Free Associations: Cooperative Interaction

By Edward K. Brown II

Introduction

Absolute certainty is a misnomer; however, there are optional opinions. Optional opinions are beliefs based on certain knowledge. Beliefs are associations to conditions, are an individual's (psychological) effect to (traditional, philosophical, democratic) causes during interaction. Knowledge is a convention of wisdom, is the individual's explanation, justification, and/or rationalization of what occurs during an interaction. Therefore, optional opinions are conditions freely associated to a convention of wisdom; optional opinions are perceived effects to causes that are based on certainties derived from an explanation, justification and/or rationalization of a situation encircling an interaction. Optional opinions catalyze relationships. Relationships are situated by cooperative interaction, and are relative to layers of cooperation that link a type of knowledge consistent with a belief. The layers of cooperation that serve as a portal for certainty are personal, professional, and political. Building relationships requires interacting on the various layers. There is a simplistic understanding between individuals who interact on a single layer, however, in most situations, interaction tends to occur on more than one layer and thus understanding is more circuitous. By exploring the permutational paradigms of layering personal, professional and political cooperation through interaction, this essay will discuss the simplicity and circuity of understanding the optional opinions presented within free associations.

Layers of Cooperation

Personal cooperation is situated in a definition of ideals--sense conditioned from the evidence derived consistently within indigenous identity, sense conditioned from the associations freely based on a conventional wisdom distributed through oral history to state an

experience that an individual finds ideal (i.e. pathos: an appeal to emotions). An individual builds a relationship with a person whom there is concurrence and opts to *share* as opinion: certain terms of endearment that indicate an experidyll. The second layer of cooperation is professional cooperation. Professional cooperation is situated in a desire to obtain stature-- *goals* conditioned from the *interests* derived consistently within an approach (a process), goals conditioned from the associations freely based on a convention of wisdom distributed through information that increases the probability that the stature will come to state (i.e. logos: an appeal to reason). An individual builds a relationship with a person whom there is an alliance and opts to *shop* (i.e. research, develop, and maintain) as opinion: certain trends (probabilities) that buttress the achievement of stature. The third layer is political cooperation. Political cooperation is situated in a devise of policy--*issues* conditioned from the *governance* derived consistently within the concern of a community, issues conditioned from (mainstream, marginal, or fringe) associations freely based on a convention of wisdom distributed through an agenda that prioritizes the policies of the state (i.e. ethos: an appeal of character/personality). An individual builds a relationship with a person with whom there is categorical support and opts to *shape* opinion: certain precedents that will constitute a policy.

The type of cooperation instantiated is contingent upon how the individual composes knowledge into belief. Personally, as the individual experiences life and defines ideals implicit to terms of endearment, one searches for others who have similar indigeneity. The individual seeks affirmation of options and opinions (henceforth optional opinions); the individual searches for certainty—an explanation, justification, and/or rationalization of psychological effects (sense of *truth*) and the traditional, philosophical, democratic causes (*collection* of evidence) that defines ideals about an experience: experidyll. Within this effect and cause does the individual interact with others—searching for affirmation of the pending truth as presented by evidence, an affirmation that prompts personal cooperation: the *sharing* of definitive pre-knowledgeable beliefs. From personal cooperation does the individual gain a *common sense*

(*a collective truth*) of the indigeneity. When there is someone else who concurs with another's experidyll that is affective/effective and is causal (i.e. true to the self) as iterated by the poetic imitation of life and art, the individual is willing to build relationships, a community premised upon this common sense. Personally cooperating within an affirming community, the individual designs history to ensure certainty, endearments on terms that honors pathos (state of being—i.e. indigenousness): associations to conditions that affirm endearments, using (this newfound) oral history to share evidence—ensure a collection of evidence that intimates a sense of truth, iterations that are private, sense common within a wisdom composed by experidyllic conventions.

Although obtaining personal cooperation affirms truths that are self-evident, an individual requires additional resources if the experidyll is to continue to honor the statehood of being. The individual, if he/she has attained (personal) affirmation of an optional opinion, desires (pertinent) information to exalt those optional opinions as stature. The approach designed to build community becomes a desire, and is understood, promoted and distributed through a rite of passage. Based on this desire, the individual gathers resources to fulfill the desire. The individual searches for yet another community, other individuals with the skills and tools (and desire!) from which to build relationships. What is sought after is an alliance of self-interest(s): information set within a (modus operandi) system; a network from which to *shop* working-knowledgeable beliefs; a group of (human) resources to contribute to the research, development and maintenance of a *common goal.* Within the network does the individual explain, justify and/or rationalize with certainty psychological effects (goals of *trust*) premised by those traditional, philosophical, democratic causes (*projection* of interests) of a focus group. Throughout the network, individuals systematize the effect and cause of desire(s) flowing within the community into a trend by firstly researching the market to better understand the desire driving the focus group, by secondly developing an (austere/alchemic) alliance to promote the desire, and by thirdly maintaining a rite of passage to distribute the desire. The goal is to affirm

public confidence (*projected trust*) in an approach, certainty in the stature. Established trust and pooled interest comprises professional cooperation. Professionally cooperating within a network, the individual researches, develops, and maintains information to insure certainty, passage by rites that instills logos (state of becoming—i.e. stature): associations to conditions that ally passage using information to shop interests—insure a projection of interests that auto-mates goals of trust, promotions that are public, goals common within a wisdom composed by staturesque conventions.

