

## ***Somehow this got titled BED***

The New Age - Hah!

There was a time when Man gave a shit about his fellow. **The Headquarters of the Federalist Party, a Meeting of Principals.** or, at least, he paid lip-service to such . . . **The Johns (Jay, Madison, and Alex Hamilton) agreed that you** sentiments. Now, he has **couldn't Fool All Of The** pretty much dispensed **People All Of The Time. But** with the LIPS, as in **our primary interest is in** Read My Lips. Lipsink. **Fooling Most Of The People** There are just **Most Of The Time. Failing** too many of us; that; **Some Of The People Disgusting! Most Of The Time; And All** A surfeit **The Others, Some Of** of **The Time. All we need** Two-Leggedness; and not is 50.0000000001 %, all that shapely. The **an' we'll have our** Solution lies somewhere **Majority Faction.** outside that which we dare speak. We the Golden Rule applies **This is a New World we live** to us as well **in, requiring a New Political** as the next. The only **Philosophy. A New Order,** Solution is to DENY, **and a New World Order. (Renew The World Order)** We DENY The Fair Share, **have tried Self-government;** Health Care, and Welfare **the process has failed** freaks. Then we will miserably. **The poor want to deprive** prosper and fulfill the **the movers and shakers** prophecy promised in **their legitimate gain; the poor the First Afflatus: want entitlements in order to** "The Rich will become **Survive; the Social Retards** Richer, and the Poor will **attempting to use government.** become Poorer; Our Nation **And those in the other Party** will become Safe for Demo- **attempting to get into Office** cracy; we shall become a **by appropriating the cause of** More Perfect Union." **THE POOR and the Social Retards. Where have we heard this garble before ?**

AND, WE shall have DOMINION over all the OTHERS.

To enhance this cynicism, we must encourage Prayer in the Schools, Pledge Allegiance in the Schools, Denunciation of the Media in the Schools. We must remove taxes on Capital Gains. No Masturbatin' (No same-sex mastering or baitin').

The voting public (those Fools of which we speak) will respond to the Simple Solution: **CHANGE**, CHANGE, the mere mention of CHANGE will be sufficient to garner their vote. They haven't the faintest notion of what is meant by Change, even when we tell them what we intend to change. We are in control, by insinuation. WE, this group, the poopholes, are the string pullers and manipulators. WE create the ambience and relevance in which all others must live. It is ours to do with as WE please; it is our opportunity to have things OUR WAY; WE are such a cotdamned bunch of feeble **CHANGELINGS.**

The Silent Majority (Faction) will speak. We need to keep them lined up with a Contract against the Poor and the Social Retards.

Lets promise them anything, because once we are in, we will turn the tables on leftist New Deal welfare, and entitlements, Once and For All (well

## ***Somehow this got titled BED***

not For All), but as in the beginning, all we require is 50.000000001%, so lets get them Fools in our corner.

More of the same.

The shoes, no longer fadionable, had been consigned to the closet. More of a boot than a shoe, nominally designed for men's workware, these had been worn by a young lady attempting to be mod., or in sync. with her peers, her class, her 'cultural' equivalents. Practicality was not a consideration, other than housing the foot, the longer standing tradition. These foot trappings encumbered the lady-like gait, causing it to seem more stilted and awkward.

I had heard that these sort-of ankle height clodhoppers were giving way to the higher topped logger's boots, as the next fad-phase moved in; the plodding clodding masses making a fashion statement.

The gang boys, and their aspiring emulating teen-age toughs, had been wearing their baseball caps backwards, without the catcher's mask, for sometime, longer than the girl boot phase. Often I would encounter these youths with a defiant look upon their countenances as they drove their mountain bikes carelessly over the (no bicylces!) park trails rutting them in the winter wet, or, as they sat in their cars in the wet winter downpours, boozing or toking to the car's ghetto blaster, literally screaming some awful noise that penetrated the very walls of their ugly machines.

There is no dress code, even though the other stuff may contravene more than the law.

We wonder why? Reflection upon our own youth doesn't seem to enlighten us. The stress we might have laid upon our individuality, that prize of pride, or limit of relinquishment, never seemed to demand so much of us and of 'them'. Our insistence upon our difference rarely stemmed from sociopathic tendencies. Perhaps less was implicitly denied to us. It was much easier to feel included, because there were fewer pressures toward exclusion. The process is ending; and conservatism and protectionism is closing the doors.

