

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

### **XI**

### **Apropos Of Nothing**

President.

**I** could be President. **I could become President!** Don't laugh. If an actor and a peanut farmer, and a CIA Director, can become President, so can I; and what's more, so can you. And what's even more important, the nation would be just as well served; at least I believe that of myself.

I'm at a good age now, where I feel I have more access to the wisdom that was born within me. I am aware that, in becoming President, I would be inheriting all the bad features of the office as well as the good. Perhaps there are not too many good features. The pay may not be adequate compensation for becoming a target for all the cranks and malcontents in the world. I was once, (actually for a rather long time) a malcontent. Could it be I thought I might solve a lot of my problems by shooting the President? Once, when I was a young man, I had been incarcerated in a local jail, suffering all the humiliations attendant to that kind of experience. I was innocent of the things with which they were trying to accuse me. I've written about this experience elsewhere so I'll let it go for now. But what I wanted to say is: I was a proles who got jerked around by the meanness of someone else. No, that is not what I wanted to say. It was this other thing: if I was thrown in the clink for over two days without a hearing for not having done 'nuttin to nobody', what in the hell would they do to a proles that had shot a President? Well, this is all beside the point. Now, perhaps, I could solve a lot of problems by becoming President.

You will ask; "if its such a dangerous job, why offer oneself as the sacrificial lamb; that is, if you are as wise as you say?" Well, like ABE said regarding another kind of humiliating experience, 'if it wasn't for the honor of it all I'd just as soon forget it'. Besides, if I took the job for only a year, the pay would still be pretty good. When I was working as an ordinary proles at the peak of my earning power, I would have had to work for eight years to earn what our pomaded charade earns in one year as President (can't forget those retirement benefits). And my spouse, 'bless' her very whole being, would have to work for ten years to accomplish the same. Well, needless to say, we cannot all be President. We do not pay a President \$200,000.00 a year for his ability either as an actor or as a President. When he screws up, we continue to pay him in recognition of our own human failings; in addition, we are all good Union people, at heart; we wouldn't consider firing him. (Actually, we are sort of stuck with him; It's the LAW).

But if you do need a President who feels he has something to offer besides the limited mentality and prejudices of a political party, then I'm your man. My father voted for Henry Wallace (not George [not another George!?!]). I think I'd be obliged to vote for myself at this juncture. I

## President

know myself better than I know anybody else. I'm a fair man. I've always tried to be a fair man, but know I have not always succeeded. I've had to discover my shortcomings as I have lived; they were not all apparent to me all at once. I've been unjust on a few occasions; most generally when angry. That's no excuse....I've been aware for a long time that there is such a thing as prejudice. I had a friend once whose words sometimes appeared as diamonds to my sensibilities. One day he made a remark to me concerning prejudice; while not directed at me, the gist of his words made a lasting impression upon me. His notion of prejudice involved more than the blatant racial or ethnic intolerances with which we are all painfully familiar. Anger itself may not represent a shortcoming, but it might possibly stem from the classic *idée fixe*. So, although I have strong feelings at times, I try not to let these feelings go unexamined for what harm they may do to my thought processes, as well as the innocent bystander. Also, once, when young, I visited a psychiatrist who told me something that exhibited, again, that gem-like radiance of my friend; he said, "The real world appears different to everyone". To examine that little sentence doesn't stir one in any particular way. "Sure, so what?", you say; "Everybody knows that." I had not been in the habit of recognizing that fact, so I suppose it seemed like some kind of revelation to me. It did stir me to thought, like the remark about prejudice. I haven't listened to too many people in my life; really listened. Although I hear, I do not listen. I've felt bad about that, because I've had many opportunities to listen, and would now be able to recall many memorable people in their words if I had done more than just hear their voices.

Well, we do tend to become preoccupied with our own problems, which is marginally forgivable.

Don't let it throw you that I've been to visit a psychiatrist; I've visited a handful of them during my lifetime, for a variety of reasons. I believe each of them stimulated something within me, something thought-provoking. Each of them held his own viewpoint; each believed in his own method. I'd say they were all human beings who wanted to help humanity. I believe some of them benefited from their contact with me. I've met others who were not psychiatrists, but who were stimulating in a similar way, indulgent people who gave of themselves, their humanity, their considered judgment. There is a lot of kindness to be found amongst one's fellow creatures, believe it or not. I suspect you will be a bit astounded to hear such a statement coming from me. Yes!, am I not the one who is always scowling at our shortcomings, at man's inhumanity to man?

I can imagine I would be like Sancho Panza after a while, wanting to get out of the job as President. It would be a big commitment. It might be more advantageous to start where George Washington did, somewhere near the beginning. Or at least make a new beginning.

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

Presidents of late have felt a need for a slogan in order to set themselves apart from the tired old 'Presidents-as-usual'. The New Frontier, The Great Society, The Silent Majority, New Foundation, the Moral Majority of the High Frontier (Read My Lips, New Order, Contract On America, The End Game). What would I say, feeling a need for something new and different - in a serious vein, not just to get votes? I would not want to appear fresh and new; I would want to be fresh and new. Perhaps the idealism of the New Frontier appealed to me; the "Don't ask what America can do for (me), but what can I do for America?" It sounded good.

One does have to believe in America to make a statement like that. I feel I would need to define what America was before I could make such a statement. There is a lot of what America is that might not receive my support. The tolerance of abuse to humanity is not an aspect of American life that I believe ought to continue one moment longer. One might ask, "What else is there to abuse?"