To ensure private confidence (in the truth) gained from self-evidence as well as insure public confidence (in the trust) gained from self-interest, the individual devises optional opin-ions that outline a policy, and sets an agenda as assurance to rally support for a process from either a mainstream, marginal, or fringe party within a community who are likely to have similar opinions. The individual focuses certainty on the agenda—explaining, justifying, and/or ration-alizing psychological effects (issues of *relevance*) that are traditional, philosophical, democ-ratic causes (*determination* of governance). Within this effect and cause does the individual co-opt (categorical) support for opinions. This co-option of opinion is political cooperation. With political cooperation does the individual (self-)govern: devise policy; set an agenda to ad-dress a state of affairs; concerns that negotiates an assemblage of categorical support for the policy. Self-governance assesses how to *shape* meta-knowledgeable beliefs: contingencies of perspective(s), priorities concerning *common issues*. How much confidence, certainty given to the cooperation depends on the priorities set by the party members of the community (*determined relevancy*) fostering an assembly of concerned individuals. Politically cooperating within an assemblage, the individual assesses the precedence of concerns to assure certainty, support (by category) that addresses ethos (state of affairs—i.e. agenda): associations to con-ditions that rallies support, using concerns to shape governance—assure determination of gov-ernance that negotiates issues of relevance, priorities that are contingent, issues common within a wisdom composed by policial conventions.

Cooperative Interaction

When an individual interacts with another, he/she is confronted with optional opinions. Given an association to conditions, each individual compares and contrasts his/her own conventional wisdom to the other person's conventions. After sharing some common sense regarding an experidyll, or after shopping some common goals regarding stature, or after shaping common issues regarding policy, or a combination of the above, the individual then opts whether or not to hold a stake in the opinion concerning either association. A positive association depends on how much each individual:

1. bases the opinion mutually in preknowledge (interpreting evidence) to honor pathos (a state of being); or
2. bases the opinion mutually in a working knowledge (systematizing interests) to instill logos (a state of becoming); or
3. bases the opinion mutually in a meta-knowledge (influencing governance) to address ethos (a state of affairs).

Opting to accept an opinion as shared experidyll, shopped stature, or shaped policy, culminates beliefs conventional to his/her wisdom, which requires the individual to derive perspective from (personal, professional, and/or political) layers of cooperation.

Perspective derived from layering cooperation is deriving perspective from layering opinions. Layering opinions provides the individual with options to intimate, automate, and negotiate (with) a stratified knowledge (pre, working, meta respectively) interactions from which to filter and synchronize the perspectives of others: decide if another is a privately, publicly, and/or contingently confident stakeholder. The conventional wisdom, that is to say the strata of knowledge (in the form of an explanation, justification and/or rationalization) and the respective association to conditions (the culmination of belief), play a primary role in illustrating options. Individuals interact with one another by drawing upon knowledgeable beliefs, optional opinions to *instantiate* the sharing of an experidyll, shopping of stature, shaping of policy to build relationships. As the individual opines, he/she could opt to redirect through interpretation, systemization, and/or persuasion (i.e. influence) the sense, goals, or issues (those psycho-

logical effects) of one's self-associations (albeit evidence, interests, governance). Redirection of opinion would assist in *navigating* through a series of counterfactuals concerning indigeneity, information, and/or agenda. Another option is for individuals to configure through indirectness associations that ensure, insure or assure the distribution of associations to conditions, those (traditional, philosophical, democratic) causes that *emphasize* (psychological) effects.

Building relationships requires interacting on various layers: personal, professional as well as political. There is a simple understanding between individuals who interact on a single layer. Simple interactions provide a linear flow from subjectivity ($_s$) to objectivity ($_o$) from psychological effects to traditional, philosophical, democratic causes and back (a posteriori ó a priori), a *reflexive* commonality, a perspective of certain probability for individuals who use a single type of knowledge to base belief. However, in most situations, when individuals interact with one another, the reflexivity flow tends to be more circuitous intellectually. Circuitousness is due to differing perspectives of what is common (sense, goals, issues). In addition, the psychological effects manifested by traditional, philosophical, democratic causes are disconnected when other layers are introduced into the interaction. Understanding is made complex; probability of ascertainment is less certain. To discern what is probable, individuals interact using knowledge to base belief counterfactually. The individual attempts to distinguish understanding (from which layer is another presenting his/her belief), and decides whether or not to cooperate in the fulfillment of the perspective provided by another within the interaction. When there is reflection, cooperation ensues. If the individual is unresponsive to an interaction, there is not an obvious commonality, no (obvious) reflection of the layer that the person is subjectively/objectively situated. The unresponsive individual is oblivious to understanding any perspective that is not of his/her own volition (i.e. definition, desire, devise)—a primary factor for miscommunication: *unilateral dislocation*. With nothing in common, misunderstanding abounds. In an attempt to limit endless possibilities, (un)intentional interfacial circuitousness occurs. With the intent of blurring the other's perspective to reveal a flaw in the person's understanding, individu-

als interact using knowledge to entrench their belief, to maintain perspective ("simplicity") by collecting evidence, and/or by projecting interests, and/or by determining governance.

