

## ***The Island***

### **XII**

### **The Island**

#### What Are You Worth?

**W**hat are you WORTH? You become drawn, sucked in, (Venturi-like), because you want to belong, then you get vortexed in (I'm now generalizing within the capitalistic milieu which would serve to illustrate any 'otherthan' milieu), you get sucked into a system of human interactions or human understandings that involve capital and contracts, a world into which you enter because that is the world that exists, that world existing as an investment in an hierarchy of collateralizations and Worths.

So - what are you WORTH? - not as a bag-full of embraces, or smiles, or tendernesses, or kindnesses, Hates, but what are you WORTH in the coin of the realm - how increase your WORTH (accumulatively, acquisitively) in, within, through the coin of the realm as an accretion? How maintain your WORTH? WORTH is the gambit toward which all our strife becomes focused; this extension in conformity is intended to become the YOU, without which there is no YOU.

If only this would lead toward something better (IF ONLY). A System of Comparatives, of betterthaneses, superlatives (and superfluties).

WORTH, measured in these terms, exclusively outside, materialistic, devastatingly impersonal, WORTH becoming synonymous with SURVIVAL, so construed, produces the most bitter alienation. It is our own invention; I say 'our', because not to do so might leave one to believe that this manner of conducting our lives was indelibly etched upon the heavenly spheres; nay! it is 'our' very own criteria for survival amongst ourselves; dogs and cats don't have it together enough to care..

Yon may perceive this as another rant if you like; let me assure you it proceeds from a deep conviction, based, albeit, in 'our' equalitarian ethic, which is developed, perhaps more keenly 'felt' or discovered, in those who find themselves on a treadmill, impossibly indebted, forever consigned to paupertuity. Victims! Too late to moralize! The system does not admonish self control; it does everything to encourage the opposite, because once indebted, more substance is garnered for the system and those who benefit by it. All become set in concrete, beneficiary and Victim alike. Well, doubtlessly, although this assessment appears short, it is a long story.

While one could launch into the story or stories of the Victims, I wish to persist in my own little sphere of tangents that bear on 'philosophy', I suppose, mostly derived from a desire to find a way of operating outside the argument rather than from within the argument i.e., which aims to deny the validity of our interiority, .

I may harbor other convictions based upon certain observations, from which I could or would construct another picture of reality, i.e., we are

## **What Are You Worth**

not alike in the particulars, therefore we may not all be equal in the particulars.

Given this, what may I be permitted to construct in the way of a Universal look-a-like? Would I be allowed to generalize; or must I succumb to arguments based upon the particulars, denying any 'generic' type?

In the first case, the deep conviction based on the equalitarian ethic; this finds its origins subjectively, but easily serves as an objective construct founded in meanings inherent in language, i.e., a defined entity which is less open to interpretation than the ethic based upon it. Thus, in the first case, equality means equal; equal means equal; it does not mean something else, i.e., we do not equate a human life in terms of material WORTH, only in so far as each human finds equality in materiality. But to say one's material WORTH equates with power, superiority, better-than-ness, success, denial of others, is to emphasize inequality and the particulars to the detriment of the whole, i.e. the Universal. Old Argument? (We are discussing practicalities at this juncture) (Are we now?).

What, pray tell, is the Universal (is that like a joint, a pivot, or is it something we can easily recognize)? No, It is not something we are easily able to recognize. It is something we must define in order to account each life, human life, as equal to any other human life in relation to the perception, first of all, as a life, secondly, as a human life - in relation to a concept of both, inclusively. Words? More Words? The use of words, as tools to fashion logical constructs, calls for a proper presentation of the constructs, an 'ear' to funnel, and aid in the assimilation of them, and an assent to them as constructs.

I would hope to persuade in order to gain assent to some constructs, in order that we may develop some notion of equality that will apply to the Universal human as a life, then as a human. If WORTH is to become a consideration, it must answer to several interpretations, not just mere material WORTH.

Material WORTH, and human WORTH must be separated as a vital construct in the establishing of the basic notion of equality, lest there be no equality, but only an enforceable inequality.

Enforceable Inequality is what exists in reality.

To say that we are each or all presented with, equally, political, social, and economic rights, is, first of all, to lie, or misrepresent in the face of reality. While we all recognize and assent (pay lip service) to this notion as pertains to ourselves, our self inherently, in our prejudices, our bigotry, our righteousness, Envy, GREED, EGO, et al, we do everything we are able to deny the same to others; not because we cannot respond to the notion, once it is pointed out to us that we hypocritically violate our own precept, but because we are fearful of something. We feel more assured in our fortifications, such as they are; assured of what? is the

## ***The Island***

question. What are we, pack rats?, or humans, or something of each. We are baubles, trinkets, middenites. We are diamonds, gold, real estate; surfaces; currency, securities. Take your clothes off - Show me!! 125 mm long, 25 mm diameter, bent to one side; she said of our leader whom she had serviced in the broom closet.

