

## THE GOOD

Did the description of power only add a further strength to its effects? If social circumstances created a negative experience for people, was there a way of describing the circumstances that altered their effect? The effects were the basis for knowing? If knowledge emerged through social interaction, then a different vantage point could provide an alternative version of the circumstances. The individual could discover the tools to change the situation. This interactive perspective suggested that dominance could be given a different characterization in the description. Such a view offered the means to dull the obstacles to self-assertion. The individual was entering difficult territory.

There was an evident instability, which threatened the self. At the same time, the individual developed self-confidence. These contrary paths help edto define the self. But the self could also exaggerate these moments. This exaggeration could make the trespass seem more severe. Its negative moment would gain authority. Such an impetus drove the individual. In some respects, it might appear as if these effects were entirely internal. This kind of conflict would be a result of contrasting states in personal experience. At the same time, the self questioned the ability to encompass all these moments. The threat came from the outside. However, this belief could give greater power off to the illusory.

The self wondered about a struggle. Perhaps complacency set in, and the individual was only more helpless. Did this gradient only resort from the lack of clarity? Analysis might provide the method to dissipate in these contraries. The self try to find a coherent narrative. This narrative could determine where the individual lost focus. I with a heightened perspective, the observer could trace a coherent path to term. That would give the overall experience of coherence.

There would be an apparent challenges, and it would be a method to resolve these obstacles. It was not the struggle that was important; it was the technique. And the technique would provide the means to smoothing out the path. The brakes will disappear. The instability would be leveled. The individual will require certainty. Did this overall approach ignore the real threats to the individual. What is the self simply accommodating to this environment? If there were gaps in the description, then the self would seem to endorse an oppressive situation. That was not the apparent intention, but the description on the aggravated the experience.

All this knowledge might seem overly abstract. Without this abstraction, there would be greater influence by the negative forces. On the face of things, the concrete description was on the aggravating in a bad situation. A logical view could underline the power of the self. It could enhance the methodology. It would even point to clear applications of the technique. The individual was not encountering objects. This was an act of creation. The self was able to create a world that met critical needs.

This outlook could excite the individual. But the excitement was not the basis for understanding. The connection was not solely emotional. If there was clarity of insight, could be supported by actual evidence. What was evidence, when it no longer had the familiar reference points. What did the individual no through and essential encounter with the world. Certainly, the self admitted to a strangeness of experience. If a person opened one side, what kind of world was staring back? The self needed to learn how to manipulate these forms. How could the individual influence this unknown? The self twisted in place. There was an apparent knocking against these structures. The individual was shaken by further encounters.

The universe was making itself known in its variable form. It did not entirely accord with the beliefs of the individual. Was this inventory all that was necessary to account for the world. Past philosophy took different approach. That outlook was based upon a detailed analysis of particular kinds of experience. For Aina, this attempt only seemed like a psychological explanation. It documented the position of the individual. But it only fell into subjective traps that affected the person.

The self saw personality reflecting back. But it was not possible to pierce the veil of individual experience. This was more than wishful thinking. The individual could be face-to-face with challenges from the past. There more involved. How could the individual bond personal experience? Did personal commitments make it impossible to overcome massive impediments to knowledge? the individual was adept describing the proximate the proximate. But the other world was outside the grasp of the self. This was the basis for these force gradients. Realization seemed to imply that individual fear could accumulate to de-stabilize the individual. Did this accumulation apply a systematic awareness? What was the source of this knowledge? Did things have a form that was both apparent and hidden to the individual?

If Aina worked to uncover this relationship, would it reveal personal discomfort? That discomfort could be traced to particular exposure circumstances. And those experiences seemed to be fostered by individuals. Once again, a conflict was apparent a conflict was apparent. What is the individual doing this to the self? There seem to be more to this arrangement. A philosophy which attributed all pain to the self seemed to avoid the actual challenges to the individual. Nevertheless, it appeared that this view credited the power of some contrary force. And this counter force could be manipulated by individuals. Aina was returning to the same dilemma.

Philosophy betrayed the delusion of the self. And this was the wrinkle in time. There was an apparent source for these experiences, but the individual continued to believe in personal fault. That actually made it more difficult to overcome the negative influences.

Once the individual could describe this power, did power already gain control over the self? Did attempts to fight the power only get further legitimacy to that kind of social arrangement?

