



ROLDO '85

 * * * * *
 * NO GOVERNOR *
 * * * * *
 * Ideas for Individuals *
 * * * * *

Issue # 8. The zine of Illuminated Anarchism, incorporating Tlaloc Grinned, H.M, S.H., The Universal Instructor in All Arts and Sciences and Pennsylvania Gazette, The Scene, and all other perished predecessor periodicals published by this person. A Green & Pleasant publication by Robert Shea, P.O. Box 319, Glencoe, Illinois 60022.

Send letter of comment, get the next issue free. Also available at \$2 per issue, \$10 for a six-issue subscription (make checks payable to Robert Shea), or in trade for your publication. Number in upper right-hand corner of mailing label is last issue on your current subscription. T means trade copy. P means a permanent subscription: you get the zine as long as you and it shall last.

"There is no governor present anywhere."--Chuang Tzu

"Laissez les bon temps roulez."

"Gort, Klaatu verrada nikto."

"Ewige blumenkraft."

"Nov shmoz kapop."

-g-

A Rather Dated Zine

After getting out three issues of No Governor in fairly rapid succession, I have allowed a gap of eight months to spread between issue # 7 (last March) and this issue (November). Readers of Golden APA and Frefanzine, where I've managed to keep up with mailing comments, already know the reason for this: That a friend of mine offered to typeset No Governor # 8 for free, to get practice on some new equipment he'd bought for his small ad agency. I sent him all the copy and waited a long time, until it finally became obvious that he had neither the time nor the money to fulfill his good intentions. I have been saintly about this (some would say wimpish). I have not nagged him, and we are still friends.

Fortunately a lot of the material in this issue is relatively timeless. The letter column goes a long way back, though, as do some of the items in Footnote. I'm sorry for that, but it's still brilliant stuff (especially the letters) and worth

your attention.

Hello, Roldo

The cover and some inside illustrations in this issue are by a terrific cartoonist named Roldo, who hails from Winnipeg. Many of you have probably already seen his work in comix, fanzines and anarchoid publications. I didn't discover him; he discovered me, and he's very generous with his work. Besides making cartoons and paintings Roldo plays in Anomaly, a band he helped to found. Anomaly's style is known as Topopsychotic Technofolk and is akin to the music of the old jug bands that used cast-off instruments and household articles.

Lost Subscribers

Still need addresses for: Beni Memorial Library, CC-SRAF, Stuart Christie, Richard Christopher, R. S. Cornish, B. Eden, Steve Eng, Equality, Eric Gordon, S. L. Hobson, Rev. M. Hoover, Ian Lind, Glenn Meredith, L. Miles, L. Molin, Philadelphia Solidarity, Resurgence, Sweet Gherkins, Harry Wade, John Walden, Rick Zehner.

Interstellar Orthography

A while ago I noted that the Star Wars toys line includes figures named Klaatu and Nikto, henchbeings of Jabba the Hutt, and that these names come from the famous line from The Day the Earth Stood Still: "Gort, Klaatu verrada nikto." This line subsequently became part of the collection of gnomic saws appended to No Governor's masthead. Now a new action figure has been added to the Star Wars collection, a colleague of Klaatu and Nikto named Barada. As an editor should be, I am fussy about details like this. Can anyone out there--Obi-Wan Kenobi or anybody else--tell me whether the original line should be spelled "verrada" or "barada?" Help!

-Ø-

THE ETHER VIBRATES

My apologies to the authors of the following, for sitting on their work so long.

Andrea Chalfin-Antonoff, Great Neck, Long Island: I was interested in the letter from Mark P. Steele [No Governor #

6] in which he describes a message he got during a mystical experience as, "The information you need will be available when you need it." When I read that I realized I take that as an axiom of the universe.

I think it's rather naive to believe that all crime is caused by law and hierarchy, which is in turn caused by the state. Of course if there were no law against murder there wouldn't be any criminal murderers, but I don't think there wouldn't be any killing. We are not all rational, reasonable people; some of us are badly deranged.

It may be that efficiency is never important in play or work, but to me it is an aesthetic value, just in itself. It just pleases me to, for example, map out a circular route for a shopping trip to the city, or cut up an orange with no wasted motion, or anything at all like that. Maybe because I'm lazy, but that wouldn't explain the feeling of positive pleasure I get from it.

