

HYPERLITERARY

“If she had a different intuitive outlook, would she have acted differently? When did she realize that she was dealing with a killer?”

“Steven, you are a killer. You had your conviction dropped.”

“That was all hypothetical.”

“But that is your way of thinking,”

“We are trying to interrogate this example. What do we realize about her ability to change?”

“We can't blame her for his behavior.”

“She would always talk lovingly about him.”

“He wasn't that different than you are.”

“He knew how to perform. But he was pretentious.”

“Steven, that does not make you pretentious.”

“He had the right reference points, and he knew how to intimidate her. That gave him his power.”

“It was a cult.”

“He knew how to create system of reward and punishment, and she obliged.”

“Steven, isn't that your dream? Your literary canon is replete with this kind of personal manipulation.”

“You could read the story from the opposite point of view. I am exploring a situation. I am trying to figure out these social forces.”:

“Steven, what are you really doing?”

“I am trying to figure out things.”

“I would say that you have it all figured out.”

“That is what Blanchard wanted you to say,”

“I am not a carbon copy of Blanchard. I have my own thoughts.”

“This is the kind of criticism that he would offer.”

“You're missing the point, Steven. I am trying to criticize you. And you are not really listening.”

“I am open to whatever you want to say/”

“You can't create your own history and not be subject to the judgments of the past.”

“That is all that you see. That would be the reason that she could never escape from his cruelty.”

“Your ideas are cruel.”

“I thought that Blanchard was trying to help us escape from the cruelty of history.”

“You think that I am saying that there is no escape. That it is all personal.”

“That isn't what you have been saying. Your graduate studies are all about trying to personalize the cruelty of history to your own situation.”

“Would you call it cruelty?”

“Would you call it cruelty?”

I had lost my direction., I was no longer sure who was defending which position. Aina was committed to Blanchard's view of philosophy. But she found it harder to attack my position by continuing this defense. She was trying to turn me into the persecutor.

If Owen's cruelty was the cause of his actions against Shira, then the spontaneity of these actions had an affinity with my way of thinking of things. For Aina, it was Owen. There was no way to forestall his behavior.

“You are still trying to blame Shira., She cannot return to the past and gain some kind of hindsight about his actions. She was a caring person. And he took advantage of that.”

“I am trying to understand context.”

“She could have never discovered any other way of thinking of things.”

“Is that situation any kind of warning?”

“There is no warning here. We have these monsters in our midst. They are sociopaths. And your own writing accords with that way of thinking.”

“If that is what you see. My writing betrays that toxic belief. But there is none of those signs in Owen. He wasn't even good at hiding his intentions. And you are accusing me of being worse?”

“Steven, you are good at hiding.”

“That is what I am saying, So Ian was much more transparent, If you can see through my motives, then Ian would have been easier to recognize.”

“Steven, you have offered more evidence.”

“Your philosophy is all about reading these cues, and you have the perfect case with Shira and Owen, and you claim that I am reading into it. What are you doing?”

“Things are completely different in the situation. The signs do not have the same clarity. The text is not apparent. And Owen was doing everything that he could to throw Shira off.”

“That is what is supposed to be so valuable about your reading of Blanchard. You are offering actual strategies. Now, you are going to back down when you actually have the ability to be influential.”

“It is one thing to offer a philosophical argument. But it is not so easy to accommodate to an actual situation.”

“Then the philosophy is a pose. You are only drowning in your sea of troubles.”

“That is dismissive.”

“How else can I read this?”

“That our lives don't subscribe to a philosophical argument.”

“Aina, you are defending the importance of philosophy. I am trying to lend credibility to your argument. But this is where you have taken us. I looking at a spectacle.”

“How can you say that?”

“Philosophy doesn't offer you the tools to overcome your dilemma. You remain trapped in this morass. Why bother?”

“You develop a position toward your situation.”

“You become more accommodating to your suffering. You suffer more. You numb your cognitive abilities. You become a victim to your own beliefs. What good is that? You

receive your doctorate, and this proceeds nowhere.”

“Steven, you are perpetuating these negative attitudes.”

