

The Island

IX

The Island

Controlled Substances.

Horse Lineament to Oraflex, Zomax and Walastan (patent medicine).

What about Mind-Altering substances. How much do they damage the brain-cells, the nervous system and the body's chemistry. How much do they alter the personality? Answers to these questions are slow in coming. In lieu of definitive answers one hears the apologists claim cannabis sativa does no harm and is not addictive. Does the 'relative innocence' (relative harmlessness?) of grass, let's say, compared to 'hard' drugs, or alcohol, truly lead to a life of dependency on any of these substances?

One might ask as well, does the pursuit of advantage damage the personality? Or is the personality so engaged merely acting innocently as the rightful agent of itself? Whom does the pursuit of advantage truly benefit? Does the supremacy or the Dominion Of The One Over The Other really enhance the survival 'picture' for the balance of the species? Who will argue that only the strong should survive and the weak must fall by the wayside? Who? Are we maggots?

Are these relevant questions? Rhetorical sidetracks?

What does *tetra-hydrocannabinol* do to one's innards? What does *anhydrous alcohol* do to one's innards? What do the products of our overly industrialized civilization do to our innards?

Pursuant to these questions exists a long list that would quite astound Rachel Carson. The Merck Index is always years behind, and the mighty Chemical Firms hide behind Confidentiality in allowing others access to data that would suffer analysis by a wider and wiser world, thus adding fuel to Rebuttal Presumptions Against Registration of dangerous substances for use in the environment. The F.D.A should borrow some personnel from the D.E.A..

Is it beyond the capacity of our will to remedy our situation?

Is it free choice that is at issue? The free choice to partake of 'mind-altering' or 'elan'-altering substances, or drug idiosyncrasies, and to destroy oneself in the process? Are we unable to cease our dependence on the industrial by-product to the exclusion of our health?

Does the free choice exist to do the opposite, not to ingest any substance introduced into the environment by one's fellow man?

'Designer Drugs' required legislation to designate them illicit enough to include them amongst the more obviously designated controlled substances.

One may choose not to procure as much as an aspirin; instead to live with a will to discomfort or pain. At his great inconvenience, one may screen his food intake to the degree he avoids purchasing any product to

Controlled Substances

which has been added any chemical as preservative, flavor enhancement, extension, binder, or otherwise altered or adulterated for marketing purposes, or has been exposed to any pesticide or herbicide, or preservative, or genetically re-engineered. He may choose to filter and boil his water. Beyond these important, yet meager efforts, the individual may do little to control the destiny of his health, even though all other measures to insure 'good' health are observed in proportion.

One might define these as the limits of free choice. An additional extension of free choice would allow him the privilege to protest against the contaminants introduced into the environment (air, water, soil, vegetation) by his fellow man. The 'protester' would necessarily need to weigh the stress of confrontation produced within the total organism against the minimal gains incurred through his efforts.

In the land of opportunity, where free enterprise is intended and purported to flourish, the key words floating in the atmosphere are "cost effectiveness", which translates to all of us, but mostly to the stockholders in the 'free enterprise' *pandamos* (because more 'dollars' are to be gained by them than by us), to the production of wealth with the least amount of investment (or effort).

Upon the Island "Cost Effectiveness" is never contemplated as a concept. Everything the Island represents conspires to undermine and negate the most basic principles of economics. While it is true the fishing fleet continues to prosper (by adapting to available marine species) and to yield a species of income, it could hardly be deemed 'cost effective'. One is not allowed the luxury of predicting what his income would be if he chose to become 'cost effective'. If the fish are not there, or if the bottom falls out of the market, or if the anomalies and vicissitudes amongst the practices of the intermediaries (middle men) cause them to fail in their obligations, 'cost effectiveness' becomes a moot point. One simply depends upon the excessiveness of the marine species (nature's bounty), and one's good fortune in his catches; and that a **gamble** will have paid off. Yes!, in addition, the masses need to eat; they eat fish; they sometimes pay high prices for fancy fish. One attaches a motor to a piece of steel, throwing on some ice, and heads out to sea.

It must be said the most 'cost effective' operation upon the Island has been the production of 'grass' on other people's land.

