

POLITICS & CULTURE: Atmospheric Boundaries

By Edward K. Brown II

I

Social order, the ideology of placing limits on a community, is established by folk through interaction, through an (in)direct assignment of views founded on a symbiotic relationship between politics and culture. During interaction, what is articulated is a point of view on the way things are/were, on the way things could/would/should happen. What is articulated is an opinion on the techniques used to implement the association of meaning and the assimilation of spirituality. As folk interact, they (un)intentionally make use of scientific and analytical techniques (ways) to articulate their opinions. Such techniques are supported by setting boundaries, by identifying landmarks (things) that compose a factual and/or valuable atmosphere (dystopian/nutopian/utopian tendencies). Not until meaning is associated to a fact and/or spirituality assimilated to a value, in other words landmarked by a technique, do folk begin to recognize the existence and/or election of an ideology. This essay will explore how folk perceive the atmosphere within the boundaries of a community to develop an ideology, how a community composes an atmosphere for social order, how folk set to the task of setting limitations, of finding ways to make things happen.

II

An ongoing task—finding ways to make things happen. Continuously, folk articulate political/cultural opinions in conjunction with using scientific/analytical techniques to designate boundaries (to identify landmarks). These things happen instantaneously; however, folk find ways to facilitate things (from) happening for purposes of stability, and, consequently, document, for purposes of stability, the resulting hegemony that progresses and describes the ideas that generate standards and images, which articulate the social order and outline

the boundaries of the community. In one instance, boundaries are outlined by standard images that provide an atmosphere for normal experiences. In another, boundaries are outlined by imagined standards that foster an atmosphere to experience normalcy. Subtle, but poignant differences, differences occurring in policy and theory.

The first instance, atmosphere is ordered by political science and cultural analysis (PS/CA). Folk facilitate through a normative progression of ideas to arrive at a policy, and they document through an empirical description of ideas to arrive at a theory. The policy is a systemic rendition (a "standard" reality), whereas theory is an approximate rendition (an "imagined" reality). Because of the symbiotic nature of PS/CA, folk propose the policy and the theory behind it to the community as the standard image for applying facts to landmark boundaries—thus composing a tendency to process the meaning of normal experiences: associating atmosphere.

Such propositions are not to be mistaken for the second instance: atmosphere assimilated by the boundaries landmarked by cultural science and political analysis (CS/PA). CS/PA proposes an imagined standard, which is, in comparison and contrast to the first instance (PS/CA), an equivocation. CS/PA folk facilitate through a normative description of ideas to arrive at a policy ("imagined" reality), and document through an empirical progression of ideas to arrive at a theory ("standard" reality). Folk propose to the community the imagined standard for the application of values as a tendency to practice the spirituality of experiencing normalcy, which is to be assimilated. Ideological constructs for instance, PS/CA and CS/PA both have the potential to exemplify atmosphere: dystopian/nutopian/utopian tendencies. In doing so, boundaries are likely to be overlapped, bringing into conflict interaction, fluxing point of view articulation. Such shifts in opinion create poignant differences.

In these instances, opinions concerning the atmosphere are articulated so to determine the meaning and spirituality of maintaining particular boundaries. For within the cubist con-

structs of norms and experience, standards and images equivocate social order; the identification to landmarks, as composed by policy and theory caught in a reification conundrum, create paradigms of *différance*. To identify with the first half of the composition, policy, folk, based in political science, compare norms to envision standards for the community to share, whereas cultural science based folk contrast norms to observe the standards, which are to be upheld by the community. PS folk initiate an agenda to develop a conscientiousness of the facts, a correctness that concerns the community. CS folk initiate a mission so to get the community to conform to the correct set of values. The use of political science allows for congenial interaction between folk as opposed to cultural science, where hegemony is an imperative, charismatic interaction is preferred. PS folk are engaged in processing (group) operations, while CS folk are geared toward practicing (group) orientation. By recognizing the second half of landmark composition, folk augment their policy with theory be it either cultural or political analysis. PS folk utilize cultural analysis to compare experience, to foster a meaningful image to move beyond the immediate surroundings of individuals, to enrich the community, whereas CS folk use political analysis to contrast experience, to sanctify an image for communal spirituality and disparage individual immediacy. The act of cultural analysis requires folk to put into context facts for identification. The point of political analysis is to get folk to consider content that is valuable for identification. Looking at the entire landmark composition, PS/CA envisions the context and CS/PA observes the content of the atmospheric changes in ideology.

