

## Why PARSE is Another Fraud



By Anna Von Reitz

I could explain it in mathematical terms, but most people are not mathematicians and it would be as useful as speaking Greek to my Labrador Retriever. Everyone would cock their heads, look polite and concerned, then go chase more rabbits. So, let's discuss this in terms everyone can understand.

All languages on Earth --- Swahili, English, Ancient Hebrew --- all our various languages ancient and modern use just three (3) operations to produce the infinite possibilities of grammar.

This underlying simplicity makes it possible to test the grammatical construction of all languages in exactly the same way.

It also means that if PARSE is true for English, it must be true for all other languages worldwide. It must be as applicable to Chinese and Ancient Hittite as modern English, so that forms the means to check our work. We "do the problem" in English and then we do it in Chinese. All results should tally.

All grammar and all variations of grammar are the product of three (3) operations:

1. We add words: "You say so." becomes "Did you say so?"
2. We change the form of words: "I eat beef on Sundays." becomes "I ate beef on Sundays."
3. We change the order of words: "This is sweet!" becomes "Is this sweet?"

In addition to the three operations, there is punctuation, which is not really grammar but notation. Similar to notation in mathematics, punctuation tells us how to order and group and value words.

In evaluating PARSE the first thing you notice is that everything is in capital letters. Capital letters is the form of Ancient Latin and also the form of DOG LATIN, which has been used for centuries as a means to defraud and enslave mankind. (See "The Justinian Deception" and the work of the Australian, Romley Stewart, on this subject.)

Also bear in mind throughout this discussion: Latin is not the official language of The United States of America, and it hardly matters if it's Ancient Latin, Church Latin, Dog Latin, Pig Latin, or a mish-mash of all four, which on the surface of it, is what PARSE appears to be.

The next thing you notice is that PARSE follows conventions of both Ancient Latin and Dog Latin in its use or failure to use hyphens between words.

In Ancient Latin, a space is the equivalent of a period so that the name ANNA MARIA RIEZINGER written without hyphens reduces to ANNA(.) MARIA(.) RIEZINGER(.) ---that is, it is as if we were talking about three different entities, and it renders the "Dog Latin" name "ANNA MARIA RIEZINGER" as gibberish.

"Gibberish" is one of Russell-J:Gould's favorite words, but in fact, he is rendering language that is perfectly intelligible English into "gibberish" by applying foreign language conventions to English.

This is a fundamentally deceitful act that changes the meaning of an English text while appearing to still be written in English---when it is actually a bastardized combination: English written in the form of Latin.

Russell and his friend, David-Wynn, attempted to explain this away by calling it "PARSE SYNTAXING" as if this mixing of Latin and English were some legitimate normal function of linguistics, when it's not.

Thus, when Russell talks about being "correct" he is certainly not talking about any form of correct English or correct Latin, either. He is talking about his own peculiar copy-righted Vatican-approved hybridization of both languages, which functions according to rules of punctuation and grammar that he made up himself the same way an inventor may patent a widget. And like an inventor claiming the excellence of his new product design, Russell preaches the supposed advantages of PARSE.

When you get a bit deeper into analyzing PARSE, you find a virtual phobia being applied against five out of eight parts of English speech:

(1) pronouns, (2) indefinite articles, (3) adverbs, (4) adverb-verb combinations and (5) adjectives.

If Russell has his way we will be reduced to talking like Tarzan and thinking like Tarzan, too. Why not just gesture and grunt and shuffle off into the bushes?

The argument against these parts of speech (which is not grammar, but which both Russell and David-Wynn describe as grammar) is the idea that they introduce elements of vagueness and opinion into communications. This is hardly a new complaint.

English developed a complete set of descriptive pronouns in every grammatical case to answer the pronoun problem of which "he", "she", "it" or "they" we are talking about, but it is still necessary to read and write carefully to avoid confusion. The alternative is to spell out every name, every time, in every sentence:

"Ann took Ann's seat and handed Ann's homework to Ann's teacher and Ann told Ann's teacher that Ann was sorry that Ann's homework was late."