Reply: I was thinking of efficiency achieved through labor-saving machinery, of the sort the Amish avoid using in their farm work. The Amish seem to get more pleasure from work than many people do, and it occurred to me that we wouldn't accept labor-saving devices in sports, such as a quarterback using some sort of mechanical catapult to pass the ball for him. In play it is often important to do things in a difficult and inefficient way. What you are referring to is economy of means, which is much admired in games and play, and can be achieved without the help of machinery and may even obviate the need for it. For instance, if I could write perfect first drafts I wouldn't need a word-processing program.



Arthur D. Hlavaty, Durham, North Carolina: I agree with Mark Steele [No Governor # 6] that The Psychic Grid by Beatrice Bruteau is an excellent book on Discordian epistemology.

Joffre Stewart's article [No Governor # 6] raises an interesting question. I agree with most of what he says about the inherent evil of the State, but I am convinced that, in humanity's present state of evolution, it remains necessary as an alternative to a law of the jungle. The trouble is that, once people agree that a state is necessary, they tend to forget all the bad things that it does, and how it corrupts the good things that it does, and say, "Since we've got a state anyway, we might as well use it to...protect the rights of minorities, educate everyone, make the economy fairer, protect people from shoddy consumer goods, protect people from sinful things that they want to do, make everyone wear seat belts, etc., ad nauseam." Maybe the trick is to keep remembering that while the state may be a necessary evil, it's still a necessary evil, and so we should be very careful about how we use it.

Reply: I don't disagree with your analysis as a schematic explanation of why the state

gets too much power. But historically the process seems to work in the opposite direction. As originally conceived in China, Egypt and Mesopotamia, the state was thought to have all power to do all things. The minimal state is a modern idea. Totalitarian states such as the USSR I view as throwbacks to ancient Egypt. It's only in recent centuries that people could even conceive of limiting the state's power. But the argument that people aren't ready for complete freedom has been used to justify slavery, colonialism, Marxist oppression, censorship of pornography and requiring people to wear seat belts.

Diane Thome, New Milford, Connecticut: There's some sort of logical flaw to Joffre Stewart's reasoning somewhere. Probably too many "if-then" statements that do not necessarily follow each other. Stewart doesn't vote, and he still gets all these terrible things. (This statement is just as valid as all of his his generalizations.) Besides which, if I stopped paying taxes I'd lose my job and end in jail. And, in another sense, I have no security guard: "Hold on, you have gambled with your own life / And you face the night alone / While the builders of the cages / Sleep with bullets, bars and stone / They do not see your road to freedom / That you build with flesh and bone"--Peter Gabriel, "Wallflower." This is true in a metaphysical sense, too. You do not need to be in physical prison to transcend it and be free. The constraints of job loss and the walls of prison are

contrasted against the constraints of paying taxes. I have freely made my choice. And I tend to vote towards less government, simply because I believe in the evolutionary process.

John P. McClimans, Berkeley, California: A fetus is alive. As time passes doctors are able to sustain the life of a fetus outside of a womb at earlier and earlier stages in the life of the fetus/embryo. We have the technology to keep both ovum and sperm alive outside of the human body. Life comes from life. Both the sperm and ovum are alive and doctors can keep them viable right now.

If you accept the logic of viability, let's take it further. Men must be forbidden to masturbate because this selfish act causes the death of millions of living organisms that could join with an ovum to make a complete human being, a human being that has as much right to live as that self-centered jackoff. In fact, let's go a little farther; perhaps we should forbid men to have any kind of sex that causes



H. HEATH 85

ejaculation. Even heterosexual intercourse causes the death of tens of thousands of sperm if not millions. It seems clear to me that men must only ejaculate in clinical situations so doctors can save as many of these potential human beings as possible.

Women may never have to menstruate again, because they must be taken to clinics and have all of their ova removed so that these potential human beings will also have their god-given right to life. We must put an end to this monthly butchery and save our children.

Silly? You bet, but it seems to me that this is where we are heading, and I don't want to go. I agree that embryos and fetuses are alive. In general, I support a woman's right to choose either to have a baby or an abortion for the same reason that I support draft resistance. I think that each human being has a right to control his own body. We are not national resources.

I think of the fetus as a parasite for as long as it is being sustained by its "host"



body. It seems to me that the host body has a right to reject a parasite at any time, for any reason. There may be a moral or ethical question about what to do with a parasite that has been removed from the host body, but the host's right to be free of the parasite must be paramount. I question the wisdom of keeping first-trimester fetuses alive after they have been removed from the woman's body, but I suppose those who want to enfranchise them can take the responsibility of raising them. Can you see it? "THE NATIONAL RIGHT-TO-LIFE BABY FARM."