Blanchard objected to Aina's philosophy. He claimed that philosophy should not be psychology. What did that mean? How could philosophy attain permanent objective knowledge. In a formal sense, the object of knowledge was not attributed attributed to any single experience. In mathematics, the circle was not generalizable from a number of circular objects. It described a particular operation in space. This operation drew its coherence from the perfection of its construction. When a person constructed a circle, it could be more or less accurate to the abstract measurements of a circle. But the variations could not describe circularity in an exhaustive manner. It required a mathematical certainty. In the same coherence could be applied to other sorts of experience.

The psychology could describe the process of coming to know the certainty. It could describe negative influences that could interrupt this awareness. But psychology could not provide the basic understanding of mathematical abstraction. The abstraction demanded a commitment on the part of the individual. In this commitment was connected to the perspective of others. Such an awareness separated psychology from philosophy. But Blanchard saw this distinction in an even more profound manner. There were attempts to localize the certainty and

consciousness. But this was a dangerous absolutism. At the same time scientific discourse seem to provide independent confirmation for the individual view.

Blanchard questioned this description. If a certainty resided in individual consciousness, it could not abide in things. Psychology could observe the certainty. And it might describe the individuals connection to personal belief. That did not grant this philosophical understanding. From the opposite point of view, the philosopher could not attack certainty from a social critique. That itself was psychology. There was a cure clear conflict: did the object's knowledge exist in human awareness, or was it reflected in the world? Aina explored the view that human consciousness built upon consistencies in the world. And this construction revealed other regularities in experience, but experience in thought played a critical role in providing a dynamic for these regularities. The universe cannot be seen in a coherent manner without human intervention. There was not an innocence to the observed object.

In creating an image of the world, did the self only select those details? Even in complex cases, the individual created a self-description among supportive ideas. The individual could use this model to influence events. Even though some details of this construct might seem contrary to the individual, there was an essential coherence in a few. As these negative details were portrayed so that they could be reversed. When individuals were confident about the situation, they could create more lasting representation. The image would maintain coherence because of its effectiveness. At the same time the self void a picture that threatened identity. At first glance, this might seem like a rose-colored vision in its complex form; it did not function this way. The gritty aspects of life were included, because they provided an impetus for change. There added clarity in the overall model. The individual recognized the challenges. They were adequately defined. In this description enabled clarity in action.

Understanding touched on universality. It could capture every element of experience. At the same time, deleterious elements or bracketed to create immunity. This process of inoculation allow the individual to confront the full breath of experience without risking his self. Identities seem to be fortified by this vision. The individual was building a view of society based on personal desires. This is not delusional. Instead, a person did not provide ammunition for a contra point of you. In looking at this country point of view the self could see how particular experiences were privileged. The opposing vision give greater flexibility greater credibility to an changing situation. The country outlook was anecdotal and character. It did not have the same transformative properties applied by the self. The picture was distorted. People were often characterized in negative terms. And the model was replete with an accurate evidence. The individual can yield couldn't yield to this viewpoint. There were so many inconsistencies in this picture. It only made the self feel helpless. The creative aspect of experience had been rendered in operative. Aina needed to question this understanding.

From a fuller perspective, Aina was isolating an atomic element that could strengthen a personal commitment to desire. In a sense, this was a relaxed view of the world. The individual could proceed along the critical terms to create a supportive image for the self.

The self was not describing the experience in the world so much as a constant process on the part of the self. This process did not result in decision-making. Instead, it was a continuity of experience the self was constantly manipulating the terms of this interaction. There are so many layers of this experience. The individual could recognize points of transformation. But site was

not moving from implication structures. This functional view of the world illuminated forces which interfered with the desired end. Thus, every challenge was framed in a manner that could be resolved within the system of descriptions. This was this need for an ongoing process, and some challenges were more intense.

