Supreme Court Justice and signer of the Declaration of Independence

[42](#)Judiciary Act of 1789 "an architectonic act still in force."

[43](#)Chutes, Eq. 4.

[44](#)Black's 3rd p 1079.

[45](#)Stanek v. White. 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.

[46](#)Stanek v. White, 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.

[47](#)Black's 3rd p 1734.

[48](#)Black's 3rd "cognizance" p 346.

[49](#)Black's 3rd "legal title" p 1734.

[50](#)Black's 3rd "beneficial Interest" p 206.

[51](#)Black's 3rd "Equitable Title" p 1734.

[52](#)Black's 3rd "clear title" p 1733.

[53](#)LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition

[54](#)Black's 3rd p 206

[55](#)Black's 3rd p 206

[56](#)Virginia Supreme Court decision, 1858

[57](#)George Canfield, Am. Law Rev., 1881

[58](#)U.S. Supreme Court decision, 1973.

[59](#)Conversion vs. Reconversion. Money vs. Mammon. Trust vs. Faith.

Citizen
(in the world)

Vs.

CITIZEN
(of the world)



"Good government is no substitute for self-government." Mahatma Gandhi

Man's basic need for government stems from his inability to govern himself. According to the beliefs that have come down to us from antiquity, man should be governed by his Divine Creator who wishes to write His laws upon man's minds and upon his hearts. History clearly shows, from Saul to Caesar and modern rulers, that men, in general, have always rejected that spiritual relationship with their Creator. They have often opted for a more secular form of government, finding an imagined stability in laws and statutes written on stone, parchment, and paper, preferring charismatic public personalities of the world and their seducing promises to those of God.

"Nay; but we will have a king over us;" (Samuel 8;19)

In the time of Samuel, the "voice of the people" "rejected" God and begged for a man to be their ruling leader. Today, we have molded with our own hands a government according to our own personal image of perfection, to exceed all others in comprehensive scope, political, and economic totality, and allegiance. But when something goes awash in the proverbial political sandbox, it is always the other guy who is to blame.

It would be convenient for our pride and the comfort of our conscience to blame the assumed or supposed acts of tyranny by government and its bureaucracies totally on their usurpation of the law, but would that be true? Would that be honest? Would that be just? After all, if it is lawful to do with our own what we will, then is it not lawful for government to do with its own what it wills?

“If we will not be ruled by God, then we will be ruled by tyrants.”¹

In order to understand government, it would obviously be important to understand the origin of man’s relationship to it. There are many ways to approach the subject, and many words that should be examined, in order to comprehend the nature of the union of man and government.

Let us examine a few words that are commonly misused by assumptions. In Webster’s, there are numerous definitions for the word “citizen”. A citizen was “formerly, a native or inhabitant especially a freeman...” The word can be used “loosely, a native, inhabitant or denizen [an inhabitant or occupant] of any place.” But a citizen may also be “a member of a state or nation.”²

There is a similar distinction between the words “person” and “individual”, which are found in The Volume Library’s³ list of “most frequently misused words”. The word “**individual**” “should not be used in the mere sense of **person**. The word is correctly used in ‘Changes both in individuals and communities.’” An individual can be considered on the same level as a community, or at least separate from it, while a person is a “member” of a community and, therefore, an intricate part of it.

The maxims, “**Every person is a man, but not every man a person,**”⁴ and, “Man (homo) is a term of nature; person (persona), of the civil law,”⁵ clarifies this distinction.

There are several other distinctions that should be understood when using the word “citizen”.

“The term ‘**citizen**’ is distinguishable from ‘resident’ or ‘inhabitant.’ One may be a **citizen** of a state without being an inhabitant, or an inhabitant without being a **citizen**.” “Word ‘resident’ has many meanings in law, largely determined by statutory context in which it is used.”⁶ “Residents, as distinguished from citizens, are aliens who are permitted to take up a permanent abode in the country. Being bound to the society by reason of their dwelling in it, they are subject to its laws so long as they remain there, and, being protected by it, they must defend it, although they do not enjoy all the rights of citizens. They have only certain privileges which

the law, or custom, gives them.”⁷ Resident alien. “One, not yet a citizen of this country, who has come into the country from another with the intent to abandon his former citizenship and to reside here.”⁸

If residents are “aliens who are permitted to take up a permanent abode in the country” and they are a resident of a State then their citizenship originates somewhere else other than the State in which they live. “A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government ...”⁹ who resides in one of the States. “A person may be at the same time a citizen of the United States and a citizen of a State, but his rights of citizenship under one of these governments will be different from those he has under the other.”¹⁰

***When people speak of “State” are they referring to the corporate “State of ---“ existing under the Authority of the United States, or do they mean one of the National states¹¹ which, in those early days, adopted the original constitution establishing the corporate United States of America.¹² Almost all governments are corporations in one form or another.¹³ The original United States was created by the individual states, but after the Civil War there was a decided change in the relationship of State and Federal government and subsequently between the natural citizens or inhabitants in the states and the Federal Government. ***

“Often the terms ‘citizen’ and voter are confused. A voter is a person who is allowed by law to take part in the government. A citizen is a member of the nation. A citizen of the United States is a member of the large society which we call the United States of America.”

“In the United States citizenship is defined in the **fourteenth amendment** to the Constitution as: ‘All **persons** born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are **citizens** of the United States and the States wherein they reside.’”¹⁴

“I believe in the United States of America as a government... whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed: a democracy in a republic.”¹⁵

The United States Federal Government is a political society, existing within the extended jurisdictional authority or dominion of the original Republic or state Republics. The largest portion of the Republics’ original authority rested in the hands of the “individual freeman”, in the realm of his own individual dominion. The authority of the government of the original American Republic was merely “*titular,*” meaning “*in name only.*” There was some limited authority that was

vested in the original Colonial Republics and State Republics, following the Declaration of Independence. However, none of the authority of those Republics could make laws regulating the natural behavior or the exercise of Inalienable Rights of the freeman without consent. Therefore, the United States Federal Government, at its inception, had no sovereignty, power, or authority to regulate natural rights. It was created originally by the State Republics (not the individual people) through an agreement called the Constitution of the United States, made during a convention of separate states.

“People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the king by his prerogative.”¹⁶ “In one sense, the term ‘**sovereign**’ has for its correlative ‘subject.’ In this sense, the term can receive no application; for it has no object in the [Original] Constitution of the United States. Under that Constitution there are citizens, but no subjects.”¹⁷ “For when the [so called American] revolution took place, the people of each state became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the constitution to the general government.”¹⁸

*****The Federal government originally operated not by right, but by the privileges granted it by the States.** The people may continue to grant more privileges by their application and participation or their apathy and sloth.***

“The government has no inherent **sovereignty** within the 50 union states...and Congress can exercise no power which the sovereign people have not entrusted to it: all else is excluded.”¹⁹

"There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the [federal] United States... In this country **sovereignty** resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they [the sovereign people] have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld." Supreme Court Justice Field

The original States, finding their limited authority and dominion inadequate, vested some of their rights and duties in a separate governmental organization called the United States.

Today, “in the United States ‘it [citizenship] 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.”²⁰
Originally, citizenship did not include the *title or sense of subject*, but later in the United States, we see a citizenship binding *subjects*²¹ to the laws of a “**sovereign**”.

A sovereign is “one who exercises supreme power; a supreme ruler; the person having the highest authority in a state, as a king, emperor, queen, etc.; a monarch.”²² A sovereign makes law.

“Constantly bearing in mind that in entering into society individuals must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest...”²³

The Fourteenth Amendment uses the word “**citizens**” as a word denoting membership, as opposed to the former use of the word, which denoted merely an inhabitant. This is not to say that there was not citizenship of the United States prior to the amendment, for there surely was. **The Fourteenth Amendment** was an across-the-board offer of **citizenship** as a member of the United States Federal Government.

Prior to the Fourteenth Amendment, “No private person has a right to complain, by suit in court, on the ground of a breach of Constitution. The constitution it is true, is a compact, but he is not a party to it. The states are party to it.”²⁴

Do you have the same rights as citizens of the United States by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment, as do **natural Citizens** of the Republic in which the United States exists? In *Twining v. New Jersey*, “due process” seems to take on a distinction separate from what many people believe to be the law today.

“The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the Seventh Amendment (*Walker v. Sauvinet*, 92 US 90), and the right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment (*Presser v. Illinois*, 116 US 252), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment against abridgment by the States, and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment by grand jury, contained in the Fifth Amendment (*Hurtado v. California*, 110 US 516), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witness is, contained in the Sixth Amendment. *West v. Louisiana*, 194 US 258. In *Maxwell v. Dow*, supra, where the plaintiff in error had been convicted in a state court of a felony upon information and by a jury of eight persons, it was held that the indictment, made indispensable by the Fifth Amendment, and the trial by jury guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment, were not privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, as those words were used in the Fourteenth Amendment... the decision rested upon the ground that this clause of the Fourteenth Amendment did not forbid the States to abridge the personal rights enumerated in the first eight Amendments, because these rights were not within the

meaning of the clause ‘privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.’
...We conclude, therefore, that the exemption from compulsory self-incrimination is not a privilege or immunity of National citizenship guaranteed by this clause of the Fourteenth Amendment against abridgment by the States...

“...it is possible that some of the personal rights safeguarded by the first eight Amendments against National action may also be safeguarded against State action, because a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law... If this is so, it is not because those rights are enumerated in the first eight Amendments, but because they are of such a nature that they are included in the conception of due process of law.”²⁵

It is understandable that the average person might not think that this was the case. But most people also don’t understand that America was a republic prior to the acceptance of the Constitution, and even before the Declaration of Independence. Nor do they realize the true nature of that republic and the motivation of those people who populated it. Many don’t realize that the majority of the people in America were in opposition to the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, at the time of its creation by the individual States. Those States remained “as foreign to each other as Mexico is to Canada”,²⁶ both before and after the Constitution. Yet, all these historical and legal facts are well documented in history.

“Just as the revolutionary Adams opposed the Constitution in Massachusetts, so did Patrick Henry in Virginia, and the contest in that most important State of all was prolonged and bitter. He who in Stamp Act days had proclaimed that there should be no Virginians or New Yorkers, but only Americans, now declaimed as violently against the preamble of the Constitution because it began, ‘We the people of the United States’ instead of ‘We, the State.’ Like many, he feared a ‘consolidated’ government, and the loss of states rights. Not only Henry but much abler men, such as Mason, Benjamin Harrison, Munroe, R.H. Lee were also opposed and debated...others in what was the most acute discussion carried on anywhere...”

“Owing to the way in which the conventions were held, the great opposition manifested everywhere, and the management required to secure the barest majorities for ratification, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the greater part of the people were opposed to the Constitution.”

“It was not submitted to the people directly, and in those days of generally limited suffrage, even those who voted for delegates to the State conventions were mostly of a propertied class, although the amount of property called for may have been slight.” ²⁷

Was the Constitution of the United States ever ratified and what is its true source of authority? There has been serious questions raised and continuous arguments made about the lawful passing of certain amendments. The fact is that the Constitution of the United States was never ratified according to the law at the time and its creation was an act of revolution against the law and the will of the people.

“If a constitution expressly provides that it may be amended only in a certain way and another way followed, such an attempted amendment is illegal; but if it is acquiesced in it becomes effective as a peaceful revolution such as took place when the United States Constitution took effect upon the ratification by nine states in spite of the fact that the old Articles of Confederation provided that they should not be amended without unanimous consent of the states.” ²⁸

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

Ignorance and vanity tempered with apathy and avarice are the greatest allies to tyranny. What is the authority that makes the Constitution of the United States and its Amendments the law of the land and the authority in our lives?

Because of constructive and direct waivers by the states, it has become common today to hear the once sovereign states referred to as only “quasi sovereign.”

Citizenship is, “The status of being a citizen” and may include a, “Membership in a political society, implying a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of society.” ²⁹

Whether a **citizen** is still a natural inhabitant or has obtained membership in a political society, he has certain rights, although, those rights may differ. The natural inhabitant may be a member of a society or *civitas* ³⁰, but he remains an individual with civil rights within that general body. Those “Civil rights are such as belong to every **citizen** of the state or country, or, in a wider sense to all its inhabitants, and are not connected with the organization or the administration of government. They include the rights of property, marriage, protection by laws, freedom of contract, trial by jury, etc.” ³¹ An individual, who becomes a member or person in a political society, also has civil rights, but the origin of those rights, being political, are rights “pertaining or relating to the policy or administration of

government..”³² So, “as otherwise defined, civil rights are rights appertaining to a person in virtue of his **citizenship** in a state or community. Rights capable of being enforced or redressed in civil action. Also a term applied to certain rights secured to citizens of the United States by the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, and by various acts of Congress made in pursuance thereof.”³³

The essential difference would seem to be that the former “are not connected with the organization or the administration of government”, while the latter are “subject”.

“It is quite clear then that there is a **citizenship** of the United States and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the Individual.”³⁴ “The rights of a citizen under one (state or United States citizenship) may be quite different from those which he has under the other...”³⁵

If the benefit of the latter citizenship includes the duty of subjection, then the assent must require a voluntary consent, or else such citizenship would be nothing more than involuntary servitude. There are countless ways of demonstrating the consummation of a voluntary consent.

“The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits.”³⁶

The United States Federal Government gives to its citizens, but only after they have bound themselves as eligible members. If all giving was by obligation, there could be no charity. It is clear that the government has no binding contractual obligation to give what is its own to another.

“A thing is said given when it is yielded otherwise than by virtue of right.”³⁷

“A gift is said to be pure and simple when no condition or qualification is annexed.”³⁸ It is obvious that the government never gives a pure and simple gift. It is not only by sworn oaths or pledges of allegiance that we are made subject to government, but by acceptance and performance.

“No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. But if he does not dissent, he will be considered as assenting.”³⁹

This being a maxim and fundamental law of nature, all men in possession of their natural perception cannot deny it. Ignorance of conditions and constructions of law can be no excuse.

“It is immaterial whether a man gives his assent by words or by acts and deeds.” ⁴⁰

It does not really matter whether we are speaking of a citizenship of the State or the United States; the same voluntary principles still apply. It is basically understood that “Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment.” ⁴¹ If an individual or an inhabitant became a citizen of the United States under the fourteenth amendment, for what ever reason, he would be a member of that same political body, and, therefore, would be considered legally born again into the United States as a person. With a birth certificate, he could apply for the privileges of that membership and incur the binding obligations of that legal association. But, “A person born in the United States has rights under this amendment (the 14th) to remain a citizen unless he voluntarily relinquishes the citizenship.” ⁴²

“To every man his own house is the safest refuge.” ⁴³

But why would someone wish to relinquish their US citizenship as a member of such a beneficially affluent political body. Do the cons of such a seemingly harmless relationship with a generally benevolent entity outweigh the pros of such a prosperous civil status so that someone, anyone, would want to completely abstain from its generous benefits? Or, is it the membership's requirements to waive our God-given rights and the denial of universal truths that calls the individual to abandon mere social securities, economic comforts, and apparent gains of entitlements? Are there higher principles?

“Choosing rather to endure ill treatment with the people of God, than to enjoy the passing pleasures of sin;” (Heb. 11:25)

The Citizenship by “membership” also includes a “duty of allegiance on the part of the member.”⁴⁴ Allegiance to a society or government that supplies the citizen with protection seems like no less than a reasonable exchange of consideration. But before we agree to grant our allegiance, we should examine and understand the full extent of the price we shall be called to pay.

“Man’s primary allegiance is to his vision of truth, And he is under obligation to affirm it.” ⁴⁵

The concept of “allegiance” is defined in Black’s as, “The obligation of fidelity and obedience which the individual owes to the government under which he lives, or to his sovereign in return for the protection he receives. It may be an absolute and permanent obligation, or it may be a qualified and temporary one.” ⁴⁶ This, of course, only refers to a citizen that is a member, as opposed to one that is a mere inhabitant.

As an example, a “Natural Allegiance,” as stated in English law, “is due from all men born within the king’s dominions, immediately upon their birth, which is intrinsic and perpetual, which cannot be divested by any act of their own.” Such acts in principle would include the Declaration of Independence and the so-called “American Revolution”, if America and its freemen, domiciled on their own land, had not already been removed from that particular dominion of the king many years before by the manumitting charters of Charles the I and II.

“The civil law reduces the unwilling freedman to his original slavery; but the laws of the Angloes judge once manumitted as ever after free.” ⁴⁷

This Maxim of English law was either forgotten or ignored by George the III, although it was proclaimed by many men of England and Parliament at the time. And it was the usurpation, by George, of the rights of the freeman living in the American republics, which gave lawfulness to the Declaration of Independence. In actuality, it was the King who did the revolting, not America.

“Art thou called [being] a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use [it] rather.” (1Co 7:21)

The principle upon which Natural Allegiance stands, although presented under other names, is the basis of the obedience owed a father by his children.

What is owed society, or the body that represents society (government), may not be allegiance. If, for instance, a person has also become a “surety” for the debts of the society, he may not simply denounce his obligation, depending on the nature of that surety.

“My son, if thou be surety for thy friend, [if] thou hast stricken thy hand with a stranger, Thou art snared with the words of thy mouth, thou art taken with the words of thy mouth.” (Pr. 6:1,2)

Before we give our fidelity, it may be wise to ask ourselves: “Of what value is our allegiance to the U.S. Federal Government and what effect will it have on our relationship to God?”

If, “The idea of law has commonly been analyzed as composed of three elements: first, a command of the lawgiver.; second, the obligation imposed thereby on the citizen; third, a sanction threatened in the event of disobedience” ⁴⁸ then, we can see in this definition of the law that there is an obligation imposed upon the citizen. This obligation is imposed by the granting of allegiance by the citizen to the lawgiver.

“Good men hate to sin through love of virtue; bad men through fear of punishment.” ⁴⁹

“Allegiance is, as it were, the essence of the law; it is the bond of faith.” ⁵⁰ Yet, *“...faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen”* (Hebrews 11:1).

It should be becoming clearer that the granting of allegiance to the lawgiver is a binding act of faith, whether by proclaimed oath or pledge or silent acceptance or application and it is the essence of the dominion and authority of a lawgiver over the citizen.

“The chiefest part of everything is the beginning.” ⁵¹

Where is the beginning of our binding allegiance? Is it at the swearing of oaths only? By oath alone, we cannot obtain rights and privileges from our lawgiver (sovereign or master) until we had reached an age of reason and competence. If it begins with our acceptance of or application for benefits, then the point of its binding beginning may be remarkably early.

“‘Civil Law,’ ‘Roman Law’ and ‘Roman Civil Law’ are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence.” ⁵²

The Natural Law and its Creator provide for the Father and Mother as Husband and Wife to have custody and dominion of their children. In Roman law, Caesar’s rights to his empirical authority and dominion over his subjects stemmed from his position as the *vicarious pater*, the substitute father. In Rome then as in America today, there was a dual system of citizenship.

Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman. He said, 'Yes.' - And the chief captain answered. With a great sum I obtained this freedom. And Paul said. But I was free born. (Acts 22)

Tribute is, "A sum of money paid by an inferior sovereign or state to a superior potentate, to secure the friendship or protection of the latter."⁵³ And "Excise (tribute), in its origin, is the patrimonial right of emperors and kings."⁵⁴

The subject of "Patronus" is a vast and interesting subject as a source of understanding. The origins of tithes and taxes and its principles are still quoted in countless cases, involving everything from trusts to postliminy. But it is best discussed in another place. It is only important to mention here because it is the principle and origin upon which a proper and comprehensive subjective that our citizenship is based.

Since a natural father gives the benefit of life to his child when the child is in the womb, so also it is important, in the scheme of the system of things, that the "substitute father" grants benefits to the individual while the child is still in the womb.

"He who is in the womb is considered as born, whenever his benefit is concerned."⁵⁵

The Sheppard-Towner Maternity Act was "for the promotion, the welfare, and hygiene of maternity and infancy and for other purposes." It was passed with a vote of 63 to 7 in the Senate, with a vote of 279 to 39 by the House, and was finally signed by the President and became law on Nov. 23, 1921. The act provided, for the current fiscal year (1922), \$10,000 for each state accepting the provisions of the act, and additional sum of \$1,000,000.

The bill was a direct outgrowth of a nine-year study made by the "Federal Children's Bureau." Note that the Bureau was not the "Federal Bureau for Children", but the "Bureau of the Federal Children". This act and the acceptance of its benefits by the states created the "United States birth registration area."⁵⁶

"(2) Birth Registration Document. The Social Security Administration (SSA) may enter into an agreement with officials of a State... to establish, as part of the official birth registration process, a procedure to assist SSA in assigning social security numbers to newborn children. Where an agreement is in effect, a parent, as part of the official birth registration process, need not complete a Form SS-5 and may request that SSA assign a social security number to the newborn child."⁵⁷

Did the federal government have the right to impose such legislation on the States? In 1923, it was argued by Mr. Alexander Lincoln, Assistant Attorney General of Massachusetts, that, “The act is unconstitutional. It purports to vest in agencies of the Federal Government powers which are almost wholly undefined, in matters relating to maternity and infancy, and to authorize appropriations of federal funds for the purposes of the act.” The complaint went on to state that, “The act is invalid because it assumes powers not granted to Congress and usurps the local police power.” “The act is not made valid by the circumstance that federal powers are to be exercised only with respect to those States which accept the act, for Congress cannot assume, and state legislatures cannot yield, the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution. The act is invalid because it imposes on each State an illegal option either to yield a part of its powers reserved by the Tenth Amendment or to give up its share of appropriations under the act.” ⁵⁸

In the final analysis, the Act was an offer from one corporate entity to another, for the purpose of providing an avenue for the individual citizen of America to register as a subject of the State and, therefore, a citizen of the Federal corporate State, the true and actual sovereign agent, called the United States. The federal government would assume the position of *Father* of the subject citizen according to the law of *Parens Patriae*. ⁵⁹

“And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.” Mt. 23:9

This was a clear granting of gifts, gratuities, and benefits, by government to a child while he was still in the womb of his natural mother. All the children who were certified by the signature and seal of a natural parent, or a professional doctor and the representing county and state, were eligible for further federal and state benefits as a child of the state and federal governments.

At one time, a friend tried to obtain a social security number for his nine-year-old son so that he could have the benefit of a deduction from his income tax. He was told that he could not get a number for his son without producing the boy’s Birth Certificate.

Because the boy did not have one (i.e. DOB because he was born at home), they could not grant him the privilege of a Social Security Number. As far as they were concerned, the boy “didn’t exist”, even though he was standing there before them. The boy was not a child of the state because he had not yet been legally born. This

process of certifying a natural birth as a legal (or connecting) birth is not unlike being born again.

Certification begins three part process the Romans called novation, including *tutor*, i.e. benefits, and ends with the manumission of a child from their parents to the their *conscripted father*, the state, as they contribute as adults upon the altars of the state. Eventually the state become the Patronus of the People, Our Father. This is a threefold process of abdication, through Novation⁶⁰, Tutor,⁶¹ and Korban⁶² where the natural fathers or patriarchs of each household bound their sons and daughters under the power of the State.

“And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken..” Ecclesiastes 4:12

Marcus Aurelius made birth registration mandatory in 168 A.D. This brought about another wave of persecutions for Christians who would not participate in this statutory social scheme. They understood why Jesus said to *call no man on earth Father* and to only pray, e.g. apply, only to *our Father who art in heaven*.

This certification does not create an everlasting bond of allegiance in itself, but it shows the origins of the process by which a complete and total allegiance and membership is constructed. It is the beginning of the process of legally binding the individual on earth to a political *body* or governmental structure.

Allegiance is, ““The tie or *ligamen* which binds the subject [or citizen] to the king [or government] in return for that protection which the king [or government] affords the subject, [or citizen]’⁶³ It consists in ‘a true and faithful obedience of the subject to his sovereign.’”⁶⁴

“It matters not whether a revocation is made in word or deed.”⁶⁵

This process of constructive faith, trust, and allegiance through offers of mutual protection and subjection creates a relationship whereby, “The citizen or subject owes an absolute and permanent allegiance to his government or sovereign, or at least until, by some open and distinct act, he renounces it and becomes the citizen or subject of another government or sovereign. The alien, while domiciled in the country, owes a local and temporary allegiance, which continues during the period of his residence.”⁶⁶

“In the delivery of writings (deeds), not what is said but what is done is to be considered.”⁶⁷

“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Proverbs 23:1, 3)

There are many different “open and distinct” acts by which we may renounce our allegiance to one government power and bind ourself to another. Some have evidenced this by changing their name in the tradition of Abraham, Peter, and Paul. Others may revoke on paper, feeling that it has been only on paper that they have assented, but, all who change their allegiance must also change in their actions and deeds, not merely in words.

“The words ‘citizen’ and ‘citizenship,’ however, usually include the idea of domicile.” ⁶⁸

There is little doubt that the individual has every right to be a natural inhabitant of the land as opposed to being a subject citizen of government, but there are other things and circumstances that make such natural freedom farther from the grasp of the average individual. However, that subject will be dealt with elsewhere.

“No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.” (Matthew 6:24)

There are two major kinds of societies in history. The first is a general republic where the individual is “free from things public”, where “no law may be made except by the consent of the freeman”. There, the individual is subject to the natural law of the land common to the people. The second has been created out of the law of the land, by private law or contract, whereby the individual can become subject to the will of the community by consent. It must follow that if there are two governments then there are also two types of citizenship.

The first, is granted to an individual by the right of his natural birth and as a natural inhabitant of a free land, subject to the “Law of Nature and Nature's God,” his divine Creator and by the authority of the full “law of the land.” The other citizenship is granted by virtue of a membership as a person in a political society under the authority or dominion of the Constitution and other Amendments and Acts of that political body. It is a membership that is bound, either by words (oral or written oaths) or deeds (including overt or submissive acts) of faith and allegiance, through the application for and/or only the passive acceptance of “bounties, donations, and benefits.”

The former is free to become subject to whoever he chooses, while the latter is already subject to the dominion of that collective society and shall become subject to whoever that society becomes subject.

Although, America is the “land of the free promised to the saints by God”, according to Brendan the Navigator, the United States is occupying most of that land with their subject citizens. What choice would you make in this land of free dominion? After all, “Freedom is the Right to Choose, the Right to create for oneself the alternatives of Choice. Without the possibility of Choice, and the exercise of Choice, a man is not a man but a member, an instrument, a thing.” [69](#)

“And if it seems evil to you to serve the Lord, choose for yourselves this day whom you will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the river, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land you dwell. But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.” (Joshua 24:15)

To whom are social security numbers assigned?

Title 42 U.S.C., §405, which provides as follows:

(B)(i) subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (F)... social security account numbers will... be assigned to all members of appropriate groups or categories of individuals by assigning such numbers...

(I) to aliens at the time of their lawful admission to the United States either for permanent residence or under other authority of law permitting them to engage in employment in the United States and to other aliens at such time as their status is so changed as to make it lawful for them to engage in such employment;

(II) to any individual who is an applicant for or recipient of benefits under any program financed in whole or in part from Federal funds including any child on whose behalf such benefits are claimed by another person; and

(III) to any other individual when it appears that he could have been but was not assigned an account number...

V. to children of school age at the time of their first enrollment in school.

If you are applying for or accepting benefits, you have begun the process of binding yourself to your provider and benefactor. If he, the benefactor, collects the

funds to pay for your desires by force, in your name, you become a partaker of his sins.

American public school advocates, “imported three major ideas from Prussia. The first was that the purpose of state schooling was not intellectual training but the conditioning of children ‘to obedience, subordination, and collective life.’ ... Second, whole ideas were broken into fragmented ‘subjects’ and school days were divided into fixed periods ‘so that self-motivation to learn would be muted by ceaseless interruptions.’ Third, the state was posited as the true parent of the children.” ⁷⁰

The same principles, plots, and pandoric “social control,” ⁷¹ which created in the minds of children a reverence to political forefathers of a given nation, are now turned to a more global union of man under the elite fathers of a planet. These usurping fathers are devoid of the character of the Father in Heaven who created this planet. Now, “Every child in America entering school at the age of five is mentally ill because he comes to school with certain allegiances to our founding fathers, toward our elected officials, toward his parents, toward a belief in a supernatural being, and toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity. It’s up to you as teachers to make all these sick children well -- by creating the international child of the future.” ⁷²

“For our citizenship⁷³ is in heaven, from which we also eagerly wait for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ,” (Philippians 3:20)

Like Abraham, we should make our applications to the LORD of lords. We should not enter into contracts of servitude to false gods and serve men who are not gods. If we live like Abraham, by faith, we will be able to obey God rather than man.

“For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.” (Romans 8:15)

Why were the early Christians persecuted? Did they enter into contracts with Rome that would put them farther under the authority of Rome? We know that the apostate Jewish authority did.

“But they cried out, Away with [him], away with [him], crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar.” (John 19:15)

“Give obedience where ‘tis truly owed.” Shakespeare.

“If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.” (John 15:19)

The Greek word for “world” here means “constitutional order” or “arrangement”.

Should we go under authority and power of the “world” of men as some would have you believe? There are a half a dozen Greek words translated into the word “power” in the Bible and even more definitions for the word “power” in the English dictionary.

Paul told us, in **Romans 13**, that we should remain subject to the *higher liberty* not go under the authority of others. The word from which *power* was translated is *exousia*, and is translated *liberty* elsewhere in the Bible. It is the strongest word in the Greek language for liberty and is defined as the “power of choice, liberty of doing as one pleases”.⁷⁴

What Paul really said was, “*Let every soul be subject unto the higher liberty. For there is no liberty but of God: the liberty that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the liberty, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.*” (Romans 13:1, 2).

This makes so much more sense considering that God has sought to liberate mankind from rulers and has warned us over and over to not make covenants, eat at the table of, bow down, or go under the authority of benefactors who rule, who diminish our right to choose, our endowed right to choose given to us by God. Paul certainly did not mean that we should enter into agreements or relationships under ‘penalty of perjury’ that bring us back into bondage to the world or under the power of systems like Babylon, Egypt or Rome.

“*All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.*” (1Co 6:12)

If we find that we are slaves in a system of bondage that doesn’t prescribe always to the teachings of Christ, should we seek to be free?

“*Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called [being] a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use [it] rather.*” (1 Co. 7:20, 21)

It can be hard to let go of the benefits of the world. What is the calling of your heart?

Each man and woman must seek the path of his own faith, in the world in which he finds himself, on the earth God made. Like Abraham and the faithful of old, we must wander the desert of mankind and seek the faith and obedience of Christ Jesus.

“Love not the world, neither the things [that are] in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that [is] in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.” ⁷⁵ (1 Jn 2:15, 16)

“In our dreams, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand... The present educational conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk.” ⁷⁶

What have we learned? There are at least two types of citizens in America. One is not connected to the administration of government and the other is subject to the administration of government. One is regulated by virtue of privilege and the other is a matter of right. Which citizenship you enjoy is a result of consent. That consent may be presumed as a result of application, acceptance, or acquiescence.

Tribute is a patrimonial right. A patrimonial right is the right of the Father. Tribute is also an excise tax. Fathers and mothers began to release rights to their children by entering into constructive contracts with the state, by activities that create legal bonds with the state. Children take their first step of emancipation from their natural Fathers, granted by our Father in Heaven, with the novation ⁷⁷ of birth certification.

The government's right to impose an excise or tribute tax on persons is because the government has presumed the office of Father, as a patron, in this process of novation. The next step in becoming the Vicarious Pater, or Substitute Father, is to supply a tutor or curator. It was upon these precepts of law that the Patronus of Rome and the modern state forged their greatest power over the people. These Benefactors are represented by schools, administrative agencies of welfare, and provision, corporate police, doctors, lawyers, and all such professional persons who provide care for this child of the state.

The corporate state, acting as our substitute father, imposes the ancient rule of *Parens Patriae*, or “Obey the Father”. With this office of responsibility comes the power to demand greater and greater compliance to its will, exercising greater and greater control.

Where does the government obtain such right and power? From us. What universal law does the state invoke to assure that authority?

“Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.” (Exodus 20:12)

Is it the plan of God that men should establish a corporate State to stand as a Substitute Father?

“And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.” Matt. 23:9

We find the word *patri* in that Greek text where Jesus went on to expound on this command in the 10th verse of *Matthew 23*: *“Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.”*

He repeated this command in *Luke 22:25* *“...The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.”*

We are to neither make men our father nor are we to be masters of our neighbors and brothers. Why does Jesus give us this command to be unlike the nations? Because he was preaching that a new kingdom was at hand.

“And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;” Luke 22:29

What is the third and final step to total subjection under the Substitute Father, the State?

Footnotes

1William Penn.

2All quotes end of page 1. Webster's New World Dict. pp.267 & 392.

3Published Educators Association. Abram Brubacher, Ph.D. Pres.N.Y.St. Col. for Teachers, Author Spirit of America, etc.

4Omnis persona est homo, sed non vicissim.

5Homo vocabulum est; Persona juris civilis. Calvinus, Lex.

6Kelm v. Carlson, C.A.Ohio, 473, F2d 1267, 1271

7The Law of Nations, Vattel, Book 1, Chapter 19, Section 213, p. 87

8Black's Law Dictionary 6th edition, page 1309.

9Kitchens v. Steele 112 F.Supp 383

10U.S. Supreme Court in US v. Cruikshank, 92 US 542. Black's Law Dictionary 6th edition, page 1309.

11States were "as foreign to each other as Mexico is to Canada" Clark's Summary of American Law, Constitutional Law.

12"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. The United States of America are a corporation endowed with the capacity to sue and be sued, to convey and receive property." 1 Marsh. Dec. 177, 181. Opinion of first Supreme Court Justice Marshall.

13"members of a corporation" are defined as: "Body Politic, government, corporations. When applied to the government this phrase signifies the state. As to the persons who compose the body politic, they take collectively the name, of people, or nation; and individually they are citizens, when considered in relation to their political rights, and subjects as being submitted to the laws of the state. When it refers to corporations, the term body politic means that the members of such corporations shall be considered as an artificial person." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856.

14Quincy v. Duncan. 4Har.(Del.) 383; etc. (see Black's 3rd.)

[15](#)The American Creed, April 3, 1918, the new American creed was read in Congress.

[16](#)Lansing vs Smith 21 D. 89...4 Wendell 9, 20 (1829) [Court of Appeals of New York, relevant to eminent domain law]

[17](#)Chishom v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419,455, 1L Ed 440 (1793).

[18](#)Martin vs Waddell, 41 US (16 Pet) 367, 410 (1842)

[19](#)Julliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S.421

[20](#)Wallace v. Harmstad, 44 Pa. 492; etc. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[21](#) "... the term `citizen' in the United States, is analogous to the term `subject' in the common law; the change of phrase has resulted from the change in government." 14 CJS section 4 quotes State v. Manuel 20 NC 122.

[22](#)Websters Unabridged Dictionary 2nd Ed.

[23](#)Andrew Jackson, March 4, 1833.

[24](#)Supreme Court of Ga, Padelford, Fay & Co. vs Mayor& Alderman, City of Savannah, 14 Ga. 438,520 (1854)

[25](#)Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, 98-99, 29 S.Ct. 14, 53 L.Ed. 97.

[26](#)Clarks Summary of American Law, Constitutional Law.

[27](#)History of the U.S. by James Truslow Adams V.1. pp. 258-259.

[28](#)Clark's Sum. of American Law, Constitutional Law Chapt 1, §1 p. 462

[29](#)Luria v. U.S., 231 U.S.9,34 S.Ct.10,13,58 l.ed.101.(Black's3rd.p.330)

[30](#)Any body of people living under the same laws. Black's 3rd.

[31](#)Right. In Constitutional Law. Black's 3rd p. 1559.

[32](#)Political. Black's 3rd p. 1375.

[33](#)Right. In Constitutional Law. Black's 3rd p. 1559.

[34](#)Slaughter House Cases, 83 US 395, 407

[35](#)Colgate v. Harvey, 296 US 404, 429.

[36](#)Plutarch.

[37](#)Donari videtur, quod nullo jure cogente conceditur.

[38](#)Simplex et pura donatio dici poterit, ubi nulla est adjecta conditio nec modus. Bracton. 1.

[39](#)Invitio beneficium non datur. Dig. 50. 17.69; broom, Max.3d Lond ed. 625. Bouvier's.

[40](#)Non refert an quis assensum suum præfert verbis, an rebus ipsis et factis. 10 Coke, 52.

[41](#)Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884), 5s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643.

[42](#)Baker v Rusk, Cal. (1969) 236 F. Supp. 1244; Reynolds v. Haskin, C.A.A. Kan. 1925, 8 F. 2d 473.

[43](#)Donus Sua cuique est tutissimum refugium.

[44](#)"Citizenship is membership in a political society and implies a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of the society. These are reciprocal obligations, one being a compensation for the other." Luria v. U.S., 231 U.S. 9, 34 S. Ct. 10,13, 58 L.Ed. 101.(see Black's 3rd.)

[45](#)J. Addams.

[46](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[47](#)Libertinum ingratum leges civiles in pristinalm servitutem redigunt; sed leges angiae semel manumissum semper liberum judicant. Co. Litt.137.

[48](#)Bovier's vol.II.Def. of Law.

[49](#)Oderant peccare boni, virtutis amore; oderunt peccare mali, formidine poenae. Black's 3rd p. 1282.

[50](#)Ligentia est quasi legis essentia; est vinculum fidei. Coke, Litt. 129.

[51](#)Cujus rei potissima pars est principium.

[52](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 332.

[53](#)Brande. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 1757.

[54](#)Vectigal, origina ipsa, jus Cæsarum et regum patrimoniale est.

[55](#)Qui in utero est, pro jam nato habetur quæstio de ejus commando quæritur.

[56](#)Public Law 97, 67th Congress, Session I, Chap. 135, 1921.

[57](#)20 C.F.R., section 422.103

[58](#)Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.; Frothingham v. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury et.al.. 262 U.S. 447, 67 L.Ed. 1078, 43 S. Ct. 597

[59](#) See TITLE 15, Sec. 15h. Applicability of Parens Patriae actions: STATUTE-Sections 15c, 15d, 15e, 15f, and 15g of this title shall apply in any State, unless such State provides by law for its non-applicability in such State.

[60](#) "the remodeling of an old obligation." Webster's Dictionary

[61](#)tutor -ari, dep.: also tuto -are: to protect, watch, keep. guard against.

[62](#)Bringing closer to the originator or father, even a substitute father.

[63](#)1 Bl. Comm. 366. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[64](#)7 Coke, 4b. Black's. 3rd Ed. p 95.

[65](#)Non refert verbis an factis fit revocatio.

[66](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[67](#)In traditionibus scriptorum chartarum non quod dictum est, sed quod gestum factum est, inspicitur. 9 Coke, 137.

[68](#)Black's 3rd. Ed. p. 330.

[69](#) Archibald MacLeish was an American poet, writer and the Librarian of Congress. (1892 – 1982)

[70](#) Sheldon Richman “Separating School and State.”

[71](#) The stated objective of the (GEB)

[72](#) Harvard psychiatrist Chester M. Pierce, speaking as an expert in public education during the 1973 International Education Seminar.

[73](#) The Greek word here is politeum and is defined “the administration of civil affairs or of a commonwealth.” It is from politeuomai meaning “To be a citizen”.

[74](#) Strong’s No. 1849 exousia exousia from 1832 (in the sense of ability); AV- power 69, authority 29, right 2, liberty 1, jurisdiction 1, strength 1; 103 1) power of choice, liberty of doing as one pleases ...

[75](#) “*the world*” Translated from Strong’s No. 2889 kosmos {kos’-mos} 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government... On line Bible and Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

[76](#) GED Chairman Frederick Gates. (General Education Board, by John D. Rockefeller in 1902)

[77](#) “the remodeling of an old obligation.” Webster's Dictionary

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.” (Gen. 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.”[1](#)

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."[2](#)

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."[3](#) To employ as a verb then denotes the idea of conversion. As a noun, it is defined as, "A confidence reposed in another..."[4](#) 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."[5](#) A use, by nature, is a trust. "Uses and trusts are not so much different things as different aspects of the same subject."[6](#)

"American labor, which is the capital of our workingmen."[7](#)

"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."[8](#) 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 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!"[9](#)

"There is a clear distinction between profit and wages or compensation for labour."[10](#) 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..."[11](#) 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."[12](#) 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.”[13](#)

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.”[14](#) Business today is synonymized with the words, “occupation, employment, employ.”[15](#)

“Employment is a business relation, if not itself a business.”[16](#) “It is easy to escape business, if you will only despise the rewards of business.”[17](#) 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...” [18](#)

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.”[19](#) 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.”[20](#) 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, in caring for the sick, receives 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.”[21](#)

“ Protection draws to it subjection; subjection protection”[22](#)

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)”[23](#)

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.”[24](#) 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 Ed 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.[25](#)

Some have believed that the income tax on the 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....”[26](#)

“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.”[27](#)

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.”[28](#) An indirect tax can be, “A tax laid upon the happening of an event, as distinguished from its tangible fruits, is an indirect tax.”[29](#)

“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...”³⁰ “The general term income is not defined in the Internal Revenue Code.”³¹ 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,”³² and, “income derived from a source is taxable without apportionment.”³³

“Income” now is described as the total, “Wages, salaries, tips, etc...”³⁴ 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.”³⁵

“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 recognized the fact that taxation on income was in its nature an excise entitled to be enforced as such.”³⁶

“ All men are freemen or slaves.” ³⁷

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 laboring individual 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;”³⁸ ,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.”³⁹ Please note, “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude ... shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to its jurisdiction.”⁴⁰

“ When people have to obey other people’s orders, equality is out of the question.”⁴¹

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.” ⁴²

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.”⁴³ 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... 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.” [44](#)

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 imposed upon income, and is as directly imposed as is a tax on land.”[45](#) 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.

*“Which say, [It is] not near; let us build houses: this [city is] the **caldron**, and we [be] the flesh... Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Your slain whom ye have laid in the midst of it, they [are] the flesh, and this [city is] the **caldron**: but I will bring you forth out of the midst of it.” (Ez. 11:3 ...7)*

“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”[46](#) Is the act of employment the act of selling oneself into servitude for the hope of security in society?

“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.”[47](#)

Let us digress once more 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.”[48](#) 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.”[49](#)

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."[50](#)

"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."[51](#)

"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."[52](#) 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.'[53](#)

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."[54](#)

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. Again, it is "the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another."[55](#)

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 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."[56](#)

CONVERSION is an, "alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction...." While, RECONVERSION as a noun is a "change, change over, ... rebirth..."[57](#)

"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, and 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, (negotium,) 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.”[58](#)

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.”[59](#)

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.” [60](#)

There may be another distinction between a slave and a servant, but the distinction is less important to the subject than the Master. The fact is that 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 corvée system - by which serfs had to work temporarily as slaves - made a permanent force of slaves unnecessary.”[61](#)

“ The man who gives me employment, which I must have or suffer, that man is my master, let me call him what I will.” [62](#)

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).”[63](#) “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).” [64](#)

“The corvée 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*⁶⁵ 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.”⁶⁶

“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 Israel’s captivity, the tribute tax paid by Pharaoh’s subjects was equivalent to two-and-a-half months of labor, 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.⁶⁷ In 1995, to pay off the average *corvée* tax liability of employees in the United States required four months and five days of labor. 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 nor its 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)

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.” ⁶⁸ “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 *corvée*⁶⁹, 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.”⁷⁰

“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 *caveat emptor*, “let the buyer beware”? The 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.”⁷¹ 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 due to lies or were you too ignorant, incompetent, and/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--- [72](#)

“ The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and benefits.” [73](#)

“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.” [74](#)

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[75](#) system... But the Government of the United States is not an insurance company and so it could be done.”[76](#)

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 serfs, 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.”[77](#)

“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.”[78](#)

“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 and the same, that is given as the sign of your eligibility for the benefit of legal employment, your 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 entrusted to you. The list goes on under these new covenants and contracts offered to 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."[79](#)

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-sized bill, we find section 511 through 513, which provides for the forfeiture of property of anyone who loses 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 effect, nullify the Privacy Act of 1971, 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.

