THE GOVERNMENT OF SLAVES - LIVING MONEY

A short law brief on today's institution of slavery

"It may be with truth affirmed, that since the establishment of the several communities now constituting the States of this Confederacy, there has never been submitted to any tribunal within its limits questions surpassing in importance those now claiming the consideration of this court." Dred Scott v. Sanford 19 How. 393, 469

The institution of slavery has existed in different forms throughout the history of mankind. Slavery has always been associated with large sums of money, because when political power is able to obtain the command of the labor of the masses, thereby directing and recieving the fruits of the labor of to their subjects, the political authority will reap large sums of money; and the larger the population of workers, the greater the sums of money collected. This is why Abraham Lincoln described slavery as "a thick coating," because of the enormous sums of money surrounding the institution. The justices in the supreme court case of Dred Scott v. Sanford (19How. 393) knew this also.

Chief Justice Taney used the phrase "government of slaves" in his majority opinion in the case. Justice Campell, in his concurring opinion, stated the following concerning slavery in England in medieval times:

"Historical research ascertains that at the date of the [Norman] Conquest the rural population of England were generally in a servile condition, and under various names, denoting slight variances in condition, they were sold with the land like cattle, and were part of its living money." supra, 498

During World War II, the Nazis enslaved the Jewish people. It is not necessary to buy a human being in order to enslave a person. All that is necessary is stated by Justice Curtis, in his dissenting opinion in the Dred Scott decision.

"The status of slavery is not necessarily always attended with the same powers on the part of the master. The master is subject to the supreme power of the State, whose will controls his action towards his slave, and this control must be defined and regulated by the municipal law.... In other words, the status of slavery embraces every condition, from that in which the slave is known to the law simply as a chattel, with no civil rights, to that in which he is recognized as a person for all purposes, save the compulsory power of directing and receiving the fruits of his labor." supra., 624, 625

The manner in which the Nazis enslaved the Jewish people was simply to conquer them and structure the laws to operate upon their labor in such a manner so as to direct and receive the fruits of their labor. One form of slavery that was imposed in this manner was the economic oppression that existed in the Lodz Ghetto of Poland under Nazi Lord Arthur Greiser.

"Greiser was happy with the proposal that the ghetto become a generator of wealth because he had arranged to pocket the profit from the scheme himself. ‘The Jews are going to be providing labor at a set rate,' says Professor Browning, ‘35 per cent of that is going to the Jews themselves so that they can buy food, 65 per cent is going to go into a special account of Greiser's, one that he controls, his slush fund.'" The Nazis, Laurence Rees, W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., N.Y., 1997, pg. 159

This brief shall combine legal and historical research to show the existence of an institution of slavery in America today. Any argument that merely claims that the 13th amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits the Negro slavery that existed in the southern States of pre civil war times is without merit, for this would leave the door wide open to other forms of involuntary servitude such as serfdom, peonage, and corvee; all of which could be more oppressive than the Negro slavery of pre civil war times. The Holocaust of World War II verifies this proposition.

The cornerstone of any institution of slavery is power over labor. This has traditionally been accomplished by the laws political authority writes in the statute books.

"Can a man, then, have a right to the labor or obedience of another without his consent? Give us this right, and it is all we ask.... ‘The traffic in human souls,' which figures so largely in the speeches of the divines and demagogues, and which so fiercely stirs up the most unhallowed passions of their hearers, is merely a transfer of a right to labor.." Cotton is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, Augusta, Ga., 1860, pp. 313, 314

Going back to the old Roman Laws found in The Institutes of Justinian (533AD), we read:

"So, too, he who has the use of a slave, has only the right of himself using the labour and services of the slave" D. vii. 8. 12. 5, 6

"slavery can exist nowhere except under the authority of law, founded on usage having the force of law, or by statutory recognition." Dred Scott v. Sanford 19 How. 393, 547

According to the Institutes, the right to despoil people of the fruits of their labor without their consent is the right of usufruct - the use of labor. The person who exercises this right is a usufructuary. The politicians of both the democratic and republican parties have been able to acquire the use of the people's labor without legalizing it through constitutional amendment. The people have been enslaved by the politicians to support their system of government as well as to help subsidize their political campaigns. No provision in the Constitution allows the politicians to enslave the people so that they may retain power. In fact, this power is emphatically denied (see: 13th amendment).