Sam Helm, New York, New York:
I enjoyed much of the material in the letters you pubbed, notably Wilgus on intelligence increase, and Steele on "the transcendent experience" as "the result of the ego-complex coming into direct contact with the Metaprogrammer." (I thought your response to that last was particularly cogent and solid.)

What I have difficulty with here, tho, is the format you've chosen, which makes it extremely difficult to tell just who is speaking when glancing at a given page. (Just one small quibble to keep you awake nights, no need to thank me...)

I do definitely prefer the stricken out "G" to the "NG," tho.

Reply: But I do thank you, and I think you'll like this format better.

Tony Parker, Boca Raton, Florida: Joffre Stewart's "Is the State Necessary?" fails for me on its tactical recommendations. Until a

significant portion of the populace is prepared to become tax resisters, draft resisters, etc. such individual actions can be (not necessarily are) futile or even counterproductive.

Burning flags and constitutions may be personally inspiring, but such actions contribute nothing else to the quest for freedom. I view them as essentially religious rituals (as are saluting the flag or singing the national anthem) designed primarily to mold the minds of the participants.

There seems to me a problem with boycotts and ostracism. It is a deterrent that is more effective if it is universally practiced. But if it does fail, the offender has nothing more to lose by continuing his antisocial behavior (as opposed to moving elsewhere and "starting a new life"). Such a universal boycott or ostracism would require incentives for offenders to change their ways (perhaps cessation of boycott upon satisfactory restitution to the victim or some such) to be optimally effective in minimizing antisocial behavior.

Perhaps a more controlled environment that the offender could voluntarily enter while working on making restitution would be useful. In such an environment, the ostracism would not be total (thus the attraction for the offender), but the offender would be removed from the rest of society while attempting to make amends for his antisocial behavior. If this environment begins to sound like a prison system, remember that it must be sufficiently attractive to the offender (who came voluntarily and can leave at

any time back to the society where he is ostracized or to a more attractive controlled environment).

I have not discussed who provides this controlled environment nor how abuses by the provider are discouraged, but I suspect such an environment could be provided at a profit for the provider and the threat of ostracism of the provider would work to discourage abuse in the same manner that it would work to discourage any other antisocial behavior.

This is all sheer speculation, of course. An anarchist society will almost certainly work differently than any one individual imagines.

Reply: A voluntarily-entered controlled environment in which ostracized individuals could make restitution is, to me, a new idea and a valuable improvement on the proposals I've seen for dealing with antisocial behavior in an anarchist society.

Nancy Lebovitz, Newark, Delaware: I hope you'll consider my mc's as locs, and reprint any that you find interesting--if the fact that you're getting them for months or so after No Governor comes out is a problem, let me know, and I may do something desperate, like mailing a letter.

Comments on No Governor # 5:

Why shouldn't small-circulation zines pay for material? I can understand if the money isn't there to pay contributors, but you make it sound as though you believe it would be a bad idea to pay them even if the money were available.

I've heard the theory somewhere that Marx added "the withering away of the state" to his theory in order to make an alliance with the anarchists rather than because it actually fit with his theory of history.

In re the idea of God: I can manipulate such terms as "infinite goodness," "infinite wisdom," etc. in ways that make sense to other users of English--this doesn't mean either that I have any very exact idea of what it would mean to have those traits or that those traits are either existent or attainable.

In re innate standards: So far as I can tell, there are people who find it unaesthetic/disgusting/immoral to give a sucker an even break, or in general to behave honestly when they can get something for not doing so. Would you say that such people have a standard which is unquestionable (because all personal standards are unquestionable) or a defective standard which comes from people's attempts to impose morality (or from something else going wrong) or do you think that I'm wrong about such people existing? (If it's the last, I've got a very nice bridge you might want to buy.)

In re people being "unable to resist paying taxes": It's true that a lot of people are, at the moment, dependent on paychecks from organizations which are too large to avoid paying taxes, but that doesn't stop them from learning skills that could enable them to make their livings in a more countereconomic way.

I haven't noticed either a disappearance or a reappearance of giggling among

young girls, but I have noticed that even though the media presentation of punk is nihilistic and violent, the punkly (if there is a standard adjective form of "punk" I don't know what it is) teenagers I see look more cheerful than the general population. This may be a small-town phenomenon, though--I mentioned this to someone from D.C. and they said that the punks they'd been seeing looked rather pathetic.