The list goes on and on: The Welfare Reform Act of 1996, The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and Public Law 104-193, additionally, a sister law, Public Law 104-208, and Public Law: 105-33 all contain information for associating the Social Security Number with a National ID card.

“Title 42 U.S.C. § 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...”

“But he [Your ruler] shall not ... cause the people to return to Egypt... forasmuch as the LORD hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way.”
Deuteronomy 17:16

You have a legal entitlement to work and the equitable title, or true and lawful owner of your labor, belongs to another. You are *converted* into a trust, the unrighteous mammon. The trust, in turn, holds that ownership of your labor as a surety for the debts of the trust. You, with your sweat, labor, and blood, is incorporated as a human resource in a system of mutual entitlements under benefactors who exercise authority one over the other.[80](#)

“Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still, Slavery! said I, still thou art a bitter draught.”[81](#)

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

How have we been so deceived to believe that 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 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.”[82](#)

“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.” [83](#)

“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 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 ambush!” 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 Republics, 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”[84](#)

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, and devoid of the wisdom of God? Is there more than one way that has brought you to the loss of the “use” of your labor, your land, and your loved ones?

“The essence of all slavery consists in taking the produce of another’s labor by force. It is immaterial whether this force be founded upon ownership of the slave or ownership of the money that he must get to live.”[85](#)

“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 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][86](#)

"Land Patents are issues (and theoretically passed) between Sovereigns. Deeds are executed by 'persons' and private corporations without these sovereign powers."[87](#)

“Also, the 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, ...(Revelation 18:)

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. ..., 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.”[88](#)

Just to get the benefit of a passport, allegiance is 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"[89](#)

Have you been manipulated into applying to a mystery government of control, because of the lack of knowledge concerning words like “use”, “employ” and “occupy”? Have you been utilized, exploited, and consecrated to a task? Have you been devoured, swallowed up, drained into a common vat of labor? Are you a human verified for any other persons than those owing allegiance, whether citizens or not, to the United States?

Title 8, CFR PART 337 establishes and defines what “Allegiance to the United States” is. You are bound under the agreement, stating 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 an 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 the error of Balaam? 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 that 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? Do you sing it in your Churches?

Can you now answer the question:

“Are men the property of the state?
Or are they free souls under God?
This same battle continues throughout the world.”[90](#)

Footnotes:

- [1](#)Multa ignoramus quæ nobis non laterent si veterum lectio nobis fuit familiaris. 10 Coke, 73.

- [2](#)Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary Unabridged (2nd Ed.).
- [3](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787.
- [4](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787. 2 Bl. Comm. 328.
- [5](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787. Bouvier's.
- [6](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p1787p.Mozele and Whitely.
- [7](#)Grover Cleveland *Annual Message* Dec., 1885.
- [8](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p 895. and Bouvier's.
- [9](#)Jonathon Swift.
- [10](#)Oliver vs Halstead. 96 SE 21 858.859. Black's Law Dictionary
- [11](#)Bouvier's.
- [12](#)Commercial League Asso. of Am. v. People ex net Needles Aud. 90 Ill. 166.
- [13](#)Bloom v. richards, 2 Ohio St. 387 Black's 3rd p.260.
- [14](#)Walter Lipman.
- [15](#)Roget's International Thesaurus 625. BUSINESS 1. n. business,...
- [16](#)Steward Machine Co. vs Davis 301 U.S. 548 1937.
- [17](#)Seneca.
- [18](#)Calhoun v. Everman, 242 SW2d 100, 103 (Ky) (1951)
- [19](#)The Volume Library (1924)
- [20](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd. p 1280.
- [21](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd. p 161.
- [22](#)Protectio trahit subjectionem, subjectio protectionem. Coke, Littl. 65.
- [23](#)Summary of American Law George L. Clark p 635 (only entry for employ or employee in the index }.

- [24](#)Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), Social Security Number.
- [25](#)Edmund Burke 1784 Speech.
- [26](#)Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co., 240 U.S. 103, 112 (1916)
- [27](#)Chief Justice Fuller in Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & T. Co. 157 U. S. supra, at page 557
- [28](#)Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 240 U.S. 1, 13 (1916).
- [29](#)Tyler v. United States, 281 U.S. 497, 502 (1930).
- [30](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.
- [31](#)U.S. vs Ballard, 535 F2d 400 (1967).
- [32](#)Form 1040. "For the year 1913.from March 1, to December 31."
- [33](#)Pollock vs Farmer's Loan & Trust Co.
- [34](#)Form 1040 U.S.Individual Income Tax Return.1988.
- [35](#)Murdock vs PA., 318 US 105.
- [36](#)Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 240 U.S. 1, 16-17 (1916).
- [37](#)Omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi.Inst. 1.3. pr; Fleta. 1.1,c.1,§2.
- [38](#)Webster's New International dictionary 1938 Second Ed.
- [39](#)Declaration of Independence.
- [40](#)Article XIII Constitution for the United States.
- [41](#)Sir John Thomas Gilbert.
- [42](#)Homer - Odyssey. Bk.XVII. L.392. Pope's trans.
- [43](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.
- [44](#)Forward by Frank Perkins, Sec of Labor 1933-45. The Development of the Social Security Act by Edwin E. Witte
- [45](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd p 944.

- [46](#)Steward Machine Co. vs. Davis 301 U.S. 548 1937. Involving the tax imposed by the Social Security Act of 1935.
- [47](#)Adam Smith (1723-1790)
- [48](#)History of the U.S. Vol.1 James Truslow Adams, p. 176.
- [49](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd Ed. p. 1734.(“Legal” & “Equitable” titles.)
- [50](#)Wallace v. Harmstad, 44 Pa. 492; etc. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.
- [51](#)Henry George - Progress and Poverty. Bk. VII. Ch. I.
- [52](#)Black's 3rd Ed. p. 761.
- [53](#)Black's 3rd “legal title” p 1734.
- [54](#)Black's 3rd “beneficial Interest” p 206.
- [55](#)Black's 3rd “Equitable Title” p 1734.
- [56](#)Black's 3rd p 430.
- [57](#)LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition
- [58](#)Blacks 3rd p 425.
- [59](#)A pirates et latronibus capti libera permanent.Dig.49. 15. 19. 2.
- [60](#)A piratis et latronibus capta dominium non mutant.1 Kent, Comm. 108, 184; 2 Wooddesen, Lect. 258,259.
- [61](#)History of Slavery, Susan Everett
- [62](#)Henry George - Social Problems, Ch. V.
- [63](#)Slavery Collection Elwell Evangelical Dictionary
- [64](#)SLAVERY AND SERFDOM Compton's Encyclopedia.
- [65](#)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 it was the system of Egypt. They were granted exemption because of the religious freedom in Roman law.

- [66](#)SLAVERY AND SERFDOM Compton's Encyclopedia
- [67](#)Genesis 47:15,26.
- [68](#)On line Bible & Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.
- [69](#) "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'
- [70](#)From R. Laird Harris' 'Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament'
- [71](#)Samuel Adams, 1772
- [72](#)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.
- [73](#)Plutarch, 2000 years ago.
- [74](#)Railroad Retirement Board, supra, 295 U.S., at 368
- [75](#)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.
- [76](#)Forward by Frances Perkins Sec of Labor 1933-45 The Development of the Social Security Act by Edwin E. Witte, ppVII
- [77](#)20 C.F.R. § 422.1(ii) publ. at 11 F.R. 177A-568, Sept. 11, 1946.
- [78](#)20 C.F.R. § 422.103
- [80](#)Matthew 20:25, Mark 10:42, Luke 22:25. 1 Samuel 8:7... Proverbs 23:, Psalms 69:22, Romans 11:9, 2 Peter 2:3...
- [81](#)Laurence Sterne - Sentimental Journey. The Passport. The Hotel Paris.

- [82](#)John Taylor Gatto told the New York State Senate in 1991 after being named that state's Teacher of the Year.
- [83](#)Sheldon Richman.
- [84](#)T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of IRS, May 25, 1956 in U.S. News & World Report
- [85](#)Leo Tolstoy
- [86](#)Legal Thesaurus by William C. Burton Second Edition
- [87](#)Leading Fighter vs. County of Gregory, 230 N.W.2d. 114.116 (1975)
- [88](#)Roget's International Thesaurus.
- [89](#)Title 22 Persons entitled to passport of the Act, "Foreign Relations and Intercourse," 6 Section 212
- [90](#)Cecil B. DeMille in "The Ten Commandments."

GOD
(THE GOVERNMENT OF GODLY MEN)
VS.
GOVERNMENT
(THE GOD OF UNGODLY MEN)



Throughout history, there has been what might appear to be a conflict between Government and God. If such a conflict does exist, its nature must rest in a conflict for position, or more precisely, one of possession. Through possession, government is able to claim the right of dominion or, as it is sometimes called, jurisdiction or authority. When is that authority of God?

“Possession is, as it were, the position of the foot.”¹

It has been said that, “All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights... That to secure these rights, Governments

are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”² On the other hand, governments are not endowed by their creators with unalienable rights and, therefore, all governments are obviously not created equal. Rights shall differ from one governmental authority to another. For a government’s authority to be just, must it be by consent alone?

“The origin of a thing ought to be inquired into.”³

To understand to what extent a government’s authority has grown, we must look first at its origins. The origin of a thing begins by intent, default, or accident. The latter of these three is not really a valid source, because, “To the sensible man there is no such thing as chance.”⁴ “Chance is a word void of sense; nothing can exist without a cause.”⁵ “Things do not happen in this world; they are brought about.”⁶ And since, “The cause of events are ever more interesting than the events themselves,”⁷ then “Happy is he who has been able to know the reason for things.”⁸

“And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s. And they marveled at him.” (Mark 12:17)

The question asked should be, “What is Caesar’s, and what is God’s?” How did the emperors and governments obtain their right to govern? Is it by force alone that the empires and governments of the world have grown in size and authority?

“What is mine cannot be taken away without consent.”⁹

“As banker James Warburg, the son of Council on Foreign Relations’ founder Paul Warburg, confidently told the United States Senate on February 17, 1950: ‘We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The question is, whether world government will be achieved by conquest or consent.’”¹⁰

Is there a third alternative to conquest or consent?

It might be said that the first government, other than the Creator Himself, was the first procreators. In other words, the first government was the first family and the first king was the first father. It should be clear that a father does not rule by the consent of his children, yet, his right to rule is real.

“He is not presumed to consent who obeys the orders of his father or his master.”¹¹

The practice of the leaders of government and rulers of a nation being called father was a common everyday occurrence in the days of Augustus, Tiberius, and Jesus. The Emperor was called *Patronus* (our Father) and Senators called *Patres* (father) or *Conscripti Patres, the Conscripted Fathers*.

“Patronus (Lat.) In Roman Law. A modification of the Latin word Pater, father. A denomination applied by Romulus to the first senators of Rome, and which they afterwards bore.”

“A person who stood in the relation of protector to another who was called his ‘client.’”¹²

“Excise (tribute), in its origin, is the patrimonial right of emperors and kings.”¹³

Even the right to tax was tied to the right of a father’s authority over his children. We have heard of the free bread and circuses of Rome that fed the apathy of the mob and seduced the people into moral decay. Like over-indulgent fathers, the Roman emperors led their children into corruption and iniquity, but also subjection.

If, “A person shall not be allowed to enrich himself unjustly at the expense of another,”¹⁴ then it should also be true that any bounties, donations, or benefits, that are not owed but accepted, will create an obligation to the benefactor on the part of the recipient.

“Who breaks no law is subject to no king.”¹⁵

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.”¹⁶

“Protection draws to it subjection; subjection protection”¹⁷

Those who are born naturally in America, but choose to be born again in that political society known as the United States, create an obligation and allegiance to that political body and its allies.

Some may assume that the United States of America and the original Republic are one and the same, but you have to look no farther than April 3, 1918, when the new American Creed was read in Congress beginning with the words, “I believe in the United States of America as a government... whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed: a democracy in a republic.” In other words, the U.S. Federal democracy is a corporate political society that exists within the Republic, a republic that predates the United States’ Constitution.

When the United States Federal Government was first created, it had little authority and influence over the lives of individual Americans. People commonly owned land in fee simple as an estate. Today, no one owns their own land in the United States, having settled for mere legal titles that grant no beneficial interest in the land and subjects that land to an excise or tribute tax. The same can be said for most American workers who labor or serve an average of half the year for the government as members of a vast system of statutory labor and marked by their Employee Identification Number to prove it.

Many benefits are offered and provided by government to those people who wish to grant an authority and dominion to government. An authority, once enjoyed by our earthly father and heavenly Father alone, has become the right of another. These benefits of protection from famine, flood, disease, poverty, or the abuses and usurpation of others have always been the price for our true subjection and obligation to the Caesars of the world. Whether those governmental authorities be individual kings and dictators or the collectively common society and democratic body politic, their position between man and God remains the same.

“Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of parental care on the part of the government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood.”¹⁸

The governments, at least in America, knowing that they had no just power except by consent, began their expansion and growth by offering services and benefits to individuals that wished membership in their political and legal society. Seemingly free services have always come with a price in a myriad of subtle ways.

“By this provision we plainly said to each citizen substantially as follows: ‘If you are not willing to pay your proportion of the expenses of this government, you cannot sue in our courts or vote at our elections, but you must remain an outlaw. If you can do without our assistance, we certainly can do without yours.’ Before this

the expenses of government were defrayed by voluntary subscriptions of individuals with the provision, “That in all cases each individual subscriber may at any time withdraw his name from said subscription, upon paying up all arrearages and notifying the treasurer of the colony of such desire to withdraw.”¹⁹

“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Proverbs 23:1, 3)

“Constantly bearing in mind that entering into society individuals must give up a share of liberty...”²⁰

“Quid pro quo?” What for what?

“The expedient adopted by the Oregon legislative committee in 1844 took the form of a section of the revenue law which read: ‘That any person refusing to pay tax, as in this act required, shall have no benefit of the laws of Oregon, and shall be disqualified from voting at any election in this country.’²¹

Something for something, one thing for another, nothing is for free. Those gifts and gratuities and benefits that we have learned to call “entitlements” carry with them an equal and balanced obligation of repayment and reimbursement. Whether it is the education, health, or welfare of our children or protection from lawless brutes, famine, poverty, or acts of God, it does not matter. Whatever we receive without having paid, infers a debt and obligation of a reciprocating nature.

“The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and benefits.”²² For, “No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. But if he does not dissent, he will be considered as assenting.”²³ Because, “Every man is presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of his own voluntary acts.”²⁴

It is not only by overt consent that a just and actual authority is established by governments and assented by individuals, but also by application for or the acceptance of benefits and privileges not owed.

“Membership in a political society, implying a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of society.”²⁵

State: “That quality which belongs to a person in society, and which secures to and imposes upon him different rights and duties in consequence of the difference of that quality.”

“Although all men come from the hands of nature upon an equality, yet there are among them marked differences...”

“Three sorts of different qualities which form the state or condition of men may, then, be distinguished: those which are purely natural, those purely civil, and those which are composed of natural and civil or municipal law.”²⁶

“He was a mighty hunter before theLORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the hunter before theLORD.” (Genesis 10:9)

In Genesis 10:9, the word “hunter” is from the Hebrew word *tsayid*²⁷, which is more often translated provision, food, food-supply, or victuals. The word *paniym* is translated “before” in the sense of face or in the face of, before or in front of.²⁸ So, it could be said that Nimrod was a mighty provider before theLORD or in front of the Lord.

Yet, we find God has said, “*Thou shalt have no other gods before me*” (Exodus 20:3). The words “gods” and “God” are translated from the single word ‘*elohiym*²⁹’ in the plural. ‘Elohiym is defined “rulers, judges”³⁰ and “occasionally applied as deference to magistrates”³¹, while in the New Testament, the word “God” is translated from the Greek word *theos*, which figuratively means “a magistrate.”³²

God goes on to expound upon this command that, “*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness [of any thing] that [is] in heaven above, or that [is] in the earth beneath, or that [is] in the water under the earth:*” (Exodus 20:4) The words “graven image” come from *pecel* meaning “idol, carved (graven) image”³³, while “likeness” is translated from *temunah*, meaning “form, image, likeness, representation, semblance.”³⁴

“Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them:” (Exodus 20:5)

The words ‘bow down’ are translated from *shachah*, meaning “bow (self) down, ... humbly beseech, do (make) obeisance ... worship.”³⁵ “Serve” is translated from *abad* meaning “to work (in any sense); by implication to serve, till, (cause.) enslave, etc.: - x be, keep in bondage ...”³⁶

It could be said that God doesn't want His people to have any ruler instead of Himself or to make anything with our own hands a ruler over ourselves other than Him. And He doesn't want you to beseech or appeal to that creation of our hands or put ourselves in bondage to it, serving it with our labor, for we belong to Him.

Why did God, meaning "Ruler and Judge", make these conditions and commands for His people to remain free to serve Him only? Is it because we become like that to which we pay attention?

"I [am] the LORD thy Ruler, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other rulers before Me... for I the LORD thy Ruler [am] a jealous Ruler, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me; (Exodus 20:1,5)

In Egypt, the people had been delivered into bondage to a governing body under the leadership of the Pharaoh, but God, 'elohiym, brought the people out from under that ruler and became their Ruler or Lord God, Jehovah, 'elohiym, "Ruler" "the self-Existant or Eternal"³⁷.

"The gods are the creation of the created. They are not emanations of The Eternal. They are made by the adoration of their worshipers."³⁸

Based upon a common consensus of opinion, we should remain in subjection to worldly governments. This opinion is fostered and promoted and hand-fed to the populous of the world by governments and their incorporated institutions. If that was the message of Christ, why was the governments of His day so adamant about His execution? Why did God take man out of Egypt just to return to it in another time?

"But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous [are they], self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities." (2 Peter 2:10)

The word "government" is translated from the word *kuriotes*, meaning "dominion, power, lordship, in the New Testament: one who posses dominion."³⁹ It is from the word *kurios*, which is normally translated "Lord" and means, "he to whom a person or thing belongs..."; or as further defined, "the possessor and disposer of a thing, the owner; one who has control of the person, the master; in the state: the sovereign, prince, chief, the Roman emperor." It was "a title of honour expressive of respect and reverence, with which servants salute their master." In the Bible,

this title was “given to: God, the Messiah.”⁴⁰ Peter is not warning those that despise government, but rather those that despise any dominion over themselves and choose selfish rule over God’s dominion, by ruling your fellow man. Many governments are merely organized systems of self-rule outside of God’s plan.

“He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” (Jn 1:10)

In today’s society, when someone says the word “world,” we might picture a blue planetary globe hanging marble-like in the blackness of space, as photographed from the moon, but when the Gospel was preached, the perceptions and viewpoints of men had not reached such astronomical heights. There are at least four different words in the New Testament that are translated into the single English word “world”. The first, from which we get the word “eon”, is *aion*, which means an unbroken age and is far more often translated into variations of the word “age”.

Another Greek word used is *oikoumene*, which originally meant “the portion of the earth inhabited by the Greeks, in distinction from the lands of the barbarians,” but, at the time of Christ, because of the conquest of the Greek city-states and the rise of the Roman Empire just prior to Jesus’ birth, it had come to mean “inhabited places”.

In John 1:10, the word “world” is translated from the word *kosmos*, which means “an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government.” It probably came from the word *komizo*, meaning “to care for, take care of, provide for” or “carry off what is one’s own,”⁴¹

“He [Augustus first emperor of Rome who called for the census that brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem] was now, to quote his own words ‘master of all things,’ and the Roman world looked to him for some permanent settlement of the distracted Empire. His first task was the re-establishment of a regular and constitutional government, such as had not existed since Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon 20 years before.’... At home it was understood that he would year by year be elected consul, and enjoy the powers and pre-eminence attached to the chief magistrate [god] of the Roman state. Thus the republic was restored under the presidency and patronage of its ‘first citizen’ (princeps civitatis).”⁴²

Of course there was no more harmonious arrangement than the world government that Adam and Eve found themselves living in when the LORD was their ruler, but when they decided to make their own rules, things changed. Cain later shed his brother’s blood in the ultimate usurpation of authority over a brother and began the

first city-state. Nimrod began his city as a mighty provider, instead of the Lord offering his own “harmonious arrangement”. Moreover, the son’s of Jacob were themselves delivered into bondage to a civil power. They had turned their backs on God and sold their own brother, Joseph, into bondage. God brought them into bondage by withholding his providing hand, allowing famine into the land. Had Joseph remained with his brothers, they would have prepared for the famine, instead of Pharaoh preparing Egypt for the famine.

Later, the LORD God brought them out of their bondage and became again their ruler, sovereign, and provider, bestowing upon them Laws on stone, manna from heaven, and water flowing from a rock, as well as protection from Kings, cutthroats, and snakes.

Rome provided free bread and circuses and the protection of its Pax Romana and, in return, faithful allegiance. A reciprocating tithing or tax was due the *Soter* of Rome.

“If you have not your own rations, you must feed out of your tribe's hands, with all that implies.”⁴³

If *kosmos* in the New Testament is referring to the harmonious and constitutional government which dominated the world at the beginning of the Gospels, then why would John say, “and the world was made by him” or “and though the world through him began to exist”⁴⁴

Let us look again at another notable moment in the history of man’s turning to rulers other than the LORD Ruler:

“...now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD. And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.” (1 Sa. 8:5,7)

It was the voice of the people that called for a man to be ruler over them. This was not a new problem for the LORD, for He said, “According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee.”⁴⁵ Turning from God to other gods is the antitheses of repentance.

In those days, they sought the wisdom of the prophets to choose their rulers and they were warned that these rulers would take their sons to serve them. The prophet went on to warn that these rulers would create a vast chain of command or bureaucracy, that they would take their lands and livestock, and the first and best of what they produce to maintain that bureaucracy. Those rulers would also take the daughters of their citizenry to serve their own purposes and they would even withhold the first portion produced by those who were employed in the service of their citizens.

“And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and theLORD will not hear you in that day.” (1Sa 8:18)

But they said, “We will have a ruler over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may be lawgiver for us, and a commander in chief, and fight our battles⁴⁶ [paraphrased].

Today, men do not seek the wisdom of the prophets, for they are wise in their own eyes.

“Woe unto [them that are] wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!” (Isaiah 5:21)

“For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.” (1Co 3:19)

TheLORD God did not choose to make the government of Saul and David, but through Him that *government began to exist* because the *voice of the people* cried out for a new ruler, so that they could be *like the other nations* and because they had *forsaken* the Lord as their Ruler.

“ While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, [The Son] of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, TheLORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any [man] from that day forth ask him any more.” (Mt. 22:41,46)

The word *kosmo* is also found combined with *kosmokrator*, which means “lord of the world, prince of this age: the devil and demons are called this.” It is derived from *krateo*, meaning “to lay hold on” and from *kratos*, meaning “dominion”.

“Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high [places].” (Ephesians 6:11,12)

Consider the words of George Washington, who was called the father of our country, when he said, “Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force, like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.” Such a radical statement by a man, who played such an important part in the establishment of the United States Federal Government, should lead a reasonable man to realize that only the most limited authority was intended to be invested in government.

“For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things.” (Lu 12:30)

“I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and courts. These are false hopes, believe me; these are false hopes. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no Constitution, no law, no court can save it.”⁴⁷ Yet, in America, the people have steadily turned over the power and authority to make and pass law to the government of the United States, in order to obtain the benefits of that government. And that government, in order to provide the justice and order expected of it, has set about revising, editing, and adding to the legal system with an overwhelming zeal. Has this system gone astray or was it fundamentally flawed?

It should be commonly understood that, “The custom of fixing and refixing (making and annulling) laws is most dangerous,”⁴⁸ yet, citizens still cling to the regulated freedom of an arbitrary legal system.

Tacitus warned that, “In the most corrupt state, the most laws.”⁴⁹ Yet, we often think that the myriad of laws that overwhelms this codified legal system are a sign of man’s love for law, when it is a sign of a general lack of law in the hearts of men.

“Society in every state is a blessing, but a government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one.”⁵⁰ “All who have ever written on government are unanimous, that among people generally corrupt, liberty cannot long exist.”⁵¹ “Is there no virtue among us? If there be not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks, no form of government can render us secure.”⁵² If rights are responsibilities, is the delegation of a right a dereliction of responsibility?

The Latin word *pater* means “father” and, as we have seen, the word was used everyday as a title of address in reference to the Senators of Rome and, of course, the Emperor and, before him, the pro council was referred to as “the father of the senate” and, therefore, the Empire. Also, in the Greek text of the Bible, we find *Pater*⁵³ meaning “father”. So, we can assume that, when the people of the day heard the word *pater*, they thought of one of several ideas. Either they were talking about their genetic father, their fathers in Rome, or their Father in heaven.

“And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. “(Mtt. 23:9)

To make such a statement shocked those who thought man’s governments and the Roman political and judicial system, was good for society, as well as business. It would be like saying, “Call no man on earth president.” The Emperor was loved, even in Judea. He was the Father of the Nation.

*“...**Our Father** which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.” (Mtt 6:9,13)*

The US presidency today, once elected, sets foreign relations and makes treaties, he is the commander in chief of the military and naval forces, he appoints the supreme court including the chief justice and federal judges in much the same way as they did in Rome.⁵⁴

The emperors were often referred to as “gods” using the words *Apo Theos*. This was not because any one believed that they created heaven and earth, but because they were the chief magistracy and ruler of the people, appointing judges throughout the empire.⁵⁵

Most government leaders today are not called *pater*, or “father,” with the words of the mouth, although they offer us new covenants and contracts, and those who wrote the Constitution for the United States are referred to as The Founding Fathers” and we are often applying for benefits and praying to them for justice.

It is not so strange to think of the Roman Emperors as gods when you realize that George Washington himself was deified in the ceiling of the Capital Dome in Washington, DC: “Across the Dome’s eye, 180 feet above the floor, spreads a gigantic allegorical painting by the Italian artist Constantino Brumidi. The painting

depicts the ‘Apotheosis,’ or glorification, of George Washington. Surrounding Washington is sweeping circles are delicately colored figures -- some 15 feet tall. They include gods and goddesses [among them Ceres, Vulcan, Mercury, Neptune, Minerva and 13 State goddesses] pictured as protectors of American ideals and progress.”⁵⁶

Did God ordain (i.e., dictate, decree, impose) the United States Federal Democracy or any other government? Or was it ordained by false gods of man’s vain imagination?

“If we will not be governed by God, then we will be ruled by tyrants.” William Penn.

As God allowed Samuel to choose a king for His people, because they had already turned from God, so also He allows man to choose his own rulers if he does not choose to be ruled by God. In the hearts and minds and souls there is a turning away from The God, for other gods. Everyday, men make other men their father through application, service, and adoption. Instead of their Father, the LORD God, Eternal Ruler in the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, they turn to other rulers, being reborn to new fathers.

“And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ. How be it then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” (Gal 4:6,9)

We often hear Christians say they believe and they are followers of the Word of God. Are they true to His word? Do they follow in His ways or are they like the rulers of the gentiles who exercise authority?

“Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” (Mt.7:21)

Are we choosing a new father? Are we denying the Father of us all, being born into that new father’s jurisdiction, that kingdom, that government? Or do we seek the kingdom of Heaven?

“If we cut the world’s population by 90%, there won’t be enough people left to do ecological damage.” Sam Keen at the State of the World Forum, September 27, 1995 ⁵⁷

“Love not the world,⁵⁸ neither the things [that are] in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.” (1 John 2:15)

When it was said to “not love the *world*,” John was not speaking of the planet created by God the Father, but the world as made by men who were creating their own world order.

“The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world is gone after him.” (Joh 12:19)

Have we gone after Him or after the men who are making the world after the discord of their own foul hearts? “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” (Ga 4:6)

Jesus said that the Kingdom was at hand. Was it at hand? Was Jesus kidding? Was he wrong? Was he misleading the people who believed the kingdom was at hand?

The Kings of the East knew Jesus was born a King (Matthew 2:1). He called the people to repent because his Kingdom was truly at hand. He told the people to seek His kingdom first(Matthew 6:33). He told them to apply to the Father in Heaven (Luke 11:2). The people proclaimed Him as king (Matthew 21:9). Jesus fired the porters or trustees working in the temple, which was the job of the King (John 2:15). Pilate said that He was king (Luke 23:38). Pilate defended Jesus as king (John 19:15).

In Mark 1:15, we see that while Jesus was in Galilee, He is preaching a kingdom saying, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the good news.” The apostates, like the Sadducees and Pharisees before them, still deny His kingdom, while, Rome officially proclaimed Jesus to be the King of the Judea (Luke 23:38).

Jesus told the apostles that the kingdom would come when we do the will of the Father (Mt. 6:10). And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high. (Luke 24:43-49).

Jesus was taking the people to the next step. He knew they would have to learn to stand on their own. This meant that He had to leave (John 16:7). Judea was the remnant of the kingdom of God: “Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof” (Mt. 21:43). Jesus appointed a kingdom to his followers to take care of and serve, not to rule over men like the nations, nor to be ruled over. “... And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;” (Luke 22:29). “Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom (Luke 12:32).

Jesus explained to them how not to operate that kingdom in Luke 22:25-27: “And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye [shall] not [be] so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether [is] greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? [is] not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.”

The kingdom of Heaven operates on the perfect law of liberty. No one (No Man) runs the kingdom of God. The Bible is telling you how to follow God’s plan and what happens if you do not. But who is preaching his plan?

“Are men the property of the state? Or are they free souls under God? This same battle continues throughout the world.”⁵⁹

Footnotes:

¹Possessio est quasi pedis positio. 5 Coke, 42.

²Declaration of Independence.

³Origin rei inspici debet. 1 Coke, 99.

⁴Tieck

⁵Voltaire

⁶W.Hays

⁷Cicero

[8](#)Vergil

[9](#)Quod meum est sine me auferri non potest. Jenk. Cent. Cas. 251.

[10](#)New World Order by William T. Still p174 secondary from Griffin,Descent Into Slavery p.214

[11](#)Velle non creditur qui obsequitur imperto patris veldomini. Dig. 50.17.4.

[12](#)Black's 3rd Ed. page 1338.

[13](#)Vectigal, origina ipsa, jus Caesarum et regum patrimoniale est.

[14](#)Blacks 3rd p 425.

[15](#)G. Chapman. 1559-1634 English author and translated Homer.

[16](#)Wallace v. Harmstad, 44 Pa. 492; etc. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[17](#)Protectio trahit subjectionem, subjectio protectionem. Coke, Littl. 65.

[18](#)Grover Cleveland

[19](#)Recollections of an Old Pioneer, p. 205. History of Oregon.

[20](#)Andrew Jackson (March 4, 1833)

[21](#)Gray, History of Oregon, p. 394.

[22](#)Plutarch, 2000 years ago.

[23](#)Invito beneficium non datur.Dig. 50.17.69; Broom, Max.3d Lond. ed.625.

[24](#)1 Green. Evid. § 18; 9 East, 277; 9 Barnue. & C. 643; 3 Maule & S. 11, 17.

[25](#)Luria v. U.S., 231 U.S. 9, 34 S. Ct. 10,13, 58 L.Ed. 101.(see Black's 3rd.)

[26](#)State in Society. Bouvier's.

[27](#)Strong's No.06718 tsayid {tsah'-yid}

[28](#)Strong's No. 06440 paniym {paw-neem'}

[29](#)Strong's No. 0430 'elohiym {el-o-heem' } plural of 433

[30](#)On line Bible and Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

[31](#)Strong's Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary.

[32](#)Strong's Greek Dictionary of the New Testament.

[33](#)Strong's No. 06459 pecel {peh'-sel}

[34](#)Strong's No. 08544 temunah {tem-oo-naw'}

[35](#)Strong's No. 07812 shachah {shaw-khaw'}

[36](#)Strong's No. 05647 `abad {aw-bad'}

[37](#)Strong's No. 03068 Yehovah {yeh-ho-vaw'}

[38](#)Kabbalah (B.C. 1200- 700 A.D.)

[39](#)Strong's No. 2963 kuriotes {koo-ree-ot'-ace} from 2962;

[40](#)Strong's No. 2962 kurios {koo'-ree-os} from kuros (supremacy);

[41](#)On line Bible and Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

[42](#)Encyclopedia Britannica 1953, Vol II, pp. 687C, and the 1910 publication.

[43](#)Rudyard Kipling

[44](#)Williams New Testament by Charles Williams, Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville.

[45](#)1 Samuel 8,8.

[46](#)1 Samuel 8:20 paraphrase with today's terms.

[47](#)Judge Learned Hand stated in the Spirit of Liberty (189).

[48](#)Legis figendi et refigendi consuetudo periculosissima est.

[49](#)Corruptissima republica plurimae leges.

[50](#)Thomas Paine.

[51](#)Edmond Burke

[52](#)James Madison.

[53](#)Strong's No. 3962 pater {pat-ayr'} 1) generator or male ancestor 2) metaph.2a) the originator and transmitter of anything; the authors of a family or society of persons animated by the same

spirit as himself; one who has infused his own spirit into others, who actuates and governs their minds 2b) one who stands in a father's place and looks after another in a paternal way 2c) a title of honour; teachers, as those to whom pupils trace back the knowledge and training they have received; the members of the Sanhedrin, whose prerogative it was by virtue of the wisdom and experience in which they excelled, to take charge of the interests of others 3) God is called the Father. On line Bible and Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

[54](#)“Octavian was legally invested...with the government of the important frontier provinces, with the sole command of the military and naval forces of the state, and the exclusive control of foreign relations. At home it was understood that he would... be elected consul and enjoy the powers and pre-eminence attached to the chief magistracy of the Roman state. Thus the republic was restored under the presidency of its ‘first citizen’ (princeps civitatis)“Encyclopedia Britannica 1953,Vol II, pp. 687d

[55](#)“The last act was the formal decree of the senate by which Augustus, like his father Julius before him, was added to the number of the gods recognized by the Roman state.” Encyclopedia Britannica 1953,Vol II, pp. 689b

[56](#)“We, the People” “The Story of the United States Capitol” by the United States Capitol Historical Society, Washington D.C., Library of Congress catalog number 65-20721.

[57](#)Sam Keen received enthusiastic applause for his pronouncement at Gorbachev's State of the World Forum in San Francisco, September 27, 1995

[58](#)Strong's No. 2889 kosmos {kos'-mos} probably from the base of 2865; n m AV - world (186) - adorning (1) [187] 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government ...

[59](#)Cecil B. DeMille in “The Ten Commandments.”

Heaven
(The dream of Man)

vs.

Heaven
(The Dominion of God)



In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.
(Ge 1:1)

Throughout time, most people of the world have had a variety of images and beliefs as to what the earth is or is not.

It was flat, it was round, it was on a shell of a turtle or inside a giant dome. The word “earth,” when heard today, conjures, in the mind of modern man, an image of a small, round, blue and white marble, floating in a sea of celestial black. That blue

marble may represent a giant but fragile ecosystem or a convenient planet on which to build thriving metropolises. An individual raised in an agricultural society, existing only in our historical past, might have thought of the earth as the soil that gave his crops and domestic stock, and, therefore, himself, the necessities of life. A member of a more primitive society, living by hunting and gathering, might simply see the earth and all its natural wonders as a total environment supplying him and his family with all the necessities of life. Each viewpoint or vision of earth is designed to support each man's ideals, hopes, and ambitions.

Heaven, on the other hand, may have an almost ethereal grasp on man's inner desires and fundamental hopes for his image of reality. "Heaven, in religion, is the place where God, gods, or other spiritual beings dwell, and the place or condition of perfect supernatural happiness for the redeemed in the afterlife. In simple societies, the concept of life after death was substantially that of a shadowy continuation of life on earth. Even in that concept, however, the principle of the necessity for vindication of divine justice was manifested. The general belief of Christians is that, "Their bliss is eternal."¹ Societies, and the religions they create, have many names for their concepts of heaven. There was Elysium or The Islands of the Blessed of the Greeks and Romans, the seven spheres of the firmament of the later Jewish mystics and Islam, Valhalla of the Germans and Scandinavians, or the state of Nirvana of Buddhists. They all carry the common belief of eternal bliss, peace, and happiness.

The images of heaven portrayed by the early European Renaissance man were cloudy realms filled with harp-playing cherubim and white-robed souls idling away eternity, staring at a glorified God. These images, and their modern-day counterparts, even with an allowance for artistic license, seem to stray from a biblical perception of events in heaven and the deeds of those who live there. Has Heaven always been, and will it always be, a peaceful and bliss-filled retirement community?

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels," (Revelations 12:7)

If there are wars in heaven with soldiers, guards, and an angelic police force, what is the Law that they are enforcing, as they serve God in what might be called mandatory military service?

Order is Heaven's first law. ²

If God made man in his own image, then it might be logical that God also made the earth in the image of heaven, and, therefore, the same principles that were applied to the Ten Commandments should also be applied to the Law in Heaven and its realms.

“Thou shalt have no other gods³ before me... Thou shalt not bow down⁴ thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God⁵ [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me; “(Ex 20:3,5)

If anyone were to set themselves up as a “ruler” (god) in the LORD’s dominion, where He is rightful Ruler (God), they would be putting themselves before God. That would be a crime against the sovereignty of the LORD.⁶ Lucifer⁷ set himself over those who would willingly bow down and prostrate themselves before him, thereby denying God as their god in heaven and on earth. Anyone who bows down or serves other gods (rulers) besides the LORD God would be putting other gods before God.

What did Lucifer or the king of Babylon do to get into trouble? Examine:

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! [how] art thou cut down to the ground⁸, which didst weaken [prostrate]⁹ the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.” (Isaiah 14:12,14)

This was the sin of Satan (the adversary) and the breaking of the first command of God, which led to war in the God’s Kingdom. God then brought his forces to do his will and cast out the usurpers.

“Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.” (Isaiah 14:15)

According to a common interpretation of this story, there was a war in Heaven, or at least in the Kingdom of God, and God’s servants did battle against a powerful foe, and those who would usurp the lawful authority of God were driven out by a justified force.

Has heaven always been a habitation of peace and tranquility? Has such force come out from God’s Heavenly Kingdom and spread its other-than-peaceful bliss to the inhabitants of earth?

“Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;” (Genesis 19:24)

“And I will send an angel before thee; and I will drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite:” (Exodus 33:2)

“And David lifted up his eyes, and saw the angel of the LORD stand between the earth and the heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem. Then David and the elders [of Israel, who were] clothed in sackcloth, fell upon their faces.” (1Ch 21:16)

“And Elijah answered and said unto them, If I [be] a man of God, let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee and thy fifty. And the fire of God came down from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty.” (2Ki 1:12)

“They come from a far country, from the end of heaven, [even] the LORD, and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land.” (Isaiah 13:5)

“Then the angel of the LORD went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they [were] all dead corpses.” (Isaiah 37:36)

“And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost.” (Acts 12:23.)

The angels, who inhabit the realms of God’s Heavenly Kingdom, do seem to be a violent lot from time to time, judging by the quotes above. Are they all standing guard or doing battle or can we find a clue that might show their true nature and purpose and motivation?

“And when the angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, the LORD repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough: stay now thine hand. And the angel of the LORD was by the threshingplace of Araunah the Jebusite.” (2Sa 24:16)

“And the LORD commanded the angel; and he put up his sword again into the sheath thereof.” (1Ch 21:27)

It is not violence and war that interests the inhabitants of the Kingdom of God, but loyalty and fidelity to His will. But something more is also evident through a biblical observation of these activities:

“And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it.” (Genesis 28:12)

“And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.” (Mt. 28:2)

From Genesis to Revelation, the angels of the LORD are a busy sort. Whether they are slaying or destroying, guarding or guiding, carrying messages, sealing or unsealing, binding or unbinding, the angels of the LORD are serving their master with diligence, industry, and praise.

“And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God...” (Lk 2:13)

The angels of the LORD also interfered with the activities of men:

“And the ass saw the angel of the LORD standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand: and the ass turned aside out of the way, and went into the field: and Balaam smote the ass, to turn her into the way.” (Numbers 22:23)

The angels battled with their former comrades in heaven and drove them out because they defied the dominion of god:

“And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” (Jude 1:6)

“For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast [them] down to hell, and delivered [them] into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;” (2 Peter 2:4)

On earth, the angels, both loyal and fallen, don't always resort to force. Men have been seduced by Satan, as they are by other men, just as the angels that followed him in heaven were also seduced. So often, the angels only encourage men to

choose the way of the LORD and guard against the usurpation's of Satan and those who serve him and his dark dominion.

“And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him.” (Zec 3:1)

Satan, meaning the “adversary,” seems to be the opposing force competing against the Kingdom of Heaven in heaven and on earth. Has the Adversary been trying to establish its own dominion ever since? Has he come to earth to make it his kingdom? Has he found willing allies among men?

“God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” (Ge 1:26)

God,¹⁰ as the creator of heaven and earth, has a natural right to rule heaven and earth. If we continue to accept the Bible as a standard from which to reason, then it should be concluded that man obtained, at least, a legal right to hold dominion over the earth and its creatures from God. As its keeper and steward, the earth was entrusted to man.

“And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it¹¹ and to keep¹² it.” (Genesis 2:15)

God gave to man a lawful title to the earth and told him to dress it and to keep it. But has he kept it for the service of the LORD? Is man being seduced into giving dominion on earth to the adversaries of God?

The Adversary has been spending thousands of years trying to seduce man into giving him the title to those gifts, given man by God. Satan wants man's granted dominion and authority over the earth, over man's labor, his children, and over man's right to govern himself under the benevolent authority of God.

“Heaven lent you a soul ;earth will lend you a Grave.”¹³

Men have also played this same roll of supplantor, superseding God from His rightful dominion, by placing themselves over other men. “Are men the property of the state? Or are they free souls under God? This same battle continues throughout the world.”¹⁴ Abraham left the authority of the civil State seeking the kingdom of

Heaven, refusing accept benefits from such states and bought only land to be buried in.

“Execrable [Accursed] son! so to aspire Above his brethren,
to himself assuming Authority usurp’d, from God not given.

He gave us only over beast, fish and fowl, Dominion absolute;

that right we hold By his donation; but man over men He made not Lord;

such title to himself Reserving, human left from human free.”¹⁵

In today’s democracies, does not man, in the form of the self-serving mob, have dominion over his brother? By joining a democracy, does man subject himself to the authority of other men?¹⁶ The modern civil churches, embracing government and its benefits, encourage men to bind themselves in the service of governments, with the mob as the new Caesar. Aren’t we to remain subject to the authority of God and His Kingdom? When we give our service by oath to men, are we giving them what should be God’s alone?