And occasionally we hear where they (the gang toughs) have beaten someone or killed him or her, without provocation. We do not know whether to be fearfully enclaved, and hope it will go away, or to be prepared, to arm ourselves, to counterattack.

The doors are closed.

A frontal attack is impossible.

How long can one can stand outside the fortress, shouting epithets, and mocking the proceedings inside? All the fortresses fall eventually.

But the crackdown is coming beforehand, before the fall. Tired of preaching tolerance as the blood flows.

How did it develop into this apparent rejection and alienation?

I have written of my lack of fit as a teenager, both at home and in the school milieu. As time has revealed, I believe I understand the source of the

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

former, but am still puzzled at the source of the latter. Father was so engrossed in himself that extraneous considerations, even those of offspring were not in the scope of his endeavors. The other may suffer many surface attributions, such as the stigma attached to occupation, nationality, physical appearance; but it was purported the Christians in a Christian Nation were exuding fraternal emanations that precluded all the other more superficial considerations. This was of course a laughable expectation (in hindsight). The puzzlement comes from the unwillingness to accept the diminution of one's social status based solely on superficial grounds, in the light of the non-discriminatory declarations emanating from Christian teachings (predominant in the social milieu then and now). The hypocritical part does not seem to bother us, even without declaring 'I am not my brother's keeper'.

Confraternity eludes us in this consumerist world. Wherewithall is what defines the consumerist ethic. Christianity has little place in any of it. Christianity serves only to group consumers. Christianity may serve as an arm of the law with its moralizing tenets.

Even the beneficiaries of the Consumed world, as in those obedient to the premise, having applied the wherewithall to the theory, having discovered its practice, have been allowed the privilege of learning the falseness of the promise. How much better does one feel having created a golden midden about him that nobody else possesses? At the pinnacle one does drugs because one wants to feel something that he cannot feel by surrounding himself with the materioconsumeristic objective.

Well, anybody can do drugs.

Its a free for all; can one get high by sniffing assholes?

What does one get out of defying a law and a social convention, for the sake of the defiance? You, nobody, can tell me what to do. Give me liberty or 'give it to me'. You gotta go sometime, the way of getting there is inconsequential, although it is said that there are consequences for one's actions. What is the consequence of inconsequentiality?

Earlier I had alluded to the (false) promise of Christianity. Much the same can be said of 'democracy'. I'll not attempt to define 'democracy', for it is much like Christianity, it has its spokespeople and its adherents, but meaning is largely prejudicial. Democracy evolves from opinions about democracy. Very often when some individual proclaims his democratic right he is behaving like a fascist. The true democrat does not deny the other. A whole pile of 'democrats', demos to you, or people, as in 'We, the people' gather together to deny the other under the auspices of exercising a democratic right to vote, these forming a plebiscite, in theory. To me this is fascism, or, more euphemistically, majority rule.

The problem with 'democracy' is that it requires an enlightened electorate. An enlightened elector would be similar to an enlightened

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

Christian. The enlightened Christian holds the image of Christ before him (or her) asking always "What would Jesus have done in this situation?" (to be contrasted to what a Bible-thumper might opine with regard to some TEXT). Perhaps a true democrat would ask, "What would Thomas Jefferson or James Madison have said or done?"

For one Christian sect to deny another Christian sect seems all too antithetic to the aegis of Christianity. Textual differences, and/or their different interpretations hardly were the concern of its namesake.

'Majority Rule' was much debated as a proper or improper function of a democracy. It was deemed by our forefathers that majority rule was in effect undemocratic. It is one thing to allow a majority to elect through 'popular' vote a person to represent them, and to periodically repeat this process. It is another thing to allow a majority (or a plurality of one at any given time) through popular vote, to determine the fate of a minority (sometimes for the duration of the 'institution'). While a minority, or a plurality of less than one, may not have been able to have elected a particular individual of their liking to represent them, the individual elected by the other plurality of one is bound by the democratic 'institution' to represent the minority as well.