The difference between the slavery of pre civil war times and the slavery of the Jews under the Nazis was that the Nazis were masters who paid nothing for the rights to the labor of those whom they enslaved. Also, the Nazis shunned the responsibilities of masters; they merely cannibalized the labor of the Jewish people and the Jews had no choice but to live on what they were left of their labor by those in power. Their slavery

varied from heavily taxed wages to forced labor without pay.

The cornerstone of the institution of slavery that exists in America today is the income tax. When this tax began in 1913 with the adoption of the 16th amendment to the United States Constitution, it was never designed to tax the wages (labor) of American workers. Benton McMillin, a ten term congressman from Tennessee, in his article entitled THE INCOME TAX, which appeared in the May 17, 1913 issue of The Saturday evening Post, explained in detail the purpose of the income tax and its congressional intent. This article begins by stating:

"The income-tax question is one that will not down. For the best of reasons this is true. Way down in the hearts of the masses of mankind there lurks a strong sense of justice, on which is founded the opinion that vast accumulations of wealth in the hands of individuals or corporations should help to support the Government under which they are acquired, by which they are protected and without which they would vanish....And why not? Why tax the widow's mite and the orphan's bread, and not tax these accumulations? Why lay tribute on what we eat and wear, and leave untaxed millions in the hands of those who can never personally consume it, and with whom it is surplus?" (pg. 6)

Moving forward in time, George Lorimer, editor-in-chief of The Saturday Evening Post from 1899 through 1936, stated the following in a March 31, 1934 editorial:

"By income taxes we strive to redress the balance and at the same time make the builders of great fortunes pay proper toll to the society which has made their success possible." (pg. 22)

In the October 10, 1936 Saturday Evening Post article entitled THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE, the writer David Lawrence pointed out that less than 3% of the people paid income tax. Hence the question: How have we gone from a tax that was only intended for the "builders of great fortunes" to a tax that taxes wages, thereby directing and receiving the fruits of labor? It is common knowledge among the people that filling out tax forms and giving an employer a Taxpayer Identification Number is a prerequisite to getting employment in America. There is nothing voluntary about a system of taxation that requires that a worker enslave himself to the tax system in order to work and earn bread. The politicians have been able to gain power over the people's labor without seeking their consent through constitutional amendment or purchasing the rights to the people's labor as did the old masters who held slaves in bondage. The politicians have become slaveholders who refuse to accept the responsibilities of masters. They want to be able to tax the people's labor to any extent they wish to gather in the enormous sums of money they need to support their system, but they do not want to responsibility "to clothe, feed, nurse, support through childhood, and pension in old age, a race of slaves." Cotton is King and Pro- Slavery Arguments, pg. 647. This is a form of slavery that George Fitzhugh of Virginia described as "Cannibalism" back in 1857 in his book Cannibals All!; or Slaves Without Masters. This is the type of slavery the Nazis imposed upon the Jews in World War II. It can be very oppressive and tyrannical.

The first law that gave the politicians a foothold on the people's labor was the Social Security Act of 1935. The wage tax this law started began at the meager rate of 1% of wages in 1937 and was supposed to peak at 3% of wages in 1949 (see: U.S. Statutes at Large, 74thCongress, Sess. I. Ch. 531. August 14, 1935, pg. 636). Also, in the 1942 revenue bill there was a 5% victory tax on labor that was supposed to cease after World War II was over. This was never done (see: U.S. Statutes at Large, 77th Congress, 2d Sess. - Ch. 619 - Oct. 21, 1942, pg. 892). From this beginning, the process of increasing servitude we find ourselves in today had its roots. In Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189 (1920), the court stated: " As repeatedly held, this did not extend the taxing power to new subjects, but merely removed the necessity which otherwise might exist for an apportionment among the states of taxes laid on income" supra, 206. With this in mind, consider this excerpt from NEWSWEEK, October 19, 1942 issue. Under the heading TAXES ON INDIVIDUALS, we read: "The new 5% Victory Tax, which has no parallel in tax history" pg. 60. This shows that even those people in the press at the time could see that a general tax upon the labor of American workers was new, and had no parallel in U.S. tax history. Hence, the Social Security Act of 1935 and the Victory Tax of 1942

extended the federal taxing powers to new objects, that is, the labor of each individual American worker. It should be noted that since this meager beginning of a 1% tax on wages in 1937, the divorce rate has more than tripled. Hence the question needs to be raised as to whether or not the family unit is being slowly starved to death. In fact, we have gone so deep into servitude that the servile maxim partus sequitur ventrem once again has an application in our body politic.