We are also deniers of our fellow man. We thus ask to be denied, according to the oddly inverted GOLDen rule. "let 'em deny us, we are fortified against them" Is that the reply? You give to charity, because you are 'charitable'; you ease your conscience (apart from your tax deduction); you help to balance the equation. Buying time; soliciting favors; Paving the road to Heaven? Philanthropic? Wonderful! Three Cheers!

Consider yourself revealed, a survivor without precepts or convictions, but an upholder of a status quo that is invested in the power of the state, in a state of enforceable inequality which Rhetoric, perhaps vested Law, (other abuses of the language) will persist in re-enforcing - in lieu of the constant application of a physical force, enforcing, as it were, inequality.

If you will note, not once did I use the word love or share; I did not wish to sound either too idealistic, too Christian, too utopian. I want you to admit to yourself that the GOLDen rule is mere convenience or scruple in argument, and in application its real truth lie in its risky inversion i.e. "do unto him before he hath done unto me" Hence the requirement of the Fortresses. SDI.

"A man's home is his castle" (This statement, in its own right, bears some analysis, but for the moment I'll employ it at its face value).

Is also "A man's hovel his castle"? - a man's tent, shack, cave, backpack, blanket, sleeping bag, cabin, apartment, - his castle?

Does 'home' imply ownership?

What is a man WORTH if he does not own a, or, his home? What is he WORTH if he lives on the commons?

If a man owns is he WORTH taxes?

If a man does not own is he WORTH rent?

As men, which is each WORTH - is one WORTH more than the other?

If a man makes his bed (squats) on the commons and pays neither rent nor taxes, what is he WORTH?

Is the corporation executive WORTH more than the hobo? Go ahead - answer the question.

What is the measure? The externals - what are the aspects of non-being?

I know we cannot part with our baubles; whether or not they are rare or common. Since we have 'bought the argument' that externals and extensions are part of us, even though it can be clearly demonstrated they are not part of us - well, let's see - when the holocaust comes, or

## **What Are You Worth**

came, one was (is) instructed to carry his family valuables (an instruction that was not necessary, since that is what we do anyway) - almost in a pathetic fashion - to wit, the descriptions of people On The March, having to leave behind on the roadway, this, that and the other as their burden becomes too heavy; until they are left with only the vestiges of nothing. Recall the Flight To Arras.

I recall the end of Nicolas II and Alexandria. Alexandria had secreted upon her person some of the "Crown" Jewels. After the family had been shot, the chore of disposal of the bodies involved dismemberment of the bodies which was done with axes, without not removing the clothing. Mention was made of chopping through and destroying (inadvertently?) many of the Crown Jewels. (An opportunity missed?) (Too tumescently engorged with blood?) A rather awkward crude impersonal equalization in that - eh wot?

Peasants, soldiers, killing, dismembering, destroying royalty and its accouterments in a blind savage extermination (and reprisal); children too, in 1918 A. D. How much reverence, how much envy, how much utter desperate hatred?

Let's begin again.

See what awaits you if you ever get caught outside the fortress!!. And your baubles - what do they avail thee? What does your eminent WORTH avail thee? How large the fortress?

As hinted, the purposes for achieving WORTH are dubious at best, a vested argument; Laws appearing as arbitrary constructs invented by the vested interest, invented to conjure and protect their, let's face it, exclusive empire; their midden. For example, wage and price controls are posited to interfere with the Free Market, where it must be interpreted we are given the latitude to screw the hell out of each other, i.e. exploit one another (are we all so motivated? How Many?). Wage and price controls do not make the world Safe for Democracy. Inflation makes the world WORTHless for Everybody. How can anyone make a buck when the bleeding hearts are always crying foul?

If we are all WORTH the same as Human BEINGS, exceptional lives, feeling a kinship therein, altruistically to be sure, we ascribe to a pretext "Do unto others as you would be done by". Only it is a lie, (a misrepresentation) it is what one can get away with that counts - and becomes, and is, the truer reality because we do not mean what we say. We pay lip service, and instead of 'being done by' we erect fortresses: MAD SDI, in order 'not to be done by'. What is it that we know or suspect about others; are they like us?