Particularly troubling is the percentage of eligible voters who do not vote. Perhaps the differences between one candidate and another is insufficient to warrant a massive voter turnout, but to assure that things have a better opportunity to become truly representative, a voter quorum should be met. If the quorum is not met, the election should be declared null and void.

Troubling as well is the interest of money in the conduct of elections. One may very well assume that the prospective voter is an enlightened individual. In so doing it is also assumed that individual may be able to ignore the dubious persuasions of a vested interest. If the prospective voter is not enlightened, and if it is so that most of what he sees is cats with two heads (those presented to him by the vested interest) it is entirely possible and even probable he will believe a cat with two heads is better than a cat with one head, and will vote accordingly.

Perhaps you perceive this as making light of the voter's intelligence. When I hear some of the reasons why people vote the way they do, I have realized that their intelligence has little to do with their vote. If you will allow that prejudice is an aspect of intelligence then perhaps you will be correct in your assumption. The fact that reasons are applied to an argument does not signify intelligence; it may only mean that rationalizations have been applied to the argument in order to support a prejudice.

Should the prejudiced voter be allowed to vote? Should the gut-reaction be allowed?

Unfortunately the system is corruptible. Those who corrupt it would never be the upholders of the truly democratic way. Moneyed interests are in the minority, and would always be the loser in a situation where interests were revealed as interests directly. Where these interests may be viable and

## ***Somehow this got titled BED***

valuable toward a universally social good we should all be partakers. But most often these interests are of a reserved (unshared) nature. In any situation of choice put before them, they become an advantaged party in their resources; they in fact can and do influence elections, often quite apart from the issue. If they are the silent partner to misrepresentations, then they are the corruptors of the system.

Preying upon the ignorance of the electorate (ignorance of how an outcome may affect the vested interests) is a paramount cynicism. Does the ignorant electorate deserve better? The vested interests believe not, obviously. Dumb bastards. Often it is too late for the duped electorate to remedy. The next time dictates new opportunities for the vested; seldom is the same issue brought again before the electorate.

We might ennoble the Institution at the outset, but we pervert and subvert as those who stand the most to gain manipulate the system.

What was that?

What did you say?

Water over the damn! Wet blanket over the damnnnnnn!.

Just what is it you do? Sit in judgment. Sometimes I stand.

Lots of other times I meditate upon the American Indian. I often wonder what the White Christmas pestilence thought it was doing in the way of God's work when it displaced, dispossessed, diseased and slaughtered the Redman, otherwise known as the ignoble savage.

There are many who claim the world is a better place for all that. Eventually someone will be saying that about our removal; the final solution (souloution). Just desserts.

When I'm musing upon those annihilated ones, I imagine myself amongst them, because I too do not fit, I too am an ignoble savage. My thoughts condemn the house in which I have been forced to live. It is an 'inhuman' place reeking of some kind of anomalous creature. I restrain myself from heaping upon the innocent 'animal', an anger and epithets reserved for that other palpable shape, that resembles myself when I declaim 'the place reeks'.

The Redman weren't no angel. He may have been **bed**lamized, but he was not Christianized; in short, he was a heathen. Was he human?

To answer that question we must know what he would have done had he invented gun powder, harnessed the atom, identified and isolated lethal biological and chemical agents; we define our humanity by these things; at least our humanity can be measured by them. Without being the least humbled by the assessment. It is to be abandoned to the imagination what a heathen might have done, when we already know what a Christian has done. Because one is identified as a Christian does not signify that he is also 'human'; in fact, as we know, there is no requirement that he either be

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

human or inhuman; as an Xtian is free to become either or both, as whim suits the case. We may know something of the Redman when we say he ate of the buffalo, but he did not annihilate the buffalo. His presence was not suffering the admonition, "Multiply and subdue the earth". He left much standing with a good deal of reverence thrown in. Surely his life was simpler, and because it was, he was considered something different than what presumed over him. He had no drive, no desire to make something of himself. He did not move mountains, he revered them as temples of the Great Spirit. Although Pagans like the Greeks, with Mount Olympus, Cronus and Zeus, and all those yummy Gods and Goddesses, just not motivated to sculpt, write, and build acropolis'. Then there were the other heathens, Aztecs, Mayans, and Incas. That's another story. Why were the American Indians so shiftless? Did the Christian Spaniard show any appreciation for anything but the Yellow Metal? Any difference between a Spaniard and any of them other European X's?

