

Objectivity

Introduction to Objectivity

Part Two

Introduction

If you engage for long in the study of how human beings relate to one another, especially through the use of language, you are bound to be struck by the importance of 'transactions.' – Jerome Bruner

Most people who transact in the marketplace are indifferent to our invitations, offers and requests. We can turn that around and say that 'we' are indifferent to most of the invitations, offers and requests made to us – and we remain indifferent until we recognize and become sensitive to the opportunities or threats associated with the invitations, offers and requests made by others. We pay attention and become concerned and interested to invitations, offers and requests when they relate to and affect some Condition of Life that is important to us.

Most adults are aware of their needs and wants and are seeking appropriate solutions to the breakdowns in their Conditions of Life. To take that one step further, most adults are already concerned about their Conditions of Life, and are already aware that some solution to them is required now, or will be in the future. Most people have already made up their mind about transacting for a solution, but they won't know that they want *your* solution until you make them an offer that a) clearly articulates your understanding of the breakdown(s) they face, and b) clearly articulates how your offer is a solution to it.

Most people know that they will buy new and more fashionable clothing in the future. Most people know that they will change the kind of phones, computers and other media technology they use to make their life more comfortable and enjoyable over time. What they may not know today is exactly what they will acquire – but they will know it when the offer is made to them and they see how the new solution solves the breakdown objectively.

Generally, this is true for everyone and for all Conditions of Life.

When sufficiently excited or agitated, they are open to invitations, offers and requests that clearly articulate the breakdown they have now (or see in the future), AND – recognize a clear and objective pathway for how transacting with you will provide the solution to their concerns.

In this paper we continue the work we began in the previous Issue to expand our understanding of Objectivity. We will examine and discuss the elements required to hold an Objective view of any transaction.

All transactions have a subjective and objective element to them.

The subjective narrative that each of us hold about our current Conditions of Life leads us on a learning journey to find out how best to satisfy them in an objective reality. We are in a constant search for knowledge, whether we realize it or not. At all times, we hold a “story” about the importance of taking care of our own Conditions of Life and our story rests on the knowledge we have (or think we have) about the condition itself and the most acceptable pathway for satisfying that condition. Where and how we get the vast majority of our knowledge about solutions to our concerns and breakdowns varies and is worthy of much consideration, but for the purposes of this discussion it is safe to say that we glean it from *The Current*.

Once we have accepted a specific kind of knowledge for how to care for our Conditions of Life, we move to take action. This kind of knowledge is best described as knowledge *of consequence*.

When we know and can articulate consequences (opportune or threatening), what we experience is a biological reaction to a subjective notion or narrative about our impending survival and/or existence. We become interested and concerned about how our life could, or most certainly will, turn out if we do not take some action to avoid it or move to take advantage of it. We are no longer indifferent but rather quite the opposite.

In these situations we will act on the knowledge we have about what to do to take advantage of or care for others or ourselves. The more real (objective) the threat or opportunity becomes, the more likely we are to act.

The closer we are to a threatening or beneficial situation in a Condition of Life, the more objective we tend to be about it.

When we find ourselves seriously threatened or highly excited, we don’t hang out for long in concepts or consideration, but rather move to act; and do so in the most objective way possible. This is easy to observe when threats are eminent, as we won’t generally make, or even have the time to deal with, the many subjective notions and offers available to us in order to handle the threat – but rather – we act on what we know. In other words – we act according to our awareness, our knowledge of the consequences, and our knowledge for how to take care of the issue at hand (preparedness).

In either of these situations we won’t have or make the time to study what is required to be prepared to act. We act based on the best information we have at that time. We act on what we

know. When threatened, willing and eager to act to avoid or remove a threat, we rely on our knowledge. When opportunity knocks, we are either prepared to act or not.

The knowledge we accept to take care of threats and take advantage of opportunities is typically found in the form of an offer in the marketplace – and supported by the most common, general and subjective notions that make up *The Current*. Our ability to gain the most valuable knowledge, that specialized knowledge that is scarce and limited, supported by social proof, authority, and evidence, depends on our ability to afford or transact for it. You may notice here too, that those who hold the most valuable solutions are typically very objective about how and for what consideration they will transact.

