

Beyond “Wah”

One is born ignorant of laws of deception and thievery. However, one is born with the capability of asking for need by crying “Wah”. Over time, there are those that succumbed to desire for want outweighs need. For crying out loud, laws were not written to protect unlawful wanton desire but to preserve justice and protect the innocent. Lest not forget, there are those that prevent the cry, some good and some evil. Evil’s judgment rendered upon them sows a path to the bowels of hell and no mercy will be available, not even by the prayers of the forgotten needy.

If wanton desire were obtained without thievery, then the laws of justice should serve to that wanton desire. Where wanton desire was obtained by deception committed by another, there is no innocence and the law must favor the truth, but evil does not want to be a factor in truth. In applying centuries old art of war, evil assigns blame so that innocent battles innocent and evil call this prosperity of war.

Professor Bob Lawless has posted an article regarding statutes which can be found at:

<http://www.creditslips.org/creditslips/2012/08/except-as-provided-in-the-syllabus-students-shall-read-the-statutory-section-i-before-coming-to-clas.html>.

Uniform Commercial Code Article 9 provides the law for the methods and means that a Security Interest attaches and perfects to Article 9 defined collateral as security measure to collect payment for an Article

9 Secured Note (transferable record). The word “Mortgage” does not only apply to Article 9 instruments but to instruments governed by other statutory law. The Article 9 deception is to have the Article 9 definition of Mortgage appear as it applies to all other forms of Mortgages, such as a Security Instrument applicable to real property which is point blank excluded by Article 9.

Where one attempt to apply only Article 9 law to a Security Instrument and discounts all other applicable law, it appears that a party that claims to be a beneficiary of the Security Instrument could be such, except, the claim of beneficiary could only apply to the Security Interest in the Security Instrument portion of an Article 9 instrument. In short, however unlawfully likely, two beneficiaries could exist at the same time, beneficiary of the real property instrument and beneficiary of the Article 9 instrument.

Where one argues only one instrument definition, all appears to be legal. Were one to argue both instrument definitions in tandem, legality would come into question.

This writer is concerned with lay people that have a belief that a limited study period will result in successfully explaining the depth of the deception.

It is not the law or the government which is at fault, it those individual within that have placed wanton desire before the need.

Vote Wisely