If individuals, during interaction, attempt to build a relationship, simultaneously each individual exchanges optional opinions pertaining to the layer that best reflects his/her psycho-dynamic concerning tradition, philosophy, democracy as best fathomed from the situation—and draws conclusions: beliefs based on the underlying options of the other's opinions juxtaposed to his/her own; (subjective/objective) associations to conditions as well as conventions of wisdom. Each individual must decide, opt whether or not to *directly* accept the opinion offered on the layer proposed (as an associative witness to the conditions as outlined by a convention of wisdom), or *redirect* the opinion to the layer that fosters cooperation, although conditionally. Additionally, each individual has the option to *indirectly* distribute the opinion amongst the layers, emphasizing direct and redirected layers with the associated condition and the conventional wisdom of the layer distributed.

If the interaction is a direct one-to-one relationship (a_s is a_o; personal is personal—e.g. fan club; professional is professional—e.g. SIG [special interest group]; political is political—e.g. board of advisors; think tank/strategy group), then the psychological effects and the correlative traditional, philosophical, democratic causes are reflected, and thus opinions are *instantiated* by conventional wisdom cooperatively. Following the personal is personal example above, truth and the correlative evidence are reflected, and thus the opinion is instantiated engaging pathos—a preknowledge of the state of being that is (inter)acted upon cooperatively.

However, if the interaction is a redirected one-to-one relationship (a_s is b_o; personal is political—e.g. activism; professional is personal—e.g. dedicated employee), there is a compound of reflection. A link is drawn from one layer to a differing layer; the effects on layer *a* are correlated to the causes on layer *b*, likewise the associations of layer *a* are correlated to the conditions on layer *b*; opinions are *navigated* through conventional wisdom cooperatively. Fol-

lowing the personal is political example above, truth on the personal layer is correlated to governance on the political layer, and thus opinions are navigated through meta-knowledge to honor pathos (the state of being) cooperatively.

Alternatively, an interaction has the ability to emphasize cooperation by distributing effects and causes indirectly upon a (re)direct permutation: $c(a_s$ is $a_o)$, or $c(a_s$ is $b_o)$; politicizing the professional is professional—e.g. questioning the business practices of a manufacturing company pertaining to the environment, or professionalizing the personal is political—e.g. lobbying; corporate activism: making contributions to officials for favorable legislation. Pieces of a layer are brought to the foreground while other pieces are set to the background. Perspective (layer c) is used as a catalyst to expedite an effect (reactions/responses) to prompt reflection on causes (facts/syllogisms) from an association to conditions (a_s is a_o, or a_s is b_o). Opinions are *emphasized* through conventional wisdom cooperatively. Emphasis is applied either intrinsically, inwardly, outwardly, or extrinsically. *Intrinsic emphasis* occurs when the third (i.e. distributed) layer is the same as the first (i.e. subjective) and the second (i.e. objective) layers: $a^3(a^1_s$ is $a^2_o)$. *Inward emphasis* occurs when the third and first layers are the same: $a^3_s(a^1_s$ is $b^2_o)$. *Outer emphasis* occurs when the third and second layers are the same: $b^3_o(a^1_s$ is $b^2_o)$. *Extrinsic emphasis* occurs when the third layer is not similar to any of the remaining layers: $b(a_s$ is $a_o)$ or $c^3(a^1_s$ is $b^2_o)$. In the first example [$c(a_s$ is $a_o)$], politicizing[3] the professional[1] is professional[2], the individual politicizing the direct permutation catalyzes the equation by politicizing professional[1]: assuring the alliance of passage for the automated interests that desires an approach through the projection of trust. The individual also has the ability to catalyze the equation by politicizing professional[2]: using an agenda to systematize a working knowledge to instill logos (a state of becoming). All in all, the individual is attempting to shape through extrinsic emphasis (prioritizing) the shopping of stature. Indirect interactions—a distributive emphasis of cooperation—catalyze optional opinion via infusion.

To quickly summarize cooperative interaction—the individual progresses through a se-

ries of direct, redirect, or indirect permutations to provide a perspective on pathos, logos, or ethos (a state of being, becoming, or affairs respectively). The individual could (1) opt to instantiate cooperation of an opinion (as is) on the layer that provides the proposed perspective (e.g. personal is personal—direct permutation, the subjective is *[i.e. instantiates]* the objective). If that option fails, the individual could then (2) opt to navigate cooperation by moving the opinion to a preferred perspective (e.g. personal is professional—redirect permutation, the subjective is *[i.e. navigated towards]* the objective). If all else fails, the individual could (3) opt to emphasize cooperation: distribute a perspective adverbially to the opinion proposed or preferred that provides a "comprehensive" perspective (e.g. politicizing the personal is personal— indirect permutation, *intrinsic/extrinsic/inward/outward emphasis of* either the subjective or the *[instantiated/navigated towards]* objective). Whichever permutation the individual uses to interact with another, such (subjective/objective) relationship building is quite conversational between individuals who are motivated (ulteriorly) to present a perspective as an appeal to emotion (pathos; common sense, truth), or as an appeal to reason (logos; common goal, trust), or as an appeal to ethics (ethos; common issue, relevance).

Direct Permutations

For quick review before describing redirect and indirect permutations, here is quick recap of direct permutations.

a_s **is** a_o – the subjective is *(i.e. instantiates)* the objective

- **personal is personal**: sharing an experidyll (affirming endearments) —intimated evidence of an experidyll that defines indigeneity, to collect the truth; interpreting preknowledge to make sense, to honor pathos (e.g. *Secret Lies, Color Purple*)

- **professional is professional**: shopping stature (allying passage) —automated interests in stature that desires a process, to project trust; systemizing working knowledge to obtain goals, to instill logos (e.g. *Wall Street, Working Girl, High Noon*)

- **political is political**: shaping policy (assembling support) — negotiated governance of policy that devises a concern to determine relevance; influencing

meta-knowledge to categorize issues, to address ethos (e.g. *Henry V, Richard III*) Since direct permutations have already been discussed and whittled down to a theorem, what follows is a description of redirect permutations, as well as a description of indirect permutations.