Perhaps it is true the American Indian did not wish to share; he wanted to hog the place all to himself, like the elder sibling. Well his Pale Christian look-a-like took it away from him to make it after his own image; the latter was the stronger. In taking away, the Xtian emasculated the former, as any brotherly brother would do. ( not a brother you will say, but a mere savage, without a cross to bear). The final solution; never again. The conquest was complete; the heathen more or less eradicated. An ailment behind us; we await our deliverance. If any of us feel we are going through the pearly gates with those accomplishments, better think again. No amount of self-righteous Bible-Thumping will alter our unerring course to the infernal regions. We may congratulate ourselves here with the occasional indignant twinge, but I'm convinced we are headed on the rhumb line to hell fire and eternal perdition. The Redman was one phase, then there was the Blackman.

What gets me is how any Blackman can line up on the side of the Christian ethos. Perhaps its the pale blood in their veins. Origins smeared. Turning the other cheek?

We are going to perish and rot, from which neither a Christian God nor Mammon can save us.

Christians (as I have known most of them) have little functional conscience; instead they are often indignant, even to one another; they are doctrinaire dogmatists (some have earned a special place as ideological bigots). They are in the forefront of all our denials.

Mental Blocks and incipient Rigor Mortis of the gray matter. Being moralistic does not signify possession of a conscience, any more than underscoring the Bible makes of one what he assumes. Many Christians have presumed so much as to alienate family members who do not get the WORD. One supposes there is such a state as conditional Christianity; whatever works.

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

Would you rather deal with a Christian conscience or a savage mentality? Is it not a cultural thing? If a savage culture abides a particular ethic as a matter of principle inviolate, for which periodic tethered ostracism becomes the price for infractions, and often such is the case; how much different and less dependable the surround of materialistic, opportunistic and superficial Christianity, for which there is no punishment (on this Earth).

Oh Yes!, there are the fervid Christians, who place brother and sister along side themselves, as equals, as deserving of the 'Lord's' blessing as any other, regardless of their persuasions (ALL of the Lord's Children, fucked over or fucked up, as the case may be.).

Bullshit has been observed to attract flies.

The greatest and simplest single arbiter in the affairs of humanity is the Golden Rule. If you treat me like an asshole, then I get to treat you like an asshole. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is not a cruel and unusual punishment; The Golden Rule of the left hand. Of the right hand it is assumed if you treat your fellow as you would wish to be treated, then things will come out right (equilibrium); if you apply the other hand things will come out left or wrongly (disequilibrium).

One drawback; if you kill me first I can't kill you. Its kind of like the question asked of the aspiring medical student, "What do you know of genetics?"; the reply, "I couldn't reproduce if my parents hadn't."

Somehow I had got going on the American Indian thing again.

Mark was telling how often he had started out to write a story with a few characters, maybe thinking it would end shortly. But as he got going into the telling maybe more characters appeared or other events came along to lengthen the narrative, and before he knew it he was launched into a book-length epistle. He also wrote of the problems he encountered, starting with one set of characters, having got the reader interested in them, then, without rhyme nor reason, deserting some of them in the story's lurch, and perhaps the reader along with them. He had imagined disposing of all those appendaged characters, one after the other, arranging for them to fall into a well. Then he realized he had so many characters to eliminate, the well would not be able to contain them all, so he gave up on the idea, and simply abandoned the reader in an annoyed quandary. But afterwards he would attempt to remedy the situation by writing yet another story which might be intended to resolve the fate of the abandoned characters. Modern day media melodramas have no difficulty in knocking off (offing) characters as they move on to new opportunities in real life. The difference of course is that the melodramas are not into telling a story, but are into pedaling dubious short-lived 'consumer' goods. Crass commercialism. In Mark's time one might include mention of the Patent Medicine Man as a minor feature of the river

## ***Somehow this got titled BED***

or western landscape; and if an interesting enough character, provide sufficient space to pass on, in passing, his appreciative appraisal, without feeling a compulsion to dispose of him afterward. In short Mark didn't have to account the media in his story telling. The fact that Newspapers would be hawking wares on the side, perhaps provided an object of derision, or perhaps earned his greater indifference. And his characters, being more vital and integral to the a story being told, were indeed very difficult to dispose, unless one was writing of war, or a rampant disease, wherein sudden death might influence the outcome of the story. But usually this was taken into account before hand, in the planning stages of the story, and even may have been its source of inspiration.