Philosophy provided the means to create an image of the world without negative influences. This was not idealism. Instead, it offered the methodology to overcome intractable challenges. Such an effort was based upon a deep understanding of the capabilities of the individual. If the self could describe the world on the basis of these capabilities, then any obstacle could be overcome. This understanding was critical. Are you the individual commercial key strategies to overcome any kind of threat. The overall movement of this kind of thinking lead to an ability to anticipate surprises. The prospective offer the methodology for complete transformation of the south's self

These critical features were the basis for an ambitious project which extended beyond the immediacy of experience. It was important to explore further. Such a commitment could avoid the traps of idealism. Idealism was rooted in a desire to ignore negative forces which affected the individual. In contrast, this kind of philosophy engaged key aspects of a concrete situation. The individual was spurred on by this understanding. This perspective needed to be enhanced. There were some more lasting foundation for these insights. The self came face-to-face with these constraintst.

Philosophy was not a turning away; it was a turning toward. But his confidence relied upon the ability to neutralize major challenges to the individual. As such, the methodology was not action-based. Instead, it found its roots in the factors that influenced motivation. A link this awareness was the composition of the world. The individual was inspired by successes. And these successes moved the philosophy along. The understanding did not work backwards. Instead, it assisted the unfolding of this project. And there's ongoing inspiration motivated the individual.

The world could be viewed as this arrangement of the tools of creativity. The self could actualize these desires by manipulating things. The commitment to the project already guaranteed an ongoing dynamic these forces seem to grind back-and-forth. In this constant movement, itself was carried forward. The universe was available to the individual. And these forces ran through ones being. A simple start could put one in touch with his general framework.

Any kind of energy could be explained by these combinations. Philosophy did not seek an external reference point. Its method was built upon a style of seeing. Philosophy engendered more thought. There was not an appeal to an outside event. This kind of thinking did not proceed along long narrow lines. Instead, it's sought to encompass whole structure. There was always reaching out word outward. Aina recognized this as a reading, and past works influenced her Outlook. She was creating a coherence among all these elements. If this was the beginning, where where did the path lead? She needed to avoid getting distracted from her vision. She was able to see by bringing all these elements together. This is not about defining these moments. Any kind of technique only prepare the self for this lasting experience. And even though she avoided idealism, this view might seem delusional and. She wanted to maintain the power of her philosophy. And so she remain with his belief and liberation. All the while, she realized how she needed to protect herself, and she used her wiles to shore up her defensiveness; that was a very nature of this philosophy. It was rooted in a constant vigilance.

Fundamentally, it was a thinking towards him but his progression could not be thought of in a successive way. It was more of an enveloping within the realm of experience she was blessed with clarity. She drew upon this recognition. And she immersed herself in the invitation. She was extending beyond narrative. She was immersing herself in the flash of creation. She felt this constant revelatory flourishing. She embrace this awareness.

If philosophy was so clearly endowed with a mission, how did it lose its grace. And Aina accepted the influences of this particular way of thinking, Some thing had prevented the development of an articulate message. Where was the breakdown? Why was philosophy unable to deal with complex situations. Was this the source of a fundamental weakness? The situation pushed the individual to a realization. But the actual circumstances prevented further development. These wonderful plans went awry. The self was immersed in a constant present, but there was so much experience that continued to move.

The individual felt overwhelmed. Aina did not want to admit this feeling. She had put so much stock in her own performance; now, she faced a real obstacle. She couldn't conceive of the elements of philosophy in any other way, so she was left with this confusion. And this sensation continued to drag her down. How could she fulfill her commitment? She had put so much faith in this development. What had it offered her? She had been able to quash these threats to her understanding. But she could overcome this recognition. Was this the condition of seeing? Had she simply got things are wrong?

For the moment, she had pushed things too far. She believed that philosophy had a special connection and she made every effort to fortify this understanding. But some thing was disrupting this awareness and that didn't coincide with her perspective. She wanted to see it in another way. I it was as if she discovered goodness, but she now encountered evil was an ethical understanding critical for her philosophy? She had almost avoided that perspective by the clarity of her presentation. She wasn't the first to face this quandary.

Life had its way of insinuating itself back into philosophy. Then, the whole project just seemed useless. She had subdued these negative forces, and then now they seemed so central to her exposition. She wasn't the first person to be cast of Eden. But she felt particularly upset at this resolution. And she had built up her ability to reach this high point. And this remained elusive for her. It wasn't enough to overcome this negative idea. That kind of struggle was beyond her. She had built a system, but it did not cohere. And that disturbed her.

Aina was developing a philosophy that was not based primarily on a relationship with the past. It addressed the direct encounter with the now. The self could recognize the weaknesses in present situation and make good on the basis of this understanding. The individual could learn from the past, but the present could enable the overcoming of these obstacles. All that mattered was the acuity of performance.