“But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government.¹⁷ Presumptuous [are they], self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.” (2Peter 2:10)

In the above Scripture, the word *kuriotes*, which is translated as “government,” is more often translated into 'dominion' and comes from *kurios*, meaning “lord”, and is referring to those who despise, at least, the Lord’s dominion, or all dominion but their own and whatever system of government that will allow them to “follow their pernicious ways.”

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.... The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:” (2Peter 2:1,3..9)

It was said, Give to Caesar what is Caesar's but our service should be God's. Is it not a damnable heresy to teach people to covet the benefits of civil society? Should we subject ourselves and our lives to the dominion of man's government rather than God's?

“Everyone wants to live at the expense of the state.

They forget that the State lives at the expense of everyone.”¹⁸

“Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me;” (Ex. 20:5)

What else have the religious teachers of today taught from their pulpits concerning the Kingdom of God? Are we fed truth or misled with fables?

Is Heaven our eternal reward for the successful passage of the test and trials of this life on this earth? Is this earthly realm only a divisionary testing field between heaven and hell?

“ And God called the dry [land] Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that [it was] good.” (Genesis 1:10)

Why didn't he establish His Kingdom on earth? Or did He? Have we been deceived?

“And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.” (Ge. 3:8)

Adam lived in the presence of the LORD God. God's Kingdom was in heaven and on earth, but Satan defied and man denied God's will. Adam followed after the counsel of the wicked and was banished from God's Kingdom on earth, but still lived on earth.

“Heaven means to be one with God.”¹⁹

Was God ever going to reestablish his Kingdom on earth? Didn't He say He would? Has God done His part? Have we done our part? Jesus said that the kingdom would be taken from those who error and given to others who would obey.

“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of [his] government and peace [there shall be] no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His Kingdom, his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.” (Isaiah 9:6,7)

More than seven-hundred years before Jesus began to set up his Father’s Kingdom on earth, this prophecy foretold His coming. And like the Kingdom of God in Heaven, the Kingdom of God on earth would have its violent and contemptuous foes.

“In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matthew 3:1,2)

“From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” (Matthew 4:17)

And was the promise of His Kingdom fulfilled?

“And from the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom²⁰ of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.” (Matthew 11:12)

Now, two thousand years later, we are told that we are still waiting for the arrival of His Kingdom or that we will only be allowed into the Kingdom upon our death. Jesus proclaimed that God’s Kingdom was at hand. Was he just fooling the people to get their hopes up prematurely?

“Blessed [are] the poor in spirit: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven... Blessed [are] they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.” (Mt. 5:3... Mt 5:10)

He said that the kingdom “is” at hand, not “will be”. He said that He was the God of the living, not the dead. But where is the Kingdom of Heaven? How do we get there? Does it come here? What does it look like?

“After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as [it is] in Heaven.” (Matthew. 6:9,10)

Would we recognize the Kingdom of God on earth if we saw it?

“Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter ²¹into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven.” (Matthew. 7:21)

Who has the dominion over the earth and the land and all the gifts God gave man when he placed him upon this earth? Do the governments of the world do as God wants?

“And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.” (1 Chronicles 21:1)

“And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it.” (Luke 4: 5,6)

Jesus did not take the easy way to gain dominion over the kingdoms of the earth offered to Him by the gods of the kingdoms of world.

“All human joys are swift of wing,

For heaven doth so allot it;

That when you get an easy thing,

You find you haven't got it.”²²

We are led and taught to believe that God's Kingdom is a perpetual welfare state of bliss and apathy-filled with souls who do nothing but soak up eternal pleasures provided by a god of self-indulgence, apathy, and sloth. That is an image painted more appropriately by Satan and the foes of God. God's Kingdom is one of possession, courage, loyalty, and industry. He created Heaven and earth working six days and resting for one. Did He not create man in his own image?

“And Pilate wrote a title, and put [it] on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING ²³ OF THE JEWS.”²⁴ (John 19:19)

If God's Kingdom is here now, who is the king? Is each man the king of himself or are other men here to exercise authority over us? Is it not established upon the perfect law of liberty?

Jesus is unlike most political leaders and their world governments: the Gentiles, the other Nations. Christ Jesus is not elected to his position of authority nor will he die. He has authority, but he comes as a servant. He lives forever in us on earth. To the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end. His Kingdom is always growing because it includes the realms of both Heaven and earth.

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” (Matthew. 28:18)

“Liberty is one of the most precious gifts which heaven has bestowed on man; with it we cannot compare the treasures which the earth contains or the sea conceals; for liberty, as honor, we can and ought to risk our lives; and, on the other hand, captivity is the greatest evil that can befall man.”²⁵

What do we do to enter His Kingdom on earth? What is the sin that bars us?

“Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous [sins]; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.” (Ps 19:13)

Could the great transgression be when we let another have dominion over us and give service in exchange for the ease of granted benefits at our neighbor's expense? Is it not a sin to make another man or institution a ruler over us instead of God? What should we not do so that we may enter the Kingdom of God?

“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Pr. 23:1, 3)

Should we not apply for and keep the gifts, gratuities, and benefits of God?

“For I say unto you, That except your righteousness²⁶ shall exceed [the righteousness] of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” (Matthew 5:20)

Not all the captivity of the Roman Empire was by force. Benefits, gratuities, and privileges were granted by contractual submission to Roman authority. If one

consented to subjection and tribute, then privileges were granted and bestowed. Even citizenship could be obtained for a price. Where do we find rest from the oppression of this world?

“And to you who are troubled [contracted²⁷] rest [tolerable captivity²⁸] with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed [made visible²⁹] from heaven with his mighty angels,” (2 Thessalonian 1:7)

If His kingly dominion is here now what is the key that unlocks the door? Will His Kingdom grow as we accept His authority?

“And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed [it] unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church;³⁰ and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.” (Mt.16:17,19)

The first king was God, the Father of Adam, and all just government authority is based upon the law of *Patronus* (father) and continued consent. Jesus said: *“And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven.” (Mt. 23:9)*

Are we adopted by governments? How do we get adopted as the children of God?

“For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” (Matthew 12:50 Mr. 3:35)

“And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted,³¹ and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.” (Matthew. 18:3,4)

“Humility, that low, sweet roo, from which all heavenly virtues shoot.”³²

“...The Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. “(Matthew 13:24,25)

“Again, the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: Who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.” (Matthew 13:45,46)

“Courage leads to heaven; fear, to death.” ³³

“Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.” (Matt 13:47, 50)

God’s Kingdom is now. In heaven and on earth, He has His servants who he adopts as his children. God entrusted the earth to man and, when he sent His servants, the prophets, they were persecuted and killed. When God sent His Son, they persecuted and killed Him also. But Jesus lives. He is a King now. He is the King of kings. Is He your king or has the “voice of the people” chosen another? Do you want to live under His dominion, accepting His authority and receiving His benefits? Would you rather accept the benefits of others and live under their dominion or God's? Who do you wish to serve God or mammon, Christ or Caesar?

God has given mankind flesh and blood and then entrusted the earth to us and we are to “dress it and keep it” in His service. He gave us wives and husbands to cherish and love, also our children to teach, nourish, and raise in His ways. Men have given the responsibility and authority over God's gifts to other men who know not God. Men have accepted the privileges and protection of those men and their created institutions, selling their birthright in the Kingdom of Heaven for the blessings of the kingdoms of men.

“Order my steps in thy word: and let not any iniquity have dominion over me.” (Ps 119:133)

“And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s, and unto God the things which be God’s.” (Luke 20:25)

“And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.” (1 Chronicles 21:1)

“For [the kingdom of heaven is] as a man traveling into a far country, [who] called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey... His lord said unto him, Well done, [thou] good and faithful servant:... Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou

hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed... His lord answered and said unto him, [Thou] wicked and slothful servant, Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and [then] at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.” (Mt 25:14..27)

Men have always had the freewill of choice to follow the ways of the Creator or to establish kingdoms for themselves, such as Cain’s city-state (Enoch), Babylon, Egypt, or Rome’s Empire. Jesus was not talking about just any old kingdom of men, but the good news of the kingdom of heaven, which is translated from *ouranos*.

Ouranos can have several senses and meanings, “...indeed we have no suitable word to express what the Greeks at first called an *ouranos*. It will be convenient to use the term “world” for it; ...³⁴

Ouranos, comes from a root that means “to cover, encompass.” The meaning of *ouranos* includes the “vaulted expanse of the sky”, from the outer edge of the atmosphere to the center of the earth. The phrase “kingdom of heaven” means the “kingdom of the world”, the “dominion of earth” granted to man from generation to generation.

“He owns the land from the heavens and to the center of the earth.”³⁵

The Roman Law, along with many other cultures, believed that, if a man owned the land, he owned it from the sky all the way to its center. Even in American courts, when someone actually owns the land, having more than a mere “legal title”, “the maxim that a man’s land extends to the center of the earth below the surface, and to the skies above, and are absolute in the owner of the land.”³⁶

Land owned with a true and actual title by an individual was his realm, his kingdom. In the Aramaic texts, the word *malkuthach* is translated into “*kingdom of heaven*”. It actually means “a realm on the earth.”

The bliss of the heavenly kingdom of God is the liberty to do God’s will on earth as it is in Heaven.

“And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.”

Footnotes

¹“Heaven,” Microsoft ® Encarta. © 1994 Ms. Corp.& Funk & Wagnall’s Corp.

2-Pope.

3Strong's No. 430 'elohiym {el-o-heem'} 1) (plural) 1a) **rulers, judges.**

4Strong's No. 7812 shachah {shaw-khaw'} 1,c1) to bow down, prostrate oneself.

5Strong's No. 430 'elohiym {el-o-heem'} 1) (plural) 1a) **rulers, judges.**

6Strong's No. 3068 Y@hovah {yeh-ho-vaw'} Jehovah "the existing One."

7Strong's No. 1966 heylel {hay-lale'} (in the sense of brightness) ... n m Lucifer = "light-bearer" 1) shining one, morning star, Lucifer 1a) of the king of Babylon and Satan (figurative) 2) 'Helel' describing the king of Babylon

8Strong's No.127 'adamah {ad-aw-maw'} [119 adam] 1) ground, land 1a) ground (as general, tilled, yielding sustenance) 1b) piece of ground, a specific plot of land 1c) earth substance (for building or constructing) 1d) ground as earth's

9Strong's No. 2522 chalash {khaw-lash'} 1) to be weak, be prostrate.

10Strong's No. 0430 'elohiym {el-o-heem'} 1) (plural) 1a) **rulers, judges** 1b) divine ones 1c) angels 1d) gods.

11Strong's No. 5647 `abad {aw-bad'} a primitive root; v 1) to work, serve 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to labour, work, do work 1a2) to work for another, serve another by labour 1a3) to serve as subjects 1a4) to serve (God) 1a5) to serve (with Levitical service) 1b) (Niph) 1b1) to be worked, be tilled (of land) 1b2) to make oneself a servant 1c) (Pual) to be worked 1d) (Hiph) 1d1) to compel to labour/work, cause to labour, cause to serve ...

12 Strong's No. 8104 shamar {shaw-mar'} 1) to keep, guard, observe, give heed 1a1) to keep, have charge of.

13Chinese proverb.

14Cecil B. DeMille in "the Ten Commandments."

15Milton - Paradise Lost Bk.XII. L.64.

16"Freedom is the Right to Choose, the Right to create for oneself the alternatives of Choice. Without the possibility of Choice, and the exercise of Choice, a man is not a man but a member, an instrument, a thing." Archibald MacLeish

17Strong's No. 2963 kuriotes {koo-ree-ot'-ace} [frm 2962=kurios=lord] dominion (3) - government (1) [4] 1) dominion, power, lordship; in the NT: one who possesses

18Frederic Bastiat

[19](#)Confucius B.C. 551 479.

[20](#)Strong's No. 932 basileia from 935; - kingdom (of God) 71 - kingdom (of heaven) (32) - kingdom (general or evil) (20) - (Thy or Thine) kingdom (6) - His kingdom (6) - the kingdom (5) - (My) kingdom (4) - misc (18) [162] 1) royal power, kingship, dominion, rule; not to be confused with an actual kingdom but rather the right or authority to rule over a kingdom 2) a kingdom or territory 3) used in the N.T. to refer to the rule of the Messiah

[21](#)Strong's No. 1525 eiserchomai {ice-er'-khom-ah-ee} - enter (107) - go (22) - come in (19) - go in (18) - enter in (17) - come (14) - arise (1) [198] 1) to go out or come in: to enter 1a) of men or animals, as into a house or a city 1b) used of Satan taking possession of the body of a person 1c) of things: -- as food, that enters into the eater's mouth 2) metaphorically 2a) of entrance into any condition, state of things, society, employment; to arise, come into existence, begin to be; to come before the public; to come into life. Concordance.W.B.F..

[22](#)Eugene Field 1850 - 1895.

[23](#)Strong's No. 935 basileus from 939 (through the notion of a foundation of power); - king (82) - King (of Jews) (21)- King (God or Christ) (11) - King (of Israel) (4) [118] 1) leader of the people, prince, commander, lord of the land, king.

[24](#)Strong's No. 2453 Ioudaios {ee-oo-dah'-yos} from 2448 (in the sense of 2455 as a country); adj AV - Jew (193) - of Judea (3) - Jewess (2) [198] 1) Jewish, belonging to the Jewish race 2) Jewish as respects to birth, race, religion.

[25](#)Cervantes 1547-1616

[26](#)Strong's No. 1343 dikaiosune from 1342; n f AV - righteousness (92) 1) the state of him who is as he ought to be, righteousness, the condition acceptable to God 1a) the doctrine concerning the way in which man may attend a state approved of God 1b) integrity, virtue, purity of life, rightness, correctness of thinking feeling, and acting 2) in a narrower sense, justice or the virtue which gives each his due.

[27](#) Strong's No. 2346 thlibo akin to the base of 5147; vb AV - trouble (4) - afflict (3) -narrow (1) - throng (1) - suffer tribulation (1) [10] 1) to press (as grapes), press hard upon; a compressed way, i.e. narrow straitened, contracted; metaphorically, to trouble, afflict, distress.

[28](#)Strong's No. 425 anesis from 447; AV - rest (3) - liberty (1) - be eased (1) [5] 1) a loosening, relaxing; **spoken of a more tolerable condition in captivity**, to be held in less vigorous confinement...

[29](#)Strong's No. 602 apokalupsis revelation (12) [18] 1) a laying bare, making naked a) a disclosure of truth, instruction, concerning things before unknown 1b) used of events by which things or states or persons hitherto withdrawn from view are made visible to all manifestation, appearance.

[30](#) Strong's No. 1577 ekklesia from a compound of 1537 and a derivative of 2564; n f AV - church (112) - assembly (3) [115] I) a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place; an assembly 1) an assembly of the people convened at the public place of the council for the purpose of deliberating ...

[31](#) Strong's No. 4762 strepho vb AV - turn (11) - turn (one's) self (2) - turn (one) (1) - turn again (1) - turn back again (1) - turn (one) about (1)- be converted (1) [18] 1) to turn, turn around; to turn one's self (i.e. to turn the back to one; used of one who no longer cares for another); metaph. to turn one's self from one's course of conduct, i.e. to change one's mind.

[32](#) Thomas Moore 1779 1852.

[33](#) Seneca B.C. 3-65 AD.

[34](#) PLATO'S DIALOGUES, Early Greek Philosophy, Introduction , John Burnet.

[35](#) Cuius est solum, ejus est usque ad caelum et ad inferos

[36](#) Taylor v Fickas, 64 Ind. 167, 172 (1878)

Republic
(Free from things public)

Vs.

Democracy
(A mob for a king)



“The multitude of those who err is no protection for error.”¹

“But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? [They] all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but [that] rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed [his] hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye [to it]. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood [be] on us, and on our children.” (Mt 27:20, 25)

“Throughout history, rulers and court intellectuals have aspired to use the educational system to shape their nations, The model was set out by Plato in The Republic and was constructed most faithfully in Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany.... One can see how irresistible a vehicle the schools would be to any social engineer. They represent a unique opportunity to mold future citizens early in life, to instill in them the proper reverence for the ruling culture, and to prepare them to be obedient and obeisant taxpayers and soldiers.”²

“Our forefathers, inhabitants of the island of Great Britain, left their native land, to seek on these shores a residence for civil and religious freedom.”³

Civil and religious freedom had become difficult to find in Great Britain. The people were willing to brave tremendous hardships, even death by the thousands, in order to find that freedom. Did those people feel that there was civil and religious freedom to be found here in the Americas?

At first, it was nearly impossible to find settlers to colonize this new land until the signing of the colonial charters by Charles I, and eventually Charles II, which waived rights of the kings of England that had inhabited Great Britain. Since William of Normandy took Harold’s lands, chattels, and personal property in action by right of “judgment in arms” in 1066 with his success at Hastings, the civil freedoms of freemen has been constantly under attack. Except for the threat of the sword by the nobles at Runnymede and the occasional revolt, there was no real progress back toward the natural liberty enjoyed by the freeman before the “will and order” of William and his “Doomsday Book” establishing his legal systems.

“The laws of England are threefold: common law, customs, and decrees of parliament.”⁴

“Before the Norman conquest of England in 1066, the people were the fountainhead of justice. The Angloe-Saxon courts were composed of large numbers of freemen and the law which they administered, was that which had been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation. In competition with these popular, nonprofessional courts the Norman king, who insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice, set up his own tribunals... The angloe-Saxon tribunals had been open to all; every freeman could appeal to them for justice.”⁵

This conflict between the Common Law and the Civil Law was one of the most important factors motivating the original immigration to the Americas for those seeking civil and religious freedom. After all, it was the oppressive civil laws handed down by the tyrannical kings and weak parliaments that was imposing the

religious persecution on the people. But it was the religious reformists, trying to right the unrighteous practices of that system, that had stimulated the governments religious and civil oppression.

“When the common law and statute law concur, the common law is to be preferred.”⁶

With the common law, the people were the fountainhead of justice through their system of trial by jury. “The jury has a right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy.”⁷ “The pages of history shine on instances of the jury’s exercise of its prerogative to disregard instructions of the judge; for example, acquittals under the fugitive slave law.”⁸ “The common law right of the jury to determine the law as well as the facts remains unimpaired.”⁹

When a Common Law jury sits, “The law itself is on trial quite as much as the cause which is to be decided.”¹⁰ In most courts today, the jury is a jury of persons who have sworn to decide the facts of a case in accordance with presumptions of law established by the legislature and interpreted by the judge.

“Man (homo) is a term of nature; person (persona), of the civil law.”¹¹

“In no relation can the religious motive in English expansion be neglected without doing violence to the record... Still more significant in English expansion than the work of preachers in quest of souls to save were the labors of laymen from the religious sects of every variety who fled to the wilderness in search of a haven all their own.”

“...Faith in Christ inspired the missionaries... and.. colonists who subdued the waste places of the new world...”

“Now the commercial corporation for colonization,... was in reality a kind of autonomous state. Like the state, it had a constitution, a superior law binding constituent and officers.”

“The colonies were ‘companies.’ ‘The legal instrument for realization of that design was a charter granted by ‘the dominionitive authority of the king’ uniting the sponsors of the enterprise in ‘one body politic and corporate,’ known as the Trustees for establishing the colony...”

“Thus every essential element long afterward found in the government of the American state appeared in the chartered corporation that started English civilization in America.”¹²

Until the colonial charters were signed, consequently ridding the kingdom of troublesome rebels, there seemed to be no relief from the encroachment of government authority. In those charters, the individual colonies were called “a republic.” But what kind of republics were they? They were not utopias, but refuges of individual responsibility where no law could be made “except by the consent of the freeman.”

“The civil law reduces the unwilling freedman to his original slavery; but the laws of the Angles judge once manumitted as ever after free.”¹³

Today, *the government* is referenced as the United States Federal Democracy, even though, at the beginnings of government in the Americas, the word “republic” was the title most sought and most used. Is there a difference?

“The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government...”¹⁴

“Republic. A commonwealth; that form of government in which the administration of affairs is open to all the citizens. In another sense, it signifies the state, independently of its government.”¹⁵

We see here that there may be more than one sense to the word “republic”. First, the ‘administration of affairs’ is open to citizens and it can be referred to as a commonwealth, which denotes the general welfare of the people or the public. In the other sense, a republic ‘signifies the state independent of its government’.

What does that mean? Haven’t we been taught that the state is the government? Here it says that the state is independent from the government. The word “state” in Webster’s has almost twenty different definitions. A state is a status or an estate or a condition of life which, in the case of a republic, can be independent of its government.

In another place, we find the word “republic” defined, “A state or nation in which the supreme power rests in all the citizens... A state or nation with a president as its titular head; distinguished from monarchy.” In this definition, we see again that the supreme power is in the hands of the citizen, who is entitled to vote. The

representatives are in charge of administrating the affairs of government. In the second definition, it states that the singular executive is titular. Titular is defined as, “existing in title or name only; nominal...” while a monarch is “a single or sole ruler of a state... a person or a thing that suppresses others of the same kind.”¹⁶

The United States Federal Government is to guarantee to every State, status or condition of life a Republican form of government. Why then does the government of the states and the United States seem to have such a supreme authority over almost every aspect of its citizenry and their lives? What is the true nature of this American Republic?

“The term republic, res publica, signifies the state independently of its form of government.”¹⁷

Before we go further, it should be understood that the original republic was one in which a freeman was free from civil authority and religiously allowed to accept or reject his God as King. The word “republic” was used because those early pilgrims and separatists knew its origins. It is a shortened form of the Latin idiom “*Libera res Publica*”, meaning “free from things public.” The heads of the government were “titular” in authority, meaning that they held authority “in name only.” In an indirect democracy, the mob elects those that govern the whole, while, in the republic, you only elected representatives with a limited authority.

Even before the so-called American Revolution, the united States found that, “Natural law was the first defense of colonial liberty.” Also, “There was a secondary line upon which much skirmishing took place and which some Americans regarded as the main field of battle. The colonial charters seemed to offer an impregnable defense against abuses of parliamentary power because they were supposed to be compacts between the king and people of the colonies; which, while confirming royal authority in America, denied by implication the right of Parliament to intervene in colonial affairs. Charters were grants of the king and made no mention of the parliament. They were even thought to hold good against the King, for it was believed that the King derived all the power he enjoyed in the colonies from the compacts he had made with the settlers. Some colonists went so far to claim that they were granted by the ‘King of Kings’-and therefore ‘no earthly Potentate can take them away.’”¹⁸

John Adams said that when the grantees of the:

“Massachusetts Bay Charter carried it to America they ‘got out of the English realm, dominions, state, empire, call it by what name you will, and out of the legal

jurisdiction of the Parliament. The king might, by his writ or proclamation, have commanded him to return; but he did not. By this interpretation, the charters accorded Americans' all the rights and privileges of a natural free-born subject of Great Britain and gave colonial assemblies the sole right of imposing taxes."¹⁹

“Accordingly, when Americans were told that they had no constitutional basis for their claim of execution from parliamentary authority, they answered, ‘Our Charters have done it absolutely.’ ‘And if one protests,’ remarked a Tory, ‘the answer is, You are an Enemy to America, and ought to have your brains beat out.’^{20,21}

George Washington, in his General Order of July 9, 1776, speaks of rights and liberties already possessed and to be defended as Christians, when he said, “The General hopes and trusts that every officer and man will endeavor so to live, and act, as becomes a Christian Soldier defending the dearest Rights and Liberties of his country.”

Almost from the beginning of English settlement, the government permitted the tradition of local liberty to take such firm root in America so that Alexander Hamilton could say in 1775 that “the rights we now claim are coeval with the original settlement of these colonies.”²²

Samuel Adams stated, on August 1, 1776, within one month of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, “Our Union is complete; our constitution composed, established, and approved. You are now the guardians of your own liberties. We may justly address you, as the decemviri did the Romans, and say: ‘Nothing that we propose can pass into law without your consent. Be yourself, O Americans, the authors of those laws on which your happiness depends.’”

The early Americans let the facts be submitted to a candid world in their Declaration of Independence as they stood against the King of Great Britain. Their complaint was not due to taxation without representation as is popularly taught in public schools. They did speak of an absolute despotism, and that it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security. That new guard became the state militia, but now has been replaced by a federal army and soon by a U.N. police force. What was the history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having the indirect object the establishment of an absolute tyranny? The list is long and numerous and sounds like a description of life in these United States, but it does include taxes imposed without consent.

“For imposing taxes on us without our Consent:”²³

“The term ‘sovereign power’ of a state is often used without any very definite idea of its meaning, and it is often misapplied... The sovereignty of a state does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of its government, but in the People, from whom the government emanated; and they may change it at their discretion. Sovereignty, then, in this country, abides with the constituency, and not with the agent; and this remark is true, both in reference to the federal and state government.”²⁴

“This word ‘person’ and its scope and bearing in the law, involving, as it does, legal fictions and also apparently natural beings, it is difficult to understand; but it is absolutely necessary to grasp, at whatever cost, a true and proper understanding of the word in all the phases of its proper use... The words *persona* and *personae* did not have the meaning in the Roman which attaches to *homo*, the individual, or a man in the English; it had peculiar references to artificial beings, and the condition or status of individuals... A person is here not a physical or individual person, but the status or condition with which he is invested... not an individual or physical person, but the status, condition or character borne by physical persons... The law of persons is the law of status or condition.”

“A moment's reflection enables one to see that man and person cannot be synonymous, for there cannot be an artificial man, though there are artificial persons. Thus the conclusion is easily reached that the law itself often creates an entity or a being which is called a person; the law cannot create an artificial man, but it can and frequently does invest him with artificial attributes; this is his personality... that is to say, the man-person; and abstract persons, which are fiction and which have no existence except in law; that is to say, those which are purely legal conceptions or creations.”²⁵

“We are not contending that our rabble, or all unqualified persons, shall have the right of voting, or not be taxed; but that the freeholders and electors, whose right accrues to them from the common law, or from charter, shall not be deprived of that right.”²⁶

“The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state.”²⁷

The fact that the State governments, as Republics of America before and after the ratification of The Constitution of the United States, rested, not in the hands of the State governments, but in the hands and hearts of the individual freeman living on his land in fee-simple. The state governments had no real sovereign authority to

make the United States a sovereign nation with dominion over the people. The states, knowing they had only a titular authority, ratified the Constitution, creating the United States in the name of the people and vested in that corporate being those few and limited rights and responsibilities that they had assumed from the delinquent king of England.

Again, as Judge Learned Hand stated, “I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and courts. These are false hopes, believe me; these are false hopes. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no Constitution, no law, no court can save it.”²⁸

“Just as the revolutionary Adams opposed the Constitution in Massachusetts, so did Patrick Henry in Virginia, and the contest in that most important State of all was prolonged and bitter. He who in stamp Act days had proclaimed that there should be no Virginians or New Yorkers, but only Americans, now declaimed as violently against the preamble of the Constitution because it began, ‘We the people of the United States’ instead of ‘We, the State.’ Like many, he feared a ‘consolidated’ government, and the loss of states rights. Not only Henry but much abler men, such as Mason, Benjamin Harrison, Munroe, R.H. Lee were also opposed and debated... others in what was the most acute discussion carried on anywhere...”

“Owing to the way in which the conventions were held, the great opposition manifested everywhere, and the management required to secure the barest majorities for ratification, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the greater part of the people were opposed to the Constitution.”

“It was not submitted to the people directly, and in those days of generally limited suffrage, even those who voted for delegates to the State conventions were mostly of a propertied class, although the amount of property called for may have been slight.”²⁹

“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights,

shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”³⁰

Even Alexander Hamilton wrote against the Bill of Rights, “Here, in strictness, the people surrender nothing; and as they retain everything they have no need of particular reservations....”

“But a minute detail of particular rights is certainly far less applicable to a constitution like that under consideration, which is merely intended to regulate the general political interests of a nation, than a constitution which has regulation of every species of personal and private concerns.”

He went on to say that the bill of rights were “unnecessary” and even “dangerous.” “They would contain various exceptions to powers not granted; and, on this very account, would afford a colorable pretext to claim more than were granted. For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do?”³¹

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”³²

“A constitution is a body of precepts, the purpose of which is to control government action until modified in some authorized manner. These precepts may be either written or unwritten.”³³

It was not the Constitution of the United States, but the body of precepts, that predated it, including the charters, that was the original guardian of the American free dominion.

“Lawyers are being graduated from law school by the thousands who have little knowledge of the constitution. When organizations seek a lawyer to instruct them on the Constitution they find it nearly impossible to secure one competent.”³⁴

The once colonial and now state administrative government and other equitable and economic interests wanted a Constitution. The State, status of the sovereign people, was independent of the administering government in the republics. This explains the need to use the phrase, “We the People of the United States.” This new agreement had almost no power over, “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 town meetings.” For he, “had a new self-reliance. Wrestling with his soul and plough on week days, and the innumerable points of the minister’s sermon on Sundays and meeting days, he was coming to be a tough nut for any imperial system to crack”³⁵ and he certainly didn’t want this new Constitution.

“And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice.” (1Sa 15:24)

This corporate charter, called the Constitution, was signed by the members of the convention and later ratified by the weak State governments, “in Order to form a more perfect Union,... and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”³⁶

“You have a republic, now can you keep it.” ³⁷

“Government is instituted to protect property of every sort; as well as that which lies in the various rights of individuals, as that which the term particularly expresses. This being the end of government, this alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own... That is not a just government, nor is property secure under it, where the property a man has in his personal safety and personal liberty, is violated by arbitrary seizures of one class of citizens for the service of the rest.”³⁸

“The first requisite of a citizen in this Republic of ours, is that

he shall be able and willing to pull his own weight.”³⁹

Everyday in the United States, one class of citizens procures for itself the property of another through taxation and lobbied legislated statutes. Schools, old age benefits, health care, aid, all types of assistance, insurance, benefits, and grants, even foreign nations reap the benefits of friendship and camaraderie with the United States Federal Government at the expense of the taxpayers.

“But Jesus called them [unto him], and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” (Matthew 20:25, 28)

If this is true, then a democracy cannot be Christian in nature, because, in a democracy, 51% of the people ‘exercise authority’ over the other 49%. Then again, if the majority of the people in the United States were Christian in nature, they would at least manifest a democracy that had a Christian appearance, but alas, this does not seem to be the case either.

In a republic, the people should pull their own weight, they surrender nothing, no law can be made except by their individual consent, the status of the people is

independent from government, and that government is titular in its authority, meaning *in name only*”.

“The Superior man thinks always of virtue; the common man thinks of comfort.” ⁴⁰

Are we confusing forms of government? Is there a distinction we are not making? Has something been changed or done that we have missed?

What is, “Most relevant to republicanism in the Western world?” Is it, “Aristotle’s distinction between democracy, the perverted form of rule by the many, and its opposite polity, the good form. He believed that democracies were bound to experience turbulence and instability because the poor, who he assumed would be the majority in democracies, would seek an economic and social equality that would stifle individual initiative and enterprise. In contrast, polity, with a middle class capable of justly adjudicating conflicts between the rich and poor, would allow for rule by the many without the problems and chaos associated with democratic regimes.”⁴¹ Still, is this Christ’s kingdom’s plan?

“He becometh poor that dealeth [with] a slack hand: but the hand of the diligent maketh rich.” (Pr. 10:4)

The poor have sought economic and social equality. But have they been the majority? They have certainly been assisted by the political demagogues wearing specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people. The economic middle class has diminished in America, but more importantly, the ethical and moral middle class, who would never consider taking from his brother what he has not earned for himself, has all but disappeared.

“Accustomed to trampling on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.”⁴²

Madison clarified our status in this “a Republic with federal form.” “It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of society against the injustice of the other part. Different classes of citizens. If a majority be united by common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecure. In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights.”⁴³

But doesn’t the Constitution guarantee a ‘Republican Form of Government’?⁴⁴

It is only the States that are guaranteed a Republican form of government, and only if they want it and take the responsibility for it. Keep in mind that, in a republic, the State (status, estate... resting in the rights of the freeman) may be separate from its government. Today, we still have that republic, but many of its inhabitants are also members of a democracy, not by legislative decree, but by our own voluntary consent through participation in word and deed. You have to look back no further than April 3, 1918, when the new American creed was read in Congress, beginning with the words, "I believe in the United States of America as a government... whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed: a democracy in a republic." In other words, the United States Federal Democracy is an ever changing corporate society that was created by the State administrative governments and it has no authority and or jurisdiction over the status or estate of the freeman in America living in the original republic, which predated the U.S. Constitution. But who lives there?

“Constantly bearing in mind that entering into society individuals must give up a share of liberty”⁴⁵

The United States is a corporate government within the original Republic. It occupied land outside the states and had little jurisdiction within their boundaries. Even after they illegally ratified the Constitution of the United States, the States were still as foreign to each other as Mexico is to Canada.

With that unconstitutional ratification, the state governments literally were in revolt against the will of the free and common people of America. Over the following years, the corporate State grew in power, position, and authority by offering a banquet of benefits, gratuities, and grants. Few have taken the time to obtain the knowledge of what is contained in the political recipe of those stirring the caldron of government soup.

Remember, “Civil rights are such as belong to every citizen of the state or country, or, in a wider sense to all its inhabitants, and are not connected with the organization or the administration of government. They include the rights of property, marriage, protection by laws, freedom of contract, trial by jury, etc. Or, as otherwise defined, civil rights are rights appertaining to a person in virtue of his citizenship in a state or community. Rights capable of being enforced or redressed in civil action. Also a term applied to certain rights secured to citizens of the United States by the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, and by various acts of Congress made in pursuance thereof.”⁴⁶

“The **Fourteenth Amendment** recognizes two types of citizenship, national and state”,⁴⁷ which are clearly defined above when it is remembered that sovereignty in the state is vested in the individual man, not the persons of government. The states have steadily (as they have done from the beginning) betrayed the people for the expansion of their own corporate power. Power gives appetite for more power.

There are civil rights that belong to every citizen of a state or status. Or, as otherwise defined, there are civil rights pertaining to a person in virtue of his citizenship in a state or community. But what community?

In the early days of the republic, the United States knew that, “In one sense, the term ‘**sovereign**’ has for its correlative ‘subject.’ In this sense, the term can receive no application; for it has no object in the [Original] Constitution of the United States. Under that Constitution there are citizens, but no subjects.”⁴⁸ But we have seen this change over time.

In the original Republics, citizenship of the individual freeman depended upon his ownership of land. Legal title does not include ownership. In the United States, its political obligation is dependent on the enjoyment of the protection of government; and it “binds the citizen”.

“And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matthew. 16:19)

It should also be understood that, “an individual can be a **Citizen** of one of the several States without being a citizen of the United States,”⁴⁹ and an individual may become, “a **citizen** of the United States without being a **Citizen** of a State.”⁵⁰ Although from that moment of attached citizenship in the United States, the individual would be an individual person. The States have also been bound by their agreements until they are no more than corporate entities of the United States.

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”⁵¹ “This section recognizes the difference between citizen of United States and Citizens of a state.”⁵²

“Both before and after the **Fourteenth Amendment** to the Federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to

be a citizen of his state.”⁵³ But, “The term resident and **citizen** of the United States is distinguished from a **Citizen** of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by congress.”⁵⁴

It is stated over and over that there is a citizenship with civil rights that is not connected with the organization or the administration of government and there is another citizenship that is granted to a person in virtue of his citizenship with rights redressed in civil action and citizens of the United States by the **Thirteenth** and **Fourteenth** Amendments. The civil rights of a citizen of the United States is a completely regulated privilege because one type of, “civil right’ is a right given and protected by law [through a legal system], and a person’s enjoyment therefore is regulated entirely by the law [the legal system] that creates it.”⁵⁵

The United States is subject to such “deceitful meats” and it has compromised its sovereignty among nations. But are the fifty States and the United States the only governments we have to choose from? Or is there a government that would not apply to the dainties of the nations or eat at its table of deceit?

“The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled, and the assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed lest Rome become bankrupt. People must again learn to work, instead of living on public assistance.”⁵⁶

The Kingdom of God is an alternative to the men who call themselves benefactors but exercise authority one over the other. To find that kingdom of righteousness men must repent... change their ways from that of the “world” to the ways of Christ and His appointed kingdom of heaven.

When you sit to eat with governments, consider what is put before you. If you be a man of appetite, put a knife to your throat. Don’t be desirous of their deceitful dainties and offerings. (see Proverbs 23:1, 3) Everything government offers, it has taken from others.

“Where, Say Some, is the king of America? I’ll tell you, Friend, he reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind...”⁵⁷

“As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism We shall presently recognize in nationalism the major obstacle

to development of world-mindedness. We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty. UNESCO must be the pioneer.”⁵⁸

Will all of America go under this new world nation or just those within the authority of the United States? Can you be under King Jesus and give obeisance to a one world order? Can you continue to take its mark and serve its gods? If you give allegiance to the United States and the United States goes under such authority, are you swept away in the harvest of those who would be god of this new world order?

“And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.” (Re 18:23)

Footnotes

¹Multitudo errantium non parit errori patrocinium. 11Coke, 73.

²Sheldon Richman in his book Separating School and State.

³Representatives of the united colonies on July 6, 1775,

⁴Leges Angliæ sunt tripartitæ: jus commune, consuetudines, ac decreta comitiiorum.

⁵Clark’s Summary of American law. Common Law Chat 1 pp.530.

⁶4 Coke,71.

⁷Chief Justice John Jay, U.S. Supreme Court Georgia v Brailsford (3 Dall1,1794)

⁸U.S. v Daugherty 473 F 2d 1113 at 1130 (1972).

⁹State v. Croteau, 23 Vt. 14, 54 Am. Dec. 90 (1849)

¹⁰Harlan F. Stone, 12th Chief Justice U.S. supreme Court, (1941)

¹¹Homo vocabulum est; persona juris civilis. Calvinus, Lex.

¹²Chapt I p10, Chapter II p36, *The Rise of the American Civilization* by Charles A. Beard & Mary R. Beard.

[13](#)Libertinum ingratum leges civiles in pristina servitute redigunt; sed leges anglicae semel manumissum semper liberum judicant. Co. Litt. 137.

[14](#)Constitution of the United States, Section 4.

[15](#)Republic. Black's Dictionary 3rd Ed. p1536.

[16](#)Webster's New Dictionary unabridged 2nd Ed. 1965.

[17](#)Bouvier's Vol.1. page 13 (1870).

[18](#)The Other Side of the Question, by a Citizen, New York, 1774, 16.

[19](#)Principles and Acts of the Revolution, edited by H. Niles, 16.

[20](#)Pennsylvania Journal and Weekly Advertiser, September 4, 1766, Supplement.

[21](#)174-175 Origins of the American Revolution by John C. Miller.

[22](#) The Works of Alexander Hamilton, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, New York, 1904, I, 172. 9 Ibid., March 31, 1768.

[23](#)The Declaration of Independence

[24](#)Spooner v. McConnell, 22 Fed. Cas. 939, 943.

[25](#)American Law and Procedure, Vol 13 pages 137-62 1910.

[26](#)The Works of Alexander Hamilton, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, N Y, 1904, I, 172. 9 Ibid., March 31, 1768.

[27](#)In re Merriam, NY Re: Merriam, 36 N.E.505, 1441S.Ct. 1973. affirmed 16 S. Ct. 1073, 163 U.S. 625, 41 L. Ed 287; Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. § 1785.

[28](#)Spirit of Liberty 189

[29](#)History of the United States by James Truslow Adams Volume I pages 258-259.

[30](#)Ninth Amendment, Bill of Rights.

[31](#)Federalist 84 Alexander Hamilton.

[32](#)Tenth Amendment, Bill of Rights.

[33](#)Clark's Summary of American Law.

- [34](#)The Committee on American Citizenship, ABA, Denver,Co. July 14, 1926.
- [35](#)Hist of US by John Truslow Adams page 44.
- [36](#)Preamble to the Constitution of the United States.
- [37](#)Ben Franklin.
- [38](#)James Madison.
- [39](#)Theodore Roosevelt
- [40](#)Confucius.
- [41](#)“Republic,” Microsoft ® Encarta. © 1994 Ms. Corp.& F & W’s Corp.
- [42](#) Abraham Lincoln September 11, 1858.
- [43](#) Federalist LI.
- [44](#)Constitution of the United States, Section 4.
- [45](#)Andrew Jackson on March 4, 1833.
- [46](#)Black’s 3rd p. 1559.
- [47](#) Witkin, Summary of California Law, 7 th Edition, p1841.
- [48](#)Chishom v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419,455, 1L Ed 440 (1793).
- [49](#)U.S. v. Anthony, 24 Fed. Cas. 829, 830.
- [50](#)Slaughter-House Cases, Supra; cf. U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 US 542, 549(1875).
- [51](#)Constitution of the United States, Amendment 14 Sec. 1, (Ratified July 9,1868)
- [52](#)Frasher v. State, 3 Tex. Ct. App.267.
- [53](#)Citing U.S. v. Cruikshank, supra.
- [54](#)U.S. v Anthony, 24 Fed. 829 (1873).
- [55](#)Nickell v. Rosenfield, (1927) 82 CA 369, 375, 255 P. 760.
- [56](#)Cicero , 55 B.C.

[57](#) Thomas Paine's Common Sense

[58](#) William Benton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State, told a UNESCO meeting in 1946:

Democracy

(A chance for the mob to choose.)

vs.

Demagogue

(The choice of the mob.)



“For several hundred years after the early 8th century BC, many of the city-states of Greece were republican in form. Carthage was likewise a republic for more than 300 years, until its destruction by the Romans in 146 BC. For nearly 500 years, Rome itself was a republic in which virtually all free males were eventually franchised. One of the oldest extant republic is the state of San Marino on the Italian Peninsula, about 225 km (about 140 mi.) north of Rome. According to tradition, it was established as a republic in the second part of the 4th century AD.”¹ There are many kinds, types, and examples of Republics and Democracies in the world today, but the oldest has been kept a secret for too long.

On first examination, it does not seem that a Republic, in itself, is beneficial to freedom or a particularly benign form of government, that is, if you used The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or The Peoples' Republic of China as your model and yardstick for the measurement of individual freedom in a Republic.

Those examples are countries whose constituency resides in a Communist regime within their respective Republics. This fact, as well as their social history and custom, may have led to their present state. Now, the Soviet Union is supposedly no more and Russia has become a democracy of sorts within and under their present government that still operates within the original Russian Republic. Even China is now moving in its own inscrutable way toward democracy, but only within the authority and restrictions of its laws, society, and historical custom.

All this, while America seems to becoming a more restrictive society with less and less individual freedoms. “Those who already walk submissively say there is no need for alarm. But submissiveness is not our heritage. The First Amendment was designed to allow rebellion against usurpation to remain as our birthright. The Constitution was designed to keep government off the backs of the people.... The aim was to allow men to be free and independent and to assert their rights against government... The America once extolled as the voice of liberty heard around the world no longer is cast in the image which Jefferson and Madison designed, but more in the Russian image...”²

There is a distinct difference between a Democracy and a Republic. Although a republic may use a democratic vote to choose its representatives, who exercise a specified and restricted authority, the sovereignty rest in the hands, heart, and head of the individual constituent. A Democracy, on the other hand, is a pooling of rights of all sorts, which are vested in the majority, who rule collectively or through their leaders who are elected. The Democracy's power to regulate, tax, and dominate may be limited by a contract or constitution, but the Constitution may be expanded in scope by a larger consensus of the voters.

