# **Etymology**

The study of the *origins* of words is called *etymology*. It is the *origin* of *words* and the true meaning that is *lost* with modern day *"Mongrel English"*. Through this lack of understanding the unsuspecting person is scammed.

#### Consensus

The Latin word sensus means "perceiving", "feeling" or "sense" with the prefix "con", meaning "with" or "joint", although "con" comes from the Latin word contra meaning "against" or "opposite".

For example: pro vs con means "for" vs "against".

Today the modern meaning of the word *consensus* means "a general agreement", although based on one of *feelings*.

A *consensus* does <u>not</u> mean *true* or even *fact*, and the sovereign mind-set will *never* go with the *general feelings* of the collective.

<u>Note:</u> depending on your chosen definition of the prefix *con, consensus* could either mean to *"join"* with, or go *"against"* the *"general feeling"* of the *group*.

### Respect

It is often quoted that you should give respect to people or just "respect others". However, the correct term is consideration and not respect, as respect has to be earned over time.

The origin of the word *respect* comes from the ancient *Latin* word *"respectus"*, which is the combination of the prefix *"re"* meaning *"back"* or to *"redo"*, and the *Latin* word *"specere"* meaning *"to look at"*.

This means that over time you "look back at" the actions of someone and make a judgement, and if their actions are just, you can give your respect to them.

When you meet someone for the first time, you give them *consideration* whether or not to give your respect, making you *"considerate"*.

Once your *judgement* has been reached, and you find the person to have good qualities, you may then give your *respect* in a feeling of admiration, or in honour of their achievement.

Respect must be earned over time, and **not** just given away.

## **Employee**

The word *employee* has its roots in the *Latin* word *implicare*, which became *implicari*, meaning "to be involved in" or "attached to".

Over time, the *Latin* word evolved into the middle English word *"imploy"*, from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century, and meant *"enfold"*, *"entangle"*, *"to entwine"* and *"imply"*, and is compared to the *Latin* word *implicare* or *"to implicate"*.

A person who is carrying out the action of, or offering *employment*, is offering you to be *implicated* with the *business* in hand, and would be called the *"employer"*.

If the offer is accepted, then you would be in the "state of being employed", making you the "employee".

Once *employed*, you can now be *deployed*, meaning "to make use of" or "to bring into effective action", just as troops or *infantry* would be.

Note: being *employed* does not mean you are entitled to payment, it just means you are *implicated*.

Therefore, if you accept "citizenship" or "civilian-ship", you are now implicated with a corporation, which can "deploy you", or "make use of you".

Meaning you have become a "taxable human resource" to the corporation.

### **Husband**

Although the common meaning behind the word *husband* since the year 1290 means *"married man"*, it holds its roots from an *Old Norse* and *Icelandic* word *"husbondi"* which meant *"householder"*, with the word *"bondi"* meaning *"a peasant who owned his house and land"*.

Note: being a *peasant* meant *clear title* to *any property* was forbidden, with *ownership* only allowed.

"Bondi" also meant bond, with the word "husbondi" being a combination of the word "house" and "bond", referring to a "serf" or "bonded slave" living in a house, also known as a "dweller".

Over time, the term "husbandry" referred to the "care of a household" or "shrewd use of resources", with women looking for a "man with resources" and, once found, would gain a "husband".

## **Ownership**

The concept of "ownership" has its origin in Ancient Rome, and although considered simple to understand, it is <u>not</u>, as it involves a similar concept of possession.

Someone can be in *possession* of an item but it may *not* belong to them, and therefore a *claim* can be made upon the item from the *rightful "owner"*.

This is where *ownership* comes from, which is the state of *"legal possession"* and possible *"control"* over the property.

Note: just because you **own** something does **not** necessarily mean you **control** it.

**Ownership** can involve multiple **rights**, with different **titles** being applied to a person with said right, such as:

- 1. Rightful owner.
- 2. Registered owner.
- 3. Legal owner.
- 4. Legal keeper.
- 5. Registered keeper.
- 6. User rights.
- 7. Legal title.
- 8. Controlling title.
- 9. Legal guardian.
- 10. Equitable title.

It is this lack of understanding regarding the word *ownership* that has entrapped so many people in bogus contracts.

To ensure "total ownership" you need to also make claim to all titles and rights, which is often referred to as Superior title or Allodial title.

<u>Note:</u> *Allodial title* comes from the Latin word *Allodium*, meaning having absolute authority, control and absolute right to the property, with no claim being possible from another.

#### **Real Estate**

**Real estate** is <u>not</u> property, but many people think it is and enter into contracts where they own **nothing**, using this **legal term**.

The word "real" comes from the Latin root word res, meaning "thing" or "significant", and from the Latin word rex, meaning "king", which became "reg", and then "regalis".

By late Middle English it had become regal, meaning "royal" or "real".

Estate has its origins based on the Latin word stare meaning "to stand", which became status, then from Old French "estat", which became "estate" from Middle English, meaning "state" or "condition".

Therefore, as historically all land was owned by kings, "real estate" means "land owned by the king".

**Real estate** became a **legal term** in the 1660's to identify a **royal grant** of **estate land**, meaning the **"king"** had **granted** one of his **"subjects"** the **use** of his land.

Not only did the king "own" the land, he also owned everything upon it and everything it produced, the "subject" just had use of it, and was taxed accordingly.

<u>Note:</u> the great fire of London was in 1666. Prior to the fire, original property deeds had *allodial title*, whereas *after* the fire, deeds were re-named *"real estate"*.

In 1670-era London, the legal term "realty" came from "real estate" and is still used to this day, meaning if you buy "real estate" from a "realtor" or "estate" agent, you have only bought the title to use it, you do not own it.

<u>Note:</u> the acronym **LOT** means, "lease of title". Therefore, if you purchased a **LOT**, you do <u>not</u> have **allodial title** of the land or property, just **lease** of a **jurisdiction** placed upon it.

The word *lot* comes from the French word *"allotement"*, which is from *Old French* word *"aloter"* meaning to *"divide by lots"*, and then portioned or *assigned* for *use*.

This deception occurs as most people believe they are *conducting trade*, when in fact they are *acting within commerce*.

It begins with *physical land*, which is quickly switched into a "paper" version of the *land* through a *survey*, which means to "examine" or "to see".

This *survey* or *jurisdiction* is then placed within a *corporation*, and then an *"interest"* in the *survey* is offered for sale to unsuspecting customers.

Interests are sold as the corporation subdivides the survey into lot numbers; with those who purchased an "interest" only holding the lowest title to the survey, with others having a higher claim.

Just because you **own** something, doesn't mean you **own** it.