

THE CONFLICT

Aina considered that philosophy might proceed from a position of privilege. At the same time, it enabled her to express her own feelings of alienation. She believed that these feelings indicated a deeper social marginalization. Her challenges were rooted in experiences of social exclusion. And her philosophical mediations revealed a more effective depiction of her own experience. She was able to highlight her own negative experiences. They had affected her development.

This understanding made her believe that she was in touch with a more profound social awareness. She wanted to believe that her experiences were exemplary. And she had undergone growth by applying philosophical technique. In some respects, this view diminished the power of her own observations. Even in highlighting key features of her life, philosophy also made these experiences more remote. She became more connected to the process of expression. This obscured the challenges that she faced. And it made it more difficult to characterize the experience of others accurately.

The philosopher seemed more attached to the authenticity of personal experience. It dismissed those aspects of an individual struggle, which did not resolve philosophical insights. There were other ways to conceive the project. A philosophy was weaker if it did not confront the concrete situation. Philosophy seemed to qualify its own model of concreteness. This minimized the effectiveness at depicting personal experience.

Philosophy was not tasked with providing a realistic depiction of a person's life. But this depiction offered the entryway for a more profound look into the emotional inspiration in a person's life. Aina knew the dangers in giving in to a psychological model. Philosophy was not supposed to fix the individual. It could not dispel individual woes.

When detailing an actual situation, philosophy seemed to have the resources to emphasize the particularities of a person's experience. This enabled an understanding of the actual force that influenced behavior. Philosophy could illuminate the constructive elements that enabled the emergence of self. A psychology might observe the variable character of the mind. Philosophy concentrated on the consistent aspects of self. There could be coherence in these variations. Or the consistent elements could result in a process.

What gave the process a more lasting dynamic? Was there a missionary zeal in the philosophical project? A stronger motivation was needed. Aina had already recognized the necessity for an activist philosophy. But that urgency seemed to be based in a sense of psychological deficit. This lack could motivate the key elements of a philosophical investigation.

Aina seemed to conflate the psychological deficit with the actual struggle of the individual. Blanchard had done the same thing with atonement. The theatrical enactment became primary. And the actual conditions were secondary. The representation had a critical

importance in philosophical discourse. She could link up these descriptions with other philosophical concepts.

What would it be to give greater validity to the concrete experiences of the individual? She did not want to personalize philosophy. She also did not want to offer an exemplary model for philosophy. This may have been the source of her own crisis. She was not privileging her own trauma. She did not want to base thought on trauma. It seemed to overvalue the rift, and it robbed the individual of the necessary power to influence the world.

She was losing herself in this drama. The players kept changing. And she had trouble creating an effective picture. The individual was not meant to embody an idea. She was not creating allegory. However, an effective philosophy seemed to be based on an allegorical perspective. She realized how she had become distracted.

Perhaps, she was avoiding the imperatives of political philosophy. Political philosophy seemed like a way to avoid actual philosophical questions. Concepts were reduced to simple ideas. Politics could abbreviate the actual struggle of the individual.

In some respects, the power of the self emerged in the polis. It was not the product of personal reflection. Personal reflection lacked a clear reference. However, the notion of the polis could tend to purify basic ideas. It could abstract the concrete situation.

The individual was altering the elements of experience. Through a person's effort, the world was achieving a productive form. She realized the dangers if she did not credit this process. The contrary view suggested that technology alienated the self from a primal home. The world did not offer an enlightenment. It indicated how the knowledge was obscured. Technology was a valid part of the overall process. It was a reminder where things had gone wrong.

Did the individual appropriate the terms of technology, or did technology mark the crushing of personal initiative? Aina did not want to endorse the view of the ancestral home. She realized how the poet's craft had been deformed into this weak imagery.

Did biography distract from the philosophical meditation? She was again resisting the psychological. What did political awareness do to fundamental features of a philosophical project? The philosopher did not want to suggest that psychology deformed important notions of philosophy. Psychology did not apply a different lens to the truth.

Were some moments of individual experience more suited to a reasonable analysis. How could philosophy serve legal thought? The principles of reason were essential for examining a particular situation. The standard of the reasonable observer was important for any legal decision. What was the foundation for this reason? How could the conditions of work determine how an individual would interpret an act of theft. What actions were acceptable for the police? When would the reasonable observer determine that a person's rights had been violated by legal authorities?

These rights were sharpened by the conditions of work. An individual could recognize when personal efforts were not respected. In work, the individual put a personal imprint on the

world. This imprint could be tampered with. And this tampering could be the basis for a legal case. How could this understanding be developed in a collective manner. What was being observed?

