

I am not a "Person," who are you?

I am not a **person**, an **individual**, or a **human**, and although some humans do look similar to me, I am also not "a human" as we will see. Some would say that I am a "natural person," but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which the "United States" (the Corporation) has placed on the words I have quoted above. These words are commonly used, but deceptive. They do not describe me. For example, take the word "person" defined or used by the "United States" or "U.S." (the Corporation).

Person - The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in the State of Washington) defines a person as follows: *"The term "person" may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or Private Corporation, as well as an individual."*

Person - Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: *"In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers."*

Person - Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines Person as: *"1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word person includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other being entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word)."* --

Person - Duhaime's Law Dictionary: *"An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to persons which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations."*--

Person, noun. per'sn. - Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines person as: *"Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage."*

Legal person - Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996 defines a legal person as: *"a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued."*

A person according to these definitions is basically an entity – a legal fiction – in other words, a "straw man," which is some kind of artificial entity that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions?

Well..... I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation." I am not "labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a "person" under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual.” Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating (i.e. natural person). So let's first check to see if I am an “individual.”

Individual - Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines “individual” as follows: *“As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”*

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a “person” and since “individual” denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an “individual” under this definition either. But I also see the term “natural person” used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a “natural” person, since I know I am not an “artificial” one.

I could not find the term “Natural person” defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word “natural” for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word “person”. !

Natural - Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 712, defines “Natural” as follows: *“Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word artificial. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term legal; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”*

Wow, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word man means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I “wild” or “untutored”? No not me! Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word “artificial” it still does not describe who I believe I am. So I must conclude that I am not a “natural” person, under this definition of the word natural. So the term “natural person” cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term “human being” and although Black's defined it as a “natural person”, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a human being. Human or human being does not appear to have a “legal definition” so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am.

Human - Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: *“n. a human being; one of the race of man, rare and inelegant. Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.”*To me, the etymology of the word “human” suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot of course be correct, (at least not politically) so I can't go there can I? Because the word would then mean 'colored man'! (Note: inelegant, means the lack of gracefulness or refinement.)

Am I of the race of man “rare and inelegant”? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not colored either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word man through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for the word “man.”

Man - Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: *“An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.”*

Oh! Oh! Well, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an “individual” so I cannot be considered “of the human race” and

since I'm not of the human race I can't be "a human being." I've also been shown that I'm not "a person" either.

When I was younger, I remember filling out forms, which had the word "Caucasian" listed for race (they don't seem to use that definition any more for some reason). I was always told that this was the word for me to use since I had white skin. (It is actually pinkish, and some is tanned, with mostly white next to the tanned, but I was still told I was a 'Caucasian'). So back to the definitions to look up "Caucasian" I guess.

Caucasian - Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, defines 'Caucasian' as follows: *"Of or pertaining to the white race."*

Well, I guess that makes some sense, since I have always held myself to be "white" but this is really not a very descriptive definition, so let's see what an "older" Black's Law Dictionary has to say, if anything (they have a tendency to change the meaning of words in the new dictionaries for some reason).

Caucasian - Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition, defines "Caucasian' As follows: *"Pertaining to the white race, to which belong the greater part of European nations and those of western Asia. The term is inapplicable to denote families or stocks inhabiting Europe and speaking either the so-called Aryan or Semitic languages."*

That's interesting, it appears that "white racist Aryan" groups, like "Aryan Nations" types, or those speaking Aryan, are not "Caucasians" under this definition, so they can't be from the "White Race" (I wonder if they know that). Neither are the people who call themselves Jews, and speak a form of Hebrew, (which appears to be derived from the older Semitic language referred to in Black's Law Dictionary).

Back to Noah's Dictionary to see if he has a vernacular definition of the word "Caucasian."

Caucasian - Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'Caucasian' as follows: *"Anyone belonging to the Indo-European race, and the white races originating near Mount Caucasus."*

OK, well now, here is my Conclusion: There may be some beings that are "persons" and some of them are "individuals," and some "Natural persons" do exist, of this I have no doubt. I've met some of them. There are also many that I believe are "humans" or "human beings," this kind seem to exist all over this globe. However!

I know my kinfolk came from Western Europe, so I must have come from one of the European Nations. I am also white (I use the term a bit loosely because I am a bit pink but sometimes a bit tanned). By definition I must be a "Caucasian." Since I am a Caucasian, I must have come from or be a member of one of the "White Races" originating near Mount Caucasus. I am a male of my race so I must conclude that I am a "Caucasian male." I am a breathing man living on the soil, I must conclude that I am a "Living Breathing Caucasian Male" in other words I am an "LBCM" (for short) – Cool. Ok, now where is that Mount Caucasus and why would my white Caucasian Race have originated from the area near that MountainHummmmmmmmm??

Presented for truth by the Assembly of Yahweh, Cascade
Assemblyoftrueisrael.com

Continued below

[The Genesis of the Fake Corporate "Personas"](#)

by Anna Von Reitz

One of the concepts that people are having a lot of trouble with is the difference between an unincorporated business and a corporation---- both are "corporate" in the sense of being fictitious, but one is engaged in private trade under full commercial liability and accrues only private property and the other seeks the benefit of limited liability and incurs the obligations to the State and accrues income by definition.

