



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Author: Your thesis

Title: Your thesis

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Yours, Vaguely

Michael John Boyce

A Thesis

for

PhD in Humanities

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

September 1994

© PRODUCTION23 and Michael John Boyce, 1994



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-10825-2

Canada

YOURS, VAGUELY

MICHAEL BOYCE

read it as if you didn't have to.

ABSTRACT

YOURS, VAGUELY

Michael John Boyce, PhD
Concordia University, 1996

The first part is a series of reflections, dated as in a journal, on the social production of culture. The second part is a more abstract, and yet also more fragmented, investigation of the issues and observations through a lexicon. This part acts as a dictionary with an oblique narrative which is nevertheless invested in a coherent through-line. The third part is an annotated bibliography which is written in the style of an autobiography, which obviously, is meant to ground the work within and pay heed to a history which is both personal and academic. Finally, the introduction means to situate and contextualize the work in relation to the history of cultural studies, broadly, and some of the key thinkers in the 20th century who could be considered responsible for the creation of a new discipline and its - now legion - related disciplines.

DEDICATION

THIS THING IS DEDICATED TO RENEGADES EVERYWHERE
AND TO ANYONE WHOEVER WENT TO SCHOOL BECAUSE THEY
ACTUALLY WANTED TO LEARN SOMETHING - NOT JUST IN ORDER
TO GET A GOOD JOB.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their support and encouragement:

Martin Allor, Arthur and Marilouise Kroker, Brian Massumi, Jim Porter and Dana Reason.

I also would like to acknowledge my family, and in particular, my mother and father.

Contents

PART ONE

proviso.....	1
INTRODUCTION	2
<i>INCLUDING:</i>	
OCTOBER 27, 1991	3
OCTOBER 28, 1991	7
NOVEMBER 4, 1991	11
NOVEMBER 6, 1991	14
NOVEMBER 10, 1991	22
NOVEMBER 16 1991	31
NOVEMBER 17 1991	41
NOVEMBER 18, 1991	62
INTRODUCTION (CONT.)	75

PART TWO

THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF CULTURE.....	89
<i>INCLUDING:</i>	
OCTOBER 27, 1991	90
THE VAGUE GENERATION	92
MARCH 18 1991	95
MARCH 27 1991	101
MARCH 30 1991	104
MAY 15 1991	109
JUNE 27, 1991	114
SEPTEMBER 8, 1991	116
SEPTEMBER 15, 1991	118
SEPTEMBER 24, 1991	121
SEPTEMBER 27, 1991	124
VAGUE GENERATION BODY POEM	128
MAY 17, 1991	133
FEBRUARY, 1991	144
MARCH 28 1991	150
MARCH 24 1991	153
MARCH 31 1991	154
JUNE 1(A), 1991	157
JUNE 1(B), 1991	158
JULY 2, 1991	160

JUNE 19, 1991	161
JULY 1, 1991	163
JULY 3, 1991	164
OCT. 15. 1991	167
JULY 11, 1991	168
JUNE 20, 1991	170
JUNE 1(C), 1991	172
MAY 31, 1991	174
JUNE 4, 1993	177

PART THREE

LEXICON	185
ALPHABET BREAKDOWN:	
A	186
B	204
C	211
D	219
E	229
F	236
G	239
H	241
I	243
J	247
K	249
L	250
M	251
R	259
S	260
T	261
V	262
W	264

PART FOUR

BIBLIOGRAPHY	265
--------------	-----

SAMPLES - - -

These appear throughout without page numbers. What are they?
 Are they intrusions, interruptions, additions, augmentations, helpful hints?
 They are an address from an oblique angle.
 They are for you, free of charge.

if you like, think of this as a creative piece, not an
academic one

it's something like a hip-hop sample mix

PROVISO :

all absolutes herein are parodic

INTRODUCTION

OCTOBER 27, 1991

The practice Greek philosophers had of teaching rhetoric to politicians is indicative of a long tradition of correlativity between aesthetics and ideology. This tradition is existent, also, in the entertainment industry.

It's largely accepted as common sense that if you want to get something across and do so persuasively, then it must be produced in a 'beautiful' way. However, now we are faced with an inversion of this proposition. It's no longer a matter of couching meaning in pretty phrases. It is, instead, a matter of making the 'pretty phrase' the meaning itself.

It is not, then, a seduction by way of clever surface play into a false depth, but a seduction into the validity of surface play itself.

At a time when a preoccupied interest in musical instruments called 'samplers' demonstrates a slippage in the conception of and attention to 'arrangements', state rhetoricians show a corresponding relation to their 'compositions'.

In sampler music, it is no longer a matter of harmonic flow, development and resolution, so much as it is of making a catalogue of disparate elements in 'amazing' juxtapositions. (The orientation is reminiscent of the Surrealists' Search for the

Miraculous).

What this cultural fascination for production lends to state politics, however, is the opportunity to equate expertise in management with the display of promotional technologies. Hence, what is seen as 'amazing' in the most contemporary form of both music and politics is production.

It is perhaps interesting to note that the entertainment industry and Western state politics developed their performative characteristics through the same medium (i.e., TV). For this medium has generated, particularly through the development of the music video industry in the 1980s, a communication system based upon an ever increasing sophistication of image processing. As a result, the promotional representation of the song overshadowed the song itself. For music, this meant that live performances began to be attempts to reproduce 'studio' versions (which would include the video) - a reversal of the relationship between live and recorded music. For politics, this meant that campaign trails were forged with more control and with more effect when done so on television than by appearing live at a number of different geographic points.

Of course, a consequence of this was the rise of acceptable vagueness and mediocrity with regard to public policy and the specifics of a mandate. This was predicated by the fact that the medium's aura of infinite potential has always been underwritten by capital investment and the desire for profit. Which is to say

that 'paying the piper' is taken to be a self-evident necessity. This leads further to substance being seen as an obligatory sacrifice that ensures seduction. It is politics without ideology. It is territoriality. Power as an abstract force.

The medium's potential was not just a matter of variety. It was also a matter of the simulation of reality. And it was so to such a degree that better reception, better sound reproduction, more angles on the subject, and all of the other production values which were racing toward the horizon of verisimilitude, accelerated until they pushed the envelope wide open revealing a 'beyond the real'. Here was something better than the real thing: more accurate, more precise, closer, more intimate and more controllable.

Hyper-reality in cyberspace.

The hyper-real is beautiful. It is hence subject to an aesthetics.

Cyberspace is the communicative dominion of the hyper-real. Anything which passes into cyberspace mutates into the hyper-real and its aesthetic.

Politics, thus, in cyberspace is mutated into an aesthetic of ideology.

Programs in cyberspace are scanned at surface level. It is not a depth medium.

Cathartic responses are mere ritualistic responses to emotional and moral signposts virtually indistinguishable from thousands of others - like samples from the library of personal interaction.

The documentation of these 'samples' is made by the medium which dreamt them up in the first place, and which then conveniently lost sight of its ownership.

Response to the 'signposts' is quickly followed up by reverence for the fact that it was so well triggered, so well produced. Brilliant acting, brilliant direction, brilliant sound score, etc., are all indications of the adoration of the process of simulation.

As it is the case that preference for technologically mediated representations of life - expressed as 'better than the real thing' (an ironic misappropriation of the motive of ideology) - are pervasive, so it is further the case that what has become adored, respected, feared, attacked, sacrificed and believed in (i.e. made a God) is 'techne' itself.

It is the machinery of politics, and no longer its meaning, which is up for grabs.

There are other things to look at here, as well. For instance, the way in which politics comes to have a gestural significance in music of the late 60's and 70's.

OCTOBER 28, 1991

The moment when cultural criticism was instituted as an academic practice with political ramifications, was the moment when power was both abstracted and given a motive.

Initially developed by critical art movements like the Surrealists and the Dadaists, cultural criticism in the hands of the Frankfurt school, (i.e., Benjamin, Adorno, Lukacs, Horkheimer, and others), for instance, was submitted to an examination under the auspices of the aesthetics of Hegel, Kant, Keirkegaard and, to an extent, Nietzsche, on the one hand, and with attention to the political theories of Marx and Trotsky on the other.

As a result of culture-wide effects through the popularization of Freud and Einstein, and the industrialization of leisure for all classes, this kind of criticism easily gained credence and validity as a new discipline. For popular (i.e. common) notions of the relativity (Einstein) between time and space coupled with

the observation that socialization is a political process constituted right at the level of the family (Freud) allowed for a relativity of social and political signifiers freely floating between the state, the workplace, the home and the 'nightspot'. It is also the moment when capital ideology is seen to be operative on the basis of a seductive double bind.

The Frankfurt school, I believe, unfolds along a course diverging from Adorno on the one hand and Benjamin on the other. For both, the means of production in the arts (say for Benjamin, photography, and for Adorno, jazz) are implicated in a cultural construction, the direction and character of which are indicative of a political orientation complicit with state interests.

Adorno identifies a seduction within cultural activities promoted as liberating. The premise is said to be false, and the enlistment into the ritual said to, ironically, ensure the opposite effect. Hence, he states that although jazz claims to liberate sexual desire, in actuality it confines it within specified arenas of expression and subjects it to commodification. Which is to say that sexual liberation is rendered an impossibility by its mediation through rituals totally dependent upon technologies formed in the service of the state, and bearing a fixed price tag besides.

For Benjamin the arts are recognized as the territory of an interpretive war. Given that practices can be informed politically one must be politically mindful of formulations of one's prac-

tices. Such an orientation inaugurates a competitive distinction between the object itself and discourse on its meaning. It is competitive insofar as the object's context is cited as equally or more significant than the object itself. This is the case precisely because actual control over the object and its possible effects is seen to lie in the determination of its meaning.

Both think and engage in their political analyses at the level of structure. Which is to say that it is believed that the signifier is equivalent to the signified. The consequent extrapolation of this principle is the belief that one's politics can be contained by a particular gesture.

Post-structuralists' reflections (e.g. Derrida, Eco, Barthes, DeMan, Fish, Kristeva, Spivak, etc.) on cultural practices resonate in accord with Frankfurt school notions of their politicality. They also correspond in their sense of such practices as constituting a kind of battle ground. However, post-structuralist reflections do not rest either with Adorno's commitment to 'disclose the truth of the matter' or Benjamin's desire to 'do the right thing'. How could they, given that, from the outset, they diverge in their notions of how structure (structuration) communicates? For, indeed, if cultural practices are a battle ground of interpretation, it is, for post-structuralism, the practice of interpretation itself which is of political significance. It is the analysis which is the political act.

Analysis is recognizable as a political act by virtue of render-

ing cultural practices as themselves political.

Post-structuralism demands an orientation to the object as that which is not inherently political (as it is for Adorno and Benjamin) but rather imminently politicizable. It is the politics of the word, of description.

Of course, there is nothing self-evident about the precise character of these 'politics'. In the measure that any object is open to interpretation (to politicization) and any practice is open to objectification (to being interpreted), any analysis is politically slippery. The politics must always be specified.

The Frankfurt school nags at the post-structuralists, however, by way of an insistence upon political efficacy (are post-structuralists too overwhelmed by contradiction to participate in conventional forms of political resistance?). But such an insistence indicates a presumption about the relation between ideology and practice to begin with. That is, that the movement from political principle to the execution of that principle is believed to be without contradiction. Or that propositions have to be taken to their 'logical' conclusion rather than being utilized in specific instances toward specific ends.

If the Frankfurt school might ask 'is it right', then post-structuralism might ask 'how does it work'. These two questions, although different, stem from a mutual interest in pragmatics.

The difference lies within a relation to contradiction: the one dreading and suspecting it, exposing it for the sake of truth; the other itemizing, exposing and exploiting it for the sake of the political potential of ambivalence.

Think of Bunuel, Satie, Kruger, Eno, Einstein, the Clash, etc.

NOVEMBER 4, 1991

In my second gig as front-man for the Points at the notable Edge in Toronto 1980, someone in the audience yelled out: "What have you guys got against music?"

A few months later the Sex Pistols disbanded and The New Musical Express proclaimed: Rock Is Dead.

Now, more than ten years after that, Public Enemy and endless House and Post-Industrial groups are 'rocking' with musical instruments which only exist virtually as tape recorded (digital disc stored) samples. Sometimes they are historically recognizable, other times not, but always they are transformed into something else: a groove.

If there is a relation between the above events/genres (and add No-Wave to the list) beyond a primacy of rhythmic orienta-

(Thus,) from the idea that to protest against specific events or policies (i.e. Vietnam) was the right and duty of every citizen, we have moved to the implicit idea that to be in a state of constant protest and rebellion was, and is, the only (and undisputed) role for the enlightened person to play. The idea of - forgive me - ongoing injustice being permanently built in to the relationship between rulers and ruled has been planted; as any Leninist or especially Trotskyist will tell you, an essential foundation for a revolutionary society. Make one if you can't find one.

"I HATE ROCK & ROLL: AN ILLUSTRATED DIATRIBE, TONY TYLER, Vermillion, 1984

tion, then it is with respect to intensity and arrangement itself. The intensity of arrangement.

Such music would not be as much a "dis" on institutionalized music itself as a take-over which is both at odds with and complicit to the interests of the industry which supports and distributes it. For although the bands representative are still just that - bands playing a categorical style - they are different in that they put to the foreground two things which up till then were distinct from, in the service of and certainly inferior to the music per se, namely, production and promotion.

With respect to production, it 'is' the music.

It used to heighten it, to supplement it, to make it more real, etc. Now there is no difference. The music is precisely something which is the mediated form of something else - where the something else is sometimes so hard to distinguish that it certainly doesn't matter what it 'is', just how it sounds. It is the processed result of the mediation which counts - that which constitutes the groove.

When the producer is a free agent then, it becomes possible that records be bought because they produced them.

With respect to promotion it also 'is' the music, but more pointedly, it 'is' the 'group'. In other words, it's not just a way of distributing their name, but also a way of coming to know

them as you would come to know them previously by seeing them perform.

Promotion 'is' performance.

Interestingly, this is also taken-up at the level of an other 'embarrassed' aspect of the artist- mythology: competition. And it is here that the rhetoric of take-over (territorialization) presents itself and further consolidates an aesthetic of intensity.

Boasting and challenging all other 'musicians' in general and nobody really in particular, the stakes are set by a rhetoric implicated in the traditions of athletic competitions ("show 'em what you got") tempered by a species of democratic encouragement (be the best that you can be), and which, of course, is not without its resonance with a military ideal ("be all that you can be ...in the army"). It is hence, part of a tradition of power and strength which becomes, after all, dislocated (especially since there is no enemy when everything's fair game and the notion of 'enemy' itself is as revered as it is indicted) in the translation to musical intensity.

Challenging the industry (if in no other way, at least at the highly significant level of copyrights) it is at the same time giving it exactly what it desires: complicity to a notion of novelty which is only dependent upon plundering the past, is totally emerged in packaging and image, and places a high premium on the

producer. What used to mean effective control of the group (those burning stars who were so unreliable, unpredictable and unconcerned with the 'dirty' business, whose talent was in their bodies), i.e. the willingness to "sell one's soul for Rock 'n Roll", in a way still does. Except that, with the displacement of, first, the virtuoso (by Punk) and then, the idiosyncratic genius of song writing and expression (by Rap, Hip-hop, House, Post-industrial, etc.) now literally anyone with a machine can make their own music. This means that the music industry at the level of pure musical production is not needed.

The 'terrain' if mapped-out only once will be negotiated only once.

What is perhaps most exciting about this 'turn' in music is precisely its possibilities for continual negotiation, and this is also what is dreadful about it.

NOVEMBER 6, 1991

The moment when music is considered to be an agent, a progenitor, communicator and/or distributor of anything of interest or concern in the social/cultural horizon, is the moment when it is situated as territory (and as territorial). Hence, as a kind of ground, it is developed, argued over, defended and etc. However,

"For by means of tones one can seduce men to every error and every truth: who could refute a tone?" -Nietzsche, The Joyful Wisdom, #106

this is largely an abstract procedure, dealing with largely abstract material (i.e. stuff). As a result its situation socio-politically and epistemologically is a bit different.

In the measure that music could be considered both liberating (or constraining) and profitable (or not at all) ideologically and monetarily, it was thus a concern to those who saw this contradictory condition as representative of a political system ruthless and unfair, if not totally oppressive and cruel. It was especially so given that propaganda, which of course could be devious and deceptive, was seen to underwrite those heralds of popular culture: promotion and advertising.

Does the promotion - the hype - live up to, constitute, undermine, falsify, or etc. what it is promoting/hyping?

At this level the concern is with the way music is framed and packaged (i.e., culturally produced) such that its meaning or value is predetermined. But its focus is such that it needn't address itself to the structural relations of the music itself. Which is to say that the critical practice reveals by virtue of the specificity of its interest a fundamental schisms which mirrors the contemporary social situation. Hence, the predetermination of the meaning of music through its promotional production is seen as coextensive with a totalitarian predetermination of meaning itself.

It is because of the possibility and implications of such a

schisms that cultural critics such as Adorno were concerned with developing a politics of aesthetics and cultural production.

Adorno, writing in early 20th century Germany amidst the rise of fascism, was particularly concerned about the way in which popular cultural activities were surreptitious mobilizations of state ideologies, especially as it was that they were presented as divergent from the current political climate. For example, the idea was that in spite of the jazz enthusiast's belief that jazz was a liberated musical form and that their participation in it (which might include listening, dancing, playing, purchasing, presenting, etc., and which could happen at home, in a club, on the road, in a studio, etc.) could liberate them, it was in fact turning them into docile duped collaborators with the machinery(ies) of repression.

What is meant by liberation here, and repression as well, is, to be somewhat glib, a matter of sexuality.

This is a moment in history when a distinction between cultural and state political-economic concerns is well established, although not mutually exclusive; for it is also the moment when it is considered that the one can influence the other.

So, the formula under consideration was this: free people from their personal orders of repression and they will want freedom

from state orders of repression as well.

It is a metaphysical view which works politics into the esoteric idea that the microcosm and the macrocosm are reflections of one another and are interdependent.

Freud was experiencing public notoriety beyond the interests of an intellectual community. It seems that he, as it were, struck a nerve, and it is perhaps particularly interesting that he did so with artists like the surrealists.

