

Dear Dick,

18Feb73A

17Feb73F seemed rather obscure towards the end. What I mean is "essential asymmetry"; I will proceed with what interests me in the context (practicalities) of our project and exchange (viz. language generation) regardless of consensual rapport viz. languages outside of our exchange. Our structure in these letters of threes is an essential asymmetry; or is it? I think what I am saying is that what is meaningful in our discussion does not depend upon the agreement of any or many in that 'field' we have designated "listener." ... A dialogue ^{speaker} can be entirely 'wrong' and ^{or active listener} is yet fundamentally meaningful. ^{love in radio} love, Mike

Dear Dick,

18Feb73B

"essential asymmetry" is a notion about what is meaningful. A seminar embodies the architecture of a coherence postulate. Everything said (within the consensual limits of the topic) will aid the learning process. What sort of 'assumptions' does this make about the learning process in an individual? There is essential asymmetry in what an individual will say, but the topic is consensual. What about a speaker before a crowd? Since the exchange is not a dialogue between individuals should we conclude that it has no meaning? Essential asymmetry: freedom; The I.S. group & program is not a necessity; meaningful entity to our project and/or to its? of course it is! ^{love, confused} love, Mike

Dear Dick,

18Feb73C

Trying to figure out the architecture of learning is like trying to find the logic and good reason in such answers to why I.S. continuity as

- 1) I want it to be my never-never land
- 2) I want to have those people - that place home
- 3) where are my old friends? my heart aches
- 4) If I am to live in a building I want that for the light in my window.

Today I am surely ill. Letters are letters,

Enough is enough.

P.S. I apologize, for our performance lately, my acting ability is needy. your brother,
Mike