I've tried to be good citizen, but at times I have been annoyed at having to carry my share of the tax burden, even in good conscience. Its not the inequities; those constitute a separate issue, a wholly separate issue. The issue that has bothered me is the tax dollar that goes into the military arsenals. While a lot of it has to do with the same people involved in the wholly separate issue of tax inequities, these particular dollars are dollars that are used to foment killing, just by the virtue of their presence, and the government's ability to levy. We sell arms for profit (in other words we traffic in **TERROR** and **bloodshed**; and **CONTROL** (as in 'control addicts') [and we are all uptight about drugs]). I say let those dollars be voluntary, to be given, especially by those who stand the most to lose if our way of life should take a turn for the worse (In my opinion it can only take a turn for the better). I believe the 'military/industrial complex' would soon dry up, or, at least, would be obliged to seek a more economic and more realistic basis for generating income. But to get back to a point I wanted to make. Part of the problem with party politics is that one often feels under some obligation to individuals who have been instrumental in furthering the interests of a particular candidate. Its as if Jesus Christ was under some obligation to the Apostles for promulgating the cause. The problem with party politics is, that, in the obligatory phase (the payoff phase) of politics, which seems to be embosomed as a part of our system, we appoint, for example, some fat cat to be a negotiator of 'peace' when he is not imbued with the Spirit of Peace. Its difficult to know if he is imbued with anything more than the ability to appear before the press as some kind of tough guy, or some kind of smart-aleck; or appear as some glib stone-face, deporting himself as the sole proprietor of peace. And furthermore, PEACE is maintained as a big secret. Well I do not need to give my tax dollars to a Department of State that makes it easy for the political hack to

## **President**

become an appointee conducting affairs on my behalf that I could better conduct myself.

We, the people, not a Congress of Rubber Stamps ought to be able to say who these appointees (political hacks) will be. And if we are truly interested in the function of any of the offices of government we ought to insist that they be properly filled; and not leave it entirely to the President and his political cronies (including congressional) to decide. Well, I'm getting ahead of myself.

Operating with the simple convictions that not only does Noise constitute an Invasion of Privacy, but acts as such an unwarranted and severely cacophonous intrusion upon the essential act of meditation, when I become President the first order of business I propose to bring before Congress will be the request to enact stringent legislation with regard to Noise Pollution. I sense a strong need to quiet things down, in order to create a reposeful environment wherein man may be afforded fewer distractions, freeing his senses from a civilizational 'overload' thus enabling him to engage in less stressful and more constructive thought processes. I will request also that no corporation, business or individual will be exempted, and no 'grandfathering' be permitted. To enumerate:

1.) All aircraft, coming and going, in and about municipalities, or places where large groups of people tend to congregate, will be completely restricted. All airports located within municipalities will be closed. No overflights of municipalities or areas where large groups of people congregate will be allowed, and all aircraft will be obliged to remain at least ten miles outside of these areas. (If this criteria cannot be satisfied, then owners and operators of aircraft will be required to make other travel arrangements. Alternatively, it might be provided that all of those irreversibly wedded to aircraft and noise, along with those so unfortunate to suffer with deafness, in that order, be given right of first refusal to purchase lands and places so encroached, otherwise to be considered unfit for human habitation. All others affected will be compensated by the Airline Corporations whose imperative need to fly exists as a privilege and not a as right.)

2.) All Freeways will be located at least two miles distant from any municipality or place where large groups of people tend to congregate. Existing Freeways will be supplied with textured noise reducing panels and/or berms such as to produce sound levels not exceeding 30 decibels 150 feet distant from the source.

3.) All vehicles will be muffled, to meet a specific decibel level of sound transmission not exceeding 20 decibels. Jake-braking will not be allowed within two miles of any municipality, any place where large groups of people tend to congregate, any residence, or any recreational area (including any Wilderness Areas and National Parks provided with hiking trails).

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

4.) All sirens will be dismantled, without exception.

5.) All discharging of firearms, operation of internal combustion engines; i.e. chain saws, power mowers, motor cycles, racing cars, hot rods, snow mobiles, go carts, power boats, etcetera, will not allowed within two miles of a municipality or area where people tend to congregate (which includes recreational areas). (*Places and times will be set aside for the noisemaking enthusiast to mow his lawn, and operate his recreational machinery. In addition, all such devices will need to be muffled as not to exceed the previously specified limit of 20 decibels*).

6.) All households will not be permitted to own barking dogs or other noise generating animals within municipalities or areas where people tend to congregate (which includes recreational areas). Further, all animals will be under physical restraint in public areas and not allowed to transgress upon space occupied by homo sapiens in such areas. Let it be clearly understood that noise-making animals will be considered a public nuisance and dealt with accordingly.

7.) All Television commercials will be required to be performed in pantomime, without sound. All media will be denied the Right to Foment.

8.) A catch-all category which is intended to reflect the spirit of this legislation which is designed to, and will in effect exercise strict control over blasting, fireworks, military exercises, the movement of trains, the control of sonic booms, and sundry explosions caused by man. It will also extend that spirit to cover any sound, noise, racket, clamor, twang, cacophony, dissonance, pandemonium, sonority, excessive ululations, stentorian outrage that exceed a twenty decibel level. All offenses will be prosecutable in a federal court.

9.) The perversion of language which construes noise-making as music will not be tolerated. In other instances music will be considered noise if audible beyond its perpetrators ears. Publicly scheduled and announced musical events will not be considered an infringement provided all agree to their pretext and social value.

10.) And, last, but not least, the Federal District courts will be empowered to issue cease and desist injunctions against any and all noise making pending an immediate court hearing to show cause. Any and all who contravene these injunctions will be subject to immediate apprehension and placement in confinement pending a court hearing.

11.) If I think of anything else, I'll expect it to be included.

Naturally enough there will be exceptions to the above which will be strictly licensed, and will be allocated on a 'demonstrated' need basis, and only in areas involving the saving of lives, e.g., the use of helicopters to transport accident victims, or people gravely ill, to hospitals, following certain prescribed air routes; or in times of verifiable national imperilment strictly under the control of the President. Other means of attracting the world's attention will need to be devised to replace the customary use of sirens.

## **President**

Every household will be provided with a recording decibel meter. It will be the user's responsibility to maintain the instrument in working order, that is, brought to service areas for repair and periodic operational checks and calibration.

After the Nation has been quieted and subjected to a prolonged period of meditation, I will request Congress to enact legislation that will be designed to facilitate, accelerate and implement The Doctrine of The Least, and the Cessation of the Dominion of the One Over the Other.