There were times that law could not offer protection to the worker. Where was there accountability? If an individual was not well compensated for work, how could the self achieve a fair settlement. In some cases, the legal system would resist a fair resolution. What was the source of redress?

A complete understanding of work demonstrated how the legal system could be used to abridge the rights of the individual. If this was a pattern of the system, then this violation could be systemic. In fact, this might seem to be a lasting condition of the system. What would it mean if every transaction was subject to violation. Contracts would not be honored, and if they were honored, the terms would be arduous. What was the basis for determining the equitable implementation of a contract?

If the negative outcomes were endemic to the system, then there needed to be a method to address this inequity. In fact, there could be a deep contradiction between the desires of those who made contracts and those who needed to abide by these contracts. The condition for enforcement could not be fair.

Those who were doing the real work could be taken advantage of by the system. What made this a system? How could legal procedures enforce inequitable results. This might be viewed as an individual thing. But if the same thing kept happening again and again, then it was no longer a personal problem.

What was the root of these legal problems? How could the failings of the legal system be linked to a social reality? This perspective enabled a more sustained understanding of experience. There needed to be a way to discover the individual's concrete situation.

The world was both constructed, but those efforts created a shared experience. It was possible to discover the basis for a collective reality. It existed in the shaping of the world by human interaction. These actions connected to the forces that created the structure of the universe. This was an active process.

Only when the self actually changed the form of the observed world could the individual make sense of independent forces acting on objects. The individual was manipulating the same forces that were being observed.

Historical forces were connected with the material determinations that were altering the form of things. How could simple interactions provide the basis for recognizing more protracted forces acting in the world. This was no a mystery. The self was not according with the world. The will was applying unique connections to relate to the world.

If human beings were involved in this interactive process with the world, what did it mean when the legal system seemed to resist this imprint. How was the system abrogating the rights of the individual? Who benefited from these actions?

Aina wanted to distinguish the productive actions of the individual from a system that denied this productivity. This seemed like an historical moment that created this process. Some individuals discovered how to exchange these social processes. From their point of view, this trade was the source of value. This trade was separate from the processes, which moved along human experience in a focused manner. Exchange only offered a portion of this process. There was so much that remained unavailable to this view.

How could philosophy account for the productive power of the individual? This power was available to everyone, but social structures worked to exploit this power. This obscured the productive power of the self. This view deferred to social reputation. Social control could direct this process only so much.

Philosophy was trying to describe something that evaded framing. The idea evaded the inherent movement of this relationship. Philosophy was trying to abstract from the process to direct its energy. This detour only became more extreme. The give and take increased. When people were able to take advantage of this play, they believed that they were part of something greater. Even the productive individual could confuse the source of this energy. The concept appeared to offer the foundation for this awareness.

Aina wanted to understand the importance of the conceptual system. It was trying to describe an interplay that was independent from the social forces. The conceptual system seemed to provide the foundation for personal interaction. The social realm did not appear to have an independence. In a more extended sense, social structure could be circumscribed the theoretical. The philosophy appeared to be fundamental.

Thought did not have this preminence. However, thought should not be viewed as merely reactive. Thought could coincide with the momentum of the productive moment. This was the perfect intersection between the philosophic awareness and social development.

Aina felt that she was starting to understand the actual zeal of social interaction. This was not sociology. It recognized the foundation of thought in an historical immediacy. Philosophy asserted itself in the incidental. The project emerged from this singularity.

What gave philosophy its unique status? It was not a sort of privileging. The foundation was more fragmentary. This volatile situation implied something that was invariant. That was more than contradictory. The full power of the moment could not emerge without explication. However, an excess of explanation only affirmed the imbalance. This was not an intellectual connection.

How could a description provide the dynamic for progressive development. Language could not constitute a unique capability. Language might be able to depict this process, but it was not the source of the insight. Aina recognized that this awareness could be the critical understanding of philosophy. There remained a more prolonged challenge.

Aina needed to sit with this experience. She needed to tease out the critical recognition. What did she lack in trying to coax out this knowledge? There was a gaping breach. And she was not supposed to fill it. There was something fundamental that could assist her seeing. Time

was building upon physical processes. And social interaction was in touch with this explosiveness. The productive power could not be reduced to a formation. It was elemental. There was a rawness to this vision.

Momentum needed weight to deliver this push. How could this relationship be constructed through observation? This was not a matter of recalling past experience. The self needed to act in the moment. But Aina understood activity as originating in ideal. She was on the verge of elucidating the important connection. But her perspective gave too much authority to her witnessing. She claimed that she had the necessary vantage point. But she was missing something. She was not sufficiently involved.

