

The Freedom to Model

Jefferson F. Richards

Preface

All of this is devoted to AZK-N - who made it possible for me to find individuality amidst massive communication dissonances.

These writings accumulated over the 2013-2014 school year within my notebook - they are not at all intended to summate the mentioned writings by other artists. The writings that flow through me are guided meditations on the necessary mental hurdles that it took for me to sprint through models of dependence, independence, interdependence, and ultimately freedom.

Eventually, Interdependence will grace the Job that is in us all.

Contents

Introduction

1. Axiom-Based Truth vs. Absolute Truth
2. Triple Entendre
3. Entitlement vs. Privilege
4. Toleration
5. Gramsci's Hegemony

Conclusion

Recommended Readings

Introduction

I agree with Isis Murdoch when she says: "The sovereign moral concept is freedom." Freedom, above all else, allows for Good, Grace, Suffering, Happiness, and social mobility. My adolescent will strives for a sense of freedom and individuality. Typically, someone my age would look to the example set by their culture for tips on how to evolve into independence. Because I belong to the null culture, it's a bit more complicated. Society tells me that I have an uninhibited blank slate on which I can paint my future - a tabula rasa. Having a tabula rasa is not all that it cracks up to be because there is no baseline comparison path, especially without the culture to fall back on. I started to study freedom and truth - with the hope of discovering the main properties of a perfect society and a just soul. I thought that if I had no culture to belong to, I would have to create one.

So the first step was to read and write about the natural phenomena that most intrigued me. I looked to philosophers, mathematicians, and political scientists for insight into topics that seemed most relevant to freedom. Modeling was the way I organized and synthesized my findings. In the context of this dissertation, a "model" is any natural phenomena, or occurrence, minimized into a simple form. An "axiom" is a base assumption or maxim that acts as a foundation for other axioms to build from. Models appeal to the senses and make teaching and learning much easier for the teacher and student. With the Freedom of Speech, U.S. citizens have the freedom to model using natural (spoken) and artificial languages. Without the freedom to model, both individuality and functional growth could not be a privilege of our society. As I will discuss, Linguistics incorporates visual anatomy, sound, and touch - all of which add meaningful dimensions to the model presented by the speaker. In a world of ambiguous symbology, it is important for models to stimulate multiple senses so as to triangulate on the intended meaning from complementary perspectives. It used to be that only royalty had the means to have an interdisciplinary education. Because education does not require as much sacrifice as it used to, our models should be expressed via more than just natural language. I look to the U.S. constitution as the ideal

model of a citizen in our country. Contradictory to common intuition, I strip the citizen of any sort of entitlement, as promised by the Bill of Rights, and endow privileges as replacement blessings. I write about toleration and the pursuit of happiness because only with tolerating perspectives can we grow from the diverse range of models presented by people. As it is difficult to produce an influential model, the last chapter outlines hegemony - the tendency for a few models to dominate the many - and sacrifice.

Einstein, Chomsky, the founders of the U.S. Constitution, and Gramsci all sacrificed their lives in a pursuit to model; imagine if they didn't have the freedom to do so.

Disclaimer:

When I claim a fact, I normatively heighten the language and model, by which I transmit the translation of an observation, above competing translations. The manner by which this paper is written and read affects the overall communicative experience. As to the significance of the choice of words, I lack the proper time for a sufficient justification. So, for the sake of freedom, I will both discredit and credit all base assumptions of this dissertation; they will act as the most extremely true foundations by which I build a grammar that is limited only to the confines of these pages.

Concentration 1

Axiom-Based Truth vs. Absolute Truth

The limited man studies freedom while the free man studies limitations.

Near the beginning of my Spring Quarter of school I found myself at the Engineering and Physical Science library staring at the 50 page, journal sized book titled: Relativity. The author was Albert Einstein. After all of the references made to this notorious writer it seemed necessary for me to at least attempt to read some of his writings. The introduction of the book warmed me to the intentions of the American Eagle - written for beginning college students.

