

Falsus in Uno, Falsus in Omnibus

“FRAUDULENT ACTS”

by Joseph DeMaio, ©2015



(Dec. 10, 2015) — “Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.” “False in one thing, false in all things.” If ever there were a Latin legal term more precisely and accurately describing the persona and character of Hillary Rodham Clinton, it is yet to have been invented. She is a liar, and a pathological one at that, incapable of discerning truth from falsehood, and insouciant as to any distinction. Oh, yeah... and she wants you to elect her as your president. Seriously?

Her most recent lie involves the prevarication that she never told the surviving families of the brave Americans who were killed in the Benghazi attack that the cause was “[that vile video](#).” Adding insult to injury, she had the temerity to lie to the families at the very same time that their loved ones’ bodies were being taken off the Air Force C-17 that brought them back from Libya. Kate Quigley, the sister of Glen Doherty, who was left to die in the attack while Clinton and her sidekick – the Jerk at 1600 – fiddled somewhere in Washington, slams Clinton as being “untruthful,” adding that she has “very little respect for her.”

Kate Quigley is too classy and kind: the real question is why anyone would have any respect AT ALL for a liar who may have facilitated the deaths of four Americans that night. The better terms would be contempt and revulsion, at least for anyone with half a brain... which of course eliminates most Democrats and all folks with “feel the Bern” bumper stickers on their cars.

But returning to Latin legal maxims, the term *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus* means, in plain English, that if someone is caught in a lie once, then everything else said by the liar, before or after the lie, is also deemed to be a lie. The equivalent term these days is “serial liar.”

Interestingly, the term has been used by the U.S. Supreme Court on various occasions to label particularly egregious lies as not only evil, but sinister as well. By way of but one example, *United States v. Castillero*, 67 U.S. 17 (1862) was a case involving competing claims to a cinnabar mine in California and disputed documentation relating thereto. The U.S. Supreme Court articulated in its opinion some truly prescient language having great relevance these days. If one can get past the indignant tone and sprinkling of additional Latin terms in the Court's opinion, its verbiage is timely and eerily applicable not only to Clinton, but to the usurper-in-chief as well. In examining a variety of forged letters and deeds purporting to convey title to the mining lands there at issue, the Court offered the following, 67 U.S. at 128-129:

***“The legal and just weight to which these fraudulent acts of the claimants are entitled, would make them decisive against a far better case than they have made out. The odium spoliatoris [hated destroyer] is always a perfectly fair element in the judgment of a Court. He who spoils the evidence or perverts the means of ascertaining the truth, or otherwise poisons the stream of justice, especially if he does so by putting false papers into the case ceases to stand on the same level with honest suitors. Common sense applied to common affairs follows the same rule; a knave once detected in trying to cheat you is never trusted again.*”**

***“It is a maxim of the common law, as it was of the Roman law, and a rule of logic which all experience proves to be sound, that *qui semel est malus, semper presumitur esse malus in eodem genere.* When, therefore, a fraud is discovered in one paper, all other papers produced by the same party are presumed to be fraudulent. “This presumption is not slight or easily repelled. OMNIA presuntur contra spoliatores—ALL things are to be presumed against the spoiler—and we have a right to invoke the natural indignation and anger which an honest man feels against those who commit these base and mischievous crimes; for this presumption is made ‘in ODIUM spoliatoris’—in hatred of the spoiler. We have not overstated the rule. Every text book on the law of evidence will bear us out. We may refer especially to Best on Presumptions, and the cases there cited.*”**

***“But the portraits of these parties are painted by themselves, and the picture they have drawn is a part of the record. The letters they have written to one another describe their moral character, and show that they were actually engaged for a long time in using their best efforts to get false and fraudulent titles fabricated for the mine and lands in dispute.*”**

***“When it is once ascertained that a witness is capable of committing perjury, all he swears to is rejected as false. In reason and in law the rule is the same when a party is found to be capable of forgery: the papers not known to be fabricated must share the fate of those which are proved to be spurious; for everything is corrupt that comes from a corrupted source. Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.”* (Emphasis added)**

Stated otherwise, Clinton is a liar and the usurper-in-chief is an odium spoliator. The real question remains whether the truth about Benghazi will ever come out. With any luck, Trey Gowdy's [Select Committee on Benghazi](#) will make some progress. Indeed, the committee now has a large volume of Clinton's supposedly “deleted” e-mails.

Who knows, there may be additional information in them relating to the persistent rumor that Ambassador Stevens was a pawn in a botched kidnapping plot to exchange him for “blind sheik” Omar Abdel-Rahman just before the November 2012 general election, as discussed [here](#) and [here](#).

If such e-mails do exist, and either Clinton or the usurper are implicated, the entire dynamic and trajectory of the Nation will change, and hopefully for the better. On the other hand, the usurper will likely avoid impeachment, although prosecution under a new administration is another matter. And if prosecution does seem likely, as a parting gesture of contempt for the Nation, he will likely pardon himself, along with the blind sheik, Bowe Bergdahl and, of course, Clinton.

Clinton, after losing the election, will of course claim that any e-mails implicating her in a Benghazi kidnap plot are either (a) old news, Tea Party/right wing conspiracy fodder; (b) irrelevant because, after her pardon, “at this point in time, what difference does it make?” or (c) the e-mails are forgeries.

Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.