Reply: As you see, I'll be publishing some mc's as locs, as many as time and space permit, but only when they refer to the genzine portion of No Governor. If it's convenient for you to send me a duplicate copy of your mc before Golden APA comes out, it would be a big help to me.

In general, I do think contributors should be paid. I once did a zine called The Scene in which I paid approximately one dollar to anyone whose material I published. It was intended to be a token of my belief that artists should expect to be paid for their work. But I've come to feel that such token payments are pointless and tend to obscure the fact that people who contribute their work to this publication are generously donating it. I do believe any publication that makes money has a duty to pay contributors. Small-circulation zines that do not make money, on the other hand, have a duty to try to stay alive, and one way they do this is by avoiding overextending their limited resources.

I asked Balthazar Brandon your question about innate

standards, and he replied:
"There are no objective moral laws, but that doesn't mean I have to put up with being defrauded. Only Objectivists believe you have to prove your opponent morally wrong before you can kick his ass."



Bernadette Bosky, Durham,
North Carolina: May I suggest the LoCcer's name at the beginning of the letter, and maybe also a few asterisks, a § at the end, or something like that? A small format change, but a good one with large effects. I never liked fanzines that didn't put the LoCcer's name at the beginning--though in a way maybe it shouldn't matter; but to me it does, and I always have to search for it and then start over. Also, maybe signal your reply somehow; I know you can't do a different typeface, but maybe brackets or something at start and finish.

I'm sure Joffre Stewart thought he was doing good for his cause when he made the "Is the State Necessary?" address; and if he was a good speaker, maybe he did, with some. The rhetoric--i.e., speech patterns designed just to please and convince, the technical and classical sense of the term--is skilled; the patterning, such as the well placed "If you do not understand me," "If you do understand me," is smooth and good. And there's some wit, and nice baroque turns like, "Constantine grabbed the cross by the short end, turned the long end into a sword, and drove it into the body of peace all the way up to the hilt."

BUT. Rhetoric alone may please some people, but it

turns me off. This is knee-jerk inflammation, and since my knee doesn't already jerk that way, it just seemed shoddy and aesthetically displeasing--and the whole line of argument in col. 2 p. 8 is just non sequitur. To spend all that time rabble-rousing and literally say at the end, "Suffice it say that with all the big problems solved, the little ones like corruption and crime will disappear with all the law and hierarchy that cause them," is just too, too, too. But I don't think Stewart's approach is even a Horrible Example compared to what's usual for this kind of speech.

Do you really think that no matter what "quality of life" is, "it is surely absent from any country where there [their?] overpopulation produces poverty and starvation and where unwanted children are abused by their unhappy parents?" Hyperbole, Bob, and you're usually better than that. There is no love in such places, no mutual striving, no pride taken in accomplishments? There was no "quality of life" among any of

the survivors (or victims) in the concentration camps? The pisser is, I don't necessarily buy the "reduction of quality of life" argument either, but your unjustified overkill could almost convince me I did! The piece on the religious part of this issue was much better overall, with a number of good points, including that of where human rights come from anyway.

I really liked your "Anti-Choice Anarchists" piece. The last paragraph is just a wee bit rosy-lensed (or Invoking Often), but in all it's a nice, solid piece.

Reply: How's this for signaling my reply? I really don't know if I'll want to keep the writer's name at the beginning of the letter, though. It seems unletter-like to me.

But you can see why I frequently say that epistolary feedback is important to me. I'm already changing this zine in response to good ideas offered in comments such as yours and Sam's above.

A lot of anarchists feel that the big problem in the world today is the possibility that the state system will lead to the extinction of the human race, maybe even of all

life on the planet. In that context, to describe crime and corruption as little problems is not so silly.

Quality of life: Not hyperbole, just unclear writing (just as bad). I was thinking of "quality of life" as a particular level of good living available to most people in a society. In this sense it could not be present in a society in which poverty is widespread. You are using quality of life more correctly to mean that it may be present to a greater or less degree in people's lives but is rarely zero.

-6-

ART CREDITS

Cover.....	Roldo
Page 4.....	Bernadette Bosky
Page 5.....	Hank Heath
Page 6.....	Roldo
Page 9.....	Roldo
Page 33.....	R. Shea
Page 34.....	Ernie Cox, Jr.

