"Facts!" "Propaganda but it's necessary to ignore
untrue. It's all in how you frame it. You can easily
make someone's account is overestimated and
in this case, it suggests that every thing is
Propaganda seems like such a convenient word.

I've introduced this net of one world. No wonder I'm dying now.

animals. That is her right. (1) Making propaganda against crime to
make her désormais years to spend her declining years.

He removes an association from himself. His removal,
separation, registration, I thought about all that.

Where are the others? Why is there no one to help me?
I thought about all those...
I think this requires sympathy as Elizabeth later notes and a compassion in order to think of ourselves into the other person's shoes - especially when this other person is our own self, as we've seen very little regard for.

Is mocking yourself into that true feeling of another something you need to ask permission for?

So is something next personal for us, or are we just finding that? I think we learn pulling of empathy, of sympathizing without, in a manner of speaking rather than rejection rather than rejection, as I agree, but I also think it's more important to encourage the unreasonably unimportant be talks about, but not so much that we are doing it all the time, but in a manner of speaking.

There is no other way our minds.

Wrong into his hands. To do things that still necessary.
"Throw at Euthyphro I say, what god does rivalry destruction do?"

(p. 66)

Is this indicating the removal of philosophy for animals? Humans? Both?

Is she suggesting that we use ethics instead of? Or is she saying we need a new discipline to get to the root of this?
"The level of behavior you wish to reach is too elementary to be mastered by talk." (p. 50)

This seems like a reversal of logic. Usually we think we need to think more to get somewhere, but this seems to be suggesting that we should stop thinking so much in order to get here. Actually, maybe we just need to think less. Meditation maybe?
"There. There. I will soon be over."
(p. 69)

placating?

we're being medicated.

Attempting to comfort by bringing up the concept of ante
diluvium and of how everything must end. But what could happen before the inevitable end? what of resistance?

I really do not know what to do. My thoughts are the last line of the novel — does it just show me how clueless her son is? AFFECTIVE MENTALITY (her tormented mind) — how inadequate am I a respondent to her pleas?
Be what? Her maneuver to care for some?

What about it, mid-career, to care for some?

Maybe she wants them to come to their realization on their own, so she presents her experience as a case study, rather than a guide.

Early in the first actuation, Elizabeth regresses a claims handler, claiming that all claims are plaintiff-centric, everything revolves around the plaintiff's claim. She emphasizes the plaintiff's perspective, suggesting that the plaintiff's rights are always superior to the defendant's.

To be near my sore (p. 43).

Why can she assume that other people have a soul and therefore make claims about it? It comes at the same price for everyone, which is what she does not do. If she cannot make claims about it, she cannot have a soul and therefore be a person. It comes at the same price for everyone.
sitting silently is doing something powerful. I think the most important thing is an awareness and a willingness about what you want to do. How long do we sit forever? If we do this, if we don't interact with others, we won't grow. But do we do something that's still like silent, like sitting with others? Elizabeth quotes that as the "embodied soul." Elizabeth speaks in regards to a distinct act of separation that is embodied when animals (and other beings) are separated from their true self and consciousness, like at a large animal farm. Although we may not be conscious of this, when we interact, we are interacting with our consciousness, our embodiment. By no longer contempt, perpetrators of evil beings, we are put it plainly, closing ourselves off to others. Although we may not be yet conscious of this, when we interact, we are interacting with our consciousness, our embodiment. Elizabeth speaks in regards to a distinct act of separation that is embodied when animals (and other beings) are separated from their true self and consciousness, like at a large animal farm. Although we may not be conscious of this, when we interact, we are interacting with our consciousness, our embodiment. By no longer contempt, perpetrators of evil beings, we are put it plainly, closing ourselves off to others. Although we may not be yet conscious of this, when we interact, we are interacting with our consciousness, our embodiment.

I don't know what I want to do.
"If principles are what you want to take away from this talk, I would have to respond, open to you heart & listen to what your heart says?"

It's strange to think of fiction dictating principles, but it makes sense. Maybe people would be more open to ideas if they thought what they were reading wasn't "true." Maybe osmosis is the best way to absorb principles?