“So you are asking me to change. Or are you telling me that I have no ability to change. That is the foundation of your philosophy. You are uncovering this unbridgeable divide. Any attempts to end this breach are doomed. That is the lesson. We leave it alone.”

“That sounds right.”

“Then Shira should have run from Owen from the beginning.”

“That sounds appropriate.”

“How would she know? She believes him.”

“Maybe, she shouldn't.”

“How can she know?”

“What are you saying?”

“I am saying that there are signs. She can read the signs.”

“Steven, where is this coming from?”

“Where did it always come from. This was something that we all knew from the beginning. That is really the basis of your philosophy.”

“It really is a little more complex than that.”

“How complex?”

“There are impediments to our seeing. That is the foundation of a philosophy.”

“What are the impediments?”

“Cultural indoctrination. That is why Ian may have seemed appealing. Even if she saw the cues, there were so many other factors that were blocking her efforts.”

“Would she recognize the indoctrination? And why did she embrace it?”

“Why are you trying to blame her?”

“Ian was a lowlife. He knew how to use pretense. And she wanted that same pretense. It was easier than doing the real work.”

“She tried.”

“Owen gave her that sense that she was better than other people. And he felt that he was better than she was. And he rode that feeling to the bank. That was the absolute sense of his cruelty.”

“You are still claiming that she made it happen.”

You gave it a credibility.

They were living off the work,

“If I accelerate my view of the world, I can market this vision of the world. My frustrations can threaten my ability to offer this perspective.”

“Why would anyone care? Why would anyone bother?”

“How do you breathe oxygen differently? I don't want to hear about breathing techniques.

A more assertive form of occupation offers more value to your life. This resilience is supposed to count for so much more. It provides a stronger argument for perdurance. And that ability to persist appears to offer a more assertive commitment to human existence. This is the

individual's sense of vitality. It bears notice to the rest of the world.

“Does philosophy only apply to those who have asserted themselves? Perdurance is only available to the happy few. They would have to do something distinguished to achieve concern. And that notion contradicts the idea of occupation. Occupation is available to all. It has everything to do with a need to sustain the self, and nothing to do with being exceptional in any way. The individual stands out by having elemental needs. This elementalism is even more primary than eating. Eating can facilitate these experiences.”

“People will try to enhance these experiences as if they have a distinctive character. That only detracts from the actual form of occupation. Occupation does not fill time; it propels times. There is no other way to conceive this relationship. When individuals engage their occupation in such a precarious way, this challenges those who create obstacles to their own development. Can occupation be more captivating. Does it imply a different kind of encounter with the world, or does the individual need to submerge in the particularity of occupation?”

“There are so many experiences that shut off this access. How can knowledge offer a more direct access to something so basic? Without this belief in knowledge, creativity is only another form of occupation. Does occupation illuminate the creative connection with the world? Otherwise, the self retreats to oblivion. Existence is not decorated. There is no costuming of the reality. Survival is cumulative, because it encourages further versions of occupation. The individual can feel reassured by any of these experiences.

Some people may feel exhilarated by getting dressed or by teeth brushing. But that can be a challenge. To accept the day can be its own wonder. That might seem overly positive without a cause. But if you need to seek a cause, that can seem burdensome.

There is enough concern in keeping things constant. Knowledge can offer nothing more. This is not an accommodation. It is nothing less than a flourishing. But it does not exaggerate its gains. It is meager, but glorious.

That might hardly seem enough. But greater expectations offer a false promise. There is consolation in the immediacy of the now. Appetite does not provide liberation. It is only a reminder of an unmet need. And that requirement should be resolved and not savored. The individual cannot allow for that luxury. The lingering failure to seek resolution can be life-threatening. And this threat can be proximate.

Aina may have felt that her mediation on occupation was only a distraction from the loftier gestures of her philosophy. Occupation's consolation does not provide enough appeal for her. That diminishes her assertiveness. She wanted to invoke the mundane. This made her seem more authentic than Blanchard. Blanchard was lost in speculation. She wanted to avoid that distraction.

