

WORKING PAPER

No. 09-01 MGT

January 2009

Reality, Duplicity and the Demise of Contrived Binary and Ternary Paradoxes: Or No More Lies, Alibis and Rationalizations

By

Charles J. Capps III, DBA, SPHR
Sam Houston State University

Copyright by Author 2009

The Working Papers series is published periodically by the Center for Business and Economic Development at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. The series includes papers by members of the faculty of the College of Business Administration reporting on research progress. Copies are distributed to friends of the College of Business Administration. Additional copies may be obtained by contacting the Center for Business and Economic Development.

**Reality, Duplicity and the Demise of Contrived Binary and Ternary Paradoxes:
Or No More Lies, Alibis and Rationalizations**

by

Charles J. Capps III, DBA, SPHR

Professor of Management

Sam Houston State University

P.O. Box 2056

Huntsville, Texas 77341-2056

936-294-1895

capps@shsu.edu

Synopsis

Conventional reality as portrayed by the establishment's mainstream media is revisited with alternative explanations proposed. The duplicity of contrived binary and ternary paradoxes is cited as an example of deception used to mislead and deceive decision-makers.

Reality, Duplicity and the Demise of Contrived Binary and Ternary Paradoxes:

Or No More Lies, Alibis and Rationalizations

Abstract

Conventional reality or “reality by convention,” as portrayed by the establishment’s mainstream media is revisited with alternative explanations proposed. Contrived binary and ternary paradoxes are offered as unethical examples of duplicity that both mislead and deceive decision-makers.

Chow (1988) stated that “The magnitude of the experimental effect is treated in a binary manner even though it numerically is a continuous variable.” He even questioned whether statistical analyses could tell us anything other than “Yes, you should continue to support this theory,” or “No, you should not continue to support this theory.” What’s more, Folger (1989) asserted belief in a possible “Duplicity of Binary Decisions” and labeled duplicity as “an attempt to dupe the unsuspecting.” Yet, sometimes the magnitude of the experimental effect may be neither a continuous variable, nor a binary determination because there really is no choice at all. It just appears there is a choice. For that reason, it makes one wonder: Is there a duplicitous “Binary Paradox” in decision-making when the two choices are only Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dumb, identical twins whose mother’s name is monopoly or duopoly? Is not this really a binary paradox used to mislead decision-makers by disguising the choices when both represent similar interests? And is it also possible there is a contrived “Ternary Paradox?”

The deceitful binary paradox is somewhat like a Hobson’s choice where one prefers to avoid both consequences. It is another “damned if you do and damned if you don’t” situation (Hobson e.g., you are in the ocean on a raft that is burning up and cannot swim), except the binary paradox has two alternatives that are simply controlled by related

interests and you do not know it. At that point, do you really have a choice when you believe there is a choice and both options are owned by the same disguised interests? Is it not like a roulette wheel with just two colors that gives the binary illusion of only two choices (red or black) and an either/or winner with the loser covering the 10% juice? The casino does not care what color players choose (red or black) as long as they continue to play and the house prospers on the vigorish. So is not the real winner ultimately always the casino owner who spins the wheel? Do consumers always have a choice, or are some binary decisions simply a deception? Are not some binary decisions just a decision to do business with the same convoluted monopolistic interest that is merely cloaked as two choices? It seems sometimes the answer is yes.

Therefore, the “Binary Paradox” is defined as that duplicitous state where “no real choice” exists because both choices are owned by the same or related interests. Conceptually, the hypothetical likelihood for duplicity influencing a decision is probably a result of the amount of money involved and the number of choices available to the decision-maker. Mathematically, the theoretical probability for duplicity is likely a basic function where $d = f(\$ n)$, and n is the number of choices involved. The motivation for not informing, misinforming and deceiving is usually increased revenue, particularly for powerful interlocked multinational oligopolies. The dollar sign \$ represents this amount. In a monopoly, n always equals 1. With a binary decision, n is equal to 2. A ternary decision has an n of 3, etc. Logic suggests when $n=1$ there is often less need to disguise the duplicity. When $n=2$ there is a greater need to hide the deception. And when $n=3$ even more calculated deceit is required to successfully camouflage and obscure the truth.

