

THE GRADUATE STUDENT

“You are his graduate assistant?”

She nodded.

“Maybe, you could explain what he is working on right now.”

“You aren’t interested in what I am working on.”

“Tell me.”

I was waiting for her to describe some obscure philosophical question. I wouldn’t have been interested if she offered anything less. But why should I even care? I questioned his pursuits, so why would I be more interested in her work. I wanted to feign interested since this might draw me closer to him.

I had heard that he had developed a new interest in metaphysics, and she could have been his collaborator in these efforts. He always claimed that he was escaping from the strictures of traditional philosophy. It was almost as if he could blame her for his new pursuits.

I wanted to figure this out without listening to her say anything more. If I was accurate in my guess, then that would give me greater insight into what he was actually thinking.

I wasn’t saying that she had to wear her philosophy, but I could figure out how she dealt with the burden of existence. That belief only contributed to my own cynicism. I was interested enough in these endeavors, but I was offering her criticism even before she had said a thing.

I truly believed that his philosophy brought with it a pose. She was no method actor. She was not a romantic. She was not a situationist. There was no performance, which necessarily accompanied her philosophy. Perhaps, I resented that complacency, and I needed to express my disquiet.

I needed to review my discomfort with his philosophy. He had disciples, and I could have had quarrels with their inability to capture his critical arguments with any sense of accuracy. My conflict with him was much more fundamental. I did not see it as a personal disagreement.

I had some difficulty expressing my feelings. He had been an influence on my own work. But there was point that I could see myself going in a different direction. And I wanted to understand what was the motivating factor. This was not due to some kind of anti-intellectual verve. In fact, I saw his work as more of a pose than an authentic philosophical discourse.

His roots were strong, and he grounded his exposition in solid scholarship. There were moments when I ascribed more authority to these predecessors.

I was not trying to be pretentious. He really had far-reaching influence. Would I have come to this same point of view without having read his work? I also thought of it from a totally different point of view. I was responding to a more urgent phenomenon, and he was only part of a crucial encounter with this experience. If that was so, how did he become distracted from depicting this phenomenon.

On first glance, this seemed to be a technical problem. That would have required extensive training simply to recognize the problem. If his discovery could simply be reduced to a popularized idea, then that would have lessened its impact. By its nature, metaphysics was describing something hidden. Even if he was witnessing the end of metaphysics, there was a hiddenness in the manifestation of the object.

He saw this as a radical project, and this brought philosophy back to a powerful mission. That gave him some of his early notoriety, He was not seeking fame, but his commitment

brought him recognition. This was not meant to be rhetorical. He was utterly convinced by his approach, and he believed in the far-reaching implications of his work. That seemed to be enough to convince others of his acumen. The times needed a voice, and he was there to oblige. He was rocking the walls of the academy.

I didn't resent his reputation. If he deserved the recognition, I was not going to begrudge his accolades. But I did not want to give him credit, which he did not deserve. People needed his sense of confidence. But that was not the stuff of philosophy. I was never there to jump on a bandwagon.

I myself had become caught up in the sensation. I may have been late to the parade, but I spent a great deal of time trying to fit together all the aspects of his thought. For the time being, my work seemed very rigorous. I admired this aspect of his thought.

His graduate student could have renewed my faith, but she also could have added to my recent doubts. There was a strong mistrust on my part. I felt betrayed.

That did not diminish my interest in the actual source of this thought. A deep understanding of the social forces of the moment was not a casual undertaking. It required prolonged analysis. This was also his thread in his writing. He felt that he was capturing the suffering of the individual in concrete conditions. What was the basis for this concrete understanding? It was not simply a question of consciousness. There was this social resistance that prevented people from recognizing the actual basis for their alienation. This alienation could create anxiety and physical discomfort. In trying to eliminate these feelings, it was necessary to trace the process back to the root.

I think the popularity of his philosophy was due to its explanatory power. It could help people to understand their lives. It had a curative ability. Perhaps, the reputation was undeserved. But I still gave him consideration.

