

“See I'm leaving
This warehouse frightens me
Has me tied up in knots”

As a certain set of individuals develop over time a transformation of their explanatory system occurs. Initially, one type of explanation is replaced for another type of explanation. Gradually, sets of explanations are replaced with other sets of explanations until a critical mass is reached. Once this critical mass attains the individual realizes that a transformation in their explanatory system has occurred and, whether they prefer the current system over the previous they know they can never return. And so they resign themselves to their current explanatory system.

The individual first develops a romantic explanatory system. Day to day interactions with other persons will instantiate behavior that affects the individual. This affect could be aversive or beneficial. In an attempt to manipulate these instantiations the individual will develop a model of that human that explains why the person instantiates such behavior. The individual then uses this explanation to predict likely future instantiations of this behavior and control it.

Underlying the romantic explanatory system is the assumption that persons in the world of the individual are aware of the affect their behavior has on the individual's situation. Imagine a scenario, where a girlfriend begins to consume all of a boyfriend's free time. The friends of the boyfriend, will explain the girlfriend's intentions in terms of stealing their friend away from them. Such an explanation requires assuming the girlfriend has awareness of her boyfriend's reduced time with friends. Otherwise, the explanation fails because the girlfriend can not be accused of stealing his boyfriend's time when she is unaware of her affect on the boyfriend's time with his friends. That is to say stealing implies that the girl is aware her actions diminishing her boyfriend's time with his friends. Hence the explanation's success is predicated on the assumption that the person that instantiates a behavior, which affects the individual, is aware of the behavior's affect on the individual's situation.

The romantic explanatory system aims to manipulate the behavior of others. It accomplishes this by administering a consequence to a person that instantiates a behavior that affects the individual's life. When a person instantiates a behavior that affects the situation of the individual the explanation will always incorporate some type of consequence that the individual performs on the person. Clearly, in cases were the individual is harmed by the behavior of a person the consequence

will aim to reduce or prevent this behavior from instantiating. In cases where the behavior benefits the individual, the developed explanation will incorporate a consequence that will aim to bring about more instantiations of that behavior.

Another critical aspect of the romantic explanatory system is volition. Volition is a requirement for this model construction because it justifies the individual's administration of a consequence to a person. Without the person having a choice, that is control over their behavior, the individual's attempts at manipulating the instantiation of such behavior would be fruitless, because the consequence would have no bearing on the person's manipulation of instantiating said behavior. Thus, the romantic explanatory system requires that persons have a choice between instantiating and not instantiating a certain behavior.

Notice then why it is so crucial that the romantic explanatory system requires awareness on the part of the person in regards to the individual's situation. The person that receives a consequence from the individual must be aware of how their behavior affects the individual. That way they will be able to manipulate their own behavior in a way that will serve the individual better and avoid the consequence. If the person is unaware of the individual's situation, and is not aware of how their behavior affects it, then the consequence that the individual administers will not have the desired effect of manipulating the behavior.

An example may help illustrate how an individual constructs a human model in the romantic explanatory system. In the example we will say that one friend, the person, is expected to go out and drink with her friend, the individual. However, when the time comes for the friend to meet the individual, the person bails out and gives some excuse. The individual is not pleased with this behavior and develops the explanation that this person is deceitful. The individual reasons that the person led her to believe she would drink, but ultimately didn't actually want to drink, and thus the person lied to the individual. To insure this behavior of deceit does not occur in the future the individual applies the consequence of friendship termination because the individual will not be able to trust the deceitful person.

- 1) The friend is aware I want her to drink with me.
- 2) The friend fails to drink with me.
- 3) The friend is deceitful.
- 4) The friend must become honest or I can trust them.

The actual explanation is deceit. The friend is aware that the individual wants to drink with them, but chooses otherwise, leading to the ultimate explanation that the person is deceitful. The individual, to control this behavior, applies the consequence of friendship admonishing that friendship termination will occur if said behavior persists. Note that in this model, the explanation for the behavior may not be deceit. Many different types of explanations could be given, such as

forgetfulness, maliciousness or perhaps the person choose to drink with friends other than the individual. In this case, the explanation is deceit and so long as the consequence derived from the explanation manipulates the persons behavior, i.e. the friend no longer avoids drinking sessions with the individual, the individual will assume that deceit was the cause of the friend bailing out.

In the romantic explanatory system the focus is placed on awareness. The individual must be aware of their current situation and how the person affects it. Additionally, the system assumes that the person is aware of the individual's situation and how their behavior affects this situation. The person must also be aware that they have choice in instantiating some behavior and that the administered consequence is applied in such a way as to manipulate the likelihood of said behavior being instantiated. Certainly, in this model, the individual is also aware that the administered punishment is to have an affect on behavior. This model of explanation assumes that both the person and the individual are very much aware of many aspects of the explanation.

