

THE METAPHYSICS OF GROCERY SHOPPING

“I met Blanchard. And we considered the lingering possibility of the philosophical project.”

“Were you a student of his?”

“I met someone, who knew him. And I was able to turn this into a meeting.”

“You actually met Blanchard.”

”Yes.”

Wes and I discussed the philosophical project. He had a rudimentary acquaintance with the philosophy.

“Should philosophy dismiss all forms of metaphysical thought metaphysical activity as confused thinking? Through metaphysics, the subject imposes a framework that assists in interpreting the world. Metaphysics endows the experience in the world with a project. This project provides for the involvement of the individual and experience.”

I was interested in understanding the philosophical viewpoint of Blanchard.

“Post modern philosophies developed from an attempt to reject metaphysics.

Metaphysics imposes a subjective framework upon the world. Without this interest, individual is limited to immediate influences. But it’s very nature and metaphysical project is a critique of the terms of experience. On this basis, the real is only a construct. Metaphysics provides access to another way of seeing things that is not limited by the immediate approximate reality. The post-modern critique suggests that the metaphysical frame supports an allusion about the world. It makes the subject think that it is empowered with this insight.”

“Blanchard tries to strike a balance among these competing views. Indicates that any rejection of a metaphysical outlook is its self fraught with critical features of the metaphysical project. This could include any form of scientific objectivity. At times, Blanchard suggests that the subject of certainty is only a more extreme form of the subject itself. Metaphysics is the foundation of the scientific project. The individual constructs a model of behavior. And experimental design applies this model to actual experience. In interpreting this application, the researcher attempts to determine if the design model fits the conditions of every day experience.”

“By its very nature, this process is metaphysical. It builds upon the coherence of the reflective model. And uses this model to frame the encounter with experience.

If the metaphysical project is central to help people see the world, then Blanchard’s critique attempts to determine how that metaphysical object obscures the world. Why is Blanchard’s philosophy not an example of relativism? He observes the relativistic gestures on the part of others. However, he attempts to elucidate the forms of this relativism. As such his critique appears to have an absolute ring. At the same time he constantly revises the terms that he uses to conduct his critique.”

“Over time, this revision eventually adopts terms that lack the same level of philosophical. Inherent difficulty of the initial exposition is replaced by a discourse that seems more jargon-laden.”

“The new critical terms enhance the position of the thinker. They give Blanchard the access to celebrity status. Blanchard celebrity status could appear to be the basis for a criticism of his later philosophy. In some ways, he only explains key aspects of his original exegesis. This leaves only a shell. And he can continue to adapt this shell for different contexts. Where is the rigorous exposition that was the basis for the early works? The philosopher’s role is now the

important part of the overall development. The philosopher grants credibility to the initial set of terms. These terms are then combined into the theoretical constructs that advance the new presentation. Blanchard's most radical project involved challenging the political basis for repressive social thought."

"The enlightenment philosopher was prevented from making this investigation, because the rational critique risked absolutism. Blanchard wanted to get closer to the actual terms for this reversal. On the initial view, the philosopher was endorsing the sovereign state. In the revision, the role of the thinker needed to change. The person could not accommodate to the norms of philosophical thinking. This was not about rational thought; it was another form of human activity."

"Philosophy focuses on this object that persists. This is the form of knowing. However, the lasting object has its form because it is retained. Thus the self continues to recognize this personal reflection. In a sense, there is no connection to anything except a desire to see. As such, that would appear to suggest wishful thinking. The individual retained images that's supported a constant eventual vigilance. But this vigilance only supported the act of seeing. Self was caught up in this circular motion. But there was no record of this movement. Nevertheless, philosophy did offer this framework for experience."

"Experience would make no sense without some level of constancy. Even if this constancy could be shaped to other kinds of experience, it would still represent a fundamental connection a fundamental encounter with matter. With this idea of philosophy conceived of a separate from human activity. What was the relationship between what was seen and what created the observed world. The scientist might look for patterns. However, these patterns only made sense if the world could be altered. Thus, the observer could compare affects. Did this comparison break a hold of wishful thinking?"