Perhaps you are inclined to feel I have begun the whole approach to a concept of the Presidency with far too much levity. Perhaps William and I live in a world of which ordinary people are not inclined to believe. And perhaps my attitude poses a danger to my physical well-being. Perhaps exposure to my father's declamatory rhetoric predisposed me to regard our More Perfect Union with some degree of skepticism. While father may not have been specifically critical of the form of our government in its particulars, but only in what it encouraged, and tolerated as an expression of itself; mostly in terms of its worship of a gaudy materialism, to the exclusion of many other social requirements, his vote for Henry Wallace may reveal some sentiments of which I am not aware. Father seldom discussed politics, per se; he tended to discourse upon aesthetics. Aesthetics became an all-embracing doctrine of sentiment, of form and philosophical symmetry following some dubious function, but most importantly, of content. Beyond pure Aesthetics, when one might be said to contemplate the notion of content, we enter into an area of discussion which may not be tolerant of equal suffrage, particularly if we come to acknowledge the gravity of what father recognized and characterized in the electorate as the least Common Denominator. It purports to say that Aesthetics, as a doctrine, tends to be undemocratic. One was inclined to dictate what was good for the other (father not excluded); albeit in a highly motivated manner, but not in an entirely selfless way. Instead of a More Perfect Union he advocated a More Aesthetic Union, overseen by a highmindedness.

Part of my quarrel with our More Perfect Union does involve Aesthetics, which in its effort to design its form while nominally answerable to some specific function fails to embrace content; while the form interests me from a theoretical standpoint, in as much as it becomes unified with its function, it is in the area of content for which I reserve the bulk of my skepticism.

By way of contrast, to illustrate more what I mean, and what role an intellectual approach plays, I cite what, in the world of aesthetics, is known as 'primitivism', wherein Joe Aborigine, or Grandma Jane, Winnie or Ike take up the paintbrush without any formal training or concept of

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

aesthetics to 'have at it', much like my becoming President. Joe Aborigine may begin with a swatch of straw to apply some gooey glop to a cave surface, or may employ some hard substance to etch an image upon a rock face. Grandma Jane may go to the local Art Store to procure a prestretched and sized canvas already mounted within a frame, along with a paint set, or she may go into the woodshed where all the old half filled paint cans reside, and with paintbrush and turps, attack the side of the barn or spare piece of plywood. Winnie and Ike would carry this process one step further by purchasing an easel and folding stool, a wooden paint box filled with Windsor Newton or Grumbacher, camel's hair brushes, palette, etc. topped off with a beret; your stereotypic Sunday painter.

**Form, Function and Content** comprise the basic ingredients to be considered in Aesthetic analysis. These become mostly intellectual considerations. They do not probe 'gut reactions' in any work undergoing analysis, whether one 'likes' something or 'does not like' something; and for which aesthetic explanations cannot be supplied.

Primitivism in politics and one's 'gut reaction' to government may comprise some antithesis to the whole process of designing a Form of government that will satisfy the requirements of the Functional Unit. In one sense these (primitivism and the 'gut reaction') may be said to comprise the Content of government. The Functional Unit acknowledges Man's compulsion to organization when more than one person is present at a gathering. The Form of that organization may be achieved through fiat (the Larger setting the pace for the Smaller; or Stronger manipulating the Weaker; etc.) or may be achieved through some common agreement based upon some idea of organization, let's say, as a practical and reasonable extension of an age old precept known as the Golden Rule. Beyond the Golden Rule what can one expect? As a group, in order to achieve the purposes of Sanitation, let's say, each is expected to contribute something towards the common good. While each may live sufficiently apart from the other to utilize the more primitive outhouse, their 'gut reaction' to being told they must contribute something towards Sanitation would be in the negative, particularly if their derived benefits fell only into the 'long range' category. For example, even though the plagues were mostly concentrated within the metropolis, and even though Boccaccio was able to survive with some impunity in the removed environment of the country, there was less guarantee of his safety than if Sanitation had been achieved within the metropolis, from which the horde could spread its noxious contamination far and wide.

Thus, part of the function of government would be to preclude from happening the affects of Citizen A upon Citizen B. How best accomplish this objective? As part of the formal consideration one might feel it obligatory not to allow free choice in the matter of Sanitation, for

## **President**

example. We may arrive at the same response to obligation through free choice; that is, through majority vote. We may arrive at the same end without submitting the consideration to vote; in other words, matters of practical necessity should never result from a plebiscite, but only from out the formal consideration that would oblige the purpose or function to reach a singular unvarying resolution. Its the same as saying one does not vote to accept or abide the Golden Rule; one is bound by the Golden Rule; it is not negotiable.

How does one distinguish Content from what must be construed as pragmatic considerations; or how does one add Content to either embellish or otherwise expand the precepts beyond their narrowly imperative nature? When one paints a picture, he accepts the confines of the rectangle and, for the most part, the two dimensionality of the reality upon which he applies paint. In general he accepts certain limitations within the medium of paint; that is he cannot mix all the colors together in one pot. And, in the end, depending upon the degree of 'clarity' he wishes to present and preserve, he is further obliged to remain within certain limits of perspective, organization, design, symbolism, etc. One might question the Function of a painting. Declaring it a 'medium' of self-expression may suffice as the answer. The Formal considerations within the definition of self expression may be many and varied. The Content of the painting becomes a highly individual matter. One may elect to paint a picture of a thunder mug, or a sewage treatment plant, or may choose to paint a picture of his neighbor's wife. The Content may be embellished to such a degree as to stimulate (move) the viewer towards some attitude or feeling with regard to the subject matter. One might choose to paint an allegorical depiction of the virtues and effects of the Golden Rule.

