

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

ASIDE For later incorporation. (from PSA 2.4)

Are we missing something? Is there something that should be obvious that is not? I ask this question after noting the number of serious publications and organizations dealing with the 'environment'. Most of these publications and organizations are informing us of our disregard for our natural habitat. They are claiming we cannot convert every square inch into asphalt, nor can we exploit every square inch of planet by transforming it into a servile production machine for our greater accretion and aggrandizement.

There are those who would detract from these publications and organizations, attacking and accusing those proponents as seeking a privileged occupation of the planet.

We might acknowledge that life in general is a series of adaptations (caroms) to what is here, to what is available. A bit self-consciously we might also acknowledge that we ought hypothetically conduct our affairs with an awareness of balance, that is, living in accordance with nature, however we assess that balance, and however we assess the nature of nature. The objective would be not to take away without putting something back, or not to take away if it in any way disturbs that hypothetical balance, balance of nature, as some might identify it.

We might envision ourselves as husbandmen of the planet, that much at least, while recognizing our inability to effect much in the larger universe, where the forces so much exceed and excel our own. And even most of those forces that influence the daily round of our very own habitat are beyond our control. These at least we might acknowledge.

We might even stupidly and naively argue that mother nature does more to disrupt the planet than ever man could. Man might become contentious with mother nature. He might employ his mighty nuclear arsenal to try to blow up the moon, so there would no longer be tides in the oceans. Well, why not? Did you ask, why such absurdity?

There are other absurdities being promoted that would reduce the planet to a 'standard of living', and all the rhetoric that goes into the promotion of a such a notion. Even before we arrive at that notion we might consider what is a 'standard of living' and should it apply to all uniformly; that is, before we decide to convert the planet to such a use.

But we are not interested in rhetoric, are we? Are we really interested in sharing the wealth; or uniformly applying the standard, if that states it more appropriately? Nor are we really interested in those who deem themselves wiser than nature, even better than nature. For example: The old growth forest is doomed

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

to decay and death, eventually. So why not cut down the old growth, and utilize a forest product rather than waste it. Then we will replant with our super species in its place. Even an improvement on the old 'sustained yield' concept. Well, if this bit of intelligent persuasion does not work, we will argue another way, "Don't think of it as less later, but more now." Or, "In fifty years, no one will know the difference". Plausible arguments? To some, yes!

And more recently, the 'multiple use' concept. Utilization of forest products, recreation, and wilderness protection. Plausible?

Man is a cagey animal. He doesn't like to be pinned down. He wants to reserve the right to exploit, regardless of the consequences. Sometimes he might even desire to relieve his conscience; but don't be fooled.

Well, now that we recognize man for what he is, how do we get rid of him? I mean how do we save the planet for those that remain? Those? You mean all those except man? If the foe shits, wear it! So our foes get to inherit the planet. What makes them better than us? *Non compos mentis*, with a complete disregard for the planet. Well, you know, there's disregard and then there's beau disregard. $E=mc^2$. **E Everybody** (fucking over the planet) = **m muthafuckas c conundrum squared**. Every body who fucks over the planet becomes a motherfucker (fucker of mother earth). Conundrum is another word for riddle (the search for true light). The planet is riddled with light that is rapidly escaping us, inversely proportional to the wisdom that is ever-increasing. What's the difference between a riddle and riddle? Is the difference important? Is it possible there is an **indifference**? I mean could we save the planet, if we solved the riddle or riddled the planet (would the mass of the ass be equal to the blast of the gas)? We need to unriddle, that is we need to rid, as earlier suggested. Get rid of...! Get riddle of. Actually **Albert Einstein** had hoped to enlighten us concerning the expanding universe in order to explain **chaos** (rapidly disappearing enlightenment). He proposed whatever happens becomes relative. But further explanation eludes us when we consider that E Energy, that is, **Energy** is Equal to a **Mass of Motherfuckers x Chaos x itself**. When you use the power of ten to its second place, you have only approximated the amount of disorder that existed before it became Chaos, hence the relative distribution of explanations irrelevant to a purposeless existence, a heap of muthafuckas. Squaring is only an approximation. In reality, how many motherfuckas are required to chaotically disembowel mother? And is it a matter of energy? Even if one used all his relatives, or so-called begats?