"The individual was still attached to familiar images. If the scientist created another model of the manifest, it would still rely on cues to inspire the observer. This otherworldly model offered another way to view the world. Critical social forces could offer the means for change. This view of philosophy we're still very casual. Nevertheless, it offered critical outlook for the individual. From this outlook, the philosopher could construct a more systematic arrangement."

"There was still a question: did that arrangement rely upon some form of initial observation? Did it depend upon a clear program of evaluation? Without some form of interested observation, all these details would seem to be useless. The individual recognized this net work. And the network received this dynamic from particular interactions. Why was this view of philosophy presented in such an abstract way?"

Wes was hanging around the grocery store with the idea of buying food. There is always something strange about his gestures there was never any doubt that he was going pay for the things that he picked up. But he put each thing in his basket as if he was pilfering it.

He was moved by this underlying cause. And that added to the unique excitement of his actions. How did Wes represent this philosophical journey? If Blanchard had a philosophy, he needed Wes to fill in the critical details. Of course Blanchard knew nothing about Wes. That did not diminish the fact that Blanchard's philosophy relied upon some kind of heroic character and his stealthy moves in the grocery store.

Wes was acting out the key details of Blanchard's thought. And I how did this work? Has Blanchard made his points he was canceling them out. He was avoiding self incrimination. There's a key element of his thoughts. I provided it with us unique articulation. I'll toward, but philosophical work with seem to disappear just as it made its point. In a sense, there was no point. The thought was disruptive. But it avoided systematization. At some moments, it was almost like a novelty. It's effects were temporary. It lasted for the moment. It's staved off contrary ways of thinking. And that was the end of the process.

Wes might've wondered if this was the real Blanchard. And this reduced his philosophy to something eminently digestible? That made Wes seem like the perfect candidate to learn this method. But there was something missing. And I wanted to share. I had seen Blanchard in action. I felt that I had a unique understanding of his style. I wanted to be able to focus all the aspects of his thought process. That seemed enough for me. Blanchard seem to be responding to a view that the individual could create the object of knowledge. The individual was not constrained by some thing in itself. This connection to things was related to the efforts of the subject. At the same time Blanchard was suspicious of the subjects motives. And he was dismissing this defensiveness.

Although he tried to avoid incriminating evidence against himself, he was not averse to entrapping the subject. He documented this architecture even as he was stripping it away. This process was engaging these constellations of human interaction were invalidated by the very form of depiction. The record was stripped away. But the glow seemed to be retained in the night sky. Blanchard could explore explore two forms of wishful thinking. On the one hand the individual witnessed these in positions of experience. On the other hand all those memories were faced.

The individual faced the individual confronted the limits of wishful thinking. The defensiveness was without defense it was as if Blanchard was a trial lawyer about to rest his case he had already destroyed the attachment to substance. There were no clear persistence is of things. At the same time the individual could not fortify personal motivation. He was seeing two very different philosophical strategies as one in the same. Was there a hopelessness in this depiction? Or Blanchard did not want to give in to such a moment of vulnerability. Nevertheless, he was facing enough challenges. So he could offer these temporary poses and each one could seem to be based on old Forest. All this further enhance his reputation. But it made the philosophy seem less substantial.

Wes was an amateur. He offered us is vaudeville act, but Blanchard wasn't all that different. He was trying to turn the history of philosophy into this prolonged spectacle. He would put together his repertory troop to represent one moment or the other. Then he could disband that representation and move on to another. His cartwheels and handstands only made him seem more adept. He was trying to be the ringleader in the circus. But he didn't want to be exposed as a fake. He needed the blood curdling growls of the lion. His portrait of metaphysics was there to frighten children. He and he was completely successful at these efforts.

At least, that was what his followers thought. He was focusing on that wrinkle in time. And that gave nothing of an excuse for the Noor. Thus, there was an object for philosophy. Humanity was not lost in an internal skepticism. At the same time he was doing everything that he could to invalidate that wrinkle. He characterized it as wishful thinking. He needed to dispense completely with any kind of thinking at all it was all a prop. If there was no circus, there would be no entertainment. And so he worked on tricks with a cane and top hat. That was

the real essence that was the real character of his philosophy. He could dispense with all of metaphysics he could let go of the focus on the object.