Redirect Permutations

Beginning with redirect permutations, there are six. Each redirect essentiates an opinion (subjective - a_s) and an option (objective - b_o) that are not on the same layer. For cooperation to occur, each individual involved in the interaction must tack towards those knowledge-based beliefs that are objective. Essentially, the individual has to "opt in," make a decision as to which knowledge to believe. Through common sense, goals, and issues, each individual must tactfully find the means to cooperate through subjective/objective reflection—unlike direct permutations where the interaction between the subjective and objective is linear. The individual finds the means to cooperate through subjective/objective equivalence. If the individual, during interaction, does not reflect equivalence from the interaction, what he/she encounters is equivocalness: miscommunication through ambiguity; *bilateral dislocation*. Below is the description of the six redirect permutations.

a_s **is** b_o – the subjective is *(navigated towards)* the objective

- **personal is political**: sharing policy (affirming support) — intimated governance of policy that defines indigeneity to determine the truth; interpreting meta-knowledge to make sense, to address pathos (e.g. *Do the Right Thing, Brass Off*)

- **personal is professional**: sharing stature (affirming passage) — intimated interests in a stature that define indigeneity to project the truth; interpreting working knowledge to make sense, to instill pathos (e.g. *King of Comedy, The Outlaw Josey Wales*)

- **professional is personal**: shopping an experidyll (allying endearments) — automated evidence of an experidyll that desires a process to collect trust; systemizing preknowledge to obtain goals, to honor logos (e.g. *Mona Lisa, High Art*)

- **professional is political**: shopping policy (allying support) — automated governance of policy that desires a process to determine trust; systematizing meta-knowledge to obtain goals, to address logos (e.g. *Roger and Me, Silkwood*)

- **political is personal**: shaping an experidyll (assembling endearments) — negotiated evidence of an experidyll that devises a concern to collect relevance; influencing preknowledge to categorize issues, to honor ethos (e.g. *Margot, Bulworth*)

- **political is professional**: shaping stature (assembling passage) — negotiated interests in a stature that devise a concern to project relevance; influencing working knowledge to categorize issues, to address ethos (e.g. *Barcelona*)

An inscrutable detail for these forms of cooperation, redirect permutations are a combination of subjective and objective perspectives. Overall, commonality of permutations, navigated by psychodynamics (the effects) instantiate an optional opinion as composed by traditional, philosophical, democratic causes as explained, justified and/or rationalized through willfulness.

Indirect Permutations

When exploring indirect permutations [$c(a_s$ *is* $b_o)$], the individual either attempts to instantiate interaction by manipulating the circumstances that lead to the perspective outcome of the relationship, or the individual maneuvers the relationship to navigate towards an ulterior motive. Such intentions (manipulation and maneuvering) distributes a third layer to a (re)direct permutation, indirectly emphasizing the perspective. There are twenty-seven indirect permutations in all; however, the ones that target an appeal (pathos, logos, ethos) specifically to either the subjective or objective layer are the most effective in determining the outcome of the relationship. An appeal targeted at an individual's subjective layer is exemplified as *$a(a_s$ is $b_o)$*; conversely, an appeal targeted at an individual's objective layer is notated as $b(a_s$ *is* $b_o)$. An appeal to one's subjective layer prompts the individual to react, whereas appealing to the objective layer requires a response. Non-targeted appeals such as $b(a_s$ *is* $a_o)$ has an evenly weighted indirection, an indirection that prompts the individual to add "flavor" to the reaction/ response. Those appeals in which neither the subjective nor objective layers are targeted are the most indirect methods for guiding relationships *$c(a_s$ is $b_o)$*—in that the individual who is spinning the relationship is placing parameters around the relationship to catalyze the subjective/

objective layers so that any reaction/response is nuanced to fit within the catalyst layer.   Those appeals in which both subjective and objective layers are targeted $a(a_s$ is $a_o)$ are a redundant indirection, prompting the individual to heartily to react or respond. If interaction does not result in a relationship, the individual's appeals result in a *trilateral dislocation*—manipulation and maneuvering that has failed to explain, justify, and/or rationalize the psychological effects of traditional, philosophical, democratic causes.   Dislocation will be discussed later in this essay. Below is a description of each indirect permutation.

$a(a_s$ *is* $a_o)$ *– intrinsic emphasis of* the subjective that is *(i.e. instantiates)* objective

- **personalizing (the personal is personal)**: iterating the sharing of an experidyll (ensuring the affirmation of endearments) — attesting intimated evidence of an experidyll that defines indigeneity through the collection of the truth; interpreting preknowledge with (oral) history that is intended to make sense, honoring pathos to honor pathos (e.g. *The Apostle*, *True Colors*)

- **professionalizing (the professional is professional)**: promoting the shopping for stature (insuring the alliance of passage) — stimulating automated interest in a stature that desires a process through the projection of trust; systematizing working knowledge with information that is intended to obtain goals, instilling a logos to instill logos (e.g. *Glengarry Glenn Ross*)