His graduate student may have resented my judgmental nature. But he had taught her to be the same way. She was probably more hypercritical. For that reason, I did not feel that bad that I had been questioning her style. She knew exactly what were his expectations. And she may have been more attuned into this kind of attitude. She was his pupil; she was not the source of the thought. She may have felt much more pressure to conform. That would only guarantee that she would make such an effort to represent his thought. She felt that it was her responsibility to be an icon.

I think that I was already getting overwhelmed by my beliefs about her. I didn't think that I was being cruel. I was only expressing honesty. That only made me more motivated to say something.

"Your actions are supposed to do the talking for you."

This was hardly his way of thinking. For him, the world of signs represented a deflection from the world of intention. The conjurer had an arsenal of gestures. Action could represent a form of distraction, a delusion.

She could see action as a form of trespass, the source of a psychological wound. This wound was an imposition. Therefore, philosophy helped to move the self away from this burden.

Had her own trials prompted her identification with this reading of the philosophy? That only made her contribution seem more substantial. It added density to his teachings. This wasn't simply a practical reading; it provided deeper validity to his way of thinking.

This interpretation only confirmed my misgivings. Rather than offer real insight about her experience, the philosophy was only this horrendous distraction.

Her connection to him only became more intense. She needed him to survive. And he knew this. She was not really allowed to develop independently. As much as she became part of this discipline, her whole being got tied up with this activity. She did not want to entertain the idea that he was exploiting her. Could the professional relationship ever be mutual? He might have acted as if he was concerned. But she was becoming a prop for his ideas.

It was a blessing that Blanchard had agreed to take me on his assistant. This would provide me with the opportunity to understand his motivation. I wanted to develop my own style as a writer. But Blanchard's work had been a revelation for me. I has struggled with philosophy. I think that I had personal conflicts about my studies. And Blanchard enabled me to bring clarity to my work.

Blanchard was very focused. He could seem intimidating. However, his method was premised on questioning his own assumptions. Every time that he started a new work, he would bring the same critical eye to his efforts. This fascinated me. I wanted to get in on the process.

I did not see myself as a disciple. We shared a similar avocation. He treated me with respect. He never made me feel as if I was a novice. He would share his own work with me. He wanted to hear my opinions. This was very much part of my growth.

I never felt as if Blanchard was taking advantage of my position. He was not demeaning towards me. He never enlisted me to do menial task for him. I was very involved in his process of writing and creating new philosophical ideas.

He encouraged my independence. I was not supposed to be his mouthpiece. I was not a disciple. He wanted me develop on my own path even if it challenged his basic ideas.

Philosophy seemed to offer the means to avoid mistakes in life. The individual could commit to a method that gave credibility to human activity. This could include a writing project or mechanical activity. Philosophy enabled the individual to overcome confusion and emotional uncertainty. Philosophy pointed the way to clear knowledge. Without this guidance, the individual could become overwhelmed numerous distractions.

This discipline provided guidance for the self. This guidance enabled the individual to explore the world confidently. Such motivation was accompanied by an emotional reassurance. The world seemed to yield to the self.

Philosophy was the right in the way of thinking. It prepared the individual to surmount challenges. It also was a corrective to lead the thinker back to the right path. This prevented let a person getting lost in the inconsistent sense impressions. The observer was directed to the clarity of matter. The fullness of the object became apparent.

Uncertainty was based on the instability in the physical world. A person could get distracted from the constancy of matter. These impressions could feed desire and waylay the individual in world of appearances.

What was this lingering object? What was there in creation that sustained human vitality? If the individual understood the arrangement of things, this could motivate secure roots in the physical realm.

Philosophy invited the self to a different kind of being. This invitation was lasting. It could persist through all kinds of different experiences. It gave access to numerous avenues of stimulation. Philosophical had a provocative nature.

The self could explore these invitations. The self could surpass the world of appearances. Even beyond knowledge, there was a unique character to apprehension. This freed the fullness of human vitality.

In order to attain its full power, the philosophical awareness needed to let go of all false attachments. The individual needed to submit to the power things in themselves. What was the basis for this marvel? How could the self peel back these layers to reveal a complete radiance to experience?

Clarity demanded a fullness of consciousness. There were no obstacles. The self was engaged by this enduring power.

Philosophy was not like other experiences. It gave momentum to these cognitive visions. Did this view of philosophy rely on the assent of the viewer. These structures could heighten a cognitive awareness. And deep emotions seemed to accompany this understanding.