Will the Golden Rule become the sole Content of the common-endedness and purposefulness of Government? What is there about the Golden Rule that is not sufficient to bring about certain objectives beyond the issue of Sanitation? There will be granted no 'individual rights' with respect to Sanitation within the metropolis. Are there to be 'individual rights' with respect to other aspects of human behavior; let's say, in view of the Ten Commandments? While we have been specific with regard to enumerating what we have construed to be implicit rights, i.e., right to talk, to worship, to argue with the chief, to carry a gun, to privacy, to escape self-incrimination, to a fair trial, to vote, to drink, etc. we have been negligent with regard to other implicit rights, in particular, certain civil rights. We have paid lip service to the Golden Rule; we have provided a sailaway package for getting under way as a body that has consented to Rule, to which we now refer as Rule of Law; we have ceded what were implicit rights to now live under the aegis of Rule of Law, in order to live upon and within the sea of human society. Still we insist

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

there are certain inalienable rights. We reserve the right to revoke the Rule of Law.

In the Southern part of our country we allowed certain practices (denial of civil rights) to maintain unabated for one hundred and seventy-five years after the formation of the More Perfect Union. It was not until the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that what had been implicit was made into something explicit. Minorities have a tough time, especially if their aesthetics do not conform to A White Protestant Privileged Majority. Whether or not it is true, depending upon one's perspective, that is, if one is inclined to think of numbers as relevant, women outnumber men in our country, but as far as their civil rights go, they are accorded a position equivalent to that of a minority. While we have instituted what might be perceived as a fair doctrine under Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunities, we are inclined not to implement such doctrine, because we perceive it also as government meddling in what we consider to be our implicit right to refuse or deny someone else if we so choose; and (we imagine) we extend that same right to that other person under the aegis of the Golden Rule. A backhanded logic often suggested by 'Conservative' Attorneys General, in this case to support the Male Ego that lives in fear of the Matriarch (or Terrible Mother [not to mention the nuance of reverse Discrimination]).

The More Perfect Union cannot be described as an arena of self-expression, even though it thoughtfully included Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness as, albeit, some ill-defined operational arena for the self. As well, the Declaration of Independence is only a dream sheet, and not part of the Constitution. When our neighborhood attempted to declare its independence from King City Hall (the Mayor and his cronies), we too had put together such a dream sheet, better known as a grass-roots sheet. King City Hall turned a deaf ear to grass-roots, to spontaneity, to the People, although the motto within the King's chambers proclaims 'The City Is The People'. Well, if you observe more closely, you will note that it was not the King who made the statement, but that it is a self-serving quotation filched from Coriolanus, intended to disarm and deceive the constituent and to encourage falsehopes.

You might easily understand why I would like to return to the beginning, for the only way to rectify the situation now is to stage a revolution. But before that happens, let us see what more we can learn through analysis and posit through analogy.

It would seem I would not make a good candidate for the office of President because I take the Moses approach, (leaving Gud out of it, of course, even though the golden calf emblazons the motto In Gud We Trust). But I am insinuating a morality as part of the content of government. Let us begin our landscape as a painter, including the elements of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness (The Three

## **President**

Graces) as something implicit to be associated with any work of art or government. Will we imbue that landscape with a feeling of permanence or one of transience; that is, will life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness become founded in some kind of materialism? Will we strew the landscape with things? Or will we depict the idyllic natural landscape devoid of Man's influence? Will we dominate the landscape with an idealized materialism? (The Three Graces transformed into one huge Midden?) Let us say we are preoccupied with our visual reality, and feel we cannot escape what it is we see everyday with our eyes (that is, for those of us who have eyesight - not necessarily vision). As wielder of brush, spatula and palette, what will we say about that reality? Will the Tomb of the Pharaoh become a central Wonder of the World, or the Nuclear Power Plant along side the Cathedral of Chartres? How about diesel powered Mercedes Benz parked in the front yard (with the stars and stripes or the hammer and sickle stuck in the flagpole holder attached to the side of the house)? If you are a Southern White, will you project a plantation depicting a colonnaded mansion surrounded by verdant fields filled with darkies, with a Confederate Flag hangin' in thar.

Of course we are not wholly constructed of an either/or mentality. We do however desire permanence, even though our consciousness of existence constantly reminds us this can never be. Even the Tomb of the Pharaoh is not permanent, although it has been around for a few thousand years; and what a small thing it is for the Pharaoh who is not around to partake of it (only the anthroapologists who are forever disturbing one's RIP [What is it we want to learn about ourselves]. Because permanence does not exist, does this mean we consciously choose the transient as the only alternative? Do we then allow Madison Avenue to clutter our canvas with their shifting idealized landscape? How, then would you fill your landscape? What would be the most rewarding vision? Could you fill the canvas with a materialism without also enclosing the whole within a fenced compound; within a boundary as it were? Would you surround the idealized fenced materialism with envious eyes? Would you not also need to man the ramparts with machine guns to ward off the covetous? In other words what is reality? Part of the reality of materialism are the anxieties we maintain with regard to it, to wit, the fence and machine guns. What does that say about the **Content** of your life? Where does one station the Three Graces in this ménage? Have they become irrelevant to the aegis of Materialism?

As President what could I do to improve the landscape? Aside from recognizing the need to support the function of government, would I be obliged to adhere to the Scrolls of Valley Forge? As I took the oath of office I would swear to uphold something. Would it be the form of the government as well as the function? Would I be at liberty to attempt to

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

change the form after I had sworn to uphold it? The form is somehow rigged to have allowed the civil (and human) rights of a certain segment of the population to be denied for one hundred and seventy five years after the inception of that government. How long do you suppose we ought allow the form to deny equal rights to the feminine majority? You see, as President, I would feel obliged, in the National Interest, to pardon womankind for whatever it is that makes her a second class citizen in the eyes of a macho chauvinistic pee-pee dominated social apparatus. I think it is time the males in our country came to grips with their 'insecurities'. The form of our government is not serving its function by allowing such implicit denial; such a situation must be remedied; I shall so remedy in the National Interest.