This overcoming of past obstacles meant that there were not that significant in the creation of identity. The individual could reinforce those elements in the environment that enhanced the expression of the self. A person would not feel the burden of past mistakes. Instead, there would be a clear path from start to completion. Success was built into this view. Each obstacle now became a focal point in the overall journey.

What was the basis for learning. It was finding out what you didn't know. In philosophy, how could that be question the unknown when it was simply another facet of the familiar. There were twists and wild turns. But none of this really described experience. And experience could be mastered by following along a clear path. The impossible was available to the individual, if a

person was willing to take the time. Everything else could accord with something from the past. Inevitably, the individual needed to learn how to get rid of the past. Thus, philosophy could offer a progression toward an eternally present. Aina wanted to share her vision. She was on the verge of a deep realization. She had overcome the present, and cast off all its deep complications. She had used philosophy to arrive at a different form of existence. All the deep pain could be cast aside.

This was not an exchange with pleasure. Philosophy was not driven by pleasure. For earlier versions of philosophy, reason was the impetus. But this perspective did not offer enough credibility to the creative aspect. Philosophy was taking the elements of existence and constructing them to advance the needs of the self. This meant dispensing with contrary stimuli. The individual was directing this path. This was not a matter of getting over panic. All these fears needed to be put aside.

In order to understand the philosophical system, it was critical to describe the role of negativity. If a system of thought could not accommodate for negative ideas, then it would be unsuccessful in reaching a clear resolution. Thought could benefit from recognizing its contrary, and this was the foundation of analytical thinking. In order to provide a clear thesis, the individual needed to overcome critical challenges. This required an understanding how negative statements could be formed within the system. If the negative articulation was too strong, then there would not be sufficient resources to counteract its influences. Therefore, the individual needed more clarity to describe the world the power of the description was based upon its ability to advance a particular point of view. If this point of view was contradicted by the negatives, philosophy could not provide an accurate portrayal to benefit the self. The self was creating a foundation for action. This foundation was based upon an understanding of a person's abilities.

In characterizing weakness, the self needed to counteract any contrary influences. Thus, there was a balance that worked in the favor of the self. Such a view might seem like a form of denial. The individual was exploring the importance of the counter arguments. These arguments might be based upon stronger evidence. The individual was simply ignoring the spaces. However, an adequate system would have to account for all types of evidence. Therefore it was necessary to dismiss these negative characters. And this might seem like a tug-of-war. The self was facing off against these formidable obstacles. Nevertheless, a more formidable description only made it more difficult to break the hold of these negative influences. Negativity needed to be viewed as an aspect of positive awareness. In other words, the negative appeared when the argument failed to develop to completion. This became the basis for a personal commitment. And the individual believed that this personal commitment could overcome negativity. This was the foundation of a philosophical awareness. Philosophy was making a promise. And the individual relied upon this connection. Philosophy provided a map for positive change.

Aina recognized how she was continuing to create a time dependent model of philosophy. In the system, there was a more prominent role for necessary in fact, a properly operating system did not have to contemplate the negative. It was not even dealing with rules of change. Instead the development occurred on a formal level. These terms were manifested simultaneously. This ongoing manifestation was what gave the system its validity. The individual might struggle to know and understand this simultaneity. But it was a mainstay of the system.

On this basis, negativity was simply an inability to encompass the total system. These partial views only gave a limited picture of the full operation of the system. The system operated without these obstacles. The system coordinated thought and action. But was good in the way of thinking became good in the way of acting. And the individual could draw supportive images from the system. Evidence could deep be developed that would advance the needs of the individual.

Could Aina trust this description? She questioned the idealism of past philosophers. She did not view this as a form of idealism. Instead it gave each person tools to manipulate functioning aspects of their experience. They were not denying their own experiences. Instead they were building upon this awareness. This functional awareness enabled people to realize their desires. It was not a matter of a commitment to the will. Instead the individual was committed to the system. And this system encompassed critical features of experience. The individual realized her wishes. A personal mission could be completed. These efforts lead to success. All these aspects of knowing were significant for personal awareness. She needed to revisit the arguments about psychology.