In the larger world, it is he that turns a base metal into gold shall deliver thee.

How many herbicides, pesticides, preservatives, extenders, enhancers, steroids, or 'designer' chemicals did you ingest at the dinner table? And how much rhetoric did you add to garnish the whole? Perhaps you will require more than the Lord's Blessing.

The Island

Inherently we are intellectually lazy; perhaps subsequently we are physically lazy as well; for which we may pay dearly in the end.

Let not ignorance be your excuse. Let us contemplate he that would turn a base metal into gold, both literally and figuratively. Shall he deliver thee?

I had originally conceived of this Faith in a Deliverance as a Religion for the Masses. She (RCWD) had accused me of entertaining too high an expectation of them. Yes!, The Scientists. Surely, one would prefer to have some expectation. Have not these ones been acclaimed to be knowledgeable? Have they not been awarded some Nobel dynamite, the most prestigious symbol of achievement in the human community? Perhaps, however, it is always naive to assume infallibility in anyone.

The Scientist (chemist in this case) 'invents' a compound which purportedly will combat, or countervail, where prayer has failed, against an 'evil' in nature, an isolated, out of context, invention; out of the context of representing the integration between time and evolution; simply by reordering the equation. Schooled in the secrets and subtleties of matter the chemists invent, (concoct) remedies; patent medicines. Then, as Vested entities they become the 'free radicals' or exponents of righteous patronage, preaching tolerable, allowable and permissible limits.

Perhaps it all begins innocently enough, as a youth, with a curiosity; "The Building Blocks Of Nature!". Then perhaps some idealism enters the equation; a desire to do some good. And additionally one needs to convert what had become his expertise as a genuine outgrowth of the curiosity, into the obtaining of a livelihood. Hurt and Harm are not intended.

Perhaps the curiosity never leaves one entirely, but the 'scientist' subverts the impetus into a stable guaranteed income, into becoming an 'achiever'. None of this obviates the idealism, though, for one will turn a base metal into gold, will discover the elixir of perpetual youth, will provide remedy to annihilate the pests that threaten the harvest; and discover a way to incapacitate the 'perpetual enemy'; one entertains notions of becoming a Chemical Don Quixote, a Scientist with a mission.

Ah! Yes!, to annihilate one form; how not to annihilate the other. One introduces into the continuum, or the equation of Time, Matter, Evolution, and Life, an alteration; a manipulation out of context; something to serve NOW, for a price.

The idealism becomes transformed into its own characteristic gospel of rhetoric: 'tolerable, permissible and allowable limits'. 'The advantages outweigh the disadvantages'. Someone has spoken. The bottom line -- is?-- 'cost effectiveness' to become the final arbiter of health?

Controlled Substances

Once the scientist has revealed his formula, or his discovery, his responsibility for that discovery evaporates; it is assumed it will not be his intellectual property, but will become patented by who pays his salary and provides him with bench space. Whatever he has 'created' may appear not only as a panacea, which one part of humanity will appreciate and utilize to its benefit - hypothetically - but also as the baser part (the ordinary part) will be turned into gold (earnings and profit).

In the first case, wherein the panacea idealistically and hypothetically salvages the harvest for the greater good of all, we have learned from 'sad experience' to be a gross distortion of the facts - for **all too many are excluded from the 'greater good'**. (I don't want to hear that 'trickle-down' shit.) To remedy this injustice, the idealistic scientist may become politically involved, or Christ-like ... he may His services are needed to create the elixir of eternal life; and more and more, his expertise is required to make adjustments to a system in order to correct all the imbalances he has created with the projection of his initial equation.

In the second case, regarding the turning of the baser part into gold; men have murdered for gold.

The scientist disavows responsibility for his creation, even though he makes personal gains in the form of monetary rewards and dynamite. The receiver of the dividends for whom the scientist has made possible the windfall, disavows responsibility, even though he gains (profits). The person who stirs the brew in the retort was just doing 'his job'. The farmer (for example) disavows responsibility; he was just following the formula for increasing his harvest (gain); whether wheat or cattle.

Somewhere there exists a conscience; somewhere there exists a murderer. Murderer? How so? Are you mad?