Yes!, in the Free Market we have the opportunity to do what our fellow man has done to us - exploit him and screw him - the perfect perversion (some version) of the precept, reiterated: "I will do unto him before he hath done unto me." ALL in the name of a superficial WORTH (take your

## ***The Island***

clothes off); such is the value we have placed upon life as a collective body. Whatever the market will bear. (Of course, you realize this is a shambles, and cannot possibly last). The force of arms cannot prevail against the basic injustice. The AXE awaits thee; one continually must be alert for the sound, the sound of the hob-nails. The sound of the Low end of the market. Pauperism arisen!

If it was not for the daily requirement of each of us to survive, if it was not for that simple fact alone, if we could extricate ourselves from the mindless conformity which we have esteemed to be vital to our survival, then we could revolt, en masse, against this exploitation, this conspiracy of capital and the market place, the bankers, and other controlling vested interests (corporations, the wealthy, the powerful because of their linkage to these and their persuasions upon government (Yep they gotta take the heat, all uv 'em), then we might have an opportunity to determine or define a different basis for WORTH founded in a different definition to our Humanity - that palpable presence. (A little bit idealistic - but so what?). Not, in making the world safe for democracy and making of this a more perfect union. (Regard what Keating did with your capital [dempfuckery]!!)

Instead of revolt, per se, and all that might entail, we could opt for the boycott. Question is: Are you WORTH enough to boycott the whole perpetration, the whole edifice, to therefore withdraw from the argument? Passively resist!

Not less would the requirement exist for us to survive in order to give cogency and substance to our own argument, not less would some imperative exist to develop order from chaos, an organized way to account the stirrings of the masses - not as a heap - but as an aggregation of individuals, of palpable presences.

Do we allow each individual to choose his own criteria for survival? Do we impose something from the outside, in the manner preceding? Do we allow the circumstance of man to become a free-running amok, that seeks its own levels, its own stratifications, its own natural inequalities (somewhat differently from the present - if you please - for Cripes Sake!)? SDI makes certain it will never happen.

What am I or are you prepared to accept as an outside - er.. social cohesiveness to allay the chaos. "Not this! NOT THIS!!", you might say.

How so order it differently to account your palpable presence? An ancient dilemma, certainly unsolved within the hierarchy of WORTH, and certainly unsolved still in the 20th Century.

If WORTH is the aim and the measure, only operating within arbitrary constraints (laws construed as universal) known to exist for the protection of the vested interests, then there can be no real argument against other equally arbitrary inventions construed to aim for the measure, artificially invented and ascribed as WORTH; it is always the

## **What Are You Worth**

argument that is put forth by the Royalty of Haves, "If not Bondage, at least Emulation."

Whatever a man does to achieve WORTH, being only arbitrarily construed, to allow and protect the doings of the ESTABLISHED, then what is to prevent growing and trafficking as a route to WORTH? We know, if the ESTABLISHED found 'material advantage' in growing and trafficking (as they might do in any case) (let's say, as does that other entity within the ESTABLISHED 'MAFIA'; like the Panamanian Drug connection to the US Gov't)), because it enhanced ones WORTH, measured only materially, then it would arbitrarily and necessarily (even through legislative process - 'the blessing') become a means toward obtaining or gaining WORTH. Consequences are not relevant.

WORTH is the empty vessel, the impalpable presence that attempts to bring order out of chaos.

"How Come?"

"Hah! Does anyone care?"

How short of chaos have we arbitrated ourselves?

One last word; while somewhat mad, rambling and specious in argument, I cannot leave off without posing to you the appearances of a paradox in offering your life to the first argument: to order the 'chaos' by accepting the status quo, not as though you did not have a choice, but as an interesting gambit; but realize now, you will become none the less indebted to it, perhaps in good faith, but your WORTH will still be a promised thing, that being the cause that enlists your participation. But alas!, down the road, through no fault of your own, the perception of WORTH has become altered, deliberately; you have been betrayed as the status quo proposes a new argument; i.e. the promise of WORTH is (was) only fulfilled in the moment, but you are indebted, through that moment of weakness, to your junkpile, your shoddy midden, for the balance of your life; after the indebtedness has been secured, you are abandoned to yesterday. That relative WORTH of today was not a promissory note to the future, the only promise to the future is the debt irremediably. The contract obliges you to stick with the bargain, even though what it promised - WORTH - is not attained. And in the end even if you had attained some of it in a hallucinatory way, i.e. believing you had done so, madly ordinating reality to convince yourself of something that was not true - still, would not all have happened to you externally? Tell me what has happened within! What is the measure? (At this point you might want to read Thumping penned by this same author.)

As you may correctly observe, the author has become sidetracked; a propensity of his, feeling always, like the Famed Windmilling Exemplar, the impulse to remedy something that persistently gnaws at him. In flashes of anger, insight, passion, and frenzies of worded

## *The Island*

bafflement, he undertakes to draw an arc across the transept of the heavens. Tally Ho!

