

## CHAPTER 4

### ***Legal Word – Crafting***

Mark Twain once said,

“The difference between the right word and the almost right word is the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.”

Law instructor and Sovereign, Gary DeMott, perhaps inspired by the above quote, liked to say,

“The difference in describing a lightning bug and a lightning bolt is only a couple of letters, but you had better know the difference before you go out and try to catch one.”

In law, words have exact meanings, and the “use” of law revolves around how words are defined. Imagine if one letter was changed in a legal document with the intent to trick you? It is done all the time. One letter in law can be just as important as the difference between an M16 rifle and an F16 fighter plane.

“We seldom try to understand the meaning of words, we just seem to mouth them and hold them dearly, but seldom attempt to investigate their substantive implications and precise meanings. How easily we are put to sleep by our eyes, even when we are awake” (Robert W. Wangrud).

It doesn't take long with a law dictionary to realize that there is more than one reason people love to hate attorneys. These drafters of encoded laws are artists when it comes to using words to deceive us. The concept introduced in this chapter is a recurring theme throughout this book, and it ties into various subjects. Some of my favorite examples of this “art” need to be held back until later in the book because of their ties into subjects I haven't explained yet; some are important enough to require their own chapter where I have room to present supportive evidence. However, I wanted to introduce “legal word-crafting” early so you might be thinking about it.

### ***Unalienable or Inalienable Rights?***

Consider the word “Unalienable.” This word was used by Thomas Jefferson in the second sentence of the *Declaration of Independence* where he described certain rights:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain **unalienable** Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Unalienable rights are unique in that no one can lien them; they cannot be taken away or surrendered under any circumstance; they are un-a-lien-able.

It is no surprise that those who want to rule over us had to come up with a distraction from the concept of God-given **unalienable** rights.

When a victim in today's courtroom makes any reference to their rights, judges are quick to ask, "Oh, are you referring to your **inalienable** rights?" By implying an interest in your welfare they hope to secure an agreement from you, and if you accept this counterfeit offering, you have just given away the farm.

*Black's 5th Law Dictionary* informs us that inalienable rights "are not capable of being surrendered or transferred **without the consent of the one possessing such rights**"

This reveals that you can surrender, sell or transfer inalienable rights if you consent either actually or constructively. By falling for the trap of claiming inalienable rights rather than unalienable rights, you have, in essence, surrendered your rights, as these devils have a number of reasons to presume that you contracted these inalienable rights away long before you came near their courtroom.

We should be thankful for our unalienable rights, and exercise them when necessary. I believe that God is going to hold us accountable if we disregard them. Think of this the next time you hear someone talk about "going down to 'request' a concealed-carry permit." Our enemies certainly like it when we ask their "permission" to exercise a God-given right we already have. This not only implies that "We the People" acknowledge their presumption of authority over us, but provides evidence that we in fact, consent to it.

### ***Upper and Lower-Case Letters***

Upper and lower case letters are used often in legal writing to flag hidden meanings, like a secret code. It is amazing how using an upper case letter in place of one in lower case can change a word's meaning in legalese. These artists of deception include alternative meanings in their law dictionaries so they can deny accountability should you attempt to point any of this out. Try it and they will look down their noses at you as if you have mental problems, all the while knowing full-well that they set up these legal tricks to deceive "We the People."

Consider the following question many have encountered on a typical job application. It is a good example of how words are used to deceive us.

### ***Are You a citizen of the United States?***

There are three traps contained in this question, all designed to obtain, or presume jurisdiction over you.

### ***The First Trick***

The first word I would like to draw your attention to is "citizen." Prior to the 14th Amendment, where this word with a lower case "c" was first introduced into American founding documents, it was always spelled with an upper case "C." This was done to imply Sovereignty, as "free White" Citizens were specifically recognized as Sovereigns in this country's early years.

The founders had debated this issue; they hesitated to refer to the people as Sovereigns, not wanting to offend God, the true Sovereign over His creations, this Earth and His children. Some argued that if they referred to the people as anything other, or less than sovereign, someone would eventually come along and presume the right to step into a position of control over them. Their concern was more over the probable designs of wicked men than the possibility of a mild offense

toward God, whom they believed would understand their dilemma. They didn't want to leave such an obvious opening for someone to take advantage of, and this side won the debate.

## **Sovereignty**

**Sovereign:** "A person, body, or state in which independent and supreme authority is vested" (BLD 5).

**Sovereignty:** "The supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed; supreme political authority. The person or body of persons in the state to whom there is politically no superior" (BLD 5).