It is common knowledge that children born in hospitals today get assigned Social Security Numbers (Taxpayer Identification Numbers) after birth. Since the primary use of the number is to identify the labor of American workers as articles of commerce to be taxed at the pleasure of political authority, we can see that the number being assigned to children at birth is in fact a claim upon the labor of the child. It has already been pre-determined that our children are in a servile condition at birth. Partus sequitur ventrem means: the offspring follows the condition of the mother. This raises the question as to whether or not the stain of bastardy has returned upon marriages in America.

"If, in Missouri, the plaintiff were held to be a slave, the validity and operation of his contract of marriage must be denied. He can have no legal rights; of course, not those of a husband and father. And the same is true of his wife and children. The denial of his rights is a denial of theirs. So that, though lawfully married in the Territory, when they came out of it, into the State of Missouri, they were no longer husband and wife, and a child of that lawful marriage....is not the fruit of that marriage, nor the child of its father, but subject to the maxim partus sequitur ventrem." Dred Scott v. Sanford, 19 How. 393, 599-600

The first cases which made it to the supreme court which challenged the Social Security Act of 1935 were Helvering v. Davis, 301 U.S. 619 and Chas. C. Steward Mach. Co. v. Davis 301 U.S. 548. In these cases, the court narrowly upheld the constitutionality the Social Security Act by a 5 to 4 margin, but ironically the constitutionality of the tax upon labor was not addressed.

"The District Court held that the tax upon employees was not properly at issue, and that the tax upon employers was constitutional." Helvering v. Davis 301 U.S. 619, 638

Hence the question: Has the constitutionality of taxing labor (wages) ever been ruled on by the supreme court? In the case of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. V. Sawyer 343 U.S. 579, Justice Jackson alluded to government power over labor.

"We do not know today what powers over labor or property would be claimed to flow from Government possession if we should legalize it, what rights to compensation would be claimed or recognized, or on what contingency it would end. With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations.... Such institutions may be destined to pass away. But it is the duty of the Court to be the last, not the first, to give them up." supra, 655

It wasn't until the 1990 term where we find a wage earner who had made constitutional challenges against the income tax. In examining this case, we can see that the petitioner did not make labor an constitutional issue, and his constitutional challenges were held to be frivolous by the circuit court. However, the supreme court reversed the circuit court and stated:

"It is common ground that this Court, where possible, interprets congressional enactments so as to avoid raising serious constitutional questions." Cheek v. U.S. 498 U.S. 192, 203

The income tax has been perverted to enslave American workers; and the pecuniary interest in their labor is enormous, given the fact that the workers number in the millions. It only stands to reason that as millions continue to add themselves to the social insurance rolls, the degree of servitude upon American workers will increase accordingly.

To try and defer the increasing servitude, the politicians have opened the floodgates of immigration. The only reason this is of concern to the court would be to show that the main reason for it is to bring more labor into the country to tax. The labor is being allowed into the country for the purpose of taxing it and treating it as commerce. In an article entitled STUDY DOWNPLAYS SOCIAL SECURITY SCARE that appeared in the January 13, 1999 edition of the Denver Rocky Mountain News on page 36A we read the following opening statement:

"Although baby boomer crunch is real concern, births and immigration will effect fund's solvency."

On page 6A of the February 6, 2000 edition of the Greenville News, the American Immigration Control Foundation pointed out that "a few years ago, the government increased the number of legal immigrants from 200,000 to nearly a million a year. By the year 2050 our population will grow by 100 million due to mass immigration."

"When the Anti-Slavery Convention, which met, December 6, 1833, in Philadelphia, declared, as part of its creed: ‘That there is no difference in principle, between the African slave trade, and American slavery,' it meant to be understood as teaching, that the person who purchased slaves imported from Africa. Or who held their offspring as slaves, was particeps criminis - partaker in crime - with the slave trader, on the principle that he who receives stolen property, knowing it to be such, is equally guilty with the thief." Cotton is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, pg. 204

Hence we can see that the slave trade was viewed in two different aspects by the abolitionists in pre civil war America. One aspect was the actual importation of slaves; and the other was raising their offspring to be slaves - partus sequitur ventrem. Our children and those being allowed into the country through immigration are slaves. Their labor is commerce in the eyes of the politicians. They represent dollars and cents.