Philosophy needed to create its own world. These representations would be enough for the individual. This encounter could dispel with the emotional register. It made sense in itself.

Philosophy admitted to the expectations of the self. The world was shaped on this anticipation. The world was shaped by wish-fulfillment. Science did not offer an alternative view. It demonstrated how these expectations could be reinforced. This enabled the individual to overcome the obstacles to human awareness.

These expectations encouraged the individual to take risks. These forays helped to describe the contours of the physical world.

“Everyone wants to dip into the water to explain perspective what is philosophy. Philosophy is more than human reflection. Philosophy is more than a kind of knowing. Although formal philosophy formal philosophy may seem strange disarm it provides a coherent framework for a unique kind of activity. Formal philosophy provides the conditions of knowledge. It offers access to unique kind of experience. Behind the mundane objects of thought, philosophy provides a lasting coherence. And it offer us a deeper explanation for the state of things without philosophy, the access to reality becomes unstable. Philosophy recognizes the gaps in human experience. It describes a path to greater understanding.”

“The ability to construct objects of thought provides access to world beyond immediate perception. The history of philosophy provides a connection beyond the tactile. He bring sense to being in the world. Otherwise, there is utter transience.”

“Philosophy proceeds from a desire to thread individual experience into a collective awareness. It asks the individual what is the factor that holds all this together. Why bother? What difference does it make? How can the individual alter these experiences? Even in raising these questions, it seems difficult to communicate the basis for philosophical investigations.”

“Philosophy provides the basis for understanding a coherent world behind the descriptions of science. Without this commitment, science would only describe continuities within perception. By themselves, these associations cannot offer a glimpse into an independent world. Philosophy takes stab at this depiction, and it offers clear links to experience that confirms this view. It is not simply a depth in human perception. Philosophy ascribes a coherent version behind the immediacy of experience.”

Aina recognized at philosophy provided a necessary connection between cause and effect. Even though an explanation seem to exhaust all possible cases, the idea of cause-and-effect demonstrated an underlying relationship between an outcome and it's creation.

Philosophy went beyond the successive events that were connected to an observed result. The notion of cause-and-effect brought the final event in a chain of related experiences. It demonstrated that the world was a fabric of interrelated events. They provided a moment of realization for the observer. Without philosophy, these observations would not relate to the actual conditions of experience. Philosophy was offering a vision to another realm. The self might seem incapable of this understanding. But committed thought provided a clear methodology. The individual can move beyond initial impressions. The world could be engaged in a direct way. Formal philosophy went beyond the particularity of any cause. And it described those mechanisms that held the universe together. This commitment was based on the active involvement of the observer. The observer could change conditions, and these causes would result in different effects.”

“Formal philosophy did not enumerate these experiences. Instead it provided a platform for the exploration. Even the fix nature of things had malleability. This kind of understanding extended to simple observation. One was recalling previous experiences. The observer understood that connection among the immediate affects of reality.”

“Philosophy existed in this dynamic relationship. It brought excitement to being in the world. This encounter was masterful. The individual wondered if a particular cause-and-effect might be elemental. This went beyond scientific explanation. What provided sustenance for the self in a very profound way?”

“Philosophy seemed so simple, but it could also be overwhelming. How can the individual develop this understanding in a basic way? Could philosophy be framed as common sense? Numerous philosophies try to proceed from this kind of awareness. What could constitute common sense? A fall on the concrete could bring about immediate contact with extensive urgencies in our experience. Philosophy could proceed from just such an encounter. Aina was looking for this kind of fundamental. What could it be? Philosophy was not meant to be a personal motivation. That kind of thing had psychological roots. Philosophy was a different kind of concerned. How could the individual attain that understanding? Did philosophy proceed from a deep hunger in the soul? Could that longing be thought of as the basis for deep thought about the world. What was the fundamental struggle in personal experience?”

“Why was the philosophical awareness needed? Aina recognized this concern. The encounter with the immediate was never enough. On that basis, every impression could fade away. The failure of memory could’ve erode any attempt to solidify a first philosophy. Philosophy was supposed to link the individual up to a lasting awareness. There were eternal truths that lasted through any kind of experience but the challenges could be immense. In a recognize this conflict. If philosophy did not inspire to an enduring awareness, then it really wasn’t of much use. It couldn’t just adorn thought with idle speculation. Momentary observations were not enough for the self. There needed to be a greater motivation.”