"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, *sovereignty itself, remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.* And the law is the definition and limitation of power" (Justice Matthews in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 US 356).

***Sovereignty is not being subject to another of higher authority.***

Incidentally, using the term "sovereign citizen" is a contradiction in itself, a misnomer. There is no such thing.

A Citizen is Sovereign and not subject to anyone without his consent. According to the 14th Amendment, explained in some detail later, a small "c" citizen is a subject slave. The 14th Amendment (1868) was pushed into place to provide a status for the newly freed blacks. It created a different class of lower case "c" citizens that were, as creations of the "District of Columbia" corporation, subject to it. These subject citizens had only the privileges the corporate "State" allowed them. In the 14th Amendment these are referred to as "Civil Rights." Civil Rights are nothing more than government granted privileges. If you state that you are of the lower case "c" citizen status, you will be considered by today's judiciary a subject/citizen/person without any significant rights.

## **The Second Trick**

Next, consider the words "United States." This is not in reference to the united States, or "states united" that the Founding Fathers referred to. With the first letters capitalized, the words "United States" identify a privately owned corporation. The corporation of the "District of Columbia" was formed on February 21, 1871. It was reorganized June 11, 1878, and renamed "United States Government." This corporation privately trademarked the names, "United States" "U.S.," "US," "U.S.A.," "USA," and "America." Prior to this deceitful act, the words, or term "united States" meant simply the states united for a common purpose. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, like the Ford Motor Company of Detroit, or the Baskin Robbins Company of Chicago, is simply a corporation based in America.

If you look up the definition of "United States" in Title 28 USC 3002 (15), you will find that it means:

(a) "***A Federal Corporation*** or some entity of the Federal government or Instrumentality of such."

The location of the United States is delineated in UCC (Uniform Commercial Code) §9-307(h):

***“The United States is located in the District of Columbia.”***

The Uniform Commercial also states:

“United States includes its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico” (UCC §6-102(n)).

### ***The Third Trick***

The third trick is the use of the word “*of*.” If you state that you are “of” something, you are acknowledging that you are subject to it and that it is superior to you.

**Of:** “A term *denoting that from which anything proceeds*; indicating origin, source, descent, and the like; as, he is *of* noble blood. Associated with or connected with, usually in some casual relation, efficient, material, formal, or final. The word has been held equivalent to after; at, *or belonging to*; in possession of; manufactured by; residing at; from” (BLD 6).

If I said, “I am a Son of God,” I would be saying that I am His son and subject to Him. Since I have good reason to believe I was created by God, and He is greater than I, it would be correct to say that I am “of” God.

If you said you were “of” the United States, you are saying, in legalize, that you are subject to the United States Corporation, with significant consequences.

Are **you** a citizen of the **United States**? Do you want to be? I am an American Citizen but I avoid using the word Citizen in questionable company so it is not misinterpreted (Upper and lower-case letters sound the same when spoken). By claiming that I am an American, I maintain claim of my sovereignty, under God, and nobody in this world has a superior claim.

### ***Color of Law***

If you find the above mildly disturbing, you should investigate property titles. If you understand the importance of property you are likely to realize that gaining control of all our property is the equivalent to gaining control of our lives. There are over seventy forms of deeds, all under “color of law” which means:

“The appearance or semblance, without the substance of legal right. Misuse of power . . . made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state . . .” (BLD 5).

In “law,” the word “Color” means:

“An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which is real. A deceptive appearance: a plausible, assumed exterior, concealing a lack of reality: *a disguise or pretext*” (BLD 5).

I thought it interesting that this would be admitted in a law dictionary.

## ***Lawful and Legal***

Lawful is not the same as Legal. Something being “legal” or “Illegal” does not mean that the same thing is “Lawful” or “Unlawful.” “LEGal” only means it was LEGislated, part of the process of becoming Law. It may or may not be “Law.”

The meaning of the word “legal” is “color of law.” “Legal Tender,” for instance, is not “Lawful Money,” which is a specified weight and purity of silver.

Consider the definition of the word “legalize” in *Black’s 6th*:

**Legalize.** “To make legal or lawful. . . *To confirm or validate what was before void or unlawful. To add the sanction and authority of law to that which before was without or against law.*”

“. . . the peculiarity of the mirror: what is seen to be right is left, and what is left is right” (Master Kan, Episode 24, *Kung Fu*).