PS/CA contextualizes ideology by comparing the normal experiences envisioned by the community. This comparison establishes standards and fosters an association with landmark images concerning the social order of folk. Policy is operated by a (group) process in which networks are forged to develop a collective meaning concerning an (obfuscating) matter. The process encourages consciousness and, in theory, provides enrichment for which the community will identify an atmospheric boundary, be it a dystopian, nutopian or utopian

tendency. In doing so, folk facilitate and document an agenda, an awareness of the fact(s) that are intended to (re)urbish and (re)present the opinions of the community as a whole. Conversely, CS/PA *content* ideology by contrasting experiences of normalcy in observance of the sanctity within the community. What results are the appeasement and imposition of image in the display of exclusive standards that encourage assimilation with landmark totems that outline the social order. Policy is oriented by a (group) practice in which rituals are observed to contain a collective spirit concerning a (nebulous) issue. The practice encourages conformity and, in theory, disparages any attempt to secede from the community's identity. By doing so, folk facilitate and document a mission, a hegemony of values, those that align and inspire the opinions of the community as a whole.

The symbiotic nature of ideology compels folk to equivocate process and practice. This is due to a *différance* of opinion in the way that techniques are used to landmark things such as an association of meaning or an assimilation of spirituality. [No more confusing is the situation between wrestling matters of the Institution (PS/CA) while tackling issues of the Orthodoxy (CS/PA)!] In what way are folk supposed to interact if things in the community that are to be a meaningful part of a process are (un)intentionally construed as an inspirational part of a practice (or visa versa); in what way are folk supposed to articulate factual and valuable significance if their point of view is in flux? Process practice or practice process. Variations on these themes perplex folk as they try to set boundaries, to collect the atmosphere of their choice. Therefore, to have and to hold an opinion is to assert an agenda or mission on the facilitation and documentation of social order, of atmospheric boundaries. To interact and articulate a point of view is to enter into a dispute over standards and images, over norms and experiences, over how free are folk to express themselves. This dispute, for all intents and purposes, is over how reality is rendered as an emphasis of politics or culture. In other words, what matters is an issue—a confusion of context with content.

This (con)fusion in the rendering of reality allows landmarks to compose boundaries

that are not only associated (via a PS/CA agenda) as meaningful, but also assimilated (via a CS/PA mission) as spiritual. This overlapping of boundaries, forcing a *différance* in the atmosphere, conflicts tendencies, which then, as ideas interact, become a matter/issue regarding the articulation of science and analysis, become a technicality between folk's political and cultural influence on the social order of things within the community. Being hitched on a technicality causes folk to offer an opinion on the way reality was rendered, to scrutinize (compare and contrast) the policy and theory that generated the ideology. What is meted out of the scrutiny is the intrinsic value of the ideology: spirituality—a judgment on the level of inherent meaning; an elected placement of importance within the social order; emphasis on dystopian, nutopian or utopian tendencies. From the scrutiny of technique comes clarity of what was also equivocated: process and practice. The result, the politics and culture of the ideology are viewed as juxtaposed outlines of facts and values, not as overlapping boundaries.

III

Just the facts, the association of meaning, are used to register (landmark) folk's PS/CA ideology. In the process of maintaining social order, folk attempt to compare facts, to operate their consciousness within the significance of their desired tendencies. In doing so, folk formulate an agenda, an intent of prioritized opinions, matters that institute the context of B/being, that which requires the community's attention and subsequent action. An advisory notice, the agenda, its facilitation through normative progression and documentation of empirical description of ideas, becomes an imperative to the standardization of an image registering congeniality. Implemented by articulating and interacting meaning, the agenda, and ultimately the ideology, progresses locomotively and describes logistically facts, those matters that allow folk to process the context of their desired tendencies within the community.

Locomotive facts are a formulation of properties that articulate meaning—that which is registered as an existing encounter: landmark cause and effect axioms that standardize reality (defined actual situations). Couched in political science, *locomotive facts* outline the basic schemata of a normative progression, an accepted association to systemic reason (i.e. policy) for enrichment. In order to achieve enrichment, as envisioned by the Institution, one must share the desires that are to be incorporated into the scheme. The incorporation is accomplished through *logistical facts*: a formula of properties that interacts meaning; the registration of an elective encounter—postulations of imagined reality (hypothesized semiotic situations). Embedded in cultural analysis, *logistical facts* propose a syllogism for empirical description, an approximation of reason (i.e. theory) that brings to fruition congeniality within the Institution, and thus fortifying the community's ideology.

Both locomotive and logistical facts, symbiotically connected as PS/CA ideology, allot folk the capability to compare contexts: expect and determine a reaction/response to the agenda; comprehend its political charge. Processed are facts concentrated on matters concerning the association of meaning: what did matter, what is the matter, and what will matter. In regular processes, folk compare the agenda to their existing interactions with community encounters. Also, folk take into consideration the context of their tendencies, that which should/would/could be encountered if the agenda is made into a regulation: registered as a policy of the Institution that reinforces the ideology. However, if engaged in the process (of checking the facts) folk exhibit signs of being in *différance*, they are confused about the adherence to institutional policy to the facts and opt to point their view in a direction that is concerned with the content of tendencies. Having lost interest in a process (that does not really matter), folk suspend reality—convert (waffle, flip-flop, flux, shift, etc.) their interests to Orthodox paradigms. They take into consideration the practice of real issues, issues of value.

