

What the Response to the Challenge of Jurisdiction Should Tell You

Challenging jurisdiction is a very effective way to reveal the emptiness of the claims made by law enforcement, prosecutors, bureaucrats, and politicians.

These folks exist, supposedly, to protect us from predators and to lead us forward toward our collective destiny of equality and prosperity for all.

That's the constant message we receive throughout our lives, anyway. And it's complete horseshit.

When any of these people are challenged on the authority they claim to wield in order to protect and lead us, they fall flat.

See for yourself care of Marc Stevens' "call of shame" archive at his website.

They fall flat because their claim is utterly unsupported by hard, factual evidence. If their claim is so right and true, what's the problem? Shouldn't it be a simple thing to produce the evidence from which their claim, that their laws apply, derives?

You'd think so, but it's not. Quite the opposite. It's impossible.

And because of the impossibility of proving jurisdiction, these folks resort to the only tactic they can: deceit.

If someone can't support their claims of a positive obligation with evidence, continuing to make them means that they are dishonest.

If that same someone is willing to use violence to enforce such a claim, despite their emptiness, they are a predator.

This is how every law enforcement officer, prosecutor, bureaucrat, and politician who's willing to enforce their non-existent jurisdiction behaves, or they wouldn't be doing what they do on a daily basis.

That's what the response to the challenge of jurisdiction should tell you about our supposed protectors and leaders.