Extrapolation*

John Bosco

This work is produced by The Connexions Project and licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution License †

The relationships of *A Unified Theory of a Law* can be depicted on *The Triangle of Law* because its three main characters - Lawmaker, Source and Recipient - give rise to three relationships, two of which are legal and one of which is factual.

A Lawmaker exists solely in the legal world. A Source and a Recipient can exist in both the factual and the legal world. They enter the legal world when a Lawmaker binds a token to them. Before a lawmaker binds a token to them, they exist solely in the factual world.

When a lawmaker binds a legal token - a duty, privilege (no-duty), right or no-right - to someone other than a Source or a Recipient, the lawmaker is engaged in extrapolation.

Beware of Extrapolation. It is usually pathological. The legal situation can often be reinterpreted to conform to the doctrine of *A Unified Theory of a Law* instead of warping it.

One example of a legal thinker trying to warp the doctrine of *A Unified Theory of a Law* occurs when an attempt is made to disconnect a Source from a Recipient in a flow of conduct. A flow of conduct from a Source to a Recipient in circumstances is implacable. Therefore, it is factually impossible to disconnect its Source and Recipient. Hence, when a legal thinker wants to give the Source a duty to do the affirmative conduct but give the Recipient a no-right to receive the affirmative conduct, *A Unified Theory of a Law* tells us that this is impossible. A Lawmaker can either turn the flow of conduct on, or turn it off or not care whether it is on or off. A Lawmaker cannot make the flow of conduct do a U turn. [Note: when the flow of conduct is itself reflexive a U turn is possible but not because a Lawmaker is making it so]

A Lawmaker who wants a Source to do affirmative conduct also wants a Recipient to receive affirmative conduct whether the Lawmaker likes it or not.

A Lawmaker who does not care whether or not a Source does either polarity of conduct also does not care whether or not a Recipient receives either polarity of conduct, whether the Lawmaker likes it or not.

A Lawmaker who wants a Source to do negative conduct also wants a Recipient to receive negative conduct whether the Lawmaker likes it or not.

With regard to the same flow of conduct from Source to Recipient through circumstances, a Lawmaker cannot simultaneously issue a command to turn on the flow, a command to turn off the flow and a permission allowing the flow to be on or off. This would be a conflict of laws. Only one permutation can exist at a

*Version 1.5: Mar 12, 2011 4:55 pm -0600
†http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/

time. King Cnut [1] , a lawmaker of old, knew that some things were impossible.

John Bosco
Project Director
The Legal Literacy Project [2]

[1] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cnut_the_Great
[2] http://www.legalliteracyproject.com/