- **politicizing (the political is political)**: prioritizing the shaping of policy (assuring the assemblage of support) — governing negotiated governance of policy that devises a concern through the determination of relevance; influencing meta-knowledge with an agenda that is intended to categorize issues, addressing ethos to address ethos (e.g. *Nixon*)

$a_s(a_s$ *is* $b_o)$ *– inward emphasis of* the subjective that is *(navigated towards)* the objective

- **personalizing (the personal is political)**: iterating the sharing of policy (ensuring the affirmation of support) — attesting intimated governance of policy that defines indigeneity through determination of the truth; interpreting meta-knowledge with (oral) history that is intended to make sense, honoring pathos to address pathos (e.g. *Annie Hall*, *I Shot Andy Warhol*)

- **personalizing (the personal is professional)**: iterating the sharing of stature (ensuring the affirmation of passage) — attesting intimated interests in a stature that defines indigeneity through the projection of the truth; interpreting working knowledge with (oral) history that is intended to make sense, honoring pathos to instill a pathos (e.g. *He Got Game*)

- **professionalizing (the professional is personal)**: promoting the shopping for an experidyll (insuring the alliance of endearments) — stimulating automated evidence of an experidyll that desires a process through the collection of trust; systematizing preknowledge with information that is intended to obtain goals, instill-

ing logos to honor a logos (e.g. *Mahogany, Being John Malkovich*)

- **professionalizing (the professional is political)**: promoting the shopping for policy (insuring the alliance of support) — stimulating automated governance of policy that desires a process through the determination of trust; systematizing meta-knowledge with information that is intended to obtain goals, instilling a state of becoming to address a state of becoming (e.g. *Moon Over Parador, Dave*)

- **politicizing (the political is personal)**: prioritizing the shaping of an experidyll (assuring the assemblage of endearments) — governing negotiated evidence of an experidyll that devises a concern through the collection of relevance; influencing preknowledge with an agenda that is intended to categorize issues, addressing ethos to honor ethos (e.g. *Wilde, Thelma and Louise*)

- **politicizing (the political is professional)**: prioritizing the shaping of stature (assuring the assemblage of passage/support) — governing negotiated interests in a stature that devises a concern through the projection of relevance; influencing working knowledge with an agenda that is intended to categorize issues, addressing a ethos to instill ethos (e.g. *The Insider, No Way Out*)

$b_o(a_s$ is $b_o)$ – *outward emphasis of* the subjective that is *(navigated towards)* the objective

- **personalizing (the professional is personal)**: iterating the shopping for an experidyll (ensuring the alliance of endearments) — attesting automated evidence of an experidyll that desires a process through the collection of trust; systematizing preknowledge with (oral) history that is intended to obtain goals, honoring pathos to honor logos (e.g. *Madonna: Truth or Dare*)

- **personalizing (the political is personal)**: iterating the shaping of an experidyll (ensuring the assemblage of endearments) — attesting negotiated evidence of an experidyll that devises a concern through the collection of relevance; influencing preknowledge with (oral) history that is intended to categorize issues, honoring pathos to honor ethos (e.g. *Saving Private Ryan*)

- **professionalizing (the personal is professional)**: promoting the sharing of stature (insuring the affirmation of passage) — stimulating intimated interests in a stature that defines indigeneity through the projection of the truth; interpreting working knowledge with information that is intended to make sense, instilling logos to instill pathos (e.g. *Gattica*)

- **professionalizing (the political is professional)**: promoting the shaping of stature (insuring the assemblage of passage) — stimulating negotiated interests in a stature that devises a concern through the determination of relevance; influencing working knowledge with an agenda that is intended to categorize issues, instilling logos to instill ethos (e.g. *The Madness of King George*)

- **politicizing (the personal is political)**: prioritizing the sharing of policy (assuring the affirmation of support) — governing intimated governance of policy that defines indigeneity through the determination of the truth; interpreting meta-knowledge with an agenda that is intended to make sense, addressing ethos to address pathos (e.g. *Angels and Insects*)

- **politicizing (the professional is political)**: prioritizing the shopping of policy (assuring the alliance of support) — governing automated governance of policy that desires a process through the determination of trust; systematizing meta-knowledge with an agenda that is intended to obtain goals, addressing ethos to address logos (e.g. *Wag the Dog*)

b(a$_s$ is a$_o$) – *extrinsic emphasis of* the subjective that is *(i.e. instantiates)* objective

- **personalizing (the professional is professional)**: iterating the shopping for stature (ensuring the alliance of passage) — attesting automated interest in a stature that desires a process through the projection of trust; systematizing working knowledge with (oral) history that is intended to obtain goals, honoring pathos to instill logos (e.g. *The Pillow Book, Erin Brockovich*)

- **personalizing (the political is political)**: iterating the shaping of policy (ensuring the assemblage of support) — attesting the negotiated policy that devises a concern through the determination of relevance; influencing meta-knowledge with information that is intended to categorize issues, honoring pathos to address ethos (e.g. *Ridicule*)

- **professionalizing (the personal is personal)**: promoting the sharing of an experidyll (insuring the affirmation of endearments) — stimulating intimated evidence of an experidyll that defines indigeneity through the collection of the truth; interpreting preknowledge with information that is intended to make sense, instilling logos to honor pathos (e.g. *Purple Rain*)

- **professionalizing (the political is political)**: promoting the shaping of policy (insuring the assemblage of support) — stimulating negotiated governance of policy that devises a concern through the determination of relevance; influencing meta-knowledge with information that is intended to categorize issues, instilling logos to address ethos (e.g. *Elizabeth*)

