

I'm not a secrecy jurisdiction - but you are

Published: January 13, 2026, 7:16 am

[Paul Sagar says:](#)

[W]henver a territory is accused of being a secrecy jurisdiction, the response is always outraged denial. Clearly it's understood that being a secrecy jurisdiction is nothing to be proud of. No matter whether the accusation comes from the [Tax Justice Network](#), the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) or the [President of the United States](#), denial is the default and automatic response.

So here's a novel idea. How about the territories repeatedly fingered as secrecy jurisdictions come up with their *own* definition of what a secrecy jurisdiction is — and why they are not one.

But there's a catch.

The definition has to allow for two things. Firstly, the jurisdiction in question has to be able to explain why it is *not* a secrecy jurisdiction, under its own definition. Secondly, the definition has to simultaneously be able to finger *other* territories as secrecy jurisdictions.

Read the rest. His logic is impeccable.

But will they rise to the challenge? Or to put it another way - is there someone with Paul's intellect out there willing to argue against him? I doubt it.