## ***Who Owns Your Car?***

A Certificate of title, say for an automobile you have purchased, is not a Title. One of the many definitions of the word Title is:

“The means whereby the owner of lands has the just possession of his property . . .” ‘good title’ being one free from litigation, palpable defects, and grave doubts . . .” (BLD 5).

But a Certificate of Title:

“. . . *is merely the formally expressed professional opinion of the company’s examiner that the title is complete and perfect* (or otherwise as stated) . . . an insurance of title warrants the validity of the title in any and all events” (BLD 5, [hidden under: Insurance: Subtitle: Title Insurance]).

When I first became aware of this, I wrote a letter to the Utah State Tax Commission asking them to provide me with the *real* Title to my car.

Some bureaucrat responded informing me that the “Certificate of Title” they had sent me had a watermark on it, which I could see if I held it up to the light. I thanked him for pointing this out in my response:

“The Certificate of Title you sent me does indeed have a very nice watermark, however, it is only a certificate ‘of’ Title. I am requesting my Title, or the manufacturer’s Statement of Origin.”

I then quoted some definitions from a law dictionary and asked, “If you do not have it, please inform me as to who does in fact have possession of it.” They never responded. I doubt that they had it, but I wanted to see what excuses they came up with.

On February 10, 1987, Tennessee Department of Revenue Operations Supervisor, Denise Rottero, explained to a Judge named Geer how Tennessee’s auto registration works. The process begins

with the “surrender” of the Manufacturer’s Statement of Origin (MSO) by the auto dealer to the Department of Revenue in exchange for a Certificate of Title. Asked if a MSO is proof of ownership Legal title to the automobile Ms. Rottero replied, “Yes.” She was then asked:

“Are you telling me that the Certificate of Title of an automobile is not title; it’s merely evidence that title exists? Your car’s legal Title is the MSO, which the dealer surrendered to the state?”

Ms. Rottero said, “*The MSO is put on microfilm for permanent keeping, and the original is destroyed.*” So, through this slick maneuver, the State ends up with legal (though hardly Lawful) ownership of our automobiles, and we end up with a certificate of title, an “opinion” that a title exists—somewhere—but now we have evidence that they do not.

All is not lost, however. I have been told that with the purchase of a new car you can request the MSO from the dealer before he sends it in. I obtained one recently from a local motorcycle dealer who had gone out of business. I was surprised when, along with the motorcycle I purchased, I was given a “CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN FOR A VEHICLE.”

Another point to consider: In Common Law, the highest proof of ownership is a Bill of Sale.

### ***Word – Crafting For Profit and Control***

Another disadvantage to us in regards to the above mentioned legal trick, is that the State, claiming that it now owns all of our motorized conveyances which it then renames “vehicles” (a commercial term), claims that we are now obligated to register them with the State. You will not find a valid law anywhere stating that we have any obligation to register any of *our own* property with the State.

Most people presume that the license plate they placed on their cars, trucks, and motorcycles is there so the police can identify them the next time they decide to do a hit and run, or to rob a bank or 7-11. The real reason for the license plate is to give justification for the police (State agents) to arrest you through unlawful traffic stops. The State’s plates with the State’s name on them are actually considered to be evidence that your motorized conveyance is in fact a “vehicle” owned by the State, and even while you are traveling about your private business you are presumed to be “driving” the King’s cattle on what they falsely presume is the King’s road. Through this deception we are fined for violating traffic regulations (traffic signs) that only (lawfully) apply to those operating in commerce.

“By changing the terminology of one who is behind the wheel of his conveyance from “traveler” to “driver” [a commercial term], and terming the conveyance a “vehicle,” the state has circumvented the right to travel and forced the licensing of such travel. It has unlawfully forced private citizens into a status of “commerce” in order to further regulate them” (Pat Shannan, author).

“No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege; license it, and attach a fee to it” (Murdoch v. Penn., 318 U.S. 105).

## **Regarding Commerce**

The feds have twisted the intended meaning of the interstate commerce clause in the Constitution for the united States to mean that they have all power over anything that happens to cross a state line.

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes” (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3).

The founding fathers included that clause to allow the feds to prevent the States from making laws that might interfere with our right to conduct business. For example: a State with an important seaport might attempt to tax the trade of other states. It was also intended to protect businessmen from Indian attack, certainly not to give the feds an excuse to rule over us because we own some item that happened to be manufactured in another state.

I will cover this in more detail later in this book.

