

A Dialogue on Challenging Jurisdiction

Here's a simple dialogue showing how to challenge a predator's jurisdiction and applicability of their laws.

The setting is a person, Mike, charged with "speeding," in conversation with his prosecutor.

Prosecutor: You were traveling at a speed of 45mph in a 35mph zone.

Mike: So what?

Prosecutor: So, that's speeding, and its a violation of our traffic laws.

Mike: What do your traffic laws have to do with me?

Prosecutor: Traffic laws apply to you as much as any one else in this town.

Mike: How do you know your traffic laws apply to me?

Prosecutor: Because you were in this town when you were speeding.

Mike: What is the relevance of my physical location to your claim?

Prosecutor: If you're in this town, the laws apply to you.

Mike: How do you know the laws apply to me just because of my physical location?

Prosecutor: Because you're a human being!

Mike: Why does that matter?

Prosecutor: Because the law applies to human beings.

Mike: How do you know the laws apply to me just because I'm a human being?

Prosecutor: The laws apply to all human beings in this town.

Mike: You keep repeating this claim, but where is the evidence to prove this claim as true?

Prosecutor: The law says it applies to human beings in this town, and you are a human being in this town.

Mike: Are you saying that the only way you know the laws apply to me is because the laws say they apply to me as a human being physically located in this town?

Prosecutor: That's what the laws say!

Mike: Let me get this straight, you say that the laws apply to me because the law says it applies to all human beings located in this town, which means that you believe the law applies because the law says so. Is that right?

Prosecutor: Well, no. The courts have decided that the laws apply to you and everyone else in this town.

Mike: What do the courts have to do with me?

Prosecutor: The courts decide what is or is not valid law, laws that apply to everyone.

Mike: There you go repeating your claim, that the laws apply, a claim of which your only evidence of its veracity seems to be the law itself. Is that true?

Prosecutor: Well, no. That would be absurd. The law can't stand as proof of its own applicability. That's circular. Without laws, we would be living in unbearable anarchy, every man or woman for themselves. It would be chaos!

Mike: That may or may not be true, but what does that have to do with whether or not the law in question, the one that says it's a violation to drive faster than your posted speed limit, applies to me just because I'm a human being and physically located in this town?

Prosecutor: You don't understand. You're confused because you've been reading nonsense on the Internet. Following the advice of quacks could get you in a lot of trouble.

Mike: How so?

Prosecutor: They'll give you bad advice about not having to obey the law.

Mike: Why should I obey the law?

Prosecutor: Because if you don't you could get arrested and prosecuted and sent to jail.

Mike: Is that the only reason, that I should obey the law, or else!?

Prosecutor: There are other reasons, but that one seems primary. Test the government's limits why don't you, and see what happens.

Mike: Are you saying that the only basis for government and its laws is the threat of violence against non-conformists however peaceful they may be?

Prosecutor: Well, no, but... but... *argh* Just get out of my office. Your case is dropped.

Mike: I'd like that in writing, please.