

Control, the ultimate chess game

Even though it is impossible to control another human being without eliminating free will, is it possible to control another human being with influential control? Can manipulation or persuasive abilities be viewed as forms of 'influential control'? In the game of chess you try to win the game by putting your opponent in check mate. This requires not only the knowledge of how the pieces move but also positioning them in preparation for your conquest. The only problem is you have to figure out your opponent's plan while at the same time positioning your pieces so you conquer him before he conquers you. If you're a beginning player, you will need to think at least 10 moves ahead. This does not include trying to figure out your opponent's moves once you've understood his strategy. A single game can go on for literally hours. Although the time of actually moving the pieces may only be 3-4 minutes combined, it's the amount of time spent thinking on a move that makes up the vast majority. How does this apply to controlling another human being? To really answer this question we'll need to look at a few things first.

What is it you're trying to control? If it's a situation involving others, then you will need to know how each individual will behave in any given variable of the situation. Like the game of chess, this takes practice and it's nearly impossible to win every time. It's *nearly* impossible simply because no one can determine precisely how another individual will or will not behave at any given moment. This is known as the human factor. Multiplied by the amount of people in any given situation, and you can see the reason why it's nearly impossible. The amount of variables is so vast that it is impossible to calculate exactly what will or will not happen. Chaos theorists and other mathematicians who are skilled in this art consider what's known as the 'likely responses'. They assess a percentage of probability for each 'likely response' and behold a 'probability prediction' is born. Ok, it's a lot more in-depth than this but let's keep it simple, ok?

John Nash won the Nobel Prize for his discovery of 'Governing Dynamics'. Governing Dynamics reshaped the foundation of modern economics and it was primarily based on his understanding of human behavior. If you want to act on something and know what others responses are *most* likely to be, then you can position your behavior to elicit the results you want. You can effectively - with predictions of probability - orchestrate the situation like a symphony with influential control. This is done from Churches to Government, from the smallest business to the largest. Like in a chess game, you can move your pieces in such a way as to elicit the response you want from your opponent. This allows you to position your pieces in preparation for your conquest, which can result in your opponent's position of checkmate. By being in control of your own life proactively, you can effectively draw a reaction out of the other players in most situations. You are not controlling others like a puppet; you are merely influencing while inspiring them to act. They are still in complete control of themselves while simply allowing you to lead them. Before you judge this as a form of manipulation, consider this: the difference between inspiration and manipulation is intent.