He could even dispel an appeal to science and its analysis in terms of atomic substances. Blanchard was entirely successful in this art. If the researcher went back to the roots of philosophy, if he tried to an earth history, he would be left with these furtive gestures furtive.. This was just kind of this was just the kind of push that West needed.

We were questioning the importance of Blanchard's philosophy. Its worth may have seem exaggerated, but he had his followers. There were many people, who awaited the laterst version of his thought. He made a special effort to craft this new version. He needed to keep selling. That might have seemed entirely cynical. What other way could I look at his work.

Wes wanted to take me back. He wanted to understand the context for this kind of thinking. What were its origins? We reviewed the two kinds of exploratory gestures. One tried to empower the thing in itself. But things represented kinds of gestures. Then there were thoughts, which were rotted in the efforts of the thinker. This was a fascinating starting point. The philosopher needed to avoid psychology. However, many forms of philosophy built upon this psychological facade.

This was also a form of philosophical discourse. Even in validating the psychology, the philosopher recognized the fundamental dissolution of the self. This created the oppositional nature of philosophy.

In order to account for the challenges of contemporary thought, some tried to ground their approach in sociology. Social theory provided a strong foundation for intellectual discovery. Blanchard did not want to validate this kind of methodology He explored the psychoanalytical affinities with the philosophical project. But he felt that philosophy would have to solve fundamental challenges before resorting to a social analysis.

Was Blanchard avoiding the political imperative? In the roots of philosophical thought, he thought that he was dealing with critical issues of political liberation. Oppression resulted from the wrong kind of thinking. He was not simply recuperating aspects of ancient philosophy. This dilemma was more suited to the present moment. In advancing this perspective, was he avoiding a fundamental political question? He did not want to reduce his philosophy to idle chatter. How could he maintain the commitment of the project.

He could have deferred to an ethical sensibility. What were the problems with this strategy? He feared all the features of bad faith. Philosophy could easily succumb. Caring could simply be the facade of a confidence game. If the dominant culture advanced such a model, then caring was nothing but an excuse. It represented nothing progressive for the philosophical project. Thus, it seemed easy to dismiss the ethical poase.

He still worked with ideas of a caring universe. He tried to offer this outlook in a critical manner. Caring represented a desire on the part of the individual. This was another form of wishful thinking. However, this was the basis for the encounter with experience. So there was a philosophical validity to this form of thinking.

What philosophies could bless this outlook? Blanchard struggled with the consitution of belief. Did faith seek to displace the philosophical gesture? Philosophical could not be reduced to a theology. He needed to retain the skeptical aspect of his thought. Indeed, this was the unique dynamic. He was casting off the trappings of religious thought. But he realized that he was lftet with all the same terms. This validated the idea of conversion.

He needed to be careful. He did not want to see philosophy as a theater. It was worthwhile interrogating these terms. But he did not support the notion of the conversion event. Philosophy did not work in that way. There were some versions, which offered this model. The individual faced this deep transformation. Philosophy emerged at the crossroads. But this version of the theater eliminated key stages in philosophical development.

Although he wanted to break down philosophical discourse, he needed to give credibility to these stages. He was attached to the process. The process was not a psychological revealing. It was an encounter with deeper challenges to the self. This could have been the basis for a metaphysical speculation. This implied a connection to spiritual questions, even as the spiritual consolation was dispelled.

He needed a philosophy, which used these profound meditative models. Philosophy was this extended practice. It was a turning inward. But it hollowed out all forms of spiritual support. It maintained the search.

I was not sure if I offered a clear explanation for Wes. I wanted to be more sympathetic to his questions.

He wondered, "Why do you feel that you have a special connection to this philosophy?"

This went beyond any kind of meeting that I had with Blanchard. What did I make of this encounter.

"I am describing this device. It is a key style of thinking. It enables me to organize what I want to say. At the same time, it can give me special insight into meaning."

"Is there such a thing as meaning?"