The Current is what we identify as the predominant narrative (subjective notions, theories, beliefs, hype, news, etc.) that informs those who seek knowledge to transact. But *The Current* isn't transacting. *The Current* is full of, and always ready to offer, all kinds of opinions, free advice, hype, information, news and more. Without a proper orientation and understanding of *The Current* it is easy for transactions to seem fluid and subjective in nature. This is why it is so evident that most people fail to distinguish subjectivity from objectivity as elements of transactions. A transaction isn't both subjective and objective. It is objective. It cannot sometimes be one thing and other times be something else. A transaction is a set of fixed and permanent moves (that include subjective and objective elements) that occur at specific intervals and in a particular cycle. Transactions have subjective elements to them, but transactions themselves are not subjective. They are not sometimes without one or two elements, and other times include them. They have a definite and knowable structure and as such are objective in nature. Every transaction, regardless of its size, complexity or value shares a common arrangement and includes specific components. The constitutive elements of every transaction are identified in our study as *primary moves*.¹ These *primary moves* are located at particular points in a cycle we identify as the *Primary Transaction Cycle* and are fixed, permanent, observable and knowable. Transactions that are accurately invented, designed and executed according to the *Primary Transaction Cycle* offer the greatest likelihood of success.

Those who choose to practice the fundamentals deliberately over a long period of time, enjoy a competitive advantage over the majority of business people who adhere to non-objective views, notions and theories about what a transaction is, how transactions work, and why human beings transact at all.

In this series of papers we endeavor to further our understanding of Objectivity. Objectivity is required to move powerfully as one approaches the planning and execution of any business transaction. An understanding of Objectivity is required to move effectively in the primary 'move' of the transaction cycle we identify as Fulfillment.

Once a transaction reaches the point in time when the promises (terms and conditions) have been made and our Contract is executed, the 'work' of the transaction begins. The state of mind, attitude and philosophy best suited to inform the Primary Move 'Fulfill' is one of Objectivity.

¹ The moves of the Primary Transaction Cycle include: *Invent, Present, Fulfill and Complete*. The Fundamentals of Transaction Program is a concentrated and focused study of these moves and other principals, mechanics and practices required to transact powerfully in the marketplace today.

© 2011 Influence Ecology, LLC

The materials used in this program are the original creation of and are owned exclusively by Influence Ecology, LLC. The source materials are used with the permission of Influence Ecology, LLC and are granted on a limited basis for use in this program session only. These materials are copyrighted and protected under applicable law. Do not duplicate or distribute these materials in any form. Do not use or repurpose the content of these training and educational materials, speeches, and other papers provided to you without the express written consent of Influence Ecology, LLC and/or the publishers, authors and copyright holders of the books, articles and other materials used in the course with permission.

In our previous paper we discussed *cause and effect* as referencing the causal relationship among “things” or “entities” that exists in a knowable world. Every cause has an effect of some kind. “Things” act in definite ways. This represents the implicit knowledge of causality. The “law of causality” states this relationship explicitly. The validation rests on two points: the fact that action is *action of an entity*; and the law of identity, *a thing is itself* (A is A). Every entity has a nature; it is specific, non-contradictory, limited; it has certain attributes and no others. Such an entity must act *in accordance with its nature*. In any given set of circumstances, therefore, there is only one action available to an entity, the action expressive of its identity. This is the action it will take, the action that is *caused* and necessitated by its nature. Cause and effect, therefore, is a universal law of reality. Every action has a cause, the cause is the nature of the entity which acts; and the same cause leads to the same effect – the same entity, under the same circumstances, will perform the same action. The law of causality, as you will come to learn in this series, is a corollary to the axioms on which Objectivity is grounded. To be objective is to adhere to the law of causality.

Objectivity, simply defined means – independent of consciousness; reality (the world) exists outside of, or independent of human consciousness. The most basic assumption is that there is a knowable and real world consisting of entities structured according to their properties and relations. Categorization of these entities is based on their properties. The ‘real world’ is fully and correctly structured so that it can be modeled. This view is based on the *primacy of existence*.

A non-objective view means that one holds reality as dependent upon human consciousness; that reality (the world) does not exist independent of human consciousness, and is unknowable. The structure of the reality (the world) is created in the mind through interaction with the world and based on interpretations, or inspired in the mind, delivered by other ‘unknowable’ forces. This view is based on the *primacy of consciousness*.

