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TABLE ANNEXED TO ARTICLE:
THE LOGIC OF ASPIRATIONS:
DUAL OFFICE HOLDING / STATUS ACQUISITION ISSUES

TABLE 138A
PHASE I OF THE ANALYSIS

Assume:

A human being

Whoever is inside this box holds an office or enjoys a status

Some definitions.

If the human being is in the box, she holds the office or enjoys the status.
If the human being is not in the box, she does not hold the office or enjoy the status.
If the human being moves into the box, she is acquiring the office or acquiring the right to enjoy the status.
If the human being moves out of the box, she is losing the office or losing the right to enjoy the status.

The effort of teasing these sentences into paradigm form may be regarded as the effort of sorting the positive and negative of predicates (with copulative):
Thus, ‘is an X’ and ‘is becoming an X’.

(a) Bill is a Senator.
(b) Bill is not a Senator.
(c) Bill is [now] becoming a Senator.
(d) Bill has [just] unbecome a Senator.

It is suggested that these four predicates and their visual representations comprise the four things that you can do with one human being (considered as a point), and with every office / status treated as a two-space.

This is not to say that other predicates (features, qualities, properties, attributes) might not be considered as candidates for assignment (negative or positive) to any human being. But there is a finite number of types of predicates, whether or not there is an unlimited supply of predicates themselves.

(All of the appraisives in the English language, that is, candidates for consideration as predicates have been catalogued within a single academic study; appraisives at least are therefore countable and demonstrably finite in number.)

Hence, a logic of aspirations is possible; that is, it is possible to inventory, census and survey paradigm sentences by selecting a few predicates and considering kinetic-like moves of human beings in and out of any two-space.

Which is exactly what these tables do.
We can start with four rules set forth above (based on one two-space) and tease out more rules, now that two two-spaces are deployed.

With two two-spaces a total of 9 rules in inventory and 13 altogether can be demonstrated.

(e) Salley is a Senator; she cannot aspire to become a judge at the same time.
(f) Salley is not a Senator; she can aspire to become a judge.
(g) Salley is becoming a Senator; she has just lost her chance to aspire to become a judge at the same time.
(h) Salley has just unbecome a Senator; she can aspire to become a judge.
(i) Salley is a judge; she cannot aspire to become a Senator at the same time.
(j) Salley is not a judge; she can aspire to become a Senator.
(k) Salley is becoming a judge; she has just lost her chance to aspire to become a Senator at the same time.
(l) Salley has just unbecome a judge; she can aspire to become a Senator.
(m) Salley cannot be a Senator and a judge at the same time.

The latter rule (m) is redundant; it is best seen as an axiom, and can be posed as (zero) or some other figure; if we were doing numbers (0) would do as well. It’s worth nothing that OCL did not posit the axiom of non-intersecting non-overlapping or uniquely occupying spaces – the reader’s choice of phrases allowed – until after (a) through (m) rules in inventory were teased out.

There is a point here.

Lots of times, especially with representation of logic through figures, be they line segments or on planes (or combinations), it’s better to worry about axioms after a preliminary inventory of rules is teased out. What you want is a test inventory and then to work backwards, with a nod to George Polya here, from a proposed inventory of rules to your axioms and rules of transformation from axioms to formulas that can be attributed to all but only the axioms and procedures stated.

There may be more rules for one human being and two two-dimensional spaces, but it is demonstrable that there are only a finite number of paradigms for rules written in constitutional text, given the predicates be and become and their affirmatives and negatives, one human being and one or two two-dimensional spaces.

This point will be made again in deconstructing ‘separation of powers’ and (thereby) ‘checks and balances.’ These ting-a-ling phrases must share top honours for the worst understood and most abused notions current in (American) constitutional studies. Deconstructing ‘Separation of Powers’: Using Spatial Logic to Direct Traffic in Offices, Officers and Duties, 2 OCL 291 is under construction.
Far from being some unique and lively insight thrown up by the Philadelphians, keeping offices, office-holders and their responsibilities (rights, duties, conditions, contingencies) tidy is a ho-hum job for the logic of offices which (OCL can show) exists *anterior* to the crafting of constitutional text.

If it’s (constitutionally) obvious that ‘office traffic controls’ must exist, don’t credit the Philadelphians. Go find something else that they did at the federal convention for which they deserve praise. But haven’t received their due.