A WORD FROM THE MGT.

No Governor wants articles and essays preferably 1000 words or less on anarchism, mysticism, SF and related subjects. Reviews and poetry welcome, too.

Artwork is also solicited.

Anyone whose writing or art is used will receive a permanent subscription to the zine.

asse
cert
imag
labe
whate

read
thos
read

simpl
flat
prov

regar
nasty
the t
ghost
mole

a sec
gover
outwa
child

inter
after
work
does

line
readi
inter

Newto
Newto
been

"Life
one m
is"

artic
"re
con

Robert Anton Wilson

HOW TO READ / HOW TO THINK

"The fear of the word is the beginning of reading."

--Hugh Kenner

Joyce's Voices

Some say that reading consists in such elementary tasks as assembling the letters "c" "a" and "t" and forming the image of a certain furry quadruped that says "meow." Similarly, some imagine that thinking consists of observing an event, pinning a label on it ("communism," "sexism," "good honest Americanism" or whatever) and then reacting to the event as if it were the label.

To say that these mechanical processes do not contain true reading or true thinking will be found profoundly insulting to those people who do not know any other modes of thinking or reading.

Since I do not wish to insult anybody, and since simple-minded people are easily insulted, I will try to avoid flat statements in this epistle, and will merely ask some provocative questions.

Henry James's The Turn of the Screw appears, to those who regard reading as defined above, to "be" an ordinary, if somewhat nasty, ghost-story. It "is" about a governess who discovers that the two children in her care are being haunted and vexed by ghosts who are not only vicious but perverse (probably child molesters).

To those who think reading/thinking requires action or work, a second story appears: the novel then concerns a hysterical governess, sexually repressed, who projects her own illusions outward and manages, without intending it, to frighten one of the children to death. The "ghosts" are "in" her head.

If reading does not require thought and work, the second interpretation "is" just pretentious nonsense invented by critics after James published his book. If reading/thinking does require work, how do we decide which interpretation is correct? And what does "correct" mean in this context?

Could James have intended both possible meanings?

Yeats's great poem on the 1916 Irish rebellion contains the line, "A terrible beauty is born." Stress "terrible" when reading it aloud; then stress "beauty." Which meaning did Yeats intend? Or did he intend both?

Blake wrote, "May God us keep / From single vision & Newton's sleep." Leaving aside for the moment his animus against Newtonian mechanics, could "single vision" refer to what I have been calling mechanical reading and mechanical thinking?

What the hell did Gurjieff mean by his remarkable statement, "Life is real then only when I am"? Is there any sense left if one modifies it to, "A book is alive then only when the reader is"?

Husserl disagreed with traditional philosophy (and anticipated modern neurology) in denying that we passively "receive" impressions. He insisted on an intentionality of consciousness, in which we vary from intense alertness, to

moderate alertness, to weak alertness, to the total passivity that philosophers regard as normal.

Do we "see" more in life when we are intensely alert? Do we see more in books and art when we are intensely alert? Is normal mechanical reading a species of what mystics call dreaming or sleep-walking?

#

"To ascribe predicates to a people is always dangerous."

--Nietzsche

unpublished note, 1873

Racism, sexism and "stupid" prejudice in general consist, in logical terms, of ascribing predicates to groups. This takes the form, All k are x. K represents a class or set or group and x is the predicate quality (e.g. "crooked," "stupid," "great sense of rhythm," "wise," "honest" or whatever).

According to Korzybski (Science and Sanity) there is one field, and one field only, in which it is legitimate to ascribe predicates to groups--namely, in pure mathematics. This is legitimate because the groups or sets of pure math are purely abstract and created by definition. All k are x, in a mathematical context, because k and x are defined that way, and because they do not exist outside of pure thought.

Once one leaves pure mathematics, the ascription of predicates to groups always introduces fallacy. Remarks about "all Jews," "all Blacks," "all women," "all men," "all plumbers," etc. are fallacies because the world consists of a phalanx of individuals. In Korzybski's handy notation, we never meet the groups; what we encounter are

woman₁ woman₂ woman₃ etc.

plumber₁ plumber₂ plumber₃ etc.

When "mystics" etc. talk about ordinary consciousness as "sleep," "dream," "Illusion," etc., are they talking about something very esoteric that only other mystics can understand? Or are they talking about the extent to which normal consciousness ("mechanical consciousness" in my sense) relates to fictitious predicates attached to groups and ignores (does not perceive) person₁ person₂ etc.?