“A democracy is nothing more than mob rule, where fifty-one percent of the people may take away the rights of the other forty-nine.”³

The original American colonies were Republics. “Our forefathers, inhabitants of the island of Great Britain, left their native land, to seek on these shores a residence for civil and religious freedom:”⁴

In a republic, the State (status, estate... resting in the rights of the freeman) is independent of its government. A freeman was free from civil authority and religiously allowed to accept or reject his God as King. The word “republic” was used because those early pilgrims and separatists knew its origins. It is a shortened form of the Latin idiom “*Libera res Publica*”, meaning “free from things public.”

The heads of the government were “titular” in authority, meaning they held authority “in name only.”

“Government is not sovereignty. Government is the machinery or expedient for expressing the will of the sovereign power... This sovereign power in our government belongs to the People, and the government of the United States and the governments of the several states are but the machinery for expounding or expressing the will of the sovereign power... But it must be remembered, under our government, all sovereign power is lodged in the People; and the government, by its different departments, can exercise only such power as has been delegated to it by the People. None of these delegated powers can be by the government delegated to someone else. They are only granted to the government to be in proper cases exercised by it, and not to be given to another to be exercised by that other... Because neither Congress nor the treaty making power can grant away the sovereign powers of the government, but they can only exercise them for the People to whom they belong.”⁵

It is important to realize that, in a Republic, the sovereign power is not collective, but individualistic. It rests in the individual Patriarchs of each family unit. The Family is the essential building block of a true Theocratic Republic. Undermine the family and you undermine the Republic.

From its first inception, the Republic was under attack, but it was in the second century of its existence that the United States, a democracy within a Republic, was able to make some of its greatest advancements by the greatest inroads against the Family.

In the 1928 U.S. Army Training Manual, it attempted to define democracy and, therefore, defines an earlier American perception of a democracy:

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

In June 1952, “The Soldiers Guide” contained the following definition and changing attitude:

“Meaning of democracy: Because the United States is a democracy, the majority of the people decide how our government will be organized and run - and that includes the Army, Navy and Air Force. The people do this by electing representatives, and these men and women carry out the wishes of the people.”

If Samuel made it clear that it was evil for Israel to desire a ruler, king, judge, e.g. Sovereign, other than God Himself over them, then how much more evil is it for the collective citizens of the US to desire to be the sovereign over each and every citizen within that created jurisdiction?

“Under a democratic government, the citizens exercise the powers of sovereignty; and those powers will be first abused, and afterwards lost, if they are committed to an unwieldy multitude.”⁶

In those early days, we were called a republic. Today, the United States is called a federal democracy, “democracy” being “mob rule” and “federal” from the French word for “feudal”. But has the seat of the authority of government changed? Are we still a republic? The Declaration of Independence only made American republics independent from that limited authority that had remained in the hands of the king, due to our charters and his usurpation. It was the king who revolted against the law of the contract, the charters, by the attempted “usurpation”, “to seize a use” not justly his. He was not unlike the Pharaoh of old, who tried, on the shores of the Red Sea, to unlawfully, though unsuccessfully, withdraw consent already given to those God-fearing Israelites preparing to serve the LORD of lords.

“I believe in the United States of America as a government... whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed: a democracy in a republic.”⁷

In the story “A Tale of Two Alamos,”⁸ Hutton refers to “Travis’ line in the dust” as “that sublime moment of democratic choice.” As the story goes, William Barret Travis gave his men a choice of leaving or staying to fight a “hopeless” battle. All the men stayed but one Louis Rose, who climbed the wall and escaped to tell the story and open a meat market in Nacogdochea. When asked why he didn’t stay, his reply was “By God, I wasn’t ready to die.”

If he had been given a democratic choice, he would have been compelled to stay by the will of the mob. It would have been both a sublime act of democracy and his last. Fortunately, it was a sublime moment of individual choice in the Republic of Texas that allowed Rose to live.

So, a democracy is a kind of common purse of rights. Even though the democracy may exist within a Republic, it may grant duties and privileges that may be legally incumbent upon its members. In a democracy, the president may not be titular and the State may not be separate from its government. One would be more likely to be electing their leaders rather than mere representatives.

BUSINESS 1. n. business, occupation, employment, employ...⁹ Employ
"Equitable conversion."

Just as the individual Republican State governments were established to continue their work legislating the remedies in equity and business that were not available at the common law, so also was the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution established by those states to take over the limited responsibilities and privileges that had defaulted from the hands of the king and his parliament.

"It is easy to escape business, if you will only despise the rewards of business."¹⁰

The repugnance of Equity, Mercantilism and Commercial laws, which are not law, but followed the law and became the law through contract, were at the core of the motivating spirits of the Separatists, pilgrims, and Quakers, who risked all for a residence of civil and religious freedom on these shores. They had become almost untaxable, except for tariffs on foreign trade and excise tax upon the 'uses' not held in fee-simple. Since the common law was not regulated by statute, then the legislature created by the Constitution for the United States did not appear to be the threat to individual freedom, rights, and responsibility that it has become. Who could have known what twists and turns and metamorphosis this system and society would take in the years to follow!

"Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse: My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path: For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood." (Pr. 1:14,16)

The Constitution of the United States was simply an agreement between individual governments, which were only republics with little dominion or authority over the people. It was generally an unpopular agreement and, had it been important enough to be put to a vote, it would have never been past. What did those people see and understand in finding the Constitution so objectionable that we do not?

"If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering, but if we neglect its instruction and authority, No man can tell

how soon a catastrophe may overcome us, and bury all our glory in profound obscurity.”¹¹

Citizenship of or in government as a person, as opposed to Natural Citizenship as an inhabitant, is a privilege granted or denied and regulated by a government, created according to the rules established by that government. If an individual wishes to join and become a person in a legal society and be governed by the rules of that society’s government, then he is legally bound to abide by the rules of that created society. He bars himself from his own liberty and becomes a surety for the debt of his benefactor.

“And God spake all these words, saying, I [am] the LORD thy God [Ruler], which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness [of any thing] that [is] in heaven above, or that [is] in the earth beneath, or that [is] in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God [Ruler] [am] a jealous God [Ruler], visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God [Ruler] in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.” (Exodus 20:1, 7)

“Some scholars regard the ancient confederation of Hebrew tribes that endured in Palestine from the 15th century BC until a monarchy was established about 1020 BC as an embryonic republic. That would make the ancient Israelite commonwealth the earliest republic in history and one of the oldest democracies; except for slaves and women, all members of the community had a voice in the selection of their administrators and were eligible for political office.”¹²

The Bible was not establishing a religion, but a Government, because “The law given from Sinai was a civil and municipal as well as a moral and religious code...”¹³

“If we will not be governed by God, then we will be ruled by tyrants.”¹⁴

If the powers that would be are to blame for our ascent into a subjective citizenship, then we would not be truly subject, for there would be no consent. But the con-artist succeeds, not because of his own larceny, but because of the larceny in the heart of those he has tempted and deceived.

“And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you:” (II Peter 2,2-3)

“The people never give up their liberties except under some dilution.”¹⁵

“According to their uncleanness and according to their transgressions have I done unto them, and hid my face from them. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel, and will be jealous for my name:” (Ezekiel 39,24-25).

“All who have ever written on government are unanimous, that among people generally corrupt, liberty cannot long exist.”¹⁶

All the people, who have beseeched government, voted for taxes that enrich themselves personally, and applied for those gifts, gratuities, and benefits offered so temptingly by government have by those acts and deeds and words, coveted their neighbors goods and made them their own through the powers of their governing body.

“When statesmen forsake their consciences for what they consider the public good, they lead the country down the short road to chaos.”¹⁷

“I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those powers than by violent and sudden usurpations.”¹⁸

Upon entering into a democratic society, individuals must give up a share of their liberty. But isn't a democracy good? It is the people choosing, not just for themselves, but also their brother. All that the individual person owns as a citizen in The United States Federal Democracy has been pooled into a common purse where the majority regularly withdraws through their chosen leaders whatever they hope will fulfill their needs, wants, and desires.

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that [is] thy neighbour's.” (Exodus 20:17)

If you want the government to pay for something, then you want your neighbor to pay for that thing or provide that thing. The more you want your neighbor to fulfill

your desires, the more it is that you covet your neighbors goods and things. Coveting your neighbors goods is forbidden by God.

Some parents send their children to a private school and pay school taxes anyway. People who don't want those neighbors to have a tax voucher to help with their child's tuition because their taxes might go up, they are those who are coveting their neighbors' goods. If they want the government to pay for their health care or old age pension or disability, then they want their neighbor to pay for it. The same goes for welfare, grants, low interest loans, etc. If they want their neighbor or their neighbor's son to go to Iraq and Kuwait to bring down or keep down the price of oil so that they will have more money, then they covet their neighbors' goods and maybe even their life.

“And the LORD said unto Cain, Where [is] Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: [Am] I my brother's keeper?” (Ge 4:9)

Entering into the democracy is a freewill choice. Look at the benefits and advantages. But is it a good idea? Is it wise? Is it right? Are there disadvantages?

“Reason is the soul of the law,

and when the reason of any particular law ceases, so does the law itself.”¹⁹

“And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint [them] for himself, for his chariots, and [to be] his horsemen; and [some] shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and [will set them] to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters [to be] confectionaries, and [to be] cooks, and [to be] bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, [even] the best [of them], and give [them] to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put [them] to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not hear you in that day. Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.” (1 Samuel 8:11, 20)

“He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance... For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally, the Forms of our Governments:”²⁰

The Republic was a place of individual responsibility. Each individual took on the burden of protection from everything on an individual basis. Education of our children, the care of the elderly and sick, protection from poverty, and the criminal elements of the world were faced with individual courage and fortitude. Charity was handed out from the hand of the donator to the receiver with a voluntary commitment.

“Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols²¹ were upon the [community] beasts,²² and upon the [beast] cattle²³: your carriages [were] heavy loaden; [they are] a burden to the weary. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not [escape] deliver²⁴ the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity.²⁵ Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne [by me] from the belly, which are carried from the womb: And [even] to [your] old age I [am] he; and [even] to hoar hairs will I carry [you]: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry, and will deliver [you]. To whom will ye liken me, and make [me] equal, and compare me, that we may be like?” (Isaiah 46:1, 5)

The United States Federal Government is a corporate entity or society, which makes it a person. A monarch is, “a single or sole ruler of a state... a person or a thing that suppresses others of the same kind.”²⁶ Can a democracy take the place of a king and, further, who should be king?

“We must realize that today’s Establishment is the new George III. Whether it will continue to adhere to his tactics, we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution... the truth is that the vast bureaucracy now runs this country, irrespective of what party is in power.”²⁷

“Reform of the Federal Judiciary in 1937 was an attempt to make democracy king in America.”²⁸

“Where, Say Some, is the king of America? I’ll tell you, Friend, he reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind like the royal brute of Great Britain. Yet that we may not appear to be defective even in earthly honours, let a day be solemnly set apart for proclaiming the charter; let it be brought forth placed on divine law, the Word of God; let a crown be placed thereon, by which the world may know, that so far as we approve of monarchy, that in America the law is king. For as in

absolute governments the king is law, so in free countries the law ought to be king; and there ought to be no other. But lest any ill use should afterwards arise, let the crown at the conclusion of the ceremony be demolished, and scattered among the People whose right it is.”²⁹

The word “**federal**” comes from the French word “**federal**”, which, in turn, comes from the Latin *foedus, foederis*, a noun meaning, “treaty, league; compact”. To give you an idea of the true meaning of *foedus* when it is used as an adjective, it means foul, hideous, revolting; vile, disgraceful. :**Feudal**” also comes from the medieval Latin word *foedum*. **Feudalism** was a system where a lord held title to the land and the vassals and serfs lived on it. The vassal owed service and fealty to his lord.

“As long as we look to government to solve our problems we will always suffer tyranny.”³⁰

Are there any problems that society has not tried to place on the shoulders of government and, therefore, upon their brother’s shoulders? Have we not, over the years, magnified the place of government and the charisma of the titular leaders of government in our lives?

“...a dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues, and ending tyrants.”³¹

“Protection draws to it subjection; subjection protection.”³²

“Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst: but thou saidst, There is no hope: no; for I have loved strangers, and after them will I go. As the thief is ashamed when he is found, so is the house of Israel ashamed; they, their kings, their princes, and their priests, and their prophets, Saying to a stock, Thou [art] my father; and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth: for they have turned [their] back unto me, and not [their] face: but in the time of their trouble they will say, Arise, and save us. But where [are] thy gods [rulers] that thou hast made thee? let them arise, if they can save thee in the time of thy trouble: for [according to] the number of thy cities are thy gods [rulers], O Judah. Wherefore will ye plead with me? ye all have transgressed against me, saith the LORD. In vain have I smitten your children; they received no correction: your own sword hath devoured

your prophets, like a destroying lion. O generation, see ye the word of the LORD. Have I been a wilderness unto Israel? a land of darkness? wherefore say my people, We are lords; we will come no more unto thee?" (Jer.2:25,31)

In a democracy, the people are collectively their own master, their own ruler. It does not have to be so, but it is the temptation of man's vanity that inclines him to disregard the will of his Creator and become the ruler of his brothers.

"His vanity swelled him so vile and rank That he could hear no voices but his own... Then and now Men must lie in their Master's Holy Hands, moved only as he wills: Our hearts most seek out that will."

"The old king Bent close to the handle of the ancient relic, And saw written there the story of ancient wars Between good and evil, the opening of the waters, The Flood sweeping giants away, how they suffered And died, that race who hated the Ruler Of us all and received judgment from His hands, Surging waves that found them wherever They fled... A brood forever opposing the Lord's Will, and again and again defeated."³³

"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay but rather division." (Luke 12:51)

"And sometimes they sacrificed to the old stone gods, Made heathen vows, hoping for Hell's Support, the Devil's guidance in driving Their affliction off. That was their way, And the heathen's only hope, Hell Always in their hearts, knowing neither God Nor His passing as He walks through our world, the Lord Of Heaven and earth; their ears could not hear His praise nor know His glory. Let them Beware, those who are thrust into danger, Clutched at by trouble yet can carry no solace In their hearts, cannot hope to be better! Hail To those who will rise to God, drop off Their dead bodies and seek our Father's peace!... Words and bright wit Won't help your soul; you'll suffer hell's fires, Unferth, forever tormented... How often an entire country suffers On one man's account!"³⁴

"Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods [rulers]. But now, after that ye have known God [Ruler], or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" (Ga 4:8,9)

In the Old Testament, the word '*elohiym*' is the Hebrew word that is translated into the English word "**God**" or "**gods**". The Hebrew word actually means ruler, judge.³⁵ This meaning makes more sense when we remember that there was no

ruler over the Israelites but God Himself until the people begged for a king and Samuel anointed Saul.³⁶

“And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; [And] having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.” (Col 2:13, 15)

Today we will not even seek the wisdom of the prophets. We, through our handwritten decrees and constitutions, which created our democracies and their authorities, shall choose our own rulers with the same results history and the prophets have foretold.

“Absalom said moreover, Oh that I were made judge in the land,... so Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.” (2 Samuel 15:4,6)

Because men now follow less in the ways of the Lord, being filled with vanities and pride, they will follow a poorer choice than Absalom and men will be bound to their choice by words and deeds. Men and women may claim Christ as their king and their lord, but is it so?

“ But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?³⁷ [They] all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but [that] rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed [his] hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye [to it]. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood [be] on us, and on our children.” (Mt. 27:20,25)



It was a vote of the people, preferring the benefits, protection, and vanities of Caesar, that willfully chose to crucify the anointed King.

“... the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship³⁸ the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” (Mt. 4:8, 10)

The adversary, the devil, the powers that would be, had long since seduced the people into handing their individual dominion over to that demonic and central power.

“And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers³⁹ of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” (Rev. 18:4)

God calls His people in their hearts to separate from those false gods and rulers who have unequally yoked their brothers under their Babylonian, patrimonial power and authority.

“Thou shalt not bow down to their gods [rulers], nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images.” (Ex 23:24)

This was the call of the LORD from Adam to Noah and Abraham to Samuel.

“With whom the LORD had made a covenant, and charged them, saying, Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them:” (2Ki 17:35)

It was with the LORD we are to make our covenants and perform our oaths.

“Thou shalt not follow a multitude to [do] evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest [judgment]:” (Exodus 23:2)

Is this where man sins? He covets his brothers works. He joins together to obtain power over those who fall prey to their defiance of their Father's will.

“Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.”⁴⁰

One of the most memorable lines from the movie, “The Patriot” was spoken by actor Mel Gibson, who asked, “Why should I trade one tyrant 3,000 miles away, for 3,000 tyrants one mile away?”

Footnotes

[1](#)“Republic,” Microsoft ® Encarta. © 1994 Ms Corp. and Funk & Wagnall’s Corp.

[2](#)Laird v. Tatum, 408 U.S. 1 (1972), 28-9, Justice William O. Douglas.

[3](#)Attributed to Thomas Jefferson.

[4](#)Representatives of the united Colonies July 6, 1775

[5](#)Cherokee Nation v. Southern Kans.. R. Co., 33 F. 900, 908-13 (1888).

[6](#)Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, published in 1776

[7](#)The New American Creed was read in Congress April 3, 1918.

[8](#)SMU Mustang’s Spring 1986 alumni magazine. Story by Paul Andrew Hutton.

[9](#)Roget’s International Thesaurus 625.

[10](#)Seneca.

[11](#)Daniel Webster

[12](#)“Republic,” Microsoft ® Encarta. © 1994 Ms. Corp. and F & W Corp.

[13](#)John Quincy Adams

[14](#)William Penn.

[15](#)Edmund Burke 1784 Speech.

[16](#)Edmund Burke.

[17](#)Sir Thomas Moore.

[18](#)James Madison.

[19](#)Cassante ratione legis cessat, et ipsa lex.4 Coke, 38; 7 id. 69; Coke, Litt. 70 b. 122 a; Broom, Max. 3d Lond. ed. 151, 152; 4 Rep. 38; 13 East, 348; 4 Bingh. n.c. 388.

[20](#)Declaration of Independence.

[21](#)Strong's No. 06091 `atsab {aw-tsawb'} from 6087; n m 1) idol, image

Strong's No. 06087 `atsab {aw-tsab'} a primitive root; v 1) to hurt, pain, grieve, displease, vex, wrest 2) to shape, fashion, make, form, stretch into shape, worship

[22](#)Strong's No. 2416 chay {khah'-ee} from 2421; adj 1) living, alive 2) relatives 3) life (... 4) living thing, animal 5) community

[23](#)Strong's No. 0929 b@hemah {be-hay-maw'} from an unused root; a; n f 1) beast, cattle, animal

[24](#)Strong's No. 04422 malat {maw-lat'} a primitive root; v 1) to slip away, escape, deliver, save, be delivered

[25](#)Strong's No.7628 sh@biy {sheb-ee'} from 7618; n m 1) captivity, captives 1a) (state of) captivity

[26](#)Webster's New Dictionary unabridged 2nd Ed. 1965.

[27](#)William O. Douglas, Points of Rebellion, 1969 (page 95, page 54).

[28](#)Document of American History by Commager

[29](#)Thomas Paine's Common Sense.

[30](#)William Pitt.

[31](#)Alexander Hamilton, I Federalist Papers.

[32](#)Coke, Litt.65.

[33](#) Beowulf, (lines 19-29).

[34](#)Beowulf v910... v1055.v1685-1695. 1:110v. Beowulf 2:175-185. v585. v3075. Burton Raffel.

[35](#)Strong's No. 0430 'elohiyim {el-o-heem'} plural of 433 defined rulers, judges

[36](#)1 Samuel 10:1.

[37](#)Strong's No. 5547 Christos {khris-tos'} 1) Christ meaning "anointed"

[38](#)Strong's No. 4352 proskuneo {pros-koo-neh'-o} from 4314 and a probable derivative of 2965 - worship (60) 1) ... in the NT by kneeling or prostration to do homage (to one) or make obeisance, whether in order to express respect or to make supplication 1a) used of homage shown to men of superior rank: the Jewish high priests.

[39](#)Strong's No. 4790 sugkoinoneo {soong-koy-no-neh'-o} from 4862 and 2841; vb AV - have fellowship with (1) - communicate with (1) - be partaker of (1) [3] 1) to become a partaker together with others...

[40](#)President James Madison

The System
(God's Plan for Man)

vs.

The System
(Man's plan for Man)



"Where two rights concur, the more ancient shall be preferred."¹

"So God created man in his [own] image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

“And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which [is] upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which [is] the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein [there is] life, [I have given] every green herb for meat: and it was so. And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, [it was] very good.” (Genesis 1:27, 31 & 2:1)

The Bible tells us that God created the Heavens and the Earth, setting the Solar system and stars and galaxies into motion. He established a system by which the Law of Nature is bound. It was a System of a Divine Order, a System into which man was created and placed. In that System, man had certain restrictions, obligations and benefits.

“And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” (Ge. 2:15,17)

Man was unsatisfied with this Godly System and he defied God. When God called to man, man blamed God and the woman God had given him for his own transgression of the Law of God.

“And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest [to be] with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.” (Genesis 3:12)

So, the Godly System made for man was supplanted by the act of man. Man had chosen another way that was not the way of the LORD. Consequently, this act against God’s will, as well as man’s lack of repentance, changed the position of man in the System of God, along with changing those things that man had been given dominion over.

“Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire [shall be] to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed [is] the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat [of] it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou [art], and unto dust shalt thou return.” (Genesis 3:16, 19)

Man would not follow in the way of the Lord’s System, but chose rather to go his own way according to his own imagination.

“So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.” (Genesis 3:24)

Man found himself discontented with his own way and its results and sought other ways to make his lot better and more propitious. These new ways led to power and oppression, maliciousness and murder, when it did not include turning to God in repentance and humility.

“And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city², after the name of his son, Enoch.” (Genesis 4:17)

These cities were civil groups which devised many cunning ways to bind the loyalty of its members for the protection of its members and rulers. The clever and charismatic leaders that could seize and maintain control of the public³ were served by those who were subject to their authority. They became the rulers of the people and their way became law. The benefits and powers of the offices these rulers granted enticed greedy, proud, and coveting men. They aspired to the protection, profit, and prestige such offices bestowed.

“And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” (Genesis 6:12)

The flood and disasters came and went, but men, who were willing to give up God’s way for their own way, multiplied upon the earth. Men continued to create civil systems to achieve their ambitions and fulfill the hopes of their own imagination. Many looked to these binding organizations of man’s ingenuity to protect themselves from the acts of their sinful brothers, as well as the plagues that befell their errant lives. They trusted in their own devices and institutions to ward off threats of flood and famine, poverty and privation, catastrophe and cataclysm.

“He was a mighty hunter before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the hunter before the LORD.” (Genesis 10:9)

In Genesis 10:9, the word “hunter” is from the Hebrew word *tsayid*⁴, which is more often translated “provision, food, food-supply, or victuals”. The word *paniym* is translated “before” in the sense of “face” or “in the face of”, “before” or “in front of”.⁵ So, it could be said that “Nimrod was a mighty provider before the LORD or in front of the Lord”.

“And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top [may reach] unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the LORD said, Behold, the people [is] one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. 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.” (Genesis 11:4, 6)

To reap the benefits of belonging to a city or city state or civil authority, a person had to support it, serve it, succor it. They were, and their status was, changed by their association. They were unified as if one; they were employed and converted as they were reborn into their civil state or status with certain privileges and obligations.

Men are made slaves. It is a forced condition. Servants are also made, but consent at one point is required. By their own act of consent, servants may become bonded servants, slaves, subjects, and then call themselves citizens. They often justify the act by allegedly hopeless circumstances, even though their circumstances were merely the results of their previous misguided actions.

“Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give [us] seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh’s. And as for the people, he removed them to cities from [one] end of the borders of Egypt even to the [other] end thereof.” (Genesis 47:19 21)

Did he move them to towns and cities? No, they only moved to a civil status of subjection and service. They still tilled the soil and planted the seeds. They did not own their land or labor, but had settled for a mere *legal title*.

“Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh: lo, [here is] seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.” (Genesis 47:23)

There was a difference, a change, a conversion. They labored, not just for themselves or for the service of God, but also for the Pharaoh who now had the power to tax their labor, their increase, their income. He took a part of their service for himself. It was sort of a civil tithing.

“And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth [part] unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones. And they said, Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh’s servants.” (Genesis 47:24, 25)

Often, men sold themselves to tyrants so that they might enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season or the treasures of the great cities or because they were fearing the wrath of the king. Sometimes, the tyrants were there from the beginning; sometimes, they grew out of their well-fed vanity. As man’s faith in the works of his own hands grew, so did his power and pomposity, his victuals and vanity, his cartel and contempt. He defied God’s place as Ruler and proceeded to create his own systems in the world to make a name for himself.

Supple knees, Feed arrogance and are the proud man’s fees.⁶

This feeding of the vanity and arrogance of want-to-be rulers has built an empire of Canaanites in the form of bureaucratic administrative tribunals. Too many, too often, have bent their knees to the powers that would be kings and rulers of man. History is filled with such examples. Less numerous, but more noteworthy, are those rare and gracious moments where men would not bow their heads, their will, or their service to any usurping, enticing, or assuring power except to the Lord God.

“By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents, because they saw [he was] a proper child; and they were not afraid of the king’s commandment. By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.” (Hebrews 11:23, 27)

Art thou less a slave because thy master loves and caresses thee? ⁷

In the days of Joseph's famine, the people had given their gold, their animals, their land, and themselves in exchange for provisions so that they would not die. So, what did they use for money in everyday business transactions? They used a small stone or clay scarab given out by the Pharaoh's treasury. The priests were not sold under the Pharaoh nor their lands.⁸ The priest had their own land and a stipends from the Pharaoh. They grew wealthy while others toiled. They had vast stores of grain which they also used as money, but the scarabs were more portable. In their temples, "granaries were included... priests became bankers through the loan of seed grain. In many societies, the main temple and dependent structures were the most important buildings, although many smaller, often isolated, temples existed as well."⁹ Their temples were the center of business, as well as the depository of records and contracts.

"Give me control over a nation's currency and I care not who makes its laws"¹⁰

The High Priests knew the arts of the temple, which was also the central bank. They had control of the flow of currency. However, it was the greed and envy of Joseph's brothers that had brought all of Israel under the power of Pharaoh and at the mercy of the priests of Egypt.

"Pride before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." (Pr 16:18)

God had chosen his people from the seed of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and led them out of Egypt. He would be their God and Ruler, but they did not have the faith of their forefathers nor of Moses. They feared for their lives and sought strength in their own numbers and bound themselves together by sacrificing the dowers of their wives and the inheritance of their sons to the golden calf.

"And Aaron said unto them, Break off the golden earrings, which [are] in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring [them] unto me. And all the people brake off the golden earrings which [were] in their ears, and brought [them] unto Aaron. And he received [them] at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf: and they said, These [be] thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." (Ex. 32:2, 4)

It was not mere superstition that motivated them, but a practicality stimulated by fear and a lack of faith. The people literally deposited their gold, as well as other goods, sacrificed the right to it, and took, in turn, some sort of exchangeable token. The gold was poured into a large statue for all to see. The wealth of the community was melted together. No one person could leave in the face of an enemy or trouble without leaving behind the golden idol. His scarabs or tokens were worthless except at his community. The priests of the temple kept track of all the complexities of this monetary system and, of course, the profits from interest and usury.

"Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still, Slavery! said I, still thou art a bitter draught."¹¹

“They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshiped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, These [be] thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” (Exodus 32:8)

The people took pride in their scheme, though it was not a new one, but God found their way corrupt. He wanted them bound together in love, faith and virtue.

“We estimate men as great not by their wealth but by their virtue.”¹²

“And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that [were] round about them, [concerning] whom the LORD had charged them, that they should not do like them.” (2 Kings 17:15)

History continues to be filled with stories and examples of men turning from the ways of God to the ways of men. Men bind themselves in as many ways. In all sorts of secular religions, city states, kingdoms, democracies, monetary systems, and corporate entities through all sorts of contracts, compacts, constitutions, and covenants. Warnings of the prophets and the sayings of the wise fill volumes of books often unread in today’s modern society, where “Coke is the real thing,” “Ford has a better idea,” and “Anacin gives fast relief.” But our gold, wealth, and the inheritance of our children has been entrusted to others, our lands we no longer own, our labor is in the service of another, people profit and gain from usury, and we beseech the government to supply our needs and security and “we pray to the court”¹³ for justice, instead of God, LORD of lords.

“Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil! Thou hast consulted shame to thy house by cutting off many people, and hast sinned [against] thy soul. For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it. Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and stablisheth a city by iniquity! Behold, [is it] not of the LORD of hosts that the people shall labour in the very fire, and the people shall weary themselves for very vanity?” (Habakkuk 2:9, 13)

People are looking everywhere but to God. The richest companies and the most autocratic governments in the world are the ones that offer insecure, faithless people security at a vain price.

“Because my people hath forgotten me, they have burned incense to vanity, and they have caused them to stumble in their ways [from] the ancient paths, to walk in paths, [in] a way not cast up;” (Jer 18:15)

Over and over, it is vanity, pride, and arrogance that turns men from the path of the LORD.

“This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind,” (Eph 4:17)

In March 1775, a young Lawyer rode into Culpeper, Virginia on a lean horse. At the whipping post, he saw a man's shirt removed, his arms tied together and as he watched he saw him whipped with a leather and wire whip, until the bones of his rib cage showed. When the young lawyer asked what the man had done, he was told that he was a fundamentalist preacher who had refused to take a license. Even after they put him in jail with all of his friends he continued to say, "I will not take a license no matter what you do." The young lawyer who witnessed the lashing was so moved he wrote a speech, and a few days later he delivered it before the Virginia assembly. He said, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains of slavery? Forbid it Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."¹⁴

The seventeenth century Americans came here looking for the religious **and** civil freedoms that were all but totally gone from Europe and the land of the Anglo-Saxon. They did not gain their freedom by the so-called Revolution, but had earned it by perseverance, hard work, and the grace of God.

"All men are freemen or slaves."¹⁵

The freedom, for which early pilgrims were willing to suffer deprivation, hardship, and even death to obtain and maintain, has all but vanished in today's comfortable, complacent, and civil society.

"Men often applaud an imitation, and hiss the real thing." -Aesop.

This modern society is democratic with each man sharing in the ruling class. As the leaders of old who fell prey to their own bloated vanity, so the people of a democracy are no less immune. Each man today can wield the headsman's ax and lop off the rights of his neighbor both in this country and other countries with a check on a ballot, secretly, safely, securely from the inner sanctum of our voting booth. Is that not the privilege and right of the people in the richest nation, the strongest nation, the greatest nation, the vainest nation under a god?

"Let not him that is deceived trust in vanity: for vanity shall be his recompense." (Job 15:31)

God created a system, consisting of a man and a woman and their children, under Himself only. He warned against covenants with strangers to His ways, he warned against kings, and He forbade us to put other gods, rulers, and judges over us and before him. He told us that, if we turned from Him, from His way and from His truths, we would be delivered into bondage and the hands of tyrants.

"For what nation [is there so] great, who [hath] God [so] nigh unto them, as the LORD our God [is] in all [things that] we call upon him [for]? And what nation [is there so] great, that hath statutes and judgments [so] righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons;" (Deuteronomy 4:7, 9)

U.S. and State laws are changing frequently. God's laws are constant. Neither the Ten Commandments nor any part of the word of God are allowed in public schools. Like heathen institutions, they preach that government is ruler of the earth and that God, if there is one, only resides in an ethereal heaven or the imaginations of the religious. God said, *"teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons."* Governments often say, "We will teach thy sons."

"Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do [them], that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you." (De 4:1)

Like those slaves in the captivity of Egypt, no man in the United States possesses his own land, having only a legal title. A legal title, whether of labor, land, or limousines "is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent [illusory] 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.'" ¹⁶ An equitable title is a right in the party, the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another. ¹⁷

"According to their uncleanness and according to their transgressions have I done unto them, and hid my face from them. Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, ..." (Ezekiel 39:24 25)

"Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment."¹⁸ It is the *application* for its benefits, gratuities, and protection that subjects the individual as a person.

"Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" (Galatians 4:8, 9)

Why do we turn always to government for salvation from the difficulties of this life? Why do we look to them to do that which God would do for us in faith or has commanded us to do for ourselves?

God is reason. "Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force. Like fire it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master." George Washington.

"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 if after they have escaped the pollution's 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 the 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.” (2 Peter 2:18, 22)

Many will say that government does good, that it cares for the elderly, the poor, the sick, the indigent and protects the weak, the innocent, the helpless. Yes, it may do some of these things, but “You are not to do evil that good may come of it.”¹⁹ Government does not do these things with its own money, out of the charity of its own heart, but with the money it collects from your neighbor. The key word here is “collects”. It collects by force or the threat of force. “If those are better who are led by love, those are the greater number who are led by fear.”²⁰ A nation that does not rely on the voluntary charity of its people will not have nor deserve any charity.

Government does not give true gifts or charity. “A gift is said to be pure and simple when no condition or qualification is annexed.”²¹

The U.S. Government says that it was ordained to “establish Justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.”²² But it has gone farther in its offers than in its duties and obligations that were required it.

The U.S. Government has also acted, “to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provisions for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children,....., to raise revenue, and for other purposes.”²³

What are these other purposes?

Government also finances, promotes, and facilitates the abortion and death of millions of children. It encourages and finances, with tax money, fetal research. Once, when I was referred to as a human resource, I jokingly commented , “I hope they don’t decide to drill.” Today, they do drill and stripmine unborn fetuses from the wombs of our daughters to obtain their organs and tissues.

The stories of government involvement in dictatorial, autocratic, and totalitarian regimes with known and repeated human rights violations are common. Financial aid, military aid, and the blood of your young men has gone to support, defend, and bolster governments that have defied and trampled on the principles that Christ taught to the world.

In the original American Republics, as in the theocratic Republic of ancient Israel, 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.”²⁴

“Freeman; the possessors of allodial lands.”²⁵

If being a citizen in the United States ‘binds the citizen to the observance of all laws’ of his sovereign, I can only ask, “who is the sovereign of those citizens?” Judging by the treatment the word of God receives in public institutions, to say nothing of their abandonment of the ways of the Lord, I can only speculate that the citizens of the United States have put another Sovereign before the God, creator of Heaven and Earth.

In a democracy, there are no equals, because all men must obey the majority, the mob. And, “When people have to obey other people’s orders, equality is out of the question.”²⁶ For a government of the people, by the people, and for the people to not perish from the earth, they would have to bow their knees to Him Who created it, for all else would be vanity.²⁷

“Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all [is] vanity.” (Ec 12:8)

If we bind ourselves with words and deeds to the things of these worldly, secular, man-made governments, then how can we bind ourselves also to God?

“Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matthew 18:18.)

Man has entrusted, in faith, his wealth and riches, his labor and service, his land and property, his rights, loyalty and fidelity in a government-instituted *cestui que* trusts, which excludes God.

“No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”²⁸ (Matthew 6:24)

Men were told to “hear the word of God, and keep it.”²⁹ Men were told to keep the land and to possess it,³⁰ but men have not kept it. Men have made covenants when they were warned repeatedly not to, for only with God thy covenants shall be made.³¹ Men have trusted stranger and set aside the gifts of God.

“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Proverbs 23:1, 3)

Have you been a man or woman of appetite and ate at the table of would-be rulers and gone under their authority, eating of their provisions? Does the government you serve grant you gifts paid for by the wealth of your brother?

“When thou criest, let thy companies deliver thee; but the wind shall carry them all away; vanity shall take [them]: but he that putteth his trust in me shall possess the land, and shall inherit my holy mountain;” (Isa 57:13)

If you serve man-made judges and call upon the civil authority to save you, then you may find them inadequate to save you when the going gets rough.

“Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit: but the upright shall have good [things] in possession.” (Pr 28:10)

Does the evil way include finding security in coveting your neighbors goods?

Wherefore say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Ye eat with the blood, and lift up your eyes toward your idols, [is the government you serve made by men like the cities of Cain, Nimrod and Pharaoh?] **and shed blood:**[the unborn are destroyed and the poor in foreign lands are destroyed and hear on this country.] **and shall ye possess the land?** [So, it is only natural that you do not own your land] **Ye stand upon your sword,** [You don't defend the helpless and the oppressed] **ye work abomination,** [Are you the bride of Christ or fornicated with another king.] **and ye defile every one his neighbour's³² wife.³³**

Do we defile our citizenship as the bride of Christ]: and shall ye possess the land?

“They [are] vanity, [and] the work of errors: in the time of their visitation they shall perish.” (Jer 10:15)

Footnotes

¹ Lex semper dabit remedium.

²Strong's No. 5892 `iyer {eer} or (in the plural) `ar {awr} or `ayar (Judges 10:4) {aw-yar'} from 5782 a city (a **place guarded by waking or a watch**) in the widest sense ... 1) excitement, anguish 1a) of terror 2) city, town (a place of waking, guarded) 2a) city, town. Strong's No. 5782 `uwr {oor} a primitive root v 1) to rouse oneself, awake, awaken, incite

³Public (l. publicus--altered by association with)

⁴Strong's No.06718 tsayid {tsah'-yid}

⁵Strong's No. 06440 paniym {paw-neem'}

⁶Shakespear.

⁷Pascal.

⁸Only the land of the priests bought he not; for the priests had a portion [assigned them] of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands. Ge 47:22

⁹Temple Microsoft ® Encarta. © 1994 Ms. Corp.& F & W's Corp.

¹⁰Baron M.A. Rothschild (1744 - 1812)

[11](#)Laurence Sterne - Sentimental Journey. The Passport. The Hotel Paris

[12](#)Magnos homines virtute metimur non fortune -Nepos.

[13](#)Quoted from a civil action case a neighbor asked me to read.

[14](#)Speech by Patrick Henry.

[15](#)Omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi. Inst. 1.3. pr; Fleta. 1.1,c.1,§2.

[16](#)Black's 3rd "legal title" p 1734.

[17](#)Black's 3rd "Equitable Title" p 1734.

[18](#)Elk v. Wilkins, Neb. (1884), 5S. Ct. 41, 112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643.

[19](#)Non facias malum, ut inde veniat bonum. 11 Coke, 74 a.

[20](#)Si meliores sunt quos ducit amor, plures sunt quos corrigit timor. Coke, Litt.592.

[21](#)Simplex et pura donatio dici poterit, ubi nulla est adjecta conditio nec modus. Bracton, 1.

[22](#)Preamble of the United States Constitution.

[23](#)Social Security Act of 1935, 774th Congress, Session I, CH. 531, p620.

[24](#)Wallace v. Harmstad, 44 Pa. 492; etc. Black's 3rd Ed. p. 95.

[25](#)liberi. In Saxon Law - Blacks 3rd. Oxford Dictionary

[26](#)-Gilbert.

[27](#)Then John Wycliffe introduced his translation of the Bible in 1382 with the words, "This Bible is for the Government of the People, by the People, and for the People."

[28](#)Derived from Ma'amon, something entrusted to safe keeping. Encyclopedia Britanica Vol 14 pp 756. 1953.

[29](#)Luke 11:28. Pr 30:5. Lu 4:4. Lu 8:11. Lu 8:21. 1 Th 2:13.

[30](#)Genesis 2:15. Le 20:24. Nu 33:53. De 1:21. Jud 11:23. Jer 30:3. Mat 21:33.

[31](#)Ex 23:32. Mat 5:35.

[32](#) Strong's No. 7453 rea` {ray'-ah} or reya` {ray'-ah} from 7462; n m 1) friend, companion, fellow, another person 1a) friend, intimate 1b) **fellow, fellow-citizen**, another person (weaker sense) ...

[33](#) Strong's No. 0802 'ishshah {ish-shaw'} feminine of 376 or 582; n f 1) woman, wife, **female** 1a) woman (opposite of man) 1b) wife (woman married to a man) 1c) **female** (of animals) 1d) each, every (pronoun)

Conversion

(The turning away.)

vs.

RECONVERSION

(Man's returning to the Way.)



“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.” (John 1:1, 3)

It is clear and easy to understand that all effects have a cause and all causes have an effect. It is often forgotten that every effect becomes a cause for an additional effect. Man has turned away from God in many ways. It may not always be clear when the turning takes place. That is to say, “is an effect the cause or the cause the effect?”

“And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.” (Samuel 8:7)

Mankind was created as a physical and spiritual creature under the benevolent authority of God. God, looking upon mankind as His children, created in His own image, placed man upon the earth and gave him dominion over that earth and the creatures in it. Man, in turn, denied the authority of God and turned from Him, serving himself as a god. This turning of man was the beginning of his conversion through what can be called sin and the effect of that sin was the conversion of the world over which he had dominion, as well as himself. The very nature of man was changed by his exclusion of God.

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:” (Ro. 5:12)

Man’s relationship changed. The very nature of man and the nature of the world itself was also changed and continued to change as man continued to sin, as man continued to turn from God’s authority.

“Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou [art], and unto dust shalt thou return.” (Genesis 3:18,19)

Man was excluded because he had excluded God.

“So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.” (Genesis 3:24)

Can man turn back to God and walk in His ways?

“And Enoch walked with God: and he [was] not; for God took him.” (Genesis 5:24)

Unless man, by faith, turns back to God and His way, how can he follow in the path of God?

“By faith Enoch was translated¹ that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.” (Heb. 11:5)

The way of the Lord has always been there for the righteous man, but few could find it, and less could follow. Each man must be translated or converted. It could be said each man must be retranslated, reconverted, or reborn back into God’s way.

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John 3:16)

God sent His only begotten Son to redeem those who would repent and turn back to God as their existing ruler of earth. Jesus, the Anointed One, is alive as a king today and all those who accept him as their king are His subjects, His servants, and, therefore, His children. All were condemned to sin, yet some turned from sin and walked again with the Lord, feared the Lord God, and denied all gods but the God. Not only can we turn to the Way of God and turn away from our own willfulness, the ways of the serpent and the world recreated by men, but now also can we turn toward Jesus as king, for he has opened the way for all men.

“For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.” (Romans 5:19, 21)

Today, all the wealth of the world is held in a *cestui que* charitable trust.² Our desires can be fulfilled if we will only serve and support the administrators of that trust.

“Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great [is] that darkness! No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”³ (Matthew 6:19, 24)

Satan and the constituted world of men call and beckon to mankind to follow in their ways, to trust in their ways, to have faith in their ways, to accept them as rulers over our lives. Who offers us more in this life than government? They offer great benefits (employment to unemployment insurance, workman's compensation to old-age retirement, bank interest to stocks and bonds) securities, comforts, and guarantees (armies of protectors from police and military to FEMA, WIC, FICA, FDIC, etc.).

“Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume [it] upon your lusts.” (James 4:2, 3)

To obtain access to all the great treasures offered by government, all you need is a birth certificate, which allows you to obtain your Social Security number, and then a whole world of wealth opens up to you. To obtain most of these benefits, you don't even have to work by the sweat of thy face. All you have to do is ask, apply, or pray to the government. But who should we be asking, invoking, praying to for our needs?

