

What manner of PERSON are you?

Just exactly what is a **person** by legal definition? What is the legal authority of a **person**? Is a Christian a **person**? The answers to these questions have eluded Americans ever since the end of Lincoln's Civil War and the general acceptance of the Fourteenth Amendment. Since all State statutes and every court in the United States, right down to the local municipal courts, define every American as a **person**, then we should find out just what this means so that we can understand what we are according to the civil governments and judges.

Law dictionaries are a necessary resource in defining any word used in the courts or civil governments. In our research, it's very odd that we found the 'not so obvious' while the 'obvious' was not there to be defined. For example, let's start with the definition for the word **person**:

PERSON : **1.** "natural person". **2.** the body of a human being. *also* : the body and clothing of a human being. Example: had drugs on his person. **3.** one (as a human being or corporation) that is recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties (see also: juridical person, legal person, personality). --*Merriam Webster's Dictionary of Law* ©1996. [underlining added].

PERSON - 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. See e.g. National Labor Relations Act, Partnership Act, §2. Scope and delineation of term is necessary for §2(1), 29 U.S.C.A. §152; Uniform determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to individual, partnership, and corporation, but not governmental unit. Bankrupt Code - "Person" includes organization. U.C.C. §1-201(30). Definition of "person" or U.S.C.A. §101; Commercial Law - An individual or "municipal utility operators suing as plaintiffs seeking damages persons" covered by anti-trust laws includes cities, whether as for antitrust violations or as operators being sued as defendants. *City of Lafayette, La. v. Louisiana Power & Light Co., La.*, 435 U.S. 389, 98 S.Ct. 1123, 1128, 55 L.Ed.2d 364. --*Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, The West Group* © 1999. [underlining added].

A **person** is defined here as various legal **entities** (i.e. a corporation, association, city, partnership, etc.), a **human being**, an **individual**, or a **natural person**. The simplest term to understand is that of any legal entity, such as a corporation. Every legal entity is created by the state itself and under the exclusive authority of the state that created it. Something that may surprise most readers is the legal definition of an **individual**:

Individual. *adj.* 1. Existing as an indivisible entity. 2. Of or relating to a single person or thing, as opposed to a group. --*Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, The West Group* © 1999. [underlining added].

At first, this seems like double-talk, but it's not. An **individual** is a single legal entity as opposed to a corporate entity (made of members who comprise a singular group). None-the-less, a legal entity is simply a legal entity. In reality, the definitions are telling us that an **individual** is a legal

entity, a fiction of "law", with the same legal structure and authority as a corporation, but with only one singular "member". If a flesh and blood man appears before a court answering that he is an **individual**, he has agreed and stated that he is a legal entity. Here's further explanation:

Entity. An organization (such as a business or a governmental unit) that has a legal identity apart from its members. --*Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, The West Group © 1999.*

This pretty much groups together corporations, cities, associations, individuals, etc. as legally created separate entity **persons**. Next, let's see what a **natural person** is as shown in the above definitions.

NATURAL PERSON : a human being as distinguished from a person (as a corporation) created by operation of law. --*Merriam Webster's Dictionary of Law ©1996.* [underlining added].

From this definition, there is the distinction that a **natural person** is *not* a **person** created by state law (a legal entity). A **natural person** is defined here as a **human being**. Although a **human being** is *not* defined as a **corporation**, both are defined as being a **person**.

LEGAL PERSON : 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. --*Merriam Webster's Dictionary of Law ©1996.* [underlining added].

ARTIFICIAL PERSON : "legal person" --*Merriam Webster's Dictionary of Law ©1996.* [underlining added].

This helps us further understand that by following these definitions, a **human being** - a **natural person** - apparently is *not* defined as a **legal person** or an **artificial person**. So, it appears that a **person** is comprised of two distinct groups:

- A. a **human being - natural person** (*not* created by state or civil "law").
- B. a **legal - artificial person** (specifically created by state or civil "law". A legal entity).

What is a human being a.k.a. natural person?

Just exactly what is a **human being** or a **natural person**? There are no listed definitions for "**human**", "**being**", or "**human being**" in *Black's* or in *Webster's* law dictionaries. We even looked them up in *Oran's Dictionary of the Law* published by *The West Group* © 2000, and they weren't defined there either. Isn't it extremely odd that the same law dictionaries which define a **person** as a **human being** don't define any of the words used within their own definition? If we were to stop right here, then according to the most recent and authoritative law dictionaries available, we have *no* legal definition of a **human being** and, therefore, do not know what a **natural person** is. Since the "law" of the United States is supposed to be so specific and exact, how can this be?

In order to find the legal definition, we had to dig deeper. Each current collegiate and standard desktop dictionary we looked into *all* had definitions for the word **human**. Only the law

dictionaries were void of these word definitions. Here is a definitive example that was mirrored nearly word for word in the other dictionaries, including medical reference dictionaries:

Human - *noun*, circa 1533 : a bipedal primate mammal (*Homo sapiens*) : **MAN**; *broadly* : any living or extinct member of the family (Hominidae) to which the primate belongs. -- *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, New World Edition 1998.*

This seems somewhat clear. A **human** is a **MAN**. A **MAN** is a bipedal (walks on two legs) primate mammal. A primate is the highest order of mammals. It includes man, together with the apes and monkeys.

Primate : any of an order (Primates) of mammals comprising humans, apes, monkeys, and related forms (as lemurs and tarsiers) -- *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, New World Edition 1998* [underlining added].