A major claim struck me as a surprise. Einstein acknowledged that his special relativity was falsified by his general relativity - in certain contexts. In a very mature manner, Einstein teaches his audience that some systems of knowledge need to be kept alive due to the practicality of what they produce. Special relativity was still very useful in certain contexts and for this reason is no less true, it is merely less useful. Einstein tore away at my conception of truth. Being always a summation of axioms, truth does not need to be true in all contexts for it to be useful or practical. I do not call for a loose interpretation of what is true - on the contrary! I just argue that truth should only be discovered through an axiom based truth deriving process. Only by this process will limitations be mere contextual differences rather than progress halting setbacks. I argue that AE would not state that "Everything is relative." The afore mentioned statement is an absolute in and of itself. I argue that he would state that "Everything is built from axioms" instead.

The axioms of the mind are the thoughts meant to encapsulate natural phenomena in a simplified form. As more often than not thought is language based, thought is constrained by language based axioms. In Einstein's mathematics it is very clear that the axioms are the assumptions. For natural language, truth is much more difficult to decompose. Because the base units of natural languages are the symbols they represent, I turn my study towards linguistics.

The models of Dr. Seuss, the brothers Grimm, and Anatomy books all complemented each other in describing the communicative process. Seuss demonstrated how whole languages can be formulated in under twenty pages. The brothers Grimm were master linguists who formulated laws of language conversion. Anatomy books showed the physiology of speech production as well as non verbal cues. One notion I worked under was that Truth is only useful if it can be communicated.

Language thought is only as free as the framework that confines it. A "framework" is similar to the scaffolding for a building project. Both the scaffolding and the building materials determine how tall, wide, and thick the building will be. As will be discussed later, the goal of having the privilege to model is to build individuality and functional growth. To achieve this, our models need to have freedom properties. One key freedom property is that the framework of our everyday linguistics augments the growth of modeling that has the potential to incorporate all of the senses. Or in other words: we

need to speak with a freedom language. Reaching the intended receiver of the model by means of multiple senses helps enforce a more vivid depiction of the natural phenomena at hand. A more vivid depiction increases the chances that the masses will understand the model. I explore grammar in the next concentration so as to discover the limitations and ramification of freedom within language.

Concentration 2

Triple Entendre

"If we don't believe in freedom of expression for people we despise, we don't believe in it at all." Noam Chomsky

A grammar is a set of rules and relations that puts meaning to the symbols of language. Inherently, a shift in grammar can twist the meaning of the same set of symbols. Seeing as a freedom language needs a freedom grammar, I turned to the master of linguistics, Noam Chomsky, for advise.

Of the many models Chomsky formulated, one struck me as pivotal to understanding the relativity of language - a grammar accumulates over time. Chomsky claims that a grammar builds from the beginning sentences that a person uses. It is then up to the speaker (or writer) to reaffirm and validate the rules that he establishes by remaining consistent in their usage. Consistency reaffirms axioms; it does not reinforce trueness. Not only is a grammar axiom based, it also limits symbols to focused meanings. In English, the word "read" by itself can only be used as a present tense or past tense verb - this word has a focused meaning. Outside of those two tenses, the word needs an article like "will" or "has" for the English grammar to remain consistent.

Understanding grammar is a crucial tool for every freedom modeler because it allows for managed expression. To create individuality, one needs to express their signature experience. Sometimes, experience out-represents the grammar that is available to express it. In these cases, the beginning axioms, of the grammar, must be reviewed and freed from limiting constraints. It is impossible for a grammar to be to uninhibited, but it is possible to reduce grammatical limitations by starting a grammar with very liberal axioms. Po-

etry, for example, is the art of managing grammatical constraints. With a craft like poetry, it is possibility to create individuality with little limitation.

Entendre translates to "meaning" in french. Words are sometimes said to have a "double entendre" when they have two meanings. Some words, like Plato's "Good", have infinite entendre. Does the word with more entendre permit more managed expression than the word with less entendre? A fine balance must be met in the freedom of a word, with an ambiguous word such as "it" having nearly pure freedom and a proper name such as "Jim" having little freedom.