- **politicizing (the personal is personal)**: prioritizing the sharing of an experidyll (assuring the affirmation of endearments) — governing intimated evidence of an experidyll that defines indigeneity through the collection of the truth; interpreting preknowledge with an agenda that is intended to make sense, addressing ethos to honor pathos (e.g. *Rikyu—Death of a Tea Master*; *The Election*)

- **politicizing (the professional is professional)**: prioritizing the shopping for stature (assuring the alliance of passage) — governing automated interest in a stature that desires a process through the projection of trust; systematizing working knowledge with an agenda that is intended to obtain goals, addressing ethos to instill logos (e.g. *Pi*)

c(a$_s$ is b$_o$) – *extrinsic emphasis of* the subjective that is *(navigated towards)* the objective

- **personalizing (the professional is political)**: iterating the shopping for policy (ensuring the alliance of support) — attesting automated governance of policy that desires a process through the determination of trust; systematizing meta-knowledge with (oral) history that is intended to obtain goals, honoring pathos

to address logos (e.g. *A Face in the Crowd*)

- **personalizing (the political is professional)**: iterating the shaping of stature (ensuring the assemblage of passage) — attesting negotiated interests in a stature that devise a concern through the projection of relevance, influencing working knowledge with (oral) history that is intended to categorize issues, honoring pathos to instill ethos (e.g. *The Longest Yard*)

- **professionalizing (the personal is political)**: promoting the sharing of policy (insuring the affirmation of support) — stimulating intimated governance of policy that defines indigeneity through the determination of the truth; interpreting meta-knowledge with information that is intended to make sense, instilling logos to address pathos (e.g. *Xiu Xiu: The Sent Down Girl*)

- **professionalizing (the political is personal)**: promoting the shaping of an experidyll (assuring the assemblage of endearments) — stimulating negotiated evidence of an experidyll that devises a concern through the collection of relevance; influencing preknowledge with information that is intended to categorize issues, instilling logos to honor ethos (e.g. *The Candidate*)

- **politicizing (the personal is professional)**: prioritizing the shaping of stature (assuring the affirmation of passage) — governing intimate interests in a stature that define indigeneity through the projection of the truth; interpreting working knowledge with an agenda that is intended to make sense, addressing ethos to instill pathos (e.g. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, *Blade Runner*)

- **politicizing (the professional is personal)**: prioritizing the shopping for an experidyll (assuring the alliance of endearments) — governing automated evidence of an experidyll that desires a process through the collection of trust; systematizing preknowledge with an agenda that is intended to obtain goals, addressing ethos to honor logos (e.g. *The Man Who Would Be King*, *The Crying Game*)

Layered Dislocation (intimate, automate, negotiate)

Now that the thirty-six different ways individuals try to communicate their opinions to each other have been discussed, let's have a look at the three ways in which individuals misunderstand one another. As alluded to earlier in the essay, misunderstanding is due to lack of perspective reflection, which comes from dislocated layer matching between opinion. There is *unilateral dislocation*—the individual is oblivious to distinguishing any opinion that is not of his/her own volition (e.g. single-mindedness). *Bilateral dislocation*—the individual, comparing and contrasting opinions on different layers, prompts equivocalness within the conversation, which results in ambiguity (e.g. mixed metaphor). *Trilateral dislocation*—the individual encompasses

appeals for commonality, complexes the conversation to the extent that comprehension of the opinion is lost in the shuffle (e.g. convolution). Below is a scenario of the ways dislocation occurs and how dislocation is made more complex by permutation.

Unilateral Dislocation—One individual perceives a situation as personal (a_s is a_o, a belief which is based on a preknowledgeable premise [pathos] that the subjective *is* objective). Another individual perceives the same situation as professional *(b_s is b_o,* a belief which is based on a working-knowledge premise [logos] that the subjective is objective). When the two individuals come together to discuss the situation, they disagree on each other's explanation, justification, and/or rationalization of the situation's psychological effect. Each individual's argument is extrapolated from traditional, philosophical, democratic causes, however, (individual) *A*'s premise is centered on personality, while (individual) *B*'s premise is centered on professionalism. *A* shares his opinion as a definition, as a preknowledgeable belief concerning the common sense of indigeneity; *B* shops her opinions as a desire, a working-knowledgeable belief concerning the common goal of the (modus operandi) system. There is no positive relationship between *A* and *B* concerning this situation because each is tuned in to his/her own layer of perspective. If an individual (for example's sake, let's say *B*) wishes to have her layer recognized, then an attempt to modify the perspective of the situation is made to "seemingly" equate the two layers: to the extent that the equation returns the result of what *is* certain—in *B*'s opinion.

Bilateral Dislocation – Through comparison and contrast, *B* has two strategies (redirect permutations) that can change *A*'s perspective on the premise. Each approach counterfactually simulates how her working knowledge is similar to his preknowledge. The simulation is accomplished by navigating the subjective towards an objective. The two strategies are: 1) simulate how the personal is professional (a_s is *[navigated towards]* b_o), which is a counter argument to *A*'s personal is personal stance; or 2) simulate how the professional is personal (b_s is *[navigated towards]* a_o), which is a counter position to *B*'s professional is professional statement. Taking the first approach (personal is professional), *B* shares how her interest in a stature

defines the situation as a projection of the truth, as opposed to how *A* shares his evidence of an experience to define the situation as means to collect the truth. *B* wants *A* to believe that the (rite of) passage (in particular, *her* passage) provides common sense, and instills a state of being. *B* argues that sharing stature affirms passage (not sharing experience to affirm endearments), and that stature sharing provides the indigeneity of the situation—focuses definition. *B* identifies with the intimation of interests rather than the intimation of evidence when attempting to define what is true within this situation. Strictly speaking, *B* argues that instilling pathos offers greater perception of the situation than merely honoring pathos.

