

# Debunking Common Government Claims

It's very rare to have parking bureaucrats respond to our defense with anything other than a curt, "DENIED". So when I got the following from a friend I was really surprised. Not surprised at the content, just because there was a detailed response at all. Since it's full of fallacies, and short of evidence, I thought it worthwhile to debunk. Keep in mind it doesn't matter that this is from a parking agency bureaucrat, their arguments are the same as we've seen with critics and politicians of all stripes.



This is supposed to be a response to the question, **What evidence do you rely on proving your constitution applies to me just because I'm physically in California?** Let's take this apart.

*Your implied or if you prefer tacit consent to the authority established by local, state and federal governments shows me that the constitution of California and the United States of America applies to you.*

Constitutions are just written instruments, they are not magical, they do not come from Zeus or Odin. Here the parking bureaucrat is assuming without a single supporting fact that two written instruments apply because a victim ostensibly consented. This is another example of proof by assertion and begging the question. In court you could say: "Objection, assumes facts not in evidence, argumentative." You can also object on grounds that it's speculation.

As we'll show below, support is compulsory, there is no rational opposition to this, "taxation" is compulsory. The claim there is consent is just wrong.

*Have you paid any local taxes, all types of sale taxes, state/federal income taxes, excise taxes, paid to get your driver's license, marriage license, personal or real property taxes, license a pet, drive on state or federal highways, buy a firearm in California (permit, background check), call the fire or police department for help, use a county service or hospital, get a fishing license, hunting license, register your vehicles with the state? Have you benefited from the County's Vector Control, from the city's Sewer Service, Sanitation Service or Waterworks?*

Taxes, Lysander Spooner already addressed this silly claim, I highly recommend reading his *No Treason: The Constitution of No Authority* if you are unfamiliar. Taxation is a euphemism for forcing strangers to give you money. It is robbery, it's the taking of money/property under threat of jail. That is not consent no matter how many times you repeat your claim.

You'll notice the bureaucrat makes no attempt at showing exactly how/why being forced to pay under threat of jail proves two written instruments apply to someone. Bureaucrats don't like discussing what their constitutions are, it tends to take the magical quality away.

The roads; the statist equivalent to a meat eater saying: "But bacon" when confronted with the futility of their position. How were the roads built? By money taken under threat of jail. How does using the roads then prove two written instruments apply to me today? The bureaucrat makes no attempt to connect the two, probably because forcing people to pay you does not create obligations on them.

All of the "benefits" are provided by the money of the victims. The victims are terrorized into compliance with perceived "authorities." Because of their compliance, the abusers (authorities) get tremendous amounts of money/property. In California, the criminals called "government" stole \$158 billion from their victims in 2015 (I don't think this includes the money/property stolen by "forfeiture"). This stolen money is then used to provide "benefits" to their victims.

Providing such benefits, as I wrote about in *Government: Indicted*, is a form of psychological manipulation. Evidence a written instrument from a hundred years ago applies to you just because you're physically in California? Have you ever used the roads? Ever call our firemen? That is just a guilt trip, it's not proof their written instrument applies because we're physically in California.

*Abusers, of course, don't see these gifts as tools for manipulation. They genuinely think they're being generous and don't expect anything back. But then when we resist their demands later on, they may complain about ingratitude, either directly to us or to others who*

*pass the message onto us. The guilt that comes from this is hard to resist because we've been taught that the giver of a gift deserves to be honored, so we may grudgingly find ourselves falling for the manipulation, unable to stop the gifts and thus the feeling of obligation to show "gratitude" by giving into their demands at other times. source*

Think of an abusive spouse, as he's beating the hell out of his wife is screaming about how he works, provides a good home, car etc., and how she *made him* get upset and brutalize her. Blame the victim, then further manipulate them into actually feeling guilty. There's a reason we talk about Stockholm Syndrome and Battered Citizens Syndrome.

You can see this played out constantly when someone is brutalized by people called "police". The sycophants in and out of the media always commenting it's the victim's fault, they just should have complied.

Exactly how does calling the police or firemen prove the a written instrument from a hundred years ago applies to me?

*Crook 1: Seems to me we have no evidence our written instrument applies to anyone and creates obligations. What should we do?*

*Crook 2. Good question. First we'll steal lots of money from them, threaten to put them in our jails if they don't pay us. We'll take that money and hire more men with guns who will answer their distress calls. Then, when they call, BAM! Our written instrument will apply.*

*Crook 1: Oh, so when they call our guys, that negates the aggression and coercion we used to get the money to pay our guys. That's brilliant. And the guilt trip we can throw down on them will keep them from complaining.*

I think this shows the faulty logic and psychological manipulation being used by bureaucrats. But wait, there's more of this manipulation:

*Have you ever attended a local, state or federal funded celebration event, parade or*

*fireworks show? Ever visit a city/county/state/federal park? Did you go to a state school(s)? Do your kids go to a state school or even home schooled... there are rules/laws that must be followed? Do you enjoy the protection of the US Military and National Guard from foreign invaders?*

Do you park your vehicles in a Red Curb, No Parking Area, block a Fire Hydrant whenever you want to, run stop signs whether safe or not, do you stop at Red Lights even when it would be safe to run it, travel at whatever speed you believe is safe, pass cars by going over the double-double yellow lines even when safe? Do you have a passport?