Also, in the National Interest I may Nationalize all Corporate Farms and/or Land Holdings, and any non-utilized productive land, feeling that private property in these areas does not serve the National Interest. In the National Interest I would do away with the Futures Markets, believing it is not in the National Interest to have a group of men parasitizing another group of men for their own personal gain. I may take the same approach with regard to 'Wall Street'. In the National Interest I will aim to do away with all speculation in the areas of food production, health related services, and education. When it becomes possible for a Market to feel it is opportune to cash in on another man's misfortune, while this may aptly describe human nature, I am of the mind to play Moses in this regard, by severely punishing those who feel they can make fortunes from out another's misfortune. It is not in the National Interest to seek to sell to a foreign country, who is in need, a life sustaining commodity at a price determined by Whatever The Market Will Bear. In the area of health-related services, once again in the National Interest, I intend to reenliven the medical profession's interest in the Hippocratic Oath; this will include all Hospital owners, trustees, and administrators; in lieu of this reenlivenment, I would Nationalize all Hospitals and set humane standards for conduct in medical profession. Not leaving anything to chance I would set a timetable for the reenlivenment, not to exceed the shortest time possible. While I would deem immediate conversion appropriate, in the interim, I would mandate that every individual in need be accorded full service regardless of his means. Those in the business of denying full service would be severely punished (mull that over for a while). (In this manner, we could do away with malpractice suits {and Malpractice Insurance} [a kick in the ass ought be sufficient. No more worshipping of physicians; they either get on with their doctoring or get out of the profession.]) We're all in this together.

Perhaps what you are hearing is an illustration of primitivism in politics, based on certain 'gut reactions' to both the form and content of

## **President**

our More Perfect Union. It is only a beginning. While, what I would do in the National Interest would seem very revolutionary, and perhaps even contrary to a certain 'democratic' spirit and prove upsetting to the many with imaginary vested interests (not in the National Interest; I don't give a damn what they say about General Mowtours), it would only be a drop in the bucket as far as the total National Interest is concerned. While we have erected real and imaginary fences to surround our pile (The Nation) we are not invulnerable to what happens on the balance of the Globe. As President I could attempt to conquer the rest of the world through any means that works. Chances are I would only succeed in stirring up a hornet's nest. The only reason I would wish to conquer the balance of the Globe would be to put to rest once and for all the anxieties attendant to sharing it all with someone else. In this day and age I would necessarily approach the other Nations with the idea of encouraging dialogue involving our mutual interests. In doing so I would not go to them to yak, yak and yak at them "Be like us, then we'll be friends" I could not do that in good conscience anyway. Although the form of our government is nominally labeled a Democracy, by declaring it so does not make it so. I have provided you with some examples, which prove that democracy, like any other form of government, is just as apt to be a smoke screen for tyranny. Democracy and Socialism are thrust at each other as antipodes, seemingly devoid of people. What is of paramount interest to me is the Humanity that fills the Ideological legions. It would seem that Humanity, like Democracy (Imperialism) and Communism (Totalitarianism) is a dirty word to be shunned by oligarchs and tyrants alike. This tyranny is founded in two Industrial Slave States ruled by minorities who are shooting for all the marbles. I suppose I could modify that situation on our end by Nationalizing all the means of production, investing, imbuing our industrial plant with another purpose entirely. I would not like to do away with free enterprise entirely because I have heard that would do away with incentives. Its all vastly complicated, but rife with potential for improvement, incentives notwithstanding ('virtue is its own reward' - need one elaborate upon virtue?).

Since Chernobyl, anything that leads us away from what has been characterized as Nuclear Winter would be in every one's Interest. Even those who imagine that the after life is for them, dying from radiation poisoning makes life with Flumdum or Allah seem a long ways off. Only a complete dullard could miss the eloquence and significance of Chernobyl (since they had already missed the eloquence and significance of Hiroshima). Even the Nuclear Winter people will need to modify their speak. Their speak is founded in what they term the 'natural carrying capacity' of the earth. They claim the natural carrying capacity of the earth is less than one percent of the current world's

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

population. Demography has little scientific basis; it thrives on statistical information influenced by wishful thinking.

In order to lead into this concept of the natural carrying capacity, which involves numbers, I wish to go back a few. While one is free to think many things, one must be mindful of our genesis, and the ratios involved in a numbers construction of which we may guess the significance, the numbers themselves revealing nothing. Let's assume our genesis began a million years ago, give or take a few, not emerging from some tadpole, but from something already evolved over a longer period, something that stood erect, perhaps arboreal part of the time, and nomadic; perhaps arboreal for safety, and nomadic for the conventional reason, to forage, and to follow the seasons, adding a few extra ingredients beyond the imperatives of a living entity, from out the desire to explore, and from out some inner compulsion and curiosity. So there we are, naked as a jay bird. Not quite the way it is written in the King James version, but they knew nothing before 4004, and not a hell of a lot after (despite the advent of the Dead Sea Scrolls [they will require something more in depth, or from a Deeper Sea than the these bogus scrolls, and perhaps something livelier and shapelier as well]).

When I say numbers mean nothing, 4004 is an example. While 100 years becomes a century, and ten years a decade, 10 months or ten days, ten minutes, ten seconds are fractions of other significances. Estimates of the planet's life reach into the billions beyond the Archeozoic (Pre-Archaeozoic), before that one gets into negative numbers, like BC/AD (Before Cronus/Archio Dhominid). Accordingly, Man (Our Time), if we accept him as such, one million years ago, was virtually introduced yesterday, calculated in planetary time, and in dinosaur time; his time occupies a 1/10,000th to 5/10,000th part of that total time. On another scale 1 day equals 1/36,500th part of a century. On the other hand Biblical time occupies a 6/1000ths part of Our Time (6,000 of the 1,000,000) even with a leap year thrown in [the year the cow jumped over the moon]). On the previous scale 1 day equals 1/2,136,000th part of Biblical time; on the original scale 1/365,000,000th part, and in planetary time 1/730,000,000,000 part.

A million years ago we were up and about with hardly the slightest notion of genesis, evolution, and the prospects for the future; and Michelangelo's Bruges Madonna and Goya's *Y no hai remedio* were a long ways off. Nowadays we are Dressed to ... er ... Kill, or to 'then eyne', with rocks in our heads. We have guessed at genesis, at evolution, and now guess at genetic manipulation and recombination, and cloning, while seeking antediluvian solutions to our common problems. Periodically, incipient gills appear in our young as a reminder of our genesis, and the rocks in our head hearken to a time of little promise.