If *A* still disagrees with the professional opinion, then *B* can opt to present a converse strategy (the professional is personal), which counters her initial statement that the professional is professional. This strategy shops (i.e. researches, develops, and maintains) the evidence of an experience as an approach to desire, as a tool to collect trust (of the situation). This argument is in opposition to actually shopping interests in a stature as desire, as a tool to project trust in a situation. *B* advises *A* to garner information about the experience. *B* wants *A* to believe that (the specific) systemization of the situation obtains goals, and honors a state of becoming (logos) more so than by systematizing the situation to instill a state of becoming. *B* argues that shopping for an experience, not shopping for stature, allies endearments—coheres desire. *B* approaches automated evidence of an experience rather than automated interests in stature when desiring to trust this situation. In plain terms, *B* declares that honoring logos is greater than instilling logos.

Compromise lost. Using either approach, *B* attempts to equate the traditional, philosophical, and democratic causes (objective perspectives) of one opinion to the psychological effect (subjective perspective) of the other opinion by melding *A*'s preknowledge to her trust or by melding her working knowledge to *A*'s truth of the situation into a metaphor. However, for this compromise to be flawless, the metaphor is must be clearly described. If the metaphor linking cause(s) to effect is not clearly described, the explanation/justification/rationalization of the

(pre/working) knowledge will be mismatched, mismatched because the metaphor poorly equates the situation's traditional, philosophical, democratic causes to the psychological effect (trust/truth). A good example of mismatching is when a person uses a sports metaphor to explain an occurrence of a non-athletic situation. If the person attempts to explain how to deal with that situation as if one was a player of that sport to a colleague who is unfamiliar with that particular sport entirely, the consequence is that the colleague will lose perspective on the actual (problem) situation. In this instance, *A* is not able to metaphorically equate his experience to *B*'s interests. *A* is neither able to trust professionally *B*'s version of preknowledge, nor able to accept *B*'s version of working knowledge personally as the truth. Thus the subjective is NOT navigated towards (matched/reflected) by the objective; the two opinions (personal and professional) are not melded resulting in a mixed metaphor. Mismatched, the two opinions propose an obvious example of an equivocal bond at best. The professional perspective of the situation is like the personal perspective, but then again, it's not. *B*'s argument is not convincing enough.

<u>Trilateral Dislocation</u> – Having failed to make a convincing argument simply or even moderately with direct and redirect permutations, *B* opts to permutate her opinion once more by taking an indirect approach. With this approach, a third layer is added to assist in filtering and synchronizing interaction. As *B* prepares, yet another premise for her next polemic, she has several options from which to choose:

1. personalizing (the personal is personal)
2. professionalizing (the professional is professional)
3. personalizing (the personal is professional)
4. professionalizing (the professional is personal)
5. personalizing (the professional is personal)
6. professionalizing (the personal is professional)
7. personalizing (the professional is professional)
8. professionalizing (the personal is personal)
9. politicizing (the personal is personal)
10. politicizing the (professional is professional)
11. politicizing (the personal is professional)
12. politicizing (the professional is personal)

Due to the fact that she has already taken *A's* time with some of the direct/redirect permutations, *B* realizes that she is going to lose the argument if she wastes time on permutations that are quite obvious and have already proven to be ineffective. Elaboration, even if indirect, would be futile. To be completely indirect, she decides to omit the first six (#1-6) approaches, considering the fact that the binary permutations have already failed, and that the (third) layer is an (intrinsic, inward, or outward) emphasis of previously argued (explained/justified/rationalized) premises.

To confront the situation with a new spin, *B* attempts to "professionalize" the personal is personal ($b[a_s$ is $a_o]$)—premise #8. The approach goes straight to the heart of the argument: agreeing with *A*'s initial perspective, but with a catch. To entrap *A*, *B* argues that the situation they have been discussing has the tendency to be construed as personal on a subjective and objective level. However, *B* filters and synchronizes the personal perspective through a third layer (professionalism) to stimulate the intimation of evidence found in an experience. Through extrinsic emphasis, *B* describes how to promote the sharing of an experidyll. Eschewing the need for experience, *B* professes how the professional layer serves as a catalyst, shows how information is able to make sense and instill logic while honoring a state of being (pathos), which insures the affirmation of endearments. To nudge *A* closer to agreement, *B* shows how her initial argument (professional is professional) has since been extrinsically augmented by *A*'s personality ($a[b_s$ is $b_o]$)—premise #7. *B* explains/justifies/rationalizes how iterating the shopping for stature is an attestation for the automation of interest(s) and honor pathos while instilling a state of becoming (logos), which ensures the alliance of passage. These (in)sincerities come to pass as *B* attempts to use premises (#7-8) to spin *A*'s perception of the situation into a complacent dizziness—a seduction that will indirectly allow her to further her opinion.