This gave her a sense of purpose. It was almost as if her thoughts represented something unique, a breakthrough. It wasn't so much that she was innovative. She just convinced enough people, and that gave her a cachet. She saw that people were awaiting her next revelation. She had used occupation as her key to excite others. This was so contrary to the basic concept of occupation. But she had made it work.

Blanchard was not going to criticize her. She had struck her first blow, and that had

backed him off. This only added to her reputation. Blanchard wanted her to offer an alternative rendering of his thought. He wanted to avoid people thinking of her as a disciple. But she had learned a great deal from him. And he wanted the world to know what he had done for her. He had given her a pretext, and she had made something of it. Blanchard wanted to think that all talk about her work only made his expertise seem more important.

Blanchard felt gratified when people turned to her writing as an introduction to his thought. Again, he felt as if her works were simply a long footnote. They offered nothing of their own.

Blanchard's own work had that same effect. He was offering commentary on thousands of years of philosophical thought. What was his actual contribution?

Some of Aina's readers believed that she was offering a truly new take. Her beliefs seemed grounded in the actual challenges of people. Blanchard was reducing all this to spectacle. What were the roots of this spectacle? How important was the nature of representation? He offered too much primacy to the forms of thought. He even felt that he had a special access to this structure.

Aina wondered if philosophy could only emerge under circumstances of disease. It was only when existence was confronted by limits to personal development, that the individual needed to find another basis for vitality. This idea may have given too much credibility to an external threat, but she did not want to see vitality as independent from the influences of the environment. The self extends a view of existence without limits. But the individual confronted an inability to overcome disease. There was not the consolation of the cure. The cure was this false promise. Always, even in the case, when the malady could be contained, there was still this fundamental confrontation with the limits of existence.

The individual could believe that there were greater resources available. The self could dodge this first attack. But there would be other more formidable threats. The individual would battle to carry on. In this struggle, the self confronted a fundamental truth. Existence was never entirely separate from these external forces. There would be a more valiant attempt to assert the self. An elaborate depiction of this struggle would endow the individual with a sense of greatness.

Aina was not trying to depict a tragic narrative. The self needed to be more accepting. Hubris would only distract the person from the process, and the process helped to give the experience credibility. There needed to be hope in misfortune. The self was not defined by sadness. There was a greater mission. These moments of dejection were keys to unlock a more uplifting sensation.

Indeed, this was philosophy. The awareness could have an effect on the wellbeing. It was more than a positive attitude. The individual was projecting in the unknown. There was an overcoming of fear.

These encounters gave the individual a sense of continuity. It was not so much a transcendence, as it was an enhancement of the moment.

Maintenance had implied a set of defined tasks. The individual fulfilled what needed to get done. There was a sense of reassurance in these actions. This was a commitment that went

beyond the immediate. It was more volatile. This was the site of philosophy. The individual was active in trying to restore something. However, this need to compensate for something became was nothing more than a distraction. Philosophy needed to accommodate with these moments without being docile.

She did not want to see that philosophy was over-aggressive. This was not the pose to take with health. There was more of a give and take. But there needed to be an assertive gesture. The self was not going along with circumstances. There was an overall movement towards vision. This vision needed its own force. The self got caught up in this whirlwind. In getting moved along by this dynamic, the self attained concern. And this concern could push the individual along. The philosophy was endowed with a program.

The philosopher emerged at this point. The thinker needed to encompass all the aspects of this encounter. Aina imagined that she was transcribing all the points of this discourse. This was her form of enlightenment; she saw the critical importance of enthusiasm. This enthusiasm enabled her to collect all these moments together into a coherent form of thought.

Suddenly, she was involved in something earth-shaking. She let the discovery stand forth. That made her what she was resplendent. She represented her philosophy in a unique manner. This gave her density. And this density was accelerating the thought process. There would be no philosophy without this weight. Her ideas had import, and she continued to build upon these insights.

This was her process. It was all very personal. Would any of this matter to Bennett? How could she get him interested? She wondered if her ideas really did pose a challenge to his way of thinking. The better that she could articulate her thought, the more that he would be resentful. She was probably reading in her own misgivings. Bennett had little to worry about.

She was uncovering this concrete situation, which mattered everything to her. Who else would bother? In generalizing about disease, she was not describing her own situation. But she started to identify with this experience.