Is there some connection between "waking up" in the mystic sense, and learning to read (or to see paintings, say) in an alert, non-mechanical way?

One Zen master, when asked what Zen "is," always replied with the single word, "Attention." What the hell did he mean?

Scrutinize the following propositions:

"Usury is a crime committed against all Aryans by all Jews."--A. Hitler.

"[Rape] is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear."--S. Brownmiller. (Italics in the original.)

To what extent do these propositions ascribe predicates to groups? To what extent do they represent "sleep," which ignores (does not perceive) e.g. the existential differences between Jew₁ Jew₂ etc. man₁ man₂ etc.

In San Francisco I read a review of John Huston's recent movie, Victory, which described it as "exciting." In the Irish Tribune yesterday I read another review which described it as "dull." Is the excitement or dullness "in" the movie, or was it in the nervous systems of the reviewers?

Colin Wilson argues that when we say, "Life is boring and meaningless," it means that we are boring and meaningless. Can there be any truth in this?

#

"Swift disoriented his readers by confusing the genre signals: critical tradition has taught us to call Gulliver's Travels and A Modest Proposal 'satires,' but new readers were led to think the former a travel-book, the latter a projector's pamphlet, and were increasingly vexed as they turned the pages and found these conventions less and less helpful, which was part of what Swift intended."

--Hugh Kenner
A Colder Eye

The Turn of the Screw was not the first book in which the narrator's "honesty" is problematical. There were earlier examples--most blatantly Poe's story "The Tell-Tale Heart," in which the narrator insists repeatedly that he is not mad, but the story makes most sense if we assume he "is" mad. How far "is" it permissible to carry this device? If it requires work and re-reading etc. before the reader finds the clues that reveal the narrator is (consciously or unconsciously) deceptive, is that "unfair" to the reader? Is it unfair to try to provoke the reader to work and thought? Should all books be for the lazy?

("You damned sadist: you're trying to force your readers to think."--e.e. cummings to Ezra Pound.)

When a critic says a book, or a film, or any art work "is" dull, what does this "is" mean? Does it mean--

(a) "is" in the critic's nervous system. (A relative and neurologically accurate statement, leaving open the possibility that it "is" something else in another nervous system.)

(b) "is" in the Mind of God, and therefore absolutely true.

(c) "is" in the Platonic world of Ideas?

Since critics appear notoriously dogmatic and pugnacious, it seems that meaning (a)--admitting relativity--is not what they mean. Is criticism then a form of theology (the only other field that claims access to "the mind of God"?) Or are we to take it that they "are" all Platonists?

If the "is" in criticism is only a convention, a short-hand, why do critics act as if they mean is-in-the-mind-of-God when challenged?

Consider:

I. It smells bad.

II. It smells bad to me.

Which of those appears more in accord with modern science?

Which appears more in accord with medieval metaphysics (Aristotelian-Platonic ideas)?

Would you regard it as a monstrous satirical exaggeration on my part, or a mere statement of anthropological fact, if I assert that art criticism is the only place in the modern world, outside the Vatican, where medieval metaphysics (the Aristotelian

absolute "is") still flourishes?

All recent psychotherapy places great emphasis on "taking responsibility." Can this be done, at all, if meanings are "outside" and have absolute is-ness?

Is "responsibility" possible at all, before one realizes that meaning is not in events but in the evaluations of the nervous system?

Van Gogh could see 28 shades of black. Why?

#

"The greatest progress the human race has made lies in learning how to make correct inferences."

--Nietzsche

Human, All-Too-Human

I used to own what was called The Uncritical Inference Test; I used it in all my seminars. Somewhere I lost it, and I don't know where to buy another one.

In this test, you see one inference at a time, and cannot go back and correct the early ones. It always astounds me how many uncritical or incorrect inferences are made by even allegedly educated people

Adapting from memory, here is part of one section of that Test: A doctor's car is parked in front of 2 Elm Street. Which of the following inferences are correct?

1. Somebody is ill in 2 Elm Street. 2. The doctor lives at 2 Elm Street. 3. The doctor parked there before he could find a better parking place. 4. The doctor, whoever he or she is, is somewhere in the neighborhood. 5. Somebody stole the doctor's car and dumped it there.

It is amazing how many people will check all of these, even though they wish they could go back and uncheck the earlier ones. Of course, all the inferences are uncritical; one cannot be sure of anything, except that the car is parked there.

