

## 10. the illusion of neutrality

If two persons follow a common relation of care, such as one asking for help and the other is supposed with some supplying, the relation will have a common ground but it is due to have different interpretations.

These interpretations are true for themselves, but not necessary for them both. They might be parallel, not correlated.

Each observant has different perceptions regarding the same relation, while the form of the perceptions remains inside of a changing-while-mutually-common-agreed linguistic codes.

The mutuality is given from the linguistic code that is shared, while the objectives, evident or implicit, can be individually maintained. Like in the common experience of every care-worker.

In other words, if both perceive their own ranks and positions within different moments of the same relationship, they are both able to draw the rank of the relationship as a function of its development during its actual passing time.

To make a “neutral” relation, their perceptions should become explicit simultaneously, so that they can both correlate it to a common given sense to the relational circumstances themselves.

This doesn't imply what each will do out of it, in anyway. And it is fairly impossible to happen, as it would recall a symbiosis effect more than reciprocity and synchronicity at every logical level and for every participants to the relation.

The illusion of neutrality. So naive, even if it sounds very politically correct. An illusion, by given facts. Even if illusions are realistic by their given nature, and might appear real, they in no way belong to reality.

The statute of illusion is challenging: they do not belong to reality

except for the fact that they exist to remind to reality.

Still, the neutrality as a common sense that dissolves all differences is almost impossible to happen. The transference dynamics reveal a certain proclivity towards the reign of desires, giving the meaning of its being asynchronous.