As we will demonstrate, it is important to recognize the difference between these two predominant views as both views can clearly be identified as we move through transactions and examine transactional behavior. For our purposes, we shall organize these views into two categories: Objective views and Subjective views. Any philosophy, theory, concept, etc. that accepts the primacy of consciousness over the primacy of existence is categorized as ‘subjective’. Any that considers the primacy of existence over the primacy of consciousness we consider ‘objective’.

Objectivity and Sense Perception

In this issue we will examine the role of our senses as our primary (if not only) source of information and access to reality. As such, we will also consider that once information is acquired, we then must form concepts. As conceptual beings, our understanding of the fact that our senses are less in question than our knowledge of what the senses tell us, informs how we form concepts and specifically how we accept certain concepts (and choose to act) as reality.

We will continue throughout our work to point to the importance of why an Objective view of reality is essential to the Fulfillment of marketplace transactions.

An objective view of reality is simply stated as: *existence exists*. *What is – is* and *what isn't – isn't*. The *objectivist* view holds that '*there is something*.' This is the foundation on which everything else rests and must be accepted before one can discuss what one knows or how one knows it – first, *there must be something, and one must grasp that there is something*. If not, there is nothing to consider or to know. Consciousness is the faculty of perceiving that which exists. *To be conscious is to be aware of something*.

The study of knowledge (epistemology) is based on the premise that man can gain knowledge and can do so through a certain process. This process, in the most objective view, rests on the notion we examined in the previous issue - the *primacy of existence*.

To the Objectivist, the world is knowable because it exists – it does not exist because we say, think or wish it so. Second, this process rests on the fact that human knowledge, though based on sensory perception, is conceptual in nature, and on a conceptual level consciousness is not automatic or infallible; it can err. Human beings must develop a method for distinguishing reality – what is – and how best to validate their conclusions.

Conceptual content is derived from the evidence of the senses. The sensory perceptual level of consciousness must establish the exact role of the senses in human knowledge and the validity of the information they provide. If the senses are not valid, if they are not instruments that provide a knowledge of reality, then neither are concepts, and the whole cognitive enterprise is thwarted. In a purely objective view - "If seeing is not believing, then thinking is worthless as well."

As we attempt to move transactions from the highly subjective domain of Invention to the evidential domain of Completion, we must, at some point, demonstrate the actuality of keeping our promises to those with whom we transact. We must prove, through demonstration, that we have produced the action required to Fulfill on the commitments we made.

Proof consists in reducing a thing back to the data provided by the senses. This data is the foundation of all subsequent knowledge and precedes any process of inference. They are, according to Objectivist philosophy, unchallengeable primaries and self-evident. Objectivists hold that the purpose of the philosophic discussion of the senses is to define their exact function in human cognition.

"Sensory experience is a form of awareness produced by physical entities (external stimuli) acting on physical instrumentalities (sense organs), which respond automatically, as a link in a causally determined chain. Obeying inexorable natural laws, the organs transmit a message to the nervous system and the brain. The organs have no power of choice, no power to invent, distort, or deceive. They do not respond to a zero, only to a something, something real, some existential object that acts on them.

The senses, in other words, do not interpret their own reactions, however, they do identify the objects that impinge on them. “They merely respond to stimuli, thereby making us aware of the fact that some kind of objects exist.”²

A pure objective view is a view that simply put, states that our senses are not right or wrong. The only thing that can be right or wrong is our knowledge of the perceived. “If a child sees a jolly, fat man with a long white beard wearing a red suit and infers that Santa Clause has come down from the North Pole, his senses have made no error; it is his conclusion that is mistaken.”

The same can be said for the inference that a stick appears to bend in water. “Within the range of their capacity, the senses give us evidence of everything physically operative, they respond to the full context of the facts – including, in the present instance, the fact that light travels through water at a different rate than through air, which is what causes the stick to appear bent. It is the task, not of the senses but of the mind to analyze the evidence and identify the causes at work (which may require the discovery of complex scientific knowledge). If a casual observer were to conclude that the stick actually bends in water, such a snap judgment would be a failure on the conceptual level, a failure of thought and knowledge, not of perception. To criticize the senses for it is tantamount to criticizing them for their power, for their ability to give us evidence not of isolated fragments, but of a total. The function of the senses is to sum up a vast range of facts, to condense a complex body of information – which reaches our consciousness in the form of relatively few sensations.