"Meaning wants to invalidate what it is being said. It wants to limit the speaker."

"I don't have the training."

"No one ever does."

"There is a secret about this device."

"What is it?"

Blanchard had created this performance that sustained his philosophy. Since, that had been his intention all along. The philosophy did not exist independently from the thinker. That understanding permeated his philosophical concepts. He tried to minimize their universality. But everything was based on this exaggeration. Well it seemed as if the exposition gave these terms their weight, close inspection of the process of deduction revealed a limited logical development.

Blanchard eschewed a logical argumentation. So these concepts had greater power in the presentation. All the while, he denied the import of these notions. He would continue to repeat each with a slight variation on repetition. They would seem to give them their power. At the same time, he offered a little strength to the overall development. This somewhat accord with his predecessors. They brought the same laxness to philosophical discourse. And at first, these texts might seem impenetrable. But they truly lacked expository power. There is something missing. It went along with the disparaging comments about metaphysics. No wonder Blanchard professed little training when it came to formal thought.

He adapted these traditional concepts. They seem to have rigor because they were drawn from other texts. His erudition alone might've seemed overwhelming. And close inspection, this wasn't that significant. He attacked the referential aspect of language. But his texts were supported by references to actual experience.

Ultimately he needed his support because of the limited development of formal logic. This question was significant. It went beyond his performance. It was something that had a little to do with the ideas of Wes. This training in formal thought provided the basis for any significant encounter with experience if meaning was not simply an arrangement assigned to a word, and the overall process of interlocking connections would propel the encounter with language this is where things became messy but that chaotic outlook represented another dimension of experience. I

Blanchard would focus on the whole team relationship with time. If time was represented continuously, mathematics could sort through these representations. The discontinuous relationship meant that meaning was suspended. However, if Blanchard was to be taken his word, and his reputation would also be as insecure. Through it all, that was the only thing that held together. And it all seemed like nonsense.

How was that possible? How could its reputation offer they needed coherence to a philosophy. His view of time would have made the manifestation of personality completely unstable. This disassociative model would've been a hallmark of his overall development. No wonder he was drawn to the notion of signature as the critical gesture to counter autobiography. If the autobiographical project was in jeopardy, the signature would seem to provide the seal to ground the project. But the signature was simply a strategy. Over time it could be altered or forged. And that forging characterized his philosophy. He was defending the authenticity of his practice. At the same time, he reserve the right of forgery. Everything was nothing and nothing was everything. When the reader tried to hold him to the contract, he could claim that the signature was forged. The contract was simply an imposition. It was all theater.

After all this devotion, the reader was owed nothing in the process quickly came to an end. On balance, that was so all there was to say. This was the beginning and the end of the process. Blanchard would've been nothing without the people who explained his philosophy. They could draw in their associations. He would make public appearances. And they could interview him. All this obscurity finally became ritual. It didn't take much to become initiated.

After a while, it was simply like an exclusive club where people paid their dues. That was the foundation of his philosophy. He could've easily be running a corporation with franchises. Eventually that would be the result. His disciples could be found all over the world carrying on the faith.

When he did have something to say, when he did want to express a philosophical urgency, it has little to do with the concerns of the people. He attached himself to a vague notion of human rights. It could easily be co-opted by the state. After all he wanted to be well rewarded.

In sharing my knowledge about Blanchard, I didn't want to insult Wes. Wes would've been a suitable student for Blanchard. He was eager to turn his platitudes into philosophical wisdom. Blanchard would have been a worthy teacher. If Wes could've told people that he was a student of Blanchard, it would've all made sense. Blanchard needed more representatives like this. He needed more people who were willing to share their zeal with him. That was basic to his way of thinking.

Over time, Blanchard's disciples had been able to carve out a place for themselves. There are enough variations on this philosophy. It could be applied to different subject matters. Blanchard had already shown interest in literature, art, and psychoanalysis. He needed new

metaphors. Each person could offer another facet. The mosaic would seem rich. But it was all that same repetitive flow.