When we analyze the entendre of a larger linguistic unit, such as a sentence or a paragraph, we notice a diverse range of subjectivity. There are so many perspectives regarding the meaning of a large linguistic unit that the unit loses any sort of objective "rightness." Even to decompose and categorize the unit calls for an agreement on just a few entendre. To move forward in life, or to have any functional growth, people need to agree on the entendres that help progress. One way to heighten one entendre over another is to include axioms, in the model, that complement the intended entendre. As I have encouraged, complementary axioms that stimulate more senses than just the eyes or ears heighten entendre even higher. Ultimately, all "rightness" requires people to agree on the similar entendre.

With the goal of modeling freely, the framework (constraints and limitations that allow for modeling) must not reduce down to solely natural language. A "freework" is a habit framework that does not require the user to rely on natural language to establish habits. For instance, if an individual seeks out clean teeth they may develop a routine that brings them close to a toothbrush everyday. To rely on a natural-language-based thought to develop a habit (e.g. "no more sleep and toss, time to brush and floss") is to rely on the mode of communication that most leads to conformity. It takes no fluid intelligence to conform to a single entendre set of instructions. Fluid intelligence requires a high plasticity of creativity to translate phenomena with complete individuality.

The freedom modeler needs to find a happy middle ground between managed expression and freely interpreted expression if he is to communicate effectively. With the relativity of entendre comes a diverse range of

perspectives. What we explore in the next Concentration is Toleration; because, freedom stems from the toleration of all interpreted entendres.

Concentration 3

Entitlement vs. Privilege

William Blackstone - "Every sale implies a price, a quid pro quo, an equivalent given to the seller in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer; but what equivalent can be given for life and liberty..."

The U.S. Constitution brought, what used to be, the rights of royalty to the lives of laymen. The first Amendment is the freedom of speech because the founding fathers knew that the only way for a government to function justly is for there to be spoken checks and balances. The freedom to model is higher order than the freedom of speech because the ftm allows for expression through more than just speech. Though that is according to my interpretation of the phrase: "freedom of speech." In this concentration, I argue that a "right" is a property of an ideal citizen that has credibility only by the agreement of entendre between many people. Having others agree to your interpretation of a "right" is a privilege.

The rights of the constitution are language based axioms that complement each other in the formation of a model citizen. A model citizen shapes his habits around those rights. When the founders of the constitution limited the model citizen to language based rights, they did not model within a freework. When "the freedom to model" is added to the constitution, all self maintenance and preservation of the living document that is the constitution is dealt with. When the model U.S. citizens has the privilege to model freely he has an equal chance in determining what is right for everyone. Every person could have the potential to formulate models that help further progress in our walks of life so every person must be regarded as having the base property of freedom modeling.

The U.S. citizen does not have art to accompany each right. He does not have sound to accompany the freedom of speech, pictures to accompany the

right to bear arms. When man relies on purely language based axioms to form his habits, he slaves to incomplete models.

A right, or an agreed upon entitlement, acts as the axioms of government recognized individuality. The issue with believing that rights are entitled is that the framework of a purely language based constitution is not inherently free. Just as Blackstone argued that nothing can be given for "life and liberty," I argue that no set of words alone can define an entitled property of a person. Any model short of the actual person is a mere image that the person may or may not agree to

A right has so many entendres, due to its inevitable ambiguity, that its accurateness is no longer based in truth. Language based rights are ambiguous and lack specificity by nature. A U.S. citizen is not entitled to own a rifle, he is privileged to. It does not specifically say that we can own rifles in the constitution, so to think that i am entitled to own such right is to stand by an axiom that is not based in truth. When a person owns a rifle, they are described by one of the numerous entendres of "bear arms." A man who owns a rifle in America is privileged enough to have others recognize the one entendre that he embodies from the constitution - "the right to own a rifle."

Concentration 4

Toleration

John Locke - "... to what end the legislative power ought to be directed... is the temporal good and outward prosperity of the society..."

John Locke's happiness shall be defined as "the end for which we strive." Happiness, in this context, is more of a pursuit than anything else. The goal oriented individual distinguishes between short term happinesses and long term happinesses. As we can see in the U.S.A., happiness is a common goal. Much of the philosophy underpinning the U.S. constitution is influenced by John Locke's writings.

John Locke exposed a very important aspect of what he believed to be a

just society when he wrote about institutions that focus their resources on Happiness. When the entertainment industry focused on temporary pleasures and pains it focused on temporary happinesses. If the entertainment industry dealt with the long-term pleasures and pains, then it would have bled over into religion. Locke called for a separation of happiness institutions (short term and long term) and for a toleration of the way by which each person sought out Happiness.