Oh!, Yes, on the surface, we appoint a nominal (token) watchdog, an animal imbued with the language and rhetoric of his profession. His standards are designed in his own modified context. Time was omitted from the equation, from the standard - not clock time, but cosmological time. One doses a rat in X fold the purported amount required to control a pest or preserve a product. The rat appears non-committal, or unaffected, showing no outward signs of change; his viscera remain in tact; his behavior seems normal. In the 'worst case' he may show an anemic tendency, or temporary blindness, or 'nausea', but only one in a thousand, or one in x number. All symptoms may or may not disappear in reducing the dosage. He excretes 70 to 90% in his urine in the first 72 hours.

Since testing shows none of what it is we are looking for, the introduction of the panaceaic compound into the greater equation is approved for contact with Mammalians, and more to the point, with humans, and is assumed is even fit for human consumption, for once it is released into the environment it is bound to be consumed by humans - in

The Island

permissible amounts. We appear to be only marginally concerned with the 15 to 20 year lag down the road when the tumors, sarcomas and carcinomas get up a full head of steam. I have heard it mentioned 'You will not live forever, in any case'. Life has a terminal waypoint, regardless.

A bit shaky, but so far so good? What of the unplanned compoundings? What of the notion of using humans for assuring the proper compoundings (quality control), and the regulations regarding permissible amounts; what about cumulative effects or uncontrollable compoundings within the environment? Getting a little shakier. More testings; but only random samplings; law of averages; really getting shaky.

In the first instance, the tester did not test all 6,000,000,000 people for the entirety of their lives; not even one; only rats. (And what have we learned recently regarding the effectiveness of using rats as a mammalian test animal {MPTP} in *The Case of the Frozen Addicts?*). He did not test the effects of one panacea in the presence of the other; perhaps only a few in vitro. He did not test the effects of the panaceas in those under stress, in the sick, and undernourished. He does not, did not, can not, and will not. Its a very shaky business. And now into the kitchen we go with Panacea A being mixed with Panacea B, placed into the stir-fry, or the stew, or barbecue (hey, that rhymes; package it and sell it) in combination with martinis and cigarette smoke, and all those other particles we inhale from our 'embellished' outer atmosphere; and what was that stuff in the water, the runoff from all the 'cost effective' forest management? All very shaky! Its enough to cause a phobia or paranoia, if not convert one into a laboratory test animal.

It is enough to suggest the testing is performed only as an enactment of a cursory and token drama. The tester (the scientist) abides the rhetoric of testing; he is imbued with his own gospel, his own beliefs. And he has the implicit faith that no one would willingly poison himself (perhaps some chemists believe one can allow for a tolerable limit of poisoning when one weighs the advantages over the disadvantages) (and the profits).

And what about those in the wings, hungry for the profits, waiting to be exonerated; and to be allowed to continue (at least until they clear their inventories and divest?)

And, after all, people are willingly killing themselves by smoking, inhaling automobile exhaust, and all manner of privately generated pollutants, and ingesting booze and alcohol. And furthermore, what about cosmic effects (from the larger cosmos) Intergalactic poisons, and radiations?

One introduces substances in isolation expecting to predict something he cannot predict. His is only a considered opinion based

Controlled Substances

upon limited data, and within a given set of testing parameters which he designed. His is the opinion of an expert, an expert expounding upon his own machinations, and *modus vivendi*. He considers himself an expert on nature; after all there are only some hundred elements, of which he uses only a handful at a time. Experts are flesh and blood entities who receive acclamation through a brotherhood of Sophists; a vast corroboration. Their knighting may comprise the ultimate honor, but he whom is so knighted is but making his debut, as it must be understood, we are all only novitiates stumbling about in our own incipency.

The politicians put forth their own cockamamie remedies, like "Let's use it up, we are soon headed for Armageddon."

As has been stated, I believe there is no deliverance; I leave for you to sleuth the murderer. We have grown calloused to life, and reassuring to death. There is so much life, death seems a welcome guest. Yes, we are able to weigh the advantages over the disadvantages quite easily. Each day we move closer to our own dehumanization; we inch closer to thing, to non-individual, to non-entity.