Next, an illustration of duplicity in restricted “either/or” and “left/right” binary decisions is presented. Then, the likelihood of deceit affecting decision-making is expanded to ternary decisions. Finally, a critique of the ethical implications of these dishonest systems is offered. Examples are now presented of these unethical practices.

A prime example of the Binary Paradox is global elitists probably want to think U.S. citizens still believe in their nation’s two party political system. However, the fact is most citizens do not vote, and this has produced a huge statistical heavy-half that does not participate in any election. Is it possible these people genuinely understand their interests are not represented, and that both political parties are owned by the same concealed global moneyed interests? Could it be they no longer believe in the integrity of a political system that offers a binary choice because of the duplicity of the binary paradox? Does one in actual fact have a choice when voting, or is it in reality a duplicitous binary paradox? Are not voters forced to choose exclusively vanilla or chocolate ice cream that they can only get from the establishment’s ice cream parlor? Is this actually a choice, or is it in reality the duplicitous binary paradox used to perpetuate the establishment and the ruling powers that be? As a result, do global elitist interests hide behind an emerald curtain posing as Oz telling us what not to see and what not to pay attention to?

The “Ternary Paradox” is defined as that duplicitous state where “no real choice” exists because all three choices are owned by similar or related interests. The Ternary, or “Three Card Monte,” Paradox is really just an expanded version of the binary paradox with the illusion containing three choices, but you, the average person, whether you win or lose, eventually still pay the fee? Somebody else runs the game and the only players who ultimately win are those guaranteed to do so by the dealer’s position and experience.

Maybe the mark now has more choices, but the only ultimate winner is always the dealer who owns and fixes the game. Consequently, it seems but a slight variation of the contrived binary paradox's duplicity expanded to three choices to confuse and swindle? If money is indeed the "mother's milk of politics," then could the three branches of the U.S. government be manipulated by enormous international financial concerns to the point average citizens have a better chance of winning a game of three card Monte than seeing their interests served. So, is not this just an extended duplicitous decision-making paradox used to confuse some and yet still maintain control for others while seeming to offer three choices? If so, then the "blame game" may be played where no one is held responsible. If judged by its actions only, larger government always seems to benefit the global plutocrats, but somehow it, the government, is never held accountable for excesses or "mistakes." And average citizens are always taxed to provide the welfare, corporate and otherwise. Surely this is no accident. In addition, is it possible the original three U.S. major television networks long produced one controlled message to support the establishment's socially engineered propaganda? And if so, is this yet another example of duplicity in the form of the ternary paradox?

Are there any ethics in camouflaging and disguising the truth? How possible is it that the explanations herein are in actuality often reality? If so, then how good are the establishment's predetermined decisions for poor, middle and working class people? What is the establishment trying to save us from, or do to us, anyhow? What is the real underlying motivation, just tangible profit? Are multinational interests trying to hide from the legal system and possibly the public's intense reaction to some ugly truths?

This article now completes the circle by again asking Chow's (1988) two basic questions: "Yes, you should continue to support this theory," or "No, you should not continue to support this theory." The presented perspectives state "reality by convention" is often created and heavily influenced by the establishment's mainstream media using contrived binary and ternary paradoxes that disguise the interests of international oligopolies from the masses. It seems multinational corporate powers do indeed control nation states, even "shadowing" the United States of America. It appears we have changed from a nation-state to a corporate-state where profits supersede the rights of individuals. In conclusion, it comes down to this basic question: which theory, or explanation of reality, should you continue to believe and support?

Finally, as my grandfather always said, "The only time to bet on a fixed horse race is when you know how it is fixed." Do you know how this new world order global horse race is fixed? Probably not! And I do not either. Consequently, therein lay the true importance of seeing through these two contrived deceitful paradoxes. If you are concerned, then remember nothing exposes and enlightens like the truth. Surely, people deserve the truth and have a right to know with whom they are doing business. Certainly, there are no ethics hiding behind lies, alibis and rationalizations. Regardless of why it is done, it is still dishonest. And it is now time for these deceptive unethical practices to end?

References

Chow, Sui. L., (January 1988). Significance test or effect size? *Psychological Bulletin*,

Volume 103, Number 1, pages 105-110.

Folger, Robert, (January 1989). Significance tests and the duplicity of binary decisions,

Psychological Bulletin, Volume 106, Number 1, pages 155-160.