You get the gist of things I am sure. Relative to the success of the formula is the amount of **indifference** to the outcome of its

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

prediction that would accelerate its significance. In other words, the incorrect power of ten may have been improperly applied. **Indifference** squared would have a powerful effect on the outcome. Sooner than later. So those who claim “Think of it as **More Now** instead of **Less Later**”, may know something the rest of us do not. That is, they have a better understanding of relativity than the rest of us. I hope this adequately explains the (in)difference between disregard and disregard. What a non compos entity disregards compared to a compos entity disregarding. Being more of purist than a politician, Einstein’s formula does not account the compos disregard. The effects are incalculable. Total destruction reduces all formulations to **Zero**.

Albert Einstein was a mathematician dealing in abstracts. He sought absolutes in equations, but had to settle for relativity. If he had applied his skills to reality instead of relativity, he might have developed a more useful formula for mankind. He might have attempted to predict how long the planet could endure homo sapiens making something out of nothing. He could have begun with a foregone conclusion that **E Everybody** wants to make something out of nothing. He could have calculated a host of finite resources **fr** times a sliding scale of constants. Knowing that fornication would produce more (remember him – *more*, well maybe it’s a her) attempting to make something out of nothing, he was obliged to enter the variable fornication constant, assuming an ever increasing number which would result in accelerating toward the hypothetical end point of **Zero**. He realized a balanced equation was an impossibility, unless all **Zero** results were to be construed as representing a balance (all used up, adds up to **Zero** unequivocally). If the end result is nonetheless true, how can one ignore its implications? Scientists have been known to consider a **Zero** result as meaningful as any other result. His rationalizations are none too different than the rationale of the exploiter who claims: “Don’t think of it as less later, but more now”. The x ploiter is not concerned with the **Zero** because he calculates it will not occur during his lifetime; same goes for he who he who he who hooo hooo hooo claims that in fifty nobody will know the diff.

This may be a problem set for an econo-misty. But lets see what us rudimentary arithmeticians come up with.

$E^{fr^{c(n)}}rc=0$ That is: **E Everybody x Finite Resources x Fornication Constant (Variable Number) x Rate of Consumption Constant = An Escalating Number (exponential rise toward) Zero (0)**. I guess it does not require the genius of a mathematician or an econo-misty to tell us where it’s at. Something out of nothing, that is,

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

everybody trying to make his fortune out of a finite resource (**mother**) will eventually result in **Zero (0)**. The three rrrs (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle) can't hold a candle to greed. Greed transcends the conscience responsible for the formula. The expedient triumphs over principle. Tomorrow! Tomorrow! Tomorrow! eventually does become tomorrow.

Obviously we have discovered a truly balanced equation, or a perfect solution.

There can be no calculation made for endangered species, because they are eliminated by **Indifference**. Perhaps I had intended, by **Inference**.

So lets fuck mother earth. When the Minotaur got the legs of a bull, he also got other parts of the anatomy; the guy with the longest pecker wins in the market. (Anybody ever seen a bear's pecker)? He used to say it was diameter that mattered. Who said that? He did! But bear's are losers, regardless of length or diameter. She didn't say that. The long or the short of being fucked does not increase with the diameter. It's the thought that counts. But it is opined 'a stiff prick has no conscience'; fornication works toward the desired end point; human binks are constantly being titrated and precipitated into the environment (into solution) at an ever-increasing rate toward saturation, then super-saturation.

The writing is crude, as is the subject matter. All the publications and organizations that concern themselves with rape are ineloquent when it comes to describing the act. If they were more eloquent, they might become more persuasive in ending of the brutality of homo sapiens with regard to its mother.

Think again fella. The change in the pocket is nigh the center of eroticism. Jingle is close to tingle; just requiring a little refinglering.

Durchanek, when you go on a tear, you just don't let up.