This approach presumes that we are not intelligent enough or honest enough to figure out the context and apply the correct interpretation to pronouns and must instead have everything literally spelled out for us. That is, it is an attempt to correct a character defect (dishonesty) or mental incapacity by using only Proper Nouns.

It's arguable, but if a man wishes to be dishonest, he will be dishonest, and if we lack the mental capacity to use pronouns we should not be entering into contractual agreements, should we?

The phobia against indefinite articles is similar. Do you really want to give up the ability to talk in theoretical terms about "a herd of cows"? Or less-than-exact amounts, such as "a pinch of salt"?

Not everything is exact and specific in life and we should not limit our imaginations-- or our language--- in an effort to pretend otherwise. Russell likes to bang on about "correctness" but correctness is dependent on truth, and the truth is that somewhere "a herd of cows" exists and there is an amount of salt pinched between my fingers. Go figure.

The rant against adverbs, adverb-verb combinations, and adjectives are all related to the idea that these parts of speech introduce elements of opinion and vagueness and possible confusion into our communications. It's easy to see why:

"He was running slowly toward the bridge." invites us to ask --- who is "he"? and what does "running slowly" mean? How slowly? Can you run and still be slow about it? What bridge? Which bridge? At what point in the past?

Someone or something (possibly a horse or dog or...?) of the male gender was running in the direction of a bridge at some point in the past and that is about all we can say about that. We have to add and change and rearrange words --- all three operations of grammar --- to get a more specific result:

"Sunday afternoon Tom Chambers jogged up the hill to the Catahooli Bridge near Memphis, Tennessee."

This version of the same basic information still doesn't nail down specific time or date. We could add those details and a couple prepositional phrases to further clarify our whole message:

"On Sunday, October 2, 1988, at three o'clock in the afternoon, Thomas Chambers jogged up the hill on the eastern side of the Catahooli Bridge near Memphis, Tennessee."

This version of the same basic information doesn't tell us which "Thomas Chambers" ..... so, we go back to the drawing board in search of exactitude:

"On Sunday, October 2, 1988, at three o'clock in the afternoon, Thomas Chambers, an unemployed blacksmith born and raised in Lowery Gap, Kentucky, jogged up the hill on the eastern side of the Catahooli Bridge near Memphis, Tennessee."

We now have a much more complete and precise description of who, what, when, where --- but still no why, which is another detail we can add to complete the whole picture:

"On Sunday, October 2, 1988, at three o'clock in the afternoon, Thomas Chambers, an unemployed blacksmith born and raised in Lowery Gap, Kentucky, jogged up the hill on the eastern side of the Catahooli Bridge near Memphis, Tennessee, to take in the view."

What do we notice about this process of grammatical changes -- adding words, changing words, and rearranging words?

First, there are a lot more words to answer a lot more questions. Second, this process requires many prepositional phrases.... on Sunday.... at three....in Lowery....up the.... on the... near Memphis.... to take in the view. Third, the information being conveyed is much more specific. Fourth, a change from the more complex "was running slowly" to "jogged" side-stepped the issue of "how slowly" was he running and centered attention on the fact that he was moving faster than walking, but not sprinting.

This is all very good. What else do we notice?

If we have the information and if we are willing to share the information, we can use our language just as well or better than PARSE to communicate to anyone else.

These two conditions: (1) having the information and (2) being willing to share it, are what mathematicians call "necessary limits".

If you don't have the information you can't share it via any language or grammar.

Imagine the very first sentence in a specific context -- "He was running slowly toward the bridge." -- being spoken by an eye-witness to an accident in which a jogger was struck and killed by a drunk driver veering onto the shoulder of the road.

The Witness doesn't have all the information to fill in all the blanks, so the communication isn't dishonest nor is it incorrect.

The second condition being willing to share the information is again a matter of honesty.