Aina was escaping from the strictures of a first philosophy. She was also avoiding the commitment to a sociological outlook. Sociology suggested that the individual could gain knowledge without lasting engagement.

The philosophical project did not throw itself in this moment. It was already rooted in the experience. But the rooting was primarily a way of seeing. This seeing was a response to an action on the part of the self. This was not entirely cause and effect, since this perspective gave meaning to the idea of cause. Cause was a facet of the subject's knowledge.

What was the nature of the subject's knowledge? Knowledge suggested the self could alter the world for personal benefit. This interaction could build on a connection with others. Communication highlighted this awareness. The will alone could not result in a positive encounter. In sharing this understanding with others, there was an effort to posit a unified system to collective action. Individuals could describe objects to each other, and the will could inspire individual action. This knowledge could proceed from a shared awareness. Together, people impressed a desired pattern on the world. The self continued to create a world based on contact with others. This shared perspective made change seem proximate. This was not wishful thinking. There was a scientific coherence in this view. In acting independently, the individual could register the same terms to deal with experience. People could work in concert for social change. Such change was predicated upon a view of the physical world. The world made itself available for change.

The self acquired a personal realization through social interaction, and the world spoke through the actions of the self. The world could be described by the individual, and this description could be recognizable to others. What were the factors that evaded this description? There was something that was inexhaustible in the collective social observation. How could a contrary view take hold?

This counter would be based on social forces that tried to disrupt the collective for personal gain. Such a perspective would be based on a limited awareness of the foundation for personal knowledge. The individual could recognize the foundation of a scientific perspective. But the contrary force would try to sequester a partial explanation to accord with personal aims. This would contradict the personal stake in these experiences. It would substitute short-term gain for lasting impact. It would disenfranchise the experience of some people in the overall picture.

Such a distortion would only provide a temporary resolution. But this resolution could become sufficient to impede the collective.

These negative efforts did not fully bring the process of knowledge to a stop. It only intensified the contradictions. Those who advanced a scientific perspective were being blocked by people, who sought immediate gratification. The world could be tricked into a lull. But people would eventually gain sufficient awareness to resist. This resistance would be rooted in the science.

Aina was doing what she could to track this social contradiction in an accurate manner. She credited the struggle, but that was not enough. This was not a matter of observation. The drive for control would be met with resistance. This realization was based on an encounter with the world. It was not situated in reason.

Philosophy did not uncover the fundamental contradiction. It only brought the self into contact with experience of others. Philosophy should not have been so remote from this conflict. However, reason often served narrow interests. It was necessary to expose the basis for the contradiction. It developed from an attempt to impose a solution from the outside.

How could philosophy inform an idealistic perspective? How could thought be so separate from the actual experiences of people. The individual aspired to a permanence that could assist in overcoming terrible situations. Once the self was lulled into this false consciousness, the individual would ally with interests, which promised short term rewards. A person could observe her life and see a lifetime of misery ahead. On that basis, the self would consider the devil's deal. The rescue of the few seemed more important than the liberation of the many.

There would be strategies that offered greater reassurance to the self. The individual would battle among these alternatives. However, the resolution seemed clear. The individual exaggerated personal resources. She told herself that she deserved such a reward. Her efforts had distinguished her.

Aina realized the dangers in not pursuing the commitment. She could believe that she had achieved her goals. But she was far off from the collective realization. She was compromising her beliefs. If she acquiesced so easily, she would not take full advantage of her abilities. She would settle.

It seemed so easy to accept such a settlement. There were so many factors that seemed to buttress the individual in this outlook. If philosophy reminded the self what was necessary, philosophy might seem like a useless distraction from life. This was not the case, but she was seeing how philosophy was being pushed off from its rightful end.

Philosophy was not meant to console the unethical. It was supposed to contest inequity. It was not allowed to lose its foundation in justice.

Had Aina allowed philosophy to lose its vigor? She was left with a faded image of its real effectiveness. How could all this power be marshaled for effective action?

Aina had accommodated herself to very abstract formulations of social interaction. She was not connected to the realities around her. She was doing her best to purify thought. She was only weakening her logic.

Where did logic reside in this fundamental social conflict? Did she want to give priority to a single point of view? There were some philosophies that wanted to give credibility to every viewpoint. However, that understanding robbed the influence of social circumstances on personal experience. The circumstances were neutral in their effect. That characterization was not credible. Relativism only gave validity to a form of lasting transgression. Philosophy emerged in an effort to counter these misdeeds. The self need to become empowered.

The relativist could use the constancy of experience for personal benefit. When questioned, the individual could dismiss these influences. Aina started to recognize these profound difficulties. She could not let her efforts become detoured from their rightful commitment.