“And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask⁴ [pray] the Father in my name, he will give [it] you.” (John 16:23)

It is not our habit to ask the Father in heaven if we are constantly asking the fathers of the world. Modern governments are based upon the law of *Patronus*, the law of the father.

And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. (Mtt. 23:9)

So, does that mean we can look to no other father or father figure but our Father in heaven?

“And I will pray [Strong's No. 2065 to ask] the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;” (John 14:16)

Who was and is this Comforter? Is He government? Is He the state-incorporated churches who call men into the service and submission to man-made governments? Have we been applying to the wrong government who may not have our best interests at heart?

“But the Comforter, [which is] the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” (John 14:26)

As you truly beseech your Father in heaven and Jesus Christ, King in Heaven and on Earth, and to His Comforter, the Holy Spirit, we are changed in accordance to God’s ways. We are reconverted to what God’s children should be and are made holy and separate.

“And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spake the word of God with boldness.” (Acts 4:31)

But as we look to the world and the ways of the world and the creations of our own hands, we continue in a way that by nature separates us from God by transferring faith to another. With the making of contracts, covenants, and trusts, we become bound and entangled in worldly snares.

“I have given them thy word; and the world^s hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.” (John 17:14, 16)

When we are called to be a member and offered access to great treasures, should we take them? Should we become subject to their sovereignty that has been financed by the sweat of our neighbor?

“Do not envy the oppressor and choose none of his ways.” (Proverbs 3:31)

Shall we trust in their offers and work to support their will?

“What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?” (Romans 6:1, 2)

You may say that this is not what you did when you become a part of the government. But do you not serve, subjecting yourselves, to the will of the majority when you enter a democracy? And has the majority ever served the will of God throughout history? Not in the days of Noah, nor Abraham, nor Joseph, nor Absalom, nor when they voted to crucify Jesus, even though Rome found no guilt in Him.

**“Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force, like fire,
it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.”⁶**

When government collects taxes by force simply because your neighbors want more benefits, more free bread, more medical assistance, more gratuities, does everyone not take part in the violence?

“And thou shalt take no gift: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.” (Exodus. 23: 8)

When people vote, in order to obtain more benefits than they have a God-given right to, are they not coveting their neighbors goods?

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that [is] thy neighbour’s.” (Ex 20:17)

When government pays for abortions, does not everyone contribute to the letting of blood?

“That innocent blood be not shed in thy land, which the LORD thy God giveth thee [for] an inheritance, and [so] blood be upon thee.” (Deuteronomy 19:10)

When government gives assistance and arms to another government that is tyrannical, that oppresses, tortures, or kills time and time again, does not everyone who serves the former also serve, aid, and abet the wickedness of the tyrant?

“Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.” (Exodus 23: 9)

When people collect interest from a bank that charges usury from those to whom they have loaned the depositor’s money (who are most often poorer people than the depositor), though it be done legally, are they not usurers defying God’s way? When people apply for, obtain, or receive the benefits of a government that lives everyday upon the benefit of usury and power of force, do they not eat and consume meat with blood in it?

“If thou lend money to [any of] my people [that is] poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.” (Exodus 22:25)

There are multitudes who will say that something or someone is good. Can they, by their numbers, make it so? Can evil be justified by the majority? Is God subject to opinion?

“Thou shalt not follow a multitude to [do] evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest [judgment]:” (Exodus 23:2)

If a person binds themselves to fools are they not also a fool or to a despot then also a tyrant?

“Keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked.” (Exodus 23: 7)

Why do we make government, insurance, or corporate benefits so important in our lives? Why do we think we should look to, trust in, or have faith in man-made institutions to supply our needs and grant us security from droughts and floods, wars and famines, disease and death, and then dishonor our Creator by calling those occurrences “acts of God”?

“For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.” (Romans 8:13, 15)

With every entreaty, application, or appeal, we make men our fathers, our masters, our rulers, our gods.

“This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with [their] lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching [for] doctrines the commandments of men.” (Matthew 15:8,9)

We become likened to what we pay attention. We have all seen, although we may not all notice, that people are changed by what is around them, by those things to which they respond, by what becomes important in their lives. From food, drugs, and television to feelings, desires, and addictions. What people want, need, or only think they need begins to form, direct, and govern their lives.

We are slowly, steadily changed. Since man has fallen away from the path of Him who created mankind, he has steadily devolved in a process of conversion, natural to his disconnected state.

To compensate for their fallen state, men have created new states. By combining their strength, in order to accomplish that which men could not accomplish by themselves without God, they defy and supplant God.

“And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” (Luke 4:5, 8)

Governments, whether they are delivered unto the devil or not, have played a monumental role in the reformation of man. In the last ten decades, governmental influence, control, and authority over the lives of man has overshadowed anything that history has recorded. Government has been touted as generally benevolent, yet billions have died horrible and merciless deaths, due directly to the acts and obeyed edicts of governments. But is government the source of evil or merely its instrument?

When government subtly designs the conditions under which man lives, it exercises its greatest potential for mischief and deception.

“The world has always been betrayed not by scoundrels but by decent men with bad ideas.”⁷

Think for a moment: If there was no social security, welfare or food stamps programs, etc., would people suffer, would they go hungry? Would they have to be charitable to those in need? No. Would they have to take responsibility for their own lives or suffer the consequences? Could they be charitable, helpful, generous, and kind? Yes, if they had it in their hearts to do so.

“And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, [It is] Corban,⁸ that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; [he shall be free]. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.” (Mark 7:9, 13)

At the time of Christ, a person might give money into the treasury and then say that he had honored Father and Mother. In that way, he provided for their social security through others by Corban.

It is not only that man has decided to keep his own tradition, knowing full well *ye reject the commandment of God (Mark 7:9)*, but he has also bound himself with covenants and contracts.

“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:” (Ex 34:12)

Over three hundred times, the Bible talks of the concept of contracts, covenants, and pledges. From Adam to Abraham and Moses to the Messiah, contracts between God and man or man and man were a major topic of concern. Even the word “testament”⁹ refers to the contractual arrangement made by God and man.

“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:” (Ex 34:12)

We are warned against making contracts, lest it be for a snare.¹⁰ Isn't a contract, just a contract? How could it be a snare or a bait? What would be the trap? Can't we just break a contract? What does God care about the contracts of men?

“Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though [it be] but a man's covenant, yet [if it be] confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.” (Galatians 3:15)

Doesn't God consider contracts to be binding? If they are not binding, why does He warn us against making them?

“Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods [rulers].” (Ex 23:32)

God tells us not to make them with other people or with their gods [rulers].¹¹ Many of the rulers at the time of Christ were called gods. Did people believe that men who they saw born, live, and die were gods? Or were men called gods because they were not merely the rulers of governments or large estates, but were men who held sovereignty and a superior power of judgment over other men?

Even Jesus warns against making a promise or affirmation that would bind us under any condition or law-making. He warns that anything more than yes for yes and no for no will come of evil:

“But I say unto you, Swear¹² not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” (Matthew 5:34, 37)

Over and over again, we are warned to keep ourselves and our children from serving, chasing, or consuming that which was sacrificed to other gods and rulers.

“Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods[rulers], and do sacrifice unto their gods[rulers], and [one] call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice;” (Exodus 34:15)

Have we been warned that the table which will be set for us may be a trap and a snare?

“And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.” (Romans 11:9, 10)

“We must realize that today’s Establishment is the new George III... the truth is that the vast bureaucracy now runs this country, irrespective of what party is in power... Man has come to realize that if he is to have material ‘success,’ he must honor the folklore of the corporation state, respect its desire, and walk to the measure of its thinking.”¹³

“Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because [they have] no knowledge: and their honourable men [are] famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst. Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure: and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth, shall descend into it.” (Isaiah 5:13, 14)

Before a person can understand the information and concepts expressed here, in a manner that will be beneficial to them, they must first understand the nature of their own status in that world and the world itself. Man has been converted to the kingdoms of the world because he has prayed to them, beseeched them and applied to them. Man has entrusted his land, his children, his labor, his natural rights, and all that God has given him. He has pooled all that was given him freely into a common governmental purse so that he might have access to their great treasures and riches.

“Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse: My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path: For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood. Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird. And they lay wait for their [own] blood; they lurk privily for their [own] lives. So [are] the ways of every one that is greedy of gain; [which] taketh away the life of the owners thereof.” (Pr. 1:14,19)

But alas these governments are bankrupt and live now upon the interest and usury, taxes and tribute, sweat and blood of all those who serve and labor under their sovereignty and oppression. Through sin we have been converted, altered, and reconstructed in a new image.

“CONVERSION (Change) noun alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction...”¹⁴

Just one way this conversion takes place is the conversion of a lawful title or right into a mere legal title or right.

“Legal title. One cognizable or enforceable in a court of law, or one which is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent right of ownership and possession, but which carries with it no beneficial interest in the property, another person being equitably entitled thereto; in either case, the antithesis of ‘equitable title’.”¹⁵

“**BENEFICIAL INTEREST.** Profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract, or the ownership of an estate as distinct from the legal ownership or control.”¹⁶

“**Equitable title.** An equitable title is a right in the party to whom it belongs to have the legal title transferred to him; or the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another.”¹⁷

CONVERT. (Change use), verb alter, amend, become, change...¹⁸

EMPLOY. “To equitably convert. Equitable conversion.” equitable conversion. “Conversion. constructive conversion. 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.”

“A **direct conversion** takes place when a person actually appropriates the property of another to his own beneficial use and enjoyment.”¹⁹

“**Constructive trust.** A trust raised by construction of law, as distinguished from an express trust. Wherever the circumstances of a transaction are such that the person who takes the legal estate in property cannot also enjoy the beneficial interest without necessarily violating some established principle of equity, the court will immediately raise a constructive trust, and fasten it upon the conscience of the legal owner, so as to convert him into a trustee for the parties who in equity are entitled to the beneficial enjoyment.”²⁰

You might think that you enjoy your home, your car and the fruits of your labor, but do you?

Enjoyment. The exercise of a right...²¹

Driving is a privilege granted by the owner of the car, the one holding the equitable title. The one holding the legal title and paying the use tax or excise may use the vehicle, but that use may still be regulated. This is true for your house, even your labor. You do not have an inalienable right to use things that you do not own as an estate.

The “state,” or equitable title holder, has an interest in the property. If someone attempts to use the property without proper permission, the state will defend its interest, often by confiscating the entire property. They will then sell part of their interest to the highest bidder. All they ever sell is the first right to pay the use tax and use the property. They have an obligation to hold that equitable title in trust as security or surety for the unpaid purchase price. Since the car was never paid for originally, a constructive trust is established. There is no remedy at common law for a purchase with a promise only with actual payment of present value.

One of the first acts of the Congress created by the United States Constitution was to establish a federal court system in the Judiciary Act of 1789. This is an architectonic act still in force. In Sec. 16., it states, “That suits in equity shall not be sustained in either of the courts of the United States, in any case where plain, adequate and complete remedy may be had at law.”

But, in the case of a legal title where the equitable interest is in question, there cannot be complete or plain remedy at law. This includes a common law remedy which is addressed in Section 9. “An be it further enacted, That the district courts shall have,... cognizance of all crimes and offences ... in all cases, the right of a

common law remedy, where the common law is competent to give it;” Again, the common law is not competent to handle such equitable relationships.

Trust is “something committed to a person’s care for use or management and for which an account must be rendered. Every man’s talents and advantages are a trust committed to him by his Maker, and for the use or employment of which he is accountable.”²²

“A person is a man considered with reference to a certain status.” ²³

“I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.”

“Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.” (John 17:14, 19)

The word “world” here is *kosmos*²⁴, meaning a “harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government,” as opposed to *koumene*²⁵, also used in the New Testament and meaning “the inhabited earth”. The word “evil”²⁶ here is from the word *poneros*, meaning “full of labours, annoyances, hardships... pressed and harassed by labours,” as opposed to *kakos*²⁷, meaning “evil, of a bad nature.” *Poneros* is from a primary *peno* (to toil for daily subsistence.)²⁸ Sanctify²⁹ is from *hagiazō*, meaning “to separate from profane things”. God created the earth and put man in the world because He saw it was good. Man has made a new world order and adorned it and organized it by the works of his own hand, governing himself and his brother. Jesus wants us in the world, living in his kingdom, serving God. He wants us to labor in the world, but separate from the oppressive labors of the world- ordered system, both new and old.

“RECONVERSION, noun change, change over, demilitarization, disarmament, palingenesis, passage, readjustment, rebirth, reintegration, re-establishment, regeneration, regenesis, rehabilitation, renaissance, reorganization, restoration, retrogression, retroversion, return, reversal, reversion, transformation, transit, transition.”³⁰

“Participation in a system of charitable uses under the Law of Charitable Uses and the Status of Wills, Among others, is voluntary. Once participation is discontinued for various reasons such as ‘breach of trust,’ and ‘lack of confidence,’ the non

participant, so separated from use, may assert rights to be restored to his prior, original status and condition.”³¹

“Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” (James 5:19,20)

He shall be reconverted who Trusts in the LORD.

What is the process of that reconversion? Seek first the Kingdom of Heaven.

Footnotes:

1Strong’s No. 3346 metatithemi {met-at-ith’-ay-mee} from 3326 and 5087; vb AV - translate (2) - carry over (1) - remove (1) - change (1) - turn (1) [6] I) to transpose (two things, one of which is put in place of the other) 1) to transfer 2) to change 3) to transfer one’s self or suffer one’s self to be transferred, i.e. to go or pass over: to fall away or desert from one person or thing to another .

2“He who has a right to a beneficial interest in and out of an estate the legal title to which is vested in another.” Blacks 3rd pp.303

3“Mammon, an Aramaic word mamon “wealth” ... It is probably derived from Ma’amon, something entrusted to safe keeping. Encyclopedia Britannica.

4Strong’s No. 2065 erotao {er-o-tah’-o} apparently from 2046 [compare 2045]; vb AV - ask (23) - beseech (14) - pray (14) - desire (6) - intreat (1) [58] 1) to question 2) to ask, i.e. to request, entreat, beg, beseech, apply

5Strong’s No. 2889 kosmos {kos’-mos} probably from the base of 2865; n m AV - world (186) - adorning (1) [187] 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government...

6George Washington.

7Sidney Harris.

8Strong’s No. 2878 korban {kor-ban’} and korbanas {kor-ban-as} of Hebrew and Aramaic origin respectively [7133]; AV - treasury (1) - corban (1) [2] 1) a gift offered (or to be offered) to God 2) the sacred treasury

9Strong’s No. 1242 diatheke {dee-ath-ay’-kay} from 1303; n f AV - covenant (20) - testament(13) [33] 1) a disposition, arrangement, of any sort, which one wishes to be valid. the

last disposition which one makes of his earthly possessions after his death, a testament or will.2) a compact, a covenant, a testament, e.g. God's covenant with Noah, etc.

[10](#)Strong's No. 04170 mowqesh {mo-kashe'} or moqesh {mo-kashe'} from 3369; 1) bait, lure, snare.

[11](#)Strong's No. 0430 'elohiym {el-o-heem'} plural of 433;1) (plural) 1a) rulers, judges

[12](#)Strong's No. 3660 omnuo {om-noo'-o} a prolonged form of a primary but obsolete omo, (omoo {om-o'-o}) is used in certain tenses; - swear (27) 1) to swear, to affirm, promise, threaten, with an oath; in swearing to call a person or thing as witness, to invoke, swear by. «

[13](#)William O. Douglas. (pages 95,54)

[14](#)LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition

[15](#)Black's 3rd "legal title" page 1734.

[16](#)Black's third pp. 206.

[17](#)Black's 3rd "Equitable title" page 1734.

[18](#)LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton. second edition

[19](#)Black's 3rd Ed. pp. 430.

[20](#)Black's 3rd Ed. pp.1759.

[21](#)Black's 3rd Ed pp. 663.

[22](#)Webster 1928 Dictionary.

[23](#)Persona est homo cum statu quandom cosideratus. Heinecc. Elem.1.1,tit.3,§75.

[24](#)Strong's No. 2889 kosmos {kos'-mos} probably from the base of 2865; n m AV - world (186) - adorning (1) [187] 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government.... Copyright © 1991, Woodside B. F.

[25](#)Strong's No. 3625 oikoumene {oy-kou-men'-ay} feminine participle present passive of 3611 (as noun, by implication of 1093); n f VAV - world (14) - earth (1) [15] 1) the inhabited earth... 2) the universe, the world..W. B. F.

[26](#)Strong's No. 4190 poneros {pon-ay-ros'} from a derivative of 4192; adj AV - evil (51) - wicked (10) - wicked one (6) - evil things (2) - misc (7) [76] 1) full of labours, annoyances, hardships 1a) pressed and harassed by labours 1b) bringing toils, annoyances, perils; of a time

full of peril to Christian faith and steadfastness; causing pain and trouble 2) bad, of a bad nature or condition 2a) in a physical sense: diseased or blind 2b) in an ethical sense, evil wicked, bad.

[27](#)Strong's No. 2556 kakos {kak-os'} apparently a primary word; adj AV - evil (40) - evil things (3) - harm (2) - that which is evil + 3458 (2) - wicked (1) - ill (1) - bad (1) - noisome (1) [51] 1) of a bad nature; not such as it ought to be 2) of a mode of thinking, feeling, acting; base, wrong, wicked 3) troublesome, injurious, pernicious, destructive, baneful.

[28](#)Strong's No. 3993 penes {pen'-ace} from a primary peno (to toil for daily subsistence); adj AV - poor (1)

[29](#)Strong's No. 37 hagiozo {hag-ee-ad'-zo} from 40; vb AV - sanctify (26) - hallow (2) - be holy (1) [29] 1) to render or acknowledge, or to be venerable or hallow 2) to separate from profane things and dedicate to God, to consecrate 3) to purify.

[30](#)LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition.

[31](#)Williams v. Williams, (1853) 8 N.Y.-4 Selden 525. McCartee v. Orphan Asylum Soc., 9 Cowen 511, 513, 18 am. Dec. 516, quoting Blackstones Comm. 104.

Money

(The substances of creation. - payment)

vs.

Mammon

(The promises of liars. - debt)



“Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy god giveth thee.” (Deuteronomy 25:13,15)

“All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America rise ... from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit and circulation”¹

Money is “any medium of exchange that is widely accepted in payment for goods and services and in settlement of debts.”² From sea shells and wampum to clay scarabs and stones, almost everything that can be imagined as having value has, at one time or another, been used for money.

“Money is the just medium and measure of all commutable things, for by the medium of money a convenient and just estimation of all things is made.”³

There are three basic types of money. The first is commodity money, which has included gold, silver, and copper and are normally exchanged for equal value of the materials contained within them.

“Gold in the hands of the public is an enemy of the state.” Adolph Hitler

The second type is credit money, which is paper money, backed by promises to pay an equivalent value in some standard form of commodity money.

“Payment is the fulfillment of a promise.”⁴

“Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit.” (Jer 7:8)

The third form has no intrinsic value nor is it backed by a promise to pay something of value. Its value is fixed merely by government edict and is known as unfunded paper money or fiat money.

"But if in the pursuit of the means we should unfortunately stumble again on unfunded paper money or any similar species of fraud, we shall assuredly give a fatal stab to our national credit in its infancy. Paper money will invariably operate in the body of politics as spirit liquors on the human body. They prey on the vitals and ultimately destroy them. Paper money has had the effect in your state that it will ever have, to ruin commerce, oppress the honest, and open the door to every species of fraud and injustice."⁵

“It has long been long settled that a promise made in consideration of an act is forbidden by law is void. It will not be questioned that an act forbidden by the Constitution of the United States, which is the Supreme Law, is against Law.”⁶

Coins may be either commodity money or fiat money, depending on the value of the metal they are made from. Paper currency may be either credit money or fiat money. With selective redeemability, currency may, in some cases, be both. These paper currencies may be interest-bearing or not. Paper currencies may come in a myriad of forms, such as government notes, silver certificates, bank notes, as well as checks which are drawn on bank deposits and are called deposit currency.

“Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I [am] the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt.” (Le 19:36)

The development of commodity monies is the result of the natural progression of trade, while the development of credit and fiat money is usually the result of greed, ambition, and ignorance.

“Whoever controls the volume of money in any country is absolute master of all industry and commerce.”⁷

“My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not. If they say, Come with us, let us lay wait for blood, let us lurk privily for the innocent without cause: Let us swallow them up alive as the grave; and whole, as those that go down into the pit: We shall find all precious substance, we shall fill our houses with spoil: Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse: My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path: For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood. Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird. And they lay wait for their [own] blood; they lurk privily for their [own] lives. So [are] the ways of every one that is greedy of gain; [which] taketh away the life of the owners thereof.”

“Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets: She crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates: in the city she uttereth her words, [saying], How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you. Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; But ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; When your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me: For that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the LORD: They would none of my counsel: they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices. For the turning away of the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall destroy them. But whoso hearkeneth unto me shall dwell safely, and shall be quiet from fear of evil.”
(Proverbs 1:10, 33)

“Banking was conceived in iniquity and was born in sin. The Bankers own the earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create deposits, and with the flick of the pen they will create enough deposits to buy it back again. However, take it away from them, and all the great fortunes like mine will

disappear, and they ought to disappear, for this would be a happier and better world to live in. But, if you wish to remain the slaves of Bankers and pay the cost of your own slavery, let them continue to create deposits.”⁸

“Interest is the invention of Satan.”⁹

Credit money being redeemable in commodity money may seem to have some advantages. If credit money or fiat money is loaned into circulation, then the interest can provide large gains for the issuer in excess of the amount of commodity money backing the original issue of paper currency.

“America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves.”¹⁰

If paper money is destroyed, only the bearer has lost its value. The issuer continues to hold the commodity that backed the note, as well as the profit, benefit, and gain derived from the issuance. “History records that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit, and violent means possible to maintain their control over governments by controlling money and its issuance.”¹¹

“A great industrial Nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated Governments in the world---no longer a Government by the opinion but by the duress of small groups of dominant men.”¹²

This credit money is only a shadow of what commodity money is. “We have, in this country, one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board. This evil institution has impoverished the people of the United States and has practically bankrupted our government. It has done this through the corrupt practices of the moneyed vultures who control it.”¹³

The passage of the Federal Reserve Act “opened the way to a vast inflation of the currency... in a flood of irredeemable paper currency.”¹⁴ “From now on, depressions will be scientifically created.”¹⁵ “By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose.”¹⁶ “The regional Federal Reserve banks are not government agencies. ...but are independent, privately

owned and locally controlled corporations.”¹⁷ “The financial system has been turned over to the Federal Reserve Board. That Board administers the finance system by authority of a purely profiteering group. The system is Private, conducted for the sole purpose of obtaining the greatest possible profits from the use of other people's money”¹⁸

“Beware lest you lose the substance by grasping at the shadow.”¹⁹

One of the most important disadvantage of paper currencies is probably the least understood. All credit money is mere legal tender²⁰ and the bearer can pay for nothing with them. That is to say that the one offering them for payment of debt, in the purchasing of a thing, is able to do so only because the issuer of the obligation to pay the redemption value of the note is assisting in the actual deliverance of the purchase price. So, although the bearer of the note may purchase a legal title, he has not actually purchased the item itself, failing to deliver present value. At the same time, he is creating a constructive trust.

“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” (Ga. 5:9)

Remember money does not work for you. “I think we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious.”²¹ Money cannot sweat; it can not toil. It is people who pay interest, who do the work, and sweat under the burdens of debt so that others, who already have, may obtain even more for doing less.

“Of all contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effective than that which deludes them with paper money”²²

“If thou lend money to [any of] my people [that is] poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.” (Ex 22:25)

“Banking institutions are more dangerous than standing armies.”²³

Divers weights [are] an abomination unto the LORD; and a false balance [is] not good. (Pr 20:23)

It is also important to understand an interesting phenomena described by Gresham’s Law. When good, full, intrinsic value commodity money is circulated along side a depreciated or debased currency the “bad money drives out good.”²⁴ So, in other words, precious metal money will eventually be replaced by credit and fiat money, not because it is better, but because it is worse.

“They shall cast their silver in the streets, and their gold shall be removed: their silver and their gold shall not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the LORD: they shall not satisfy their souls, neither fill their bowels: because it is the stumblingblock of their iniquity.” (Eze.7:19)

“Spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale.”²⁵ “... 100% of what is collected is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal Debt ... all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services taxpayers expect from government”.²⁶

In order to sustain paper currency, it is necessary to back it with redeemability in a commodity money, at least at first. There is a long history of monetary systems using a bimetallic or a gold standard, with a total or limited redeemability. Because of a greedy process of devaluation to stimulate foreign trade or an over indulgent issuance policy, after a period of time, it would seem to become necessary to restrict redemption. Roosevelt in 1933, with his HJR 192 and a “modified gold bullion standard,” blocked redeemability of notes into gold for citizens of this nation. This was due to the fact that it was illegal for citizen of the United States to own gold.²⁷

“It is well that the people of the nation do not understand our banking and monetary system, for if they did, I believe there would be a revolution before tomorrow morning.”²⁸

“In 1978, in conjunction with reforms made by the International Monetary Fund, Congress formally removed the United States from the gold standard on an international basis.

Divers weights, [and] divers measures, both of them [are] alike abomination to the LORD. (Pr 20:10)

The 1792 Coinage Act describes the weight, content, and purity of US coins. The law also prescribed the penalty for anyone found guilty of debasing the coin. Looking at Sec.19 of said act, “And be it further enacted, That if any of the gold or silver coins which shall be struck or coined at the said mint shall be debased . . . every such officer or person who shall commit any or either of the said offenses, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and shall suffer death.”

Yet, at the end of the 1970's, no major currency was redeemable in gold for citizens. As of December 31, 1974, private citizens have been allowed to own gold, but not to use it "as currency."²⁹

"No State shall... make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts,... impairing the obligation of contracts" Sec 10, Art I, The Constitution of the United States.

"I see in the future a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of our country; corporations have been enthroned, an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the public is destroyed."³⁰

"The world has always been betrayed not by scoundrels but by decent men with bad ideas."³¹

"This (Federal Reserve) Act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth. When the president signs this bill, the invisible government by the Monetary Power will be legalized. The people may not know it immediately, but the day of reckoning is only a few years removed. The trust will soon realize that they have gone too far even for their own good. The people must make a declaration of independence to relieve themselves from the Monetary Power."³²

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." (Mt. 6:24)

"Mammon, an Aramaic word mamon meaning 'wealth' ... It is probably derived from Ma'amon, something entrusted to safe keeping. In any case there was apparently a threefold play on this meaning in Lk. xvi. II: 'If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true [riches]?' the word italicized representing forms of the Semitic root word 'men.'³³

That *most gigantic trust on earth* was to be (and is now established) constructed in a very interesting way. It involved the entrusting of almost all the wealth, property, and rights of man, granted to him by God, into a world-wide trust. It was a process not limited to the money system, but it is that system that is focused on in these pages.

This was not the first attempt to accomplish these ends, nor will it be the last. The so-called Civil War had begun to collateralize the debt of the federal government. By 1872, in response to “National Bank Act,” Horace Greeley stated his perception of the changing civil situation in no uncertain terms when he said, “We have stricken the shackles from four million human beings and brought all laborers to a common level, not so much by the elevation of former slaves as by practically reducing the whole working population, white and black, to a condition of serfdom. While boasting of our noble deeds, we are careful to conceal the ugly fact that, by our iniquitous money system, we have nationalized a system of oppression which, though more refined, is no less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery.”

Internalizing the debt saved America for a short while. But the Federal Reserve Act again pushed the process of collateralizing the debt and title to everything in America and, eventually, the world into a massive collective trust.

There has been only one real attempt to undue this process on a governmental basis. Kennedy had prepared to print four billion dollars in US notes to replace the Federal Reserve notes. He began to bring troops back from Vietnam, he signed a series of Executive Orders in preparation for total economic depression if and when the money powers made their move to collapse the economy as they had done in 1929. Robert Kennedy, as Attorney General, had realized the collateralization of US debt which made every piece of land and natural resource, all livestock, factories, and machinery, as well as the people themselves, nothing more than chattel for the security and surety of debt. Kennedy’s plans died with him and all his efforts were thwarted by Johnson.

“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)

“This note is legal tender for all debts public and private and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve Bank”
Originally printed on all Federal Reserve Notes.

Here is where several ideas began to come together. If legal tender at one point is redeemable in lawful money, then it is not lawful money. Legal tender can only buy a legal title, not a lawful one.

“There is a distinction between a 'debt discharged' and a debt 'paid'. When discharged the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist which may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be consideration for a new promise to pay, so as to make an otherwise worthless promise a legal obligation, makes it the subject of transfer by assignment.”³⁴

“For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy³⁵ lucre³⁶ sake.” (1Ti 1:10)

Here again, we see the process of creating a legal title and a constructive trust. “Legal title” is, “One cognizable or enforceable in a court of law, or one which is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent right of ownership and possession, but which carries with it no beneficial interest in the property, another person being equitably entitled thereto; in either case, the antithesis of ‘equitable title.’”³⁷ So, with your legal title, you now have only an apparent right of ownership and possession, but no right to the beneficial interest, which raises a constructive trust.

A “Constructive trust” is, “A trust raised by construction of law, as distinguished from an express trust. Wherever the circumstances of a transaction are such that the person who takes the legal estate in property cannot also enjoy the beneficial interest without necessarily violating some established principle of equity, the court will immediately raise a constructive trust, and fasten it upon the conscience of the legal owner, so as to convert him into a trustee for the parties who in equity are entitled to the beneficial enjoyment.”³⁸

“BENEFICIAL INTEREST” is the, “Profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract, or the ownership of an estate as distinct from the legal ownership or control.”³⁹ It should be clear that, although a legal title may appear to grant ownership or a right to the profit and benefit, it does not.

We can also see that a legal title is the antithesis of ‘equitable title. “An equitable title is a right in the party to whom it belongs to have the legal title transferred to him; or the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another.”⁴⁰ So, again it is clear that a

person holding a legal title to property, whether it is real or personal property, is not the real owner, even though the legal title is vested in him. Also, it should be noted that the legal title can be removed from the one holding it and transferred by right to the one holding the equitable title.

The one holding title has been called a “feoffee to uses” which is, “A person to whom land was conveyed for the use of a third party. (The latter being called ‘cestui que use.’) One holding the same position with reference to a use that a trustee does to a trust.”⁴¹ He answers to the ‘*haeres fiduciarius*’ of the Roman law.”⁴²

“§ 30. **Bona fide purchase for value**---(1) paying value. In 1450 equity gave a remedy against a trustee or feoffee to uses but not against his transferee unless he to expressly undertook the trust. This... soon hardened into a rigid rule that the transferee was bound whether he did or did not undertake the trust; the obligation thus being imposed or constructed by equity... called a constructive trust and the doctrine was extended to all cases where a defendant would be unjustly enriched with specific property at the plaintiff’s expense including cases where the conveyance was in fraud of equities of specific performance, reformation of instruments, equitable mortgage and rescission....”

“A judgment creditor is not a bona fide purchaser for value because he gives no present value for the property upon which his judgment is a lien and also because he gets no title to it; but if he buys the property at the execution sale he is regarded as then giving value because he credits the amount of the purchase price on his claim”⁴³ In the first paragraph we see that it has become a rigid rule that the constructed trust must be honored. The problem is that the purchaser of a legal title is not a Bona fide purchaser for value because he has left an Unperformed obligation of payment to the issuer of the note’s obligation, under seal and treaty.⁴⁴

“I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of the moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our Government to trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country.”⁴⁵ “The interests of the corporation state are to convert all the riches of the earth into dollars.”⁴⁶ “If all bank loans were paid ... there would not be a dollar of coin or currency in circulation. Someone has to borrow every dollar we have in circulation. We are absolutely without a permanent money system”⁴⁷

The United States, and the world in general, has gone off the gold standard, but has not yet removed the notes of obligation from circulation. [Since I originally wrote

this, the new notes under a new seal are steadily replacing the old notes under seal. The notes are not returned to the United States or Washington D.C. They are not municipal notes from Washington D.C., but are a new “will, deed or testate written entirely by the hand of the testator”.]

“Faith must be kept; the simplicity of the law of nations must prevail. A rule applied to bills of exchange as a sort of sacred instruments.”⁴⁸

For the trust to succeed, the seal and obligation must be honored or the sealed notes must be replaced in timely fashion with a different note.

“Criminal: A person with predatory instincts who has not sufficient capital to form a corporation.”⁴⁹

“... the [Federal] Reserve Banks are not federal ... but are independent, privately owned and locally controlled corporations ... without day to day direction from the federal government.”⁵⁰

The constructive trust created by the Federal Reserve Act, and the years of almost exclusive use of their notes and banks, has eventually reduced almost all the land of the United States to a mere legal title, with the equitable title and true ownership held in a public trust that is bankrupt.⁵¹

“No one is considered to be solvent unless he can pay all that he owes.”⁵²

This constructive trust is a three-party trust, with the citizens of the United States as both beneficiary and surety for the debts of the trust. The United States Federal Government is the issuer of the obligation of the notes and the Federal Reserve is the issuer of the notes, as well as the owner of the notes, having bought them from the United States.

“Be not thou [one] of them that strike hands, [or] of them that are sureties for debts.” (Pr 22:26)

It is eventually necessary to issue notes entirely from a single source in order to execute the trust (This is now the case with the new notes in circulation). Those notes will be, in their entirety, fiat money. They shall have no true value except what is placed on them by edict. They shall also be holographs.⁵³ The sealed notes shall return to the new issuer and the equitable title and ownership of all property, things, and choses still in the trust shall be transferred to the possessor of the original notes.

“Every effort has been made by the Federal Reserve Board to conceal its powers, but the truth is... the Fed has usurped the government. It controls everything here (Congress) and it controls all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will!”⁵⁴

“There are two types of notes the Federal Reserve is allowed to issue (Federal Reserve Act of 1913), the first is the Federal Reserve Note. The currency of the United States exists in several forms, but the predominate note is the Federal Reserve Note, although most of the money in circulation is in the form of entries in bank books as a result of borrowing. The second type of note is the Federal Reserve Bank Note which have not been used since 1935.”⁵⁵

“A ‘fiduciary relation’ exists when confidence is reposed on one side and there is resulting superiority and influence on the other, which relation need not be legal, but may be moral, social, domestic, or merely personal.”⁵⁶

“Each note includes the following features: the seal, number, and letter of the Federal Reserve Bank that issued the note; the seal of the Department of the Treasury; the serial number; the year when the note was designed; and the printing plate identification numbers.”⁵⁷ The phrase “This note is legal tender for all debts public and private and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve Bank” was removed from the notes, but it was not that phrase that made them redeemable, but the seal and obligation of the Treasury.

This resulting *cestui que* charitable trust,⁵⁸ through the process of equitable conversion,⁵⁹ brings all the property bought over the last generation with these notes into the most gigantic trust on the face of the earth.

“Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I [am] the LORD that maketh all [things]; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself; That frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad; that turneth wise [men] backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish;” (Isaiah 44:24, 25)

How can this be, that everything you thought that you owned is owned by another? Is there any way to own and possess Gods gifts again?

“A trust is an obligation of conscience of one to the will of another.”⁶⁰

Remember a “TRUST” is, “A right of property, real or personal, held by one party for the benefit of another. An obligation arising out of a confidence reposed in the

trustee or representative, who has legal title to property conveyed to him, that he will faithfully apply the property according to the confidence reposed, or in other words, according to the wishes of the grantor of the trust... an equitable obligation, either express or implied, resting upon a person by reason of a confidence reposed in him, to apply or deal with property for the benefit of some other person, or others, according to such confidence... 'Trust' is further defined in a broad comprehensive sense as a relation between two persons, by virtue of which one of them holds property for the benefit of the other... and as a confidence reposed in one person, by and for the benefit of another, with respect to property held by the former, for the latter's benefit."⁶¹

A constructive trust is an implied trust, which is "raised or created by implication of the law; a trust implied or presumed from circumstances" or an "Imperfect" or "Executory trust" "which requires the execution of some further instrument, or the doing of some further act, on the part of the creator of the trust or of the trustee, towards its complete creation or full effect" and is distinguished from an express trust or executed trust.

An "Executed trust" is, "A trust of which the scheme has in the outset been completely declared*... A trust in which the estates and interest in the subject-matter of the trust are completely limited and defined by the instrument creating the trust, and require no further instrument to complete them."⁶²

"Fear can only prevail when victims are ignorant of the facts"⁶³

Some new instrument must give notification of trust; it would be a holographic testament and it would be issued entirely by the Federal Reserve with agreements guaranteeing its acceptance, most likely set forth or backed through world organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the United Nations. This new instrument of exchange (fiat money) would no longer be the same kind of note and would mark the execution of the trust. It would allow for the removal from circulation the notes under seal and obligation {See new notes in circulation}.

Is there any escape from this world-wide trust? Can you ever return to a lawful title? Can a mere legal title and an equitable title be restored or recombined into a good and complete title?

"Things which have not yet been introduced within the enemy, do not need the fiction of postliminy on account, because their ownership by the law of nations has not yet changed."⁶⁴

“§ 79 Equitable conversion. Where... money invested for the benefit of certain beneficiaries, equity regards- especially for purposes of devolution⁶⁵- the prospective sale or investment as if it had taken place at the time the will or deed took effect; this is usually called the doctrine of equitable conversion. Historically, the adoption of such a rule owed much to the influence of the maxim that equity regards that as done which ought to be done; ...“ There are some limitations to this conversion. “...the rule does not operate to deprive a widow of her dower right. Where the beneficiaries are all *sui juris*⁶⁶ and agree to do so, they may before the conversion actually takes place elect to take the property in its original form, because the trustees in such a case must obey the beneficiaries rather than the directives of the creator of the trust; this is usually referred to as the doctrine of equitable reconversion.”⁶⁷

“Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury:” (De 23:19)

“He who knows nothing is nearer to the truth than he

whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors” Thomas Jefferson

Monetary Summary

Everything that is purchased with a note has not actually been paid for with present value. A person merely offers [tenders] the note [bill] for legal payment in order to discharge a portion of the debt. The one who has promised, under seal, to pay the debt holds in trust the equitable title, while the person tendering his note obtains a mere legal title. This process is called “equitable conversion” and arises out of a construction of law. In order to obtain a true and actual title and equitably reconvert the property, one must pay present value to the one holding the equitable title.

“None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free.”⁶⁸

An individual must pay present value and have the capacity to own property. Citizens of the United States still can not use gold as currency. Individuals cannot reap the benefits of the trust while claiming to be immune from the debts of the trust. An individual must be *sui juris*.

If an individual pays present value for property with gold or silver to someone else who is a citizen in the trust, but only has a legal title, can he claim to have broken off the equities? Or should he do more?

“But the doctrine of constructive trust has an important limitation: it is not enforced against a transferee who had both paid value and received title before notice of the trust or other equity.” but “A purchaser from a known trustee who has the authority to sell need not see the proper application of the purchase money.”⁶⁹

“Delivery cannot and ought not to transfer to him who receives more than was in possession of him who made the delivery.”⁷⁰

Purchasing with present value from someone who has legal title does not break the interest of the one holding an equitable title in trust.

“No one can grant or convey what he does not own.”⁷¹

There still may be a value in the old notes to directly pay the holder of the equitable title, though a known trustee may not have the authority to sell, but may be compelled to by preexisting circumstances.

Those original Federal Reserve Notes are still under seal. The treasury no longer has the gold to pay out for those notes at face value, but they do have substance. They have the equitable title to all the property you hold the legal title to. If they change the nature of this merely constructive trust from a three party to a two party trust or change the relationship of any of the parties involved in the trust, then it is only reasonable that all have an option to change their relationship, also.

Shall I count [them] pure with the wicked balances, and with the bag of deceitful weights? (Mic 6:11)

“One who gives up a pre-existing claim against T in exchange for trust property should be and is considered as having given up present value; and the tendency is toward protecting one who merely accepts trust property as collateral security for a pre-existing debt, the value being found in the forbearance to sue.”⁷²

These notes under seal, and the agreement that allows them to come into existence, preexisted the trust. Therefore, the claim for payment existed before the trust and the tendency is toward protecting the preexisting claim.

An example of this mechanism on a national level was seen after October 28, 1977, when it was clear that the United States was no longer going to pay out gold to sovereigns in exchange for the Federal Reserve Notes. Almost every country in the world had already established their own federal-reserve-type monetary system of debt notes and were in as bad a shape or worse than the U.S. Those countries were in no position to put any real pressure on the U.S. and were willing to make concessions and agreements to maintain some sort of economic stability.

Panama used Federal Reserve Notes of the United States and coined some money. They had a large supply of those notes and could continue to demand payment in substance with relative economic impunity. If the United States agreed to transfer the Panama Canal to them, then the government of Panama would waive any right to demand such payment. A treaty was promptly written and signed, granting Panamanian government the canal.

This principle of waiver as payment is similar to what individuals can do in America today. If they waive their right to the preexisting value owed them, it must be considered as having given present value. But this trust has extended to almost every aspect of the lives of the citizens of the United States. An individual must waive rights to all the privileges offered by the United States Government to its subjects. They must become free and natural individuals. They must waive their right of redemption in one system and be redeemed in another, in order to seize⁷³ the land they wish to truly possess under that heavenly government they wish to live in .

[There is another door. Though the sealed notes are quickly disappearing from circulation as they are replaced with the new notes there is another hope. As the door to liberty and a free dominion closes there is another preexisting debt of the world system in innocent blood that can liberate the people from bondage.]

“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)

“I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those powers than by violent and sudden usurpation.”⁷⁴

It has been man’s turning away from God’s ways. His desire for the wealth, benefits, and comforts of those worldly regimes and their boastful words that has seduced man into his present bondage. The right and authority to impose an excise

tax (tribute) on land or labor, is based on the inadequacies of a legal title having been equitably converted, just as in the days of the Pharaoh.

“And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.” (2Peter 2:3)

Are today’s usurers as forgiving as the usurers in the time of Nehemiah or have they followed after Rehoboam?

“For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.” (Revelation 18:3, 5)

“To equitably reconvert sets a man between the Red Sea and a hardhearted Pharaoh with but the song of Moses and the Lamb. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous [are] thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true [are] thy ways, thou King of saints.” (Re 15:3)

“But the mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness; and the house shall be holiness; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions.” (Obadiah 1:17)

It should be clear that even though you may discharge the debt of a mortgages and obtain legal titles you still do not have clear and good titles, which “are synonymous; ‘clear title’ meaning that the land is free from encumbrances, ‘good title’ being one free from litigation, palpable defects, and grave doubts, comprising both legal and equitable titles and fairly deducible of record.”⁷⁵

“Also, the merchants of the earth are weeping and mourning over her, because there is no one to buy their full stock anymore, full stock of gold and silver and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, And cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and coaches and slaves and human souls. “(Revelations 18:11, 13.)

Who has bought the earth with lies and subtle tricks? Who are those who have sought to be gods, but are no God?

“Be not thou [one] of them that strike hands, [or] of them that are sureties for debts.” (Pr 22:26)

How could all this happen? Ask the modern media.