Philosophy was not supposed to be the worries of the hypochondriac. If disease had a presence, it needed to be real. She started to wonder if she could reveal this discomfort in her own being. Was she dealing with a lasting infection, and did this experience offer her insight? She was not suffering. She was not trying to overcome her emotional displacement.

Where could she situate this sense of estrangement? This was not anxiety. It needed an actual source. How could she characterize this force? What did it mean to constitute a whole philosophy based on this actual disruption of the body. Did philosophy require a check up to set its processes in motion. Where would this inventory end? Would it give validity to some kind of obscure ailment? Or would the process try to offer meaning for a collection of symptoms. The philosophy was not a form of diagnosis. It occurred after that point. It gave a sense to the personal realization that accompanied knowledge.

Was philosophy coaxing the process along? What was being added by the thinker?

Aina was coming back to the volatility. She was trying to contain this explosiveness. But the philosophy was pulled along by the events. She needed to do her best to keep up. This added to the validity of the philosophical form of thought.

She was not even worried about Blanchard. She was caught in her own personal challenge.

Her efforts now got her caught up with her own ailment. She could barely figure out what was the reason. She didn't have a fever or a cough. She was not all together. She no longer felt right in herself as if she was dizzy. And this dizziness became more protracted. She was battling the world.

She looked herself in the mirror in the hopes that she might be able to figure out the issue. She didn't feel well. She was not well, something was wrong. This appeared to be a pressing philosophical problem. She could review the possible issues. But this offered nothing to her. She was now confronting a mystery.

If there was an actual illness, she would find a strategy. This was not about playing physician. She wanted to recognize something more fundamental in the process. She did not want to give credibility to the idea that sickness represented a problem in the soul. It was the other way around. The soul manifested itself when the individual confronted disease. Disease gave the contours of the supernatural. It was the immediate encounter with the otherness of the world. The individual could open up to a new kind of being. The supernatural intermingled with the actualities of the now. Disease was very reassuring on this perspective. It marked out a path.

There was also this recoiling before such a massive obstacle to vitality. The individual felt overcome. On this basis, disease was something more upsetting. This self was ripped in two. There was nothing that would enable escape. The self was being driven down by this intrusion.

Blanchard might have been better served by this outlook. She was not there to please him. Her own feelings had taken her to this place. She was now chasing a difficult presence. Could the notion of disease encompass all the aspects of her thought?

Disease gave way to contagion. There was no possibility of containing this phenomenon. Everything was now out of control. Blanchard might have wanted to contain this energy. There was so much invested in present. Blanchard could never have massed this energy. He might have felt bothered by this marvel.

She could protect herself against the invasive force. That gave her a sense of confidence. She had felt distracted. She again had a counter-momentum.

She was dealing with something entirely unstable. And she liked all the aspects of this school of thought. This could have been the impetus for something even more original on her part.

The efforts to circumscribe her thought were now replete with these more unruly feelings. She was not simply delimiting disease. She could capture all the other features of life. Her sense of the program was now more apparent.

If disease was indeed part of her thought, there could be no remedy. She could not run away from this feeling. This was a lasting sensation.

Philosophy was rooted in the body. There was no need to resort to an abstract conception. Each idea manifested itself sequentially. She now had a method. And she could

teach this perspective to others. They could follow along the same progression. It was completely natural in its clarity. It was effortless. It was contrary to the arduousness of Blanchard.

He might have resented this facility. How could knowledge reveal itself so effortlessly? That almost contradicted the need for a discipline. That hardly mattered. Why bother? The world assumed its form in such an evident manner.

Aina acted as if she had nothing to do with these matters. She was simply going along with the available.

Aina considered if philosophy required the independence of the individual. Was this simply a response to the overwhelming influence of Blanchard? Did she really believe that solitude was a prerequisite for deep thought. She had premised her ideas on the notion of disease. She was conceiving of this disruption as a kind of calling. She had already devised her own path to liberation, It was living with this disorder. She did not want to think that some kind of remedy could connect her to a community of wellness. She needed to remain with her sense of isolation.