“Aina didn’t want philosophy to take her around and around in a circle. She was groping in the dark for coherence. Something was missing. How could philosophy touchdown in a solid world. These basic perceptions didn’t seem enough. There was a tradition of philosophy which try to carve away all the grand gestures what was left with a meager knowledge. The individual might as well have stopped trying. None of this would get anywhere. What was the basic atom of this awareness?”

“How did the combination of these basic forms provide for Aina’s prolonged understanding. There was an essential truth about which there could be no doubt. Could truth

be linked up to a basic vitality of the human spirit? Again, she did not want to resort to psychology. Even if the philosophical awareness originated with the subject, the individual looked for a more consistent relationship with the world. Where was the takeoff point? Where would philosophy travel to? Beyond the immediacy of the now, philosophy could empower the individual through an encounter with a hidden reality.”

By manipulating these forms, the individual could gain greater control of the situation. This philosophy could endow the individual with massive cognitive powers. She liked this description. Was this actually the do the right exchange, or was she simply reshuffling the same cards over and over again in and dealing them all in the same order? If that was so, the whole process was this interminable cycle without any form of rest. I she needed to get back to a more basic understanding. It was always the same thing. The first philosophy returned the philosopher back to the first philosophy. There was always an effort to get things right. This ideal beginning could permit a long lasting process that was marked by certainty. The individual could regain lost confidence. There were no longer be any cause for doubt. The science promised a myriad of combinations. The individual could enjoy all these alternatives. She felt overjoyed in these on observations. But that might have seemed like some silly kind of alchemy.

She was stitching together bubbles into the necklace. And this form was supposed to give her the needed assurance of philosophical understanding. She was not tracking DNA. She was not detailing the periodic table. For some this was a form of certainty. These combinations could yield more complex arrangements in nature. These processes could be explained. But the individual was again looking back at a reflection of the self. The busy self was piecing together all these components into a fine composition. That was not sufficient. There needed to be more. What was absent from this picture?

Philosophy had its own version of simple elements. Numerous thinkers tried to sketch these atomic particles. In some cases they included primitive elements of consciousness. It could be a basic thought or a provocative gesture. On that basis, philosophy almost seem to be a duel with an enemy. And the philosopher was there to strike first. A first philosophy could be devastating. Even if no other philosophers and recognize this connection it was evident to Aina. this made her more adept at her craft. She was introducing others to this valuable connection.

“Philosophy can provide the basis for how we act in the world. Its imperative has often been the motivation for thought. The individual constructs clear principles based on actual experience. From this foundation, actionable knowledge can emerge. When the individual is prompted by actual circumstances, beneficial actions can occur this process is ongoing. The individual asserts to self through the consistency of particular acts. Taken together, this process creates a system. And the system can be examined reflectively. The individual can question her place in the scheme. Given him a lot even in outlining these principles, there are challenges. The individual faces obstacles to further action. And these obstacles can limit the development of a of a person. Emotional frustration can result in confusion, and this confusion can become worse. The individual is suspended among various alternatives.”

“The drive to action now becomes a form of paralysis. The self does not recognize a clear path to improvement. Even the idea of change can promote a cynical attitude on the part of the individual. It is this attitude that can prevent further progress. The philosophy has only promoted greater skepticism. Philosophy offers a positive program for change. But I can also suspend the self in total bewilderment. Philosophy seems like a useless exercise. The self marvels at the possibilities, but nothing can be done.”

“Fear becomes worse. The self is lost among these alternatives. The individual is weighted down by the burden of time. What can philosophy now offer?”

Blanchard portrayed philosophy as a process of erudition. The individual familiarized the self with traditional texts, and these text depicted critical problems of philosophical understanding. In some cases, key problems of philosophy could be dismissed on the basis of an historical awareness Blanchard was offering another path. I think I was not caught the thinker was not caught in these dilemmas. There was a way to dispel confusion. But it required an extensive familiarity with the scholarship. This often seem like an a distraction from actual human concerns in a deeper sense, a philosophy promoted a numbness.