Does one cry too loudly in this insistent alarm, as one who sees only this evil or that evil? Is there no good then? Yes, perhaps. There is in the beginning a curiosity, and there might be an idealism; Yes. There is also self-deception, and the deception of others, and the perversion of idealities. There is dishonesty, and lying; of course, there is greed, and more dishonesty and more lying and deception in support of greed; and collusion of corporate interests mingled with governmental agencies. There is the conversion of the gold of life, of a human life into a base metal, and there is an end Alas! What kind of end? Some competition for 'designer' chemicals! AnDow!

It was too early in the morning to consider all the foregoing. It was almost as distracting as tuning the airwaves, only to hear it was all still there, just as we had remembered it, full of violence and catastrophe - without redemption, and without deliverance. As I have said I believe there is no deliverance.

There exists the possibility occasionally we may force the claptrap down the prevaricator's throat; however there are many variants upon those who lie, deceive and misrepresent the truth, as to provide full time employment for those who cause 'men' to eat their words.

Periodically there are of those of you who live conscionable lives, awake to the repercussions of the magic of 'cost effectiveness'. Cost effectiveness sounds ominously suspicious. Eventually some of your objections have forced the abatement, have forced suspension and cancellation of Registration. Unfortunately, you have only won the day; you have not smote the malady. Hang onto your disillusionment a little longer. Because we have forced an abatement in the use of DDT, 2,4,5-T, SILVEX, EDB, Paraquat, in our own barracks does not mean we have ceased to manufacture the substances. Alas!, *Horresco Referens!!*; we

The Island

sell or dump these designer chemicals upon our neighbors, and anybody else who will do business with us. Then we import the agricultural products they raise using these selfsame deadlies we have somehow managed to ban. *Double Horresco Referens!! Risk Benefit, Folks!*

You may understand in the first case why I say there is no deliverance. In the second case there is no deliverance because man has his priorities all Ω ucked up. In the third case there is no deliverance for I truly believe man, per se, is incorrigible.

After all has been said, it would not avail you, or be in keeping with the thrust of this polemic, to list some of the miracles of the twentieth century. It is the one 'chemical miracle' which prepares the ground for and **excuses** the second, the 'mistake'. One assumes the 'miracle' is repeatable; surely the mistake is. In all we do in these areas of endeavor there develops an inevitable dichotomous evolution, to put it mildly; and more severely, a duplicity or hypocritical duality, wherein we devise the penicillins and the vaccines, antibiotics - and the mustard and nerve gases, biological and chemical agents, wherein the first are intended to salvage what we know to be finite and precious to us, and whereas in the second we taunt nature with something so horrible we can leave little doubt of our greed and pathological meanness. We dutifully and affectionately raise a new generation of offspring; not only do we to send him or her off to aggress or defend in our interest, we expose them to these horrors!; we renig on what we had the presumption to imagine we have given (we have cast our precious seed to the vagaries of the Capital [Sins]). We have assured for nothing. In one sense we feel we ought congratulate ourselves upon our discoveries, while in the more important aspect, our persuasions reek of duplicity. In addition we shove the myth of "Cost Effectiveness|" upon ourselves and the world at large, encouraging false hope, and excessive abuse rather than discipline and restraint; and gambling that cumulative poisoning will not become as great a curse as what we imagine to be a life of disease and hunger. Question: How had we prospered throughout the millennia? While the question is not easily answered, it is not answered by saying, "Not very well". There is little reassurance and wisdom to be found in arrogance. However, we had multiplied and prospered.

The list is long, and growing. Besides designer drugs (uncontrolled substances), which are few in comparison to the controlled (condoned) substances, our waters and atmosphere are becoming loaded with the byproducts of industrial effluents; hosts of unknowns that react with the environment as they are released into it (enough instances of this phenomenon have made their way into the courtroom.)