She may have been denying the fundamental basis of her thought. That disruptive sensation linked her up with others. She could see disease as systemic. But the more that she explored this dilemma, the more that she was drawn by the unique character of her situation. She had moved beyond a hypochondria. She understood the actual basis of her disorder. It went beyond her beliefs.

She considered that this dilemma was shared. It was more of a sign of something else. That would make her dilemma the foundation for communication. She was not drawn to that place. Instead, she felt more disordered. And this understanding was driving her philosophy. That added to its radical nature.

Could her discovery lead to a more profound social connection? That was why she was doing philosophy. It allowed her communicate these insights. But that was not enough. She was living this experience. So her basic understanding was lived. As such, she did not have the words to encompass her world.

She was not giving a road map for performance. She was marveling at the inability to perform. She could document, but she did not have the terms to avoid this dilemma. She needed to attain a time without recoiling. How could she avoid these influences?

For the moment, she considered thought as the source of her dilemma. She needed to detail the conditions of thought and dissipate these effects. That may have ignored the full impact of situation. She could not cast off these feelings with the will. That was the difference in her philosophy. She would have to sustain this process. And sustaining this process meant that she needed to endure the worst.

Would her dilemma invite her to isolate herself from social interaction? She needed to find an understanding that would sustain her. But her interactions could only aggravate these feelings. That made her commit herself to this isolation.

She did not want to feel drained. She was already dealing with such a burden. She did not want to feel that she was exaggerating. This discomfort was becoming almost debilitating.

That made her somewhat ashamed of her self-indulgence. How else could she explore her actual situation. Consciousness only told her so much. She needed to peel back the layers of experience.

Was she offering further justification her isolation? How else could she work her way through these ideas? She needed to nurture this process. That only made more successful at probing this philosophy with more probity.

She had a demanding course of intellectual training. How could she approach it with another person. She needed to train herself. This was not a matter of relying on someone else. She was committed to dialogue. But this was a different kind of discipline.

Aina needed to consider how she could exemplify her way of thinking. This meant a more thorough overcoming of her discomfort. There was supposed to be no barrier between her assertiveness and her resolution of this understanding. Before, her perspective of illness had prevented her from attaining a unity of consciousness. That only left her subject to severe doubt. She was now encountering another awareness of this connection. That meant that she needed to dispense with her doubts. She embraced the self-confidence, and she felt that the world needed to reflect this realization. It was no longer a matter of the intellect. There needed to be a material form of this relationship.

Such a manifestation would go beyond metaphysics. There would need to be an actual presence to substantiate this sensation, She was supposed to embody this arrangement. If she ascribed to the incarnation, would others share in the same ascription, She was more fervent in advancing this philosophy. She wanted this relationship to be practical. She did not want to get distracted by the frivolous.

She recognized that this embodiment was everything. She needed to live this reality. Any excess seemed like a distraction. But she needed to continue to grow. Her representation needed to reflect these gestures. She was building a systematic approach.

Aina needed to exemplify this feeling in all her being. She could appeal to others by reflecting her personal development. As such, she needed to direct their focus. This was where the challenges became intense. Each distraction was meant to enhance her program. That gave her the sense of a mission. She needed to carry on with purpose.

This was not just a given. She could be endowed with a sustained commitment, but she needed to carry this further. She was drawing from her radiance. She learned how to adorn her presence. This might have been a little frustrating. She did not want to be reduced to an image or a gesture. How could people see the underlying necessity? If the effect was too stunning, it would only serve short term stimulation. This was not an exposition of pleasure. The message was supposed to be long-term. But it needed some kind of grounding in something immediate.

She wanted to be taken seriously. The connection was not simply symbolic. The physical presence was rooted. The image could not be consumed. What was seen was a clue of a process. So she could engage the observer with this manifestation This electrified the awareness.

She was thus chosen. How would this relate to Blanchard's view. He may have been. trying to resist the contrary sensation. She accommodated her outlook. She gave it credibility.

She was chosen because she wanted to be noticed. This notice could brr impetus for the philosophy.

If philosophy was formulated in this manner, would it still constitute itself as a radical form of thought? Was it doing more than encompass the moment? As such, what was the actual motivation?