Its like this; somewhere along the line I began using words like 'harmony', even as it applied to places that might not be considered paradise; like the earth, for example. 'Living in harmony with environment'. Now what in bejeeezzuuus gawt damned could I possibly mean by that? It sounds like one of those Democrat Bills put before Congress in order to protect the Wilderness. Only James Light Bulb (volts x amperes) construes another meaning than the one intended. Harmony acquires new meaning to the After Rapture fundamentalist. The Em-fass-sis is upon the up beat instead of the down beat. The word itself had

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

become polluted. There's this harmony and there's disharmony. To the utilizer, perfect harmony is achieved when his objective is gained. So living in harmony with the environment to a person who doesn't give a shit about the environment only contrasts dis kind of harmony with dat kind of harmony. Disharmony Datharmony; a little bit of dis and a little bit of dat. What we identify as the first Law Of Solution or the Law of First Solution (Solution of the First Law, anybody?). What is the First Law? There's only gummy law, or lip law; law without teeth. Anybody who who who whooo fucks over the environment gets pitched into the bottomless canyonder. Environment contains a broad meaning, not a narrow meaning.

That goes to say anybuddy who who who whooo attempts to convert the planet into the generation of wealth gets pitched, no mitigating circumstances. 'Providing Jobs!' That's bullshit.

They had yakked at us about the separation of powers, then they yakked at us about separation of church and the state as though these notions actually were in force, when in fact all forces of wealth were conspiring to reunite them. Its so the new religion of Capitalism could persuade government to do its bidding. Capitalism and democracy are not synonymous, in fact they are not even remotely connected; so be careful how you think and speak. Sancho would claim that 'Money is the root of all evil'. We have heard the yak about subversive government, about subversives and about subversion, without ever once applying it to ourselves. The whole idea of campaign contributions, paid (and otherwise) lobbyists intimately walking the halls of government, of political payoffs, influence peddling, is not only a manifest attempt at subversion, it is an offense to the dutiful voter in a 'democratic' form of government. When proclaiming aloud about ourselves and our great mission in life, like crusaders, do gooders, missionaries, exemplary this or that, we claim we are spreading the word of the demos. But in fact Capitalism cannot function alongside Democracy. Capitalism requires enslavement, enslavement of the masses to the manufacturing of wealth, and consumption of its goods (or bads, as the case may prove). It is clear that Capitalism and democracy are not compatible. Capitalism cannot exist without exploitable resources, both human and planetary. Raw labor and raw materials. Tell me where this fits into a democratic concept. Voting to see who who who whooo gets to fuck you?

Oh sure we all go along with it because we get a pittance; we're no better'n they are; we get bought off with baubles. Shoddy goods and P.O. is what we settle for. We're involved in a system of banks and landlords, passed off as the true way 'our way of life'. We don't have the substance required for something better, nor the guts to fight for it. We are acquiescent out of fear, fear of loss of our

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

bauble, and fear of being shot for insurrection. Fucking useless is what we are, and mother earth suffers because most everybuddy is too chicken to fight for her. There is no shame for a ravished mother. It's a pile on, a gang bang! He who who who whooo is not guilty, cast away.

Our visceral responses dictate our shortsightedness.

As I had begun, the allusion to publications and organizations that direct their energies toward conservation and preservation of a fast-disappearing environment, cannot and do not prevail against the forces that conspire to convert that environment into the noble pursuit of creating a standard of living.

We have to realize that these publications and organizations would not exist if there was not also a problem.

Being a complete ignoramus in the area of human persuasion, I cannot recommend any particular method of communication to bring about a desired result. The publications argue persuasively for a certain course of action to reverse the predations of mother nature. And organizations concerned with conservation and preservation make manifest their purpose as well as supply an up to date record of the predations; as well as the results of their activities.

But many of us are not convinced. Even if we might be persuaded that an attrition and alteration of the environment is occurring, we calculate that as long as the end result = **Zero** does not occur in our lifetime, despite what we might gummy lip away about the grandkids, we are not concerned.

