

Rogue Sabre --- Truth and Lies, Land and Sea



By Anna Von Reitz

In our present condition it is impossible for us to know the whole truth about anything. That's why nobody should ever take the oath to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth". We can't know the whole truth, so we can't speak the whole truth, either.

And if we can't speak it, forget writing it down.

Truth is absolute in that there is a total truth that is factual, and yet, the best we can do is subjectively experience it. No two people see the truth exactly the same way, because we see it through our own unique lens of life and being.

At best, as more honest people experience the truth and share what they perceive, we can hope to get a closer approximation of it and a more informed opinion about it.

Our ancestors fully realized that all names are fictional.

There is a woman we call "Anna", but "Anna" is not the woman. You could just as well call the same woman "Emily" or "Ruth". There is a piece of land called "Bavaria" but you could just as well call it "Schwarzwaldeland".

This is the eternal truth behind the famous line, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." It turns out that it really doesn't matter what you call me, as long as it's not Late for Supper.

This circumstantial dilemma of being compelled to represent actual fact--- a woman or a piece of land or a tree--- with a fictional name--- is a real pain in the logic sensors. And, as it turns out, it opens up endless conflicts and opportunities for fraud and graft.

Names are intrinsically imprecise and arbitrary and dishonest. At some level, we all know that, but we continue to use names because we need a means to identify and categorize things in the world around us.

We couldn't communicate about anything outside our immediate surroundings otherwise. It would be impossible to reference "Bob Johnston in Baltimore" or talk about something that happened "the day before yesterday" much less project our thoughts into the future.

It would not be possible for me to convey the thought of a "cedar tree draped in snow" to you, except that we both accept a name for "cedar tree" and "snow" and have a common concept of what it means to "drape" something.

Are misunderstandings possible with such a system? They are unavoidable.

What if "cedar tree" in my language means "maple sugar" in yours?

What if I am talking about "Baltimore, Maryland" and you are talking about "Baltimore, Oregon"?

To improve upon this situation somewhat our ancestors took up the practice of using what are called "descriptive names" or "Lawful names" as opposed to "Legal names".

Instead of using a simple fiction like "Anna Maria Riezinger" to stand for me and my immediate patrilineal ancestors, you might say, "Anna Maria, the daughter of Emmett and LaVera, of the House Riezinger, born in the town of Black River Falls, in Adams Township, in Jackson County, in Wisconsin, one of the United States of America, in the white two-story farmhouse standing on the north side of the confluence of Levis Creek and the Black River, two minutes before midnight on the 6th of June in the Anno Domini year of 1956.

With each tidbit of descriptive information you hone in closer to the target, making it less and less likely that this "Anna Maria Riezinger" could be mistaken for any other "Anna Maria Riezinger", but this is also very cumbersome and still imperfect.

There are 72 names of God in the Bible, each one describing a different attribute of our Father, and it still does not come close.

So we are imperfect beings with imperfect means.

We should probably just let it go with that, but we don't.

Instead, we pretend to be able to know things we can't know and do things we can't do.

This in turn gives rise to much of the false pride, conflict, and confusion in our world.

It doesn't matter if you call something "Unity States of the World" or "United States of America" or "Buckwheat Fields of Mars". It's all equally fictitious.

If you try to describe what you mean by these names by saying, "the forty-eight contiguous land jurisdiction states plus the land jurisdiction states of Alaska and Hawaii" or "the fifty-seven inchoate Territorial states" or "all the Buckwheat fields on the planet Mars" ---- it is only nominally better.

Now Russell-Jay:Gould and David-Wynn:Miller have noticed the mathematical fact that three is an uneven number and that our grammar is not correct. They have used this to overturn all sorts of contracts. I say, bully for them.

But then, they turn right around and try to make new contracts. They claim that if they just correct the grammar and get that right, the new contracts they make will be valid and their meaning will be certain.

Not so.

The discovery that all contracts are invalid is not new, and it's not just because of faulty grammar.

Show me someone who knows for sure where he is going to be and what financial condition he is going to be in thirty years from now and I will show you someone competent to sign a mortgage contract.

Poof! There went the whole mortgage and foreclosure machine right out the door.

There isn't a competent mortgage signatory on planet Earth, and we all have cause to know it.

Not only is our grammar fraudulent, we are incompetent to sign contracts, and whether we use legal names which are pure fiction or we use descriptions, we can't actually identify parties to contracts, either.

We don't even know where we are or what time it is. Literally.

Naming a street or giving a house a numbered address is just as gratuitous and arbitrary as naming a stuffed doll "Polly" or a dog "Fido". What makes this "2390 South Park Road" and not "1637 Birch Street"?

I'll tell you that in the local case, it's a middle-aged woman driving around in a cheap car arbitrarily assigning street names and addresses for a foreign corporation calling itself the Matanuska-Susitna Borough.

So what? It's my land and house. What if I want to call it "Spruce House 0606"?

Obviously, there is a misunderstanding about where I and my property are located, the name of the place, and the number associated with it.

Who gave the "Matanuska-Susitna Borough" (which is who and what exactly?) any right to locate, identify, or put a name or a number on my house and land parcel? I didn't. Did you?

Come to that, what kind of a map are they using? Old Mercator, New Mercator, GPS coordinates, Metes and Bounds or WTG or WTF?

You see, we don't know where we are, we just pretend to know according to some system we dream up based on this or that organizational scheme---- and then we write up contracts based on things we don't know and can't know and pretend for the sake of argument that this process results in "valid and binding contracts" that don't exist and can't exist by definition.

Then we always date these things and pretend that we know what time it is, too. Are you using the Hebrew calendar, the Gregorian calendar, the Julian calendar, the Universal Time calendar, or the Eskimo Dog Fur calendar?

I rest my case.

The fact is that our fundamental limitations render contracts of all kinds invalid. It's not just the grammar that is screw ball. It's the entire concept.

The sooner we realize this, the sooner we can put a lot of scam artists and people who make fat livings off this bull poop out of business. Lord hasten the day.

I applaud Russell-Jay:Gould and David-Wynn:Miller for being awake and trying to introduce some standard of sanity and logic, but they haven't followed the logic chain far enough.

Rewriting the original Constitution in Parse Syntax after registering it (and giving up ownership interest in Parse Syntax to whatever entity registered it) and then copyrighting Parse Syntax (exactly who or what is competent to grant a copyright?) and then claiming that you have now created a valid Constitution by translating the document using Parse Syntax grammar--- is silly.

It's wonderful, but it is silly.

Well-intentioned as it is, it is just another process of enclosure, not that much different from what the lawyers did back in 1868 by "adopting" the Constitution as the basis of their articles of incorporation for The United States of America, Inc. and then the United States of America, Inc. and then the United States, Inc. and then the United States of America E Pluribus Unum, Inc. and then E Pluribus Unum the United States of America, Inc. and.....ad infinitum.

We've been there and done that and don't need to go again.

Whatever the governmental services corporation holding up the federal side of the services agreement calls itself is immaterial. However it structures itself is immaterial. Whether it uses Parse Syntax or speaks in Swahili or uses Esperante is immaterial, too.

What matters is that it obeys its limitations and provides Good Faith service.

See this article and over 500 others on Anna's website here:www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.