The romantic explanatory system assumes both the person and the individual have a awareness of certain elements in the model construction. However, there are numerous examples where an individual's model of some person evades the awareness of the person or the person is unaware of how their behavior has an affect on the individual situation. In these cases the romantic explanatory system applies language to bring awareness to the those involved.

In this way, language holds very special and mystical place in the romantic explanatory system. Through the mysterious application of language all awareness problems the model runs across can be rectified. If the person does not understand the individual situation - no problem - just explain it to them. If the person does not understand that the model the individual has constructed - no problem - just explain it to them. If the person does not understand how the consequence is supposed to manipulate said behavior - no problem - just explain it to them. In the romantic explanatory system language serves as a flashlight of awareness making those conscious of the crucial elements in the system to make the explanation successful at manipulating behavior.

This system assumes that the act of communication is enough to illicit the phenomenological experience necessary to convey the content that resides in the mind of the individual. In this way the system empowers the individual to impart insight in the mind of person to make them aware of some element of the explanation. This insight will enable the person to control the behavior the individual wishes to manipulate. The system assumes that insight's value within the consciousness of the mind of the person is equivalent to the actual phenomenological experience insight must replace. Otherwise, it would be fruitless to give insight about some mechanism of the explanation only to find such insight fails to bring about control over such behavior because the person's

mind does not regard as insight as valuable as the actual phenomenological experience. Language plays a powerful role in this system such that even when the person lacks the phenomenological experience of the elements in the explanation, the individual can still impart that phenomenological experience via insight. Language can serve as a substitute for experience in the romantic explanatory system.

Manifestations of the romantic explanatory system permeate through all aspects of culture. No doubt it is most commonly used to explain behavior for its seductively simple means by which problematic behavior is manipulated. Behavior instantiation that vexes an individual can be manipulated simply by dialogue and application of consequence. The individual need only give insight into the person, apply some consequence and the behavior can be manipulated. This system most certainly is favored because of the simplicity in which language is applied to control behavior. Here is just a small sample of how this explanatory system is manifests in culture.

In cinema, television, and literature, a type of story line can be discerned where the conflict resolution always comes about through dialogue. Perhaps the protagonist feels defeated and needs only that inspirational speech by the wise sage to invigorate her resolve. Typical in this type of model construction the protagonist always learns a simple lesson, i.e. insight, thorough the words of others and modifies their behavior appropriately. Those that don't 'hear', though are aware, are generally evil and punished for this.

Clinical psychology, particularly the kind that emphasize talk therapy, is founded on the romantic explanatory system. Counseling relies heavily on insight, as if, the person will be able to manipulate their behavior more effectively if the individual, that is the counselor, is able to find the correct explanation for the behavior. This would be called insight, and once the counselor is able to convey, via language, the explanation, the patient will acquire insight and be able to modify behavior accordingly.

All of morality (and justice) is predicated on this type of explanatory system. The moralist applies the romantic explanatory system in manipulating people. When people's actions perturb the moralist the moralist will apply the principle of change to control this behavior. The principle of change uses the notion that insight will allow a person to understand why they instantiate a certain behavior and subsequently control that behavior. The principle of change also attaches a consequence once insight is gained to punish a person that persists in instantiating a behavior. This way the moralist can control the perturbing behavior.

Using words and symbols to inspire people is another example of how this type of explanatory system manifests in culture. With this system it is believed that

that good poetry, art, and political speeches motivate people to action. Again this is because such things allow the person to gain insight that results in behavioral manipulation. The antiwar painting motivates the viewer to object to war, the song that scoffs at those that wonder how great their life could of been motivates the listen to make the most of their life, or the poem that admonishes of neglecting a true love motivates the reader to pay closer attention to their lover. All these types of art aim to control behavior by imparting insight into the person which then affects their behavior.

The romantic explanatory system permeates thorough countless other things and paints a glorious and wonderful world. It's a world full of great men and great woman doing great things because the choose to. It's a world where those that make poor moral choice need only insight to change. Its a world were 'truth' can motivate men and women to do great things. It's a world were insight leads to happiness. Its a world were the luxury of good and evil can exist. Ultimately its a world were life is determined by choice, which you are aware keenly aware of because insight acquired through dialogue with yourself and others.

This explanatory system is desirable. It enables the possibility that people can change through will alone. Human models in a romantic explanation are simple entities with one drive that they are aware of and choose to express. To control this entity you need only understand this chosen drive give insight about its affects and apply consequence. Humans are simple easy to understand entities capable of rapid and profound change.

But alas, this warehouse is slipping away and my mind is not so reckless anymore.