“We’re grateful to the Washington Post, the New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promise of discretion for almost 40 years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subjected to the lights of publicity during those years. But, the world is more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to national auto-determination practiced in past centuries.”⁷⁶

“We are going to impose our agenda on the coverage by dealing with issues and subjects that we choose to deal with”⁷⁷

“Our job is to give people not what they want, but what we decide they ought to have.”⁷⁸

“The Federal Reserve system pays the U.S. Treasury 020.60 per thousand notes -- a little over 2 cents each-- without regard to the face value of the note. Federal Reserve Notes, incidentally, are the only type of currency now produced for circulation. They are printed exclusively by the Treasury's Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the \$20.60 per thousand price reflects the Bureau's full cost of production. Federal Reserve Notes are printed in 01, 02, 05, 10, 20, 50, and 100 dollar denominations only; notes of 500, 1000, 5000, and 10,000 denominations were last printed in 1945.”⁷⁹

It was not mere superstition that motivated them, but a practicality stimulated by fear and a lack of faith. The people literally deposited their gold, as well as other goods, sacrificed the right to it, and took, in turn, some sort of exchangeable token. The gold was poured into a large statue for all to see. The wealth of the community was melted together. No one person could leave in the face of an enemy or trouble without leaving behind the golden idol. His scarabs or tokens were worthless except at his community. The priests of the temple kept track of all the complexities of this monetary system and, of course, the profits from interest and usury.

This was a common plan found in many governments of that day and this. They deposited their family wealth in a central vault controlled by trusted men of government, in this case the golden calf was their “reserve fund”.⁸⁰ Moses understood how it was a wicked thing to bind the people by anything more than love for one another, a passion for mercy and justice and the way of God the Father.



Greek geographer Strabo wrote of a 40-foot-high, gold-and-ivory, statue of the ruler of the gods seated on a throne. "It seems that if Zeus were to stand up, he would unroof the temple."

Footnotes:

¹- John Adams, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1787

²“Currency,” Microsoft ® Encarta. ©1994 Ms.Corp. Funk & Wagnall’s Corp.

³ Moneta est justum medium medium et mensura rerum commutabilium, nam per medium monetæ fit omnium rerum conveniens, et justa æstimatic. See 1 Bouvier, Inst. n. 922.

⁴Payment Black’s 3rd Ed. pp. 1340.

⁵George Washington in a letter to Jabez Bowen, Rhode Island, Jan. 9, 1787

⁶In Craig v. Missouri, 4 Petters 912, Chief Justice John Marshall.

⁷President James A Garfield

[8](#) Sir Josiah Stamp President of the Bank of England (1920's) the 2nd richest man in England.

[9](#) Thomas Edison.

[10](#) Abraham Lincoln

[11](#) James Madison

[12](#) Woodrow Wilson

[13](#) Congressman Louis T. McFadden in 1932 (Rep. Pa)

[14](#) Henry Cabot Lodge Sr., 1913

[15](#) Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Sr. , 1913

[16](#) John Maynard Keynes, The Economic Consequences of the Peace, 1920.

[17](#) Lewis vs. United States, 680 F. 2d 1239 9th Circuit 1982

[18](#) Charles A. Lindbergh Sr., 1923

[19](#) Aesop.

[20](#) tender. An offer of money. Black's 3rd Ed. pp. 1714.

[21](#) Thomas Jefferson Letter to William Ludlow, 1824

[22](#) Daniel Webster, lexicographer

[23](#) Thomas Jefferson's letter to John Tyler, one of you, 1816.

[24](#) English financier Sir Thomas Gresham

[25](#) Thomas Jefferson

[26](#) 1984 Grace Commission report submitted to President Ronald Reagan

[27](#) note: It was not unlawful for a natural person to own gold. see citizen vs. citizen.

[28](#) Henry Ford

[29](#) "Gold Standard, Currency," Mis © Encarta. ©1994 Ms.Corp. Funk & Wagnall's Corp.

[30](#) Abraham Lincoln

[31](#) Sidney Harris.

[32](#) Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Sr., December 22, 1913.

[33](#) “ There is no evidence that the word was the name of an a angel or a God , as in Milton (Par. Lost i. 678, cf. Spencer F.Q. II. vii “8) Encyclopedia Britannica.

[34](#) Stanek v. White. 172. Minn. 390, 215 N. W.784.

[35](#) Strong’s No. 150 aischros {ahee-skhos’ } from the same as 153; adj AV - filthy (1) 1) filthy, baseness, dishonour

[36](#) Strong’s No. 2771 kerdos {ker’-dos} of uncertain affinity; n n AV - gain (2) - lucre (1) [3] 1) gain, advantage.

[37](#) Black’s 3rd “legal title” pp. 1734

[38](#) Black’s 3rd Ed. p.1759

[39](#) Black’s 3rd pp. 206.

[40](#) Black’s 3rd “Equitable title” pp. 1734

[41](#) Black’s 3rd pp. 767. 1 Green1. Cruise, Dig. 333.

[42](#) Black’s 3rd pp. 767.

[43](#) Clark’s Summary of American Law, Equity, 263-264

[44](#) International Monetary Fund (IMF). The U.S. dollar played a key role in the new system, becoming, in effect, the world’s currency. This was true, first, because all IMF members defined the value of their own currencies in terms of the dollar and, second, because the U.S. agreed to convert all dollars held by foreign governments into gold on demand and at the exchange rate agreed on when the IMF was established. Officially, this meant that the world was on a “gold exchange standard” since governments could change their currencies into gold via the U.S. dollar. “Money,” Ms © Encarta.

[45](#) From Jefferson’s letter to George Logan, November, 1816.

[46](#) William O. Douglas.(pages 95,54)

[47](#) Robert Hemphill, Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta, in foreword to “100% Money” by Irving Fisher

[48](#) Fides servanda est; simplicitas juris gentium praevaleat. 3 Burrows, 1672; story, Bills. § 15.

[49](#)Howard Scott

[50](#)9th Circuit Court in Lewis v. United States, June 24, 1982

[51](#)“Under the new law the money is issued to the banks in return for Government obligation, bills of exchange, drafts, notes, trade acceptances, and bankers acceptances. The money will be worth 100 cents on the dollar, because it is backed by the credit of the Nation. It will represent a mortgage on all the homes and other property of all the people in the Nation.” House Congressional Record March 9, 1933 pg. 83

[52](#)Solvendo esse nemo intelligitur nisi qui solidum potest solvere.Dig.50.16.114.

[53](#)HOLOGRAPH. A will or deed written entirely by the testator or grantor with his own hand.Black’s 3rd. Ed. pp. 898.

[54](#)Louis T. McFadden (ex-chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency - murdered!)

[55](#)“Money,” Ms ® Encarta. ©1994 Ms.Corp. Funk & Wagnall’s Corp.

[56](#)Black’s 3rd ed page 775.

[57](#)“Currency,” Microsoft ® Encarta. ©1994 Ms.Corp. Funk & Wagnall’s Corp.

[58](#)“He who has a right to a beneficial interest in and out of an estate the legal title to which is vested in another.” Blacks 3rd pp.303.

[59](#)Equitable Conversion “Conversion. constructive conversion. 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. A direct conversion takes place when a person actually appropriates the property of another to his own beneficial use and enjoyment. Black’s 3rd Ed. pp. 430.

[60](#)Fides est obligatio conscientiae alicujus as intentionem alterius Bacon.

[61](#)Black’s 3rd Ed. p. 1759.

[62](#)Adams, Eq. 151.*...Black’s 3rd Ed. p. 1760

[63](#)Thomas Jefferson

[64](#)Res quæintra præsidia perductæ nondum sunt, quanquam ab hostibus occupatæ, ideo postliminii non egent, quia dominum nondum mutarû ex gentium jure.Grotius, de Jur. Belt.1.3,c.9,§16; 1.1.3,c.6,§3.

[65](#)Devolution. The transfer or transition from one person to another of a right, liability, title, estate or office. Black’s 3rd 573.

[66](#).not under any legal disability, or the power of another, or guardianship. Blacks 3rd.p.1676.

[67](#)Clark's Summary of American Law, Equity, 263-264

[68](#)Johann W. Von Goethe

[69](#)§ 30. Bona fide purchase for value. Clark's Summary of American Law, Trusts, 279-281.

[70](#)Traditio nihil ampliùs transferre debet vel potest, ad cum qui accipit, quàm est apud cum qui tradit.Dig. 41.1. 20.

[71](#)25 Barb. N.Y. 284,301...

[72](#)§ 30. Bona fide purchase for value. Clark's Summary of American Law, Trusts, 279-281.

[73](#)SEISED IN DEMESNE AS OF FEE. This is the strict technical expression used to describe the ownership in "an estate in fee simple in possession in a corporeal hereditament." The word "seised" is used to express the "seisin" or owner's possession of a freehold property; the phrase "in demsne," or "in his demesne," (in dominico suo)signifies that he is seised as owner of the land itself, and not merely of the seigniorship or services; and the concluding words, "as of fee," import that he is seized of an estate of inheritance in fee-simple. Where the subject is incorporeal, or the estate expectant on a precedent freehold, the words "in his demesne" are omitted. Black's Third page 1597.

[74](#) James Madison..

[75](#)Black's 3rd "clear title" p 1733.

[76](#)David Rockefeller -June 1991 Bilderberger meeting, Baden Baden, Germany. Published in The French Press.

[77](#)Richard M. Cohen, former Senior Producer of CBS political news

[78](#)Richard Salant, former President of CBS News

[79](#)Donald J. Winn, Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system

[80](#)Athens, under the leadership of Pericles, was driven to her golden goddess, their reserve fund, and compelled to melt it down and coin it into money Peloponnesian Wars. They eventually minted a plated bronze tetradrachms in Athens during the hard times which followed the Athenian collapse, viz. from B.C. 406-393. "In 393 the wretched bronze money of necessity was cried down, the Town Crier being sent round to proclaim that silver was once more to be the only legal tender :” ARIST. *Eccl.* 819.

""Aerarium "" (from Lat. aes, in its derived sense of ``money") the name (in full, aerarium stabulum, treasure-house) given in ancient [[Rome]] to the public treasury, and in a secondary

sense to the public finances. The treasury contained the moneys and accounts of the state, and also the standards of the legions; the public laws engraved on brass, the decrees of the senate and other papers and registers of importance. These public treasures were deposited in the temple of Saturn, on the eastern slope of the Capitoline hill... In addition to the common treasury, supported by the general taxes and charged with the ordinary expenditure, there was a special reserve fund, also in the temple of [[Saturn]], the aerarium sanctum (or sanctius), probably originally consisting of the spoils of war, afterwards maintained chiefly by a 5% tax... The later emperors had a separate aerarium privatum, containing the moneys allotted for their own use, distinct from the fiscus, which they administered in the interests of the empire. " From a 1911 Encyclopedia

Trust
(Faith in man)
vs.
Faith
(Trust in God)



“ For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.” (Romans 15:4)

The word “trust” has 24 different definitions under four different uses in Webster’s Dictionary. It comes from the Old Norse word *traust* meaning “trust, protection, firmness.” As a noun, it is defined first as a “confidence, a reliance or resting of the mind on the integrity, voracity, justice, friendship, or other sound principles of a person or thing. ‘Who so putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe - Prov. 29:25.’” Or ,also, as a noun, a trust is, “One who or that which is trusted. ‘O Lord God, thou art my trust from my youth.’” The seventh definition simply says, “keeping; care;

custody.” The eleventh is more specific, defining trust in law as, “the confidence reposed in a person by giving him nominal ownership of property, which he is to keep, use, or administer for another’s benefit;” also a trust is when an, “estate or property” is “under the charge of a trustee or trustees” or it is when “a person’s right to property” is “held in trust for him” as a presumed benefit.

The word “trust” can also be used as an adjective as well as a verb. As a transitory verb, it means “to place confidence in; to rely on; to believe in the honesty, integrity, justice, etc.” As an intransitory verb, it means “to have trust or faith; to place reliance; to be confident. to hope...”¹

“Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.” (Lu 22:42)

“A trust is an obligation of conscience of one to the will of another.”²

“And he shall say, Where [are] their gods, [their] rock in whom they trusted, Which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, [and] drank the wine of their drink offerings? let them rise up and help you, [and] be your protection.” (Deuteronomy 32:37, 38)

The word “trust”³ shows up here for the first time in the Bible and, then, it is referring to the trust men place in false gods, instead of trusting in the God. It is a word that expresses the idea of protection, confidence, and hope for something better. Better than what? Better than God? Who will have confidence and trust and hope in the LORD’s protection?

“Protection draws to it subjection; subjection protection.”⁴

“...

O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?” (Mt 14:31)

If man wishes the protection of gods, he must subject himself to them. If man looks to someone or something for protection, that thing shall be like to him a god. If he trusts in it, swears allegiance to it, prays to it for his benefit, and looks to it for guidance, then it begins to become the object of his trust and faith.

“Allegiance⁵ is, as it were, the essence of the law; it is the bond of faith.”⁶

Most things, such as governments, usually require, not only allegiance, but fidelity of all sorts and service, as well. The people of Sodom lived there because they found safety and comfort under the protection of the city walls. As always, they paid tribute in money and service to the King and, in return, the king supplied protection and order.

“And Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto the LORD, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth,” (Genesis 14:22)

Abram knew that often the gratuity proceeds the subjection. When the King of Sodom offered him the spoils of the city, he refused to take even a thread. Abram proclaimed his subjection and trust in the Lord his God and not in man or his cities. This choice, by its nature, builds character.

“After these things the word of the LORD came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I [am] thy shield, [and] thy exceeding great reward.” (Genesis 15:1)

Abram trusted in God’s rewards and benefits. He had faith in His protection. For this faith and the actions he took by that faith, he received a promise and the new name, Abraham.

“And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, [saying], In thee shall all nations be blessed.” (Ga. 3:8, see also Roman 4:12)

The seed of Abraham was delivered into bondage for four hundred years, but they were led out of that bondage by a man of great faith and trust in God. A man who could have had a kingship and glory for a season, but trusted instead in the LORD.⁷

“By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.” (Hebrews 11:24, 27)

Moses’ faith and trust in God separated him from other men who chose to trust in men and their governments. Moses set aside all the benefits, luxuries, and riches of the kingdoms of men, choosing rather to serve the LORD God in the desert. His

trust extended beyond a mere spiritual trust and allegiance, but it also required that he come out of Egypt and serve his LORD God, Ruler and Sovereign.

“[It is] better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man. Better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in princes.” (Ps.118:8,9)

The slavery in Egypt had become much more of a burden than the one-fifth income tax that had been placed on them and all Egyptians, except the priests, by Joseph at the time of their original captivity. Through subtle devices, they had been bound into a laborious corvée system of slavery from which there seemed to be no escape.

“And it shall come to pass in the increase⁸, that ye shall give the fifth [part] unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones. And they said, Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh’s servants. And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, [that] Pharaoh should have the fifth [part]; except the land of the priests only, [which] became not Pharaoh’s.” (Genesis 47:24)

“He who is in the womb is considered as born, whenever his benefit is concerned.”²

In the systems of slavery of both Rome and the United States, there were many who did work and save money until they bought their own freedom. But the labor, taxation, and money system of Egypt with its revenue officers and their clay scarabs, had become so oppressive that the people found children to be a burden rather than an asset. They often limited the size of their families by several means, including adoption and abortion.

“The same dealt subtly [subtle devices]¹⁰ with our kindred, and evil entreated [oppress]¹¹ our fathers, so that they cast¹² out their young children [fetus]¹³, to the end they might not live¹⁴ In which time Moses was born, and was exceeding¹⁵ fair, and nourished up in his father’s house three months: And when he was cast¹⁶ out, Pharaoh’s daughter took him up, and nourished him for her own son.” (Acts 7:19, 21)

Moses took the Israelites out of Egypt, but he couldn’t take Egypt out of the Israelites. They were constantly trying to return to the ways of Egypt. When the powerful figure of Moses was no longer there at their side to bind the people together, they began to fear the loss of loyalty in their great company. If attacked, they might break and scatter or just drift away and bind themselves to other

communities, leaving their number diminished and vulnerable. Aaron knew the art of the temple of Egypt. He knew the complexities of the system of the high priest that had bound the people together for over four hundred years.

“And all the people brake off the golden earrings which [were] in their ears, and brought [to be enumerated] ¹⁷ [them] unto Aaron. And he received [them] at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf: and they said, These [be] thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And when Aaron saw [it], he built an altar before it; and Aaron made proclamation [address by name]¹⁸, and said, To morrow [is] a feast to the LORD. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings¹⁹; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.” (Ex 32:3, 6)

These Israelites were practical people. They did not melt down all their gold and wealth simply to make a golden god to worship. This was a way to bind the people together into a consolidated body for defense, allegiance, and economic protection. Commerce and wealth being vested in a common purse, the people gained at least a benefit of protection through unity. Even charity was administered through the temple, which assured the loyalty of all those who wished to partake of the benefits of this man-made conglomerate of wealth.

“Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.” (Pr 3:5)

Moses put an end to such trust and common depositories of wealth. There was no king over the people, no sovereign but God, no ruler but the LORD God. Not a central bank, benefactor, or king, nor was it a democracy, but a theocratic republic. The kings of Israel were the heads of each household. How did such a kingdom work?

“For had ye believed²⁰ Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” (John 5:46, 47)

The people didn't believe Moses, nor did they believe Samuel. They sought kings which brought subjection and burdens time and time again. The fall of the Israelites was constantly proceeded by the people trusting in kings or foreign allies.

By the time the Jews found themselves under the influence Roman rule in the world of Augustus and Tiberius, the idea of a government-controlled economy and peace had become accepted. Corvee' labor gangs built roads, aqueducts, harbors,

and amphitheatres to stimulate commerce and revenue and to appease the masses. The Roman armies were spread throughout the world to keep the peace and maintain a flow of trade goods and a stable environment for business. That protection brought subjection and the repose bred apathy.

Herod had fashioned his rise to power and his kingdom after the political and economic designs of the day. Under the rule of the Pharaoh, the Israelites paid only one-fifth at first; under God, he asked only for one-tenth and that only according to their service. By the time the Romans, Herod, and the new high priests under Herod were finished taxing the people in the overstimulated Roman economy, the middle class was oppressed and the poor were disgruntled, with their rebellious nature needing to be placated or controlled.

“Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide²¹: keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom.” (Mic 7:5)

“In Jesus’ day an impressive system of welfare tended the poor.... The tithe of grain and fruit could first be exchanged for silver.... silver for grain, wine, oil, and whatever would promote the joy of the people in the presence of their God The tithe also functioned as a kind of a tax to support the temple and its personnel... An administration was in charge of the storehouse for the continued welfare of the personnel... The presentation of any offering required careful adherence to the prescribed regulations as well as love for the Lord. The prophets often called for obedience rather than sacrifices (I Sam. 15:22-23; Isa. 1:10-20), for praise of the Lord rather than offerings (Hos. 14:2), and for humility (Mic. 6:8).”

“The prophets... were inspired by the vision of a faithful Israel responding freely in faith and obedience to the regulations given in the law.”²²

“For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, [was] not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.” (Romans 4:13)

Faith comes from the Latin word *fides* meaning “faith, belief, trust, from *fidare*, 'to trust'...” It often has the idea of an “unquestioning belief” and has as numerous synonyms, words such as, “belief, trust, confidence, credence, fidelity, conviction, creed...”

“Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?” (2Co 13:5)

Do we believe in God? Do we trust God? Do we have faith?

*“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”
(Hebrews 11:1)*

What do you hope²³ for? In what do you desire and have confidence ? In and upon what, in your heart, do you trust and rely?

In every day life, people trust in many things. They trust in the tires and brakes of their vehicles as they speed down life’s highways. They trust in doctors and lawyers, plastic packaging, and elevator cables. They rely on these things and they have hope that they will not fail. They deposit their savings and the fruits of their labor in banks and the stock markets. They trust in the military might of the nation, the local police or the revolver they keep in the night stand by their bed. Should they not rather trust, believe, and have faith in the LORD God?

That is not to say that any of those things are bad or evil in themselves, but, if they deplete or distract or seduce us in the smallest way from God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, then there is danger. If we tremble at their loss, then our faith in God comes into question. If we compromise God- given rights and responsibilities in exchange for the benefits and comforts of men, we sin.

“Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.” (Acts 16:29,31)

From the beginning, it was a trust, faith, and confidence in God and His way that has been the key to God’s will for man on earth.

“By faith Abel offered unto God ... By faith Enoch was translated ... for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and [that] he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” (He 11:4, 6)

Some men believed with their faith in God and not in men or the worlds and institutions they created.

“By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, ... Abraham, By faith ... not knowing whither he went.” (Hebrews 11:7, 8)

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob traveled from the safety of their homeland and lived in tents. They chose not to look to the great cities of man for their security, trusting with faith, in the power of God, which was prepared for them. They chose to have faith and hope in the LORD God as their Ruler, in His city.

By faith, Joseph knew what was to come. “By faith Moses, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction and By faith he forsook Egypt and its wealth and protection. Even the harlot Rahab as well Gedeon, and [of] Barak, and [of] Samson, and [of] Jephthae; [of] David also, and Samuel, and [of] the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.”²⁴

Do we look to Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit or have we, like the Israelites, turned to kings, governments, and foreign, alien customs to bring a false sense of security to our minds and our lives?

“Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight²⁵, and the sin which doth so easily beset²⁶ [us], and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of [our] faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.” (Hebrews 12:1, 2)

Any time we are looking to, appealing to, or trusting in other things rather than Jesus and his way, it can become an occasion of sin. We must always seek to know the will of God, to do and serve the will of God, and to follow the way of God, through Jesus. If we remain steadfast in true faith in Him who made us, then why would we seek to serve others and do their will and serve their desires and ambitions and trust in them?

“For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.” (Hebrews 10:36)

Should we not believe in both word and deed? Jesus established the Kingdom of God on earth, but we must seek it by doing the will of God.

“Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as [it is] in heaven.” (Matthew 6:10)

So, what is the will of Jesus, God and the Holy Spirit? What does their kingdom look like?

“But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Lu 12:31)

Do you seek the kingdom of God or the kingdoms and governments of the world?

“But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” (Mt 5:34 see Js 5:12)

But, if you go into the military or take public office, do you not swear your allegiance to an earthly government? Whether you swear or affirm, you are adding to your word and binding your conscience.

“For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, [It is] Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; [he shall be free]. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.” (Mr. 7:10, 13)

Today, man has entrusted other men with their land and their labor and the care and protection of their families. Their elderly are cared for by others, for they have given Corban²⁷ in the form of a social security at their temple.

“That which bars those who have contracted will bar their successors also.”²⁸

“The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute.” (Pr. 12:24)

Men have sold themselves into servitude and now pay tribute, excise tax, on their labor.

“ And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.” (2Pe 2:3)

People have wanted to rest before their labor was done.

“But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.” (Galatians 5:15)

People expect their neighbors in the democracy to pay for those things that they themselves cannot afford. They vote one special program or benefit into existence after another expanding the tax burden.

“Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them thy sons, and thy sons’ sons;” (De 4:9)

Children are raised with values and customs foreign to their parents because parents do not raise their own children. From day care to college and the media to their peers, the youth of America and the world have little contact with their economically-burdened, preoccupied, and working parents.

“But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” (1Ti 5:8)

Families were the building block of God’s kingdom with the honor to our fathers the only tax. The people as a nation also gave contributions. The sacrifices of the people, in the times of Jesus' preaching, went to care for the poor and those who administered those gifts and sacrifices. People brought their sacrifices to the temple or synagogues. Before the temple, there was the altars of Abraham.

Foreign nations, like the Romans, did the same, but they had tax collectors who went out and collected the sacrifices of the people. These contributions were given, not to the God, but to strange gods. Today, government collects taxes by force or threat and gives back, that which was collected, in the form of welfare and other benefits, gratuities, and grants. The churches and temples of today do not manage the offerings of the people, but encourage them to filter their charity through government.

“As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol [is] nothing in the world, and that [there is] none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords²⁹ many,) But to us [there is but] one God, the Father, of whom [are] all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom [are] all things, and we by him.” (1 Corinthians 8:4, 6)

So, is it that a man should not trust in other men and man's institutions? What harm will it do? What harm has it done?

“When thou criest, let thy companies deliver thee; but the wind shall carry them all away; vanity shall take [them]: but he that putteth his trust in me shall possess the land, and shall inherit my holy mountain;” (Isa 57:13)

In America, there is a democracy where each person may help decide the fate of his brother, in common with his own. Is that wise?

“Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother: for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbour will walk with slanders.” (Jer 9:4)

In both the Old and the New Testament, God constantly reminds his people to make no covenants, to keep themselves separate, and to trust, believe, serve, and have faith in Him alone. He will care for His people.

“They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.³⁰ Sanctify³¹ them through thy truth: thy word is truth.” (John 17:16, 17)

Are we to stay separate from the world and loyal to the LORD spiritually and physically?

“But [it is] good for me to draw near to God: I have put my trust in the Lord GOD, that I may declare all thy works.” (Ps 73:28)

The Lord prayed that we would have the faith in Him and remain separate from the world.

“And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in [them]; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean [thing]; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.” (2 Corinthians 6:16, 17)

“Holiness then denotes the separateness, or otherness, of God from all his creation. The Hebrew word for holy, *qados*, in its fundamental meaning contains the note of that which is separate or apart.”³²

Some will divide “separation” into categories of separation, but does God? If man’s institutions have taken the place of God’s institution, then we could take Elwell Evangelical Dictionary's list of four reasons to separate and apply them. (1) heresy is not to be tolerated (2) By remaining in, one shares in the responsibility for it. (3) Remaining in seems to be a tacit endorsement and even recommendation of evil. (4) It is poor stewardship to give one’s money to help support ... ministries that are not unequivocally Christian... Each believer will have to seek the Holy Spirit’s guidance in reaching conclusions for his own convictions.³³

Jesus preached a kingdom. He told us to do the same. He told us to preach that it was at hand. He appointed his apostles a kingdom to serve and he told us that it was not to be like the kingdoms of the gentiles, who are called benefactors and exercise authority one over the other. If you are in a government that acts as a benefactor but *exercises authority one over the other* to provide benefits and welfare for the people, then you are not in a Christian government.

Within the pages of the Bible and the untold history of mankind, there is a government form that edifies the Kingdom of Heaven. It is actually the most common form of government used throughout history, but there are few students coming from our modern schools that would recognize it or could tell you about it or the essential characteristics of it. It is not a centralized government of control, but a diversified network of faith, hope, and charity. In fact, "our modern reliance on government to make law and establish order is not the historical norm".³⁴

From the Altars of Abraham to the Levites of Moses, from the network of ministering Essenes to the early Christian Church, and from the Tithingmen of Britain to the Kapauku of New Guinea, history is ripe with the chronicles of spontaneous customary law bringing private property, free dominion, and order to vast cultures for hundreds, even thousands of years, without a central government.

Central governments have brought an endless series of wars and invasion, dictators and holocaust, national debt, inflation, and depressions. They have produced a divided populous, with a welfare society on one end, a rich ruling elite on the other, and a laboring middle class supporting both. People receive a designed education producing an unwitting population that equates comfort and the appearance of affluence with liberty. And historically, the family suffers a corrupting influence and a moral decay, the community is divided and ignorant of concepts of justice and law, and every person covets the gratuitous benefits supplied at his neighbor's expense. In this land of double speak, lies are called

learning, servitude is called freedom, license is called liberty, and violence is called justice.

That voluntary system of spontaneous justice, which was the enemy of kings and rulers of men, had no taxes, no compulsory membership and no dominating authority to make law for the people. They depended upon a free population who chose to be involved. Their goal was protection of the rights of their neighbor, not punishment which was left in the hands of the superior authority, God. It's success demanded mutual respect and diligent arbitration. There was no central state, for the civil power was held within each family, but guarded by all in a commonwealth of honor, love, and hope.

Through the sacrifice, attention, and virtue required to maintain such systems, people are compelled to develop and reward the superior qualities of man's character. Those of more selfish and delinquent nature soon smart for their neglect of virtue under the cleared minds of diligent participants.

"[As] the door turneth upon his hinges, so [doth] the slothful upon his bed."
Proverbs 26:14

Few people realize that the prophets along with Jesus Christ taught men a way to be ruled without going under the authority of Kings, Benefactors, and Soters. These systems were not common purses of rights or authoritative dictators, but systems of hope and charity that cultivated strong communities, as long as virtue prevailed in the hearts of men.

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, [which is] your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed³⁵ by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what [is] that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God. For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think [of himself] more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith."
(Ro. 12:1, 3)

"And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth [his] sheep from the goats:" *(Mt 25:32)*

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean; and I will receive you," *(2Co 6:17)* *"Occupy till I come."*
(Luke 19:13)

Footnotes:

1Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary unabridged 2nd. Ed.

2Fides est obligatio conscientiae alicujus ad intentionem alterius Bacon.

3Strong's No. 02620 chacah a primitive root; v 1) (Qal) to seek refuge, flee for protection 1a) to put trust in (God), confide/hope in (God) (figurative)

4Protectio trahit subjectionem, subjectio protectionem. Coke, Littl. 65.

5ALLEGIANCE. The obligation of fidelity and obedience which the individual owes to the government under which he lives, or to his sovereign in return for the protection he receives. Black's 3rd Ed. page 95.

6Ligeantia est quasi legis essentia; est vinculum fidei. Coke, Litt. 129.

7Genesis 15:13

8Strong's No. 08393 t@buw'ah {teb-oo-aw'} from 935; n f 1) produce, product, revenue 1a) product, yield, crops (of the earth usually) 1b) income, revenue 1c) gain (of wisdom) (figurative) 1d) product of lips (figurative)

9Qui in utero est, pro jam nato habetur quæstio deejus commando quæritur.

10Strong's No. 2686 katasophizomai {kat-as-of-id'-zom-ahee} middle voice from 2596 and 4679; vb AV - deal subtilly with (1) 1) to circumvent by **artifice or fraud, conquer by subtle devices**; to outwit; overreach; to deal craftily with

11Strong's No. 2559 kakoo {kak-o'-o} from 2556; vb AV - entreat evil (2) - make evil affected (1) - vex (1) - hurt (1) - harm (1) [6] 1) to **oppress**, afflict, harm, maltreat 2) to embitter, render evil affected

12Strong's No. 1570 ekthetos {ek'-thet-os} from 1537 and a derivative of 5087; adj AV - cast out (1) 1) cast out, exposed

13Strong's No. 1025 brephos {bref'-os} of uncertain affin.; n n AV - babe (5) - child (1) - infant (1) - young child (1) [8] 1a) an **unborn child, embryo, a fetus** 1b) a new-born child, an infant, a babe

14Strong's No. 2225 zoogoneo {dzo-og-on-eh'-o} from the same as 2226 and a derivative of 1096; vb AV - preserve (1) - live (1) [2] 1) **to bring forth alive** 2) to give life 3) to preserve alive

15Strong's No. 2316 theos {theh'-os} of uncertain affinity; a deity, especially (with 3588) the supreme Divinity; n m AV - God (1320) - god (13) - godly (3) - God-ward + 4214 (2) - misc. (5) [1343] 1) a god or goddess, a general name of deities or divinities 2) Christ is called God in John

1:1, 20:28, 1 John v:20, Rom.9:5, Titus 2:13, Heb 1:8 etc. 3) spoken of the only and true God; refers to the things of God; i.e. his counsels, interests, things due to him 4) whatever can in any respect be likened unto God, or resemble him in any way: God's representative or viceregent, of magistrates and judges

16Strong's No.1620 ektithemi {ek-tith'-ay-mee} from 1537 and 5087; vb AV - expound (3) - cast out (1) [4] 1) to place or set out, put outside, expose 2) to set up, **exhibit** 3) metaphorically, to set forth, declare, expound

17Strong's No.0935 bow' {bo} a primitive root; v 1) to go in, enter, come, go, come 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to enter, come in 1a2) to come 1a3) to attain to a4) **to be enumerated** 1a5) to go 1b) (Hiph) 1b1) to lead in 1b2) to carry in 1b3) to bring in, cause to come in, gather, cause to come, ...

Also in the New Strongs Exhaustive Concordance, "abide, aply, attain...to employ (cause to enter)"

18Strong's No. 7121 qara' a primitive root - 2063; v 1) to call, call out, recite, read, cry out, proclaim 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to call, cry, utter a loud sound 1a2) to call unto, cry (for help), call (with name of God) 1a3) to proclaim 1a4) to read aloud, read (to oneself), read 1a5) to summon, invite, call for, call and commission, appoint, call and endow 1a6) to call, name, give name to, call by 1b) ... to be called, be named, be called out, be chosen. "address by name"

19Strong's No. 08002 shelem from 7999; n m 1) peace offering, requital, sacrifice for **alliance**/friendship 1a) **voluntary sacrifice of thanks**

20Strong's No. 4100 pisteuo from 4102; vb AV - believe (239) - commit unto (4) - commit to (one's) trust (1) - be committed unto (1) - be put in trust with (1) - be commit to one's trust (1)-believer (1) [248] 1) to think to be true; to be persuaded of; to credit, place confidence in 2) to intrust a thing to one, i.e. his fidelity; to be intrusted with a thing

21Almost always translated governor, captains, chief, or duke.

22Elwell Evangelical Dictionary

23Hope. a desire... a confidence... a trust; reliance. Webster's Dictionary.

24Hebrews 11

25Strong's No. 3591 ogkos probably from the same as 43; - weight (1) 1) whatever is prominent, protuberance, bulk, mass, hence a burden, weight, encumbrance

Strong's No.43 agkalefrom agkos(a bend, "ache"); - arm (1) 1)the curve or inner angle of the arm,the bent arm 2)anything closely enfolding,as the arms of the sea, etc.

26Strong's No. 2139 euperistatos; adj AV - which doth so easily beset (1) 1) **skilfully, surrounding** i.e. besetting

[27](#)Strong's No. 2878 korban and korbanas of Hebrew and Aramaic origin respectively [7133]; AV - treasury (1) - corban (1) [2] 1) a gift offered (or to be offered) to God 2) the sacred treasury

[28](#)Quod ipsis, qui contraxerunt, abstat; et successoribus eorum obstabit.Dig.50.17.29.

[29](#)Strong's No. 2962 kurios {koo'-ree-os} from kuros (supremacy); Lord (667) - lord (55) - master (11) - sir (6) - Sir (6) - misc. (4) [749] 1) he to whom a person or thing belongs, about which he has power of deciding; master, lord 1a) the possessor and disposer of a thing, the owner; one who has control of the person, the master; in the state: the sovereign, prince, chief, the Roman emperor ...

[30](#)Strong's No. 2889 kosmos {kos'-mos} probably from the base of 2865 komizo; AV - world (186) - adorning (1) [187] 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government... On line Bible and Concordance. Woodside Bible Fellowship. Strong's No. 2865 komizo {kom-id'-zo} from a primary komeo (to tend, i.e. take care of); 1) to care for, take care of, provide for

[31](#)Sanctification To make holy. The Hebrew qadash or qodesh and Greek (hagiazō) roots represented in AV by "sanctify, holy, hallow," and varied in RSV by "consecrate, dedicate," are applied to any person, place, occasion, or object "set apart" from common, secular use as devoted to some divine power. Elwell Evangelical Dictionary

[32](#)Easton Illustrated Dictionary

[33](#)From the Elwell Evangelical Dictionary

[34](#)Part I of *The Enterprise of Law* : Justice without the State by Dr. Bruce L. Benson.

[35](#)"Participation in a system of charitable uses under the Law of Charitable Uses and the Status of Wills, Among others, is voluntary. Once participation is discontinued for various reasons such as "breach of trust," and "lack of confidence," the non participant, so separated from use, may assert rights to be restored to his prior, original status and condition." *Williams v. Williams*, (1853) 8 N.Y.-4 Selden 525. *McCartee v. Orph. Asylum Soc.*, 9 Cowen 511, 513, 18 am. Dec. 516, quoting Blackstones Comm. 104.

Deported

(Cast out from the governments of men)

vs.

Departed

(Fled into the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.)



“The civil law is what a people establishes for itself.”¹

“And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city², and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.” Ge 4:17

From Cain to Lamech and Nimrod to Pharaoh and Caesar, men have been subjecting themselves to other men in exchange for the assumed peace and security of the city state and civil governments made by the hand of man. Is that God's plan?

“And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the LORD.” (Ge 4:26)

Enos did not call upon the names of the civil states of Cain through Lamech but upon the name of the LORD. Should we do less?

“I will take the cup of salvation³, and call upon the name of the LORD... For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” (Ps 116:13... Ro 10:13)

We may imagine that thousands of years ago people lived primitive lives all over the world, much like the aborigines of North America or Australia, even Africa. Yet, when the record is examined, we find not only complex societies, but societies that have many similar characteristics to our modern systems of economics, justice, and government.

Men began to band together in clans, tribes, and, then, into communities for a number of reasons. Villages became towns, towns became cities or city-states. Eventually, those cities became wealthy, or, at least, some of the inhabitants in them became wealthy. When greed, jealousy, envy, avarice, and sloth began to motivate the people instead of God's ways, new methods of protecting and increasing that urban wealth were devised.

“And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top [may reach] unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” (Ge 11:4)

Over four thousand years ago, in the kingdom of Ur, there were systematic methods and specified rules in courts of record. They settled, “disputes arising out of sales, inheritance, gifts, or divorce.” There were different kinds of courts with different jurisdictional authority. “When the claim had been ‘in the king's name’ and rebutted, the case was settled by an oath either taken by one of the parties or by a witness.”⁴

“Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:” (Mt. 5:33)

The *Ana Ittishu* (legal phrases and extracts) was an ancient code preserving the “Sumerian Family Laws.” Such codes made provisions regulating marriage, adoption, liability for personal and property damage, as well as obligations to neighbors, penalties for false accusations, and rules for hiring laborers as slaves for a period of time (employment). The systems were established by social compacts that brought benefits and edicts.

“A man void of understanding striketh hands, [and] becometh surety in the presence of his friend [fellow-citizen].”⁵ (Pr 17:18)

In a natural society, without the imposition of one man’s will upon another, each individual is answerable to his own God given conscience. He may seek to do the will of his Creator or not.

“And sometimes they sacrificed to the old stone gods, Made heathen vows, hoping for Hell’s Support, the Devil’s guidance in driving Their affliction off. That was their way, And the heathen’s only hope,

Hell Always in their hearts, knowing neither God Nor His passing as He walks through our world, the Lord Of Heaven and earth; their ears could not hear His praise nor know His glory.”⁶

Men lacking faith and feeling the terror of the absence of God in their lives band together and create false gods to worship through false hopes. In this self-indulgence, men will be recreated by another god who will demand their service, loyalty, and homage. All is done to protect themselves from the perils of the world, other false gods created by other men and/or the acts of the Almighty God or Nature.

“The old king Bent close to the handle of the ancient relic, And saw written there the story of ancient wars Between good and evil, the opening of the waters, The Flood sweeping giants away, how they suffered And died, that race who hated the Ruler Of us all and received judgment from His hands, Surging waves that found them wherever They fled.”⁷

City-states sprung up in answer to this fear, often creating fear in their neighbors. Those states, in turn, were ally together into oligarchies, constitutional confederations, and despotic empires. What appeared to be one man’s salvation, often became another man’s oppressive enemy and tyrant.

His vanity swelled him so vile and rank That he could hear no voices but his own...

“How often an entire country suffers On one man’s account!”⁸

By the time of the writing of the Code of Hammurabi, the “king is already the source of justice; the judges are strictly supervised, and appeal to the king is allowed.”⁹ With a contracted dominion by oath, appeals to God by individuals could not be heard over the authoritarian trumpeting of one man over another and that power made a bed for injustice.

These were not evolving legal systems, but archetypes that grew naturally due to social constructions and moral choices or moral neglect by the people of God’s earth, in those times and now.

“A brood forever opposing the Lord’s Will, and again and again defeated... Words and bright wit Won’t help your soul; you’ll suffer hell’s fires, Unferth, forever tormented...

Then and now Men must lie in their Master’s holy Hands, moved only as he wills: Our hearts must seek out that will.”¹⁰

People that lived in different societies developed rules and customs which permitted their survival. Droughts, floods, famines, as well as enemies of peace, were managed in different ways, unique to the economy, social, and moral or amoral customs of the people in that place.

As man’s socioeconomic base changed, so did his environment. The new environmental conditions stimulated another resulting social and economic change. What may appear to some as an evolving process is, in fact, merely a revolving one, which is the result of cause and effect. Has this revolving spiral been going up or down? Is it fueled by virtue or vanity, by righteousness or wickedness?

None of these systems were perfect. They depended on the wisdom and justice and charity and love in the hearts of the people of those societies.

“What shall we say then? [Is] the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” (Romans 7:7)

Some people might believe that the history of the evolving social nature of men is defined by the progressive history of governments and the expansion of their civil systems. Is the quality of man's state as a noble human based upon the amount of civil government required to hold his corrupt nature in check or is it based upon the purity of his own virtues and the God of virtue who he worships?

“In the most corrupt state the most laws.”¹¹

I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and courts. These are false hopes, believe me; these are false hopes. “Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no Constitution, no law, no court can save it.” ¹²

Could the evolving, burgeoning, and encompassing bureaucratic government be causing an addicting, apathetic effect upon the virtuous nature of its citizenry, bringing about the decline of the human character?

“Be not thou [one] of them that strike hands, [or] of them that are sureties for debts.” (Pr 22:26)

In the days of Hamurabi's codes, there were benefits and drawbacks to the centralized power and man-made jurisdictions, as men were bound under oath.

“And Haran died¹³ before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees.” (Ge. 11: 28)

Haran died in Ur. Did he just die, or was he “put to death” by the legal authorities of Ur because he offended the state? Terah felt compelled to leave by the events of his son's death.

“And Terah took¹⁴ Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran his son's son, and Sarai his daughter in law, his son Abram's wife; and they went forth¹⁵ with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came¹⁶ unto Haran, and dwelt there.” (Genesis 11:31)

The word *laqach* can mean “to take”, “lay hold of”, “seize”, even, “to buy”. Together, they exited and came out of Ur and its jurisdictions, as well as the protection and subjection of that flourishing civilization. When they came unto (bow' - to go in, to be enumerated) the city, that they called Haran, they were simply in the same condition with a different ruler, but not yet by faith under the rulership of the LORD (YHWH) God.

“Avoid the reeking herd, Shun the polluted flock.”¹⁷

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get¹⁸ [depart] thee out of thy country,¹⁹ and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee:” (Genesis 12:5)

Abram, with Lot, departed out from Haran, being led by faith. Haran was another city-state in which his father had settled. But it was not what God wanted for Abraham, nor was it what Abraham wanted.

“Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” (Ga 3:7)

“Therefore [it is] of faith, that [it might be] by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,” (Ro 4:16)

Abraham was the father of all true Christians. because true Christians put their faith in The LORD and His only begotten Son, not in the institutions of men, their leaders and social schemes and promises.

According to the story of Joseph, his brothers cast him into slavery and, in turn, Joseph’s brothers went into slavery, that they might learn the lesson of their earthly father, Abraham, whose Father was in Heaven and, in hope, that by faith, they would be saved in the great deliverance of a new covenant.

“And God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance.” (Ge 45:7)

Hundreds of years later, Moses and the people of Israel would also exit another civilized kingdom and again become Hebrew wanderers in the wilderness.