Blanchard might've been a little more elusive than other philosophers. He was adding another layer of contention. But in his version of metaphysics, the universe reflected a uniform vision. This was the fits and starts his thinking. There was nothing else there.

I wondered if Wes had the concentration to carry through all aspects of this philosophical exposition. He attached himself to simple ideas. He wanted something that could motivate his seduction. Blanchard offered him a suitable philosophy. But it might have been too overwhelming for him.

I had already made the comparison. Wes's behaviors had their roots in some kind of tumult. How could this be explained on historical terms? He wanted to overcome his biography. He would talk about his father. But this was not the beginning and end of his act. Wes had taken a few simple ideas and expanded them into an act. I wanted to add to my thoughts about Blanchard.

He created a classic classificatory system that added key elements to a philosophical awareness. As the user traveled along the categories, they demarcated a more active contribution of the individual. At the same time, Blanchard suggested that the strength was a weakness. The individual that came lost in a personal illusion. The creative endeavor only distracted the person from a more sustained understanding. Philosophy appeared to describe thorough way of seeing the world. At the same time, the individual was cut off from this universal view. That created a deep conflict.

Blanchard's portrayal the subject always worked against itself. This might imply a more intense dynamic. But that intensity could also be attributed to the psychology of the individual. Again, Blanchard could've spell this notion. This was a very conflict that became some part of his theater. Are there seem to be an attendant activism. The self criticize these gestures. Could lead to a more austere presentation. It was important to understand Blanchard's influences. He developed from a very dynamic presentation philosophy to something much more muted. The highs were all rolled off. Overtime this offer greater inspiration. He believed that his philosophy was more. So he did what he could do embellish the ideas.

Everything remained somewhat restricted. Even when there was this explosiveness, lacked that magic. He didn't see this as a failure on his part. Instead the result was intentional. He was re-casting the drama. It would lose its initial wonder. But that excitement would be replaced by a long lasting gesture. Even if this gesture was somewhat limited, he understood challenges. He felt that it was fundamentally personal expression. So he built upon the symmetry. That would appear to make him more assertive.

In a sense, he had replaced one absolute for another. He would deny the preeminence. The philosopher was staying true to form this marginalized the activity. But It didn't leave them wanting.

Philosophy relied upon an ability to see beyond immediate experience into alternative view of the world. This outlook enabled the individual to exit exercise greater control over experience. In a strict sense, the notion of substance who is this magical form that could be combined through combination and subtraction into the various frames of reality. The individual discovered a method to impress these frames. This could be an instrumental view of the world.

Or it could be more spiritual in nature. Philosophy could teach someone how to accommodate with reality. It offered different viewpoints how to relate. The world of appearances could yield to a deeper analysis of social interaction beneath the feelings of helplessness was a theory that explained forms of social oppression. This knowledge could provide the basis for change. And offering a grand theory, philosophy provided a perspective how to engage the world. On another view, this was the source of the personal challenges. The individual needed to let go of the desire to control. This kind of perspective had similarities with Blanchard's methodology. Blanchard offered opportunity, because he offered techniques to dispel common challenges. He wasn't the first philosopher who offered such a means. It was the bad in the way of thinking that got people messed up. There was an opening to seeing a different perspective of the world. Wes was attracted by just such a form of looking. Thus, he could tap dance his way through the variations. The show would never end.

That might make it seem as if Blanchard's philosophy only touch the surface. Indeed, they were simplifications. That didn't diminish its power. In someways, the simple versions open the door to a more complex way of thinking. This could fascinate Wes. There was a brilliance to this formulation. If Blanchard could boil it all down to one simple idea, that would be a worthy foundation of philosophy. What would that idea be? Even as the philosopher tried to resist the imprint of the past, there lingered a lasting architecture. This idea was a critical part of Blanchard's description. The philosopher invited this encounter with the impossible. There would be an invitation to cast off the negative influences. But it would be difficult strip away the effects of the past.