It is during a time when such a thing was possible that repression was developed into a very general reading and was absorbed into the vernacular of everyday life, which further heightened interest at the popular level with the state of being (the mirror of the being of the state) as not any longer merely a question of one's economic position but also of one's mental and emotional condition.

That the body could be considered expressive of itself and its relationship with others, and that such an expression could be of the torment of cultural formation, made it possible to conceive of the body as a self-enclosed political system. Further, the popularized relativity of Einstein and the cosmological residue of a religious empire which was transforming into a secular morality (i.e. in the name of humanity instead of God), made it possible to establish a comparative link between it and the state and then make relative the relationship and the effects of it.

Perhaps this is made possible by virtue of a morality-psychology interface, i.e. a question of what is 'healthy' as equivalent to a question of what is right. This all made it possible to differentiate and blend the relationship between the body and the state in new ways. And it is precisely because of this that music could be said to set you free.

With jazz, of course, there are many reasons why it was a target of cultural consternation, and it was this very attention which made it possible for it to be framed as liberating. First of all, jazz was identified with a 'liberated' people, a people who were, and still are, always 'becoming liberated' or becoming 'more' liberated, i.e. the black American.

Already mythologized through a kind of aestheticization of the savage (partly as a consequence of certain Christian paradigms imbued with a species of social Darwinism on the one hand, but with a romanticized vision of the African native as representative of 'man' before the fall from God's grace, where, most pointedly, sexuality was unmediated by God's higher order of consciousness on the other) as sexually uncontrolled (i.e. free 'in a dangerous way') and powerful, as well as magical (the primitive didn't do things out of reason but out of desire, and they didn't 'develop' prowess, rather, it was for them innate, that is, divine). This mythology extended itself through a symbolic rendering of them as those who free - and are still freeing - themselves from slavery. At the same time they were also romanticized

as the objects/subjects of racism, i.e. as quintessential victims. Thus, they could stand as the very condition of being human itself.

The state represses them in the same way that social conditions, and the socialized body, represses its subjects (i.e. ourselves).

Jazz was idealized by virtue of the utopia of a freed psychological state, and this was partly conceived of by way of the myth of the American Negro. Note, the music itself, insofar as Afro-Americans created it, was thought of not only as being sexy, but also as created out of the free flow of a desire unmitigated or mediated by reason. It was believed that blacks 'knew' nothing about music, they had no training in harmony, composition or any other institutionalized educational form of music (which was at this point more a science with laws than an inspirational process of creation). It was thus not only a dangerous music because it was considered licentious (and again, I must point out the correspondence between artistic work and social being, i.e. you 'are' what you play and vice versa) but also because it was considered completely unreasoned yet still structured and complex.

This seeming violation of a law/belief could only be derided by calling it noise or accommodated by calling it devilish (i.e. an insidious simulation, a superficial resemblance which houses the dark world of the first fallen angel Lucifer, whose name means "false light").

But most of all it was considered dangerous because it was believed to be infectious. This is the right word for it inasmuch as it was held (as it still is) that ideas and beliefs can be communicated (commuted) by mere exposure to a (latent) representation.

Indeed, Adorno remains complicit to this formulation. For his notion is that, in spite of what jazz fans believe they are participating in, they are actually being duped because of the ideological conditions under which the whole ritual is being managed.

Since what is claimed to come from the free flow of desire is packaged and produced for consumption and profit by the very machinery it is supposedly meant to defy, transform and perhaps replace, it is thereby nullified in the breach of an irresolute contradiction. And further, not only is the freedom project nullified, it is, by virtue of its continued commitment, overcome and conquered, thus entrapping its unaware subjects into a more insidious (by virtue of its being more invisible) repression.

Adorno's job then, is to render the invisible workings of repression visible. In the process however, he misses out on the ironic effects of the contradiction. For jazz fans are not just duped - they are both duped and not duped. By collapsing the contradiction - in the name of reason, I believe - he misses out on the magic that actually does occur.

This is not to mystify jazz, or any other kind of music which at anytime is positioned as noise (in Attali's sense of this, i.e. meaning that which counters the prevailing culture, and perhaps is the herald of the next one as well), but rather, to indicate the way in which a myth can serve to empower despite its availability to comply at some level with an order whose logic is threatening to it.

In this respect, although Simon Frith, for instance, may say that an alternative music industry will always be subsumed by the majors and that hence, there is no possibility for a totally free independent music label to manifest an exploratory utopia, but that people in their own homes can at least use the new technology to make their own music (an industrial pessimism coupled with an entertainment optimism) he forgets that, for one thing, people like to hear music they (nor their friends) didn't make, and for another, even if the majors do use the independents as a testing ground, the independents nevertheless do exist and do offer different material and different conditions under which one can be recorded.

But most of all, he neglects to notice that whether the situation is true or not, and whether listeners are being duped or not, the contradiction is sustained with equilibrium because the 'dupes' keep treating the situation as though it 'were' actual and as if the music really 'is' representative of difference.

Precisely because music is that which is subject to epistemo-

logical typifying, it remains always available to such renderings with very ironic compliance.

It doesn't matter in the cultural relativity horizon where things are because the sheer possibility of use value itself always remains open, and nothing can be totally contained.

What is needed now is not so much analyses grounded in notions of unnoticed cultural appropriation and hegemony, as much as descriptions of the ways in which such analyses and the identification of victims are confounded by cultural practices which are immersed in irresolute contradictions.

NOVEMBER 10, 1991

Because music could be said to be the perfect condition of and for an outside referent, for the outside referent itself.

Because it is possible, and continually possible, to ask whether it is informed or informing ('active' or 'passive').

Because it is the very possibility of contradiction, dichotomy, dialectic, dissemination, etc.

Because it is spatial and temporal...

...and so on...

...the why and what of music is virtually inexhaustible.

This condition is a consequence of being always and already implicated into a field of infinite abstraction, but it does have material too.

Not only is music subject to politicization (as representation or in its constitution) it also is the very condition of politics itself. For what it plays with is always the relation(s) between materiality and abstraction.

The proposition that action is made possible by, and is the re-enactment of, a spatio-temporal logic which imagines the execution of an idea (ignited by desire) as analogous to the motion of a projectile towards a target, is by the very fact of its conception itself indicative of a political gesture. The implication being that politics can be considered as the practice of saying what things are and what they are akin to.

Politics is philosophy is politics.

Because the 'idea' is the progenitive law of action.

That is, the 'idea' is the point from which a flight is taken towards the deed.

All of which is to say that both politics and music, insofar

as they can be conceived of as being anything as such, are operating within a metaphysics of visibility and invisibility (the inside/outside - signifier/signified trope). To this effect, they are always debatable, negotiable, etc. (i.e. ontologically, epistemologically, existentially, or indeed, practically).

Of course, this may be said of anything.

At the topical level of music and politics some interesting things are going on.

First of all, that music could be said to be political or non-political. Such a designation, over the last 25 years, was the concern of the music press that developed during this period. It was, and largely still is, dependent upon: judgment of lyrical content; stated positions in interviews; the degree of political contextualization with respect to live performance; and, to some degree, social behavior in general.

There is also, now, some politicization with regard to image, production value, and, in the avant garde, the extent to which a musician composes within traditional frameworks of harmony and rhythm.

These are all paradigms by which the political character of the music is designated. But whether or not a music is 'political' has largely been so ordained or recognized by the degree to which it can be said to be 'consciously' so. That is, music is

called political when it refers to itself as such and is contextualized as such.

In this respect, music's politicality is always mediated by the process of its recognition.

It is, then, not necessarily self-evident, and it can, thus, be contested.

This is a politics which is circumscribed.

Initially, political interest in music was more phenomenological. This meant that the focus was upon the socio-cultural effects of certain 'movements' in music, both with regard to the mobilization of (these) effects and to accounting for them.

This later development, however, is more interested in a deliberate and self-determined production of a specifically desired political effect. Recognizing the apparent capacity for music movements to influence, inspire and collectivize social groups without any obvious pre-intent to do so, the interest became directed towards what could be possible if the intent was present before hand. This makes it possible to move from a general conception of music as reflective of socio-political space to one which is constitutive. Precisely because it always was conceived of as 'capable' of doing just that. Although initially, this was more of a secondary move. That is, the music was thought to be representative of a community which was small and aberrant,

yet capable of spreading its influence like a disease (this is Plato actually).

In the 20's (Jazz) and 50's (Rock 'n Roll) music was a virus; in the 60's (Psychedelia and Art Rock) and the 70's (Disco and Punk) music was an expression; and in the 80's (Post-punk, Industrial, Hip-Hop, House and Retro) music was an industry and a 'becoming-movement'.

This condition of 'becoming-movement' is one where music freezes into a sheer potential for cultural significance.

It is a consequence of the fact of the industry.

Because music is identified now at all levels as production, it is totally mechanized with respect to its effect.

Even Rap and House which are in some ways reminiscent of a 'grass-roots movement', are more entrepreneurial success stories than they are cultural burgeonings (focusing more on climbing steps up the hierarchical ladder of performance space and recording distribution - e.g. Black Capitalism - and thus giving to a culture the opportunity to make money and become part of the status quo more than to establish its own voice and distinctive power relations - and why not?). Ironically enough, rather than fear the viral character of grass roots movements as some kind of threat to the established order of dictated needs, industries at all levels in the West mirrored this strategy and, indeed, formu-

lated it as a global ideal, i.e. the utopia of optimum distribution. Consequently, the specificity and actuality of an audience was rendered insignificant.

Consider, for example, best-selling books and records which are designated as such on the basis of sales to consumer outlets. The books and records are bought on speculation of a 'potential' audience, i.e. on the likelihood of their being in demand. This sometimes has an historical ground, e.g. the last issue by the same creator was a success. But it also can be the case that the outlet is owned by the publisher who wishes the item to be listed as a best-seller in the press in order to stimulate interest.

Both of these cases are dealing with a virtual audience; one which is economically - and the other which is psychologically - based.

The important thing is not the production of an actual audience, it's the production of sales figures - which only requires the existence of a virtual audience.

There would no longer, hence, be any necessity to service people's needs, 'or even' create them. Rather, production would simply run parallel to need, being another example of it, and a monument to polymerization.

In this respect music doesn't (just) reflect or constitute sociopolitical space(s) - it distributes it (them).

Music, now, is the background or sound score to any number of possible activities, and in the interest of infinite availability it 'provides' for a multitude of cultural activities and formations which are always yet to be determined.

It is no wonder, then, that its politics is one of circumscription. If it has any political position inherent within itself at all it can always be dispersed or undermined by the way it is contextualized. Its politics is territorialized and deterritorialized. In this respect, music can be said to be a "body without organs" (Deleuze and Guattari) accelerating through and by way of the body of industry (which is no longer just the factory or the corporation, but also culture itself).

In the face of this, music doesn't so much herald social change (Attali) as provide the opportunity to distribute shifts in its shape. It is that which can become, if not a testing ground, at least an indicator before, during or after the fact of the circumscription of its particularity(ies) (even if by way of 'recognition'). It doesn't matter, temporally, where you situate intent and to whom you attribute it. And it also doesn't matter if there are versions at odds with one another - the more the merrier.

The future is only "perceived" after the fact.

Of course, there are those who are said to be trend setters, but it is always debatable whether they are perceptive, lucky or

just popular and likely to influence in any case (i.e. on the basis of a seductive celebrity status). Nevertheless, however such a debate is settled, the actual setting of the trend is totally mediated and catered to by an industry almost, if not completely, equal in responsibility for its continuance and - more significantly - its affirmation.

Every movement and insight is totally networked.

It is always yes and no and maybe so...

depending ... with regard to its effectiveness.

Which is not so much a sign of ideological relativity as it is of a shift in emphasis from structural and phenomenological specificity to description and outline of pathways and course lines; from ideas and meaning to movement and potential.

The Devils are not unlike the Gods in form and substance but they differ in their instances of restriction and freedom, their blocks and flows - and it's not so much a matter of choosing one over the other as it is of the actualizing potential of choice.

If, then, the question of music can be specified as one regarding its agency, and the interest is in outlining a participation within it, then it won't be with respect to a 'music' as such (that is, to a question of music as such) that an address is

made but rather, to activities which are situated, described, oriented and contextualized - and not just to the 'way' in which they do, but the very occasion of them doing so. Not so much a discourse, discussion or analysis of music, as all of those practices as musical in themselves - even if the topic they consider is music - because topicality will here after remain as illusive as the specificity of music itself.

What this would require, concretely, would not necessarily be (although it could include) a reproduction of the traditional recognized materiality of music (e.g. instrumentation or sound as such), so much as a parallel pursuit of its course.

Concretely then, a writing for instance - or more vaguely, an interest - which would allow itself to be swept up in a virtually uncontrollable distribution wave, and at the same time circumscribe its politicality as one wills or sees it to be.

Not to play you're right or you're wrong about what you think about it so much as to play this is what I think about it, this is how its relevant, this is what I am doing, this is what this makes possible, etc.

Not then, an agro-politics (a politics of negative differentiation - although, again, this may be included) so much as a politics of affirmation, unfolding, etc.

The advantage of this, if it must be known (and which, of

course, is subject to the same charges of arbitration concerning any claimed advantage) is completely dependent upon a gauged sense of suitability (it is, also, always to be established) as a kind of becoming advantageous.

What is at stake here is not, I feel it must be said, a mirroring of the industrialized condition of music on the one hand and, thereby, a disarming of its bad politics on the other. It is, rather, - beginning with the notion that music can be questioned with regard to its social situation, politicality and philosophical character - an accommodation of/to the same operations of exploitation of potential that contemporary capital endorses and engages in (that is, it becomes both an agent and an object of this paradigm).

Then, given this double availability, the idea is to plot the lines of flight it produces and to then gage its character neither as a question (or Utopia) of substance or form, but, instead, as an address of/to vergencies and divergencies; its proximities and its distances; its movements toward, away from and along side of.

NOVEMBER 16 1991

Having to and wanting to.

INT.31

Should do and would prefer to do.

This is the plan: 'rarely' negotiate.

One strategy is to make the 'have to' into a 'want to'. If it's worth it.

Re(de)fine the order to obey by saying: "I want to because" - and be genuine otherwise why bother?

Reclaim the philosophical grounds.

When failure is inside then it isn't when you do what you want to.

Failure is pretty much constant outside although it is often debatable.

They want and I want.

Sometimes it's the same, but basically it's different.

It's been made to be that way and there isn't much you can do about it.

To make it all the same is how you can play: 'I despair in failure and rejoice in success, and I hope to get it all right one day.'

Many will cheer you on.

Others will find you in contempt.

That will be: 'them and them', which is: 'them and us', and so quite naturally: 'I and they' again, you see?

Is there any strength in numbers? Quite likely

but the point is now I can feel good and bad

in this manner and it is already set out how I can calculate the problem

and the specificity of me

does not matter

because idiosyncrasy is not the point

is it?

If it is it is not

and so

different.

This then is not the plan.

Sometimes, however, it goes that way.

Reflection

then means that is a failure inside. Woe is me. I am a hard judge of myself. Being easier on myself is: "I was duped."

"How did that happen?"

Now I am thinking.

There is an enemy or enemies

and

who is it are they

and

what does it mean that this is so

and

what do I do? Now is when everyone has advice. Armies are almost always recruiting.

The outside is outside and

the outside is inside and so

battles

are fought

on at least two fronts.

Outside and inside

can almost be anywhere.

There are many strategies.

What's important is what's your enemies' strategy

and what does it mean to have one or more enemies?

Having one or more enemies means having at least one or more strategies.

Not having a strategy is a strategy when you have one or more enemies.

Your enemies' strategy is important because that is how they think you are

and

how are you anyway? The important strategy is how you are.

Sometimes you never finish saying

how you are and that is a way of saying it.

Some are content to keep going on and some are content to finish.
Some are content and some are not.

You are content when you say you are

and if you lie

you are content to do so

unless you are not then you are perhaps puzzling if anyone knows
because you are at least content to keep going on as you do even
if you are not because sometimes or more times

you just can't settle on it. Sometimes you are both.

Some things are invisible.

Because they can be.

Deception

and

subterfuge

and secrets are generally possible

and if they are then they can be discovered

possibly and that is a popular strategy both ways.

Keeping secrets

and

finding them out

It is easy to be implicated in a logic

in a system

which forces you or provides you

with the occasion of having an enemy or enemies

and

how you're going to deal with it.

When you don't see that, it's very easy to be in it and when you do it's a little less easy perhaps but not much easier to do something about it.

That is when the enemy becomes abstract more than personal although

you may still take it personally all of it

the way it has impinged upon you

when it has.

This is also how it can be said that knowledge is important.

To say

to know is important is to say

knowledge really is important and

what is it and

how can I get some and

well

now

we're going to let you in on that.

Knowledge is a commodity and some of it can be had pretty easily because lots of people like to let you know but it all is supposed to be pretty special

and

makes you go a long way kind of like gasoline

and

it can make you pretty strong too supposedly

which is

kind of like vitamins

and

kind of like weapons.

In any war, there are almost always weapons.

To engage

is to agree

at least a little.

So maybe you can't refuse absolutely

and why would you want to?

OK, so this is the way it is. Clarify.

But leave some left over.

I like that.

Is that enough

and

why not?

You decide.

It's OK.

Think.

That is sometimes hard to see

but you can show it.

Sometimes if you tell someone you spent the day thinking they will not think you did very much that day, but if you tell them you spent the day writing or vacuum cleaning they will.

That is a value and many people have at least one

and most likely more

and something to say about how they go together

and how they are important.

Thinking can be a dreary effort and it can be quite entertaining and interesting to oneself and others and it all may hinge on whether anything is considered worthwhile thinking about.

And how important to you is it that your thinking is worthwhile.

Personally, I won't unless it is.

Sometimes I feel someone is forcing me to think what is not worthwhile and if I know it I won't and that can cause relational conflicts but oh well I say and I know why and can say if I care to.

Sometimes it's worth it to follow the wishes of others and quite a pleasure to actually.

NOVEMBER 17 1991

I've been thinking about music for a very long time now and sometimes I just don't know what to think except that I do enjoy it very much it is so very important to me and a part of my life that I just couldn't even think of doing without it.

Music is something I have found that no-one seems to take issue with if you enjoy it

and you enjoy it as you listen to it

and the fact of enjoyment alone

as something that is just for you and not shared with anyone else

is OK

if you are listening to it

but is an issue

if you are playing it.