I'm not a story teller. I am an observer, a social critic, and a philosopher, a scavenger of and ruminator of ideas; and a stalking horse for the future.

I make noise. I leap to conclusions. I try not to be two-faced.

I don't like to be branded by my utterances.

I do not like to be thought a liberal, or a socialist, or a utopian, or anti-democratic, because I advocate a certain kind of (hominid) behavior, and certain constraints upon other kinds of (hominid) behavior. We should all be required to define our terms, and not be allowed to make assumptions.

I believe I am not in a minority of one, and could never be a minority of one. Anyone's circumstances can become altered, thereby altering his or her perspective. This would not have anything to do with liberalism, socialism, or utopianism. IZZZUUUMMMitis.

We all speak of 'fairness', in one breath, because, in principle, we are all the beneficiaries of such a concept; but in the other breath, if we have achieved an advantage, we become protectors of the advantage, also duplicitous, conniving, rhetorical etc.. We do not choose to become unfair, we simply cease to speak of fairness; 'fairness' no longer exists as a concept.

As the advantaged, we often become complacently smug, dictating to those who have not. Having not is a condition that marks a person, and relegates him to a class within an hierarchy. We speak from a vested position, we are not to be trusted because of our conflict of interest.

Who can be trusted?

Are we all dangerously in conflict with our conflicts of interest? We make much of 'conflict resolution'. What this means is open to question. There are conflicts and there are conflicts. Its one thing to speak of attempting to slow the automobile traffic in one's neighborhood, and another to address the underlying causes of national or international social unrest.

If we wish to understand this plight, for it is a plight, we must look at the individual, we must look at ourselves. Understanding ourselves might provide us a clue.

We must know what we mean when we utter 'fairness'. And unless a person is totally inhuman (inhominid), or outhuman, as the case may be,



### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

and by that I mean totally separated in a cocoon, 'fairness' is a concept that will be recognized, if only as something one might affirm or deny depending upon what he feels he must yield to be party to the concept. If he has nothing to yield, he might assent immediately, "Sure, I'm all for fairness." Or he might anticipate being bound by his utterance, to his disadvantage, thereby exercising a cagey caution. He does not want to be numbered amongst those who would be called upon to support a position in perpetuity; he would make it conditional. Is he a weasel? Or is he just being prudent?

I tend to identify strongly with the so-called 'underclass'. Once you label an individual as belonging to a class, and in this case, the 'underclass' you have effectively denied him. You have unwittingly or intentionally made him responsible for his condition.

You fear his condition for yourself. That fear compromises your sensitivity, your 'human'ity and your better judgment.

We tend to sit ensconced within our somewhat comfortable self-understood temporal milieu making pronouncements with regard to the others who have not arrived, and who persist in being the object of our pronouncements. We are indeed demigods who wish to make others in the image of ourselves. We wish to do this with pronouncements rather than actions that would assure that all would indeed become as oneself.

Perhaps some of what I am writing is a reaction to the 'change' in our congressional makeup that thinks it has a mandate, or at least its golden opportunity, to effect its 'dubious' agenda. It has conspicuously not chosen the term 'fairness' for fear of compromising its agenda, through challenges to its definition of the term.

As an aside, this is, of course, a very temporary condition for 'the nation' in terms of the agenda's inherent philosophy. Although I am a cynic (a person too long exposed to the separation of word and deed, and all the associated equivocation and circumlocution in between), I harbor beliefs (futile though they may be) that augur to the forefront of these cogitations, and become preeminent amongst them. I elect to believe in them because I do not wish to believe the opposite of them. And again, it is the honesty with which I must view my own individuality that leads me to feel there is something to believe; and not because of some outside agent, like the Almighty for instance. It is something that emerges from what I also believe is in our best interest, believing that conflict serves no purpose. The dinosaurs are all dead, the dreaded wild animals are virtually all dead; we have left to fear volcanoes, earthquakes, cyclones, hurricanes tornadoes, floods, the cold and the heat; the perturbations of our planet; but MOST OF ALL, our fellow man.