III

A question of values, the assimilation of spirituality, is used to validate folk's CS/PA ideology. In the practice of maintaining social order, folk attempt to contrast values, to orient their conformance with the significance of their destined tendencies. In doing so, folk plan a mission, a manifestation of prioritized opinions that orthogeneticizes the content of b/Being, that which requires behavior modification and subsequent education of the community. A proclamation of agency, the mission, its facilitation through normative description and documentation of empirical progression of ideas, becomes imperative to imaging a standard of hegemonic alignment. The mission is accomplished by articulating and interacting spirituality, by describing logistically and progressing locomotively values, those issues that instruct folk to practice the content of their destined tendencies throughout the community.

Logistical values are a method of principles that enhance the spirituality of interaction—that which is validated as an elective belief: unconditional resolutions conveying imagined reality (defined semiotic situations). An implication of cultural science, logistical values is a plan, a faith of normative descriptions, an accepted assimilation of systemic reason (i.e. policy) for sanctity. In order to achieve sanctity, as sanctioned by the Orthodoxy, one must complete a predestined deed that is a gesture, a profession of faith. This gesture is accomplished through *locomotive values*: a fabulation of principles that articulate spirituality as an existing belief on display for validation; those effects landmarked, causing the planning of reality into a standard (hypothesized actual situations). Inherent in political analysis, *locomotive values* keep the faith, produce a myth for empirical progression as an approximation of reason (i.e. theory) that heightens the charisma within the Orthodoxy, and thus stabilizes the community's ideology.

Both logistical and locomotive values, symbiotically connected as CS/PA ideology, allot folk the ability to contrast content: the expectation and determination of responses/

reactions to the mission; assess the cultural impact. Practiced are values concentrated on issues concerning the assimilation of spirituality: from where did the issue come, from where is the issue currently coming, to where will the issue go. In ordinary practice, folk contrast the mission to their elective articulation about community situations. Also, folk concentrate on the content of their tendencies, that which should/would/could be situated if the mission is made into an ordinance: validated as a policy of the Orthodoxy that reinforces the ideology. However, if engrossed in the practice (of appraising value) folk exhibit signs of being in *différance*, they are confused about the consistency of orthodox policy to the issues and opt to point their view in a direction that is concerned with the context of tendencies. When folk interpret the mission as a polarization of rationale, thus requiring a leap of faith, formulating folk strive to curtail their imagination, converting their mission into an agenda. Taking the time to process matters (of fact), folk develop an agenda to find support from Institutional paradigms to stave off withdrawal from social order.

IV

Folk process facts to register an ideology and/or practice values to validate (potentially the same) ideology. The registration of social order is primarily a process of locomotion; the validation, mainly a practice of logistics. While both facts and values maintain social order simultaneously (which gives rise to *différance*), folk expect and are determined to articulate their ideas and interact under the influence of associative and/or assimilative constructs of an agenda and/or mission respectively. However, to implement an agenda and/or accomplish a mission, folk must focus on matters and/or issues. This would enable folk to distinguish the atmosphere, be it an expression of political charge and/or an impression of a cultural impact. An expression/impression of freedom—folk choose the context/content in which to direct a conversation, initiate a dialogue.

Essentially folk have two choices in which to influence social order: by emphasizing

context or content. The first choice, emphasizing context, is a freedom of expression concerning a matter of fact that instills determination in folk as they encounter an agenda that has the potential to lead to a process—PS (policy). The second choice, emphasizing content, is a freedom of impression involving an issue of value that meets the expectations of folk as they situate a mission that has the potential to lead a practice—CS (policy). If folk are unable to make a choice, a decision on an opinion, they are betwixt emphasizing limits, in *différance*. Opinions—choosing to articulate either context/content brings flux (conversion) to social order. The interaction of opinion influences the course of ideology in the association and assimilation of folk in a community and thus brings into crisis social order. To prevent flux (conversion of ideology), CA (theory) is utilized to refurbish and represent the meaning of a PS (policy). PA (theory) is utilized to align and inspire the spirit of a CS (policy). In the end, from emphasis comes an opinion that culminates in a set of ideas be PS/CA or CS/PA. A proposal is made concerning how folk should/would/could think and behave in order to bring about change in the community, to set boundaries as choice encounter (desire being an act of self-determination) or chosen situation (destiny Being an act of self-expectation).