How did philosophy create its objects of knowledge? Thought was constructive in nature. It wasn't simply a matter of seeing the world. Thinking created the conditions for an encounter with things. By its very nature, philosophy was creative. The individual needed to uncover this creativity. Such activity seemed natural if one observed dreams. This achieved total power in that advanced narrative which was the basis for experience. Even in confusion, people engaged in wish-fulfillment. They saw what they wanted to see so they could transform the world into an image of their desires.

Philosophy needed to piece through these structures. This also created a dilemma for the observer. The more of the individual wanted to believe that there was a collective understanding, the more this knowledge seemed to withdraw from the self. The individual side of coherence based on a sustained belief, but this coherence was unstable. The self battled with us image of things to create an effective vision. Nevertheless, life seemed to retreat behind these glittering images. Where was the entryway for human liberation? Cognition was not supposed to accompany the world. It was supposed to create the world. But this tension remained the individual tried to shape experience in a positive way. But there were so many contrary factors.

The self battled allusion. There was not enough certainty to guide the individual. Therefore the self fluctuated among these alternatives. The individual site stability site stability sought. And philosophy pretending to offer a method to untangle these contradictions. There's a great deal to figure out. The self rested with uncertainty. On this basis, philosophy was automatic. It played upon the beliefs. It played upon the beliefs of the individual.

Philosophy populated us world with phantoms. There were numerous unanswered questions. Ritual seem to promise coherence. However, there was no apparent rest. The philosophical project could draw on hierarchical structures to classify the various encounters with experience. In some cases, the fantastic seemed a more appropriate way to describe the given. It's only made the philosopher into a special kind of see her, and seer, who applied a personal vision in discovering the foundation of creativity.

The individual was stripping away layers. The search reached the substratum of existence. Philosophy could offer a mystical awareness. And the individual came into contact with a supposed power moving the universe. This kind of philosophy offered a murky practice. And ambiguous calling lead to committed initiation. Itself became immersed in the unfolding magic. And there were these forces that seemed to buttress the universe. And the individual attained certainty through this encounter.

The self believed this power. This long-lasting conflict resulted in a deeper insight. The thinker moved toward to this promise. There is a wonder in such a revelation. Apart from these wonderful facets of consciousness, philosophy provided a clear map for the observer. And this

map could be applied to more routine experiences. In this way, philosophy seemed to offer a practical perspective. The individual was empowered by this description.

Philosophy was not supposed to be advanced through mystical apprehension. But obscurity had created these challenges. And the individual tried to work through this presentation. There was something elemental in this encounter. And this reflected back on the knower. The image projected on the inner eye exploded in the realization of the conscious individual. These objects could be broken down and described.

This gave potency to this thought from this awareness. The thinker could establish a discipline. And this discipline offered objects for contemplation. Contemplation was not an ideal activity. It was based on reasoning and analysis. And this analysis enhance the overall picture. How could individual analysis provide an outlook for collective understanding. As the thinker tried to sort through these matters, knowledge hidden offered to coherent picture. What connected all these perspectives? Philosophy could assume an active role in explicating human experience. Again, the constructive power was preeminent.

Philosophy permitted an encounter with the absurd. There was a strangeness to human existence, and this strangeness what is the basis of philosophical investigation. The individual tried to accommodate to the unusual experience. Philosophy appeared to offer guidance. At the same time philosophy cast the individual into strangeness. The scientific understanding was based on providing order. Philosophy pushed beyond this understanding to confront a more fundamental confusion about human existence. Philosophy engaged this perversity of consciousness. And the apparent coherence of the universe dissolved before close inspection.

Science might be able to describe the conditions of the world, but it did little to indicate the position of the individual within this wonder. In these spaces, confusion reigned. A person questioned where there was a place within this dismal confusion. Science might offer answers, but philosophy emphasized unanswered questions. The self could become more frustrated within these contradictions. Could there be a question without an answer? The very notion of well-formed question suggested a process for an answer. But philosophy did not yield to this easy explanation. It left a self immersed in the marvel.