"That it is contrary to the law of nature will scarcely be denied. That every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and that no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will, seems to be the necessary result of this admission." The Antelope, 10 Wheat 66, 120 (1825 case involving the slave trade)

The most oppressive form of slavery that exists in America today is the servitude that child support imposes. Since government at all levels controls around 50% of the national income, many child support orders push workers into the levels of slavery that the Nazis imposed upon the Jews in World War II. Recall Greiser's 65% taxation upon the labor of the Jews in the Lodz Ghetto in Poland. Hence, we can see that coercion of law being used to take an additional 15% or more of a worker's labor away would cause that worker to be despoiled of 65% or more of his/her labor. The use of the labor of the children when the children come of age to labor is something the politicians want very badly; otherwise they wouldn't assign Taxpayer Identification Numbers to our children at birth. However, the expenses of raising the children they do not want. The politicians have structured the laws to see to it that the biological parents will bear this yoke. Think about giving a blood test to a slave to determine parentage. It is an absurd proposition. The politicians have gained the use of the people's labor and have retained all of their wealth by further enslaving others, thereby absolving themselves of the responsibilities of masters. As servitude increases with time, this form of slavery will become more oppressive.

The laws which surround the child support slavery also show the restoration of some of the old slave laws found in the Dred Scott decision. Persons alleged to have arrearages in excess of $2500 are denied passports by the Secretary of State.

"This law, shows that this class of persons were governed by special legislation directed expressly to them, and always connected with provisions for the government of slaves, and not with those for the government of free white citizens....The conduct of the Executive Department of the government has been in perfect harmony upon this subject with this course of legislation.... and that free persons of color were not citizens,

withing the meaning of the Constitution and laws; and this opinion has been confirmed by that of the late Attorney General, Caleb Cushing, in a recent case, and acted upon by the Secretary of State, who refused to grant passports to them as 'citizens of the United States.'" Dred Scott v. Sanford 19 How 393, 421

Then there are the state laws which deny or revoke drivers licenses because of alleged child support arrearages. This same coercion also applies to forcing people to buy auto insurance in many states.

"Well, I want spectin' nothin'; only Sam, he's a-gwine to de river with some colts, and he said I could go 'long with him; so I jest put my things together. If Missis was willin', I'd go with Sam tomorrow morning, if Missis would write my pass, and write me a commendation." Harriet Beecher Stowe, Uncle Tom's Cabin, Bantam Books, N.Y., 1981, pg. 255

"At night, I returned part of the way in the official car. At the corner of Jerozolimski Boulevard I was stopped by a patrol. My Ausweis (identity card) was not sufficient." The Warsaw Diary of Adam Czerniakow, October 21, 1939 entry, Elephant Paperbacks, Chicago, pg. 85

"No person is to depart from one parish to another, or from one hundred or county to serve in another hundred or county, without license from the local authorities." Edinburgh Review, October, 1841, describing the laws of Queen Elizabeth, 1562 (5 Eliz. Cap. 3)

Then there is the "Deadbeat Parents Act of 1998" which makes it a federal felony to cross state lines to avoid the child support slavery. This Act, as reported in the Denver Rocky Mountain News on June 6, 1998, passed overwhelmingly in the House by a 402 - 16 margin. Also, the Senate passed it by a voice vote without debate. When we look at the magnitude of the servitude child support imposes, we can see that this law is a disguised Fugitive Slave Law and restores Article IV, Sect. 2 of the United States Constitution, which states:

"No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered upon Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due."

The "person held to Service or Labour" would be the worker who has been ordered by the court into the slavery of child support; the "Party to whom such service or Labour may be due" would be the child support enforcement agencies of the states.

In a free society, there is supposed to be a right of locomotion and a right to free labor. We have neither in America today, and no amendment has ever been proposed that legalizes the politicians' claim upon the rights which they have usurped from the people. Lincoln was right when he stated that the struggle against slavery would be an eternal one, for the struggle continues.