In As I Lay Dying (Faulkner) black people are always referred to as "niggers." A. This proves Faulkner was a racist. B. This proves Faulkner was being accurate in representing the language of his narrators (Mississippi poor whites). In The Town (Faulkner) both "nigger" and "Negro" appear. A. Faulkner was recovering from his racism. B. Faulkner was indicating different speech patterns of different classes in Mississippi. (Are these alternative inferences certain or only more-or-less probable?) (Both books were written before "Black" became fashionable.)

It is a well-known idea, not just among "mystics," but among modern psychologists, that the sad person lives in a sad world, the angry person in an angry world, etc. Then the sad person reads sad books and the angry person reads angry books? Even if those books seem funny and optimistic, say, to other readers?

"This book is a mirror. When a monkey looks in, no philosopher looks out."--Lichtenstein. Does that refer to one book only, or to all books?

To quote Gurjieff again, "Life is real then only when I am." If normal (mechanical) consciousness consists largely of uncritical inferences, projections, glandular-emotional reactions etc. then what it perceives, in art or in life, will have many traits of dream, will it not? If consciousness is intentional (Husserl), then making an effort to perceive will make both oneself and the surround more vivid, more meaningful,

more "real," perhaps?

"Who is the Master who makes the grass green?" (Zen koan).

If you look at your watch, realize you still don't know the time, and look again, were you strictly speaking awake the first time you looked?

Ezra Pound in one of the later Cantos writes:

awareness restful & fake is fatiguing

What the devil does that mean? Does it connect with my topic here?

#

"...to be truly human demands a real effort of will rather than our usual vague assumption of 'mutual concern.'"

--Colin Wilson

Criminal History of Mankind

Everybody who has taken a modern literature course, even if they've never read Joyce, knows that the last word of Ulysses is "yes" and that the whole book leads up to that affirmation. The first word of Ulysses happens to be "stately," which contains "yes" backwards (StatELY). Is this an accident? If not an accident, why did Joyce do it?

Hamlet's first three speeches (short ones, by the way) each contain a pun. Was Shakespeare just feeling whimsical when he wrote that, or is it a clue to Hamlet's problems and the problem of the play itself?

St. John's Revelations, St. Augustine's City of God, Crowley's Magick in Theory and Practise, among others, all have 22 chapters. Is this an accident? If not an accident, what does it indicate? (Why does the first sentence of Ulysses have 22 words, beginning with "stately" and ending with "crossed"?)

Krishnamurti distinguishes between thinking, an active process, and thought, the result of past thinking filed away in the memory of the brain, or in a library or computer etc. Thought contains all the wisdom, and much of the folly, of the past; it's a great labor-saving device. Why does Krishnamurti regard thought as profoundly dangerous and the enemy of thinking?

If a writer tries to provoke thinking, is this only because of "damned sadism" (Cummings' joke) or is it an attempt to liberate readers from the mechanical repetition of dead thought?

"Is" this an essay on literature and semantics, or "is" it an essay on the most common fallacies of political thought?

Consider the following sets of statements:

Column I

He is an anti-semitic.

She is a sexist.

They are fanatics.

Column II

He seems like an anti-semitic to me.

She seems like a sexist to me.

They seem like fanatics to me.

Which column implies the medieval Aristotelian metaphysics (the "essence" theory) and which implies modern neurology and psychology (perception as the judgmental ACT of a perceiver)?

-6-

Neal Wilgus

LOOMPANICS LIBERTARIANISM

Anarcho-libertarians worth their salt-of-the-earth should know about Loompanics Unlimited (Box 1197, Port Townsend, Washington 98368), which publishes its own unusual titles and runs a book service carrying many more. This blanket review is inspired by a nagging guilty conscience because Loompanics proprietor Michael Hoy keeps sending me review copies of Loompanics titles even though I only occasionally review any of them. He even sends second and third editions of titles I haven't reviewed the first edition of, yet.

That pesky conscience prompts me to add that while I'm in accord with the anarcho-libertarian spirit at Loompanics, my own nonviolent outlook is often at odds with some of the material they publish. I suppose there's some value to books about weapons, explosives and fighting techniques, but I'm just not interested. Similarly, books advocating slavery, racism, sabotage and war go against my grain and I tend not to read, let alone review them.

On the other hands, any publisher that keeps the Discordian classic Principia Discordia (paper, 100 pages, \$4.95 plus shipping) in print just can't be all that bad!

