

Triangulation 20180723

Once again, these are going to be some rough notes. Let's see, today's July 23, 2018. It's coming up about 12:26 in the afternoon. I was listening to one of my old recordings, and while I was listening I was kind of jotting down some rough notes, and I also reviewed a couple of my earlier notes. One of the first things that kind of triggered this was, in a previous note I talked about how astronomers rank heavenly bodies in a magnitude, and it has to do with luminosity, I believe is the correct phrase or correct word. It's how bright or how dim the heavenly body appears to us from our observation of it. And what kind of struck me about this was that when you think about these principles and priorities, these standard references, or what I call the choice of first magnitude, the references that we choose that our lives revolve around. You know, I was considering the orders of magnitude of these points, and I was actually, the notes I was briefly discussing, how most of the time you could easily picture a constellation of concepts or a constellation of points. And one of the examples that I remember using was that of friendship, because when you consider friendship, it's like I said, if you reach up and you grab that point, there's, it's pretty easy to understand how a constellation could come down with it. One of the connections or lines that I showed as a correlation or a connection, connecting two of these points would be the relationship or connection or correlation between friendship and trust. I mean, if you have standards, you know, it seems to me that if you uphold and support these standards, and if you call someone by that token friend, it almost would have to be someone that you had a level of trust with. So, you know, and that's, you know, rapport, there's so many other things that would come into that, but that's kind of how I was looking at this constellation of concepts and the connect-the-dots puzzle. You have these points, and they are related to other points, and I was thinking about how, you know, when astronomers rank these heavenly bodies, these points in the sky, and they assign them a level of magnitude, they're assigning that level based on their position or proximity to that heavenly body, meaning it's not, the magnitude that is assigned is not directly related to the actual luminosity of that heavenly body. It's related to our observable, our observations of that heavenly body from our position or our proximity. Now, I do realize that based on the measurement of the luminosity or the magnitude from our observable point, from the point at which we observe from our proximity, if they can estimate the distance, they can then estimate what the true or actual magnitude or luminosity of that heavenly body is.

But what struck me about it was it reminded me of the principles and priorities that our lives revolve around and our proximity and inclination to the enduring and endearing principles, meaning if we're not in close proximity in our views and what we value to one of those core principles or points, standards, standards of measure, then we're viewing our view, let's say our observation of it, is somewhat, at least somewhat influenced or a factor of it, of our observed value of it, is based on our nearness to, close proximity, or our distance from, our further away proximity, a further point away. So we're not really getting possibly the true value of it, it's from our current position or our proximity to it. Now, I would have to think that direct experience would be a little different because that observation is different from experience because that would mean that you're incorporating it into your practice and so you're receiving direct experience. So the way I wrote it was observation can be remote or, you know, much more remote, but when you're having direct experiences, that's, you know, that's, when you're having experiences, that's direct. Anyway, and I know that's in my previous notes somewhere, remote control and remote access, or no, it's remote control and direct address. So I think it may have been in a different context, but I do recall that I, that I kind of stumbled across that, those concepts in a previous set of notes. So the next thing I real quick wanted to capture was about the mutually supportive. You know, I just keep coming back to, you know, so I've always said that these principles and priorities, they're mutually supportive and adaptive. And of course, trust supports friendship, friendship supports trust. You know, that's how, that's that correlation, that's that connection, that's how they're tied, that's how they're connected and therefore tied together. In fact, another word I've used is, it's how they become tethered together. But, and I was thinking about the strength of the mast and that beacon, that highest point. The more support, the higher that mast can become. And so, you know, two steps back, expanded consciousness, etc., etc. Referring back to the magnitude, the order of magnitude, or the magnitude of the luminosity, the brightness of that point, that beacon. So again, this was just kind of reiterating to myself how, you know, there's a correlation between the modeling I've done with the connected dots and the parable, I guess, the story that I'm telling about the mast of the ship and the lookout and that's in the crow's nest of the mast. It's all, the structure that enables that lookout to safely man the crow's nest is all that rigging that supports the mast against the load. So, you know, I just, I know that's all connected together. I just, I mainly just wanted to capture it in the notes. I'm not going to go into any detail about it. I just want to make sure it's in here. And that's, that's sort of a connection