If you are playing

and are enjoying it

and you are not caring

if anyone else is enjoying it especially if they paid for it to
watch and hear you play it

then that seems to be a problem to some

if you don't care if they enjoy it too

especially if they don't.

Sometimes

it is a problem if you enjoy listening to something that someone
else

doesn't enjoy but that

is a different kind of problem.

That problem questions

how it can be

and

what kind of a person are you anyway

if you can like that

and do

and they can't

and don't?

But the other problem

questions

how you dare seem

to not consider them

or care if they enjoy it or even make it

however you would that your pleasure could also be their pleasure?

That some

may disagree with them may not matter at all.

This problem

I don't think is peculiar
just to music
but it certainly is
peculiar to music
because it does get said
that some musicians
are too self-indulgent
and
that is a reason
for not liking them.
Some people
want to be told
what they should like.
Think about Punk-Rock for a moment.
This seems to be
a fairly popular thing to think about

and discuss and do so in a way

that says

this is a philosophy

with social and political

ramifications

for music

and other things

because it is a sensibility

and that can go anywhere

and you can have it anywhere

about anything.

Some people

sometimes

like to be told

what to think about something

or at least be convinced and others

not

and they both

can have words

with one another

about that.

There are those

also

who like to confirm their thoughts

in the thoughts of others. Sometimes

you can be like others and other times

not.

It depends.

If it does.

Punk-Rock in many ways is said to be

the saying

and illustration of

anything goes

there are no rules

and don't give a dam

what anyone else has to say about it.

You can like it

because it illustrates this

and you can like it

because you do

and you can like that about it

and like some

but not all

who do it and to whatever degree they do it

if you wish to consider that also.

So

if you say

that you like

that someone

is doing what they want

in the face of fairly predictable adversity

but don't like

what it is

they are doing

then

that is different

from not liking

that someone

is breaking the rule

whether you like what they are doing

or not.

Sometimes

it's not good

because it's been heard

too many times before

and sometimes

that doesn't matter

and actually seems to be

the reason

it is good

if it is done a certain way.

Liking it

and thinking it's good

is sometimes

different

but very often

the same

as it is here

when it's said

unless it's otherwise said.

Thinking it's good

is liking it

usually unless it's made to be different.

It's been heard

too many times is a copy you don't like.

A bad copy.

It sounds like

something

I liked before

is a copy

you don't like.

A good copy.

A bad copy

is a copy

you don't like

but you can elaborate.

Sometimes

it is

a question

of degree.

I notice

that music

is where degrees

can be very important

and I think

it is connected

to thinking about music

as a matter of

intensities.

The degree

in this case

is how near

can they be

without

seeming to

pretend to be

and

is their horizon

music

or people?

Very often

it is the music

which becomes

a kind

and it is

particular people

who do it so well

or not.

Yes

particular people

make the music

but then

and no-one is exactly sure when

but someone

is usually

for the most part taken to be

responsible

for starting it all up and then

there are lots of them

and it is a really big

or not so big

but certainly

recognizable

it

and when that happens
anyone can play it or close to it
or any degree of it and the people
are the people and the music is the music
and they are associated but quite capable of being
and
for the most part
are
independent
unless they are not in which case
there can be a person
who is not
made distinct
from their music
and
it is most certainly theirs and it is them

and not a music and if anyone else plays it
as not playing actually it
but it
as though
it were a music
to play
and not their music
someone else is playing
then
people can be quite divided on that.
Some think
it's an homage and anyway
they have not had
quite enough of whoever
and are willing
to allow it to be a music anyone can play

but it should probably at least

be thought of

as an homage.

But others say no way

and perhaps they do

because they have a belief

in the propriety

of idiosyncratic production.

There really is

a lot of believing

when it comes to music.

Even

when

there

is

a

music

to

play which

is

not

identical

with

someone if

you

seem

to

be

more playing

at

being

like

another

representative

of

the

music

especially

anyone

assumed

to

be

largely

responsible for it all

to

begin

with more than

representing

the music itself

unless

it's

in

parody

which is another thing

all together

really

then

that

can

be

something

which

can

offend

people

who

listen

especially if they know and especially if they really like

or really dislike

that being imitated.

There you see the language is like that you can

play

the style but you

imitate

the person.

Sometimes people get fed up hearing people play music like music
that was played in another time

when it was new when now that it is old it is thought to be still
great or just recently recognized as great

and in some way better than or just as good as

what is around now and so why not keep playing it or bring it back revive it as it were.

And this can happen in a way

that particular people

can once again be

mainly responsible

for it being the case

that a fair number of people

also do this.

And who was the first really seems to make a difference.

And there is here another question of degree namely the extent to which it purely reproduces the style of music including a regard for the time it was created in and how it was more than just music but also a way of dressing and talking and dancing and wearing your hair and behaving and generally having views about things as they were and going on

and to what extent it recreates that in the spirit of now and with regard to what has happened in between.

So whether it all is updated at all and whether that is preferred

or not.

But to be fed up with all that

sometimes is to really want it to be all now and sounding new for the now that is now even if one can see that there is a history there that is in some way responsible or heeded-to but more than that and so quite different although historically connected it is new and now and to be understood in a way that the now could be understood.

Do something new and it can be taken to mean this is what is going on now and this is what it all means.

That happening won't ensure it will be liked or even heard by many if anyone besides who makes it but anyone who does hear it can think about it all and what it means if they like even the one who made it.

Some think that the one who made it is the one who really knows what it's all about but others don't believe that is necessarily so and can even make examples quite to the contrary.

NOVEMBER 18, 1991

It is not necessary to like or dislike anything you might hear in order to wonder about it all. That is why some people think that thinking is such a separate thing.

Some people like to think only about things they like even if that is thinking about things they don't like but they are capable of doing otherwise even if they choose not to.

Some people will say that thinking and liking aren't the same but others say that the only difference is that one can talk about itself and other things unlike the other and that really it's very hard to extract thinking out of anything anyone does and vice versa and that to separate them like many have separated the mind and the body is only a convenience and a way of talking and what isn't after all just that.

But thinking can be figuring things out and why try so hard as others have to isolate it and understand it as isolated and really a very oh so the most magnificent thing to do of all the things to do which won't happen here if at all quite by accident I'm happy to say although I am thinking and will continue to do so.

There are good thoughts and bad thoughts and that is another story and some people and very many too really like to know what is best and what is worst and who too.

Sometimes I like to think very hard about music I consider to

be the worst and who does it and why it is so bad and why I dislike it so.

Some people prefer to talk about music they don't like and can get paid to do it and others like to hear what they have to say also.

Some people like to hear what some have to say about music or the people who play it even though they rarely if ever like what it is that they actually say.

This can be because it can be good to think about what is wrong with what is said and perhaps feel that one knows better. Or it can be because it can be wanted to be known what is being said officially and how it fits into the official scheme of things because what isn't liked officially could also be what isn't you officially and so wanting to know how you fit into the scheme of things.

Sometimes it can be what are the different ways of thinking about something and maybe also why and or how is it different and perhaps other implications.

The scheme of things is an interesting way of putting it because this can be quite a descriptive thing not wanting to be a plot ,or this can be some kind of suspicion of -just that- a plot.

A number of people get paid or at least get to feel a little

important for saying what is good or bad about some particular music.

You can agree or disagree and tell who's ever responsible for them continuing to do what they do as much and either way you tell it seems to be good because at least you're reading which would imply purchasing and for those who are responsible purchasing and reading as meaning purchasing and continuing to do so are the least things that must happen in order that things could be said to be going well.

It's usually preferred that things go well.

There are many reasons for liking or disliking some music and many degrees to which either can be done.

You can try to be persuasive and care or not.

All in all it can go any way because talking about music especially when that is a review of a recording of music is something which is considered a thing to do for any number of reasons but in any case done quite a lot although some ways in which it is done do seem to out-number other ways in which it is done and that discrepancy is thought of as representative of there just being too little of that which in the world affirms or speaks of or to who they are and how they think of themselves as having a way of going about things which is difficult to go about doing when other ways get so much attention that it goes to the point

of excluding other ways which are different and implying that they really should be excluded because they are smaller in their occasions of being or at least in being represented.

This may come as a result of believing or at least enforcing the idea that quantity is the force of correctness. Quantity however, and curiously, is a tricky thing to really ascertain the actuality of sometimes because you always have to count, to add, subtract and divide and it often seems that someone says: as far as we can tell.

Also, quantity can easily be assumed by having someone who is charged by whoever or whatever with being the spokesperson of a generally large but characteristically unspecified quantity say that there seems to be a large quantitative support for a particular way whether or not any counting has actually been done.

If it gets said often enough it can be taken to be the common understanding. Perhaps this is because it is quite a bother to really do all that counting on one's own part or perhaps because it's preferable to believe what spokesperson's say.

But, of course, not everyone will swallow it and there is thus quite an industry in differences of opinion about just what the actual quantity is. And then again there is a fair amount of divergence from what quantity should really mean anyway. All that, though, is the

difference

which continues to

fuel the idea anyway and who knows why it continues to be pre-dominant.

One theory is that it is enforced by a powerful group of people who see it as

their way

of remaining in power. This, of course, is the source of much discontent. But it is not seen to be quite as simple as this

by

those

who

wonder well aren't the ones in power capable of a variety of ways of holding it and why choose this one in particular?

Perhaps it is

convenient or perhaps it is deemed to be the most

efficient because really it must be fairly simple to hold on to power if most are convinced that most prefer it that way.

Yet again that means one has to believe in the force of quantity to start with. And that really has to be a belief which is reinforced through education and other very pervasive representations of it. Which might be to say that the more something is said in more arenas of saying the more convincing it becomes. In other words in order for it to be convincing it must create the pudding

of its own proof

to be in.

This is a logic which goes like this:

the more there is

of saying something

the more it is true

and the proof of it is

that there is

so much saying of it

and acting upon it thus.

Sometimes the specifics of something can change and lots will say we were wrong because we didn't know something but now we

know it we see that this is actually the way it is. The particulars don't matter because the logic of quantity pervades regardless

and that really is the point.

And so many things are like that.

Fashion for instance

pervades

whatever

the particular instances

of it are.

However, just because lots of people are doing something doesn't necessarily mean it all has the same meaning

but

anyone

can say

lots of people

are doing this

and it means overall that

and some can challenge that 'till they're blue in the face

if they want to change the general opinion

because it can be said

oh well

that

is

just

your little opinion

next to a rather

big

opinion

isn't it?

Because in that game

numbers are everything and you have to have a lot of power in order to have a lot of numbers.

For some this is quite a good reason to despair.

But others don't seem all that keen on playing the numbers game
and are also

and perhaps therefore not that interested in the quantity is
force

theorem as that which would be something that would influence or
measure the worth of what they are

doing

or

saying

not that those are necessarily different but they could be
thought to be.

And they perhaps do not

thus

despair

but seem rather

more intent

with getting on with it

whatever that is

and whatever the consequences.

And they also have supporters

or not

whatever

if that matters

or not

they might really just want to do it

because

they

do

that's all

and if they want to make money at it by doing it

for others

then that is another thing but not an unrelated thing

because their way of thinking about money is

also

perhaps

not so much taken by the logic

of the force

of quantity

even though that seems to be an area

most difficult in ignoring

of the promises

the lure of quantity

for the

force of quantity is also

the reward

of the force of quantity

perhaps because many like to be enticed. That is another logic.

The more the merrier is a popular thing to say but so is two's

company, three's a crowd.

All of which is to say every logic must be disputed.

This is so it can be said again.

Repetition is important for it all to carry on and it must be interrupted

so that it can start again and be noticed.

This logic is not this one instead of that one

but rather

both are nice

which one should I do and back and forth but mostly

one

or

the

other.

A mostly is usually there.

Enticement is there because preference can be maybe and wonder

what is correct.

Preference can be preference and preference for the correct.

There are always divisions.

This keeps it all going.

Where does it go?

Back and forth and along but not out.

If it goes out then it is not.

Outside the logic is a new logic and some want as many as possible but not necessarily save them up.

Can you see that this all is music too.

One place can be just about any place if you work at it enough or it can go anywhere and anywhere can to too

if you let it.

INTRODUCTION (CONT.)

So, I begin with a number of things and continue to introduce

I would sneak down the hall, down the back stairs into the backyard, where tall weeds towered over me, amber and dead. Morose spiders spun glistening webs in the moonlight, and the high power lines sizzled in the starless sky like Dad's voice. The power lines were filled with the voices of the world's other dads, calling their sons on the telephone. The world's other dads were real too. They were real people who dealt with real things in a real world. Sometimes they found bits and pieces of the world which were not real, and then they had to make them so, or dispense with them altogether. Things were never as real as they could be for the world's dads. Someday everything in the entire universe would be real, and the world's dads would finally prevail. When that day arrived, civilization and not nature would be rampant. When that day arrived, you could talk to everybody in the universe on the telephone.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

more things.

The idea here is to present as many different angles on as many different subjects as the fancy strikes. I say "the fancy strikes" because I wouldn't want to pretend that I could possibly exhaust the absolute number of considerations, categorizations, contextualizations and various other permutations of any subject matter (including the very idea of subject matter). But, on the other hand, I wouldn't want to give the impression that the interests that are pursued here are merely the result of pure whimsy, as though I were indifferent to the specificity of the interest. Rather, I would like to lend to a notion of "fancy" a motive which is intent upon discerning the larger implications of what appears at least to be a natural inclination.

In effect, this results in a deliberate over-determination of the import of what is otherwise considered to be trivial, superficial and insignificant.

Of course, this is not the exclusive target. Nor is it the intent here to strictly attempt to legitimize certain subject matter (of a popular character) as valid for academic - or otherwise 'serious' - contemplation. It is not, then, in this sense, meant to be taken as an "alternative" work or as something up against something else taken to be representative of some kind of analytic protocol. It is not, strictly speaking, meant to be delivered as an intervention.

However, at the same time, it does not mean to exclude any kind of possible positioning of its symbolic or gestural aspect vis-a-vis anything it could be said to be different from or at least making some reference to.

The attention to the so-called popular is not without precedence. Indeed, it is fairly well entrenched in such academic disciplines well represented in a number of universities as Cultural Studies, Communications, Comparative Literature and, to some degree, Sociology and Political Science. Certainly such popular and contemporary socio-political analytic 'movements' such as Post-modernism and Post-structuralism (not to mention the Frankfurt School and the Birmingham School) and others from the near-past (e.g. Surrealism, Existentialism) all of which share at the very least an interest in aesthetics and the social production of leisure, are well represented not only in universities but in commercial bookstores and intellectual or arts communities in general.

The communion between the arts and socio-political activism so particular to the 20th century (although not exclusively so much as more extensively and expectedly) is, in many ways responsible for the degree to which popular culture is taken seriously. For the moment when artistic expression is taken to be representative of a recommended way of life (which goes at least back to Plato's Republic) and is further coupled with a basic break down of so-called high and low art distinctions (that is, when soap-opera

for instance can be considered an art form - if for no other reason than the fact that it is contrived and constructed with regard to certain standards of production and logic of cathartic effect/affect) is the moment when the domain of cultural production can be deliberated upon as consequential and contestable. In short, this means it is ground which can be fought over. For if it can influence and effect people, and large numbers of people at that, then it is an appropriate area of concern for those who wish to mobilize and rally support for their ideas.

So, it is with regard to all that I pay attention to the popular. And that is perhaps the best way to put it, i.e. "pay attention to it", because the orientation here is to inclusion not exclusion.

Ostensibly, the subject of this thing (and I will say in a moment why I call it that) is music and its production as a socio-political entity or interest, on the one hand, and on the other, an attempt to ascertain the peculiarities of - and even the very possibility of considering - the current generation which I call The Vague Generation (this more broadly could be thought of as an interest in the relationship between super and infra- structural constructions of communities). But actually, the thematics are more diverse and at least attempt to be more far reaching than that.

This work consists of a series of reflections and analyses of cultural artifacts, social institutions and systems of communica-

tion in relationship to an anthropological assessment of people currently in their twenties to mid-thirties who were more or less born and raised in North America. It thus spends some time making sense of what I call "The Vague Generation", i.e. those who have grown up under the social umbrella of uncertainty not with fear and dread, but with acceptance. They are the ones who, seeing the doubtful outcome of a future, are forced to make sense of their lives only in how it relates to the present and an ever increasing nostalgia for the past.

It takes as its point of departure an interest in describing the parameters of a contemporary pragmatics. In this respect its interest lies in the way in which practical application and realization of ideas, ideologies and beliefs is considered and carried out.

In some respects this is consequent of an observation of the prevalence of social and political cynicism to the degree that rhetoric is taken for granted as lip-service, and policy is reduced to a regard for the level of technical expertise in image management. But it also comes in the wake of many proclamations of the death of meaning, truth and the real. The question I pose is: In what sense are these 'deaths' proclaimed? Is it correct? How, then, do we live our lives and make sense of them, or plan out of them? If it is the case, then how is politics possible? What then would be the stakes of artistic expression? What would be the constitutional basis of any philosophy? If these things

are dead, then do they leave behind some legacy, an inheritance, ghosts perhaps? People still think, dream and do things they say they believe in, is it the case that they are deluded? Or is it that their language has become inadequate to the task of describing and exemplifying their experiences and desires?

Now, more than ever there seems to be cries for a voice of the current generation. Yet it is a generation which has no total sense of itself and distrusts all attempts to totalize it. It has a deep suspicion of categories. It tends towards the multiplicitous - a pastiche of life-styles and beliefs. It is at once reactionary, liberal, retentive and without any firm philosophical or ideological ground for any of its decisions. It is a culture which reacts like quantum physics notions of matter at the subatomic level. That is, its behavior is relative to whether its orientation is to its position or its momentum. Its position is both a matter of security and opinion, whereas its momentum is both a matter of its freedom to move around or within various cultural paradigms, and its capacity for moving up and down the social ladder of success.