This is mostly more of the same non-sequiturs as above. How does forcing people to send their children to political schools prove the constitution applies to them just because they're physically in California? It doesn't, it presupposes the constitution applied in the first place.

Traveling in a safe manner is from self interest and empathy; it's not evidence a written instrument from over one-hundred years ago applies to us just because we're physically in California. Political "laws" that are not redundant to our basic principles of right and wrong, are only complied with out of fear of going to jail or being killed in the process. Our parking bureaucrat seems to forget compliance to political mala prohibita laws is compulsory, there is a prison system in place.

How does having a passport prove the California Constitution applies to someone just because they're physically in California? This is another non-sequitur and no less so when in regards to the US Constitution.

Traveling outside the geographic United States is not permitted without permission. The men and women forcing us to pay them do not permit us to travel freely. If we want or need to travel, we may not do so freely without risking our lives. Passports are compulsory.

If having a passport is proof the constitution applies, then without the passport the constitution doesn't apply. Think the bureaucrats will admit that? I personally don't have a passport, they're not going to care as their claim of jurisdiction is based on physical location, not political status or passports. Also, the parking bureaucrat doesn't even know if his victim has one.

Forcing people to pay you doesn't make written instruments apply and create obligations on them. Forcing them to also get permission to freely travel doesn't make the written instrument apply *retroactively* to someone either.

*There is of course much more, however, if you have not yet come to the conclusion that you may have given your consent to be under the authority of the local, state and federal*

*governments and laws that are established I am positive more will not help.*

If someone does not consent to the established legal authority of their physical location, that circumstance does not stop the authority from exercising its' authority over the people in their location through the means that it has available.

There is no evidence of consent, the coerced support contradicts the claim. There is no "may have consented" as support is coerced, pay or go to jail.

Those "means available" are threats, duress, coercion, a force continuum and a prison system. This is all that is meant by the PR phrase "established legal authority of their physical location..." Men with guns who force everyone in that physical location to pay them under the guise of being a "government." Again, how does the "means available" i.e., coercion/prison, prove a written instruments apply and create obligations just because I'm physically in California?

*If you do not agree with a law/code written by the authority, get the law/code changed, but to deny or argue the authority does not have jurisdiction over your vehicle and because you registered that vehicle with the state and obligated yourself to following the established laws of city, county and state makes for a very poor argument in my opinion.*

This is a common straw-man. My position is not that I disagree with a law written by the "authority", I disagree there is evidence it applies to me or anyone else just because of our physical location.




The vehicle registration is compulsory, it's not proof the magical written instrument applied in the first place. It's only proof someone would rather comply than die on the streets at the hands of men and women who demand compliance or they go up the force continuum until they get it.

*Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Hobbs, Locke, Montesquieu, Hayek, Hume, Raz, Wolff and you have all struggled with what it all means... Do we have an obligation to obey the laws established by legal authorities?*

There's no evidence these written instruments apply to anyone and create obligations just because of physical location. That is clear and even critics defend this claiming evidence is

not required. They are somehow different than us regular people, their magical rules apply because they say so, no evidence needed. And why aren't they required to have evidence? Because they said so, *vox et praeterea nihil*.

But the question is easy to answer: No. **There is no obligation to obey rules created by men and women forcing us to pay them.** Because forcing people to pay you makes you a criminal. Rules created by criminals don't magically apply to people just because the criminals create another ruling saying they do.



And no, the "people" did not consent, you pay or you go to jail. There is no rational argument that basic principles of right and wrong do not applying to people called "government" or so-called "legal authorities". There's just a fallacious double-standard used to justify these criminals. And it's a logical fallacy no matter how much you ignore the evidence and logic presented. Asking who will build the roads does not magically take away the double-standard and change the facts.

And I'm not arguing from a lack of evidence either. It's not because politicians cannot provide evidence, it's because the evidence disproving their claims is the coerced support. Just because even a Chief Justice of a Supreme Court cannot prove his laws apply is not my argument why the laws don't apply. It's the pay or go to jail support, that's why. Because it's a double standard to claim basic principles of right and wrong don't apply if you call yourself a government.

That debunks another bureaucrat and these common fallacious justifications for the criminals called "government." You should be able to recognize these fallacious claims and know how to respond to them. But as always, if you disagree with my analysis, if you think I have the facts wrong, there are now two live broadcasts of the **No State Project** where you can confront me in real time to discuss the matter. Please feel free to call in, and you can contact me in advance so I can make sure we can get you on the show first.