## **President**

Now, to delve more into the numbers in order to offer some meager hope, while simultaneously puzzling over Malthusian equations. When one imagines the seemingly little "progress" between 1,000,000 and 10,000 BT (before our time, yours and mine) that is, in the civilizational sense, and what has happened rather dramatically since 5,000 BT, he cannot fail to be impressed. It is difficult to know for certain the natural carrying capacity of the earth at any one time, before agriculture, for any number of cataclysmic considerations. The Nuclear Winter people are estimating somewhere near 40,000,000 people. For some time, the earth's hominid population remained rather stable, or showed only a gradual increase, this latter perhaps occurring with the advent of primitive agriculture. Adam and Eve's inauspicious beginning has burgeoned into a redundant presumption.

Thus, to put down some numbers. Until 5000 BT, the most population one might have anticipated finding amongst the census of mostly nomadic peoples was 40,000,000 (The proposed natural carrying capacity of the earth, measured in our 1988 perception of carrying capacity). Thus for approximately 1,000,000 years (less 5,000) the population growth would reveal 40 persons per year, average growth. It may well have happened that, in the last 1,000 years of the approximate 1,000,000, population began to show a marked increase. However, at the most, it would not have exceeded 10,000 per year given longevity, infant mortality, famine, disease etc. (only the fittest my love). With the advent of more sophisticated agriculture along with improved techniques of storing foodstuffs, and sundry speculative benefits accruing therefrom, by the Seventeenth century (1600 or 385 BT) the earth's population is estimated at 400,000,000 thereby increasing approximately tenfold in 4,600 years, an average of 100,000 per year, obviously showing a more exponential rise towards the latter part of that time, probably not exceeding 1,000,000 per year, given the same conditions of longevity, infant mortality, famine, disease, etc.

Since the Seventeenth Century (385 BT) the population has once again increased over tenfold to 5,000,000,000, of course producing a far greater number over a shorter period of time, having increased in the last thirty years alone by more than it had increased from 5000 BT to 100 BT at an annual rate of ~ 66,666,666. From 30 BT to 0 BT population has increased by 2,000,000,000. A pile of numbers to be sure, tabulated as follows for easier comparison:

Number of years:	Number of People:	Approx. Avg./Yr. Increase:
995,000 (1,000,000 BT to 5000BT)	40,000,000	~ 40 to 5,000)
4,615 (5,000 BT to 385BT)	400,000,000	~ 10,000 to 100,000)
385 (385 BT to 30BT)	5,000,000,000	~ 1,500,000 to 13,000,000)
0 BT) Last 30	2,000,000,000	~ 66,666,666



## **President**

144,000 will survive [since the astronomical rise in population in the last 30 years a lot of pressure has been placed upon Jehovah to expand that number]). Aw, come on. O.K., so 3,000,000,000 survive the initial blast; then what? How much time will you allow for us to die of the ALL the complications, which includes beating the hell out of each other as we raid the contaminated granaries? Come on, come on. You don't know; you can't know; I don't know. What I do know is that if the natural carrying capacity is what they say it is, we better get our act together. While, what some apologists might characterize as unique, and others not insurmountable, contamination on Bikini has lasted for 40 years (to date). Small comforts. Don't Forget Disease! Do we have some obligation to get at least one individual to the finish line?

To any leader with VISION, visionary schemes pale before the requirements. The burden to the planet, which has attempted to remain the same size throughout the eons, and which is actually dematerializing into satellites, has yielded many of its non-renewable resources to the two-legged pestilence. She cannot hold out forever against the onslaught. One doesn't get 'something for nothing' forever, in a finite scheme of things. The numbers are outrunning and outgunning the possibilities. Any glitch in Nature's status quo will most likely echo what we have assumed has happened to the dinosaur, resulting in massive hominid expiration. AHOY! Cameroon (not to mention the non-nuclear man-made gliches [Bhopal, Serveso, nerve gas, agent orange, palliatives; TB, Pox, Hep. C, Cholera, AIDS - you get the picture]).

I don't mean to set you up, but I do believe we cannot ignore; I do believe we cannot ignore; I do believe we cannot ignore (Abort, Do Not Ignore, Retry).

If I continue in this vein, I will begin to realize being President is not for me. Even if this proves to be hopelessly true, in good conscience I must forbear, and not bring my spiel to a premature conclusion ("Here, Dapple! .. er .. Here Nameless Ass!".) Thus, to return once again to the canvas, and to folly.

I do not mean to undermine your confidence as I make mockery of myself. If ever my mockeries and expletives should prove intolerable to the plebiscite, I would gladly resign. But meanwhile we do have a job to do.

We must realize that the Presidency may represent a vast undertaking; and mere prejudices will not be enough to sustain any policy that is expected to further the interests of the nation or humanity. Politicization of the office of President is one of the initial errors we make in this whole process; quickly followed by party politics, which in the end acts as the repository for dubious involvement at the grass roots level. In lieu of putting ourselves forward as a candidate for any political office, purely as a spontaneous gesture of offering our services and inspiration, we allow some canvasser talk us into supporting their enthusiasm for some body he or she doesn't know, and

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

we sure as hell don't know; and in the end some body linked to a political party. That's the end of it, right there. One becomes a bunch of slogans and red white and blue brochures. At some point you may meet the candidate at a candidate's forum. To all the 'questions' (inquiries) you might be allowed to ask, sandwiched in between the thousands of 'enthusiastic' yea-saying inquiries and planted questions, you are not apt to get anything but a carefully programmed and rehearsed response. If the question merits an 'in depth' answer, you are apt to receive, "I do not have all the facts; I would wish only to give you an answer based on all the facts; it would be premature for me to say anything at this time". While that may be an honest answer in more ways than one (like the guy may be stupid), it may be only the conventional way to escape controversy, or to paraphrase it another way, like Fritz, "Where's the Beef?"; not that Fritz would have been able to tell you; its just that he got to ask the question first in what was really a cute exchange, which in the end produced nothing but a laugh. What relevance! (I make jokes too. Is this a serious undertaking?)