It is, thus, a difficult task to speak for such a group and still remain true to one's membership to it. And it is important to maintain such membership because the project should not be so much one of exposing fault for the sake of doing away with behaviours, as it should be for the sake, precisely, of doing away with a kind of self-loathing and mistrust endemic to a generation

which truly does not believe it can accomplish anything any more. It is, then, the task of one who does speak for this generation to recover its sense of possibility and potential on its own terms. To reveal, as it were, the affirmative aspects of a condition rendered dire by its prophets, for those prophesies came from those who were witnessing the death of their old paradigms: without knowledge of what glorious phoenix could rise up from the ashes. It is this phoenix which must be discovered and let loose.

Music is chosen primarily for personal, and hence, somewhat and yet not at all - arbitrary reasons. Indeed, I have a personal history which is very much wrapped up in it. And that would be as a listener, a composer, a performer, as well as a thinker and writer of it.

But beyond personal history and prejudice as to its import, and precisely because my life is so wrapped up in it, - not to mention the fact that it is something deeply entrenched in social, economic, political and philosophical activities and value systems - it comes to be something which I often think about. It is, thus, in the wake of attempting to sort out its influence upon my own life that I have come to consider its influence upon other lives, in fact, upon life itself.

More to the point, in the measure that it was conceivable that a great deal has been and still could be thought and said about music, I have taken the opportunity to think about music as

though such an act were exemplary of thinking about anything, indeed of thinking itself. And I hence and furthermore investigate the notion that thinking about music is like the very occasion of inquiry, analysis, representation, etc. - in other words, it could be considered as exemplary of the very idea of considering something and its meaning and its relationship to objecthood and subjecthood. At one point this even becomes posited as: "music is thinking".

So, I consider music inasmuch as music might stand in for anything but it is the thing that has captured my attention and my imagination.

As to the "thing", it obviously has formal properties which beg questions of its formal significance, i.e. what does it mean that it is set out this way?

First of all, I call it a "thing" because this allows it a degree of ambiguity. It is meant to be capable of being received into various domains all of which have their own protocol; their own notions of what is formal/informal, serious/non-serious, acceptable/unacceptable and agreeable/offensive. In no way is it meant as an affront to any place or persons to whom it is delivered. I merely submit it for consideration.

Ambiguity is an interest because availability and fluidity are also interests. That is, the interest is for the piece to have as free a passage as possible. It is, in this respect, taken often

with the subject of limits, borders, paradigms, statements of degrees of difference, and, in general, any system which marks in any way a territory as distinct from another. It often wonders what the investment is in delineating differentials of a social, political, aesthetic and philosophical character. And at the same time it wonders about wondering.

Each part of the whole is intended to be both independent and inter-related with the rest of the parts. This for the sake of a reader who prefers an episodic or aphoristic approach. But, at the same time, the leitmotif(s) are for the sake of an over-reaching assessment by readers who may prefer the more traditional thesis format. It means to remain available to both generalizations and specifications. To single in on (or out) either is to accrue something at the expense of something else.

A number of different "voices" (i.e. in the narrative sense) are expressed for the sake of exploring what might be insights peculiar to their form. This is not to suggest the transparency of form and meaning. Rather it is to recognize and play with stylistic conventions and their accepted parameters of interest.

Of course, sense needn't be made out of it at all. It would be quite legitimate to read it "casually", and if something comes of it, be it entertainment, the spark of something else (related or not), insight (regarding the work or something else) or judgment (of whatever) - then so be it. And if nothing should come of it at all - so be it also.

SAMPLING

"Sample: 1n. Small part or quantity intended to show what whole is like; specimen; illustrative or typical example. 2v.t. Take or give sample of; try qualities of; get representative experience of."

"Sampler n. Piece of embroidery worked in various stitches as specimen of proficiency."

OK what about sampling?

First of all, a sampler is a recording and playback device which translates analog signals into digital signals, or transfers other digital signals into its memory bank. Digital processing is an electronic operation which reads the sign wave of a sound and translates it into numbers (i.e. 0 and 1) which are stored as electronic potentials in a circuit. Memory circuits have a variable capacity for storing serial number relations. The larger the memory capacity the more information on a sound can be stored. Memory in a sampler can be used to store as much information on a single sound as is possible, or it can be used to store a number of different sounds. The more information on a particular sound the more "true" it is. This is especially of interest in the translation of analog or acoustic sounds. Digital to digital allows for a verbatim transference. A: sampler can be linked

to an electronic keyboard in order that the sound stored can be harmonized. The sound for piano, for example on an electronic keyboard is managed by programmed sign waves which represent pitch, attack, decay, tone, etc. - a series of electronic impulses which reproduce the sound commonly recognized as piano. Likewise any other sound, (e.g.. the human voice, glass breaking, construction machinery) can be used as the basic pitch form which is distributed through the electronically produced differentiation commonly recognized as a scale. Any sound distributed through the keyboard can be manipulated in the same way that any keyboard could be said to be manipulated (e.g.. alteration in attack, decay, delay, envelope modifications such as reverb, etc.). The sound can be more or less recognizable depending on interest and composition intent. For instance, you might be able to discern the human voice speaking a specific word or phrase - it might perhaps be a phrase with some kind of cultural import or historical recognition. However, the sound, in order to come in "true" on every key demands a massive amount of memory. So normally, it comes in on the note A (the traditional tuning key for orchestra) and is harmonized from there. This means that the manipulation of pitch (its duration or speed for instance) required to be true to the harmonic differentiation costs the articulateness of the particular sound. It distorts it. In this case, a word, for example would become perhaps harder to discern as it moved up or down the scale. The smaller the memory, the more distorted the sample. With the human voice this gives the impression of it speeding up or slowing down.

To say sample music is to be as vague as to say guitar or keyboard or percussion music. There is little that can be attributed to it as innate, beyond its physical properties and anything you might want to glom from its being an electronic device. Certainly there are things about the machine itself which have possible cultural import. Likewise with certain issues around composition which concern themselves with property rights. But these are perhaps less musical issues than economic and legal ones - and perhaps moral ones. They highlight certain social architectures of music and to a degree expose the ulterior motive behind its historicization (i.e. back cataloguing, nostalgia for profit and entropy, and the predominance of vicious kitsch), but it is not as if this doesn't have precedence in other music (the magnetic and very much analog musing of the American and German avant gardist of the period between 1945 - 1977 in particular, e.g. John Cage, Stockhausen, Robert Ashley, Brian Eno, etc.) even the issue of produced music is not new in this respect, Glen Gould, the Beatles after 1966 and Frank Zappa are illustrative of this aesthetic. And the notion that now anyone can make music is about as accurate as the notion that anyone with a word processor - now - can be a writer. It's not that you don't have to train any more but that you train for different things; the central thing is still training and expertise.

As a species of textual exemplification of the aesthetic and the effect of sampling, this "book" - or whatever you want to call it - contains periodic moments of sampling which are placed

specifically to augment certain sections and to occasion the curious sense of location, ownership and authenticity with respect to narrative (in this case, in a theory mode) voice, to meaning, and indeed, to sense itself - not to mention a complicit embroilment into issues of intellectual property.

I suppose they could simply be called quotes in this medium, but I have decided to experiment with the effect of calling them samples; to see if such a specification co-ordinates their function. Partly to this end, the pages with samples are not numbered, but are indicated as samples. This quite simply, is an easy way to register their partial exclusion from the textual body, despite their placement within it; in other words, to show up their invasive function on the one hand, while not denying any invitation for them to do so, on the other.

just take that moment
and put it aside
for a memory

- scrambled sample of a scrambled sample from an episode of Star Trek: The Next Generation used in a piece by Arthur Kroker and Steve Gibson about a transexual named Toni Denise for the book/cd Spasm.

What we wish to encourage is uncertainty. People must be convinced not just that the priest may be a humbug and the judge a thief, but that all systems of philosophy are equally dubious, that all papal bulls are as absurd as picaresque novels, that the latest scientific theories are no more infallible than papal bulls, &c.; in short, that all books are works of fiction, whether they are so labelled or not. -
The Historical Illuminatus Chronicles, Robert Anton Wilson

THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF CULTURE

OCTOBER 27, 1991

EXPLANATION

"There has been, at least ever since Aristotle, a certain strong tendency in the West toward explanation - a kind of syndrome. The first and initial step is fairly innocent - to consider a verbal explanation of creative art as necessary to an understanding of the act.

The second step is less innocent.

In this second step the explanation of the art becomes a substitute for the art.

But the third step is really something.

It is a sort of apotheosis, where the explanation actually becomes the art." *Harry Partch*, from SOURCE #1 1967

THE COMPOSER

"He (sic) no longer makes the final object as he once did.

He now, at last, has the chance to concentrate on the creative process itself.

In this way many different objects can come out. (...) The composer is freed." *Karlheinz Stockhausen*, from SOURCE #1 1967

SCORING

"The composition is not the paper. The composition is your relationship." *Robert Asheley*, from SOURCE #1 1967

"I call the form the finally crystallized object which is the result of the process of formation.

As in an organic process you always have a certain form at a certain instant.

But it changes the next second and is no longer the same.

The matrix remains constant, and the composer concentrates on the matrix... We know very little about the genetic rules of music.

(...) How to bring about music. (...) We have to compose the composition." *Karlheinz Stockhausen, Ibid.*

"With whom, therefore, shall I compare the men of this generation, and whom are they like? They are like young children sitting in a market place and crying out to one another, and who say 'We played the flute for YOU but YOU did not dance; we wailed, but YOU did not weep.' (-) All the same, wisdom is proved righteous by all its children."

THE VAGUE GENERATION

We who are recognized now as a generation are the Vague Generation. We who grew up under the umbrella of uncertainty not in fear but with acceptance; who understand uncertainty as a banal everyday aspect of living.

We are the ones without specificity.

We still have the same feelings and experiences: we love, fear, hate, desire and get depressed, we live and wonder what to do with our lives until we die. But none of this can be reduced to a singularity any more; we feel things but we don't know specifically why. There are many reasons why we *might* feel what we do, but not one over-reaching one, and often it seems there really is no reason at all and that the multiplicity of reasons we consider are, in their consideration, actually an unsuccessful attempt to fix on something which just cannot be fixed upon any more.

Likewise with the question of what we are going to do with our lives. The posing of this question opens up a yawning great abyss of vague anxieties that one responds to only in hope of placating, or waylaying, the implication of what is very real for us: the fact that we really don't know what to do with our lives. The comfort of the old singularity is out of our reach and we are still too nervous about actively affirming and employing the current conditions as the way we must now live our lives. We resemble very much the condition of stereo-typified adolescence, even though we are beyond the age of passage. That passage didn't occur because what we were supposed to pass into just doesn't

exist any more. It may seem that it does, especially after the ambitious 80's, but the overstated character of that ambition revealed it to be a trend with very little actual materialization. Many acknowledged the principle, and it was even developed into an aesthetic, but as such it was an investment with very little return as real currency; providing in its stead the empty sign of success. This was the basis for the development of a much encouraged trend towards acquiring an 'attitude' - regardless of whether there was anything there to back it up.

In tune, then, with a credit economy - where money exists mostly as potential - attitude was substance and achievement on credit. It was the sign of potential business success. An enrollment in, or purchase of, the dream of success - which is underwritten by a 'lottery logic', i.e. that anyone could be lucky enough to win the big one.

Sure the odds are stacked against it, but if you don't play you can't win. What's forgotten in this formula is, if you don't play you - also - can't lose.

Many thought they were 'getting their shit together' by clarifying their career interests (and the number of MBAs increased at a phenomenal rate), being cautious with regard to family planning, exercising, eating right, avoiding intoxication and refraining from sexual excess. But as the "are you ambitious" 80's gives way to the "are you organized" 90's it becomes clear that process is everything and that all those preparatory concerns and endeavors have no guarantee of a pay-off - unless you consider another addition to your persona wardrobe to be that. In other words,

what you're left with is a fashion identity fated to become a stale code for the nostalgia machine of the future (in some ways, now, the future is only the potential for a longer and greater past - as time has become one of the biggest purchasing items on the market of consumer distractions - and hence, a great resource for capital plundering).

With no guaranteed end in sight (whatever your GPA, GNP, or YOE [years of experience]) what else can you do but have a tidier desk and more appointments than the next person? Indeed, tidiness may be one of the most difficult achievements for the vague generation. It already has heavy currency as metaphor and analog. Everything needs to be tidied-up: living/sleeping quarters, laundry, deadlines, personal affairs, world affairs, the environment, project intentions, and our state of being - its continually one big fucking mess.

We are teenagers for life and we suffer as they do because its pretty much been assumed that this is not a cool way to be - oh, you may 'be' cool within it, but that's a limited charm, a grace of the duration, the term. If we could explode the transcendental imperative (which no longer pays off anyway - if it ever 'really' did) and affirm our condition (...to say: "So Be It", like the teenagers in the movie "Pump Up The Volume") then we would not suffer the identity crises (or we wouldn't mind suffering it) because identity would both literally and figuratively be immaterial (not erased, just not that important), and maybe the world would shift a little on its axis.

This, of course, is what I tend towards. The power of affirmation.

Currency and sex were forces in our lives now, like smoky, violet surges of electricity and light. Sex and currency, currency and sex. The hum and the pop, chirring and turning, beating like electricity. We could drive cars with that force radiating deep inside us. We could activate industrial machinery. We could generate enough massive interior energy to drive cities, planets and suns.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

MARCH 18 1991

Now that sex has been resituated as a threat not just to a way of life but to life itself, it is not surprising that this threat and its consequent paranoia result further in an intensification and reinforcement of the seductive relation to/of danger.

A de-intensification of the paradigms of liberation believed to manifest in a variegated series of intimate physical encounters, coupled with an intensification of the pleasure of intensity itself. A pleasure which is realized in the mere consideration of risk.

Not, then, so much a matter of seeking one's pleasure in spite of the risk, as it is the pleasure of the risk itself.

It is likewise no wonder that in a time of public service announcements recommending extreme caution, representational 'displays' of the body as an object of sexual enticement, and the production of graphic obscenity in/as language are proliferating ad nauseam.

This, however, is not a contradiction. Indeed, the one assures and provides for the other.

They are consistent with one another.

These 'contrary' images are extensively and pervasively proliferated both as a reaction against a general restriction on sexuality and as an expression of it.

The acceleration and hyper-repetition of these images nullifies their ostensible meaning as exotic erotica and renders them instead as totally banal.

The further consequence of a sexuality rendered commonplace as 'display' is an increased feeling of remoteness from actual physical contact.

In fact, it promotes the body as a remote sensor and beacon of sexual expression.

Lighthouses of desire with no shore to guide ships into, functioning only to entice them into an erotic of longing itself.

Take the wax out of your ears, then, and feel the rapture of the mad longing for Agamemnon's sirens. After all, to actually touch them could mean death.

For this is a sex which is so intense as display (and so wrapped up in an heroic athleticism) that one could only be a voyeur or an(other) exhibitionist in relation to it.

It is the seductiveness of proximity and hyper-suggestion (which also, incidentally, could account for the abundance of conspiracy theories).

Think about dance music videos. Therein can be found a number of dancers in form-fitting clothes designed not so much toward a suggestion of the disappearance of clothing altogether (to an unveiling - although nudity in music videos is becoming quite fashionable), as toward an absolute fusion with the body - to become the same as skin.

And there we have the 'perfect' indication of a status of sexuality today: where the skin itself is prophylactic.

The moves (the gyrations and pelvic thrusts), if considered sexy, reveal sex as situated within a virtuosity of effort and execution (which could be said to be the case not just physically, but

I thought it was the anticipation which made sex real, but now I know it was merely my explicit faith in that imagination which unreeled around me in my childhood like the spokes of a milky galaxy. I was beginning to learn that the imaginative act was more important in my life than action itself. Action merely articulated you with an exterior and superficial network of facts, data and information which superimposed itself across the real world of my imagination like a restraint, or a clinging, oily film. I wanted the dream of sex, the energy and heat of it. Had I been able to articulate the problem for Rodney, I'm certain he would have preferred the dreams too.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

probably otherwise as well).

This happens in a climate where the 'relationship' has become the familiar and familial ground of hyper-uncertainty, and where one bares witness to an investment in durability that is no longer plausible.

Not only that, but the unattainable longing for relationship finds itself running parallel to and conjunctive with a desire for solitude (which often finds its heroics expressed in an "I-worked-hard-and-did-it-my-way" aesthetic). A mutual exclusiveness which is both satisfying and unsatisfying, and which is also neither of those, exactly. It remains vague.

The death of meaning (through both its omnipresence and consequent exhaustion, i.e. its being relativized to such an interpretive extent that any designation is adequate and equivalent in value to any other, and hence, meaningless with regard to any particularity and 'worn-out' with respect to any novelty) has laid the way for an over determined pragmatics which seeks the security in the tangible or physical (which is to say in general, then, the material).

But consistent with other modernist horizons towards which one might attempt to accede, the gesture for such security is, in its very reaching, assuredly lost and impossible to complete.

For a body which moves towards its materiality is a body hopelessly divested of its substance.

Hopeless because the body is the original figure of material, of the physical, the physique; and to throw this out as that which the body must develop is to render the body as that which can

only constitute itself as such by an acquisition mediated through abstract investment.

The body, then, as a ghost made flesh by the mechanics of the logos.

By virtue of this over determination of pragmatics, thus, we have not only the death of meaning at the so-called ephemeral or intangible level of ontology, but also the death of material itself.

Substance, then, as a ghost right at the surface.

Or, the body as a double ghost: one of a chance, and one of an idea.

That is, the body as ghost by inheritance seeking out its ghostly ideal in order to materialize itself like a hologram.

This is where the 'appearance' of reality counts for more than reality itself.

Where it is insisted that the body was never anything more than an idea, and so the idea (the abstract) is inscribed like Kafka's punishing machine right into the flesh itself and makes it come undone.

Or perhaps it is covered like wallpaper, not in an effort to disguise, or even in an effort to define, but rather, to render an absolute equivocation of all forms and substance for the subsequent production of them as inter/intra/ex/changeable signs with the mere pretense - not even to meaning - but to sensation alone. Thus, all recent assessments of the carnage in the after wake/ aftermath of meaning's death (e.g.. the identification of a shock or thrill economy) is now, or very soon to be, proven obsolete -

as we bare witness to the death of feeling also; of sensation itself.

Indeed, it would seem that the only faculty remaining is precisely our capacity to bare witness... ..and also to wait.

All of this, when taken into consideration, makes the traditional correspondence between rock/pop music and sex/uality due for a re-evaluation.