She did not see this as a design concept. She was not articulated fashion as a form of thought. She was heading into new territory. If image was important, it was almost as a subtraction from what was seen, Could any sense be made of this notion? She wanted to exemplify this way of being. But she was also denying its reality. What was seen was nothingness. She didn't want to be obscure. However, she couldn't let herself be so exposed. She was not asking people to marvel. They needed to become more involved in what they were seeing.

Did her philosophy need a radicality? Was it supposed to be an imposition on people's lives? They could not get close without some kind of recoiling. They were attracted. It was not disgust. But there was an underlying belief. If she abandoned this aspect, this would be an advertisement. Even in offering a connection, the manifest spoke to the impossibility of a union. The self was still divided. This was no longer disease. It was complete in its realization. There was still something that was denied. This was something that was evident to their view.

Aina felt that she was taking an active role. She was interrupting a perspective, instead of sharing an image. She had applied a great deal of intention in constructing her presentation. Did the seen become an invitation to what remained unseen? How could that work? She did not want to be destroyed by her reception. She had made an effort to control this response,

As such, philosophy became a series of scenes. Each scene offered a different stage of emergence, like tracking the origins of the butterfly, And each act was represented in a recognizable manner.

Did she need to be prese realization of the movement for each one of these stages? This seemed like a great deal, She did not want to see her philosophy as a show. But did the very realization of the moment imply this set of stages. Was she already involved in a performance?

If she was seen as part of show, this show could threaten the integrity of her thought. Someone else was giving her wholeness. But her thought needed to be based on some kind of notion of trust. She needed to rely on the reader to provide authority to her writing.

How was she going to coax her audience? Did she already have to be living this charmed existence? She could not see this as a simple philosophical exercise. But she did not want to report on her experiences. That would seem to contradict the idea of a philosophical project. Philosophy needed import. She did not want to lose her attachment to the project. This was not meant to be an afterthought. She was not doing social science. She wanted her philosophy to be grounded in an understanding of social experience. The relationship needed to be more dynamic.

Was she already situated in relationship to experience? Her actions simply advanced that connection. She was identifiable. How could that make any sense? In being an active representative of her way of thinking, she was not simply reacting to the moment. She wanted to

shape her world. Was this presumptuous when she was just grasping what her presence actual meant. Or was this built in to her existence?

Had she attained her philosophical awareness by seeing how people acted towards her. Or was there something more fundamental about her insight. Was she more an active participant in creating this outlook?

In creating her philosophy, she was trying to catch up with these experiences? Was her understanding going to lag behind this phenomenon? Philosophy did not seem able to catch up with the remarkable. Even in advancing this motivation, it lacked the full impact of the moment

She could enumerate all these appropriate gestures, but she was not offering a philosophical outlook. She needed to create a program. She needed to discipline all these actions. Was she supposed to be doing this for someone else? Did this constitute the philosopher as an observer?

She was reacting to the fact that she was observed. And she was not adjusting her image to the observation. She was becoming philosophical. Her philosophy did not emerge because she felt dejected.

Did her philosophical realization develop from the sense that she stood out from her surroundings? Was she representative of a time? There was something uniquely appropriate about her image. She had not crafted her image. But she had not been birthed this way.

She imagined that she was staring at herself in the mirror. Her eyes were peering back. Did she feel that she was subsisting in the wrong world? She could reflect this view, but it was so right.

This moment necessitated philosophy. Was she necessarily cut off from her self-realization?

If a person realized that she was being observed, did she alter her image? Who was observing her, and what was the intent?

“Everyone here is performing in one way or another.”

Adam thought that he was isolating something unique in people's actions.

“There are many levels of symbolic communication.”

“What are they saying? They are insecure.”

She did not see her philosophy developing from weakness. It was built on self-awareness. And people liked to have control over their environment. They adopted a shorthand.

“Look at me.”

“Who is looking?”

Philosophy tried to generalize about the observer.

“There is self-reflection.”

“The individual notices by changing the environment.”

“Are you working on the background or the foreground?”

The hyperliterary continued to weave together these layers.

“There is a cure.”

“That suggests silence.”