Blanchard a form of therapy, and Wes could welcome this invitation. That added to his understanding. What was the foundation of an historical awareness? What did Blanchard offer to historical interpretation? He could emphasize these aspects of wish for salmon. The past was presented like a dream. Some dreams represented personal frustrations. Others made false promises to the individual. Whatever formulation, the self created a full song. Blanchard offer the means to break with this song. At the same time he recognized that his break would itself be powered by the same understanding. Therefore, he faced this deep contradiction. That could be the basis for explaining his philosophy. He was more drawn to the skeptical formulation.

Philosophy made promises. They cannot be kept. In many ways, Blanchard what is denying his role. Some people wanted him to be a magician. He was nothing of the kind. However, his readers seem to endow his texts with his sacred quality. What was he doing? He was drawing on the thoughts of others. He was trying to draw his commentary he was trying to slice his commentary so close to the original, so that it did not appear that he was just starting the original work. He was clever. He could repeat each move again and again and make slide adjustments. The reader could concentrate on the original inspiration. But Blanchard had moved on. He had created his own illusion.

With his hefty quotations he gave the impression of mastery. He would play up on the slight variations in a word. He was finding a secret meaning. Readers could welcome the skill. They would feel somehow superior through this approach. If they were good, they can memorize all the key expressions. They could map overall development. Blanchard was adept at this technique. Blanchard would make his readers feel as if they were a part of a select group. They

would feel fortunate to play along. That would create excitement. Everyone would be loved by this portrayal. Are his disciples would add to the portrait. Now, the historical weight would appear to be overwhelming. This group had covered all the angles. There seem to be no convincing way to contradict Blanchard's assertions. He had appropriated all the philosophy for his project.

It was almost as if the past had anticipate this moment. Blanchard was a savior. His followers spoke and enlighten time. There was nothing cynical in this devotion. The readers that already let go over there cynicism in attaching themselves to Blanchard's descriptions. This commitment only made him seem more authoritative. But this was not a blind faith.

These ideas extended across the breadth of history. He could even recognize these influences. That made them all the more worthy. Philosophy relied upon such a presentation. On first glance, this form of thought seemed full of rigor. That gave it its . Blanchard was going to yield for nothing less. That made him all the more assertive.

Philosophy could offer a promise. It could help dissipate the disorders of the soul. How is this even possible? Where are the challenges of the body only more blonde in the sore? If that was so, what was the source of this disorder. Did a prolonged encounter with the stress on humorous the self in a deeper morass? These questions could be dismissed as the illusions of a metaphysics. Blanchard might've been asking for more direct confrontation with experience.

At the same time, he might suggest at the very notion of experience was based on the expectations of the subject. His role was to eliminate these expectations. He returned philosophy to its darkness. At the same time, he was demarcating space. He elaborated the roadmap. What else was there? What was left to be seen? Philosophical insight provided a self reflective model. Individual could feel submissive to authority. Philosophy might reinforce that authoritative you. Again, Blanchard's intervention would appear to be welcome. Was he simply shuffling the terms of existence? Did he really offer an alternative? If you did, how could it be constitute.

The thinker was trying to gather sand in his hands. There was no clear shape. There was no clear intent. Everything was suspended. How else could understanding be achieved? For Blanchard, understanding was this an easy consolation. The self confirmed this idea but needed to be heard. The troubling secrets remained. They were hidden. How could philosophy focus these ideas? Once again, in terms of the philosophical project were evident. Could the individual encounter the world without this mediation. There was nothing haphazard in these efforts. But without this meandering, philosophy only stayed in the familiar path. It only came to an agreed-upon resort. This was the consolation that people wanted.

They had goals. They want to clear outcomes. They didn't want to see the rips in time. They wanted to stay lost in nostalgia. One could remain in the solution for a long time. However, once the edifice crumbled, the self would be devastated. Should the individual to care for some event that might never happen?

Was this like the squirrel gathering nuts for the winter? Was this the preparation for the coming hurricane? Or was it in anticipation for a catastrophe that never arrived? This anticipation was the very stuff for philosophy. But the philosopher wanted to avoid the same position. Even in complex formulations a simple resolution was expected. Blanchard understood this ambiguities. For his part, he was ready to muddy the waters. That was how things really

were anyway. People saw the clarity that they wanted to see. They reinforced their own expectations. Even as Blanchard seem to upset the proverbial apple cart, his efforts only substantiated his own reputation. More and more, this looked like a performance. That could only support the perspective of Wes. Wes was playing along. He felt the appeal of this model. These were magic tricks. The magician always knew what going on. The mystery existed only for the observer. In some cases, the audience was willing to give everything for one of these tricks. Wes had his own version of trickery.