If I don't throw myself into my work, then I'm going to throw myself out the window.

Practice, it would seem, is our refuge today.

A seamless and unself-conscious (i.e., uninhibited) physical execution which operates ideologically within the comfort of materiality, and which thus staves off the discomfort of uncertain ontological meaning (i.e. because its ideology is unrecognized as such).

In practice, meaning is predetermined: follow the rules and everything will be as it should be.

This is the comfort of an environment, the determined meaning of which, is completely controlled.

It is hence not surprising that the condition of ontological uncertainty opens doors wide to fascism.

Power certainly is not dead, even if it is vague.

Behavior can be controlled if one volunteers to let it be. It is also not surprising that an increase in violence be remarked upon under such conditions; as the frustration of failed promises rise along with the bitterness of being excluded, disenfranchised and generally disadvantaged with respect to opportunity.

The promise of certainty and comfort in materiality does not necessarily - if ever - pay off (for even the successful are riddled with the fear of loss and change).

To say that we are today overwhelmingly immersed in the deepest form of despondent nihilism is to so blatantly overstate the obvious as to actually be inaccurate.

What we are actually immersed in is an intense (and yet not so intense) condition of vagueness.

Which is to say that although much may be proclaimed 'dead', there remains, nevertheless, fairly effective phantoms haunting the old house/s of the social order - and the new house/s as well. For although things are dead, the general effects of them carry on just as though they were still here, and perhaps even more efficiently thereby, precisely because their disappearing materiality grants them a mythological status which, ironically, gives them more 'potential' substance than they may have ever had.

That is, because their substance is consigned as 'potential', its efficacy is always (yet) to be determined.

It is thus easier to manipulate.

In order to free the self, one must abandon all preconceptions about what the self is. As I worked, the words arose in me without my volition. They were the like the hard intricate tools I wielded, they were like the dense yielding body of Dad. Associative, crystalline, buzzing, hard. Next to these words, the world itself seemed to reliquefy itself, dissolving in the blood of some archetypal Christ. Make no mistake about it - the self exists, Rodney, and this is it. 'This' is the self. This is the self here, I showed Rodney something on the end of one stubby screwdriver. Blood, tissue, bone, cartilage, marrow, mass, gravity, liquid, sound, light. It moves or it doesn't move. It lives or it doesn't live. This is the history of luminous motion, Rodney. This is the flux and convection of sudden light. We're all the same but we're all not the same too. What you prefer is not what I prefer. There's just this - and this - and this (-) This here, or this here. This is all we are, this warm and fragile envelope, this thin impacted tissue. It's not that we exist but that we know we exist that makes our lives so miserable. And this - this is nothing. And this, and this, and this. This is all nothing too. This is the progress men and women make alone in the world of light,

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

MARCH 27 1991

In many ways this is all a question of identity.

This may seem to be a somewhat archaic subject matter, especially given pronouncements of the death of the subject (and many other things) from as early as the mid 50's (thinking here of the writings of Roland Barthes, for example, and, of course, the so-called French semiotic movement through the 60's, American literary criticism from the early 70's and post-modern theory from the mid 70's until the present).

Nevertheless, considerations of its reconstitution have run in tandem with its displacement, and, during the 80's, found itself as the interest of conferences, journals and other markers of what is normally called a 'movement'. But it is not, strictly speaking, in the spirit of a reconstitution that I cite it here as a question or interest, rather it is in the face of the existent contention (to ask or not to ask the question of being) that I find that it is, whether displaced or sought out, a concern which has effects and ramifications in cultural formations as well as social and political philosophy which attends itself to those formations.

Indeed, the conditions of vagueness and uncertainty that I pay heed to are directly related to questions of identity, and more specifically to the production of (i.e. its construction and its products) being vague and uncertain as a conditional question of being.

Interest in matters of who we are and what we are doing ('going' to be/'going' to do) are now 'virtually' rendered as 'identical' questions. (The emphasis is for the sake of irony or to indicate a certain loaded quality these words - given their position as subject matter in this writing - have.

So, "virtual" is to be read at once as: "not really", "as if it were the case" and "for all intents of purpose as".

"Identical" is to be read at once as: "the same thing as", "like identity" and "confounded, localized/positioned or matched together."

The irony of such instructions to read do not escape me; insofar as they are illustrative already of an immersion into confluences between pragmatics and presence which it is their intention to displace.

The consequence of such irony would be the production of a problematic, which by virtue of its mode of production, assures the place of the problem. This, then, will not be the idea...). In many ways what has been, is, or will be observed and considered is a contemporary penchant for incorporating (or is it merely exemplifying) contradictions with regard to cultural practices and notions of ownership (or culpability/responsibility for their existence and their consequences).

A history is displayed in order to show a certain progressed development which - if not simply responsible for it - can be recognized as making this condition possible and/or a likely outcome.

I want to know where we stand today.

There are a number of different "voices" here (i.e. narrative styles). This is not for the sake of a stylistic subversity - for this writing is operating under the contention that style, form or gesture is not in itself any guarantee of meaning (of say, politics) - but rather, it is for the sake of exploration of the different possibilities open to different consideration 'dialects'.

If I use a particular voice, then, it is not in order to reflect 'upon' that voice, but to reflect 'with' it - to see if it does reflect in a productive way and notice what it does produce. Again, this is not to say that meaning is reserved to a specificity of mode (or means/medium) of communication, or a challenge to the capabilities of a standard and uniform style of writing. Rather, it is an allowance for or remittance (where the 'currency' is sense) to/for the very difference which the existence of a standard implies (such that this/these difference/s are free to exemplify the 'character' of that difference as either - or both - a limiting and delimiting of their production/s).

Simply, if they are different, then how do they produce differently and what is different about their production/s (products) - what is the 'quality' of that difference?

This writing is, in its lay-out, consistent with its interest. It is an example of the condition it explores.

"It is by no means an objection to a book when someone finds it unintelligible" -Nietzsche, Joyful Wisdom, #381

MARCH 30 1991

That which is ideologically refused refuses to be refused.

Think about Intention and think about Silence and think about John Cage.

Me, I'm going to think about what happened when I'd read from "Conversing With Cage - Richard Kostelanetz."

There, as I was reading, was something which made me stop, because what I read made me feel that maybe I agree, and then again maybe I don't. I don't like this voice.

Stop.

Begin:

I cannot write when I don't feel free to write as I like.

Why do you do something the way you do: because I can.

Think about intention.

Some people don't like to show it - to have it be shown (revealed) in what they do.

It is always "what I mean", so it doesn't matter to say, because it can always be said for you.

Even if you do say, it will still be said for you.

If anything could be said to be a saying, then there is always meaning - whether you want it or not.

If anything could be said to be meaningful, then there is always 'wanting' - whether you want it or not.

It could all be vague or uncertain (usually, this is the case), but it is still filled with 'wanting.'

Any talk about how you do it is a talk filled with 'wanting.'

'Wanting' is intention.

You needn't say it in order for it to be there; it's there all on its own.

So, it doesn't matter if you put it there.

So why bother?

Because you can.

What does this mean?

Practically anything you want, or don't want, and not-so- practically either.

So, what is it - if you like to ask.

If you don't somebody else can.

You cannot escape meaning or intention. You can say you don't want it there, where someone else can put it. You can say you didn't intend for 'intending' to be there, so you are not responsible for whatever anyone says it is that is there. But if you say it is yours, then you are always held to be responsible for it.

So you can refuse intention as much as you can but it will still be there.

Now, when you do what you do as a way of 'not-doing' something, it will always be the case that the 'not-doing' will always be in some manner, still, the 'doing.'

So, why not do something because it is the way of doing, and refuse nothing in particular (although not as a 'anti-refusing', because that will just be another refusing, which will just get you back to the problem of determining "what-it-is" by virtue of "what-it-is-not").

It can be many things - and not too - so just let it be whatever it can - and can't - and if someone asks, well then, that is another thing - which is the same thing ...and not, also.

So, however it goes is fine - and not fine - because it always can be. So let it, and don't. It doesn't make any difference, and does. However you choose, it can be contradicted.

But you needn't care if you don't want to.

You might as well do it all in the way you do, because you're going to anyway, whether you do or not.

Then, what does it matter what anyone says? - Whatever you want. Anything can be contradicted.

You can go ahead and try to find something which cannot be contradicted, but the thing about 'saying' is precisely that it can always be said one way or another.

This is why there are those who don't care to say "why"; because it can always be contradicted, and unless they want to fight about it, they just can't be bothered to say something which is a saying about something that only explains it to those who agree with the explanation. That is, that it is too much a matter of whether anyone agrees or not, or can except that or not.

Of course, it doesn't much matter if they say why or not, precisely because someone always can.

There are those who don't want to say anything about their speaking and that is the same thing: it doesn't matter whether you do or don't because someone can.

Of course, 'matter' or 'import' is a way of being.

What matters to you, and saying it, is a way of being-in- your-

speaking and speaking-in-your-being.

So why not go ahead and do what you do, and it may matter to some, and not to others, and if it matters that some do not agree, then you can fight if you want; for whatever reasons you want to fight.

Fighting is a very popular thing to do and it is done for many reasons.

Some want to and some do not want to and some are forced to and some can freely choose either way.

There are those who wish to avoid it at all costs but that does not mean they will.

Fighting is prevalent and there are many different ways of doing and 'not-doing' it.

If things are largely a matter of belief, then you might as well believe what you care to believe, and that is one reason why fighting happens.

But, of course, fighting and believing can happen for any reason, and so, they do.

Things are as they are because they can be.

If things today are said to be not really what they are said to be, it does not matter, because whether they are really what they are said to be or not, they still happen as 'if' they are, and that is all that is necessary in order for something to happen, ever.

To say that it used to be real and now it only 'pretends' to be real (or doesn't even bother to pretend) doesn't matter because it still is what it is, and if people act differently then that

can be interesting, or not, and whether or not it is real, it still is what it is, and you can say it is one way or it is another way - Because you can always say "so what."

MAY 15 1991

Why are intellectuals so concerned with the truth these days, that is, with its disappearance?

Under suspicion in the fifties (or is it at the moment when the bomb - and deterrent - is established as both potential threat and protection, indeed a potential itself?), through the eighties it has come to be that which is the sign of ultimate fraudulence.

This isn't even like saying that it is only relative; because relative truth is still a truth, only conditional upon a context.

Truth now, in the early nineties, in intellectual circles, is an impossibility - and more, it is a ruse; a con-job.

This, of course, makes belief a ridiculous prospect indicative only of political force; of power (itself).

Hence, the prevalent mode of expression is despair, and its only function is neurotic, because any and every mode of expression can only, given that there is no truth, be grounded in false consciousness, or at the most, a provisional statement of, not even intent, but rather, impulse.

In this world we have no principles, only the organization of uncontrollable urges.

Here, even - or is it especially - justice is this.

But if nothing is true, if it is only made to appear as such, then isn't this thinking (in all its resplendent melancholy and/or cynicism) subject to the same finding?

Is not this thinking also just another organization of (an) uncontrollable urge(s)?

Could it also be the case that this thinking is complicit with, indeed, in some way responsible for, the very condition it seeks to describe and identify?

What are the stakes in such a complicity?

Many deaths, break-ups, and general 'releases-from' are misconstrued as freedoms, that is to say, *carte blanche*.

These ruptures are opportunities, and what is an opportunity if not the acceleration, proliferation of, or simple indulgence in, the urge itself - or the *very idea of the uncontrollable*?

Is that not already a misconstruction of freedom?

And if, as has also been well established in the contemporary intellectual cannon, logic is a power-oriented pragmatism which plays out a symbiotic host/parasite game with ideological oppositions, then the beauty (ironically speaking) of the phrase 'organized uncontrollable urges', especially under the auspices of 'freedom', should be apparent. For freedom as a compulsion (Sartre, Foucault) is ultimate slavery.

Plato, of course, discoursed on slavery to one's desires. Deleuze and Guattari discourse on freedom through them. But in the logic of contemporary thinking as suggested, they are one and the same.

You are free to be your own slave, or you are enslaved to your own freedom.

Slavery and obsession, like giving (and receiving) abuse, have become proffered as the most prevalent and desired dialectic of seduction and seductiveness in the name of a freedom which has

almost exclusively defined its parameters as one of expression (as opposed to, say, mobility - in fact to the point where mobility and expression are almost identical), and its principles are consigned to a system of justice which rules with regard to a notion of consent.

Legality, with respect to all this, is a mere stipulation, and committing a crime is often considered less a failure than getting caught is.

Why does 'bottom-lining' (i.e. the ultimatum, the fundamental, etc.) seem so prevalent?

Now when pragmatism is featured as the only realistic (at a time when the real is called into question) philosophy (no wonder, then, that any other philosophy must question the real, and indeed pragmatism itself, i.e. for the sake of its own survival) worth considering (although it is often not so much considered as it is implemented), is it any wonder?

The two most important things today are: a good (paying) job and the best, most optimized, leisure space (whether it's the bar, the car or what is, perhaps laughingly, referred to now as the home).

Both of these are collected under a general paradigm of the optimal - or opportunity if you like.

"What do you (want to) do for a living?" and "How do you (wish to) live your life?", then, are the two most crucial questions - with the former taking precedence.

Work and leisure are the components in a prime binary system within which we pass away our time.

Part survivalist philosophy, part social Darwinism, part sci-fi fantasy and part absurdist's Plato's Republic, contemporary life (in this part of the world at least) is a spatial co-ordination of time as that which is 'spent' (in all senses of the word). As such, further, it is, of course, a cycle of production and consumption. But more than this, it is also the active (and passive - i.e. the being) combination of production and consumption.

An effective collapse, then, of this old dialectic, which thus increases its efficiency (by virtue of its consequent acceleration).

An achieved simultaneity of cyclical oppositions allows for a speeded up cycle which leaves space (time) for more cycles. Faster is bigger and bigger is better and better is best. Here then, is the 'real' proof of the relativity of space and time, as well as mass and energy.

If time is money then the reverse - money is time - must also hold true.

And if time and space are relative then so are money and space.

It could be said at some point in this line of logic that money is energy.

(And, indeed, as more market trading is done by computer, this becomes increasingly the case. For the materiality of money is only a fanciful representation of actual credit which exists as electronic impulses in cyberspace, where capital volume is more fluid.) Both money and energy are the bottom line, and they are, hence, both relative to space.

Now, in order for this to really work effectively and as efficiently as possible, space must be abstract, i.e. cybernetic (in order to further assure that it can be designated anywhere with infinite rates of measurement - and so, volume must also be abstract).

Space can never be too small or too big to occupy in some manner.

Occupancy, volume and duration are the bottom lines of space and time, and money and life.

It is impossible not to be working for someone, whether inadvertently or not.

For anything you do keeps somebody employed, and where there's employment there are employers.

You are a resource and excuse for work whether you are dead or alive, or even somewhere in between.

You are at once an asset and a liability.

JUNE 27, 1991

Why is it that sad songs seem to be more popular and longer lasting to the public's taste than happy ones? (Or, slower songs more than fast ones?)

Happy or sweet songs which are slow to medium tempo stay longer on the play list.

Could this be so because at these tempos happy songs have a tinge of sadness about them, i.e. that they are somewhat melancholic?

Bob Dylan said in reply to a question concerning the success of Blood On the Tracks, (a success which had waned with previous albums), that he guessed people liked pain.

When slow songs are played in Country and Western bars, the patrons drink more.

Common opinion about the Country Blues singer Patsy Cline is that her ballads show her at her best form.

Likewise with Elvis Presley; it was the ballads which "joyously" broke hearts.

But perhaps the question "why" is inappropriate.

Doesn't that question -historically, at least- carry with it the implication of pathology (i.e. in the psycho-analytic sense)?

Why ask why?

Since psycho-analysis, reason is that which is hidden.

Face-value is suspect; it is seen as a screen for the actual.

The implication of taking things at face-value then, is that one would be duped.

Post-modernism takes this one step further by contending that whether your focus is latent or manifest meaning, you're still being duped (because meaning is only a surface effect; a simulation for the workings of power).

To operate from that position is to, in effect, be in a constant state of being a victim of a potential con-job.

This is the position of the permanently oppressed or paranoid.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1991

Strength lies in being.

But the vague generation knows being only as a possibility - one which can never be fully realized.

That is, one which can never be assuredly realized.

And also, one which can never be convincingly recognized. Only this is possible: belief in a claim-to-being.

Therefore, all being is representation - because it is always something which someone claims to have or have had.

And what of those who make such claims?

It is only arrogance.

Or, it is a part of the past.

It cannot, however, for the vague generation, truly be what it claims to be because the vague generation is constituted precisely by virtue of the impossibility of such a claim.

And yet, it is also constituted by the likelihood and frequent occurrence of such a claim.

But never as a single claim. Rather, as many, i.e. as a number of 'attempts' to claim - 'to be able' to claim.

The vague generation is sheer potential.

It experiences only what it 'could' be.

For this reason alone it obliterates history, because the proposition "strength lies in being" belongs fundamentally to history, i.e. to "History" (the story of our coming-to-be); it is what makes history possible, and the vague generation's strength lies in being nothing in particular.

This is a strength almost inconceivable to possess, for although history may be dead, its ghost still haunts us - and we are doomed if we continue to believe in its promises.

The vague generation is, therefore, almost completely unacceptable to every generation which proceeded it, to the orders which they have established, and even to itself.

And yet, even if only as a curious malaise, its condition is more and more apparent, and recognized as a cultural development.

An insidious take-over is imminent. So insidious, in fact, that the rulers themselves will be largely unaware of their action as such.

Nevertheless, a take-over will occur and only unconditional surrender will make it possible to survive.

Not, then, as in the past, 'surrender unto being', but rather 'surrender unto being vague', i.e. surrender unto a being which is always conditional.

Finally, then, strength, also is conditional - always.

That is, the terms for, or bases of, strength are mutable.

Which means that the moving force of being or presence will present itself as a kind of self-satisfied moodiness.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1991

What is a voice of a generation?

One answer: a representation.

Do we lament the lack of such a voice?

It does not exist because representation is an obsolete form of expression.

How is that the case?

One answer: the pervasive belief in cultural relativity.

What is that?

The belief that all meaning is context bound and completely open to interpretation.

Meaning in this sense is determined by the way in which it is relevant to one's experience.