To some extent all people begin to see the shortcomings of the romantic explanatory system. Repeated application of the proscribed consequent that supposedly lead to behavior instantiation manipulation fail. The individual is unable to control the behavior the person instantiates. This will often be the case even after the individual has given the person insight making them fully aware of the whole explanation. In light of repeated contradictory evidence the individual will abandon one type of romantic explanation and apply another romantic explanation. Sometimes this will lead to behavior manipulation but often times this will fail as well. So the individual continues developing new romantic explanations until one leads to control or the individual abandons attempting to control the behavior. But in another cases the individual will replace the romantic explanation with an empirical explanation. This change in explanation is subtle and so the individual is unaware of any fundamental difference between the explanations. Since they apply this type of explanation sparingly their world view remains romantic.

However another group of individuals take repeated failed attempts at controlling behavior and develop a whole new way of explaining behavior. As

they begin to trade one failed romantic explanation for an empirical explanation they become aware of the assumptions of a romantic explanatory system that prevents effective behavior manipulation. As they develop even more empirical explanations to replace their romantic explanations they find these new explanations prove more effective at behavioral control and so the individual applies this type of explanation to more and more behaviors. Over time whole romantic systems of explanation are replaced with empirical systems. At some point the individual realizes the transformation and can see very clearly two kinds of world. The romantic world and the empirical world.

In the empirical explanatory system awareness in general is no longer crucial to manipulating behavior. What replaces the requirement that a person must be aware of the individual's situation is the requirement that the individual must be aware of what context controls the instantiation of some behavior. So instead of assuming that the person is aware of the affect they have, the empirical explanatory system assumes that an individual's is aware of the context that evokes the person's behavior. This assumption removes the person that 'controls' the behavior out of the process by which the individual manipulates the behavior. Instead the power to control behavior instantiation is placed in the hands of an individual able to manipulate the context that evokes the behavior.

Unsurprisingly, the empirical explanatory assumes that person have no volition. That is, the person is determined to instantiate those behavior that the context evokes. Clearly this assumption is used to justify removing the person from the explanation of behavior instantiation. For if the person has a role in the instantiation then they have some type of control, that is choice over instantiating a behavior. However the empirical explanatory system regards person as entities unable to control behavior. Hence the person has no choice, in the proper context the behavior will instantiate regardless of the person's will. Context determines what behavior a person instantiates and not their will.

In the empirical explanatory system the individual does not apply consequences. If a person has no volition over whether they instantiate a behavior then its meaningless to hold the individual accountable by applying some consequence. Such effort will have no affect on whether a behavior is instantiated. However the individual using an empirical explanation does have the option to manipulate certain behaviors. To control the instantiation of behavior the individual simply manipulates the conditions (if possible) that will evoke the behavior. In this way, the explanation's ability to control a behavior is directly related to the condition the explanation designates as the force that evokes the instantiation of the behavior. The more calibrated the conditions are to behavior instantiation, the more control the individual has over the person instantiating that behavior.

Perhaps an example will aid in understanding. Consider a group of friends hanging out. One of the friends becomes dejected while in the presence of his

friends. The individual explains the friend's behavior as a function of not recently having any quality time with his girlfriend. So the individual sets it up the occasion so that his friend attains some quality time with his girlfriend.

1. The dejected behavior diminishes the individual's enjoyment.
2. The friend is determined to be dejected.
3. He is dejected because he has had no quality time with his girlfriend
4. If the individual sets up intimacy to control the behavior.

The explanation for the friend's dejection is a lack of quality time with his girlfriend. The individual manipulates the context by arranging time for the two to have some intimacy and when the friend returns he should no longer be instantiating dejection. Thus, the individual can successfully apply his explanation to control the context evoking a change in the person's behavior. Notice, in this example, that it was not crucial for the person to be aware of any of the elements of the explanation for the individual to manipulate the friend's behavior. Certainly this is not to say a person can't be aware of the situation. Its only to say that it is not a requirement. It also worth noting that the explanation need not actually be the appropriate cause for behavior instantiation. So long as the context variable that the explanation prescribes as the determinant for the behavior in fact manipulates the behavior the individual will assume this explanation is correct.

The romantic explanatory system's saving grace was language as a means to insight. Insight was to lead to awareness which would then lead to behavior manipulation. But as some individuals discover, the problem with this explanatory system is language. Insight is unsuitable for replacing the actual phenomenological event that must be experienced before the person can manipulate their behavior. To clarify we will use this previous example but give a romantic explanation and show how insight fails to replace the phenomenological event needed for behavioral manipulation.