One cannot truthfully say whether this represents the beginning, middle, or end of a phenomenon. I had wanted to list a few of the failures of our presumptions with respect to what our laboratory

Controlled Substances

discoveries have yielded in the way of general benefit to mankind. I cannot know whether I have only touched upon the proverbial Iceberg. Even when they know better, people will stick their neck in a noose. It was predicted for sometime, even as the moment neared, that Mt. St. Helens would blow; there are those who chose to die within its environs, there were those who did not wish to miss the thrill, there were those who ventured too close heedlessly, there were those who relied on the guesswork of the experts (who failed in their 'worst-case' scenarios), getting caught as it were; a total of 68 deaths there from attributed. Those (1700) in Cameroon were less fortunate (no experts; no choice). Somewhere in between lie we who are in the hands of the likes of Dow Chemical, Union Carbide, Hoffman-LaRoche, Kerr McGee, DuPont, only to name a few, and in the hands of the EPA, DEQ, FDA and Congress. Before us we have Donora, Pa., USA; Seveso, Italy; Bhopal, India; Bikini Atol, South Pacific; Chernobyl, USSR; Agent Orange in Vietnam; many more, less dramatic, but just as insidious invasions and ruinations; scatterings across the globe of things that got out of hand. There are many of us; we all contribute in our manner of consumption; our waste products become our legacy. Our health (and lives) are couched in semantics, and legalities. The lobbying message to Congress from the chemical companies (Corporate entities; Vested Interests; Benefactors; Makers of the World Safe for Democracy) is, "It is safe until it is proven lethal". Lethality then becomes entangled in denial language that speaks of 'correlation' or 'co-existence of two factors, not in a cause and effect relationship'; 'definite linkage'; 'increased frequency' 'latency period'; and finally 'causal relationship'. An earlier standard would have said 'increase in prevalence of a disease or group of diseases' (as scientific proof). So Congress involves itself in policy decisions rather than health decisions because nothing is conclusive. Latency is involved in nearly every case; carcinogenesis, necrosis, nervous disorders, depression, and even death. The 'latency period' is tendered as that catch-all phrase utilized to put things off from administration to administration, from senate term to senate term etc. Causal relationships fall mostly into the area of correlation because man cannot use man, directly, as a test animal. Because there is 'an increase in prevalence of a disease' proves nothing scientifically, i.e., that does not establish a 'direct linkage'. Resources are spent on confusing the issue by introducing the peoples smoking habits, drinking habits, other contributory possibilities that may produce their own effects, but only clouds the issue with respect to the agent being investigated (notwithstanding the successful court cases). Regardless of the language used either to promote the use of a particular chemical agent, or discontinue its use, it seems mostly irrelevant as far as world wide use is concerned; the Corporate rational will be forced to accept a local ban only, not the cessation of the manufacturing.

The Island

Expediency in other areas of the world dictate another policy promoted as 'socioeconomic', wherein the following rational ensues: 1). How much do alternatives cost (presumably hand labor)? 2). Who should pay the additional economic costs (The assumption being it will be done regardless)? 3). Why should the low-cost method be discarded in the first place?; all of which sound very much like our own Forest Service policy, which more or less states 'the only good environmentalist is a dead environmentalist'. The whole mess boils down to 'catastrophe' as the only measure of effect. It continually echoes in my ear 'Think not of it as less later, but more now'.

For some 4,000,000,000 years the planet survived in balance, withstanding the onslaught from the Universe, only to engage in a futile struggle against the clever and perverted logic of its savage two-legged, who promises the world tomorrow.

Some of the facts are in, however you care to play your semantics, your legalities, your cost-effectiveness, your socioeconomic concerns. DDT, 2,4,5-T, SILVEX, AGENT ORANGE (Dioxin), CYBERQUAT, PARAQUAT, DIQUAT, ALDRIN, DIELDRIN, ENDRIN, EDB, FORMALDEHYDE, CARBON TETRACHLORIDE, DMSO, DMF, PCBs, DES, (in each case give or take an acid, ester, or salt thrown in). THALIDOMIDE, RED DYE #2, CYCLAMATES, SACCHARINE, CHLOROMYCETIN. Others bringing up the rear rapidly, ALACHLOR, ALDICARB, CAPTAN, CHLORDANE, DAMINOZIDE. There's a truckload of stuff going into the environment that we sort of know about (all locked up in semantics and lethality to rats): certain herbicides: 2,4,D, MCPA, MCPB, 2,4,DB, 2,4,DEP, DICHLOROPROP, MECOPROP, PROPANIL, DINOSEB, DICAMBRA, GLYPOSATE, PICLORAM, BROMOXYNIL, AMITROLE-T, (ATRAZINE), (SIMAZINE), FOSAMINE, ASULAM, DALAPIN, PRONAMIDE, DNPB, MSMA; certain pesticides, insecticides, fungicides: DDE, BHC, TDE, DIAZINON, HEPTACHLOR, PARATHION, KEPONE, DAPSONE, MALATHION, LINDANE, MIC. The List is long. (The Risk/Benefit is beyond the scope of this inquiry.)