Here's a batch of Loompanics books that's a typical mixture. On the positive side, to my way of thinking, are Michael Hoy's I.D. for Sale: A Comprehensive

Guide to the Mail Order I.D. Industry (paper, 92 pages, \$9.95 plus) and Jon Fisher's Uninhabited and Deserted Islands (paper, 116 pages, \$7.95 plus)--titles I see as useful and worthwhile, even though I don't anticipate buying a new identity or moving to a desert island any time soon. Hoy's Directory of Mail Drops in the United States and Canada (paper, 39 pages, \$7.95 plus) is also a useful compilation of data, this edition updated to 1983.

On what I find a more negative side are the anonymous The Right to Be Greedy (paper, 94 pages, \$5.95 plus) and How to Cheat on College Exams and Get Away with It by Butch Cavendish (paper, 46 pages, \$6.95 plus)--though even these are not without value. Greedy is a reprinting of a 1974 "radical subjectivist" tract which carries Stirnerite anarchism to ridiculous extremes (i.e., communist egoism), while Cheat offers some cold tips and rationalizations on How to Get Ahead Without Really Learning Anything. Michael E. Marotta's The Code Book: All About Unbreakable Codes and How to Use Them (paper, 86 pages, \$7.95 plus) occupies a sort of neutral ground, providing what is certainly useful information I simply have no interest in.

Looking back to earlier Loompanics titles I see much the same spread. On the useful/worthwhile side I find

two books by Burgess Laughlin, Job Opportunities in the Black Market and Black Markets Around the World, to be first rate; two more, Michael Valentine Smith's Psychedelic Chemistry and The Fabulous Illustrated History of Psychoactive Plants by Michael Starks, to be scholarly beyond belief; and a miscellany including The Muckraker's Manual by M. Harry, Space Colonization: An Annotated Bibliography by Michael Marotta, How to Buy Land Cheap by Edward Preston and The Case Against a Libertarian Party by Erwin S. Strauss to be thought provoking, at the very least.

Strauss, by the way, is also author of three other Loompanics titles--The Complete Guide to Science Fiction Conventions, Basement Nukes: The Consequences of Cheap Weapons of Mass Destruction (revised 1984) and How to Start Your Own Country.

Loompanics titles of little use or interest to me include: How to Start Your Own Motorcycle Gang, How to Organize and Manage Your Own Religious Cult and Brave Words and Bloody Knuckles, all by Duke McCoy; Manuals on Mayhem, Subway Survival! and Close Shaves: The Complete Book of Razor Fighting, all by Bradley J. Steiner.

And on the neutral ground are things like: How to Make Your Own Professional Lock Tools, The Complete Guide to Lock Picking and How to Bury Your Goods, all by Eddie the Wire; Ronald George Eriksen 2's How to Find Missing Persons and Getaway: Driving Techniques for Escape and Evasion; H.R.D.'s How to Collect Unemployment Insurance (Even If You're Not Eligible);

and Where to Buy "Forbidden Drugs" by Mr. X.

More recent Loompanics offerings include a reprint of Eunice Minette Schuster's excellent Native American Anarchism (first published in 1932), L.A. Rollins' The Myth of Natural Rights and Richard A. Nossen's Advanced Investigative Techniques for Private Financial Records, as well as reprints of government reports such as Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance and The Criminal Use of False Identification. And the latest supplements to the Loompanics catalog list some new titles I haven't yet seen, but which look intriguing indeed: Guerilla Capitalism: How to Practice Free Enterprise in an Unfree Economy by Adam Cash, The Sling for Sport and Survival by Cliff Savage and Might Is Right by Ragnar Redbeard. Best of all is Loompanics' Greatest Hits, the collected articles, interviews and features from Loompanics catalogs past.

You may well find my "negative" category quite worthwhile and my "useful" selections utterly worthless. That's okay, too. The good thing about Loompanics, in spite of their outrageous prices, is that they're making available information and ideas about a whole range of subjects that are usually ignored, often suppressed.

The Loompanics book service specializes in similar titles from other publishers and the Loompanics catalog (available for \$2) is a unique journey through a libertarian small press universe of alternative publications. You ought not to miss it.

-6-

Green and Pleasant Publications
P.O. Box 319
Glencoe, Illinois 60022

*
* FIRST CLASS *
*

The Labadie Collection 11
711 Hatcher Library
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