Here the individual explains the dejection behavior as a function of the person being too needy of his girlfriend. The individual attempts to impart this insight on to the person by telling them they are too needy. This realization, at first affects the person and they begin to act more cheerful. However this does not last and they return to their dejected state. To which the individual must apply the same explanation and be met with the same end result: inability to manipulate the dejected behavior.

The problem is that the insight that the individual has gained concerning the person's behavior is one phenomenological experience. Telling this insight to the person is another phenomenological experience. Thus, the individual experiences the 'insight' and the person experiences 'being told what the insight is'. Not the same thing. The motivating effect of insight that affects a person's

behavior is not derived from having gained actual insight in what causes the instantiation of behavior and choosing to control that behavior. Instead behavior modification is gained through social dominance and consequence application.

The behavioral modification diminishes over time particularly when the individual is no longer present at which time the drive for intimacy will instantiate dejection. Effectively, the behavioral modification is attained through coercion in which the individual forces the person to instantiate an artifice behavior or suffer some consequence. This artifice behavior will persist as long as the individual can make the person's drive for compliance more forceful than the drive that leads to the instantiation of the undesired behavior. In this sense, the behavior manipulation comes about through a social dominance then actual insight. The person must display an artifice behavior of cheerfulness to appease the individual until it is safe for the drive for intimacy to instantiate dejection again. Otherwise the person will suffer the consequence designated by the explanation.

Over time individuals that change explanation types realize that it doesn't really matter if he can impart insight on to a person because it does not lead to long term behavior manipulation. He also realizes that applying consequences only coerces an affected behavior and brings about no genuine change. In this way, the individual abandons language as a function of explanation because insight does not enable a person to control their behavior. So in light of the evidence, the individual gives up on the virtues of language and embraces an explanation system that does not require language to manipulate behavior.

Does the empirical explanatory system permeate through all of culture much in the same way the romantic explanatory system does. For the most part it would seem no. Certainly the empirical explanatory system is strongly applied in science particularly in the 'natural' sciences. Where god used to be able to 'choose' how the natural world operated but now science determines it. Its also present in art, cinema and television but to a limited degree. Some clinical psychologist employ this system particularly in behavioristic and or neurological theories.

However, one area where the empirical explanation becomes very prevalent is in long term relationships. The longer individuals spends with each other the more they realize they can't control each other's behavior through insight. They learn they can create an affected behavior when necessary but they also know that it will dissipate eventually and the behavior will return. They also know how to control context to manipulate certain behavior. Family relationships develop these kind of relations because they are forced to deal with family members constantly. In friendship, one can affect another though insight, achieve behavioral manipulation for a short time and then part ways leaving the friend in the previous state before insight manipulated behavior. In a family relationship a

brother must remain after the affect of insight has dissipated and the other brother's perturbing behavior returns. For this reason those in a family learn to accept certain behaviors and learn contextual ways to manipulate other vexing behaviors. This ultimately leads to very strong bonds that cannot be easily broken since most relationships separate because of some recalcitrant behavior.

The empirical explanatory system is present in culture. However these manifestations are not nearly as popular as the romantic variety. This is because the empirical explanation removes the individual from the choices they make. In this system of explanation one has no direct control over their behavior. They are determined to perform and act they way they do. One's first impression of such a conclusion is horrifying. Embracing an empirical view means embracing determinism a conclusion most can not accept.

The empirical explanatory system paints a boring determined life. A world denude of good and evil and instead man is simply a product of his fate. Language can not inspire actual behavior modification, it at best brings about artifice behavior. Insight does not bring happiness. Its world were possibility is limited by what has been determined. Its a world were life is determined by context and genetics. People are barely aware of the individual's current situation have no real understanding of how their behavior affects it.

Human models in a empirical explanation are complex collection of drives all eager for expression via behavior. To control behavior and person must find which drive express it and find variables that will strengthen this drive while also finding the variables that suppress competing drives. Humans models in this system are complex - difficult to understand - entities capable of slow but profound change.

This is not to say the empirical world view is undesirable. Most individuals that switch to empirical explanation do so because they find they can control behavior much more effectively. Context control also leads to greater certainty in behavioral control because it can cause greater long term behavior modification. Ultimately, an empirical framework leads to greater control over one's life even though it means admitting they have less direct control over it. One can change. Just not easily.

And now I stand at the crossroads viewing two different worlds. One full of possibility but randomness and another full of determination but systematic.

For all the predictive power and behavior modification the empirical system offers me, I still cant help but desperately wish that the romantic system worked. I prefer the romantic system.

Because I admit it seems so good.

Hard to believe an end to it and while I love to stay here I wonder: Could a change be better than this? And then I worry. Maybe things won't be better than they have been here in the warehouse.

And a fear wells in me, but nothing seem good enough to defend and so I'm going away.....man I'm going away.