And just in case you have not read this elsewhere, like a Greenpeace circular reporting the discoveries of a National Human Adipose Tissue Survey, it is included for your general enlightenment: in the Fatty Tissue of 90% of Americans tested, Toluene, Benzene, ethyl benzene; 1,2,3,7,8, Pentachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin; and chloro-benzene; these are known or suspected to cause cancer, leukemia, macrocytic anemia, liver damage, and immune system damage. In 7 out of 10 Americans hexachlorobenzene, PCBs, b-BHC; 2,3,7,8, tetrachloro-dibenzo-p-dioxin; hexachlorodibenzo-p-furan were found. In every sample taken during the NHATS study were found styrene, 1,4-dichlorobenzene; xylene, ethylphenol and octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin, the last very damaging to the immune system. And in 98% of the samples: HXCDD, considered one of the two most potent carcinogens.

Controlled Substances

The Vietnam war left its own legacy of ~ 150 ailments ranging from untreatable skin eruptions to a host of cancers, neurological disorders, anorexia, cardiovascular and gastrointestinal disorders, abnormal sperm development, low sperm counts, loss of libido, birth defects, exposing its own personnel (not to mention the geeks) to AGENT ORANGE, AGENT BLUE, AGENT WHITE, AGENT PINK AND PURPLE, UROX 22, BROMACIL, PLUS CHLORDANE, LINDANE, DDT, EPA, MALATHION, DAPSONE, DEET, AND BINOCTAL. (Followed by the Gulf-War syndrome caused by depleted uranium.)

IS THIS THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG ?

WHO IS TO BE SACRIFICED ???

Not to belabor the point, but, Yes!, to belabor the point; and to not broaden and thereby lessen the assault upon the chemist-scientist, for it is the presumption of science-technology, and the godlike expert, that is under the gun; I persist therefore, challenging us not to believe, even though we want to believe. We are at great risk if we believe. We are not dealing with herbal remedies and placebo-like patent medicines; there are few innocuous Laetrils and Kreboizans. Its all rough stuff. And while most of us are not directly touched by the blatant failures (only by the insidious part), like the trichlorethane leeching into the aquifer in Woburn, Mass.; the PCB fish kill in the Mississippi River; The PG&E hexavalent chromium; the Torrey Canyons; the ruptured undersea oil wells; the Appolo Capsule and the 'Major Malfunction'; The Three Mile Islands and those who less dramatically release tritium into the air; the Dugways; the train derailments; the Ammonium Nitrate explosion in Roseburg, Oregon; the rocket that got launched with the 9 Megaton warhead; the Strontium 90, Cesium 137 and Iodine 131 spewed into the atmosphere during all those years of atmospheric testing of the ultimate Death Weapons; to recount a few, in order to jog your memory. (What was that Radiation contamination unhappily discovered recently in Brazil?) Where was your science and technology then; out for a coffee break. Even pore innocent little aspirin, the APC, causes Reyes Syndrome in certain of our ailing children, and the 'miracle' drug, penicillin ain't for everybody. Whadda we know? The advantages outweigh the disadvantages. War Is Peace, Ignorance Is Strength, Freedom Is Slavery, Survival Is Success.

I am able to imagine there have been some *Horresco Referens!!* improvements over Nazi Germany in the area of Chemical and Biological death weapons, via the Fort Dietrich (that even sounds a bit German) connection. One might excuse this sort of nasty business; at least it has some rationale; just as long as they never get used. These other guys who are in the Capitalistic world, and who need to show a profit; there is

The Island

more to it than getting rid of the pest. Get rid of ALL the pests. What the Quack can you do to get rid of a Vested Pest?