It seems logical to conclude that a **human being** is scientifically defined as the top group of the species of two legged mammals. But what has this to do with the current American "law" or the legal defining of a **person**? The key that ties the scientific and legal definitions together is the word **MAN** or **mankind**. The following definitions are from *Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, The West Group* © 1999 [underlining added]:

Man. 1. An adult male. **2.** Humankind. - Also termed mankind. **3.** A human being. **4.** *Hist.* A vassal; a feudal tenant.

Mankind. See **MAN** (2).

Vassal. *noun*. [Law Latin *vassallus*] *Hist.* The grantee of a fief, feud, or fee; a feudal tenant. Cf. **FREEMAN**.

Vassalus. *noun*, [Law Latin] *Hist.* A feudal tenant.

Freeman. 1. A person who possesses and enjoys all the civil and political rights belonging to the people under a free government. **2.** A person who is not a slave. **3.** *Hist.* A member of a municipal corporation (a city or borough) who possesses full civic rights, esp. the right to vote. **4.** *Hist.* A freeholder. **5.** *Hist.* An allodial landowner. Cf. **VASSAL**.

Now we're able to tie things together within the authoritative law dictionaries. According to the legal definitions shown above, a **person** is: 1. a **human being**, 2. a **MAN**, 3. **mankind**, 4. a **feudal tenant**, 5. a member (individual part) of a **corporation**. Also note that a **person** enjoys the rights of the **people**. These words are *not* the same. The plural of **person** is **persons**, *not* **people**. Notice how most of the definitive words and phrases immediately above are also found in the law dictionary definitions of **person** at the beginning of this article. Compare them all and see that they are the same. Let what is written and recognized speak for itself.

Feudal tenancy?

This all seems to fit quite well with the law dictionary definitions of a **person**. But now, we also have the added definitive fact that a **human being** - a **person** - is a **feudal tenant**. This defines a

specific element of a **person** that appears to have been hidden from the law dictionaries by their own exclusion when defining a **human being - person**. A **feudal tenant** is a term from the English Feudal Law of land ownership and tenancy.

Feud. n. Hist. **1.** An inheritable estate in land conveyed from a feudal superior to a grantee or tenant, held on the condition of rendering services to the superior. **2.** An interest [not ownership] of the tenant in the land conveyed. **3.** The land itself conveyed. - Also termed (in 1, 2, & 3) *fee; fief; feod; feude; feudum.* --*Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, New World Edition 1998* [underlining and bracketed notes added].

A **human being** is the tenant to a feudal superior. A **feudal tenant** is a **person** who pays rent or services of some sort for the use and occupaton of another's land. The land has been conveyed to the tenant's use, but the actual *ownership* remains with the superior. Since this applies to modern "law" in America, the implications of fact cannot be ignored. If a **person** does not own what he thought was his land (he's legally defined as a **feudal tenant**, *not* the superior owner), then a superior **person** owns the land and the **feudal tenant - person** pays him to occupy the land.

Welcome to your introduction of the hidden Feudal Law in America. When a **person** (a.k.a. human being, corporation, natural person, partnership, association, organization, etc.) pays taxes to the tax assessor of the civil county or city government (also a **person**), it is a payment to the superior land owner for the right to be a tenant and to occupy the land belonging to the superior. If this were not so, then how could a local government sell the house and land of a **person** for not rendering his services (taxes)?

We used to think that there was no possible way Feudal Law could be exercised as "law" in America, but since 1865, the facts have proven otherwise. Now, the modern law dictionaries are telling us that we're correct in our assumption of the facts. It's no wonder they hid the definition of a **human being** behind the definition of a **man**. The next time you enter into an agreement or contract with another **person** (a legal entity), look for the keywords **person, individual, and natural person** describing who you are. Are you the entity the other **person** claims you are? When you "appear" before their jurisdiction and courts, you have agreed that you are a **person** unless you show them otherwise. You will have to deny that you are the **person** and state who you *really* are. Is the flesh and blood standing there in that court room a **person** by their legal definition?

The Christian Man vs. a legal person

If you're a Christian, are you also a **person**?

- 1.** Man was created by the immediate hand of God and is generically different from all other creatures --Genesis 1:26, 27 and 2:7.
- 2.** Man was created in the likeness of God and the perfection of His nature in knowledge -- Col. 3:10.
- 3.** Man was created in His righteousness and holiness --Ephesians 4:24.
- 4.** Man was created with dominion over all the inferior creatures --Genesis 1:28.

5. God created man in His own Divine image --Genesis 1:27.

Is this Man God created the same as the legalistic MAN who is defined in our present law dictionaries as a **human being**, a **natural person**?

The legal terms **human being** and **natural person** are *not* found in the Bible. They are *not* created by God. They are legal titles for entities created by a "law" which is *not* the Law of God, the Lex Ecclesia.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. --Genesis 2:7.

It was the breath of God Himself that gave Man -Hebrew, *Adam*- Divine inspiration, a soul, and spirit life. Why are the words **inspiration**, **soul**, **spirit** and **life** not within the current legal definitions of MAN? Because the legalistic "law" now prevailing in America does *not* recognize the Law of God and does *not* recognize that Man is Divine life. If the corporate and governmental **persons** were to recognize the superior and allodial authority of the Lord God, they would have to admit that the Law of God was superior to their "laws" - mere legalisms. How could they collect their **feudal tenant** servitude from the Christians who occupy God's land since the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof?

Legally, MAN is a superior creature and nothing more. Their legal definitions say so. Lawfully, Man is a spritual creation in and of God's image, separate and distinct from the other animals. Man was created by and has inherent life from the Lord's **breath** -Hebrew, *n^eshâwmâh*-, but a MAN is created by the civil laws of an entity and owes it's existence to a mere legal **person** who creates more legal **persons**. Whereby, the Man of God's image has life, but a MAN has no life outside of the legal realm that created it.

How do you choose to call yourself now that you know the truth?