Once the mind acquires a certain content of sensory material, it can, as in the case of dreams, contemplate its own content rather than external reality. This is not sense perception at all, but a process of turning inward, made possible by the fact that the individual, through perception, first acquired some sensory contents. Nor, as Aristotle observed, is there any difficulty in distinguishing dreams from perception. The concept of “dream” has meaning only because it denotes a contrast to wakeful awareness. If a (sane and mentally healthy) woman were actually unable to recognize the latter state, the word “dream” to her would be meaningless.

Two people, who see the same thing differently, will ultimately come to the same intellectual conclusions regarding the object and its objectivity. Differences in sensory form do not matter and have no consequences in regard to the content of cognition. The role of the senses is to give us the start of the cognitive process; the first evidence of existence, including the first evidence of similarities and differences among concretes. On this basis, we organize our perceptual material – we abstract, classify, and conceptualize. Thereafter, we operate on the conceptual level, making inductions, formulating theories, analyzing complexities, integrating ever-greater ranges of data; we thereby discover step by step the underlying structures and laws of reality. This whole development depends on the sense organs providing an awareness of similarities and differences rich enough to enable a perceiver to reach the conceptual level. The development is not, however, affected by the form of such sensory awareness. As long as one grasps the requisite relationship in some form, the rest is the work of the mind, not the senses. In such work, differences pertaining to the form of the initial data has no ultimate consequences. This is why men with normal vision and men who are color-blind (or plain blind) do not end up with different theories of physics.

² L. Peikoff, *Objectivism*

© 2011 Influence Ecology, LLC

The materials used in this program are the original creation of and are owned exclusively by Influence Ecology, LLC. The source materials are used with the permission of Influence Ecology, LLC and are granted on a limited basis for use in this program session only. These materials are copyrighted and protected under applicable law. Do not duplicate or distribute these materials in any form. Do not use or repurpose the content of these training and educational materials, speeches, and other papers provided to you without the express written consent of Influence Ecology, LLC and/or the publishers, authors and copyright holders of the books, articles and other materials used in the course with permission.

This understanding and acceptance of the role of the senses is fundamental to further study of concept formation, which we will continue in our next issue.

Objectivity and Fulfill

In the fulfillment of our offers in the marketplace, we are most often in the position of relying on others to keep their commitments and promises. We cannot simply rely on them to hold the appropriate subjective notions, beliefs or narratives that will have them act. We cannot and will not in most cases, accept some subjective explanation in exchange for the reality of producing a concrete. Unless we are situated and hold an Objective view of transactions, and certainly in the transactional domain of Fulfillment; we will not be able to consistently perform on the promises we need to keep and satisfy our transactions – especially in light of the indifferent nature of the marketplace. We must be able to cause, produce, demonstrate and evidence a consequential action that produces a specific result – that exists outside of, but in concert with, the subjective (mind) that is not contrary to the realities of existence - and have others do the same.

To ‘transact effectively and consistently’ means that we understand and can recurrently apply the fundamental mechanics and practices required to produce compliance from those who are qualified and able to accept our invitations, offers and requests – and in doing so – satisfy the conditions we intend to meet our Chief Aims in Life.

To think and act objectively is to apply accurate thinking. As the transaction narrows into the highly objective world of the Producer – that of Fulfill – the possibilities of what can and/or will be allowed beyond the confines of the reality of the Contract become limited. There is very little if any creativity required in the yes, no, and “by when” world of Fulfillment. Requests must be made with clear and objective terms, conditions and integrity. For the transaction to hold footing its value, recurrence, repetition and consistency are required. For any recurrent transaction to deliver on the Chief Aims of those involved, it must be held to a standard that leaves little room for reality to exist one way for some and another way for others.

What *is* – *is* in Fulfillment. Yes means yes, no means no and the demonstration of transacting powerfully is delivered or not in the move of Fulfill. Power, as defined in our work (borrowed from Napoleon Hill) is simply defined as organized effort. When we organize the effort of those who make and keep promises to us, we are able to deliver on those promises we make to others and in so doing, establish an uncommon value in the marketplace. Organized effort and cooperative, coordinated action, is power. Power is produced in Fulfillment. Power in the marketplace is being known for doing what is promised, and doing so in highly effective, uncommon ways, with specialized, limited and scarce knowledge that is difficult for others to reproduce recurrently.

In our next issue we will study the role of the senses in our ability to perform, concentrate and focus in reality and in the reality of The Current marketplace.