Meaning is not in itself truth, but rather an opportunity to explain one's life, and understanding is the ability to practically situate it within an environment.

Representation is dependent upon recognition.

The contemporary generation cannot be represented because it cannot recognize itself.

There never could be a voice for such a generation.

And what is the desire for such a voice? How is such a thing to be understood?

Is it not another example of a rampant in-itself nostalgia, i.e. a nostalgia for the sake of itself?

It is a nostalgia which is indifferent to its referent.

A promiscuous nostalgia.

The question is posed as: why don't we have a voice for our generation - as other generations had?

We are a generation defined by our claims of cultural poverty and dispossession.

But this is wrong.

What we need is many voices raised in affirmation of what we have.

Why?

Because we can, but we do not.

Why don't we?

We are a transitional generation caught up in old paradigms of expression and understanding which are of no use to us but which are foisted upon us by preceding generations through their worn out orders of representation.

They wish their loss to be our inheritance.

They want us to cash in for them.

But their true legacy is a melancholic nihilism which possesses us like a viral strain of suicidal logic.

They could be our undoing.

Our first defense, however, is a marked tendency for laughing at things they don't find funny.

Hence, we have an - almost innate - sense of irony which accounts for a capacity for a recuperation of the means of oppression which makes Deleuze and Guattari's *Body Without Organs*' political redistribution operations look and sound like so much statement of the obvious.

Not that we mind, for statements of the obvious are fine enter-

tainment for us.

We treasure the opportunity to state things simply as we see them, because for us nothing is ever simple, and so to do so is high comedy, a blessed relief and great revolutionary liberation.

Almost like chronic and terminal adolescents, no-one wants to let us do it our way (although they're willing to let us 'have' it our way - at Burger King, Harvey's and McDonald's, that is, make our choices from their selections) - and that is why manner and style are central to our revolutionary rhetoric (even though revolution is something we don't really think about).

Revolution for us is not called revolution because such talk carries at this time too many presumptions about its execution.

Therefore, it is called "doing what we would like to do" instead. For previous generations this can only be considered trite and superficial.

They have no idea.

Never has there been such a gap. And it is all the more acute because it doesn't look like there really is one.

The cultural artifacts which were representative of those generations are still a major staple in our consumer consumption diets. They seem to be as much a part of our lives as they were of theirs. And so they are, but they are not the same lives, and the artifacts no longer are representative; they are only corollaries from shifting propositions employed in the service of shifting usage.

In effect, they are less artifacts and more technologies.

Sometimes the images sped and raced in my mind, and I
imagined myself taking a seat in my own subjective cinema.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

SEPTEMBER 24, 1991

Re: Slacker: a film and a catalogue of the vague generation.

The ecstasy of part-time suicide.

It is not a case of live or die. It is a case of fluctuating self-destruction.

Slow death is "having a good time", or "killing time" - hanging out.

This is life in the face of the absurd (Camus) all right, but it is neither the forceful optimism of a life in tension with a forestalled death, nor is it the blank stumbling of nihilistic cowardice.

It's sometimes a life which carries on for lack of anything better to do.

Or it is simply carrying on - hanging out.

Life is hanging out until the hanging out's over with - although it doesn't wait for that moment.

When life is absurd, so is meaning; and when meaning is absurd then conspiracies and divinations (of the fortune cookie variety) abound.

No possible explanation is refused because none are taken seriously.

If it may seem one is, it is only because of a compulsion (or at least a interest) to be exhaustive, which is not to say to understand. In this respect, excess (like very many televisions in a room and very many facets to an explanation or theory) is not shocking (Tofler) or sickening (Sartre).

In fact, it is so understated as to be simply accommodated. It is not remarkable as such, it is merely situated into either a frenzied solipsism (with mystic proportions) or a completely alien and alienated phantasm of a social reality which is always covert and never manifest to the naked eye (like so much contemporary political philosophy and theory).

No wonder, then, that divination comes in the form of "pick a card any card" - an old set up for a bit of sleight of hand. Nor that the cards themselves would be the Neo-dadaist/ surrealist/futurist/situationist (as in Duchamp and Satie) Brian Eno's "Oblique Strategies".

That is, fortunes whose meaning remain blithely vague opportunities for that sense of irony which at least makes our lives seem entertaining, or for even further vague opportunities to frame our day into some sense of greater fiction (like walking around with an empty picture frame in front of you in order to get perspective on your life, simulating the seriality of TV or the movies - both of which, of course, are completely contrived...and so why shouldn't our lives be as well?).

What all of this also demonstrates is that the consideration that capitalism has moved from a production economy to one of consumption has to be amended (that is, augmented) by the observation that consumption is not merely a process of depletion and replenishing (or stock-piling); of intake, digestion and excretion cycles; of, ultimately, cycles of purchasing, using-up and purchasing again, but has moved into a stage where distribution has usurped production and redefined consumption.

What this means is that product is not just produced and consumed, it is purchased and integrated.

Like floating ideologies, consumer goods become networked into cosmologies of everyday life.

In other words, they are not objects which are enjoyed in themselves, they are objects which facilitate the construction, maintenance and management of a personal mise en scene (the set, scenery, condition and direction).

Like a bodily prosthesis, they are fashioned to assist in the construction of a pass-time (which in the Indian Vedas was the term for Krishna's adventures, i.e. his life) for those whose sense of life's purpose is crippled - or at least handicapped. This is when life as a hobby or career mean the same thing, i.e. that it has no innate sense of itself.

Consumer goods, in this sense, are not so much sold as they are distributed (of course at a price), and not so much purchased as integrated (again, of course, at a price).

They are, then, no longer goods - they are elements and constituents.

They are systemic.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1991

Conspiracies are the only legitimate social and political theories today.

Why? Because everything which can be identified as a prevalent trend has no clear onus - there is no sense of it as a rational outcome.

Remember Salvador Dali's Paranoia Critical Method?

Through that we can imagine a gleeful practice of conspiracy theorizing.

Think about the situation today, for instance, with regard to sex and relationships.

In Hollywood, apparently, the newest trend amongst the young up and coming gods/esses is the enactment of a species of neo-beatnikism.

This means hanging out in coffee houses and talking instead of in clubs and chic pads drinking, snorting, shooting and copulating.

In the article I read about it (and I'm sure Faith Popcorn based her prediction of this phenomenon for the 90's on the same one - or one very much like it, because it's an easy assumption that the denizens of the U.S.A. will always follow in the footsteps of their celebrity-gods/esses) the favored topic of conversations was relationships, i.e. as: what the last one was like; what they want the next one to be like; what the one they are having is like; what someone else's are/were/will be like.

All of this was explained as a kind of panic maturity grounded in

a cultural terror of promiscuity (of course by virtue of it being absolutely valorized) on the one hand, and a genuine nostalgic longing for a constituted myth of the family and so-called traditional values (values which mostly were constructed, determined, or at least heavily suggested by Hollywood itself, i.e., the movies) on the other.

Now, socio-political conspiracy theory would have it that this preoccupation with relationships (and with sex in general, i.e. as a subject of discourse) is meant to keep everyone so fixated as to be completely unfocused and unaware of anything else that is going on.

Citizens as satellites in orbit about their sexuality.

Similarly, the promise of technological convenience, i.e. that certain appliances and machinery (such as the personal computer) would create more free time is reworked through conspiracy theory as a plot to absolutely consume our time, to create, in fact, a time deficit.

It becomes abundantly clear as a result of the PC that there just never is or will be enough time to process all the information either about how to get the most out of your PC or to manifest all its uses.

Again, following the computer phenomenon, the predicted end of the so-called age of paper was actually a plot to increase our use and dependence upon paper, and generally increase the possibility - and hence the need - for storage, documentation, record-keeping, etc. Another lie - let us shift right into conspiracy gear and call them that, all the while knowing, of course, that

it is not quite that simple - about the computer is that it would be a labor saving device.

Actually the presence of the computer in the home means that labor - that is to say work and the work place - has extended itself from the office and factory right into the home.

No home can be a refuge from the labor process meant to make the home possible because now the home makes possible the increase and expansion of labor.

Every home with a computer in it is an office - a work space.

And it doesn't matter if you're not actually doing something that you're being or going to be paid for because what's important is the very idea of being comfortable with doing work in the home.

In fact, all the better if you're doing it without being paid, i.e. doing it as part of some personal project, because that means that you are quite used to the idea of spending hours bent over the keyboard and would probably be overjoyed at the prospect of actually getting paid for it.

So when that time comes you'll be all the more eager.

The beauty of paying people by salary instead of by the hour is the virtual guarantee of getting more for your money.

When there isn't any clock to punch, then check-out time is never.

Being 'on-the-go' means never arriving anywhere.

'No rest for the weary' means keep 'em weary 'cause then they won't rest.

Education is a plot to increase and secure ignorance.

etc.

Flippant, but easy to imagine.

Why?

Because dialectical thinking, and reason itself, are dead - and nobody knows why they do anything any more...

...they just do, that's all.

Assurance is that evasion by means of which cultures exist. The world we seek to grab hold of often grabs hold of us.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

VAGUE GENERATION BODY POEM

If you have a body then one thing you can do about that is think about what it means.

What it means to have one and what the body itself is meaning and what are you going to do about it.

When you have a body you can often ask well what can I do about it and you can ask what can I do with it and also it is very popular to ask what can I do to it.

Because the body can be a thinkable thing it can also be a determinable thing and anything which is determined can be contested.

So if the body is said to be a fixed thing or a malleable thing which ought to be fixed then it is quite likely that such a thing said as such would be contested.

There are different ways to do that.

You could say so.

But saying also is said to be a thing that can and cannot be working and noticeable in different ways so it could be a talk-saying and a writing-saying and other-savings too including the saying which is often called a doing like wearing an ear-ring for instance.

If the body is said to not want extra holes in it you might put one there and be saying that way perhaps you'd be saying oh yeah I don't think so I don't think you're right about that my body seems quite amenable to the idea.

There is my body and then there is everyone else's body sometimes.

It's my body and our bodies and what's the same and what's different?

This is a big question a lot of the time.

Because the body can be a frontier.

Because it can be explored mapped specified and disciplined and more.

Because it can be one thing it can be its opposite and in between and any degree of any thing it is said to be or to potentially become.

Because difference is so often by contrast and it is sometimes interesting to pretend and also to become that which you are contrasted with.

Because the body is always also a conceptual thing.

A change can be a transformation and a mutation and a shifting and a movement and an acceleration and a de-acceleration and a more and a less and a coloring and a removal and a step and an opinion and it all can be in relation too.

And a modification too.

When your body has been one way you can make it another way for whatever reason you like.

Economy of course is everywhere.

If it wants to be.

Economy is often how much is it.

If you have a body you can modify it if it ever is a way that could be said to be the way it is and if you do and anyone else notices they can ask why you did and mean I'm curious why did you

bother or even you really shouldn't have.

And it might or might not make a difference to you that they mean whatever they asked at all.

It also can happen that someone can claim you have modified your body and it might be a surprise to you to hear it's believed to be so.

Because we can want response and because we can want to be different and because we can want to be peculiar to ourselves meaning unique in a way that seems to be our own way even if it is similar to someone else's way.

Sometimes a mark a sign a badge any of these and other things on a body can mean more I like to be not quite like everyone but like this smaller group of people and others can wear the same thing in agreement and large groups of people can do the same to distinguish themselves from smaller groups or simply because so many others do and it seems the right thing or the most advantageous thing to do.

Because economy is often how much is it a prevailing number of people can say sometimes that the most is the best and back it up by saying we all say so and there are more of us.

But others say there are too many of you and you are too greedy and look out you're stepping on me ya big Palooka.

Because we're all supposed to get along.

Because this really is an effort.

And because you can be how you can be only with consequences.

Some consequences are barely noticeable and may be quite agreeable that way and it may be quite disagreeable and the same goes

for consequences which are greatly noticeable.

If you are small then things can often be more difficult in some ways and in many ways too but there are those who say there are great advantages in being small and you can use being small to alter the unpleasant circumstances of being that way.

Because there are said to be ways to turn forces against you back against them.

Many would like to know how and are presently researching the matter and giving it a go.

Sometimes it's fun to be naughty and sometimes you can say well you say I'm being naughty but I really don't think so and how imposing and unfair for you to say so and then do whatever you want about it.

If they kill you or even just hurt you, you can consider that a defeat or you can consider yourself dead or hurt which is sometimes quite different if maintaining the sense of integrity to what you are is uppermost.

Some prefer to be accommodating.

There are many battles being fought and many different notions on how to do this.

The body is modified because it can be said to be something.

Justice and freedom can be economies and so can be things which can be said to be something and so can be modified and can be contested.

The body is always able to be implicated and be the site of anything.

It can be an horizon which things go towards and away from.

Theory can do this.

Theory can be a prodigal to the body.

It can also be a dubious guest.

A virus.

A blessing. A curse.

Because it can be.

Because the body is always a possibility and what are we going to do about it.

MAY 17, 1991

If Virilio can have his theory of total war, then I can have my theory (if any of these theories can ever be said to be exclusive) of total work: work never stops, you just shift in relation to employers, whether they be persons, institutions/corporations, ideas/ideals, habits/neuroses, urges, etc.

Even sleep is the active employment of rest, the flow of depression, assessment or tuning by the unconscious, recharging of body energy, etc.

If you don't sleep you'll go insane, and the same could be said of work except that going insane is itself an occupation, i.e. work.

And if you can have a theory of total work, then you can also have a theory of total theory - of total anything, including total totality.

Total excess.

Total exhaustion.

Both ends of the spectrum totally extended and stressed to the point of being totally over-extended (as in the financial sense).

We have a way of life which at all levels is precipitated by a deficit logic and its consequent constant recession.

Indeed, depression (in the financial and psycho-emotional sense) is totally replaced by recession and its economy (in literal and figurative terms). Manic recession.

"There's too much confusion, I can't get no relief." -All Along the Watchtower. Bob Dylan.

"Relief is just a moment away." -Commercial for headache medicine

The second quote does not provide the solution to the first.

On the contrary, it is consistent with it.

It's an elaboration, the meaning of which is analogous to the proverbial eternal chasing of rainbows.

Of course, its promise is that relief will occur, i.e. your headache will go away.

But this is only partial relief because the headache is just a symptom.

The bio-physical headache is an embodiment of the social headache.

Total pressure does not let up but the consequent feeling (effect) of it can be deferred or erased.

And why take the headache pill - so that you can take more pressure.

With regard to this circumstance, relief will always remain "a moment away," that is, in sight but not reached.

Only the resemblance of it - a pseudo reminiscence constituted, itself, upon a fantasy nostalgia - is possible.

Relief, retirement, recreation - these words and others which morphologically, by way of the prefix "re", denote something occurring again, are totally absurd in a time where it's hard to imagine the conditions the roots that the words denote ever being recognized as anything we have ever experienced except relative-

ly.

What is relative relief in a state of total angst?

Perhaps it is only the possibility of standing a little more pressure.

"Life's a bitch, and then you die." -Anon.

This popular credo, although certainly meant to be humorous, is indicative of a general temperament which predicates both the conditions of total resignation and total barbarism.

They could be verbalized respectively as: "if life's against me, why bother?"; and "kill or be killed."

"My son says daddy I don't wanna go to school 'cause the teacher's a jerk, he must think I'm a fool, and all the kids smoke reefer. I think it'd be cheaper to just get a job - learn to be a street sweeper. I'd move to the beat, shuffle my feet, 'cause it's all about money. Ain't a damn thing funny. You've got have a card in this land of milk and honey. So don't push me, 'cause I'm close to the edge. I'm trying not to lose my head. It's like a jungle. Sometimes it makes me wonder how I keep from going under." -The Message. Grand Master Flash and the Furious Five.

Has education ever been so restricted in its sense of application?

Has it ever been so forced to deal with the ever-more- quickly posed question: "What can you do with that?"

Has the hierarchy of utility ever been so job-oriented that the consequent effect upon philosophy specifically, and the arts in general, has been to so degrade them and consider them all but

worthless?

Disciplines which are restricted in their application for labor to teaching or producing the written materials for teaching create thus the conditional circumstances for a welfare state of the mind.

School in this respect is a ghetto of thinking, and the only way you can make a living off it is by staying within its confines.

There are, of course, exceptions.

There are those who are like hired guns for political parties or corporations.

Here, the relationship between thinking and violence is truly revealed and the intellectual becomes known as the consummate war machine.

"My secret weapon's my mind." -Secret Weapon. Ice-T

A 'head honcho', whether that be a head of state or a corporate executive, is never featured as a thinker so much as someone who knows how to manage his or her army(ies) of thinkers, doers, etc.

They are featured as either personable and/or effective.

They are decision makers.

If they are featured as thinkers, then that practice is usually qualified as craftiness, and they are further, usually presented as evil (like Sadaam Hussein for instance, or even Pierre Trudeau) or at least bad for who they are representing.

For such a person is always considered to be a power-hungry ego-maniac.

By the law of syllogistic logic, then, a megallo-ego-maniac is

usually presented as a mental case - someone whose preoccupation with their thinking has led them astray.

Serial killers and political leaders with an intense ambition to conquer and increase territory, thus, are considered to be practically cut from the same cloth.

Yet the supposed viciousness of the hyper-intelligent fits quite logically with the barbaric cut-throat attitude so proselytized by the corporate industry.

It is an aesthetic equated with strength (which in itself is an interesting self-evident - i.e. taken-for-granted-as-superior quality).

This same logic considers the benevolent thinker - the philosopher - to be a fool, weak and useless, although sometimes amusing.

An idea has a currency which is valuable only relative to its exchange potential, and the specificity or materiality (in the sense of what the return actually is, e.g. money, victory, love, land, goods, services, solution to a problem, etc.) of that potential is made hierarchical and privileged.

The corporate way, so privileged today, judges on the basis of money (capital, or investment potential) and territorial expansion.

An idea is the war machine of the 'business community'.

The members of this community are, in effect, not so different from evil war lords.

The Iraqis kill in the name of their god and are considered evil for it.

The Americans do the same and are considered good.

What's the difference?

The critical difference seems to lay in a notion of onus - one which is linked to a problematic centrality.

The problem with thinkers is that they are central figures.

They take most of the credit.

It is not a team effort.

This is permissible, and even admirable, in the fine arts.