What I believe then hinges upon this notion of 'fairness'. And yes, this may have to do with my predisposition to view myself as part of a class to which I do not choose to belong, for fear of the stigma associated with it. Why do I care about the stigma? I care because it denies all the other things

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

that might be me and that rank me with any other human as both a human and as an equally rightful occupant of this planet. Should not my opinion of myself be sufficient in this case, if I know truly who I am? Those who are in 'control' would force me to answer this question in the affirmative, and might even temporize, "Man does not live by bread alone."

I recognize I am very circular in my arguments; and always return to the same point of departure, which is generally summed in two basic statements: "The one shall not have dominion over the other", and "The Least must be considered the measure of the effectiveness of any system of government." 'Fairness', 'conflict resolution', 'conflict of interest'

'advantage', 'class', 'label', 'stigma', 'belief', 'individuality', 'agenda; the parade of utterances marches by.

Identifying with the underclass places one in a position of shaping and testing one's beliefs. One realizes the 'problems' of the underclass are immense. As a nation, as a species, as conscionable

individuals, we are confronted with something that is part of us also. We cannot ignore that which looks like us. Even though we may say to ourselves, 'This does not mirror me', 'I am above this', we have slipped into a denial of a basic empathy, which, as we do say, not only denies our self implicitly, but also alters the scope of our humanity. We become the lesser animal, no longer the hope, but merely something that survives within a tenuousness of prejudices and a fortress of denials of life. We limit our identification to a milieu, to an artificial strata that satisfies our egos. When we shut off the empathy and relegate it to rationalizations, temporizings, lip services, equivocations, moral judgments, we have become something lesser because we have closed ourselves off from that which confronts us; we have walled ourselves in.

One makes judgments about the underclass that tend to make it responsible for its condition, and make it a rule of thumb, a fated inevitable circumstance;. that's where they belong with their low life, their groveling selves, their chosen ignorance, their lack of motivation to 'climb' out of their quagmire. GOD DAM it, I am not my brother's keeper, but I am going to make sure that this repository of junk humanity, and social retards, stays where it is, and does not interfere with or become a drain upon my life.

We, I, cannot ignore Number. Number becomes an uncontestable, incontrovertible testimony for all we might associate with it -redundancy. In one breath, in one context, we are declaring all of life has meaning; we might even declare all of life to be precious; in another we are shrinking from the implications of too many, too much; our sensitivity to the other becomes dulled, obviously apprehensive of the immense weight of that huge colossus dwarfing each and every one of us, making each one of us irrelevant.

The Big Picture; much larger than this one I attempt to elucidate. But in the last analysis, while reduced to its smallest integer, the individual, we have become absorbed and lost in the fleet of mouth who yammer in

### ***Somehow this got titled BED***

Ideologies; First, Second and Third Worlds; in Upper, Middle, Lower, and Under Class; In Minorities, Ethnicities, Religiosities. If that isn't enough we are confronted with dubious questions of Morality. All these are externals that tend to encourage factions, and divisive, conflicting interests - to what end?

Given our treatment of life - living forms; as a species we are shown to be ambivalent, killing indiscriminately on the one hand, while preserving and protecting on the other. Is that it, are we reserving the right to do as we wish, without being restrained by inconvenient principles? Any rationalization that, in the moment, will serve our interests?

Beyond the pale of this discussion? Civilization and its Discontents?

For the lack of a better example and a better word to describe what we have, do we really settle upon 'Civilization', without defining it by the extant example, stripping it of its idealism? Do we forsake the criteria because this is all we got, and this is all we're gonna get? In short, do we reserve any part of the ideal, or do we acknowledge our compromised circumstance?

I continually return to a narrow focus. The individual. If the makeup of the individual cannot be compromised into something that is best for the all, how can we expect anything better of that individual when he is put in a place of public trust? Self-serving to the end? How can we avoid being at each other throats? How can we avoid anarchy and revolution?

Fear and Control?

Abortion/Right To Life Issue; more an emotional than a moral or rational issue.

Prayer In Schools.

Pledge Allegiance. Welfare.

Bedlam?!?!?