

-Human Interaction and the Law-

Fuller's passage provided another cumulative idea onto previous readings, this being that private institutions also follow a code of "law". Places that follow this include universities, churches, community centers, clubs, etc. In these areas' cases, there presides over the members of the community a "customary law". If something that has become normalized, such as "no dirty shoes" or "no discriminatory behavior" in the institute therein, then a long-staying member should expect that all members and themselves would follow all of the rules lest they be punished accordingly. According to what continues in the passage, customary law is a long-lasting phenomenon throughout human development, and it plays a role of governing what is acceptable of a peoples whether they be governed by a rule of general law or not. As described in the text, there are still customs in newly developing countries (as of the writing of this text) that create an order of acceptable and less acceptable practices in their respective communities. The topic that Fuller enlightened me on, was the one that we in developed countries also employ the use of customs; the differences that we see in our communities is that of whether custom law should have a say in what is generally legal. Furthermore, Fuller goes on to relate the feelings of lawmakers when approached by peoples that have accepted a custom as their community's mode of law; this being that rather than explore the throes of new legal territory in order to find what could be described as "general law", it would be easier to cherry pick that of which communities of peoples have already accepted into their ranks. Personally, and as Fuller goes on to debunk, I believe that a community governed by no other than "what is acceptable" does not hold up to and protect the rights of an ever-progressing race such as humanity. In a paraphrase of Fuller's words, general law creates a framework in which the person works around to go about their life, whereas customary law becomes an "expectation" of what relationships one should have with one another in their same community. For instance, a subordinate should follow the order of their

supervisor to print out the documents for their next meeting, but of course that same subordinate would not be pressured by others to feel guilty if they refused their supervisor's orders to splash hot coffee on their colleague's lap. The "in a nutshell" idea that I've come to glean of the "Human Interaction and the Law" section of Fuller's writing is that general law is a mode of rules for a set legal dominion of a society, whereas customary law is what is expected of different demographics within said community. However, from Fuller's last words throughout the final pages, I feel that I can better describe general law as a "suggestion" for how people act, whereas customary dictates how we as humans desire to be seen or expect others to act or "be" in a general sense. A question I found within the text – under what pretense on page 11 at the first paragraph would the lawyer be held in contempt for? Oh, read over it slowly and I get it now. Held in contempt for insulting the intelligence of the judge, I see, I see.

Addendum: I was scanning through the text again to find the aforementioned question that I had in mind, and found an interesting sentence ascribed to the idea of how customs do not often go questioned as to "How did this get in place?" or "Why is this still in place?"

Addendum based on "Two Principles of Human Association"-

Fuller's anecdote of "The Petition of Wilber vs. Five Young Literary Snobs" (lol) brought back similar parables from my own life where I've wronged a person under no pretense fairly set either by a greater legal institution or by the law of the private group in which we were established. The talk about "creeping legality" and what it can do for people governed by any institution of law was something that I found of particular interest. In regards to this, I see it in

humanity to have leniency in their delegations that crop up in private group settings. However, as mentioned by Fuller, over time “creeping legality” steps in and demands normalization of habits often taken upon members of the group in question. Due to this normalization, a bond between members is made in exchange for services or accomplishments mutually expected between the parties. My concern with this is of the overextension of this rule; the point at which human nature to flourish and venture towards success in their own regards to is impeded by the domineering from an entity to follow a set path or code of law.

Addendum based on “Means and Ends”-

My thoughts on this subject stay rather uniform to how I felt when this subject was broached by Kant. Using a person simply as a means to an end is morally unjust, although seeing/using others as a means to an end is an intrinsic part of forming and going about relationships with others. However, as long as one respects that although others may be invaluable to accomplishing a given number of ends, they are their own person and are therefore deserving of the respect and freedom due to an individual. An interesting topic discussed by Fuller that I found was that immediately upon deciding a means to an end, the end’s outcome already changes. To wrap it up with a pretty bow, it feels to tie into the idea of “the means do not justify the ends”, and I feel as though the careful inspection of intentions and consequences is vital to how we view ends and means.