or a correlation between the analogy or the story of the sailing ship with the mast and the lookout being a visionary, an expanded consciousness, a position, being in a position of expanded consciousness, a commanding perspective and a comprehensive view. I don't know if that's the two, two of the words I chose to express that, but that's close, if not what I chose. So anyway, that's kind of what I wanted to make sure I caught in that set of notes. I was just kind of toying around with that. But finally, I want to talk very briefly about some notes that I'd made about triangulation. And so I remembered when I started writing the notes and this kind of got sparked by that luminosity. You know, it's, it's not there. When astronomers observe the heavenly bodies, it doesn't mean that's their true luminosity. It's an indication of the observed brightness of the star from our position here on Earth. So somehow I, in relation to that, because I think, I think it was partly because of the observed, I somehow connected over to the triangulation. And so where I kind of started was, it has to do with three, it has to do with a set of knowns, you know, all trans, all solving for the unknown, and part of that transposition, all solving for the unknown is you solve for the unknown based on the knowns. So the knowns in this was two fixed points of a known distance apart. And then it's the bearing of the target from those two fixed points. And based on that data set, the two fixed points with a known distance in between and the observed bearing from each of those two fixed points, you can fix the position of that third point. So I set up my notes as the two fixed points are the competing ideologies. And I think it's kind of understandable at some level that we could at least somewhat comprehend the distance between the two points of view. And now, in this particular set, because I had another set of notes that I went back to, I was thinking about the storytelling and triangulation. I think what I initially chose was the competing ideologies of human rights and class privilege. So that was the two competing, that's the two fixed points of the competing ideologies, and then there's a distance between them. And I put that distance, I labeled it as range based on some other notes that I had written earlier in time. It was range and scope. And so I pointed to the line between the two fixed points, which is the distance, and I put that as range. And then I drew kind of a circle around the whole triangle, and I labeled that as scope. So the position that in this triangulation that I was trying to identify would be the point of the delicate balance between the competing ideologies. And I labeled that, of course, as the delicate balance wherein when the magic happens. So that's kind of where that led me, based on getting those notes written and then referring back to the previous notes, that's kind of where I was trying to get when I was working on the previous

modeling. And this just allowed me to better understand what I was trying to accomplish in that set of notes and the diagramming that I had completed. So it comes down to what I had talked about, thought of, contemplated, and actually written some notes about in the past about equal versus fair. So the way I have it written is under the category or the concept of human rights, we should all be seen as equal and we should all be treated as equal. But then versus under the concept of class privilege, we should all be treated fairly. And again, that original set of notes, which included some diagramming, inside the triangle for triangulation that I had created, I labeled it initiative. And the two stories, because this is kind of what I was working towards, as a storyteller, as someone who, through their presenting, wants to impart impact, you know, it's a gift to others, just like it's been a gift to me. The two stories I chose was the story of Mr. Knauff about the red brick porch and "remember you helped build it" and how in a later time, I realized that people who don't contribute, who are not afforded the opportunity to be participants in our, in the human condition, they're, yes, they're kind of getting the free ride, maybe somewhat taking advantage, but they're also being cheated. And that what they're being cheated of is the experience of command performances, and that peak experience that comes as a result of that command performance. So, and I actually need to kind of expand on those notes a little bit to make sure I include all that. And then on the other side, the other story, I was talking about the editor's choice. And of course, this had directly to do with initiative, had to do with interviewing qualified candidates, the editor set the stage. He said that all that needed to be, all that was necessary for these candidates to become successful, and become a valued member of the team, they could be taught. But the one thing that he couldn't teach was initiative. And so, you know, it can be acquired, but it can't be taught. And so what I was attempting to draw, you know, draw a distinction, what I was attempting to discern there, or point to the distinction of, is that the individual who exhibits initiative, and goes beyond survival, doing just what it takes to survive and get by, the person that goes beyond that, and thrives through their own drive, through their own initiative. I don't want to take away from the person that is doing just what it takes to survive. So that's the equal part. But I want to reward the person who based on their own initiative, applies themselves and shines and contributes in ways far above and beyond just surviving, and just being a passive participant. They're much more active. And, ~~and~~ because of that, they thrive. So I don't want them to be I don't, I still wouldn't want money and power to become monolithic. I don't want that, that's not going to be a fair system. But there's a balance

between that and being a completely equal system where nobody is rewarded for their efforts any more than anyone else. I don't want that. Those are two extremes. I don't want either. I want to strike, I want to find that delicate balance wherein when the magic happens. So as far as I can see, that is something that's somewhere between, you know, social, social, type of socialism and a type of, well, that's the two bookends, socialism and capitalism. You want people to be rewarded, but you don't want wealth and power to become monolithic. So there's got to be, you know, we've got to find, we got to tweak the system that we can establish and maintain at least a range within a range of that delicate balance. Okay, do I see it being perfect? Well, no, because there's all you know, I believe in a system of pure potential. So if that's the case, no matter how good you got it, there's always a little bit more. There's always room for growth. And I want to make sure I make that clear. We're always building on the foundation, the best that has been left to us. But I think the point is, you always strive. It's a quest. And the better you can tweak it, the more magic happens. Anyway, I think that's about all I really needed to get in this set of notes. Signing off.