Philosophy emphasized these positive elements of action. But it was not a motivational program. It simply recognized the awareness of the self. And these powers resulted in effective action.

A person could look at a stick figure, and realize this was an image of a human being in. A fuller outline might be clearer for identification. The individual recognized the contours of this image. And these contours confirmed past experience. Such a repertoire of images could provide the basis for understanding experience. The individuals saw, because the self wanted to see. The self could create its own version of these images. There was an active participation in seeing. This trade-off in a board a person to interact in the immediate environment, and this interaction referenced other similar experiences. A person could design a picture of the world which acted in a similar manner; the self did not only observe the world. Observation meant changing the visible world. These changes helped to solidify these images. There was always an element of experimentation for the observer. Everything included is a dynamic perspective. The world was in flux, and the viewer could build upon regularities. This connection gave meaning to personal experience. This kind of certainty extend it to the individual individuals perception of personal experience.

Personal experience was never confined to the individual. Seeing was based upon interaction with others. And the overall framework was shared. Even in taking an interest in the world, the self participated with others. Life was being shaped, as it was being experienced. The self could build from these advantages. This ongoing interplay provided a deeper insight. The individual related most intensely to this immediate connection in the environment. Thus, the perspective was limited. At the same time, there was an alternative that was enhanced in the world of work. All the multiple arrangements of this world gave a complete understanding of the universe. The individual could build up on these constraints to create a scientific model. And this model developed from each person's experience. This model of human activity became the foundation for a shared picture of the cosmos. Science built upon these insights. Thus, in this way, knowledge revealed basic principles.

The self could act effectively in this realm. And these features of experience engage the world for the individual. Even though the individual had to overcome local challenges, there remained new obstacles. And when this complete picture self recognized how directly these affects involved the individual. This involvement created a psychological picture, and, on this basis, the self would be tempted to shut out elements of this observation in an idealistic sense. The individual might become attached to only those elements that could be controlled immediately. Indeed, this was a challenge. The self had to come connected with others in recognizing a lasting contribution. At the same time, it's required a great deal of commitment. And the individual could be easily distracted in the situation. This ongoing give-and-take clouded the vantage point. Short term models seemed to provide more immediate gratification. The self welcome these alternatives. Philosophy tried to bridge the gap it offered more coherent way of seeing. But the individual had become attached to an ability to influence objects in the immediate soon. This reinforced short term thinking. But the individual really believed such a view. It was easy to shut off any concerns any concerns that did not coincide with this gratification. More than ever, philosophy seem like a distraction. Why should the philosopher remind someone of a connection, when that person was deep in the experience? This was an exaggeration of the self.

The individual truly felt endowed with a lasting awareness. But it totally contradicted any kind of philosophical understanding. Aina wanted to explore this relationship further. She recognized a tendency in philosophy to overgeneralize individuals experience. But this was the opposite view. The self avoided deep lessons about experience. She recognized that philosophy was built upon a confirmation of individual experience. At the same time, experience seemed to resist this feeling. Period at work, the person might feel cut off from pressing needs. And the work routine only reinforced this idea. However, individuals taking steps to alter the personal environment. There was evidence of a shared experience.

The person could describe the influence of time in a way that would correspond to a similar review by other people. On a short term basis, a person might complain that no one else understood. But this assertiveness was based upon an experience that could be described in detail. And these details elicited is similar response on the part of others. This was not a mystery. In a deeper sense philosophy was not positing an uncomfortable mystery about the world. No, philosophy highlighted this common foundation. It was important to understand how this foundation had become obscured. On that basis, some people could ignore the tragedy of others.

At its most extreme, these experiences might look at the struggles of other people, and this reinforced a feeling of helplessness. A person might blame the others for one's slot. It didn't work that way. Each person was susceptible to these conditions, and this common outlook was actually the basis for changing the situation. Philosophy struggled to assume an activist role. It was no longer simply describing the world; it provided the terms for changing the world. And Aina had been committed to overcoming profoundly negative experiences. She had created an outlook which showed these influences which couldn't make the individual immune from these experiences. In a deeper sense, this immunity was linked to a process. And the understanding of



this process offered a foundation for human consciousness. Philosophy was once again on a firm footing. Was making philosophy a transformation experience?

