

On the State II

When one party is accusing another party of wrongdoing, for who should the benefit of the doubt be afforded? I'd say, the weaker party. Why? One reason: the stronger party holds more power. An example: the state is the most powerful party in any accusation. It has the power to destroy lives, families, and entire communities at will. Should we ever afford such a powerful entity the benefit of the doubt? Should we ever not doubt the claims of an institution that has destroyed whole currencies, privileged the rich over the poor and men over women, held slaves and serfs in bondage, and invaded, occupied, bombed, cooked, and bullied hundreds of millions of people innocent of any crime? Please. And that's today's two cents.

Skyler.