Its so much more to the point to say, "I wish to make it perfectly clear I don't know". But as a political candidate one is expected to have an answer; if one is an underdog with nothing to lose, he or she is apt to say anything to get some coverage and exposure. The more apt one is to become a shoo-in, the more circumspect and scarcer he or she becomes, waving babies and kissing the flag. I am a shoo-in with myself, so I have lots of confidence in that area; but, because I'm not so sure about the rest of you does not mean I will invent a bunch of poppycock in order to get your attention. You've gotta trust me. If some previous phony political candidate had not already used the line I would be tempted to say, "In your heart, you know I'm right". He lost by a landslide. I do not imagine I could lose by much more if I merely said, "If I seem to have forgotten to comb my hair, don't take it amiss."

Another political candidate combed his hair and said, "Stay the course", and won by a landslide; albeit he was an incumbent. The man he defeated before he became President was also an incumbent, but unfortunately that fellow also appeared to be a 'nice guy', and you know what is they say about nice guys; so there is no point in becoming one of them.

I prepared this script using a 'word processor' (they have processors for all kinds of things these days). The program I was using allowed 60,000 bytes to a file. At this juncture, having used over 50,000, I thought I had better get on with it, so I didn't need to start another file. By the time this one is over I will have said enough.

Obviously I will not stay the course. I will do everything in my power (in what I believe to be the national interest); as a matter of fact all that follows must be construed to be proposed in the national interest) to turn down the volume. I will advocate most every means available (not

## **President**

genocide) to reduce population at home and abroad, believing that fewer will enjoy more; fewer would also lessen the necessity for WAR. While WAR is a means towards reducing the aforesaid, we are apt to start something that will finish us, while eclipsing or obviating our objectives. If it is not already apparent, I shall state succinctly that I am against WAR. Towards that end, after the volume is turned down, I shall make every effort to dismantle all the machinations that make WAR possible. MAD is the antithesis to sanity. We cannot forever remain locked in this obsessional behavior controlled by an anxiety neurosis, even if After Rapture awaits us (our sojourn on this planet is short enough, I believe we need not hasten to the end). I realize such cessations will put a lotta people outta work; I believe this can be remedied by putting idle hands to the task of cleaning up the messes we have made. If I have any say in the matter, nobody will go hungry (that is, I better not hear about it). Nobody will want for decent shelter, no one will want for health care, no one will want for educational and/or cultural opportunities. These are not guaranteed in our Constitution; believing this to be merely an oversight, I will have them included in the beginning of that document as basic to the National Interest. What is implicit for Genrul Mowtours, must also be explicit for the entire population. More Now, Less Later.

While I would be inclined to do away with GOVERNMENT after I have straightened out everything, I realize that, since the lessons of now are not transmuted into the flesh, but need to be relearned rehearsed and passed on) with some emphasis, there exists some requirement for a structure to our lives in order that we may avoid anarchy, mayhem, and a random disorder. I am reluctant to want to impose one FORM in preference to another, but believe the purpose of the FUNCTION will always remain. I would do everything within my power to minimize the affect of Government, but would bring the weight of Government to bear upon assuring the aforementioned oversight be included as the vital part of our Constitution, as well as guaranteeing that said inclusion be put into effect.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am wholeheartedly in support of Sanitation and regard this area of public health as nonnegotiable. I consider myself rather adamantly and non-negotiably in favor of mandating cessation of all activities that contribute to the pollution of the environment, and in particular the water we drink and air we breath. I will order the revamping of the offices that are designed to assure that we ingest only wholesome healthful foodstuffs; these offices will be protected from any and all lobbying influences that would tend to subvert their function; these recommendations will be put into affect immediately; any failure at compliance will be met with severe penalties.

I wish to make it the purpose of my Administration to end the Dominion of the One Over the Other, and to implement the Doctrine of the Least. White over Black, Male Over Female, Big Over Small, (vice

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

versa) The One Over the Other will not be tolerated. And the Least amongst us will be accorded the minimum basic aforementioned explicit inclusions to the Constitution, as well as all others.

While I realize I cannot force the people to do something they do not wish to do, nonetheless I would hope all will not fail to inquire of themselves "What can I do for the common 'good'?" I will occasionally remind you of this expectation?

I would advocate diminishing the emphasis upon nationalism, flag waving, and the general tendency to foment confrontations between peoples and nations.

As an extension of my own personal preference, I would attempt to effect legislation, without necessarily invoking the National Interest, to 'aim high' in the area of Aesthetic considerations. I do not believe necessarily that we beautify what is already beautiful, but would rather advocate not uglifying what is already beautiful. Materialism is a dangerous way of life; it tends towards waste and offal, and an indiscriminate scattering thereof upon the landscape. NO MORE!! Penalties Galore! In conjunction with this last I would encourage a keen visual awareness with regard to all man-made things; I would encourage all to ask "How may I not intrude and impose upon the natural environment with what it is that I do?" It is to be understood we do not live apart from nature (our natural surroundings) but within nature.

"In 3500 bytes or less, tell us about yourself."

Well, I'm like most of you, more or less. While I am skeptical, pessimistic, critical, even cynical, I have made an effort to control the big three: aggression, hostility and a destructiveness; perhaps deeply influenced by the Golden Rule, and an abhorrence of pain. I do not dislike babies; babies grow up to become people; people cease to be people when they proliferate like rats. I do not dislike the flag; at times flags create a rather pleasant sight in a gentle breeze. I do not dislike apple pie; I think everybody ought to get a slice. I do not feel it necessary to 'multiply and subdue the earth', or to remake Nature in my own image; too much 'humanity' is simply 'too much'.

I believe in a fairmindedness. In order to fulfill that notion, I have found it necessary to become keenly aware of my ignorance, prejudices, arrogance, bigotry, pettiness, insolence and egocentricity; and where these have originated, whether in the head, in the viscera, or from listening to my fellow man. While one's observations may lead him to believe that all men are not created equally, in looking beyond the mere statistics of an individual, I wish to perceive a uniqueness in the Least; and in the Most, also the most magnanimity.

