

Laws for Simplicity

ir. Emile M. Hobo – 6 October 2021

E-mail: e.m.hobo@hotmail.nl

Abstract

A proposal for laws for simplicity of law and procedure with a short reference to the inspiration for them: the construction of computer networking models and an appalling encounter with law, morally unjust and lacking any empathy, in older books of law.

The Volume of the Law Alone Can Be Incomprehensible

Laws on laws, procedures on procedures... Desks pointing to desks pointing to yet other desks, quite frequently making sure you end up at the desk you started at without any resolve nor progress. This can never be the intent of democratically elected laws. As such I propose we construct laws for simplicity to keep the law short, simple, and comprehensible.

Laws, the way they are now, quite frequently aren't adhered to anymore. Instead of having a police force, we have "cops" obstructing justice. Instead of having judges with the proper mindset, educated in civics, arts, and sciences, we have people that feel you have to see, but that don't see, or worse, people that feel they determine what the law should be.

My aim is to make sure that all people, even those of limited but adequate mental abilities, will be able to say, "I get it! This makes sense!"

My background in terms of studies, unfortunately, was in university limited to computer science, but didn't bother to go into the actual science of it all. It did go into rules for efficiency. Some computer models were constructed with the researchers first developing rulesets or frameworks to introduce some amount of efficiency.

Essentially, I intend to make use of the progress made in the past within computer science to introduce rules for efficiency and clarity of law. On top of that, looking at some historical laws, I've also had to come to the conclusion that many laws were governed by the morals of men of limited views, aptitudes, and understanding.

We also need to have clear laws on what the law governs and doesn't govern. These should be included in the laws of efficiency as I propose them, as much as the laws should be written in such a way that they apply to all, rather than having the laws of the few forced on the many. It's time to make the law simple, also to adhere to...

Rules for Simplicity in Computer Networking

The most generic model of all network models that allows you to discuss any other networking model we have, is the Open System Interconnection Reference Model. This isn't a discussion of what this model is, this section merely references the construction of that model. The designers came up with a clear set of rules as referenced by Tanenbaum (2000):

1. Where a different level of abstraction is needed, a new layer has to be created.
2. Every layer must have a well-defined function.
3. The function of every layer must be chosen keeping in mind the definition of internationally standardized protocols.
4. The boundaries between each of the layers must be chosen thus that the amount of information that has to be transferred using interfaces is as small as possible.

5. The number of layers must be thus large that the different functions don't have to be put together in the same layer, and yet so small that the architecture doesn't become awkwardly big.

These are good rules, but written for computer networks and it will be part of my challenge to be fulfilled by the writing of this paper, otherwise it shan't be made public, to rewrite these rules as some of the laws for simplicity. To reduce the clutter further, the other rules should pertain to what law is for and what it isn't for.

False Morals, Empathy, and the Scope of Law

One of the laws that my country The Netherlands used to have, was that if a baby were to be born deceased it were to be considered as never having existed at all. It reduced a baby growing in the womb of a woman and all of the hormonal changes invoking feelings of motherhood and protection in a woman to nothing, which is even less than an ulcer.

This can't be what laws are about. Ask whether one believes that one should "Live and let live!" or that, "It's all in the game!" and it confronts the question of man versus dog. Who am I engaging with? Someone that feels and listens? Or someone that requires you to fall in line and feels in all cases when it didn't work out, life moves on, it wasn't meant to be?

Laws should be written to maintain a live and let live mentality. As long as you don't break those laws, you govern your own life and don't subject yourself to the system of law. If that's the intent, what does the law look at?

It should be clear that the law doesn't govern feelings, it only governs what we do, actions, but even then, what actions? For a man to have sex with another man clearly is an action, but the fact that they are of the same sex shouldn't be a part of the law. It should be a part of the law, and I do apologize, that if I'm 100% heterosexual, which I am, that I can say, "No."

What is the intent of the law?

To prevent damage from being done as much as possible. To limit damage done when it was done. To offer maximally available and necessary reconciliation. To further progress and development on a personal, social, and environmental level.

The law doesn't govern cost, but necessity, and in its scope should be minimal to maintain the attainability of necessary action by law.

My Proposal for Laws for Simplicity of Law and Procedure

Without further deliberation, I hereby set forth to illustrate the proposal as I mean to submit it. These are the laws I propose:

1. Laws and procedures should be written contextually such that they apply making clear the context within which these laws and procedures apply and what the law and procedures be when other contexts apply for each and every other context.
2. Laws (a) pertain to action on and threat to life and living, not to feeling, (i) to prevent damage or limit further damage when damage be done, (ii) to prevent, limit, or end suffering, and (iii) to sustain opportunity to progress and develop on a personal, social, and environmental level, (b) recognize individual contributions and needs and wants of life and (c) sustain life without damaging the lives of others whenever possible, (d) offering maximally proportional and available reconciliation to those to whom it should offered be.

3. A separate new procedure or category of law or law should be created only if it is not befitting respectively any procedure or category or law that has been created and it in itself hasn't been created before either.
4. Every procedure, category of law, and law has to have a well-defined scope.
5. Every procedure and category of law and more specifically their scope should be chosen (a) keeping in mind the general consensus of people with the highest degree of empathy, i.e. the ability to feel what and as others feel, (b) to sustain life and a living of those that can adhere to, but don't necessarily perceive, a live and let live mentality, possibly with some guidance during parts of their lives.
6. The boundaries of every procedure, category of law, and law must be chosen (a) such that their application be as simple as can be, (b) opting for minimally necessary procedures and laws (c) for the procedure of law to be as swift and efficient as possible.
7. The number of procedures and categories of law must be thus large (a) that the differing types of procedures and laws don't be put into the same procedure or category of law when conflict will arise, (b) making sure that precedence constraints are maintained while also maintaining maximum efficiency on all levels, (c) recognizing that small law supports big law and small crime leads to bigger crime.
8. Procedures are listed in a book of procedures, laws are listed in a book of law, separating their functionalities with laws only governing procedures in terms of when they have to be adhered to or not.

A Propos

We have by now entered another era where people don't not recognize the necessity of an understandable system of law. Yet, they also recognize that lawmakers and institutions have ceased to recognize the democratic rule of law, the laws that govern our hearts and souls. They even witness the imaginative superposition above the law of those with responsibilities.

We need to get back to simplicity, adhering to a live and let live mentality. An understandable book of law that applies to all is as such a necessity. I hope to contribute with my proposal of the above laws for simplicity of law and procedure. I hope to realign not people but a common understanding of why law be law, such that everyone will adhere to it provided minimal abilities to do so be part of their person.

I mean to take away responsibility from those that can't handle it and offer it to those that can in such a way that those that can't handle it are offered the opportunity to live a life without care and as such without the need to take any responsibility.

If you want to do the job in full, take it. If you don't want to work, don't, but please remember, it's okay, we love you anyway. We are all born important, without exception. People are also important, just for the sake of knowing them, and knowing that you mean to be a friend to them, even if it can't be.

Literature

A.S. Tanenbaum. "Computernetwerken." Academic Service, Schoonhoven, 2nd edition, March 2000. ISBN 90 395 0557 8. Original title: "Computer Networks," Third Edition.