"That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles - right and wrong - throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity, and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. 'You toil and work and earn bread, and I'll eat it.' No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle." The Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, The Tandy - Thomas Co., N.Y., Vol. V, pg. 65

When an institution of slavery takes deep root in any body politic, the party or parties in power may become jealous of their power and structure laws which discriminate against any opposition parties that may develop. In any country where free elections are supposed to take place, the people have a right to see and hear what their choices are. Unfortunately, today it takes large sums of money to get before the people and be heard,

and much free media coverage is given to the parties in power. Newspaper ads and media time for commercials require sums of money far beyond what the average American can afford. If the campaign laws are structured to favor the party or parties in power where they can gather in all the mammon they need while inhibiting the opposition to do the same, obviously the party or parties in power would be able to expose themselves and their message to the people far more than any opposition. The slaveholders in pre civil war times had just such a system. They stayed in power by commanding the labor of their subjects, thereby commanding the wealth of the system. They also structured the laws to prohibit any printed materials which criticized their system and public speaking that did the same.

"As to education, you will probably admit that slaveholders should have more leisure for mental culture than most people. And I believe it is charged against them, that they are peculiarly fond of power, and ambitious of honors. If this be so, as all the power and honors of this country are won mainly by intellectual superiority, it might be fairly presumed, that slaveholders would not be neglectful of education. In proof of the accuracy of this presumption, I point you to the facts, that our Presidential chair has been occupied for 44 out of 56 years, by slaveholders; that another has been recently elected to fill it for four more, over an opponent who was a slaveholder also; and that in the Federal Offices and both Houses of Congress, considerably more than a due proportion of those acknowledged to stand in the first rank are from the South." Cotton is King and Pro- Slavery Arguments, pg. 642

"In the slaveholding States, however, nearly one-half of the whole population, and those the poorest and most ignorant, have no political influence whatever, because they are slaves." ibid, pg. 638

A new physiognomy of servitude has developed in America, and ignoring it will not make it go away. The people have a right to so-called free elections in a political system that swims in a sea of billions and trillions; and the ones who gather in the most mammon usually win by default.

The judges in the courts are supposed to be independent from the political departments, but political power that is jealous of its power has attacked the independence of judges throughout history. Chief Justice Marshall, in the course of the debates of the Virginia State Convention of 1829 - 1830 (pp. 616, 619) stated:

"The Judicial Department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all. Is it not, to the last degree important, that he should be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience?.... I have always thought, from my earliest youth until now, that the greatest scourge an angry Heaven ever inflicted upon an ungrateful and a sinning people, was an ignorant, a corrupt, or a dependent Judiciary."

This quote comes from the case of O'Donoghue v. U.S., 289 U.S. 516 (1933). However, just 6 short years later, a newly appointed justice named Felix Frankfurter, in the case of O'Malley v. Woodrough, 307 U.S. 277 (1939), reversed the whole history of court decisions on the constitutionality of taxing the salaries of judges. According to Article III, Sect. 1 of the Constitution, judges are supposed to receive a salary free from taxation. This is a provision which was designed to secure their independence from the political departments. Taxing the salaries of judges, and for that matter, the salaries and wages of all government officers and workers is absurd, for it produces no revenue. Simple common sense tells us that taxing tax money produces no additional revenue. Hence the reason for this type of taxation must be to condition the minds of all who labor to believe they have a legal duty to file and pay income tax and also to place the same enslaving club over the heads of the judges in the courts to deter them from ruling against the slave power. Hence, the O'Malley case and the Public salary Tax Act of 1939 (U.S. Statues at Large, 76th Congress, 1st Sess. - Ch. 59 - April 12, 1939, pp. 575 - 577) do nothing when it comes to raising revenue. They reflect nothing more than an attack upon the independence of the judiciary and the independent thinking of the people.

In the beginning of the Dred Scott decision, Chief Justice Taney stated that the "Declaration of Independence does not include slaves as part of the people." This is a very true statement, for slaves have never had any inalienable rights, but only the privileges their masters grant them in the laws their masters write. No doubt

this is why the Confederate Constitution began by stating: "We, the deputies of the sovereign and independent States..."

In all soberness, we should ask ourselves what good will become of awakening the slavery demon again.

Home