“By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;” (Heb 11:24, 25)

Both Abraham and Moses were very successful against the difficulties that confronted them. Lot, living in Sodom under the protection of the king, found his family corrupted and himself a captive of an invader and was saved by his Hebrew uncle and his invisible God more than once.

“And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual.” (Ex 12:39)

The Israelites, while coming out of the corvee bondage of Egypt, had to go through a process of change, or reconversion, living under God’s law in the desert for forty years, to prepare them for the promised land. Having lived under the civil government of Egypt for four hundred years, they had been changed or converted from the ways of their forefathers. That change began even before they left Egypt. The hard times of the plagues taught them to depend upon charity and not benefits of Pharaoh.

For hundreds of years following that exodus, God’s people would have no king, no emperor, and no president. In the affluence that God’s way brought them came pride, vanity, sloth, apathy, and foolishness.

“Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us;” (1 Samuel 8:19)

The people had now departed from the ways of the LORD again. They chose to have another Ruler between them and God. Those rulers, in turn, acting like gods themselves, counted the people as their own and required the people to tithe to them as benefactors and patriarchs of the people.

“And David’s heart smote him after that he had numbered the people. And David said unto the LORD, I have sinned greatly in that I have done: and now, I beseech thee, O LORD, take away the iniquity of thy servant; for I have done very foolishly.” (2 Sa 24:10)

“Covetousness is a sort of mental gluttony, not confined to money, but greedy of honor and feeding on selfishness.”²⁰

The Israelites stumbled under kings like Saul, Absalom, and Rehoboam, who, like all demagogues, appealed to the democratic whim of the people to empower themselves and to supplant God.

“And on this manner did Absalom to all Israel that came to the king for judgment: so Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.” (2 Sa 15:6)

Men had returned to the ways of the city-state. No longer trusting in the prophets and judgment of the LORD, they built cities and temples of stone and trusted in the

storehouse and treasuries of ruling classes. They trusted in the leaders they had chosen for themselves and their neighbor. They went under tribute.

“But Solomon built him an house. Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet,” (Acts 7:47, 48)

Rehoboam burdened the people and caused division among them. Like the heathen, his kingdom was not made in the image of God’s Kingdom, but in the imperfect, merciless image of men.

“For whereas my father put a heavy yoke upon you, I will put more to your yoke: my father chastised you with whips, but I [will chastise you] with scorpions.” (2Ch 10:11)

Without God as their King and Ruler, the people fell into one snare, trap, and pit after another, blindly following the blind. The people devolved as they were weakened by their own institutions.

“So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and, behold, they [were] written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah, [who] were carried away to Babylon for their transgression.” (1Ch 9:1)

The law of God was understood by men like Enos, Samuel, Elijah, and others. There is the LORD thy God and there must be no other gods before Him; you must not bow down to them nor may you serve them.

“And it shall be unto them as a false divination in their sight, to them that have sworn oaths: but he will call to remembrance the iniquity, that they may be taken. Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Because ye have made your iniquity to be remembered, in that your transgressions are discovered, so that in all your doings your sins do appear; because, [I say], that ye are come to remembrance, ye shall be taken with the hand.” (Ezekiel 21:23,24)

Men living by the wisdom that God had granted them, knew that the depositing of their wealth, their rights, their God given gifts into a common purse or bank or vault or golden calf or cestui que trust would lead every man quickly into debt, slavery and even death.

“Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse: My son, walk not thou in the way with them; refrain thy foot from their path: For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood. Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird. And

they lay wait for their [own] blood; they lurk privily for their [own] lives. So [are] the ways of every one that is greedy of gain; [which] taketh away the life of the owners thereof.” (Proverbs 1:14, 19)

Why would people cast in their lots together, except to gain the use and benefit of their neighbor's goods, possessions, and wealth? How can someone gamble, putting their inheritance into a common pot, unless they are hoping and praying to get more out from their neighbors' share than they put in?

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that [is] thy neighbour's.” (Exodus 20:17)

Anyone, who lends money to someone who is poorer than himself and, in addition, charges interest, would be going against the teachings of the Bible and the principles laid down by God in His government.

“Under Capitalism man exploits man; under Socialism the process is reversed.”

“If thou lend money to [any of] my people [that is] poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.” (Ex 22:25)

People who consume the goods and services paid for by the sweat and blood of those who, by force, toil to provide those goods and services are consuming the sweat and blood of those souls still living and laboring.

“And whatsoever man [there be] of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul²¹ that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh [is] in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it [is] the blood [that] maketh an atonement for the soul.” (Leviticus 17:10, 11)

Many would say that this is Old Testament and we are not under the law. Is not God the same today as he was yesterday? His law, His way, His charity, His love should be written on our hearts in the fullness of His provision and we, by the virtue of our new nature, no longer seek the ways of sin.

“ Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. And if any man think that he knoweth

any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of him. As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol [is] nothing in the world, and that [there is] none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) But to us [there is but] one God, the Father, of whom [are] all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom [are] all things, and we by him.” (1 Cor 8:1, 6)

“Government big enough to supply everything you need, it is big enough to take everything you have ... The course of history shows that as a government grows, liberty decreases.”²²

When a person enters into a tax contribution system in order to gain the benefits and protection offered by the rulers of that system, crafted by the hands of men, he subjects himself to the jurisdictional authority of those rulers (gods) of that system. The benefits they receive are the meat and, sometimes, the blood of those victims, which that system strangles and devours daily. The sins of that system rest upon the beneficiaries of that body, that corporation, that creation of men as much, if not more, than the rulers.

“Selfishness is not living as one wishes to live. It is asking others to live as one wishes to live.”²³

“Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent . . . the greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding.”²⁴

“A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency. The problem of how a constitutional democracy reacts to great crises, however, far antedates the Great Depression. As a philosophical issue, its origins reach back to the Greek city-states and the Roman Republic. And, in the United States, actions taken by the Government in times of great crises have - from, at least, the Civil War - in important ways shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency.”²⁵

“But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols,²⁶ and to commit fornication.²⁷ So hast

thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans,²⁸ which thing I hate. Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth [it].” (Rev 2:14, 17)

Will men repent of such associations? Can he stop serving the lusts of idols and contributing to rulers other than “The Ruler” of Heaven and Earth? Is there a kingdom to which one may exodus ?

“If a man vow a vow unto the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth. (Nu 30:2) Thou art snared with the words of thy mouth, thou art taken with the words of thy mouth.” (Pr 6: 2)

Will men stop devouring the sweat and blood of those poor souls who are bound, by oath, to sacrifice their service to false gods? Is there another system of government not taught by men?

“The term republic, res publica, signifies the state independent of its form of government.”²⁹

In a republic, the citizenry is free from the administration of government, as opposed to democracy, where rights are placed into a common purse.

“Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was [free] born.” (Acts 22:27,28)

Citizens of the original Roman republic were not subject to the administrative civil authority, which was designed to regulate those residents of Rome, who were subject to the administrative powers. After the Roman civil war, which came about because of their own corruption, the Imperial Roman power protected, and even controlled, many kingdoms and domains throughout the world. Some kingdoms did not fall under their empirical power and influence.

People who were citizens of these separate kingdoms could pass through or even live within the realm of the Pax Romana without being subject to many of the administrative regulations and taxes. Jealousy, envy, and hate sometimes brought unjust persecutions for these free citizens.

“And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed.”³⁰ (Lu 2:1)

A census in those days required some form of accounting and usually required a token to mark those who had been counted. The census called for by Augustus ‘was regarded as the badge of servitude, and incompatible with the Theocratic character of Israel.’³¹

All Jews did not hate the Emperor (Emperor³²), the commander-in-chief of the multinational military force that kept the peace throughout the world.

“The annual Temple-tribute was allowed to be transported to Jerusalem, and the alienation of these funds by the civil magistrates treated as sacrilege. As the Jews objected to bear arms, or march, on the Sabbath, they were freed from military service. On similar grounds, they were not obliged to appear in courts of law on their holy days. Augustus even ordered that, when the public distribution of corn or of money among the citizens fell on a Sabbath, the Jews were to receive their share on the following day. In a similar spirit the Roman authorities confirmed a decree by which the founder of Antioch, Seleucus I. (Nicator), [d Ob.280 B.C.] had granted the Jews the right of citizenship in all the cities of Asia Minor and Syria which he had built, and the privilege of receiving, instead of the oil that was distributed, which their religion forbade them to use, [e Ab. Sar ii. 6] an equivalent in money. [Jos.Ant. xii. 3. 1] These rights were maintained by Vespasian and Titus even after the last Jewish war, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of these cities. No wonder, that at the death of Caesar [g 44 B.C.] the Jews of Rome gathered for many nights, waking strange feelings of awe in the city, as they chanted in mournful melodies their Psalms around the pyre on which the body of their benefactor had been burnt, and raised their pathetic dirges.”³³

Judea did not hate Rome. Many loved and desired their protection, generosity, and social security; besides, they were good for business. There were rebels, as always. There was corruption, as always. The Caesars were the protector of their peace, the benefactor of their welfare.

“The year 2 B.C. marked the 25th anniversary of Caesar Augustus’s rule and the 750th anniversary of the founding of Rome. Huge celebrations were planned. The whole empire was at peace. The doors of the temple of Janus were closed for only the third time in Roman history. To honor their emperor, the people were to rise as one and name him pater patriae, or Father of the Country. This enrollment, described in the Book of Luke, which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, has

always been a mystery since no regular census occurred at this time. But the pater patriae enrollment fits perfectly.”³⁴

“And call no [man] your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven.” (Matthew. 23:9)

Much of Israel did not choose to serve their true King, the Anointed Jesus (Yeshua), and His Father (YHWH) in Heaven, but they did choose to serve their father in Rome, to worship him and to serve him.

“But they cried out, Away with [him], away with [him], crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar.” (John 19:15)

Those, who chose to follow the anointed king, Jesus, were cast out (excommunicated) from the temple and its benefits. Jesus sought the faithful and the Apostles ministered to them daily in the temple after their restoration at Pentecost. Until the fall of Jerusalem, the temple was a center of Christian activity, but, by that time, the kingdom was being preached throughout the world.

These new citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven were also cast out from Rome and other city- states and kingdoms, for they would serve but one king only. Their system of government was the reverse of the systems endured by the other nations, the Gentiles.

“ And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this [matter]. So Paul departed³⁵ from among them. Howbeit certain men clave³⁶ unto him, and believed³⁷...” (Acts 17:32, 34)

“The more a power departs from God’s law, the more impotent it becomes in coping with real offenses, and the more severe it becomes with trifling offenses or with meaningless infractions of empty statutes which seek to govern without moral authority and without reason.”³⁸

“After these things Paul departed³⁹ from Athens, and came to Corinth; And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome:) and came unto them. And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers.” (Acts 18:1,3)

There are three Greek words is translated into “depart” or “departed”. The first is *exerchomai*, which really means “expelled” or “cast out” or “to go forth from one’s power”. The second and third times, the word is *chorizo* meaning “to separate” or to “separate one’s self from”. When people were deported by the command of Claudius, how did officials make sure that they did not come back? Why was it so important that all these people be deported? Were they also barred from buying and selling in the Roman markets and practicing licensed professions?

In Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, he praised “the union and discipline of the Christian republic.” He also pointed out that “it gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman Empire.”⁴⁰ The early Christian *ekklesia* was a republic that was recognized by Rome through the proclamation nailed to the cross by order of the Proconsul of Rome, Pontius Pilate. When Jesus rose from the dead to stand again upon the earth, so did his Kingdom. His kingdom now lives in the hearts of those who follow His way.

“All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.” (1 Cor. 6:12)

Paul would not go under any authority but the highest power of God.

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.” (Ro 13:1)

Believers were cast out, excommunicated, deported and they chose separation, rather than subjection. Jesus heard that they had cast him out⁴¹; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him. (John 9:35, 38)

Early Christians were expelled from the welfare systems of the day, run by the state churches of the world government of its time, the Roman Empire. They then appointed ministers to handle their tithes to the poor, but not men to rule over them and their hereditaments.

“And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples [unto them], and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables (bank).⁴² Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven

men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.” (Acts 6:1, 3)

There was a system to the government called the kingdom of Heaven. There were Apostles appointed and ministers to take care of the daily administration. There was a system established and functioning that spread across the world.

Jealousy, envy, and greed brought persecution to the early Christians as they became successful in their separate and holy Kingdom, established by Jesus the Christ (anointed king). Those persecutions kept the body of Christians pure from the corruption that was so prevalent in that day and now, in our own time.

When Constantine legalized a portion of the church with the Edict of Milan, some were already on the road to corruption. As the legal church began a fornicating relationship with the kingdoms of men, true Christians departed to the remote ends of the earth. Christians were eventually hunted and persecuted by both, the kingdoms of men and the legal churches, reciprocally empowered by each other.

Today, legal churches are not incorporated in the Body of Christ, but in the body of man-made governments. The few duties that the church still performs are done so by the authority vested in them by the state. They still claim their right to tithe, but have relinquished the obligation of the daily ministrations to the state, having squandered the tithing on temples of stone and wood and glass. These churches claim that God has ordained that men should not only bow down to these governments, but that we are to serve them with our sweat and our blood. They say our children should run before their chariots and we should give them the first fruits of our labor. They tell us that this is what God wants, but the Bible is an unending procession out of such systems.

“They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor Safety.” [43](#)

Men in the world today have returned to the corvee’ slavery from which God had taken them while in Egypt. Because of the subtle economic and social oppression, women cast out their children by the tens of thousands each year in government-endorsed abortions. Large sections of the population feast on the sweat and blood of those living souls who toil in service to man-made institutions. The prophetic warnings of Samuel are accepted as the should-be fate of all Christians.

If we are to listen to the apostate churches, we would have to conclude that Enos should have built a city, that Cain was right in establishing the city of Enoch;

Abraham should have stayed in Ur, or at least in Haran; the Israelites were better off in Egypt; that Paul should not have departed from Rome; and that we should serve the United States Federal Democracy, its Emperor (Commander-in-chief), its *Principas Civitas* (first citizen, chief executive officer) and its Apo Theos originator of gods (god, ruling magistrate, appointer of judges)⁴⁴.

“Go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen; let them deliver you in the time of your tribulation. Judges 10:14 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”
(Ga 5:1)

If we are to depart from such systems, how has it been done? What manner should that departure take? Where shall we go? There are no wildernesses to which we can depart . What did Jesus tell us? Seek first the Kingdom of Heaven. Where is that Kingdom and what does it look like? Is it a place of the dead or the living? Must we die to enter?

We must die to the ways of sin. His kingdom comes when his will be done on earth as it is in heaven. What was the system that Jesus established? He told us, but have we ears to hear? The blind and deaf have lead us back to Egypt and the doors are closing. It is time for the faithful to repent and turn to the ways of the Lord.

Who shall be the modern Levites and come out first to traverse the gates of the walled-in city with a sword of truth at their side? This is the mission of those “called out,” the *ekklesia* of the Lord, that Holy Church appointed by the King. Who shall learn His ways and teach them in the streets of the city?

“For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ”. 2 Peter 1:11

Footnotes:

¹Jus civile est quod sibi populus constituit.1 Johns. N.Y.424, 426.

²Strong’s No. 5892 `iyar {eer} or (in the plural) `ar {awr} or `ayar (Judges 10:4) {aw-yar’} from 5782 a city (a place guarded by waking or a watch)... n m 1) excitement, anguish 1a) of terror 2) city, town (a place of waking, guarded) 2a) city, town

³Strong’s No. 3444 y@shuw`ah {yesh-oo’-aw} feminine passive participle of 3467; n f 1) salvation, deliverance 1a) **welfare**, prosperity 1b) deliverance 1c) salvation..

[4](#)Encyclopedia Britanica Vol II p. 862 1957.

[5](#)Strong's No. 7453 rea` {ray'-ah} or reya` {ray'-ah} from 7462; . n m 1) friend, companion, fellow, another person 1a) friend, intimate 1b) fellow, **fellow-citizen**, another person (weaker sense) ...

[6](#)Beowulf 2:175-185. Burton Raffel.

[7](#)Beowulf v1685-1695. Burton Raffel.

[8](#)Beowulf v910.; v3075. Burton Raffel

[9](#)>Encyclopedia Britanica Vol II p. 862 1957.

[10](#)Beowulf 1:110v...v585...v1055. Burton Raffel.

[11](#)Corruptissima republica plurimae leges. Tacitus.

[12](#)Spirit of Liberty 189 Judge learned Hand.

[13](#)Strong's No. 4191 muwth {mooth} a primitive root; v 1) to die, kill, have one executed 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to die 1a2) to die (as penalty), be put to death 1a3) to die, perish (of a nation) 1a4) to die prematurely... 1b) (Po) to kill, put to death, dispatch 1c) (Hiph) to kill, put to death 1d) (Hoph) 1d1) to be killed, be put to death 1d...

[14](#)Strong's No. 3947 laqach {law-kakh'} a primitive root; v 1) to take, get, fetch, lay hold of, seize, receive, acquire, buy, bring, marry, take a wife, snatch, take away 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to take... 1a4) to take to/for a person, procure, get, take possession of, select, choose, take in marriage, ...

[15](#)Strong's No. 3318 yatsa' {yaw-tsaw'} a primitive root; v 1) to go out, come out, exit, go forth 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to go/come out/forth, depart...

[16](#)Strong's No. 0935 bow' {bo} a primitive root; 1) to go in, enter, come, go, come in 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to enter, come in 1a... 1a3) to attain to 1a4) to be enumerated ...

[17](#) Elenor Wylie [1885-1928]

[18](#)Strong's No. 3212 yalak {yaw-lak'} a primitive root [compare 1980]; v 1) to go, walk, come 1a) (Qal) 1a1) to go, walk, come, depart, proceed, move, go away 1a2) to die, live, manner of life (figurative) 1b) (Piel) 1b1) to walk 1b2) to walk (figurative of life) ...

[19](#)Strong's No. 0776 'erets {eh'-rets} from an unused root probably meaning to be firm; n f 1) land, earth 1a) earth 1a1) whole earth (as opposed to a part) 1a2) earth (as opposed to heaven) 1a3) earth (inhabitants) 1b) land 1b1) country, territory 1b2) district, region 1b3) tribal

territory 1b4) piece of ground 1b5) land of Canaan, Israel 1b6) inhabitants of land 1b7) Sheol, land without return, (under) world 1b8) city (-state) ...

[20](#)Chamfort 1741-94

[21](#) Strong's No. 5315 nephesh {neh'-fesh} from 5314; n f 1) soul, self, life, creature, person, appetite, mind, living being, desire, emotion, passion 1a) that which breathes, the breathing substance/being, soul, the inner being of man 1b) living being 1c) living being (with life in the blood) 1d) the man himself, ...

[22](#)- Thomas Jefferson

[23](#)Oscar Wilde 1856 1900

[24](#)Justice Louis Brandeis, *Olmstead vs. United States*, United States supreme Court, 1928

[25](#)CONGRESSIONAL RECORD-SENATE, Vol. 119 Part 29, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, November 19, 1973, pp. 37619-37623.

[26](#)Strong's No. 1494 eidolothuton {i-do-loth'-oo-ton} neuter of a compound of 1497 and a presumed derivative of 2380; adj AV - things offered unto idols (4) - things offered in sacrifice to idols (3) - things sacrificed unto idols (2) - meats offered to idols (1) [10] 1) sacrificed to idols, the flesh left over from the heathen sacrifices; it was either eaten at the feasts or sold (by the poor and the miserly) in the market

[27](#)Strong's No. 4203 porneuo {porn-yoo'-o}from 4204; vb AV - commit fornication (7) - commit (1) [8] 1) to prostitute one's body to the lust of another 2) to give one's self to unlawful sexual intercourse; to commit fornication 3) metaph. to be given to idolatry, to worship idols; to permit one's self to be drawn away by another into idolatry

[28](#)Strong's No. 3531 Nikolaites {nik-ol-ah-ee'-tace} from 3532; n pr m AV - Nicolaitane (2) 1) Nicolaitans meaning "followers of Nicolas" is a sect mentioned in Rev. 2:6,15, whose deeds were strongly condemned. They may have been identical with those who held the doctrine of Balaam. ... In the time of persecution, when the eating or not eating of things sacrificed to idols was more than a crucial test of faithfulness, they persuaded men more than ever that it was a thing indifferent. Rev. 2:13,14. this was bad enough, but there was yet a worse evil. Mingling themselves in the orgies of idolatrous feasts, they brought the impurities of those feasts into the meetings of the Christian Church. And all this was done, it must be remembered, not simply as an indulgence of appetite, but as part of a system, supported by a "doctrine", accompanied by the boast of prophetic illumination. 2 Pet. 2:1. ...the "deeds" of the Nicolaitans. To hate these deeds is a sign of life in a Church that otherwise is weak and faithless. Rev. 2:6. To tolerate them is well nigh to forfeit the glory of having been faithful under persecution. Rev. 2:14,15.

[29](#)Bouvier's Vol.1. page 13 (1870).

[30](#)Strong's No. 582 apographe {ap-og-raf-ay'} from 583; n f AV - taxing (2) 1a) a writing off, transcript from some document 1b) an enrolment or registration in the public records of persons together with their income and property, as the basis of a census or valuation, i.e. that it might appear how much tax should be levied upon each one.

[31](#)The sole grounds of resistance to the census, appears from Jos. Ant. xviii. 1. 1, 6.

[32](#)Emperor, imperatoris m. commander in chief. Collins L.E. Dict. '62.

[33](#)Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah Chapt. V

[34](#)The Star of Bethlehem by Crag Chester, Imprimis D/96 Hilsdale College.

[35](#)Strong's No. 1831 exerchomai {ex-er'-khom-ahee} from 1537 and 2064; vb AV - go out (60) - come (34) - depart (28) - go (25) - go forth (25) - come out (23) - come forth (9)- misc (18) [222] 1) to go or come forth of 1a) with mention of the place out of which one goes,... **of those who are expelled or cast out** 2a) to go out of an assembly, i.e. forsake it 2b) **to come forth from physically, arise from, to be born of** 2c) **to go forth from one's power, escape from it in safety ...**

[36](#)Strong's No. 2853 kollao from kolla ("glue"); vbAV - join (one's) self (4)- cleave (3) - be joined (2) - keep company (1) [10] 1) to glue, to glue together, cement, fasten together; hence to join or fasten firmly together; to join one's self to, cleave to

[37](#)Strong's No. 4100 pisteuo from 4102; vb AV - believe (239) - commit unto (4) - commit to (one's) trust (1) - be committed unto (1) - be put in trust with (1) - be commit to one's trust (1) - believer (1) [248] 1) to think to be true; to be persuaded of; to credit, place confidence in 1a) of the thing believed; to credit, have confidence ...

[38](#)-- From The Institutes of Biblical Law, R.J. Rushdoony, Chalcedon Foundation

[39](#)Strong's No. 5563 chorizo from 5561; vb AV - depart (8) - separate (3) - put asunder (2) [13] 1) to separate, divide, part, put asunder, to separate one's self from, to depart 1a) to leave a husband or wife: of divorce 1b) to depart, go away

[40](#)Rousseau and Revolution, Will et Ariel Durant p.801. fn 83 Heiseler, 85.

[41](#)Strong's No. 1544 from 1537 and 906; vb AV - cast out (45) - cast (11) - bring forth (3) - pull out (3) - send forth (3) - misc. (17) [82] I) to cast out; drive out; to send out 1) with notion of violence 1a) to drive out (cast out) 1b) to cast out: of the world, i.e. be deprived of the power and influence he exercises in the world; a thing: excrement from the belly into the sink 1c) to expel a person from a society: to banish from a family 1d) to compel one to depart; to bid one depart, in stern though not violent language...[They were not cast out of the planet but out of the kosmos, the worlds of man's civil systems.]

[42](#)Strong's No. 5132 trapeza {trap'-ed-zah} probably contracted from 5064 and 3979; n f AV - table (13) - bank (1) - meat (1) [15] 1) a table 1a) a table on which food is placed,... 2) the table or stand of a money changer, where he sits, exchanging different kinds of money for a fee (agio), and paying back with interest loans or deposits.

[43](#)Benjamin Franklin

[44](#)The three offices delivered after election, solemnized by oath, to Caesar Augustus and other subsequent rulers of that day and this day.

The Charagma

(The badge of servitude yesterday.)

VS.

The Card

(The badge of servitude today.)



The Roman Slave Market
Charagmas about their necks

“And I beheld another beast¹ coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth² all the power³ of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men,” (Rev 13:11, 13)

This new beast only had horns like a lamb, but it constituted the jurisdiction of the first beast.

Is it a wild animal or a brutal man? Or is it a government or dominion as foretold in Daniel 7? Are there governments who can make fire come down from the heavens in the sight of men?

“And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap,⁴ and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.” (Ro.11:9,10)

“Beast” is from *therion*, which is the same as *thera*, meaning “hunting”, which is found only in Romans 11:9. It is translated “trap”, referring to Psalms 69:22. Nimrod, too, was a mighty hunter before the LORD.

“Let their table become a snare before them: and [that which should have been] for [their] welfare, [let it become] a trap.” (Ps 69:22)

Has the table, set for the general welfare of the people, become a jurisdictional trap for them? Has their eyes been darkened to the deception? Have they bowed their backs?

“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Pr.23:1, 3)

What appears to be an entitlement or a gift may be but a bait? Entitlements beget entitlements.

“Give not sleep to thine eyes, nor slumber to thine eyelids. Deliver thyself as a roe from the hand [of the hunter], and as a bird from the hand of the fowler. Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise.” (Pr 6:4, 6)

Have we eaten deceitful meats? Have we slumbered in sloth? Have we been deceived?

“And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by [the means of] those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.” (Rev 13:14)

This beast is able to deceive,⁵ to seduce, or to lead, the people away from God’s ways with a miraculous⁶ power⁷, or by offering and giving a sign, mark, or token.

“And he had power to give life unto the image⁸ of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship⁹ the image of the beast should be killed.”¹⁰(Rev. 13:15)

This new beast is created in an image, or a likeness, of the old beast. Like history repeating itself, an authority or jurisdiction that once was, would control the lives of the inhabitants of the whole earth instead of God.

Would it be by force or consent? Would this new power simply swallow up the world and the remnant or would they compel compliance to their will? By what authority or condition shall they compel compliance?

The word “killed” in verse 15 is not *phoneuo*, meaning “to slay” or “to murder”, but *apokteino*, “to kill in any way whatever, to destroy, to allow to perish to extinguish, abolish as to deprive.”

“And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.” (2Pe 2:3)

“The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits.” ¹¹

“Eat thou not the bread of [him that hath] an evil eye, neither desire thou his dainty meats: For as he thinketh in his heart, so [is] he: Eat and drink, saith he to thee; but his heart [is] not with thee. The morsel [which] thou hast eaten shalt thou vomit up, and lose thy sweet words.” (Pr. 23: 6, 8)

“And he causeth¹² all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy¹³ or sell, save he that had¹⁴ the mark, or the name¹⁵ of the beast, or the number of his name.” (Rev 13:16, 18)

This beast, or jurisdictional authority with only lamb's horns, was able to cause everyone to get this mark,¹⁶ that is to say, to get a badge of servitude. If they refused, they could neither buy nor sell anything, which could include their labor. If they did not work for the beast and/or this image of the beast, they would be excluded and persecuted, even unto death.

Not everyone works for the government, or do they? The news media announced on April 15 a number of years ago that the average worker works three hours a day

for the government or over 4 months out of every year. That would be serving the government, or the ruling authority, for 4 months out of every year. Since that time, with the inclusion of other taxes, that percentage has vastly increased.

To buy or sell, people will need to have or hold this mark or *charagma* [i.e. stamp (as a badge of servitude),] or just its name, or the number of its name. Anyone of these acts will do to allow you to participate in the system of the beast, but would you want any of them if you truly wished to serve and worship the LORD God?

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” (Rev.14:6,7)

“I [am] the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness [of any thing] that [is] in heaven above, or that [is] in the earth beneath, or that [is] in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me;” (Exodus 20:2, 5)

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive [his] mark in his forehead, or in his hand,” (Rev. 14:8, 9)

The first word we can examine is “worship” from *proskuneo*, meaning “an expression of profound reverence... used of homage shown to men of superior rank: such as a profound reverence for a flag or an attitude of ‘my country right or wrong.’” The words in Old and New Testaments are political terms denoting allegiance.

The second word to examine is “receive”,¹⁷ which comes from the word *lambano*, meaning “to take with the hand, lay hold of, any person or thing in order to use it; to take up a thing to be carried; take possession of, i.e. to appropriate to one’s self ... to receive what is offered; not to refuse or reject... give him access to one’s self.”

It should be noted that the curse that follows in Scripture only applies to men who both worship AND receive the mark. Is the mark implanted or simply handed to the one who receives what is offered?

The word *lambano* means “to receive” or simply that the mark can be taken with the hand or laid hold of; however, we see the preposition “*in*”, which could leave us with the concept of “inside.”

“In” is translated from the word *epi*, which is a generic preposition that is translated many different ways as a mere preparatory word, and has been translated “in, upon, on, come to, by, at, before, over”, etc.¹⁸

It should be clear that there is no specification that the mark actually enters the flesh of the hand; furthermore, the use of *lambano* should lead one to think the mark, “i.e., the badge of servitude,” can simply be taken into the hand or accepted.

This brings us to *metopon*, which is translated “forehead.”¹⁹ If one need only remember the name or the number of the name, it could be assumed that the physical possession of a *charagma* or a badge of servitude is not even necessary and that the reference to the forehead, or the space between the eyes, is cognizant of the mind and the location of thought and memory. This is commonly understood in the use of the word in other text.

“And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth. And the first went, and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome²⁰ and grievous²¹ sore²² upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and [upon] them which worshipped his image.” (Rev.16:1, 2)

How could a mere card or badge of servitude cause a sore in the flesh of your hand? If we look at the word *kakos*, translated “noisome”, we can see that it means something negative, like unto the idea of evil or bad, but more in the sense that things are not such as they ought to be or a wrong or unnatural mode of thinking, feeling, acting; while “grievous” comes from *poneros*, meaning “pressed and harassed by labours; bringing toils, annoyances, perils; of a time full of peril to Christian faith and steadfastness; causing pain and trouble.” The text is simply speaking of evil burdens placed on the people, although having more to do with labor than a wound or sore.

“The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented²³ with fire and

brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever²⁴: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.²⁵ Here is the patience of the saints: here [are] they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.”²⁶ (Rev 14:10, 12)

Who was the first beast? Was it Babylon or Rome, or does it matter, for were they not all the same as was Egypt also? Who is the second beast made in the image of the first?

We must ask, who is the beast that causes the new image that was like the first beast and what would this image or likeness look like?

At the time of Jesus, Rome, as a faltering republic, was well into a process of decay.

“Of a population of about two million... Each class contributed its share to the common decay... The free citizens were idle, dissipated, sunken; their chief thoughts of the theater and the arena; and they were mostly supported at the public cost... While, even in the time of Augustus, more than two hundred thousand persons were thus maintained by the State, what of the old Roman stock remained was rapidly decaying, partly from corruption, but chiefly from the increasing cessation of marriage, and the nameless abominations of what remained of family-life.”

Family values were a chief topic of political rhetoric before every election and during the writing of the new constitution by Augustus. Today, the media fills the chief thoughts of the people and those kept at the public cost have peaked.

“All contributed to the general decay.... The social relations exhibited, if possible, even deeper corruption. The sanctity of marriage had ceased. Female dissipation and the general dissoluteness led at last to an almost entire cessation of marriage. Abortion, and the exposure and murder of newly-born children, were common and tolerated; unnatural vices, which even the greatest philosophers practiced, if not advocated, attained proportions which defy description. As regards the Roman rule, matters had greatly changed for the worse since the mild sway of Augustus, under which, in the language of Philo, no one throughout the Empire dared to molest the Jews.”

Today, living together, divorce, abortion-on-demand and promiscuous life styles of the rich and famous are proclaimed, admired, and envied.

The first Procurator whom Tiberius appointed over Judaea... found in Caiaphas a sufficiently submissive instrument of Roman tyranny. The Procurators were Imperial financial officers... The office was generally in the hands of the Roman knights, which chiefly consisted of financial men, bankers, chief publicans, &c. The order of knighthood had sunk to a low state, and the exactions of such a rule, especially in Judea, can better be imagined than described.²⁷

Today, it is financial men, bankers, chief publicans, and lawyers (republican or democrat) and the money powers that sway authority in government at home and abroad.

Rome was not an anarchy, but a complex system of laws, regulations, and obligations. The burdens that fell upon the average laborer, in order to support this burgeoning bureaucracy and apathetic welfare state, were immense and they depended upon a complex system of tax collectors and revenue officers. The Gabbai [tax collector], collected the regular dues, which consisted of property tax, income tax, and poll-tax and the Mokhes collected tax and duty upon imports and exports; ‘on all that was bought and sold; bridge-money, road-money, harbour-dues, town-dues, etc.’ They had invented a tax that reached into the life of almost everyone. There were taxes on axles, wheels, ‘pack-animals, pedestrians, roads, highways; on admission to markets to sell or a sales tax on much that was purchased; on carriers, bridges, ships, and quays; on crossing rivers, on dams, on licenses, in short, on such a variety of objects, that even the research of modern scholars has not been able to identify all the names.’²⁸ Today, not even certified public accountants can figure all the complexities of the present tax system and few understand by what authority it is imposed.

“And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute [money] came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute?” (Mt. 17:24)

They not only had to collect these taxes, but they had to keep track of who had paid and who had not, as well as who was a taxpayer and who was excepted from that obligation. With all the traveling and trade that was done, there had to be ways of establishing who you were and what your status was. Slaves even had different statuses, as well as the residents. Subjects of the Empire might be required to supply statute labor for work on local roads or public projects besides the poll tax. How were all these records kept and recorded in an orderly way?

They had many ways to keep track of slave and freeman, as well as who had paid what and how much and who was still owing on the myriad of taxes, fees, tariffs, interest, and penalties.

Contracts were sometimes etched or engraved with a quill in wet clay and, then, the marks or seals of the parties and witnesses were pressed into the clay as a signature. The tablets were allowed to dry and were stored in the temple. This ancient method of record keeping, although not exclusive, was widely accepted.

Long-term loans of indebtedness and usury took advantage of this permanent form of record-keeping and made men and their lands a surety by virtue of those etched covenants, solemnized by the signing of the hand. Such covenants often resulted in a form of bondage. The Romans, having no forgiveness in the seventh year and no year of jubilee, often enslaved men through debt more quickly than men were able to buy their freedom.

“Be not thou [one] of them that strike hands, [or] of them that are sureties for debts.” (Pr. 22:26)

Articles of clothes and social demeanor also marked a man and his status. A man might go about with a *Qolemos*, or reed-pen, behind his ear, as a badge of his employment and, similarly, a carpenter carried a small wooden rule behind his ear. The use of more official identifications, made of copper, brass, silver, or gold with family seals, was a common practice.

Slaves in the market place were given dried clay tablets to identify their owner, their qualifications, and origins. If such tablets were baked with the seal of the owner, they took on a permanency that protected the slave from unwarranted detention as he traveled through the public streets on errands for his master. That etched document was referred to as a *charagma*²⁹, which was a badge of servitude. As oaths of loyalty to the government of Rome and its rulers became commonly required during the early rise of Christianity, the evidence of such a pledge of allegiance was often upon paper in front of witnesses and signed under penalty of perjury. A study of these paper trails showing proof of allegiance and subjection to authority is a parallel to our modern times.

A census required some form of accounting and usually required a token to mark those who had been counted. Before the days of plastic lamination of official identification cards, Herod had such a token in his plans for a Kingdom of Heaven on earth. The census called for by Augustus ‘was regarded as the badge of servitude, and incompatible with the Theocratic character of Israel.’³⁰ Herod’s

mark was your new Hebrew name, carved in a white stone taken from the river Jordan, and was given to you at your baptism. At the same time, you were registered with the priests of his Kingdom and the first of your regular contributions was collected.³¹

Everyone understood that John was preaching that the kingdom of heaven was at hand and baptism was part of that right of entry into its governmental system. The question raised in the Bible was, by what authority did he baptize? It was clear he was not a missionary of Herod, but he was the son of Zacharia and the cousin of the true heir of the throne of Judea, the highest son of David.

In 29 B.C., Gaius Octavianus marched into Rome as the savior of the Republic and was given the title of Augustus³² by the Senate. He was then legally granted, under constitutional forms and limitations, the position Emperor,³³ commander-in-chief of all military and naval forces, for a period of ten years. He could set foreign policy and establish treaties, but, at home, each year he was elected consul and chief magistrate, swearing a binding oath of office read from clay tablets. Today's first citizen appoints federal justices who judge its citizenry. "Thus the republic was restored under the presidency of its 'first citizen' (princeps civitatis)."³⁴

"But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black." (Mt 5:34,36)

Augustus as Emperor had dropped his position of Consul of Rome for almost 18 years while he settled disputes as a sort of combination N.A.T.O, U.N., and U.S. military force, all rolled into one. He kept banking, trade, and commerce prospering throughout the world and received great praise and adoration for the accomplishment.

Today, the United States, a democracy in a republic,³⁵ with constitutional forms and limitations, has a president who sets foreign policy and establishes treaties and who is also the commander-in-chief of the military and naval forces, including the Air Force, which can make fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men. Today's modern ministers, licensed by the state in which their churches are incorporated, baptize the people into what kingdom? Men claim to worship God by singing on Sundays, but their practical allegiance and service is pledged to Rome by swearing words and applicatory deeds.

When the Separatists and pilgrims departed from the shores of England, they said, “Good-bye Babylon. Good-bye Rome.” The Common Law and the Holy Bible was the foundation of this Republic in the 1600’s. The government’s authority was insignificant, although it rose from the Common Law of the Land. It is now Roman Law that dominates the legal system and the courts. In Black’s Law Dictionary, found in every law office of the democracy, there is hardly a page that does not make reference to its Latin origins of legal principles.

“Civil Law,” “Roman Law” and “Roman Civil Law” are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence.”³⁶

Today, the public schools and the legal courts, and almost every aspect of the lives of the citizens of the United States, is manipulated, guided, and taxed by a legal system that mirrors that of Rome, which has conquered the people, not by the sword, but by their own covetousness.

The Common Law and the Holy Bible have become catch words of the so-called radical extremists and religious fanatics. Such titles of derision have not been so commonly used by the legal authorities in America since the Tories and Redcoats went back to serve George III.

“If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animated contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or your arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen.”³⁷

A vast social welfare system, which has grown up in the United States, as well as the burdensome bureaucracy that feeds on and supports it, are supported at the public cost. The true productive laborer who carries the weight of this beastly incorporation staggers with no rest in torment under the infliction of today’s Gabbai and Mokhes.

The result has been a breakdown of the family values, a disrespect for the authority of parents, and a cessation of marriage and its permanence. People now take delight in the imagery of violence, erotica, and moral degeneration found in their two dimensional modern arenas.

“But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” (Mt. 5:28)

It is said that we don't actually do such things as was done in the blood soaked arenas of the coliseums of Rome, but is the violence not done in the hearts, streets, and homes of our cities? Rome, too, started with blunted sword and choreographed battles. We can now watch in the comfort of our own homes, with fascination and patriotic cheers, as missiles crash through the roofs and walls in the blood-soaked soil of remote lands.

Of course, there is no slavery in the United States, or is there?

“EMPLOYEES See Master and Servant (this index)”³⁸

“People have not yet discovered they have been disenfranchised. Even lawyers can't stand to admit it. In any nation in which people's rights have been subordinated to the rights of the few, in any totalitarian nation, the first institution to be dismantled is the jury. I was, I am, afraid.”³⁹

In Rome, “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).”⁴⁰ “Other forms of servitude related to slavery, and sometimes indistinguishable from it, are serfdom, debt bondage, indentured service, peonage, and corvee (statute labor).”⁴¹

“The man who gives me employment, which I must have or suffer, that man is my master, let me call him what I will.”⁴²

To employ is defined as, “to give occupation to... 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.”⁴³

“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”⁴⁴.

“And he said... He will take your sons, and appoint [them] for himself... And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and [will set them]... to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters ... And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, [even] the best [of them], and give [them] to

his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put [them] to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not hear you in that day.” (Samuel 8:11, 18)

Historians proclaim that the death of Marcus Aurelius brought to an end the golden era of the Roman Empire and, yet, this good emperor was one of the sternest foes of Christianity. Today’s true Christian may find himself under the same stern persecutions, with an apathetic modern society, unsympathetic, and even maliciously intolerant, of their faith in God.

Marcus Aurelius may have died, but the state lives on and on. Even now, it is the blood of the Roman law that pumps through the judicial veins of our present legal system. Who redeemed the children of the kingdom of God from the tyranny of the Roman Empire that now saturates the land with its own character?

“Redemption is deliverance from the power of an alien dominion and the enjoyment of the resulting freedom. It involves the idea of restoration to one who possesses a more fundamental right or interest. The best example of redemption in the Old Testament was the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage, from the dominion of the alien power in Egypt.”⁴⁵

Though we may be redeemed, we may still be set upon by thieves and robbers, masquerading as government, law, or authority. Or we may give authority by word and deed and again learn to depart from iniquity in repentance.

“Violence may also put on the mask of law.” ⁴⁶

As Moses, though dead, was contended for by the Lord’s angels, so also are those who worship the LORD bought from destruction. The battle for those who would journey down to the shores of the Red Sea, seeking not to worship in the temples and byways of Egypt and Rome as servants of false gods, will be defended by the power of the God of us all. That final defense may again be found in the “Wrath of God”.

Should America make its contract with the Republicans or should we make a “new covenant”⁴⁷ with the Democrats or should we perform our oaths unto the LORD?

“He who contracts, knows, or ought to know, the quality of the person with whom he contracts, otherwise he is not excusable.” ⁴⁸

“And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God. And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, [and] over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous [are] thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true [are] thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for [thou] only [art] holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.” (Rev.15:1, 4)

Today’s *charagma* is the “badge of servitude” that subjects our service to the rulers and judges of this world. They are the gods of this world system and they stand where only our Father in heaven should stand. It marks the child and servant of those powers created by the hands of men.

Are we condemned to hell if we take that mark of beast? Does it say that in the Bible?

*“The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb:”
Revelation 14:10*

There are many assumptions concerning what the wrath of God is.

The word “drink” is from *pino*, which does mean “to drink”, but, figuratively, “to receive.” To “drink of the wine of the wrath of God” seems to be a figurative statement meaning that those that drink will receive something that, if it were merely a liquid, it would not be desired. Being “poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation” can at least give us the idea that whatever is coming is full strength and not very diluted.

The last part of this verse sheds important light upon the purpose and meaning of the whole verse. “And he shall be tormented” can give us the idea of torture or punishment, but as with most words, there are several connotations that can be construed. “Tormented” here is from *basanizo*, which, in turn, is from *basanos*. *Basanizo* actually means “to test (metals) by the touchstone, which is a black

siliceous stone used to test the purity of gold or silver by the colour of the streak produced on it by rubbing it with either metal.” It can imply torture, which might be applied during questioning. Or it was even used by sailors whose ship was struggling with a head wind. The word clearly has the sense of a test, rather than punishment.