Philosophy was no longer an interrogation of the self. It was an effort to discover a consistency in the world. It offered the foundation for knowing. The philosopher was an explorer; therefore, the real interest was the discovery. How could an object of discovery emerge from thought? Aina attempted to sketch this framework.

The objective philosophy was not simply awareness. The self was not conforming facet of consciousness. There was a deeper commitment to grounding thought and actual experience. Beyond that, experience described a shared object. This recognition was important for the development of understanding. The self went beyond individual awareness. What kind of object acted on the self? These effects be based on something more than the concerns of the individual in a deeper sense; philosophy seemed to encompass the needs of different people. At the same time, philosophy grounded its search in the independent structure of things. How did things fall together? What was the relationship that made it all function? Such inquiry might seem to be based on science. There was no possibility of a science without answering these questions.

Science implied a concern for the universe. If the individual was unconcerned about the surroundings, there would be no experimentation. It was this tension between individual and the surroundings that became the foundation for science. Science renewed the fervor of human activity. People sought to improve their conditions. They battled against scarcity or the elements to create favorable environments. These environments responded to the needs of individuals. At the same time, philosophy could characterize these environments to reinforce an overall intent. This intent was linked to the desires of the individual in a self-reinforcing system. The individual manipulated objects of thought. Things in the environment could be moved back-and-forth to grant a favorable and.

This went beyond any skepticism. If skepticism abounded, there was some psychological disorder which could prolong this denial. If a person went without food, hunger would result; hunger could motivate action. But philosophy was not simply an inventory of basic instincts. The environment created a caring connection between the self in the world. Skepticism was marginalized, because the individual wanted to feel connected to the world. They would not give in. The individual would not give in to hopelessness. This contradicted the urgency of philosophy.

Philosophy was an ongoing experience. It facilitated positive outcomes. It found an order in the universe. That order might seem to contradict an ethical understanding. There was the interplay among the objects of the world. It was not simply nature. People created a supportive nature that could advance their concerns. They extended the caring universe. Aina embraced this insight; she gave a philosophy of preeminent position. She made it possible because she marshaled key elements that could support the project. This was a mission to change the world in a favorable way. She again returned to the transformative nature of thought. She didn't simply look at objects.

She asked what needed to be done in order to arrange these objects in a favorable way. People focused on education, because that gave the foundation for influencing the environment. To move behind an expression of desperation, the individual no longer felt lost in the heavens.

Desperation did not take hold. The self built on this deep understanding. This enabled personal liberation. There was a deep conflict in human experience. It was necessary to overcome a cynicism about human nature. Sure, some people felt reduced to the raw desires. But this told the individual little about the actual conditions of the struggle. People shared their concerns. They worked together. They found expressions of teamwork. And this enhanced the individual. The self could move beyond restrictive constraints. There was a flourishing in this awareness. If such a commitment was so prevalent, why were there significant disruptions to misunderstanding.

Aina needed to do more to understand this instability. Where were the shared experience that offered a foundation for growth; there was a contrary idea that seem to threaten the overall development. How was Anna supposed to relate to social challenges? She had already striven to build a cohesive system. This went beyond thought. It was a kind of activity she was not giving into paralysis. Nevertheless something did give. And she wondered how she become distracted. It was almost as if another world lived in the darkness. And there was an effort to destroy her gains. She had already decided that she would not attribute this challenge to expressions of power. It was a different kind of manipulation. And she did her best to provide a method to dispel decisions.

Philosophy was the good in the way of thinking. And this opposite perspective was evil. She didn't want to become obsessed in a characterization of the negative. She did not want to exaggerate its intentions or its effects. She needed to understand more consistent perspective what would be the basis of this knowledge? She had already made an effort to get rid of the negative influences. So what remained? What were the real impediment to giving credit to human activity. She didn't want to localized this in particular individuals. She did not want to focus on expressions of power. This wasn't simply a mistake in her technique.

Where was the source? What did it mean for some people to take advantage of this thriving situation? If these rewards had been created through a team effort, how are some individuals able to work together to derail this project. There was a great deal to figure out. She saw all these things slip away before her eyes. And what remained? She was not giving up on her insights indeed she had created an effective system. But there still seemed to be something missing. This could be the basis for another investigation. Or she could build on the existing insights. What was her entry way to a deeper inside? She hadn't yet arrived at a resolution. There is a great deal to consider. She continued her search.