I sure did get sidetracked on that one; remember, its just the **TIP**. My Tip for the day.

On the Island, when the call for land-fill was requested for filling in a swampy area near the Community Hall in order to level and expand the play area, the thoughtless and uninformed included 'stored waste' as part of their contribution (deposit). Certain odors, etc. became associated with the fill, later identified as paint thinners, turpentine, chlordane, other pesticides (probably used in the pot trade), certain unknown solvents of dubious origin, other unknowns; all of which necessitated the complete removal of the laboriously compiled fill; laboriously removed. Fortunately, an unpleasant odor alerted people to a problem; a hazard, about which they were able to do something; shortly thereafter publishing a list of common commercially available chemicals and chemical products, their human toxicity, and how to dispose of them.

To Get In On the World Class Fast Track Globally Withits, our fair city in Provincialburg, Idealcity, Northwest USA, decided, after much committeeing, to procure (at the Taxpayer's Expense [NATCH; another example of Global Withits] - despite protests from one's not unlike myself [old grouch - sour grapes himself]) to procure a Separator to compliment its Solid Waste Disposal Facility at the modest cost of \$200,000.00. Peanuts! After A time; not as long as the WPPSS fiasco, the World Class 'thing' was erected, and put into operation. I cannot recall the details now, whether it was during the first or second minute, the first or second hour, the first or second day, or the first or second usage, the 'thing' exploded, never to be used again; but to remain as the eyesore it was from the very beginning; also to serve as an embarrassing reminder of the failure of preemptive rubber-stamping committees to decide anything. I do not think the manufacturer sustained any culpability in the affair, since the cause of the explosion was undetermined, although amongst the suspected culprits were simply too much dust ignited by static electricity, dust in combination with disposed volatile solvents such as paint thinners and turpentine; and even the thought that some unthinking unknowing soul, 'cleaning up', dumped an unknown decoction long sequestered in a storage room, backroom or garage; or perhaps a knowing individual disposed a decoction guaranteed to get wasted. That was the end - for a few years - until the 'thing' was finally auctioned off, in the part or the whole, as an effort to dismantle it forever. See what you can do with a few ill-gotten bucks; easy come easy go. This kind of thing goes on all the time at the taxpayer's expense. We are too easily taken in with the notion of technology. It is our own 'colossal

Controlled Substances

ignorance' which makes us prime pickings for the panhandlers of Industry; those Vested Pests who are forever forswearing Making the World Safe For Democracy, and Creating the More Perfect Union, and a Better America, embalmed in the Statchoo of Liburrty, and in The Gud We Tryst.

GARBAGE! That is a seven-lettered expletive.

If we would learn to live with a few pests and diseases, and learn not to generate waste (reduce) that we cannot reuse, or recycle in our own backyard, we could do away with 99% of the rationalizations put forth by those readily accessing government and the taxpayer - and we might begin to realize some control over our own destiny.

This rant against the Scientist and what his presumption (and arrogance) inflicts upon the environment, most of which cannot be adequately measured (however one measure informs us that since 1969 the Ozone Layer has been reduced by 2.5% [using numbers creatively what would that do to the planet's atmosphere in 200 years; and could the planet tolerate such a reduction (a different kind of reducing) and still remain as we know it; a paradise for certain forms of life}), leaves us with a depressing quandary, diversion.

Whether or not I attain to an Island, I would only be marginally removed from the effects, the causes for which I might guess without succor, since it would be impossible to construct a magical umbilical envelope, 'a bell jar', as it were as we have done in our joy ride to the land of Green Cheese.

Malthus is in the driver's seat. All 6,000,000,000 want to live and many wish to procreate; so we must inquire; when will it cease?

We are constantly challenged to redefine the parameters to the 'quality of life' we imagine it is we desire. Rhetoric persuades us (by now 'reduced' to the baser metal) it is all-right to murder for Gold, while rhetoric also construes as murder, and as capital offenses, AIDS knowingly transmitted, ABORTION, and *Trafficking in controlled substances*.

Bio-engineering, anybody? Cloning?