Many will tell you that this means, if you take the mark, you will be cast into hell. This is a conclusion based on the word “torment, which we have seen has to do with a test and the words “fire and brimstone.” Fire and brimstone are not, nor have they ever been synonymous, with hell. Fire and brimstone are mentioned in the Bible. One particular place it appeared was during the time of the liberation and redemption of the Israelites from Egypt. I suspect that, since most of the world is now back in a bondage worse than that of Egypt, it would seem reasonable that we will see fire and brimstone before we are all free on earth again. A more detailed explanation will be discussed elsewhere.

Here, the words “smoke ascending” has also been interpreted as coming from hell. Throughout the Bible, the idea of smoke going up has to do with the accepting of a sacrifice as worthy and, in the times of the great test, men will be called upon to sacrifice many things, including their very lives, in order to pass the test.

The word “presence” is from *enopion*, which is more commonly translated “before” or “in the sight of.” To clarify the testing nature of these events rather than a condemning punishment and tormenting tortures, I ask one question: Why would the holy angels and the Lamb want to watch people suffer? This is clearly a test.

Footnotes:

[1](#)Strong’s No. 2342 therion {thay-ree’-on} diminutive from the same as 2339,.. n n AV - beast (42) - wild beast (3) - venomous beast (1) [46] 1) an animal, a wild animal, wild beast, beast; metaphorically, a brutal, bestial man, savage, ferocious.

[2](#)Strong’s No. 4160 poieo {poy-eh’-o} apparently a prolonged form of an obsolete primary; vb AV - do (357) - make (114) - bring forth (14) - commit (9) - cause (9) - work (8) - show (5)- bear (4) - keep (4)- fulfill (3) - deal (2) - perform (2)- not translated (2)- misc (43) [576] I) to make

1a) with the names of things made, to produce, construct, form, fashion, etc. 1b) to be the authors of, the cause 1c) to make ready, to prepare 1d) to produce... 1e) to acquire, to provide a thing for one's self 2) 2a) to make a thing out of something 2b) to (make i.e.) render one anything; to (make i.e.) constitute or appoint one anything, to appoint or ordain one that; to (make i.e.) declare one anything 2c) to put one forth, to lead him out... 3) to be the authors of a thing (to cause, bring about)... 1e) to perform; to a promise.

3Strong's No. 1849 exousia {ex-oo-see'-ah} from 1832 (in the sense of ability); n f AV - power (69) - authority (29) - right (2) - liberty (1) - jurisdiction (1) - strength (1) [103] 1) power of choice, liberty of doing as one pleases; leave or permission 2) ...the ability or strength with which one is endued, which he either possesses or exercises 3) the power of authority (influence) and of right 4) the power of rule or government (the power of him whose will and commands must be submitted to by others and obeyed) 4a) the power of judicial decisions; of authority to manage domestic affairs.

4Strong's No. 2339 therā {thay'-rah} from ther (a wild animal, as game); n f AV - trap (1) 1) a hunting of wild beasts to destroy them; hence figuratively, of preparing destruction for men .

5Strong's No. 4105 planaō {plan-ah'-o} from 4106; vb AV - **deceive** (24)- err (6) - go astray (5) - **seduce** (2) - wander (1) - be out of the way (1) [39] 1) stray, **to lead astray, lead aside from the right way** 1a) to go astray, wander, roam about 1b) metaph. to lead away from the truth, to lead into error, to deceive; to be led into error; to be led aside from the path of virtue, to go astray, sin; to sever or fall away from the truth: of heretics; to be led away into error and sin.

6Strong's No. 4592 semeion {say-mi'-on} neuter of a presumed derivative of the base of 4591; n n AV - sign (50) - miracle (23) - wonder (3) - token (1) [77] I) a sign, mark, token 1) that by which a person or a thing is distinguished from others and is known ...

7Strong's No. 1325 didomi {did'-o-mee} a prolonged form of a primary verb (which is used as an altern. in most of the tenses); vb AV - give (365) - grant (10) - put (5) - show (4) - deliver (2) - make (2) - misc. (25) [413] 1) to give 2) to give something to someone 2a) of one's own accord to give one something, to his advantage; to bestow a gift 2b) to grant, give to one asking, let have ...

8Strong's No. 1504 eikon {i-kone'} from 1503; ; n f AV - image (23) 1) an image, figure, likeness ...

9Strong's No. 4352 proskuneō {pros-koo-neh'-o} from 4314 and a probable derivative of 2965 (meaning to kiss, like a dog licking his master's hand); vb AV - worship (60) 1) to kiss the hand to (towards) one, in token of reverence; hence among the Orientals, esp. the Persians, to fall upon the knees and touch the ground with the forehead as an expression of profound reverence; in the NT by kneeling or prostration to do homage (to one) or make obeisance, whether in order to express respect or to make supplication 1a) used of homage shown to men of superior rank: the Jewish high priests 1b) of homage rendered to God and the ascended Christ, to heavenly beings, and to demons.

10Strong's No. 0615 apokteino {ap-ok-ti'-no} from 575 and kteino (to slay); vb AV - kill (55) - slay (14) - put to death (6) [75] 1) to kill in any way whatever, to destroy, to allow to perish 2) to extinguish, abolish, to inflict mortal death, to deprive of spiritual life and procure eternal misery.

11Plutarch, 2000 years ago.

12Strong's No. 4160 poieo {poy-eh'-o} apparently a prolonged form of an obsolete primary; vb AV - do (357) - **make** (114) - bring forth (14) - commit (9) - cause (9) - work (8) - show (5) - bear (4) - keep (4) - fulfill (3) - deal (2) - perform (2) - not translated (2) - misc (43) [576] I) to make 1a) with the names of things made, to produce, construct, form, fashion, etc. 1b) to be the authors of, the cause 1c) to make ready, to prepare 1d) to produce, bear, shoot forth 1e) to acquire, to provide a thing for one's self 2) 2a) to make a thing out of something 2b) to (make i.e.) render one anything; to (make i.e.) constitute or appoint one anything, to appoint or ordain one that; to (make i.e.) declare one anything 2c) to put one forth, to lead him out 2d) to make one do something; cause one to 3) to be the authors of a thing (to cause, bring about)... 1e) to perform; to a promise.j

13Strong's No. 59 agorazo {ag-or-ad'-zo} from 58; vb AV - buy (28) - redeem (3) [31] 1) to be in the market-place, to attend it, hence 2) to do business there, buy or sell 3) of idle people: to haunt the market-place, lounge there.

14Strong's No. 2192 echo including an alternate form scheo {skheh'-o}, used in certain tenses only), a primary verb; vb AV - have (612) - be (22) - need + 5532 (12) - misc (63) [709] 1) to have, i.e. to hold; to have (hold) in the hand, in the sense of wearing, to have (hold) possession of the mind (refers to alarm, agitating emotions, etc.), to hold fast keep, to have or comprise or involve, to regard or consider or hold as 2) to have i.e. own, possess; external things such as pertain to property or riches or furniture or utensils or goods or food etc., used of those joined to any one by the bonds of natural blood or marriage or friendship or duty or law etc, of attendance or companionship 3) to hold one's self or find one's self so and so, to be in such or such a condition 4) to hold one's self to a thing, to lay hold of a thing, to adhere or cling to; to be closely joined to a person or a thing.

15Strong's No. 3686 onoma from a presumed derivative of 1097 (compare 3685); n n AV - name (194) - named (28) - called (4) surname + 2007 (2) - named + 2564 (1) - not translated (1) [230] 1) name: univ. of proper names 2) the name is used for everything which the name covers, everything the thought or feeling of which is aroused in the mind by mentioning, hearing, remembering, the name, i.e. for one's rank, authority, interests, pleasure, command, excellences, deeds etc. 3) persons reckoned up by name 4) the cause or reason named: on this account, because he suffers as a Christian, for this reason

16In Strong's. "5480 charagma, khar-ag-mah; from the same as 5482; a scratch or etching, i.e. stamp (as a badge of servitude), or sculptured figure (statue);- graven mark." Strong's concordance. also :Strong's No. 5480 charagma {khar'-ag-mah} from the same as 5482; n n AV - mark (8) - graven (1) [9] 1a) a stamp, an imprinted mark: of the mark stamped on the forehead or the right hand as the badge of the followers of the Antichrist; the mark branded upon horses 1b) thing carved, sculpture, graven work: of idolatrous images. Woodside bible concord.

17Strong's No. 2983 lambano {lam-ban'-o} a prolonged form of a primary verb, which is used only as an alternate in certain tenses; vb AV - receive (133) - take (106) - have (3) - catch (3) - not translated (1) - misc (17) [263] I) to take 1) to take, i.e. to take with the hand, lay hold of, any person or thing in order to use it; to take up a thing to be carried; to take upon one's self 2) to take in order to carry away: without the notion of violence, ói,e to remove, take away 3) to take what is one's own, to take to one's self, to make one's own 3a) to claim, procure, for one's self; to associate with one's self as companion, attendant 3b) of that which when taken is not let go, to seize, to lay hold of, apprehend 3c) to take by craft (our catch, used of hunters, fisherman, etc.), to circumvent one by fraud 3d) to take to one's self, lay hold upon, take possession of, i.e. to appropriate to one's self 3e) catch at, reach after, strive to obtain 3f) to take a thing due, to collect, gather (tribute) 4) to take, i.e. to admit, receive; to receive what is offered; not to refuse or reject; to receive a person, give him access to one's self, i.e. to regard any one's power, rank, external circumstances, and on that account to do some injustice or neglect something....

18epi or epi. is translated in Rev 7:3, 9:4,13:6,14:1,14:9., but translated upon in Rev.20:4; Matt 24:3; Luke 17:31; John 19:31; Acts 12:21 and on in Matt 14:19, 24:17, 27:19; Mark 13:15; John 19:19; Acts 25:17; Rev 4:10, 5:1, 5:7, 6:16 and come to in Matt 28:14 and by Mark 11:4 and at in Luke 22:40; Acts 25:10; Rev 8:3 and before in Acts 24:20 and over in Rev14:18 etc.

19Strong's No. 3359 metopon {met'-o-pon } from 3326 and ops (the face); n n AV - forehead (8) 1) the space between the eyes, the forehead.

20Strong's No. 2556 kakos {kak-os'} apparently a primary word; adj AV - evil (40) - evil things (3) - harm (2) - that which is evil + 3458 (2) - wicked (1) - ill (1) - bad (1) - noisome (1) [51] 1) of a bad nature; not such as it ought to be 2) of a mode of thinking, feeling, acting; base, wrong, wicked 3) troublesome, injurious, pernicious, destructive, baneful

21Strong's No. 4190 poneros {pon-ay-ros'} from a derivative of 4192; adj AV - evil (51) - wicked (10) - wicked one (6) - evil things (2) - misc (7) [76]1) full of labours, annoyances, hardships 1a) pressed and harassed by labours 1b) bringing toils, annoyances, perils; of a time full of peril to Christian faith and steadfastness; causing pain and trouble 2) bad, of a bad nature or condition 2a) in a physical sense: diseased or blind 2b) in an ethical sense, evil wicked, bad

22Strong's No. 1668 helkos {hel'-kos} probably from 1670; n n AV - sore (3) 1) a wound, especially a wound producing a discharge pus, a sore, an ulcer

23Strong's No. 929 basanismos {bas-an-is-mos'} from 928... n m AV - torment (6) 1) to torture, a testing by the touchstone, which is a black siliceous stone used to test the purity of gold or silver by the colour of the streak produced on it by rubbing it with either metal. 2) torment, torture.

24Strong's No. 165 aion {ahee-ohn'} from the same as 104... n m AV - ever (71) - world (38) - never + 3364, 1519, 3588 (6) - evermore (4) - age (2) - eternal (2) - unto the ages of the ages (42) - unto the age (29) - this age (15) - unto the ages (8) - end of the age (6) - from the age (5) - misc (28) [256] 1) an unbroken age, perpetuity of time, eternity, for ever 2) the worlds, universe 3) period of time, age, a human lifetime.

[25](#)Romanized,unaccented: (Rev 14:11) Kai ho kapnos And the smoke tou basanismou autoon of their torment eis aionas aioonoon anabainei ascendeth up for ever and ever, kai ouk echousin and they have no anapausin heemeras kai nuktos rest day nor night, hoi proskunountes to theerion who worship the beast kai teen eikona autou and his image, kai ei tis lambanei and whosoever receiveth to charagma the mark tou onomatos autou of his name.

[26](#)Romanized,unaccented: (Rev 14:12) Hoode hee hupomonee toon hagioon estin, hoi teerountes tas entolas tou Theou kai teen pistin Ieesou.*

[27](#)“Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah” Bible CD: CHAPTER XI.

[28](#)“Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah” Bible CD: CHAPTER III.

[29](#)Strong’s No.5480 charagma {khar’-ag-mah} from the same as 5482; a scratch or etching, i.e. **stamp (as a badge of servitude)**, or sculptured figure (statue); graven mark.

[30](#) That these were the sole grounds of resistance to the census, appears from Jos. Ant. xviii. 1. 1, 6.

[31](#)The Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls by Barbara Thiering

[32](#)*augeo, augere* increase.

[33](#)Emperor, imperatoris m.commander in chief Collins L.E. Dict. ‘62.

[34](#)Encyclopedia Britanica Vol 2, p. 687, ‘53.

[35](#)the new American creed was read in Congress April 3, 1918.

[36](#)Black’s 3rd p 332.

[37](#)--Samuel Adams

[38](#)Summary of American Law George L. Clark p 635 (only entry for employ or employee in the index).

[39](#)Gerry Spence

[40](#)Slavery Collection Elwell Evangelical Dictionary.

[41](#)SLAVERY AND SERFDOM Compton’s Encyclopedia.

[42](#)Henry George - Social Problems, Ch. V.

[43](#)The Volume Library (1924).

[44](#) *Steward Machine Co. vs. Davis* 301 U.S. 548 1937. Involving the tax imposed by the Social Security Act of 1935.

[45](#) Zondervan's Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, the word "redemption"

[46](#) *Est autem vis legem simulans.*

[47](#) Nomination speech William J. Clinton, Democratic candidate.

[48](#) *Qui cum alio contrahit, vel est, vel debet esse non ignarus conditio ejus.* Dig. 50, 17, 19; 2 Hagg. Consist. Rep. 61.

The Body of Christ

(The Church established by Jesus Christ.)

Vs.

The Body of the State

(The church established by the state.)



“For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (Matt 18:20)

In America, there has been a separation of Church and State. Exactly what that separation means can be debated. What cannot be debated is what is written in the Constitution of the United States, also known as the Bill of Rights. Article One of that Constitution states that, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

That statement was not made to create rights in a government, a government assumedly created by the Constitution of the United States. That article was made to make it clear that no right or privilege was granted to government to make laws respecting an establishment of or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

“Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle that [is] among them.” (Le 15:31)

All religions and churches should be exempt from government influence. As we look out into America, can we say that this is still true or does it appear that government today both establishes religion and prohibits religion and churches? Are churches subject to strict operational restrictions by government authority?

“And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth [his] sheep from the goats:” (Mt. 25:32)

Who is supposed to establish a church and when is it established?

I have been told more times than I care to recall that all churches must file 1023 forms and become tax-exempt as a 501c(3) church. People have quoted Paul’s letter to the Romans over and over again. They declare that we are required to apply for tax-exempt status as a 501c(3) church because “it is the law.”

Is it the LAW? Is it required by law or statute or regulation or rule that a church must apply to the state or be established by the state as a corporation of the State? What is required to become exempt?

The Internal Revenue states that, “The following organizations will be considered tax exempt under section 501c(3) even if they do not file Form 1023: (a) churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches,...”¹

“Some organizations are not required to file form 1023. These include: Churches, interchurch organizations of local units of a church, conventions or association of a church, such as a men’s or women’s organization, religious school, mission society, or youth group.”

“These organizations are exempt automatically if they meet the requirements of section 501c(3). However, if the organization wants to establish its exemption with the Internal Revenue Service and receive a ruling or determination letter

recognizing its exempt status, it should file Form 1023 with the key District Director.”²

By this, we can see that churches are ‘automatically exempt and are not required to file’. The publication does go on to say that “these organizations are exempt automatically if they meet the requirements”. Two questions should be asked:

First, what are those requirements?

Second, what is included in the classification of “organization”? Note that the publication does not say that ‘churches’ are exempt if they meet the requirements, but only that ‘organizations are exempt.’

The same Section of 557 states,

“If Organizations that have a statutory requirement to apply for recognition do not comply with the requirements relating to exemption applications, deductions for charitable contributions will not be allowed for any gifts or bequests made to those organizations.”

Again, note the use of the words, “organizations” and “statutory requirement to apply.” None of this refers to churches which are not required to file, nor does it refer to true church organizations.

All churches are organizations, but not all organizations are churches. Is the word, “religious” used merely as a descriptive word to describe a type of organization or the source of its authority that established it?

Are there any regulations, rules, or statutes that determine approval if you do decide to apply to be religiously exempt as a CHURCH?

Department of Revenue and the I.R.S. state:

“In order to determine whether recognition of exemption should appropriately be extended to an organization seeking to meet the religious purposes test of section 501c(3), the Internal Revenue Service maintains two basic guidelines:

- 1) That the particular religious beliefs of the organization are truly and sincerely held, and

2) That the practices and rituals associated with the organization's religious belief or creed are not illegal or contrary to clearly defined public policy."³

On the same page of that publication, we see phrases like, "If you are organized to operate a home for the aged, the following information must be submitted:" Or if you are a scientific organization, "You must show..." etc. But for religious organizations, there are only 'two basic guidelines' which are merely 'maintained' by the Internal Revenue Service. These mere guidelines are maintained only 'to determine whether recognition of exemption should appropriately be extended to an organization seeking to meet the religious purposes test.'

Are there actual statutory regulations defining churches or their requirements to apply?

The I.R.S. rules and codes are not statutes and have no authority of law in themselves. They are based upon the USCS, but the I.R.S. makes no mention of statutory requirement for churches. "The regulations do not define the term 'church' and Congress has given no guidance in this area."⁴ Regulations do not exist for religions or churches because there is no power granted to government to regulate or establish religions.

What statutes do exist that allow the I.R.S. to establish a 501c(3) church? The regulations do not define the term 'church' and Congress has given no guidance in this area but in 508c(1) of the United States Codes, Title 26 we see:

Title 26 USCS §508 Special rules with respect to 501c(3) organizations.

(a) New organizations must notify the secretary that they are applying for recognition of section 501c(3) status Except as provided in subsection c....

(b) Presumption that organizations are private foundations. Except as provided in subsection c. ...

c Exceptions. (1) Mandatory exceptions, Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to ---

(A) churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches....

Or: Title 26 USCS § 508 - 1 Notices

(a) New organizations must notify the Commissioner that they are applying for recognition of section 501c(3) status --- (1) In general. Except as provided in subparagraph (3) of this paragraph...

(3) Exceptions from notice. (1) Paragraph (a) (1) and (2) of this section are inapplicable to the following organizations.

(a) churches, interchurch organizations of local units of a church, conventions or associations of churches,....

Or: Title 26 USCS § 6033 Returns by exempt organizations.

(a) Organizations required to file (1) In general. Except as provided in paragraph (2)...

(2) Exceptions from filing. (A) Mandatory exceptions Paragraph (1) shall not apply to

(i) churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches,....

Or: Title 26 CFR Ch. 1(4-1-96 Edition) Internal Revenue Service, Treasury § 1.508 - 1

(7) Exceptions from notice. Subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph are inapplicable to the following organizations:

1. Churches, interchurch organizations of local units of a church, conventions or associations of churches, or integrated auxiliaries of a church, such as a men's or women's organization, religious school, mission society, or youth group...

The USCS § 508, § 6033 and the CFR's do not include churches. All the statutes make mandatory exceptions in the case of churches.

Many have told me that, if you are not a 501c(3) church, you can not deduct your contributions. For those who believe that to be true, they should know that,

“Although a church, its integrated auxiliaries, or a convention or association of churches is not required to file Form 1023 to be exempt from federal income tax or

to receive tax deductible contributions, such an organization may find it advantageous to obtain recognition of exemption.”⁵

So, contributions are deductible, if you do not file. Yet, many churches do file. Why? What are the advantages that they may find under a 501c(3) status?

“Advantages and Disadvantages of Exemption Under Section 501c(3).”

“The main advantage to classification under §501c(3) is that the organization is generally spared federal taxation of its income.”⁶

The use of the words “generally⁷ spared” should make it clear that any “organization” granted or permitted exemption under § 501c(3) is spared, not because of its nature or right, but because of its “classification.” Probably the most important words to note are the words ‘under’ or the word ‘income,’ as opposed to “contribution.”

“Even if these organizations are not required to file form 1023 to be tax-exempt, they may wish to file form 1023 and receive a determination letter of IRS recognition of their section 501c(3) status to obtain certain incidental benefits such as public recognition of their tax exempt status; exemptions from certain state taxes; advance assurance to donors of deductibility of contributions; exemption from certain Federal excise taxes; nonprofit mailing privileges, etc.”⁸

How is it an advantage to exchange a God-given mandatory exception as Christ’s Holy Church for a classification as an organization which is only generally spared taxation under an authority to obtain privileges?

So, what are the disadvantages?

“The disadvantages of exemption under §501c(3) stem from the strict operational restrictions.”⁹

A church or a religion is exempt, in the sense that it is not taxed or regulated, because the government has no power, granted by the document that created it [government], to make rules to the contrary. Do you want to be merely “spared a tax”, although your operations will be ‘strictly restricted’ under the administrative rule of 501c(3) regulations and authority?

It is true, “There is not a shadow of right in the general government to inter meddle in religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation.”¹⁰

Voluntary surrender of rights by those claiming to be the Church established by Jesus Christ is not an usurpation by government, but a breach, violation, and betrayal of the liberty of Christ by the ignorant or by an apostate and, therefore, usurper of the true Church.

What is a church?

Congress does not define what a Church is, but the legal dictionary does consistently.

“Church. In its most general sense, the religious society founded and established by Jesus Christ, to receive, preserve, and propagate his doctrines and ordinances.”

“A body or community of Christians, united under one form of government by the profession of one faith, and the observance of the same rituals and ceremonies.”¹¹

“The Supreme court has held that tax exemptions are a matter of legislative grace.”¹² Is this true with all tax exemptions or just the ones granted by the legislative power over institutions that fall under or go under their jurisdictional control?

“That being justified¹³ by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” (Tit 3:7)

One exemption is by the grace of the government of men. The other exemption is by the grace of Jesus Christ, the Savior of God’s kingdom on earth.

“Who hath saved us, and called [us] with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,” (2Ti 1:9)

If, by the grace of God, you have been granted a mandatory exemption from the prohibitions and regulations by man’s governments, why would you desire an exemption by the grace of the legislator who only generally spares taxation and already designates the Church as an mandatory exception to their authority?

“The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the government is compensated for loss of revenue by its relief from financial burden which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare.”¹⁴

Is your Church “established by Jesus Christ and united under one government to receive, preserve, and propagate his doctrines and ordinances” or is it doing the work of the state governments of men, established by men for the personal benefit of men? If your church is actually a creation of the state, then who is collecting and receiving the tithes you contribute? Where is its authority from? Who owns the church?

“The IRS, for many years has had the right to examine church records, because churches have been collecting taxes for many years for the government. The churches, therefore, hold in trust that which belongs to the government. We have a right to examine church records to see if the churches are handling government funds properly.”¹⁵

Is your church a Church of Jesus Christ, established by Him, or is it an organization of the State, created by its corporate powers for their purposes and under that State which established it?

Have you been deceived into granting dominion over the Church and your congregation to a foreign authority who is an adversary to the doctrines of Christ?

“Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil¹⁶, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world. But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle [you]. To him [be] glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” (1 Peter 5:8, 11)

Why would you put the strict operational restrictions imposed by the arbitrary and human rule of the legislators over the Church instead of the loving and benevolent and eternal restrictions of Jesus?

“Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another [man’s] conscience? For if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?” (1 Cor. 10:29-30)

If a church is “a body or community of Christians, united under one form of government by the profession of one faith,” why does it want to go under another form of authority and government from which it already is mandatorily excepted? If a Church is a body or a community “established by the authority of Jesus Christ”

then why would it want to become a body politic established under the authority of a democratic community of unbelievers with ‘strict operational restrictions’?

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?” (2Co 6:14)

Should the church want to be “considered tax exempt under section 501c(3)” by a restricting permission? We have seen the advantages and disadvantages. To be considered under the statute is to be considered under the authority of the men who made it. Neither men nor their government, have, by themselves, any power to establish or prohibit the Church, founded and established by Jesus Christ.

If the Church is “mandatorially” excepted from regulation, should it go under the power and authority of man-made statutes?

“All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.” (1Co 6:12)

Is the Church, that was founded and established by Jesus Christ, autonomous?

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common [unclean, unholy]¹⁷ salvation [thing that keeps you safe and healthy]¹⁸, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort [you] that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not.” (Jude 1:3, 5)

Do not be a participant in the unclean salvation with its wantonness, denying the Lord God, but seek out the LORD and be a part of His body under the Lord Jesus Christ, lest you be destroyed with those that believe not. Stand fast in the faith of the Lord Jesus, Yahshua, the Christ, our King whose kingdom was not of this world.¹⁹ Should a church be incorporated by the State?

“Incorporate. To create a corporation; to confer a corporate franchise upon determinate persons.”²⁰

Isn't the Church already created by Jesus Christ, according to the legal definition of a church? If Jesus was a king and He established his church under that one form of government with His doctrines and ordinances, then his church is already incorporated as His corporate franchise upon the earth.

“For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: So we, [being] many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.” (Ro 12:4, 5)

“Corporation (Latin corpus, a body). An artificial being created by law and composed of individuals who subsist as a body politic under a special denomination.”²¹

“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also [is] Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether [we be] Jews or Gentiles, whether [we be] bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many.. But now [are they] many members, yet but one body.” (1 Co 2:12, 20)

“Corporation. An Artificial person or legal entity created by or under the authority of the laws of a state. An association of persons created by statute as a legal entity.”²²

A corporation is a legal entity created by a state.

“Establish ...To found, to create, to regulate.”²³ “Legal... Created by law.”²⁴

A corporation is an entity of the state and its statutes.

“Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.” (Colossians 2:7)

“Corporation. All corporation, of whatever kind, are molded and controlled, both as to what they may do and the manner in which they may do it, by their charters or acts of incorporation, which to them are the laws of their being, which they can neither dispense with nor alter.”²⁵

“Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.” (Joh 19:30)

“Charter. An instrument emanating from the sovereign power, in the nature of a grant, either to the whole nation, or to a class or portion of the people, to a corporation, or to a colony or a dependency, assuring them of certain rights, liberties, or powers... is granted by the sovereign...”²⁶

“All scripture [is] given by inspiration²⁷ of God, and [is] profitable for doctrine, it], Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?”
(Romans 9:20, 21)

What is the act of incorporation of the Church established by Jesus Christ? Was it not the act of His sacrifice upon the cross and the shedding of His blood? Jesus, as Soter and Sovereign, incorporated the Church.

“And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;” Luke 22:29

Is God not the sovereign power of his church? Was His Son’s sacrifice not enough? Is the holy writings of his servants not the charter of His Church? Can we add to it with a new charter of a foreign authority? Should we?

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and [from] the things which are written in this book. (Revelation 22:18, 19)

What is the character of the church, of the body of Christ and from where is it derived?

“The character of the corporation and the purpose for which it was organized must be ascertained by reference to the terms of the charter, and the right of the corporation to its exemption must be determined like wise given by the powers given in its charter.”²⁸

“Men will surrender to the spirit of the age. They will say that if they had lived in our day, faith would be simple and easy. But in their day, they will say, things are complex; the Church must be brought up to date and made meaningful to the day’s problems. When the Church and the world are one, then those days are at hand.”²⁹

If the Holy Bible is the charter of the Church given to us by the power of God and the church is the body of Christ or His holy corporation, then it is the character of Christ and His purpose that shall be ascertained from His Word. Therefore, also it is His power, given in His charter, that determines His Church's status.

“Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,” (Ro 16:25)

Has the body stood fast in faith in Christ as we were warned?

“Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.” (1Co 16:13)

Have they worshiped and called upon the name of another?

“Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?” (Jas 2:7)

Have we been blinded by our own pride and vanity?

“Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.” (Ro 11:10)

Do we continuously call upon the name of the Lord throughout the earth?

“But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to [the image of] Baal.” (Ro 11:4)

Have we taken pride in our own creation and bowed down to it worshiping, trusting, and putting our faith in the institutions of men?

“That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of [things] in heaven, and [things] in earth, and [things] under the earth; “(Php 2:10)

Are we bowing our knee in the wrong direction?

“For it is written, [As] I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.” (Ro 14:11)

Have we given authority over what is God's to a man appointed authority like unto Caesar?

“Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?” (Col. 2:18, 22)

If the state, created by man, establishes the corporation then the state is founder and creator of the corporate church.

“Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, [is] God;... for by faith ye stand.” (2 Corinthians 1:21, 24)

Upon State incorporation, the church, once established by Jesus Christ, the King, is reestablished by a new State. The Church has been converted and changed. It has been reborn as a church organization under the authority of a new father.

“RECONVERSION, noun change, change over... readjustment, rebirth... re-establishment, ... return, reversal, reversion, shift, transformation...”

“And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife.” (Re 21:9)

Jesus Christ is not the Father of the Church, but the husband, for the Church is the bride of Christ. Incorporation with the state by a Church, established by Christ, is like fornicating with another groom, another governing power and authority.

“For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.” (Eph 5:23)

If the Church is the bride of Christ and His Holy Body one with Him, then how can it let another authority rule over it? Is this relationship established, not because it is the Law, but because it grants gifts or payment? If the church enters into a relationship with the state by its own desire, which was reserved for its husband, has it committed fornication?

“And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication:” (Rev. 17:4)

Those ministers and priests, who continue to hide their eyes and put no difference between the holy and the profane and conspire to cause the faithful to stumble and go under the authority of those who are not of Christ, must repent and turn about into His Holy way.

“And the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, say unto her, Thou [art] the land that is not cleansed, nor rained upon in the day of indignation. [There is] a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion ravening the prey; they have devoured souls; they have taken the treasure and precious things; they have made her many widows in the midst thereof. Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed [difference] between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them.” (Ezekiel 22:23, 26)

Can there be any doubt that Christ’s Church is exempt and excepted without application³⁰?

“For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” (1Co 6:20)

Can you justify giving to Caesar what Christ has bought?

“Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.” (1Co 7:23)

Can there be any doubt that, if you request an exemption that is already mandatory, you are going under a strict regulatory power that claims ownership of your church and your tithes?

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.” (2Pe 2:1)

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” (2Ti 2:15)

“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.” (2 Thess 3:6)

To sum up:

“I call heaven and earth as witnesses today against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both you and your descendants may live.” (Deut. 30:19)

The God that created man and set the world into motion has an inalienable right to judge man. He has granted man free will to obey His judgment or go it alone, or turn to lesser gods. Men bind themselves together with other men to gain or to sustain themselves or others. The nature of these bonds enslave nations or set them free.

Men desire to believe they are blessed of God or are servants of God, but many are workers of iniquity. In the quest for power, men may covet their neighbors' goods, their neighbors rights, both corporeal and incorporeal. The bonds, covenants, contracts, and constitutions, and the corresponding allegiance they often require, enslaves men to the will of others. The bonds of faith, hope, and charity, and the perfect law of liberty, sets men free.

When man steals he rejects the way of God even if he steals from men like Cain who separate from God. They may become answerable to those men and the gods they have chosen for themselves. When man steals from a servant or a child of the living God, that man is answerable to the LORD God, Creator of life.

The words translated “covenant”³¹ show up some 300 times in the Bible. A covenant is nothing more than an agreement between two or more parties. “... thou shalt make no covenant with the them...” (De 7:2)

We are not to make covenants with their gods³² either. All the word “god” means here is “ruling judges.”

“Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their judges.” (Ex 23:32)

Covenants are also treaties and alliances and we should not make contracts, leagues,³³ and agreements with men who can make treaties and alliances for us. We should not strike hands, sign agreements, and become a surety³⁴ for the debts which will bring us under the authority of ungodly men who do contrary to the will

of God. Nor should we covet our neighbor's goods through the exercising authority of men who call themselves benefactors. God wants us to live in righteousness as free souls under Him.³⁵

We become subject to Caesar because we strike hands, through application, and by oaths.³⁶

We should not go under the authority of any,³⁷ but if we go under the authority of man-made institutions or governments, we must obey and keep our word and be redeemed from that alien power in righteousness, not rebellion. It is not enough to be free of the authority of men, we must be free of the character of men who do contrary to the Character of God.³⁸

Men have desired the gifts, gratuities, and benefits of men, the “dainties of rulers” and the welfare provided by systems of men who offer those benefits at our neighbors' expense. By so doing they have sold themselves into the service of false gods. Like Joseph's brothers, they have coveted their neighbors' goods and, through democratic ambush, and delivered themselves into servitude. Trusting in liars, we have been delivered into bondage and, through covetousness, we are bought and sold as merchandise, human resources.

“And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.” (2Pe 2:3)

It is not the tyrants who sit at the tops of governments who oppress the people but the tyranny written in the hearts of the people³⁹ who do not have the ears to hear the warnings of God.⁴⁰ There are many crafts of state, systems of society, and methods of men that may be used to evidence your consent and subjection, but none is more dangerous than our own mouth, slothful hand and covetous heart.⁴¹ The merchants of the earth have bought a full stock including the souls of men.⁴² Men have eaten at the tables of the wicked, and collected the use of their brother's sweat and blood, to the condemnation of their very own souls.⁴³ They have blindly eating to their fill and have been snared.⁴⁴

What is the Remedy?

It is not by the knowledge of men, nor by the information found in these pages, that men and women are saved from the delusions and illusions offered from a world that has turned away from the sanity of the LORD.⁴⁵ It is by the knowledge of our Holy Father in Heaven, engraved in our hearts and mind. Through that

knowing of Him, His identity, His Name, His character, we may begin to trust in His will. It is by our faithful obedience to His will, as trusting doers of His word, that we are made one with Him who made us.⁴⁶

Yeshua, Jesus the Christ, has won for us the opportunity to be grafted into the Kingdom of God, established by Him on earth, which was, and is still, at hand. By the grace of the princely Lamb, who overcame the beast of man's ordered world of Satan, the adversary. Now, we can find salvation in His princely station and appointment. Again, we can be grafted to the Tree of Life with our status as His subject. As we repent from the vanity of the knowledge of good and evil and return like obedient servants to do our Father's will, He embraces us as His true children that were lost and now are found.

We must forgive the vanity, judgment, and transgressions of others against ourselves, so that we may be forgiven of our personal iniquity, arrogance, and pride. In our humility, we will be led back to the ways of Him Who created us. All but a few have been deceived and even they would have been lost, except by the grace of the Most High.⁴⁷

Shall we awake?

Are we to sleep forever? Is there a time to awake?⁴⁸ What time is it?⁴⁹ All have not chosen for a season to live in the comforts of this strong delusion, but have rejected such false security to seek in the obedience to the Father, in order that the grace and inheritance promised of ancient times might be manifest upon God's earth.⁵⁰

"... Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." (Eph 5:14)

Should we on awakening, continue to participate and remain in a covenant of iniquity? Should we not seek a better way though we may have to make bricks without straw and glean in the fields at night like Israel in the land of Egypt? Should we seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and set His table for all to eat?

... Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. (Revelation 18:..5)

Has God the Father made us so that we in bondage should serve men? Should we have sold the inheritance of our Father in Heaven for a bowl of porridge and the benefits of a king who rules over the people?

The kingdom of Heaven is not for liars, and rebels. It is for those who care about the rights of others as much as their own. We must seek those who have eyes to see and ears to hear and the desire and industry to do the will of the Father in conformity to Christ rather than merely rebelling against men.

“Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be [any] that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it. And though they say, The LORD liveth; surely they swear falsely.”

“O LORD, [are] not thine eyes upon the truth? thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, [but] they have refused to receive correction: they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return.”

“Therefore I said, Surely these [are] poor; they are foolish: for they know not the way of the LORD, [nor] the judgment of their God.”

“I will get me unto the great men, and will speak unto them; for they have known the way of the LORD, [and] the judgment of their God: but these have altogether broken the yoke, [and] burst the bonds.”

“Wherefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, [and] a wolf of the evenings shall spoil them, a leopard shall watch over their cities: every one that goeth out thence shall be torn in pieces: because their transgressions are many, [and] their backslidings are increased.”

“How shall I pardon thee for this? thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by [them that are] no gods: when I had fed them to the full, they then committed adultery, and assembled themselves by troops in the harlots’ houses.” (Jeremiah 5:1, 7)

God knows that liberty is good for the soul. The right to choose is the blood of repentance. We are forgiven as we forgive others. The world of men does not commonly forgive as Christ. We must choose to set others free from our own desire, wantonness and even our true needs. We must choose the righteous way of charity and hope with daily exercise of faith. The liberty of others is essential to

the growth of virtue in our own hearts; and to choose another way brings its own condemnation and punishment.

“Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.” (Ga 5:1)

“But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first [covenant] had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:”

“Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this [is] the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” (Hebrews 8:6, 12).

Footnotes:

1“Application for Recognition of Exemption Under Section 501c(3) of the Internal Revenue Code,” under “Purpose of Form,” section “2. Organizations not Required to file Form 1023. Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service.

2Department of the Treasury, I.R.S., Pub. 557 Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization. Chapt. 3 Page 9

3Department of the Treasury, I.R.S., Pub. 557 Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization. Chapt. 3 Page 14.

[4](#)Detailed Analysis, Tax Management Inc. a subsidiary of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. 464-2nd, A - 3

[5](#)Department of the Treasury, I.R.S., Pub. 557 Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization. Chapt. 3 Page 14.

[6](#)Detailed Analysis, Tax Management Inc. a subsidiary of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. 464-2nd, A - 1

[7](#)“GENERAL. Pertaining to, or designating, the genus or class, as distinguished from that which characterizes the species or individual.” Black’s 3rd ed. Page 840.

[8](#)Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for form 1023. section 2.

[9](#)Detailed Analysis, Tax Management Inc. a subsidiary of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. 464-2nd, A - 1

[10](#)James Madison

[11](#)Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd ed. Page 325. also 4th, 5th 6th Ed.

[12](#)Detailed Analysis, Tax Management Inc. a subsidiary of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. 464-2nd, A - 1

[13](#)Strong’s No. 1344 dikaioo {dik-ah-yo’-o} from 1342; vb AV - justify (37) be freed (1) righteous (1) justifier (1) [40] 1) to render righteous or such he ought to be 2) to show, exhibit, evince, one to be righteous, such as he is and wishes himself to be considered 3) to declare, pronounce, one to be just, righteous, or such as he ought to be

[14](#)House Report from the Revenue Act of 1938.

[15](#)Roscoe Egger, former IRS Commissioner.

[16](#)Strong’s No. 1228 diabolos {dee-ab’-ol-os} from 1225; adj AV - devil (35) - false accuser (2) - slanderer (1) [38] 1) prone to slander, slanderous, accusing falsely 1a) a calumniator, false accuser, slanderer, ... the author of evil, persecuting good men, estranging mankind from God and enticing them to sin, afflicting them with diseases by means of demons who take possession of their bodies at his bidding.

[17](#)Strong’s No. 2839 koinos {koy-nos’} probably from 4862; adj AV - common (7) - unclean (3) - defiled (1) - unholy (1) [12] 1) common 2) common i.e. ordinary, belonging to generality; by the Jews, unhallowed, profane, Levitically unclean

[18](#)Strong’s No. 4991 soteria {so-tay-ree’-ah} feminine of a derivative of 4990 as (properly, abstract) noun; AV - salvation (40) - the (one) be saved (1) - deliver + 1325 (1) - health (1) -

saving (1) - that (one) be saved + 1519 (1) [45] 1) deliverance, preservation, safety, salvation: deliverance from the molestation of enemies; ...

[19](#)Strong's No. 2889 kosmos {kos'-mos} "an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government." from komizo "to care for, take care of, provide for" or "carry off what is one's own," Bible and Concordance. Woodside B. F.

[20](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd ed. Page 946.

[21](#)Bouvier's Law Dictionary

[22](#)Black's Law Dictionary 6th ed.

[23](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd ed. Page 681.

[24](#)Black's Law Dictionary 3rd ed. Page 1085..

[25](#)Bovier's Law Dictionary.

[26](#)Black's Law Dictionary 6th ed.

[27](#)Strong's No. 2315 theopneustos {theh-op'-nyoo-stos} from 2316 and a presumed derivative of 4154 [=pneo {pneh'-o} a primary word 1) to breathe, to blow..]; adj AV - given by inspiration of God ...

[28](#)Harrison v. Barker Annuity Fund; 90 E2d 286

[29](#)St. Anthony the Abbot (4th Century)

[30](#)Roget's Thesaurus 765.1 prayer... application.

[31](#)Strong's No 1285 b@riyth {ber-eeth'} from 1262 (in the sense of cutting [like 1254]); n f 1) covenant, alliance, pledge 1a) between men 1a1) **treaty, alliance, league (man to man)** 1a2) **constitution, ordinance** (monarch to subjects) 1a3) **agreement**, pledge (man to man) 1a4) alliance (of friendship) 1a5) alliance (of marriage) 1b) between God and man 1b1) alliance (of friendship) 1b2) covenant (divine ordinance with signs or pledges) 2) (phrases) 2a) covenant making 2b) covenant keeping 2c) covenant violation

[32](#)Strong's No. 0430 'elohiyim {el-o-heem'} plural of 433; n m p 1) (plural) 1a) rulers, judges ...

[33](#)"And ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; ..." Judges 2:2

[34](#)"Be not thou [one] of them that strike hands, [or] of them that are sureties for debts." (Pr 22:26)

[35](#)“I [am] the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondmen; and I have broken the bands of your yoke, and made you go upright.” (Le 26:13)

[36](#)“But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” (Matthew 5:34)

“But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and [your] nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.” (James 5:12)

[37](#)“All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, bring up the next line but I will not be brought under the power of any.” (1Co 6:12)

[38](#)“Then Peter and the [other] apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God¹ rather than men.” (Acts 5:29)

[39](#) “And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.” 1 Samuel 8:7

[40](#)“This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons... make his instruments of war... take your daughters ... take your fields... take ... take... take... and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day ...and the LORD will not hear you in that day.”

[41](#)“When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what [is] before thee: And put a knife to thy throat, if thou [be] a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they [are] deceitful meat.” (Proverbs 23:1, 3)

[42](#)“For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.” (Re 18:3)

[43](#)“And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived”. (Re 18:23)

[44](#)Psalms 69:22 Let their table become a snare before them: and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Romans 11:9 And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them:

[45](#)“I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose [that] in which I delighted not.” (Isa 66:4)

[46](#)“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and [by] our gathering together unto him, That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.”

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for [that day shall not come], except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;” (2 Thessalonians 2:1,3)

[47](#)“For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if [it were] possible, even the elect.” (Mark 13:22)

[48](#)“And that, knowing the time, that now [it is] high time to awake out of sleep: for now [is] our salvation nearer than when we believed.” (Ro 13:11)

[49](#)“Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak [this] to your shame” (1Co 15:34)

[50](#)“I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, [of] the tribe of Benjamin God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to [the image of] Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.... What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway....” (Romans 11:1, 10)