ABC Company does not equal ABC Corporation.

ABC Company is a "corporate entity" and can do business with ABC Corporation without breaking the "in kind" rule of contracts, but a living man named John Raymond Doe acting as a living man cannot. He can only contract with other living men.

This is what necessitated the adoption of "doing business as" names at the beginning of the 20th Century. More and more businesses were operating as corporations and those corporations wanted to be able to deal directly with living customers who were NOT organized as any kind of business entity. Likewise, many living people wanted the goods and services provided by corporations, but did not have a company or company name that would allow them to do business with a corporation.

So the "State of _____" stepped in and began the process of issuing "doing business as" Names conceived as foreign situs trust franchises doing business within the fictitious "State of Ohio" and subject to the statutory laws of the "State of Ohio".

Foreign situs trusts are named using the same style conventions as those being used by living men at the time, so there was no way to know the difference between "Hans Luke Jorgenson" the man and "Hans Luke Jorgenson" the foreign situs trust. People could do business with other people and with corporations without ever actually realizing that they were "presumed" to be acting in separate capacities.

It never crossed their minds and they were never told that they were acting as corporate "persons" when they walked into a Ma Bell Office and signed a contract to receive telephone service, but for the purposes of that transaction, they were considered by the State and by Ma Bell as acting in a "corporate" capacity. They had to be, otherwise the in-kind provisions would have been violated and it would not have been possible for corporations to sell services to individual people on contract.

Then along came another layer to the puzzle--- in addition to American corporations, international corporations began coming on shore and selling goods and services. This opened up another can of worms. Not only did Americans require a "doing business name" to be able to contract with and receive goods and services from American companies and corporations under "State" law, they needed another "doing business name" to be able to do business with international corporations under international law.

So, the Washington DC Municipality began registering Cestui Que Vie trusts under the doing business names of all the American foreign situs trusts and the additional all-capital letters name was born: HANS LUKE JORGENSEN could now do business with international corporations and he was "presumed" to be a franchise of the UNITED STATES (Inc.) and obligated to obey federal statutory law and international law generally.

The problem of course is that poor old Hans back on the farm was never told any of this and never educated to be able to responsibly conduct his own business affairs. The "State" and the "federal government" decided to "indemnify" him as a "ward"---in exchange for him granting all control over his name and estate assets to them. And from that, all the abuses have sprung.

Not only was Hans not told about the meaning of names being "presumed" upon him by the self-interested corporations, but he wasn't informed of their offer to copyright his name, convert the ownership of his estate to their control, and micro-manage his life according to their statutes, executive orders, and corporate policies.

He was never told about their offer of his labor and his private property including his interest in his land and his business enterprises as collateral backing the debts of the "State of _____" and later, the "STATE OF _____" corporations, as well as the debts of the United States of America, Inc., and the debts of the UNITED STATES (INC.).....and soon poor old Hans was "presumed" to be bankrupt.....yada, yada, yada.

The corporations are by nature evil, irresponsible, and self-interested entities created for the sole purpose of making profit and avoiding liability. Unlike companies which bear the burden of full commercial liability, the corporations routinely get away with murder and discharge their debts through abuse of bankruptcy protection.

We have looked high and low and can find no justifiable reason for corporations to be provided with protection from liability in exchange for paying off a portion of their profits as "protection money" to yet another corporation in the business of providing governmental services. It has both the plain appearance and affect of racketeering and extortion under armed force---and all under conditions of semantic deceit and constructive fraud, personage, and impersonation of public officials.

All legal presumptions held against individual people obligating them to perform under commercial contracts that are and always manifestly were NOT in-kind and NOT fully disclosed should be dropped immediately and without recourse as unconscionable and the people should not suffer any loss or claim against their labor, their private property, or their public property interests as a result of the constructive fraud being practiced against them by these corporations--including and especially the governmental services corporations which have passed themselves off as the lawful government owed this nation.

The actual Congress of the united States of America ceased functioning on March 28, 1861 when it adjourned sine die for lack of quorum. As a stop-gap, Lincoln formed The United States, incorporated, and installed the remaining members of Congress as a Board of Directors. It was at this juncture that the "federal corporation" recorded at 28 USC 3002 15 (A) came into being.

Acting in 1862, this "Congress" changed the meaning of a single word. That word is "person". For the purposes of their private, for-profit governmental services corporation, they redefined the word "person" to mean "corporation". See 37th Congress, Second Session, Chapter 119, Section 68 – "Manufactures, Articles, and Products".

In 1868, the United States Corporation published its Articles and By-Laws as the Constitution of the United States of America. That document included the 14th Amendment proclaimed by Secretary of State Seward. It was this document which established the existence of private "federal" States—corporate franchises of the United States Corporation. This sound-alike, look-alike "Constitution" and its 14th Amendment created a different citizenship, a different jurisdiction, and a different government.