You will rightly, justifiably, inquire, "What has any of this to do with the Island, since notions and dialectic of this kind could not stand the test of even the kitchen table; one would soon be found abandoned to babbling his gibberish to himself. All in the realm of the esoteric then; flaunting reality.

The perception of WORTH becomes a consideration upon the Island, only because one can never be inconspicuous with his materiality. When it has become apparent that an obvious (perhaps ostentatious) increase in materiality has evidenced itself, speculation arises as to the availability of means with which such increase has been devised, managed, acquired. 'No Visible Means Of Support' is presumed to harbor its own set of rules which speculation richly embellishes.

One 'measures' things by themselves, by the externals in this case, not excluding oneself as an external (the Exemplary).

Measure #1: That increase in materiality could not have been achieved by that individual with what is known he does with himself during the daylight hours.

Measure #2: That increase in materiality, I could not achieve in several years, given what it is I think he does with himself during daylight hours, our attributes being equal in most respects thus enabling me to labor as effectively as he, even allowing for some differences in our resources.

Measure #3: That increase in materiality could not have been achieved by any known standard external to either one of us operating within any known parameters.

Therefore it is assumed some illicit means are involved in creating and obtaining that magnitude of materiality.

The baronial part, the hiring of Island labor, quiets the indignation and lessens the alarm; everyone's hands become tainted in the pay off - and besides, Who Cares? Really, Who Cares? The Kitchen Table? As a matter of principle?

"**CHEATERS!!!**", she declaims.

The table has heard her denunciation, the confession, the expiation. There is an implacable anger arising from a sense of unfairness. "Unfair because we have, others have, labored so hard to uphold and observe some little thing that we have, on a scale measured in terms of our resources, our own labor, undertaken with a certain perception of 'conforming', if you will, to a principle, be it a legal or moral constraint. That is, we have not contravened the precept in order to achieve this something which we are, or have, if you will." "The Cheaters have violated that precept (our precept), they have trafficked; anyway that is the assumption (lacking prima fascia evidence)."

"One might marvel at the conjuror. But he is suspect - to the degree - that in violating the legal and moral precept he has endangered

## **What Are You Worth**

someone other than himself, someone unknown to him, but someone who appears as a statistic, the end user for whom he assumes no responsibility. He is 'only' a trafficker, not a pusher; he has no clients that are users. Its all very impersonal, like the computerized launch of a nuclear warhead."

"Are we to further speculate that if he contravenes one convention, would he not contravene another to assure a continuum of the first, i.e., must we guard against the "connection" in defense of imaginary threats to it? If we speak against the illicit, do we risk the intervention of the proverbial mafia 'Contract'.

"There are those who maintain one must always be on guard." The Inquisition abates for the moment.

He that has overheard inquires.

"Is that all you have to do on this Island - yammer over the kitchen table? Gossip does us all in, eh what? We all fall heir to some assessment, whether or not we court it. Is it not just a matter whether or not you get caught? We claim to place principles and scruples above self-interest. Are we not just a bit cowardly; or do you really imagine that you are upholding a society and a civilization by not violating certain of its mores, its Moses edicts? Ought not your virtue be more highly accorded and rewarded than the those others who have no scruples or principles? How have we come by this obversion that malfeasance opportunizes a fatted purse, while feausance must go about with hat in hand. Is it not just a matter of opportunity, and what one deems are his prerogatives with regard to it? You will claim your scruples and principles are worth more than something else. The something else that seems to invite envy. If an apparently kindly and philanthropic man, who was unknown to you, was to appear upon the scene, would you set out to discover the source of his bounty? Lets say he appeared as well to exemplify and personify all the social graces and virtues. Would you question his prerogative to be all the things he appeared to be? If he was known to be a crook, must he also act the part, the part that your imaginings ascribe to him; must he sport a scowl, a scar, an evil presence; must he announce himself?. Is it what a man does, or what he has done? Look at what the Charismatics, the Kingdomites, the Reconstuctionists have done in the name of all that's Holy; there are many others of a spiritual persuasion who are in league with these, trafficking in one kind of Lord or other. Indeed one might well ask if one kind of blatant immorality excuse another? The answer may very well be Yes! If its all a matter of opportunity and who gets there first, for whatever impetus serves. I suppose if we know or would admit to ourselves how it is we view he that sits richly ensconced upon the hill as opposed to he that resides in lowly poverty without knowing the tenets each holds dear, then we might know something of what we are worth and whereof we might speak with authority."