Suppose that the Witness knew the victim, but for reasons of their own, chose not to reveal that to the police investigating the accident.

That's the other necessary limitation of honest communication.

Both of these necessary limitations apply to PARSE just as they apply to Latin and English.

Finally, every word in a mathematically interfaced system of language is a unique alpha-numeric operator. PARSE obligates you to ignore that fact and pretend that "cucumber" and "pickle" are equivalents and also ignore the fact that "aqua" and "Turquoise" are not the same thing.

When you have more than one word describing the same or even multiple things that may or may not be associated there is no such absolute mathematical truth involved.

"Please peel the cucumbers." and "Please weed the cucumbers" aren't in the same ballpark, as one refers to the fruits and the other to the vines, and neither one implies anything about "pickles".

"Turquoise" may describe a range of blue-green colors (including "aqua") or a stone.

You can do the same test in any language on Earth and get the same negative results. PARSE does not and cannot address these factors much less reduce them to any absolute meaning.

At the end of the day it all still comes down to the "necessary limitations" -- how much information you have and how much information you are willing to share. These limitations are the "Prime Operators" in any communication system, and the grammar used --- as we have just demonstrated --- is then secondarily deployed according to one of the three operations: adding to, changing, or re-ordering of words, orchestrated by a common and agreed-upon system of punctuation. So there is no actual benefit to PARSE and no basis for the claim of a valid mathematical interface. Even the symbol logos is flawed. There is no provision for double letters, no provision for letter conversions like "w" versus "v" and "v" or "j" for "i" and we could go on.

Suffice it to say that PARSE is just another attempt to baffle and bamboozle with arcane fakery being offered to us on the part of the Municipal Government(s) administered by the Vatican and a con game by men who are either (1) shysters or (2) who have been co-opted in ignorance or (3) are being blackmailed to act as front men.

There are two real dangers to PARSE.

The first is that when you go into a court and start presenting Russell's language to the Judge you identify yourself as belonging to Russell's corporation, which is a Municipal Corporation of the old French-Belgian-Swiss UN CORP Cabal and the UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION which is also affiliated with them, so all you have accomplished by adopting PARSE is to move to a different pen in the same feedlot as you have been in since 1946. It's just not operating under the name UNITED STATES anymore.

This sad outcome may not be what Russell intends, but that is what the practical bottom line of it is. He may think he has escaped and formed a whole new world construct, but in fact, the same old webmasters own him and own his inventions, his patents, his copyrights and everything else.

The second danger of PARSE is even more insidious.

Those of you who have studied government and history for any length of time have become aware of the fact that "Federal Code" is literally written in code, so that only members of the government corporations, their employees, and their subcontractors know what the lingo actually means.

For example, in Federal-ese, the word "person" means "corporation". And we are all considered "non-resident aliens" for the purposes of the Tax Code.

It's all like Buck Rodgers and his famous Decoder Ring.

As PARSE is a made-up language copyrighted by Russell-J:Gould he gets to encode whatever meaning he wants to encode, and change the meaning of words and punctuation to suit himself. Not only that, PARSE is so obtuse and complex and picky as to be: (1) unintelligible and (2) difficult to write.

All this expands the ability of the Vermin to make things say whatever they want them to say, based on an extra space between words, or the use of a semi-colon instead of a full colon, or an accent mark or a hyphen. It becomes the "Ultimate Code" and its purpose is not to clarify, but to hide the meaning of things except to the acolytes---- the members of the Bar Associations and the Vatican Municipal Government network.

If you thought "Legal-ese" was nasty and difficult to deal with, just adopt PARSE instead.

This is one old Grandma who has been up the hill, down the valley, and up the other side, and I am not going back again. I've been victimized by these fakirs for most of my life, but I haven't been deceived. And that is where the sticking point is.

In order for the Vermin to get away with their crimes under Roman Civil Law, which is commercial law, they have to be able to claim that their victims allowed themselves to be deceived.

And that ain't happening.

-----

See this article and over 1400 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.