Reading / EN

A claim needs a basis that can be examined.

Fact, evidence, norm, and result are different tasks.

A claim needs a basis that can be examined.

A reading about legal thinking that does not treat a clear presentation as a correct result in itself. With a fictional set of facts and an exercise in arranging statements and evidence.

The statement is not yet its proof

In a fictional study group, one person has bought materials for a joint project. Later, she writes: “You owe me half.” The other person remembers only a nonbinding idea. A third heard part of the conversation. Even this small case contains several questions: what was discussed? Who was supposed to take on what? What documents exist? And what legal significance might the agreement have?

A shared sum of money alone does not resolve these questions. Nor does a clear map. But it can prevent a memory from immediately becoming an established fact, or a moral expectation from appearing as a legal claim without examination. The source therefore treats law as a separate discipline with its own language and procedural requirements.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung

1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

First make the sequence readable

A simple timeline is enough for an initial arrangement: the original discussion, the later message, the purchase, and the subsequent request for payment. Each entry should state its basis. Is it a personal memory, a message, a document, or another person's statement? A source can substantiate an event without also supporting every interpretation of that event.

In the example, a receipt can initially show that particular items were bought. On its own, it does not yet answer whether another person was supposed to pay half. A message can address a division of costs while its context remains important. The exercise consists of describing the scope of a piece of evidence as precisely as its content.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

Who demands what from whom, and on what basis?

§ 194(1) BGB uses the term claim for a right to demand specific conduct from another person. The provision appears in the context of limitation periods. It does not thereby supply the legal basis for every demand for payment. A specific legal examination must additionally clarify the basis on which this particular conduct might be demanded and which prerequisites would have to be met.

As a methodological orientation in civil law, the source manuscript names examination of the creation, possible extinguishment, and enforceability of a claim. This sequence is a working framework. It replaces neither the selection of the relevant provisions nor their interpretation and application. A missing point of examination must not be filled with a general feeling for fairness.

Gesetze im Internet: § 194 BGB – Gegenstand der Verjährung · Paragraph 1 on the definition of a claim; no independent legal basis for a claim in the fictional case. Checked on 22 October 2026.Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

A presentation is not a judgment

A diagram can connect statements and sources. It can show contradictions or make a missing reference visible. This does not automatically decide which

statement is true. In civil proceedings, § 286 ZPO governs how the court forms its conviction from the content of the hearing and any taking of evidence; the grounds supporting it must be stated in the judgment. This is a legally regulated task of the court.

A personal note or software graphic does not take over this task. Nor do questions of burden of proof and special statutory requirements disappear when two documents are connected by a line. The editorial application of AdL is more modest here: each connection should make clear whether it represents a documented relationship, an assertion, or an assignment that still needs to be examined.

Gesetze im Internet: § 286 ZPO – Freie Beweiswürdigung · Paragraphs 1–2 on the court's formation of a conviction and its statutory limits. Checked on 22 October 2026.Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

Four fields for a fictional case

The following exercise serves conceptual work. Create four fields: “Alleged event,” “Available evidence,” “Legal question,” and “What is missing?” Enter only information from the fictional example. Under the purchase, for instance, enter the act of buying and its date. Under evidence, state which document supports

that information. The question of an agreement on costs remains visible as a separate question as long as its content has not been clarified.

Add an alternative to each important conclusion. Perhaps a contribution to costs was promised; perhaps only the usefulness of the materials was discussed. What information would distinguish the possibilities? The result of this exercise is not a decision on payment. It is a clear list of the points that would need professional examination.

The right question may change the first result

A neatly formulated argument can rest on an incorrect account of the facts. A correct account of the facts can be connected to an unsuitable provision. Even a suitable provision must be examined in the version applicable to the case and in the proper context. Precisely for that reason, the arrangement of information must not be confused with its legal correctness.

This reading is a general methodological introduction. It assesses no real dispute and gives no instructions for dealing with a specific deadline or demand. Its benefit comes before the result: distinguish what is asserted,

what is substantiated, what legal question arises, and who is responsible for deciding it with binding effect.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

Questions

What does your evidence actually show, and what additional interpretation is attached to it?

What prerequisite would need examination before an expectation becomes a claim?

What information could change your result so far?

About this edition

An independent adaptation of chapter 46, “Das Recht als Ordnung,” pp. 133–134, and chapter 49 and appendix B of the final October version of “AdL – Architektur des Lebens.” The examples are newly developed. Additions include the definition of a claim in § 194(1) BGB and a limited reference to judicial assessment of evidence in § 286 ZPO, each checked against the published statutory text.

Clearly separates the facts of a case, a statement, evidence, and legal assessment.

Develops an organizing exercise from an explicitly fictional project case without assessing an actual claim.

Adds current statutory provisions as separate primary sources; introduces no statement about deadlines, prospects of success, or individual legal consequences.

An independent adaptation of selected passages with new examples and context. This is not a complete reprint of the source texts. Examples are fictional; ADL interpretations are editorial applications. External sources do not establish ADL's effectiveness.

Sources

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0
12 October 2026 · Chapter 46, pp. 133–134; chapter 49, pp. 135–136; appendix B, p. 148. This application is an organizing tool, not a substitute for professional legal examination.

Gesetze im Internet: § 194 BGB – Gegenstand der Verjährung
Paragraph 1 on the definition of a claim; no independent legal basis for a claim in the fictional case. Checked on 22 October 2026.

Gesetze im Internet: § 286 ZPO – Freie

Beweiswürdigung

Paragraphs 1–2 on the court's formation of a conviction and its statutory limits. Checked on 22 October 2026.