If *A*'s opinion remains intact (meaning *A* has not been nauseated by *B's* spin, and has not excused himself to use the WC), *B* has one last opportunity. The opportunity for success resides in premises #9-12. *B* attempts to politicize the situation. *B* hopes to influence *A* to look at

the issues surrounding the situation, using common issues to negotiate synchronicity, and governance to filter concurrence. Premise #9 ($c[a_s$ is $a_o]$) is the most aggressive approach because it is a blatant analysis of what *A* believes is true subjectively and objectively, assuring the affirmation of endearments. *B* could argue that governing the intimated evidence of an experience that defines the situation through the collection of truth is inefficient and thus irrelevant because the sharing of an experidyll is prioritized, suggesting that *A*'s point of view does not make sense, that *A* is politically incorrect because the truth (definition and interpretation) is specific to *A*'s identity and not necessarily to the public's identity. However, such facilitation could be categorized as smearing—not a good approach to influence someone to change one's views: addressing a state of affairs that (in this case) dishonors a state of being; bashing common sense via an agenda. A holier-than-thou attitude tends to generate (if not openly) contempt. Premise #10, ($c[b_s$ is $b_o]$) is an analysis on what *A* should/must trust subjectively and objectively. *B* could argue that governing automated interests in a stature that desires the situation through the projection of trust is efficient and thus relevant to obtain goals because shopping for stature is prioritized, suggesting that her point of view is politically correct, and her view is the only view worth attaining because trust (interest and systematization) is general information for the public to consume, which assures the alliance of passage. However, such facilitation without categorical support from compatriots could be considered by *A* to be self-aggrandizement, and dismissed—not a good approach to influence someone to change one's views: addressing a state of affairs to instill a state of becoming; confirming common goals via an agenda. An unchecked (non-challenged) attitude is a poor benchmark for gauging correctness. Both premises #9-10 are heavy-handed approaches to getting one's point across.

The most practical and streamlined recourses of action are premises #11-12 because these approaches entangle opinions *a* and *b* in a symbiotic fusion; politicizing dissimilar binary permutations assures that *a* does not exist without *b*, nor *b* without *a*, which is the best *B* can do

to bring *A* onto "common" ground. First, taking a look at politicizing the personal is professional ($c[a_s$ *is* $b_o]$). *B* argues the relevance of her perspective by stating that professionalism is a necessary "evil," thus empathizing with *A*'s personality: ability to make sense. *B* shows how prioritizing the shaping of stature, for better or for worse, is integral to instilling *A*'s state of being for this situation albeit extrinsically. To emphasize the significance of *A*'s being, *B* argues that governing the fusion of the personal as professional brings forth intimated interests in stature to define the situation through the projection of the truth, which is one of the best compromises to bridge the gap between the two perspectives, and the success of maintaining an equilibrium of perspective.

Conversely, *B* could argue that professionalism is a necessary "good," but she should make every attempt not to degrade *A*'s personality. *B*, honoring a state of becoming, argues that personality is important, but what is needed is an air of professionalism—the ability to obtain goals. Sensitizing one's self to *A*'s alliance to endearments, *B* manipulates the situation by governing the automation of evidence of the situation through the collection of trust, though compromise, acknowledging that the honoring the state of becoming is an ongoing process that keeps personality fastened to professionalism, keeps the situation organic. *B* could also cast *A*'s perspective in the role of the necessary good/evil, but *B* runs the risk of *A* declaring his opinion as being the more significant factor—which is not necessarily bad, but places *B* in the supporting role. If *B* wants *A* to take control of the situation, then fine, otherwise *B* should compliment *A* indirectly. Nevertheless "playing" the lead or supporting role, *B*'s campaign has gotten *A* to acknowledge the existence of her opinion—if only for the moment.

Conclusion

Mutuality—agreement in understanding—is the key to overcoming dislocation. Besides the outright disapproval of perspective, individuals disagree when the explanation, justification and/or rationalization of the association to conditions is too convoluted (as described in bilat-

eral dislocation), or too complex (as described in trilateral dislocation). However, while simplicity may be the key to reflecting mutuality, simplicity only scratches the surface of comprehending the traditional, philosophical, and democratic causes that affect the psyche. Simplicity does not give rise to full understanding, only to agreement in principle.

For individuals do freely associate conditions based on conventions of wisdom. The complexity of the individual's conventions is directly proportional to the amount of complexity he/she has in his/her life. The simplicity or complexity of an individual gives rise to optional opinions. Paradoxes such as complex simplicity or simple complexity rarely give rise to mutuality. Reflection occurs when an individual decides/attempts to follow a path of simplicity (agreement in principle) or complexity (agreement in understanding).

Belief and knowledge conflict within the individual, as belief and knowledge conflict within a group of individuals. Such potential for conflict either keeps mutuality at bay, or sets mutuality as a rigid standard. There is little difference for gaining certainty. So, to arrive at certainty, individual's difference needs to be tolerated to the point of gaining certainty. This does not mean individuals must reflect mutually each other's opinions. No. Certainty means clarity of opinion and the ability to (re)locate perspective flexibly.

Flexibility allows the individual to ascertain more clearly what common sense is, what the common goal is, what the common issue is. Henceforth, the individual is able to see the simplicity as well as the complexity involved in a situation, associate the associations to conditions and conventionalize the conventions of wisdom.

Through self-evidence, self-interest, self-governance, one could begin to freely associate relationships between (another's) cause and effect, begin to fathom the key dynamics of unilateral, bilateral, and trilateral configurations, and learn how to protect one's opinions, that is if one can keep one's options open.