Blanchard had questioned this single-mindedness. He tried to hide his strategy. The individual was pulled along by the currents. At the same time, philosophy offered the means to avoid the traps. That gave too much credibility to the philosopher.

Ultimately, disdain accompanied Blanchard's outlook towards others. They were not granted that same genius. They were distracted by the everyday, and they wanted a basic solution. They needed to whittle away their own participation in the morass.

When the self tried to assert its opposition, Blanchard questioned the circumstance of such an act. He deferred its import to some moment in the future.

Was the individual receiving sufficient acknowledgment in the present? How could a person be expected to wait? If enough people saw the problem, this was the time for a change. Blanchard eschewed the psychological basis of philosophy. But he was using psychological method as the means to counter his opponents. He was eliminating a powerful argument from social circumstance.

There needed to be a method to offer greater validity to individual efforts. The collective awareness could acquire enough momentum to battle injustice. Blanchard saw it differently. This collective awareness was the source of a shared delusion. The dominant forces had worked to propagate these ideas. And people were susceptible.

People might have felt the crushing blows of a dominant culture, but they were not so willing to go along with these aims. There were enough people, who recognized their actual strength.

The crushing blows alerted people that enough was enough. Blanchard should not have worked to dispel this awareness. It was not a matter of waiting for history to anoint the movement. History could not anticipate. It could only document. It could verify the experience of people, and this actual connection would create actual change.

These forces already percolated, and people became involved in these movements. This was the moment to take a stand. It was not a matter of validating an obscure philosophical discourse.

What was the role of philosophy? Did philosophy help people to see? Could it be reassuring? Aina recognized how these insights were not personal. But there were a lot of influences that tried to diminish the understanding of the individual.

If all these forces became overwhelming, people needed to form a collective will. The terrible conditions could erode any effort to fight against those conditions. The self could feel herself worn down to nothing.

This was not Aina's situation. Blanchard was offering her an escape. She could dull her assertiveness. She could find a greater support in the scholarship. That would be enough. If she tried to be too assertive, she would lose the thread. She would no longer be conducting philosophy.

How did social conflict offer a strong basis for philosophy? How did the world make itself known? Individuals could question their own experience. They could have doubts about their lives. Things would seem to change around them. And they would lose touch with the foundation for personal growth. They could see their lives become distracted from their goals. They would lose the thread. This would hardly seem the basis for philosophy. But these doubts were existential, and the only way for the individual to proceed was by dispelling the uncertainty.

Blanchard might see this as a psychological dilemma. The self was getting lost by these influences. This might be an argument for the diminishing of reason. On the other hand, this evidence was indubitable. The self could not awaken without a reminder what the day would bring. There would be constant pressure. The effects would not end. No amount of will could change things. This was an actual condition. The self did not have to accept this reality, That was a key part of the conflict.

Wouldn't this motivation be primarily psychological? The psychological experience revealed key elements of the world. This view of experience revealed things about the world. Blanchard might have resented this generalization. It exaggerated these psychological effects even more. Philosophy seemed even more prone to idealism. The individual was becoming absorbed by the tics of experience. Personal worries became more prominent. Philosophy was subject to temporary concerns.

Aina was not going to yield. She had touched a greater urgency. How could the inhospitable universe reflect this urgency. The fabric of knowledge only reinforced these psychological insights. A different observer might see things differently.

Aina had already addressed the problems with this relativism. It wasn't enough to express individual certainty. There needed to be a road to a more lasting awareness. It was not subject to individual consciousness. Consciousness was needed to affirm the urgency, but the urgency was created by actual situations. And this recognition could be connected to a scientific

awareness. The method was critical. It enabled the individual to pursue a more complex understanding. The awareness of things was connected to social realities. These realities found people in action. And these actions opened the self to scientific regularities.

This method helped to expose the string of scientific principles. But the connection for these principles was human interest. This was not an immersion in human suffering. The self needed to find a way to overcome these feelings. That was part of a social process. And it illuminated the form of the world.

What kind of science could develop from this social experience? Aina wanted to move beyond social observation. The urgency was rooted in individual observation. The self connected to a sustained social process. This was the basis for any kind of science.

How did that work? Science arose from the individual's connection to the world. Only when the world was subject to transformation could a scientific awareness merge. A personal longing was connected to the refusal of experience. The self figured out a technique to overcome these obstacles. The self was not simply becoming immersed in being. Experience offered the way to create a desirable world. There was this tension between the efforts to change and contrary forces that denied the importance of individual contribution. Science could expose the collective basis for this denial.