There were so many alternatives, so many possibilities. The self might've needed coherence, but there was none. therefore, the conflict of the universe remained. And the individual wondered what to do next. The self with submerged in the philosophical project. Where was understanding? Where was solidity? What concrete reality supported the search? Philosophy pushed into this realm. It continue to challenge the self. But the individual did not shy away from the questions of philosophy. Instead, the investigation continued. And this emphasized the very absurdity of existence. There was clarity. At times, there was pain, even constant suffering. All that should've been enough.

The concreting encounter should've dispelled the confusion, but it hardly did. The individual wondered about fate. Was there a near time when personal frustration might vanish? For all the promises, philosophy only complicated matters. Could someone easily walk away from this experience? A person could deny the importance of philosophy. The important philosophical questions could simply be aspects of vanity.

These were questions that were not meant to be answered. Therefore it wasn't worth trifling on such problems. Science could chart a path. Philosophy encouraged the end of the journey. Even when such a skeptical position seemed favorable, the philosopher continued the

struggle. Existence seemed to embrace the absurd even more. And that was not enough to address these questions. Instead, they remained.

The individual withdrew. The philosophical dilemmas were more pressing. It almost seemed tragic. There was an urgency in finding an answer, but his efforts came to not. The self remained locked in darkness. It was terrible to suggest that suffering was an inherent part of human existence. The active individual had the means to end this belief. Philosophy could offer a logical process that ended this feeling. It was not so hospitable. However, the individual continued in the quest.

He was lost in the quandary. Was this an excess of personal drama? And the individual in tricked by the universe? Even if such a belief held, that did not diminish the presence of these questions. And philosophy continued its influence. The philosopher seemed aloof from every day problems. No individual could accommodate a lack of food. It was important to solve critical issues of every day sustenance. Philosophy seem to mock this urge. It offered a method without a resolution. An advanced technique that did not create insight. And it maintained all the disquiet of the individual. Still, that did not end the process.

The philosopher became more immersed in the conflict. In these alternatives, the individual found greater dissolution. Aina understood that Blanchard was attached to these paradoxes. He wasn't there to clear up the confusion. She could've offered her own personal solution. And her research seem to tempt her in this direction. Would she have studied with Blanchard if she really expected such a simple resolution? Blanchard didn't want to make this easy.

A number of these questions created a puzzle in her own history. She could've reviewed the events that shaped her emotions, and she might've discovered the source of her own challenges. Did philosophy operate in that manner? Was she allowed to see things in such a crystal clear way. Where was the breach? She needed to uncover the gap in her own experience. Even if she arrived at an explanation, it only answered her particular questions. It offered little for the larger questions of philosophy. That was why many people ran from this investigation. They considered futile. They also wanted a stronger personal imprint on reality.

Even if it was an illusion, they could live with the result. Aina was so committed to be accommodating. What is this a personal resistance on her part? She didn't want to believe that she had been so manipulative with the facts. She conceived herself as deep within the contradiction. Therefore, she could let go of these challenges. That was what made her a philosopher. That was what drew her to Blanchard.

She could put aside all the concerns of Blanchard, but the philosophical questions remained. They were not the property of Blanchard. They were not her property. In some ways, they seemed independent of the thinker. The individual sought to pierce the fabric of being. What would remain even without human influence? The universe made itself present through a different picture.

The objects were resistant to wish-fulfillment. But the world did not realize itself sufficiently to leave unambiguous traces of the process. There was no intention. Without intention, necessary seemed accidental. Indeed there were forces then move matter; nevertheless, these forces did not have a purpose. And they could be interfered with my country dispositions that had no connection to the initial assertiveness. Thus, the universe seem to suggest outcomes without a clear basis for those results. It was not so much a cause as a happenstance.

For the observer, the situation confusing. These were remote events and that seemed beyond the intervention of human hands. Even complex intentions could not accommodate for these experiences. There was a hollowness in the universe. And the self was lost in this room. Where was the person supposed to venture? There might have been a power in the proximate world.

Now, the self ventured into a space with a little coherence. That only added to the interest of the overall project. The foundation of philosophical discourse was the apparent encounter with substance. Substance provided the link between alternate descriptions of the world. This thread offered a consistency for the observer. Without this awareness, things did not hold together. Individual perceptions tore at the self. The individual was cut off from awareness.