I like quiet; I like peace. I do not like my field of vision to be cluttered and violated with a clamoring for participation in a

## **President**

materioconsumerconomic lifestyle. I do not like what happens to those who so participate. While it is all ostensibly based in free choice, one is harangued and belittled into a pattern of existence that could as easily be fulfilled by a world peopled with manikins. I just had to get that one in.

I prefer to be thought of as an individual, not necessarily a unique individual, but recognized beyond the mere surface, even though I may resemble Apollo or a frog. Although I cannot live without these exteriors, it is the interiors which have received the bulk of my time and effort, and therein lies my individuality. Truly I am not like anyone else, although I have learned from the many, and cursorily and superficially resemble the many. In short, I have tried to absorb the total man, mostly in order to understand what MAN is. While I share many thoughts in common, I have chosen the uncommon road from out some natural curiosity. As your President I will unstintingly share what it is I have learned in my journey; I will do this in any case.

William is my best friend and confidant. His wife Rose is a very special person, who feels deeply the plight of suffering life. Most likely they would volunteer to serve by my side.

I'm running out of bytes; I need to save some space for corrections; I do not need to save space for deletions. If the deletions permit I shall think of something more to add.

Since the office of President is such an important consideration in the affairs of men, and since I have not said all that might be said in this matter, and since I have shouldered up to the confinements of this File, I am obliged to revoke my original understanding with you by extending this dialogue into yet another. I must apologize for so soon breaking my word, but hope yet to provide you with justification for having done so, finding persuasion of the sense you will find in my additional rhetoric, and the urgency of its message.

Next Week I am scheduled to deliver a lengthy oration upon what is commonly referred as the Big Picture; and upon the following week I will be granted one further opportunity to respond to the criticism my candidacy has created, and to further adjure you with those controversial notions I deem most worthy of our consideration.

### **Add where appropriate**

One should be bold in his assessment of equities?

Leave no question unanswered?

The barest argument places 'free enterprise' squarely counterpoised to the most legitimate concerns of 'moderation' 'equitableness', 'preservation' and/or 'conservation', and all that would pretend towards 'continuance' (i.e. over the long haul -'futures' beyond what is measured in terms of profit or gain). What all this portends is a convolution that 'vested interests' would refer as 'socialism', or some antithesis to 'private incentives'.

## ***Apropos Of Nothing***

LIST all functions that must not be entrusted to 'free enterprise' or the 'private sector'. Fear not that they have been stated before under one utopian guise or another; the utopian gig as yet has not been proven unfeasible whereas most other systems of government have fallen by the wayside, regardless of their idealism, pragmatism, etc. The criticism of utopianism has always been its lack of accounting real humanity versus a rose-colored product. What is said of YOUTOPE can also be said of all other forms of civilizational groping. SO LIST:

a.) One Man Shall Not Have Dominion Over Another. This is a self-evident proclamation with great implications.

b.) The Success of the Least shall be the measure of Success of any system. While not so self-evident as the first, it is nonetheless a prerequisite for the establishment of any equitable system.

c.) All that pretends to serve the needs of humanity will not be abandoned to the whims of the market place; that is to say: Humanity Comes First.

d.) All that pretends to planetary salvation must be in the hands of conservators.

1.) Economics, Banking, Consumption, as we know these things are proven anachronisms. They involve purposeful abstractions, that while pretending to serve, instead rob.

2.) Energy production may be singled out because it has the potential to do things that are not in the interest of life on the planet. Energy, like most other commodities that are available to serve the needs of humanity, must be placed in the hands of conservators, first to preserve the environment, second to conserve a resource. There are many ifs that will find argument from the have nots as we would pretend to outline a measured use of energy in the future. Competing industrial states consume vast quantities of energy that in the end result in waste as well as pollution and needless consumption. The EEC is bare a step in the right direction, barely because it is predicated on old arguments of an industrial collusion (economic signifies industrial).

There are 5 billion individuals who cannot all have that kings have. The first to go must be the kings in what ought be a willing sacrifice on their part in order to save the planet and in order to assure that the LEAST are included as part of the whole. The intent is not that the LEAST should live like kings, but that they are regarded as a king would regard himself, and that each individual should not want for basic necessities; NOR should that individual's life be consumed in WORRY over attaining those basic needs. If we are to answer to the expression 'human community' then we must stand on this last as its cornerstone. If we do otherwise we cannot answer the call and must be relegated to the call of the beasts. Yes!, it is an either/or proposition.

## **President**

Energy is not key to the last, but energy is part of a whole picture that must be clearly drawn.

Human Energy that tends to VIOLENCE must be accounted as a force to be harnessed, and when not harnessed, subdued. Its a practical consideration. Other forms of Energy Consumption must be predicated in a system based on need and conservation. Also to be construed as a practical consideration.

Some will argue that we cannot turn back the clock. Are we to accept some fated dissolution as a result? 5 billion (update as required) racing ahead with the clock spells doom. 5 billion is an impractical overload in itself. Life and more life redundantly proving the uselessness of life is hardly an argument for its continuance.

Elsewhere I have argued that it is a matter of WILL (not a new idea). It is also a matter of intelligence (not smacking of a higher intelligence, but a matter of using the intelligence with which we are born). Obviously other forces are at work (greed, anxiety and rightful expectations amongst them). Intelligent choices must rein in these other lesser forces. It is not that one is denied, but that one is asked to live within bounds that accord other than visceral and certain prejudicial habits common to us all. OVERCOMING acquires new meaning. Its more than OVERCOMING adversity. We are denied the ultimate in any case simply because we cannot have it all. We are forced to curtail our lust for it all at some juncture; so why not begin now, at the beginning; why wait until the end. Must every soul travel the road we have already traveled before it becomes convinced there are limits - ALL KINDS OF LIMITS.

YES!, someone must take the first step.

However, one is mindful of Sancho Panza abandoning his Governorship after one week on the job.