The world in flux was rooted in the actual efforts of the individual. There needed to be a program in order to see the deeper level of experience. Science was a confrontation with with transformative events.

How was the self being distracted? If these were only subjective experiences, then the self would question her own beliefs. The beliefs helped the self work against the confusion of the work routine. The individual learned key skills, but herself became estranged from the wherewithal to apply this knowledge. There was the opportunity to have greater influence.

Personal discouragement could slow the process. Aina was trying to maintain a philosophical understanding. She needed to strip away the sense of futility. She was documenting a form of knowledge. And she wanted to follow its trajectory. She could not give in to skepticism. Apathy could drain knowledge. The self could never know.

Aina did not endorse this abnegation. She immersed herself in the real. She hesitated. She saw the problems. She became lost in the quest.

She needed to work through these identity issues. She was afraid that her identification with these situations would prevent her from attaining the needed awareness. She needed to complete her work. Even if that meant forcing the resolution, she needed to keep on.

She was even more susceptible to the criticisms of Blanchard. He was not sympathetic with her explanations. He viewed them as excuses. She needed to stay with the method. She was getting lost in depicting the social context. She was not documenting another historical era. There was not enough coherence to justify this view.

Blanchard had observed this distraction in others. He had even engaged in the same activities on his own. He believed that the self could give too much credibility to the present

moment. That credibility evaded the self as the individual came closer to understanding. That only made the self invest more energy in the present.

Aina felt that Blanchard was not getting it right. She was not exaggerating the present moment. She was sensitive to history. She recognized how productive forces could change over time. And society would create different institutions to accompany these changes. However, the individual was rooted in this process. And individual awareness was important for understanding these changes.

The individual was the site of change. But the individual only achieved identity in social process. And Aina was illuminating that experience. Was there enough specificity to her description? She could spend her time locked in the library. That only shared a little bit with the struggles of others. She was protected with her books and and papers.

When did teaching remind her of the greater challenge for the self? She was in a field which faced different pressures in trying to justify itself on a practical level. There was still a need for logical argument. And philosophy could provide a map. It could also highlight ethical challenges. She was providing guidance for other fields. And they could improve their efforts from drawing on an enhanced methodology. This could improve finance or medicine. A clear argument was fundamental to any field. But Aina was also questioning the assumptions of these disciplines. She saw power as having a greater power.

Here, Blanchard might have criticized her on the basis of her philosophical calling. She was not supposed to be a social critic. She claimed that she was arguing on the basis of reasoning. But the argument became clouded. And she accepted that obscurity.

She claimed that there were different forms of social productivity. Some were more empowering of the individual. How did that work? There was a point when the self lost touch with the personal encounter with the world. Wishful thinking might open a door for the understanding. But some occupations confirmed that focus. And the individual remained in that delusion.

This understanding went beyond the social denials. The self needed to learn which activities offered a special view of the dynamics. This wasn't just about making things. There were processes that could release greater productive powers. But the individual needed to take a risk. Amidst extremes in temperature or threats to life and limb, there was a sustained effort to bend the stuff of existence into a coherent form. This power was not an illusion even as it engaged the resources of the world. This was a direct confrontation with the constraints of time. But the individual created results. And there was pleasure in these outcomes.

Time was being shaped by human effort. The individual could recognize this process and build from there. What did seeing really mean? It was moving beyond the evident. But it was rooted in this deeper feeling. This was complex arrangement that was immersed in this relationship with things.

Knowledge offered an entry to the world. The process was not dominance. It was becoming immersed in the texture of things. But she self needed to be assertive. And there

would be an activist side to the claims of certainty. The self was charting out a program. The individual built from everyday activities, but there was an effort to change the course.

Aina relied upon another revelation. Something was missing from her depiction. She was not immerse in the experience of others. She had tried to alleviate her isolation., It was not possible. These were the very conditions of her thought. She accepted this explosivness.

She felt that she knew too much to give a truly accurate picture. Her experience had been washed clean of the actual turmoil of existence. But she was not trying to render the suffereing of human existence. She was not exposing squalor. She wanted to depict the terms of liberation. Blanchard might have winced at such positive intentions.

Blanchard was not offering sufficient support to head off on the next journey. She had given enough credit to her own efforts. She had made her philosophy into a unique pursuit. But she had lost the basis for an activist position. There was too much that was absent from her depiction. This was not the time to dispense with the abstractions.

1. The last reincarnation:
2. Give her the look she needs.
3. Everyone is gorgeous'
4. Gaze
5. What do you really say?
6. Defer to
7. I GOT TO GO.
8. She has one more question.

GORGEOUS