Language was only a nonsensical ritual without any commitment. Substance gave authority to speech. It offered support for reflection. It enabled an exploration of the universe. Substance could motivate causality. The effect it was a result of a transformation of substance. But the coherent form remained. In this coherent form moved language along. Understanding derive from this connection. A world of action found its basis in a lasting awareness. This motivated vision.

Vision was held together by the fabric of substance. The individual worked through this connection. It carried along further interaction with the world. The substance could provide the link among speakers, and it became the foundation of communication. It was a handy reference point from one individual to another. It's shaped the structure of things, and the structure of things could be conveyed from one person to another. There was a collective understanding. But the understanding did not exist apart from a reality. In this reality was enhanced through substance.

The form enabled substance to be impressed on the mind. But the mind drew sympathy from being in touch with substance. Knowledge offered direct contact with things. Words flowered through this understanding. Human consciousness did not float in nothingness. It was anchored by the deep roots of substance. Substance could also be the basis for a deeper skepticism. If the individual dispelled contact with substance, what remained. The shell was hollow, and it seemed to dissipate upon close inspection. This created a philosophical urgency. Perhaps substance was only a deeper form of belief. If that was the case, the whole edifice seem to crumble. The self was left with fear. In a sense, emotion was this solid connection.

The more that the individual was attached to substance, the more that it seemed to get immerse in the here and now. As such, this could be a source of instability. The thinker was holding on to some thing and that was only a characteristic of reflection. None of these connections lingered in the world. It was as if everything had been erased. The words floated along. On the other hand, they seemed to connect everything together. On the other hand, nothing was being connected. This skeptical view underlined a sense of personal isolation.

The individual was struck by the intensity of individual experiences; however this intensity was only a facet of the self. The subject could not pierce piece together a more pervasive argument. Everything seemed to orbit around a desire for something more. And this longing made substance more doubtful. The individual became lost by all these aspects of experience. It was a profound difficulty in trying to hold everything together in a single view. There was an entire transients to experience.

The self could get deep in the connection. There was nothing to grab onto. The self-doubt was caught even more in the absurdity. Substance was supposed to grant a greater sense of

assurance. It was the form that was the basis for logical certainty. Its certainty just turned on itself.

It was little more for the thinker. Philosophy created a stronger foundation for belief. It was more stringent faith that only disappointed at the individual. There was no respite. There was no apparent escape from these threats. That was disheartening, the individual did what was possible to patch together all these heterogeneous elements.

Brash nothingness seemed to look back. The laborious process of accounting was dissipated by the questionable origins of this search. The individual did not have a clear reference point. Everything was floating around without any sense of meaning. On this basis the thinker could try to reinvigorate the notion of substance. Substance had all this promise. If one traced along these contours, there could be a unified picture. But it did not work itself out that way. The unity fell away.

Each experience seemed to contradict some other event. Overall nothing else together. Human emotion seemed triumphant against reason philosophy was not supposed to give us resort. It was meant to offer a more urgent defense of the rational. Even if the inconsistencies of experience predominated, reason could still charge a certain path. It could reinforce contractual obligation. It could emphasize shared intent. It could find string in a solid awareness.

Philosophy battled with the alternatives. It had a method, but the method had been exposed. The thinker seemed hopeless against these effects. The mind had betrayed the self. How had this occurred? What was the trap? We're at the individual gone wrong. If the self simply roof reviewed the process and everything could be made right again. What was the difficulty?

Substance was the answer; nevertheless, substance was excluded from discourse. It was wish-fulfillment. Wish-fulfillment could not be a part of philosophy. From another point of view the apparently psychological foundation could provide a framework for a more constant encounter with the universe. Does philosophy emphasized urgency? It could adopt the architecture of psychoanalysis. Dreams and wish fulfillment were key elements.

This seemed to contradict the historical nature of philosophy. Could the two perspectives be accommodated in a single discipline? Aina thought of her role. Could there be a philosophy without the philosopher? If she kept on along this path, philosophy might be reduced to simple gossip. She did not want to yield to this awareness. She wanted something else. What was missing. What did she lack? She felt the missionary zeal that accompanied her exposition of philosophy.