Lately we have heard a lot about Evil, the Axis of Evil, in another context. But when we apply high-minded principles to others, we ought (Yes!, we ought) also apply high-minded principles to ourselves. It is plainly Evil to fuckover (do a makeover of) mother earth. The same people who speak of the one are in fact the promoters of the other.

I cannot get away from the obscenities simply because my cynicism will not allow reasoned argument to be forestalled. I use the resource that I figure will get the attention, and create the necessary response. But I am not fooled into believing that any response is the proper response.

If I felt that the use of the fouler language, because of its generally offensive nature was and is more to the point, or letssay, more effective, then I will use it. A well reasoned argument may put many people to sleep because the inferences in the argument are not serving their interests.

The ultimate end of all argument, whether fair or foul, is to persuade one's fellow man that punishment is a real thing that

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

MUST be implemented. Alternatively, banishment from the planet, or to its remotest, most formidable Netherlands. The list of transgressions must be formed, along with their very real penalties; the severer the better. I do not propose cutting off a guy's cock because he fucks over mother earth; but it might not be unwise to relieve him of his testosterone, along with the fruits of his ill-gotten gains. Sorry, its gotta be done. The public pillory is highly recommended. Anything that will get the Evil vermin their just desserts.

Doubt must favor the mother. In other words, anything suspected of polluting the environment, whether or not proven in the causal relationship i.e. cause and effect relationship, must not be allowed to be discharged into the environment. Simple; when in doubt, don't.

We know that the industrialization of the planet has produced both known and unknown pollutants. We allow ourselves the latitude of tolerable or permissible levels of trace elements, arguing that our daily existence, without industrialization, is still exposed to unknowns in the environment. At least, that is the assumption, and also the argument put forth by the polluters as justification (rationale) for their estimation of the releasing 'trace' elements. The total load on the environment of each and every trace element is not part of the calculation.

I believe the assumption has to be made that any manufacturing process produces a load on the environment, whether or not specifically measurable. Tolerable or permissible levels begin on day one; after 100 years of loading the environment, the numbers have to be revised downward. We are speaking now of half-lives, slow breakdowns, accumulative effects, and a host of other unknowns to do with reactivity of substances compounded by the ever-increasing load.

Besides depleting the planet in the name of profit, the wrong argument in my opinion, mankind is altering the planet both by an essentially irreplaceable depletion, and by the chemistry of waste, to which any living organism must adapt. We think of adaptation as a relatively long process. If the adaptive process is short circuited, we cannot predict the result. We might use laboratory animals in testing some of this; that is, the grosser effects to produce grosser changes. I think it is wrong to assume that subtle changes will not effect the adaptive process. I think it more prudent to assume that any unnecessary change to an environment where the adaptive process has slowly oscillated over generations, would mess with the order of things.

If I was to allow my underlying cynical nature to assume its true shape, I would continue with four letter words. But since at

More Bullshit Pardon The Obscenities

the moment I am restraining myself, I would like to continue with more probing questions and arguments. Some of these border on the philosophical. If I raise the issue of the purpose to life it would seem there can be no identifiable guiding light – unless – as I have repeatedly suggested, life achieves purpose through what we assign to it. That assigned purpose might involve the conversion of the planet into a standard of living. To argue that one should leave something for future generations complicates that assigned purpose. A standard of living for now or a standard of living in perpetuity. A matter of conscience, or a matter of responsible planning.

Without describing a utopian economic state, we do need to account number. As it is now, number is irrelevant as long as we can contain number behind some physical barrier. That is, those who can, do. And those who can not, do not survive. A natural weeding process. However, even such indifference cannot lessen the true impact of number, because the number does continue to grow, encroach, migrate, and overwhelm, whether or not it is hypothetically contained. Number creates a larger host for disease which cannot be contained as easily. The more deprived the host the more likelihood of disease.

Further reference: Isle9X

See, the author didn't use the f word in the last six paragraphs. Does that infer there is hope? Hope for what, the possible continuation of the rape of the planet until everyone has got what heshe wants?