So it all seemed to work out. On this view, philosophy could mediate the sensible world. But it also exaggerated a curiosity of the subject. The subject would avoid instability. Safety was only a temporary belief. Indeed this was the fundamental conflict. Wes could take delight in this representation. He had been mocking the efforts of the individual. It's more extended form, Blanchard's critique mocked the self. It exposed person own hesitation.

Philosophy had made people too cautious. Blanchard merged Nessa certain moment. And west could find his own support in Blanchard's ideas. On this basis, Blanchard must've felt adventuresome. However, there was still a reticence in his offerings. He avoided him to be too radical. That was sufficient. Blanchard was an offering redemption. There was no rescue available. However there was just enough of a glimmer that could please his followers. On that basis, he would offer a more suitable revision. This revision suited is readers. The difficult exegesis of the early text might've seemed famed. Each new volume could be mastered with ease. And there was a temptation to see the total recasting of the traditional philosophical order.

Socrates never had it this good. Blanchard lived the moment for what it was. What is dialectics last? He might not of seen himself in that tradition, but he still involved in his readers Easton process of interrogation. The answers. In the newer texts. I didn't take much to get to the heart of the matter. This was the essential conflict. It was entertaining. Wes now truly felt like the ringmaster. He had never come in to contact with Blanchard. But he could offer his own take, and this would be just enough forhis life.

Did Blanchard's philosophy lead to emotional paralysis? The dissolution of the subject neutralized the will. The individual sought respite. But the efforts were condemned to silence. There were no words. The favored terms were sidelined. There was no other points of entry. This seemed like the suitable resolution.

Wes might have craved this position. He preferred to say less. He could make his points, and then he could savor the result. He would love to enjoy the spoils. Would Blanchard's thought tolerate such an easy popularization?

The self emerged in this confusion. It was necessary to allow the gestural posturing. The exaggerations were not permitted, but that did not diminish the propulsive attitude.

How could the text work this way?

"You call it a drive, and you already assume its trajectory."

"What are you talking about?"

"Does this have anything to do with the actual manifestation?"

"In every facet of observation, the self intervenes. Death is the only limit on this manifestation."

"What about intersubjectivity?"

"Wes did not exist through someone else."

"Wes is all-knowing."

“All-knowing of nothing.”

“Not even of Wes.”

“I HAVE A SECRET!”

“Did the psychological drive describe an actual physiological impulse? Or was the notion of motivation a combination of factors that made sense to the individual. This active intervention of the individual was a product of philosophy, not psychology. Psychology could describe the circumstances for such an intervention. But the actual activities of the individual are philosophical in nature. In other words the individual constructs of model for interacting with the world. Even if there are psychological influences on this model, the individual still has to exercise decision-making capabilities. This is the foundation of a philosophy. Individual is creating value. A person is not simply responding to environmental influences. Psychology can only describe these processes after they have occurred. The address the conditions of observation. This is independent from turning off the scientific project. Psychology can categorize ethical processes. But psychology does not create the actual decisions. Philosophy describes that experience.”

“Do I need to understand philosophy, or do I just need to live it?”

“Where are we?”

“We are sitting in the second level food court.”

“This is all edible.”

“It is an edible philosophy.”

“Do I eat it all? Is there a choice?”

“You do not make the choices for yourself. You only see the effects.”

“I am not sure that I like that.”

“That goes for the both of us.”

“Do we make decisions together?”

“Are we a public safety committee?”

“What is in the freezer?”

“They froze the meal before eating.”

“I want all the right elements.”

“You start with carbon.”

“It is a chemical dance.”

“We need a theory.”

“I have a little bit of money.”

“What about Blanchard?”

“Don’t be crass!”