The one who writes the music, songs, poems or stories; the one who paints or draws the pictures, sculpts the statues, stages the play, directs the film, etc. is honored and valorized as one divinely inspired.

The theorist also is acceptable in this regard, where analysis has reached a celebrity status and has been qualified as entertainment.

But actors and musicians who do not sing their own songs or perform their own music are more like political leaders in the manner in which they are aestheticized and valorized.

Esteemed for the quality of their performance, they are like icons of successful organization.

They represent the metonymic glory of the working part of the whole.

Their glory is a different responsibility than the author's, for they are spokespersons of a working system.

They indicate that business is good - because of them.

The author is (actually misconstrued as, but it is the very possibility of being so misconstrued that typifies them) a self-suf-

ficient unit.

What is desired is dependency upon a system; industry.

That is why threat to integrity is such a centrally represented issue for the author - because he/she is always vis-a-vis the industry; whereas the actor/performer is the consummate sign of the working(s) of industry.

They are industrious - authors are creative.

The symbolism around these two types is itself revealing: The author/composer is like a mother creating a baby; The actor/ performer is like a father creating an industry.

(Obviously this symbolism is only possible given an history of sexist delineation of gender-specific qualities).

The father image is always akin to a spokesperson and is generative (i.e. of a field of discourse or of a discipline).

This holds true in intellectual circles also, (e.g.. the father of surrealism, existentialism, post-structuralism, post-modernism, method-acting, etc.).

The father produces gangs; he disseminates.

The mother is selfish - others may benefit from what she produces, but she has ultimate responsibility for it. The father offers shares in responsibility.

Is Madonna the father of pop-image processing, or is Andy Warhol, David Bowie or Malcolm McClaren - or is it Claudette, Sandra Bernhardt?

The gender, here, is misleading - you don't have to be a male to be a father in this sense, and an industry isn't necessarily fathered once.

In fact, what is critical about an industry is precisely that it can be fathered (i.e. generated) repeatedly.

Mass production over singular production for more mileage.

It's been said that Hollywood actors are America's royalty, and it makes sense; especially when you consider that the British Monarchy is now purely a figurative power.

The queen is a spokesperson for the political good.

Likewise with Hollywood actors (and now all American celebrities).

It doesn't matter what the good is - as long as it is recognizably a version of the good.

Their power is strictly a matter of potential influence - the sheer possibility to marshal others to the cause by mere association, i.e. if they look good, then so does the cause; or, if you like them, then you'll like the cause.

The power of celebrity status has not been lost on the heads of state. If they are in the public eye (the TV, the printed media - and the public's ear, the radio), then they are presented and are figured - featured, if you will - in the same manner and under the same auspices.

Political leaders and celebrities alike, then, are teamsters, and the so-called rugged individualist is exiled from political power and consigned instead to a space of romance where the most they can provoke is sexual interest.

And what is that if not the latent (or not so latent) desire to conquer and tame (i.e. to socialize) the wild and uncivilized beast (which happens to be a constructed nostalgic romance fraud

of our 'freer' days before civilization).

Killers are made to killed.

To sexualize the image is to give it a power which it thus can be stripped of.

True, the celebrity is sexy too - but as an after effect.

That is, it is second to their primary appeal and function, namely: they are good looking and lovable and they reaffirm the ideal that hard work and co-operation will lead to success.

The sex object has a much shorter life span.

They're supposed to die (figuratively or literally) young.

They are largely absurd caricatures: the brutish male; the highly sensitive pretty male; the slutty cruel female; the demure pretty female; the sophisticated lady.

They are 'machines' designed and built to break down: to grow weaker, flabby, dissolute, flaccid, shrill, foolish, arrogant, deluded, and generally unattractive and undesirable - no longer tempting to have sex with and useless for anything else.

This same teamsters logic is what is symptomatic of - or what underscores - the prevalent push toward a bibliographic orientation in academic critical thinking.

Keeping the discourse moving through industries of commentary on the great thinkers of the past, limits the parameters of research and directs the potential utility of these thinkers' works to a constant replay of either a master/disciple dialectic or a continual establishment of critical discourse under the auspices of confrontation (reading and writing as practices of war).

This circumstance constitutes antinomies within the academy

itself.

The hermetic and ossified research facility tied either in/directly to the defense budget or to a specious status quo versus the independent think tank making sense of the contemporary political structures and climate.

Of course, these are not, necessarily, mutually exclusive enterprises.

The difference is supposed to be between figuring out what a thinker means and figuring out what the state of things means/are.

Positioning your self with respect to your interest regarding these two options (and not disregarding some kind of confabulation of them) is to allow yourself to be situated within a political field with peculiar circumstances and consequences.

The thinker, then, even within the confines of the academy is divisible.

In keeping with the ghetto analog, thinkers become factions like gangs with territory.

Here, thinkers can be 'sexy' like pop-stars and are subject to the same whims of fashion which influence interest and popularity, as well as the same limit on popularity life span, and the subsequent recuperative nostalgia (or what's called - ironically, I think - in the television industry, going into syndication).

But does longevity even matter any more?

Perhaps not so much with respect to import and cultural influence as with salary potential.

How long will it last as: "How long will I get paid for it?" - or, considering multiple forms of payment, "How long will I gain from it?" (the same question which seems to govern most kinds of relationships these days; as marriage - in all its forms - becomes once again a business venture, with the new business aesthetic well in place - a relationship as a series of relatively fair exchanges).

FEBRUARY, 1991

Power is everywhere.

Ignore nothing.

It is with these two phrases that I begin today.

And I wonder about them with respect to two things: music and social interaction.

Then again, there is a third matter which has both a topical and a methodological interest: theory.

And finally, as a corollary: strategy.

Firstly, regarding the phrase "Ignore nothing", I am considering a number of issues: what is worthy of consideration?; what is paranoia?; what is intuition?; where should one research the signs of social and political formation and formulation?; what is pragmatics?; what is effective and/or influential?; what is an agenda?; what is enough?

Secondly, the phrase "Power is everywhere" is to be considered with emphasis on its "is-ness", that is, with regard to its ontological and metaphysical status.

But also with respect to a general question of implication; of the omniscient and the dreadful.

Finally, partly by way of this, a further inquiry into presumption (i.e. into the taken-for-granted understanding of and agreement to this phrase).

"Refuse Nothing"

If I choose to experiment with this maxim, I find myself in an interesting predicament: one concerning the tendency, on the one

hand, towards prescription and judgment, and on the other hand, towards description and neutrality.

All of which is further complicated by the problematic consideration of public and private action.

Now, what happens when you collapse oppositions?

If the ghost of the one haunts the other, then the collapse is a recognition of a parasite/host dialectic.

And if you collapse dialectics then the relation remains unresolved and the question becomes "what do you make of it all?"

A question, then, of its productive relations and of one's feeling (that is, of will and desire).

This leads to a decisiveness which is relative and personal - and, well, why not?

In other words, if at bottom it all amounts to the same thing, then one's particularity and difference might as well be presented (or represented) in one way as the next.

The best defense against any attack is to keep on doing it as you do; whatever it may be that you are being attacked for.

Philosophy as ontology becomes a pointless task when you see that everything is both what it is said to be and what it is said not to be.

The social consequence of this is firstly: an over-determination of technique, discipline and practice.

It is believed that these domains are not implicated in the metaphysical conundrums of ontology, but this is a misapprehension because pragmatics is always already tied up in notions of being, no matter how obtuse these notions may seem, for they all boil

down to notions of the good (e.g. the good worker, artist, doctor, citizen, etc.).

The further consequence of this for a society in the declining moments of the Age of Reason, is the horrific realization that action is now only motivated by either an oppressive force or by casual and relative indifference (i.e. because you 'like' to, you feel like it).

Here, difference and power, are arbitrary and completely relative - even if they are still constituted as ideologies and supported as beliefs by organized communities.

It is a simple matter that people who try to harm you do so either because they wish to have control, they enjoy inflicting pain and/or they simply don't like you.

What happens when you realize this?

People do what they do because they feel like it.

Isn't this why 'reason' forced itself as an issue to begin with, and why anarchy always is the 'natural' threat?

But actually, anarchy is always the present state of things, i.e. it is the ghost in the machine of order.

Some people are not sure whether they like some things or not. Sometimes they do and sometimes they don't, and "sometimes" means they can be persuaded.

But it is not clear whether they are actually persuaded to like or dislike something, or whether they just like to be persuaded.

If you like to be persuaded then persuasion isn't quite persuasion.

That is, your victory in doing that is not really all that victorious. You're not as much in control as you might think. Sometimes you can like being with somebody you don't particularly like.

People do pretty much what they feel like doing and there is very little you can do to stop them except threaten them with unpleasant consequences - and even that doesn't always work because the wanting is still there and it can be stronger in them than their fear of the consequences of it.

There really is very little that can be done to control matters.

What you can do is exploit advantageous situations - it might be better than beating your head against the wall.

If you want to relax but you are finding it difficult to do so, then maybe learning how to wait could help.

Sometimes you can get quite impatient, however.

It is really very interesting that you can want to do things - including being who you are - differently.

It is very interesting that you can be unhappy with how you are.

It is very interesting that you can be unhappy...

...or happy.

Perhaps being one way or the other is only ever inevitable.

It's not news then to do something because you feel like it, because that is why anyone does anything they are not forced to do.

Difference isn't constituted there, then, even though some pretend

that it is.

Why somebody does something does not seem to be as important as whether people like it or not.

If someone does something you don't like, can you live with it? Sometimes yes and sometimes no, and sometimes you just don't know.

Indecision is an interesting thing.

Some people think that a decision is imperative...
..well, maybe.

It all just comes out.

The question "Why?" can seem really pointless because the answer doesn't really matter.

So, sometimes it is just polite to ask because people often like to explain.

But asking "Why?" probably won't give you much direct understanding.

Try avoiding it and see what happens.

If you don't ask why, should you ask something else instead?

Should you ask any kind of question?

Well, why not?

Do whatever you like.

So what if questions are in the 'final' analysis all gestural; that doesn't discount them, nor does it validate them.

I don't know if I like "is" questions that much any more...

.

..or "Why?" questions either.

I'm not sure what I like to write any more.

Sometimes I like to say things.

Sometimes you need to do something which makes you happy before you do something which makes you unhappy - like doing something you know how to do well before you do something you are learning to do well.

ISSUES IN MUSIC : Technique; discipline; legitimacy; authenticity; in/genuity.

MARCH 28 1991

There are always different ways to think about something and that is quite a normal thing.

Sometimes this can lead to fighting but that is not so interesting to me because that often means that what it is, that it is, whatever it is, is said to be what it is as it goes along defending itself.

It is defending itself so it can be better, and better said what it is, and what it is not, too.

Very often what it is seems to be said by virtue of saying what it is not.

This is why it is not so interesting to me, because it seems a waste of time to me to spend so much time saying, and even proving, what something is not, rather than saying, or just finding out, what something is.

Take education, for example.

There are many different ways to say what it is, and to disagree, so why not just say them - and the disagreements too, if you like.

But that is always a diversion because many like to fight, and fighting is a very popular diversion - even though many are sad when it is happening because there is always loss, and the gain is only a cynical gain.

If all the ways of saying are all said, then some are interested sometimes, and some are not interested sometimes.

It is not necessary to be interested always is it?

Because not being interested can also be interesting - or not. Sometimes it can be interesting to say all the different ways that can be thought of, and what difference does it make.

Some want to choose more or less.

Decision can be popular and can come fast or slow.

Some like to change their minds.

It can be allowed, and what does that mean?

Especially when it is not allowed?

'Say it in a special way' can be your desire or somebody else's.

I wonder, now that I know so many who are unhappy with their education - with their circumstances of being educated - I wonder, if given they are so unhappy with it - so many of them - if that is quite a normal way to feel, and the way they should feel, and part of the whole thing is to feel that way.

Many are unhappy because they are not sure, and they are not sure what they like about it all, and why they are doing it, and what they should do.

And is that the point.

Not everyone wants to, or is going to, continue being educated, or educate, and some want to know if they should.

In a Canadian movie made in Quebec, called The Decline Of The American Empire, a thesis was put forth which was a thesis one of the characters put forth as their thesis - so, it was, and maybe it wasn't, the thesis of the film too - that any empire, and particularly the American one, could be recognized to be in its decline when its people or citizens were noticeably spending a

great deal of their time worrying and wondering about their happiness as really a major concern of the state of things; as the state of things is largely the state of themselves.

It was put that it was quite a natural outcome of the state of things. That is the way it is likely to be, and that is the way it is expected to be, and everyone wants to know, in that state, if they are happy, and should they be, and how can they be, and they are very sad, or wonder if they are sad, and they are - or ask themselves if they are - confused too.

That is the way it's supposed to be.

It is going according to plan.

People name economic times qualitatively and that can be the quality of the times in many ways.

MARCH 24 1991

Arts and Entertainment.

Here in this simple phrase lies a fundamental problem.

The problem is with regard to certain 'creative' enterprises or practices (i.e. institutional and individual application), and notions of paid and non-paid production).

What is the problem?

It is not one thing, of course, but a number of tendencies.

For instance: concepts of what art is and what entertainment is are contentious (not only with respect to each's own definition, but also with respect to their relationship, i.e. are they, or when, how, why, etc. are they different or the same thing?); concepts of intent (philosophic, aesthetic, commercial, political, social, etc. - and the relationships between these); concepts of judgment (as with intent); and also, perhaps less obviously, concepts of identity (calculation of certain ramifications or consistencies with regard to social orientation, e.g. the notion of what constitutes a current generation).

MARCH 31 1991

The 'work' is not restricted to a single representation.

There is the so-called art object, but it is surrounded by its idea in such a way that the art ends up not containing the idea so much as the idea containing the art (especially since the art object is not so much an artistic representation as a presentation of an idea which deconstructs or disassembles art).

What this means is that the object as a gesture is not completed until it is perceived and responded to, an operation which - because it is confronted with ambiguity and paradox - can continually be employed.

This is advanced further by exploiting that relationship between the artist and the audience which positions the artist as an authority on the meaning and interpretation of the work.

Since both Cage and Duchamp displace the privilege of the creator, through an elimination of intent and a general resistance to (final at least) interpretation, any critical approach towards them in this regard garners only a continuation of the work or idea - which itself continues to demand interpretation.

Interpretation, then, is resisted by keeping it open-ended.

Any instance of their art (i.e. within a certain period wherein such a method is localized or been markedly developed) then, is simultaneously an object and a (working) theory (in progress) of the object.

It is for this reason, perhaps, that they are often considered to not be artists at all, but rather, men of ideas.

True, they work with/in recognized artistic mediums (i.e. music, painting, sculpture), but they depart from the traditions of these mediums by way of a formal reflexivity (a metaphysics) which emphasizes that which was previously hidden.

In the linguistic sense, this is like emphasizing the signifier (that which conveys meaning) instead of the signified (the meaning) to such an extent that the signified 'is' - in effect - the signifier.

This in itself may sound like formalism (the elimination of the represented subject for the sake of emphasizing structural elements), but it differs in that it not only abstracts the subject and highlights form, but also, puts a purchase on the very idea of formulating as a practice with potential effects.

Not, then, just a flattening-out and privileging of the surface, but also, a philosophy and science (social and otherwise) of construction.

In this regard, they are also not so much structuralists, as precursive post-structuralists - in the sense that the 'final' meaning is always ambiguous and indeterminate.

Meaning, in this regard is always relative to its context and practical applications, or the possibilities of this.

Assemblage.

A resistance to a rendering of a whole.

Resistance to interpretation is also that.

Analysis without synthesis.

No collectivization.

And indeed, if this, then no construction either.

Or else, an enforcement of irony which allows for such moves as only further variants of enforcement - ones which contain the very elements which dissolve the frame (in both the structural and criminal sense of this word).

Resistance as discouragement and the possibility of dissolution of repressive structures of containment.

The whole as a part of the parts.

Co-ordinates.

Music is the structuring of noise.

JUNE 1 (A), 1991

If knowledge is power then teaching is management.

Corporate/institutional philosophy is equivalent to the protocol of secret societies.

All is potential but only certain potentials are celebrated officially.

Most political activism is a matter of questioning privileged representation.

This can be somewhat formulaic. Which is to say that political activism can be functional - in the sense of playing its part within a larger schema.

JUNE 1(B), 1991

"The electric light is pure information" -McLuhan, Understanding Media, The Medium is the Message.

- To communicate effectively and convincingly one should utilize the popular (i.e. the pervasive) communication media.

"...we have confused reason with literacy, and rationalism with a single technology." -Ibid.

This is not a matter of translation.

It is a matter of learning the language.

"Is it not evident that the moment that sequence yields to the simultaneous, one is in the world of the structure and of configuration?" -Ibid.

Style is repetition.

All forms of communication are appropriate but some are more pervasive than others.

Every medium of communication has a grammar and a language but it is not innate.

It is an invented one privileged through usage.

Any number of dialects is possible.

"...the content of any medium is always another medium." -Ibid.

The more pervasively disseminated a mode of thinking is, the more radical and powerful it is.

This is why media is territory, and why electricity - its life blood - is spatial.

The currents along which information travels is limited.

Deliberately.

Control is conducive.

That is, the conductor is the organ of management.

Electrical points of pick-up and delivery, and the lines which run from, to and through them are all indicative of a system of passage between different governed lands.

They are like border check points, toll booths, roads, rails, ports, terminals, etc.

The spatialization of electricity is the definition of it as passage (way).

"...the medium shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action." -Ibid.

Freedom of speech could only be relative given its contingency upon license and the fact that not just anyone can set up a broadcast system and say - or have said - anything they please over it.

Information coming into your home (or wherever) is governed by a right of passage.

"Specialist technologies detribalize. The non specialist electric technology retribalizes." -McLuhan, Understanding Media, Media Hot and Cold.

JULY 2, 1991

I used to...

...Now I...

...I never learn...

...Or maybe I do...

Anyone can see if anyone were to look and remember what they saw and what they deliberately overlooked that you should look long and hard at.

Never change your mind.

The first impression is the correct one.

You can know it all in a glance, but you will likely ignore it.

When bad times come you will forget the good times.

Bad times are more insistent and are the only thing, today, which warrants a sense of history.

Any one bad time is equal to, but also carries an accumulated effect of, every other bad time.