I think fiction has a way of targeting emotions in a way that non-fiction doesn't. There is always some sort of emotion at the heart of fiction that author is allowed to highlight. Emotions cannot be highlighted in non-fiction b/c we view emotion as distortion of facts. However, emotion is ever present in all our lives, so maybe fiction is the true non-fiction.

Reminded me of "A million little pieces" scandal - author produced best selling work that he claimed was a memoir only to later admit he made the entire thing up. People felt out w/g the betrayal but I had to wonder if the book any less true if it made the book any less true if good? People liked it because they related to main character emotions/feelings.
There is no position outside of reason where you can stand and lecture about reason and pass judgement on reason. (48)

What do we do when we don't reason?

Isn't reason a concept whose definition evolves over time and is almost always dependent on circumstances?

Isn't it necessary to stay outside of reason to better be able to comment on it? Returning to earlier questions of whether one can properly criticize something while being deeply involved in it.

I feel like you can never define anything 'outside' anything - to sometimes in stepping outside we cannot see the full complexities that are being on the 'inside'... to be removed is to undervalue the fully intricate meaning of something. Then again, to be wholly inside is also a way of being unable to see - maybe we need the flexibility of both?
"Why can't she just come out and say what she wants to say?" (35)

She can't really come out and say what she means to say because even by doing so, her audience still won't understand her views and she believes she is unable to explain it because it is part of her own unique thought process.

But this is a laudable because she believes no one will understand her. She does attempt, and her laudable effort prevents people from staying to understand her. This gets her nowhere, and is problematic.

It's a bit self-indulgent on her part that she doesn't try to understand or explain how she thinks because she believes that no one will understand. In the academia it's your job to at least try to make your ideas understood, at least if you are voicing them publicly.

Yet she believes in the power of poetry to open our minds to the possibilities of moving representations...

That is why poetry and prose forms can be accurate representations—to may change and reflect more than pure description and definition, especially through form.
I will take it that you concede me the theoretical power to evoke these horrors and bring them to your mind, adequate force, and leave it at that. Remembering you only that the horrors themselves are... nonetheless, on the center of this lecture.

How can one fully appreciate her lecture without taking these horrors as fact? Why would you deny that they are facts? Perhaps "horror" is too strong of a word?

Do we need to state everything directly in order for them to be present?

Does being confronted by the horrors talked about in the lecture actually allow us to face what makes us uncomfortable and slowly make the uncomfortable less uncomfortable to us? Is that the power of such a rhetorical style?

I'm unsure, because although it may serve as a catalyst for a call to action, it may just as easily make someone feel hopeless to their state of affairs. Just go about their daily as usual.

Perhaps a more reduced style would be used? Or less about? One less fear-inducing.

What's really ever changed anything in our world? Fear or love?  
love of pure hatred?
Marxism: Critical Theory

We are entrapped in a web of reason that prescribes what we do not understand.

"Of course reason will validate reason as the first principle of the universe. What else could it do? Dethrone itself?"

Reason, a concept used to address and solve complex problems. It is our tool of understanding.

That's a possibility my mom told me that her goal as a teacher was to get her students to a point at which they no longer needed her — teaching so that teaching wouldn't be needed, and students knew how to learn.

"How can one argue against reason with more reason? So why don't we just accept reason?"

Because this is a circular argument, a tautology. Plus, who came up with our contemporary notions of reason, anyway? Why don't we question them and their motives?

Principles promote a sense of predictability, certainty. However, they are no guarantee from emotion.

A What Terms does Elizabeth Castile Question The Value of Reason? Why do she argue "not to evaluate principles," why is she not interested in "postmodern" (p 37)? What is wrong by living in accord of such
We are not mere passive observers. We are active participants.

If we want to understand languages and culture, we must engage in the process of studying and interpreting.

We cannot simply impose our own values and norms on others. We must strive to understand their perspectives and ways of thinking.

Failing to do so can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts.

Therefore, we must approach the study of languages and cultures with an open mind and a willingness to learn.

— P. 51
If principles are what you want...
To take away from this talk, I
would have to respond, open to
your heart, listen to what your
heart says.

Can the hearer, are poorly defined places contain principles,
or are the outward muse?

Yes, I was never understood. Are discrimination between
two the same thing.