## **Who Is The Client?**

Regarding the word “client,” attorneys have:

“. . . an obligation to the courts and to the public, *not* to the client, and whenever the duties of his client conflict with those he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of justice, the former must yield to the latter” (*Corpus Juris Secundum*, 1980, section 4, *Redemption in Law Second Ed.*, p. 89 Hereafter referred to as RIL 2nd Ed).

“Clients are called ‘wards of the court’ in regard to their relationship with their attorneys” (*Corpus Juris Secundum*, 1980 Section 4, *Redemption in Law Second Ed.*, p. 99).

According to *Black’s 5th*, “Wards of the court” are “Infants” and “persons of unsound mind.”

One of the legal definitions of the word “person” is an artificial entity, a fiction. The word “person” comes from a Latin word, *persona*, which means mask. People are real, but a person is not necessarily real. This word, as used in today’s courts almost always refers to a fiction. The bottom line is: ***Clients are not flesh and blood people.*** I will provide more detail on this in the next chapter titled, “The Game of Your Name.”

An “Individual” is defined in law as a United States Government employee (5 USC 552a(a)(2). And from *Black’s 5th*, “it [the word individual] may, in proper cases, include ***artificial persons.***”

“Artificial persons are persons created and devised by human laws for the purposes of society and government, as distinguished from natural persons. Corporations are examples of artificial persons” (BLD 5).

## **The Black Connection**

Another legal definition of person is: “A human being” (BLD 5).

**Person:** “An entity (such as a corporation) having the rights and duties of a human being” (BLD 7).

“The word ‘person’ in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of *entities other than human beings*” (See e.g. 1 U.S.C. ss 1. Church of Scientology v. U.S. Dept. of Justice (1979) 612 F 2d 417, 425).

*Black’s Law* doesn’t define “Human Being,” but *Ballentine’s Law Dictionary* of 1930 does:

Human Being: “See Monster.”

Looking up the word Monster we find:

“A human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

A fellow student of the Law insists that a **H**uman is a colored man, but the dictionaries I have consulted so far stay away from this.

Random House *Webster’s Dictionary* defines “hue” as:

**Hue 1.** “A gradation or variety of color; tint. **2.** Color.”

## ***The Dred Scott Decision***

Incidentally, Vin Suprynowicz, a nationally syndicated Libertarian columnist and author, paraphrasing Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Taney, who ruled in the Dred Scott decision of 1856, wrote:

***“Black Americans were neither citizens nor men—if they were so considered, there would be no option but to allow them to own and carry arms without restriction”*** (Vin Suprynowicz, *The Ballad of Carl Drega*, p. 346 Regarding: Dred Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393 (1856).

As you might imagine, this was a very controversial case. I doubt even the gun rights groups would dare mention this Supreme Court decision—if they knew about it. They should though—as it is one of the strongest admissions ever made by our judicial system in support of our “unalienable” right to keep and bear arms.

Yale Law professor Akhil Reed Amar, in his 1998 book titled, *The Bill of Rights: Creation and Reconstruction*, wrote:

“Roger Taney and [prominent abolitionist] Joel Tiffany hardly saw eye to eye in the 1850s, but they both agreed on this: ***If free blacks were citizens, it would necessarily follow that they had a right of private arms bearing.*** According to Dred Scott, ***the ‘privileges and immunities’ of ‘citizens’ included ‘full liberty of speech in public and in private . . . and to keep and carry arms wherever they went.’*** (As quoted by Vin Suprynowicz, *The Ballad of Carl Drega*, p. 347).

Anyway, Dred Scott was a slave who had been promised that he would be set free at the time of his master’s death. Instead, his master’s widow failed to honor her husband’s wishes, and Scott



remained in slavery. He petitioned the Federal Court but lost because he was not a “person” as contemplated by the Constitution and had no right to petition them. They have been criticized for this decision ever since, but they were actually doing their job and following the law. It was not their privilege to change it, that being a subject for Congress to consider. Their duty was to assure that the law was followed in the particular case they were examining.

A study of how the law relates to black Americans is *very* revealing. I found that I couldn’t avoid this issue and still explain certain key principles of Law. Anyone who draws near this important key is criticized for it, but if you ignore the subject you will miss more than you realize.

The supposedly freed slaves were the excuse behind the 14th Amendment, examined later in the chapter titled, “Poison in the Well,” and an understanding of that amendment is of critical importance.

The above noted operations of “legal art” that I call “word-crafting” have been designed to deprive us of our liberty, and while so doing, shear us of all our wealth.