Using various axioms with a diverse range of grammatical frameworks, people communicate with each other. People share their models of natural phenomena and attempt to depict the world using truth that is signature to them alone. The individual should have a blank slate through which he can carve out whatever truth he feels is right. Only by toleration can this be achieved.

Toleration should be a key long term happiness that people seek out because it alone can lead to freedom. The tolerant mind does not have trouble listening to unheard of axioms. The tolerant mind sees limitations for what they are - opportunities for individuality. To add on to Locke's arguments, I argue that there should be a separation between church, state, and entertainment industry. Each having a religious nature - habit based - it is important for the three to remain as exclusive as possible. The EI contributes enough to happiness that the three could act as a checking system. How well each sector tolerates the other should define the class and honor each holds.

Each sector should also define how a perfect marriage should look. Anybody may look to any marriage as the model for how an interdependent team functions. Through these standard teams, citizens have a standard prototype to aim for - a role model.

A role model communicates through human expression. The axioms of human expression are defined by habits. In the extreme form, toleration leads to appreciation.

Concentration 5

Gramsci's Hegemony

The hegemonic behemoth does not solely define beauty”

What is right is not always based on what is true; what is right is often times based on what is sacrificed for the right to be implemented and maintained. For all of the writings that I mentioned to have come into fruition, time and livelihood was sacrificed. It took major sacrifice for the model citizen of the constitution to be regarded as more right than any other group's model. The same goes for the models of Einstein and Locke. In this chapter, I look to Antonio Gramsci - a man who gave his life for his models to rise to the top.

Gramsci was a writer living under Mussolini's regime in Italy. He was sent to prison because he wrote against the fascism of his governing body. Before dying in prison, Gramsci wrote incessantly - providing models for posterity.

Gramsci brought a concept called "hegemony" to the micro level. He writes that just a few individuals within a mass of people determine the standards of habit and behavior expressed by the mass. The hegemonic individual creates a model that people naturally follow. According to Gramsci, as much as we strive to open up the freedom to model for everyone, only a few will determine keystone limitations.

A paradigm does not shift often. So also do the models of mathematics, language, and behavior change gradually over time. What is considered right and what is considered wrong shifts depending on the context.

The hegemonic factor that Gramsci introduces strips titles, diversifies entitlements, and frees up the privilege to model for everyone. He illuminates how a model becomes paradigmatic - through sacrifice. Even Jesus needed a star marketing team for his parables to take off. The presidential campaign manager sacrifices his time and money for his candidate to be the "right choice." Countless freedom fighters sacrifice their lives for the "right" to be free.

A primary reason why mathematics are limited down to one language is that the paradigmatic model should be based more on what is true than the marketing involved for that model to be known. In a very limited framework,

consistent trueness can more easily be achieved. Regardless, Einstein needed to set his model apart from other similar ones on top of depicting consistent trueness. Einstein needed to sacrifice livelihood to establish hegemonic dominance.

Cocnclusion

How do we sum up this book that is meant to embody all of the extra curricular studies that i felt were more important tto undergo than the childish past times of most of the young students trying to get loaded that i know. It started off as a way to curb some of my manic tendencies - studying helps me cool. It turned into a pursuit for freedom - the sovereign of all axioms. Because without freedom, we do not have a chance to create models of the natural world for our posterity. Even Gramsci had the freedom to write in jail. If Gramsci established hegemonic standards with his little bit of freedom, we should be able to move mountains.

The adolescent mind can identify with metaphors, parables, and analogies. As we can see from the bible, the parable is the simplest yet most effective linguistic model. Children have no problem comprehending new mental models. This conclusion should really focus on moving into interdependence with wht i have learned.

The independence of a freework allows the modeler to describe their natural experience. Eventually, the modeler needs to incorporate othe rmodels because the cant do it on their own

Recommended Readings

1. Einstein's Relativity
2. Noam Chomsky
3. John Locke's A letter regarding toleration
4. U.S. Constitution
5. Edward Abbott's Flatland
6. Khalil Gibran's The Prophet

