

A Distribution of Consequences and Balance of Incentives versus Rule or Law Making and Keeping

Frequently, throughout my life, I have encountered those occasions,
when rules or laws didn't combine or combined poorly.
Usually, the person who made or who enforced the rules or the laws
bore no consequences from this lack of combining or the poor combining.

One such case was when a young student, totally dependent upon student loans,
while attending a university, had his revenue stopped because of an inconsistency
in the record of his employment and his educational attendance.
It turned out that a data entry operator, who bore no consequences from her act,
made a mistake in transcribing his hand written information into data
able to be processed by a computer.

For weeks, the student tried to determine what went wrong.
All the while trying to figure out how to eat.

Just days ago, a woman from a South American nation
that had been devastated by storms, was the mother of two children,
and was about to be deported, back to that South American nation,
while her children, born in Canada, were to be put in custody of social services.
She had a federal court order which directed her to not be parted from her children,
for their sake, but the immigration law directed her deportation.
Again, the people who made and who enforced the rules or laws
bore no consequences, or few consequences,
while the people who bore heavy consequences, had no authority.

We must see that rule or lawmaking and rule or law keeping requires:

1. a distribution of consequences
 2. a balance of incentives
- such that those who make the rules or laws bear the consequences
and have incentives as a fundamental responsibility
and those who bear the consequences and have the incentives
have some authority, some recourse, some appropriate effort they can make.

A Distribution of Consequences and Balance of Incentives versus Rule or Law Making and Keeping

It becomes apparent that the paradigm of solving problems
by the making and keeping or enforcement of rules or laws
must include systemic relations that distribute the consequences and the authority.

This vast accrual of rules or laws which are not systemically related
is bearing heavy consequences on society as a whole.

Sometimes, it is a matter of territorial jurisdiction.

Democracy is the rule of a majority.

Sometimes, the majority is created by shaping the boundaries of the territory.

Beyond politics, it is sometimes a matter of territorializing a subject,
in an argument.

We have organized justice around the practices
of having prosecuting advocates debating defending advocates.

These advocates depend upon the use of reason, debate, rules and laws
to determine guilt or innocence.

The use of reason, debate, rules and laws depend upon words,
language and its territorialization,
the ability of words or language to map the territory of real experience,
of reality itself.

General semantics, the pioneering work of Alfred Korzybski
and subsequent luminaries such as Samuel (S. I.) Hayakawa,
clearly formulate: the map is not the territory.

Zen goes far beyond this.

Zen shows that delusion follows from word based, language based thinking.

Zen commends thusness or suchness.

Zen commends that we stop the aboutness.

Zen commends the cessation of thinking.

A Distribution of Consequences and Balance of Incentives versus Rule or Law Making and Keeping

This does not eliminate content from the mind, but allows
an alternate streaming of information and pattern into the mind as a sensory agent.
Often, the practice of Zen is to stop the talking in your head.
It is seldom that the alternative experience is described or anticipated.
The act of providing a description and the anticipation
actually create a barrier to the satori experience.

Certain yogas yield the same experience.
It is this alternative flood of knowing by connection with the mind
as a sensory agent that is the goal of both Zen and these yogas.
For thousands of years, this human possibility has been shielded
from much of humanity.
The human species has been allowed to indulge in reason
in the use of language and the propagation of representational knowing.

In a certain sense, it would be appropriate to say:
there is no more to say about anything.