In other words, every bad time reminds you of all the other bad times and connects up to them to form a string.

This doesn't happen with good times.

Bad times are productive and generative - they always amount to something.

Good times never amount to anything except an interruption of the bad times.

It used to be thought the other way around.

Good times make one momentarily forget bad times - only bad times are insistent.

Beauty is the culture industry's attempt to make each of us a commodity. The culture industry, guys, is vast and incredibly articulate. It knows exactly what it wants to say all the time. It wants to make each of us the same on the outside, while letting us pretend we're somehow marvellously special on the inside. The culture industry hasn't invented "beauty" in order to control how we look, but how we 'are', and that's the scary part. How we think. How we 'be'.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

JUNE 19, 1991

Imagine what it would be like if there was not an aesthetic standard for the body.

In what way, then, would our desire be constituted?

Imagine a writing which was not embarrassed by the interrogative as something posed more than just rhetorically.

Imagine a writing not so taken up with the declarative - especially one which is oblique.

Most writing, it seems to me, academic or otherwise, is fraudulent because it occupies a conventional posture which it seeks to legitimate - like putting on a coat you must prove belongs to you, or you are at least worthy of wearing.

But this is not surprising in these technical/technological times.

Why isn't it surprising?

Because the world today privileges the technical, and technique is always a question of standardized rules reduced to no question at all - just a contention between official and unofficial versions.

And what is the official?...the one with the biggest armies behind it.

* * *

(The sociology of judgment.)

* * *

In the age of cynical politics (politics without ideology), how else can anyone understand any political policy or platform except as strategies for power?

This was once considered a sophisticated political analysis. Now it is common place.

In fact, it is believed to be the truth about politics, as if there never was a true moment of the political ideal.

Now, political value is judged on the basis of aesthetics: The aesthetics of power; The aesthetics of strategy; The aesthetics of the body of power; The aesthetics of the empty word.

JULY 1, 1991

What is "too much" if not an indication of personal taste?

And what is taste, if not the most occluded form of politics?

Personal policy has political ramifications.

So, when someone says of their creative work that they try to avoid personal taste, what does this mean?

If it is in the interest of eradicating opinion, then it fails in at least two respects: one, it is operating under the artist's opinion about opinion; two, there is no foreclosure on the audience's superimposition of opinion into the work - regardless of whether the author intends it to be there or not.

The artist may renege on his/her responsibility for how the work is received and operated upon.

In which case, what is at stake is not so much the work as the artist's commentary on it (j.e. his/her opinion).

JULY 3, 1991

What we honor in representation we despise in reality.

We find something that plays with the structural aesthetic boring, but someone on stage announcing how horny they are is entertaining.

Why is there a presumption that "just fun" is restricted to common-sense notions of the physical?

"Just fun" is usually reactionary - it means the vulgar.

Even with respect to writing, "turgid prose" is prose which does not contain itself within the common vernacular, or which avoids difficulty and reticulation in its vocabulary or syntax.

"Boring" is what makes your brain work.

"Fun" is what makes your body work.

* * *

John Leland in his article "Rap Can it Survive Self-Importance?", in Details' July 91 special music issue, complains that Rap is becoming too preachy.

He compares previous lyrical preferences - which involved physical/gangster/fuck-god bravado - to current politically conscious lyrics.

He says the former is fun and the latter is edifying (i.e. boring).

But he forgets, like so many critics who fixate on lyrical content - or also on pose/image - that the fun is in the groove (or

the total arrangement of music/lyric/image).

Music is totally functional and listeners use it however they wish - and why not?

It's understandable, of course, that someone would cry when their favorite brand is in short supply.

But if you really need it why don't you D.I.Y., guy?

Also his audience/performer theory is all wet.

It doesn't matter what you're saying, if you're on stage then you assume some kind of expertise, and if someone's listening or watching instead of doing it themselves then you're active to their passive.

And again, it's even more 'wet' because an audience does its job in however a manner it desires - it takes whatever it wants.

* * *

- The problem in the long run with the "parents are the villain" theory is it demands an infinite regress back to the original parents.

And the thing about parents is - they're never exclusively the parents; the whole social environment is the parent.

* * *

- Critics are useless unless their readership shares their criteria for judgment.

If you want to understand your culture, reading a critic won't

do it any better than examining its fascinations (one of which happens to be critics/criticism, actually).

- History confirms contemporary irrelevance.

It exposes the self-evident.

- We get excited when someone says something in the common vernacular which corresponds or is reminiscent of something a great thinker said - as if the excitement is a confirmation of the correctness of our reading list.

The content is secondary and immaterial to the present context.

* * *

- "Philippe Ambert, whose fall/winter men's wear line is now available in the U.S., claims his clothes "can make a rock 'n' roll star out of anyone on the street." Using leather, metal mesh, wool, cashmere, and rubber, Ambert creates clothing whose sleek lines and stark effects are, he says, "...quiet and extreme at the same time." " DETAILS pg.23

- "Let's be honest, it's difficult to be a bona fide pop star without proper hair." pg.26

- "Remember what beards did to Jim Morrison and David Bowie? It took away their sex." pg.26

- "A record collection exists in time as well as space." pg.27

- Addictive culture.

- The Privatization of Feeling.

- "Music is inspiration and information. You can never have too much of it around the house." pg.27

OCT. 15. 1991

Apparently, while the legendary Be-bop jazz alto saxophone player Charlie Parker was on a tour of France he was introduced to the French existential philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. The story has it that Parker said: "How do you do, Mr. Sartre, I enjoy your playing very much."

JULY 11, 1991

If you want to figure out what's happening in the world you have to think about it in as many ways as you can.

Actually, working-out what's going on and what it all means is like making music.

There are a lot of examples around that can be learned from, and training can be had from someone who knows the craft.

Likewise with theory.

In contradistinction, theorists tend to copy, mimic and quote other theorists ad nauseam.

When musicians do that they are considered to be uncreative, laboring hacks who are too commercially oriented.

Uniqueness in theory is frowned upon unless celebrity status is already achieved.

Initiation in the field which permits development of a personal/idiosyncratic style demands homage, commentary and explication of previous material, and this material is largely interesting methodologically and illuminating in explication of previous times, i.e. gives a good historical perspective.

But, even if the examples are contemporary, if you want to become a theorist in your own write/right you have to forget about the rest of them.

Like other pieces of music a musician might listen to, other works of theory can be read and they might inspire and/or influence, but they are, strictly speaking, unnecessary.

As far as importance goes, there are few things which truly are - theory is about as important as music.

Opinion can be entertaining, and what you entertain can be more or less significant to anyone who wants to think about any of it. However, theory can get to be more important when its interest is contesting or determining facticity.

This is so because facts and truth usually have more political ramifications.

The speculative arts are free game; they are capable of constructing enforceable opinions, but as speculation they can only be contested on the grounds of effect, and such a contention is usually a power struggle that is rarely resolved discursively.

Opinion as collective representation has powerful effects sometimes, which hence make them worthwhile to contest.

When they are contested, however, it is usually on the grounds of the truth of the representation.

JUNE 20, 1991

At the beginning of this, the 20th century, virtuosity was defined by speed of execution.

Pianists who were representative of this included: Rudolph Serkin, Vladimir Horowitz, Ignace Jan Paderewski, and Leopold Godowsky.

It was the acceleration of the score - the rule.

Later, in jazz, this definition continued with the addition of a notion of intensity.

It was not, then, just a matter of fast fingers, but of playing outside a score, accelerating towards a 'heightened' or 'fevered' pitch (i.e. pitch in both senses of the word).

The acceleration of an 'alternate' rule.

Later, in rock, this was defined as an acceleration of rhythm and lyrical importance.

Presently, in rap, it is elocution.

All are representative of an acceleration of a convention which, thereby, stands to challenge the standard.

The rule is bent by hyper activating and/or hyper driving it.

What effect does this have? Initially: shock, wonder, awe. Later: boredom.

Boredom is the feeling of the de-centered, (poke the "navel", i.e. Delphi, i.e. the central government) the imploded ones (turned/ tuned in/to themselves; their disengaged interior).

Speed implodes the rule.

Hyper application disengages and renders its object abstract and vague.

Its meaning becomes restricted to its potential to apply.

It is emptied of content; of rationale.

It becomes, thus, exposed as that which is devoid of ideology - of a principled philosophy - and thereby, strictly an instrument of power.

JUNE 1(C), 1991

People say that if you talk to yourself you must be crazy.
What is writing if not talking to yourself - or an imagined
other?

Isn't writing, therefore, crazy? Isn't thinking? Or is it only
because of the silence of these activities that they are exempt?

Indeed, silence does have a power, and it seems to garner suppo-
sitions, e.g. "still waters run deep."

Has absence always been met with the desire to read it as the
veil to the absolute (or, at least, to deep meaning)?

Silence is certainly mystified, but it is given another power,
i.e. political - e.g. the silence of stealth and the aggressive
control of overt/covert political/social/psychological pressure.

Silence then, has a variety of potential readings/ interpreta-
tions.

But it always seems to be the sign of control.

Noise is the sign of chaos.

That chaos and control are actually constants does not change the
fact that they manage to act upon and in relation to one another
- that one can be more present than the other and force out the
other.

- Our attention is grabbed by movement, but our notion of move-
ment can be abstract.

Hence, disclosure is like movement - as is a sharp and sudden contrast.

Or a sudden change in course.

Either silence or noise can be movement.

What cannot be detected cannot be judged, and it is often considered a sign of intelligence to be able to way-lay or escape detection - likewise for making a successful detection.

But it is precisely the power of disguise and disappearance which does not exempt silence from madness - especially as psychosis.

Chaos can be madness, but so can control when it is considered to be excessive, that is, when control becomes chaotic.

Silence then, can be noise.

Of course.

Take note of that "of course", because it reveals something about ontology.

Namely, that it is so formulaic that it is too easy to imagine all the possibilities.

Perhaps that is the - possibly sinister - advantage of abstractions, i.e. being so easy to imagine makes it so banal and mundane, which in turn makes it so unremarkable and so unnoticeable, which in turn makes it more efficient for getting more done faster, and further, can generally make one less attentive, and hence, easier to manipulate.

With ontology as such an obvious question with an equally obvious answer, what is left but practice and management?

MAY 31, 1991

Music as sound track.

Not just in the commonly understood sense of this as background to augment a film, but further, to augment life.

The work space has had muzak for a while now.

But there is more to it than that.

Music as an emotional guide.

Always this.

Guide your emotions to be co-ordinate with productivity and efficiency.

Emotion on the job scene as necessarily regulated.

Even an actor, musician or other so-called artist who supposedly determines their creative flow emotionally, follows to some degree a scripted course for the expression of that emotion(s).

If emotion is out of place, then, on the job (or anywhere, for that matter) it is not as emotion in itself, but as specific emotions.

However, the ones which are discouraged are classified pathologically as 'emotionality', and the preferred ones are prerequisite for a stated recognition of 'doing the job well' or 'behaving accordingly.'

Either way, 'though, both conditions are collapsible into an aesthetics and pragmatics of attitude.

Feeling 'emotional' is feeling 'out-of-sorts', but feeling good is just being normal.

If you are really disturbed, then you have a psychological problem.

The hierarchy of problems always ends at/in the mind - which (still) is considered separate from the body.

The body supposedly has faculty modalities: mental, emotional, psychological, spiritual, physical/sexual.

Consideration of these largely falls under assessments analogic to machinery and corporate management.

Corporate management, actually, is the way to deal with maintenance of machinery - where, here, machinery is to be understood as an analog to being.

So music, in this sense, is a device for proper maintenance employed by either employers, merchants or individuals.

Music as architecture - in the sense that the Masons believed architecture had the quality of influencing states of mind and modes of being/behavior.

Not just muzak Inc., but the total rendering of all music as total muzac.

Music as an aesthetic and idea superseded by music as function. Portable, with headphones for people on the go.

In the car, home, store, office, transportation terminals, restaurant - anywhere and everywhere.

And most of it is steeped in either notions of compromise as necessary, or notions of the alternative as challenges to the notion of listenability.

Music as almost anything but music - if it ever was.

Music wars.

The torment of having to listen to music you don't like.

This is why muzak fails and yet still succeeds as an operative

ideology or strategy - because it can't remain invisible, and in the measure that it is noticed it becomes an object of criticism - and more to the point, scorn.

And although noticing it may interrupt its covert seduction, it nevertheless prevails to sculpt the environment by applying pressure precisely on the basis of its intent being revealed, because it is representative of a common notion of propriety.

Even if you hate it, therefore, you still are being informed of what is proper and expected of you - and like it or not, you know the consequences of not conceding to social correctness.

Music as an agenda for feeling.

Like Mom, we did not die or cease to exist so much as
awaken to a more enduring and unfathomable life.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

JUNE 4, 1993

**stare into the face of refusal
and refuse it not
Refuse Nothing!**

DEATH IS DEAD

At this point I've noticed two cultural predispositions -- aesthetics with lifestyle, as it were. The first: Kitsch Cynicism is in its declining phase (it's de-intensifying -- or as Kroker and Weinstein say: it's in recline); the second, now emerging to a peaking phase, is, as yet, without a name, but I identify it, provisionally, with the slogan: Death is Dead.

I hazard to avoid nomers which precede with "Post" and which would thus lead me to rest with something like Post-Mortemism (and I say I hazard to avoid it because I find myself still under the auspices of another slogan: Refuse Nothing! -- and with that I may anticipate myself by remarking upon the recent preference or inclination towards lifestyle slogans where structured categories of philosophic thought ("isms") were preferred before -- Slogans, after all, are a curious identifier and are naturally mutable and malleable), but nevertheless, Death is Dead can be understood as sign of yet another dissolving cultural horizon.

I wish to speak about these two manners (Kitsch Cynicism and Death is Dead) in tandem because I believe they signal predominant phase-shifts, and also register a prevailing social valence organized within a logic of volume and passage. This logic

deploys a vernacular of: Disappearance, "Ushering", and Establishment. It is a social production of culture reticulated within a general social epistemological industry that is in collusion with ontology and science.

This shift I tend to understand as non-transcendental in effect, although (perhaps for the last time) it retains the gestures of transcendentalism. Death is Dead is the graduated reduction of the volume of transcendence. And Death is Dead is turning up louder than Kitsch Cynicism.

Death is Dead is not the Death of Death, because its relation to transcendence is already, lucidly, ironic and ambiguous, because it isn't nostalgic, and because it is neither, overtly, harboring resentment nor reactionary. The Death of Death follows in the tradition of relegating and delegating eschatological epistemologies as "Post". This industry, over the last thirty years especially, operates an "in-out" machinery that's both fascinated with - and hypnotized by - alterity, and is governed by a territoriality (territorialization/deterritorialization) of personal identity (Being) which places it always at war.

Death is Dead is not war; Death of Death is, and further, it is a casualty.

Kitsch Cynicism is a merged divergence of two strains of social humor (disposition/temperament). Its inclination is usually a display of established signs as re-invested-in totems.

It is a parallel communiqué. A pre-established aesthetic is recognized as motivated lifestyle, and so then subjected to a superimposition; an overlay which recapitulates and recuperates an

exclusive and compromising set of icons and displaces the motive which makes them such. It defies them, divests them, re-invests in them, and claims (deterritorializes then reterritorializes) the icons as the indication of their own issue. It is the rendering of an established course as flagrantly re-routed, and exposed thus as mutable. Its driver is the ecstasy of reversal. It is called play. Its principle is relativity and sublime indifference. What is high class is presented as cheap and vice versa. This is Kitsch.

Cynicism operates (with) this system by proffering the reversed state of significance as arbitrary and adds an equivalent dose of ridicule. Its alterity casually manifests; it is seemingly unobtrusive, but it is, nevertheless, still war (also). Cynicism is the weaponry of the lifestyle. It is a continual dislocation of establishing codes -- of identity itself. This is the case despite the fact that Identity is still the prize. Its slogan is: I want to be whatever I want in however a way I wish to represent it. It is a challenge to a fixed policy of representation.

Lately, this movement has shown itself in Gay culture as a petulant mimesis of middle-class accruement of artifacts (the politics of the tacky), and haughty display of sexual dress and gestures upon which aspersions have been cast by a hierarchized social order that designates them (and their practitioners) as marginal. It is a tactic which orients to confounding a placement while it simultaneously revels in its difference. This (also) is war.

And more recently it can be seen in a feminist culture -- or perhaps it is more accurate to say a certain community of women (inasmuch as with regard to Feminism it is inclined to not refer to itself as such; in the wake of a general territorialization and colonization of that discipline) -- in a similar fashion but with the following differences: 1 it plays out an ambiguity with respect to sexual partner gender preference; 2 it displaces any notion of a settlement (whether as 'settling down' 'settling with' or as negotiated compromise) 3 it contentiously represents the transcendental fissure between the 'stages' of womanhood from 'little girl' to 'teenage girl' to 'young woman' and the process of adulthood (or 'adulteration' as my friend Jessica says) right to the social politics of "aging" woman. Here it challenges at each instance the predetermined currency of these as a self-evident position.

This can be seen recently in the emerging increase in the volume of artistic production by women (mostly on the part of their current generation) from fashion shows, to theater, visual arts, literature, cinema, and music.

Death is Dead introduced itself to me initially in the late phase of the cult of death, which in its decaying sustained note presented an anti-transcendentalism (which was its undoing) in a cultural production of a revised fascination with vampirism (or more pointedly, with vampires). Goth music and vampire stories (as literature and cinema) proliferated throughout the 80's and

worked-out a seductive disregard for rites of passage and sustained the rite itself as a romance logic no longer culminating in apocalypse but rather commensurate with it -- a romance, in fact, of apocalypse itself. It was the erotic of uncertainty, where the certainty of death as a social function (as a social philosophy of a biological/medical event) was challenged.

Vampires are warriors.

It was a bit like Peter Pan with a hard-on, or a horny Wendy cultivating her archival fascination with the image of a dangerous and sardonic male, and her role in overwhelming the overawing -- all this with both of them having a drug habit (the delicacies of excess). It was the seduction strategies of the predator, and it was articulated largely within an aesthetics which privileges the male through a reversible metaphysics of master/slave relations.

The next move of the ushering aesthetic of Death is Dead was the cultural side-effect of the AIDS crisis, that is to say the crystallization of the entanglement of sex and death; of pleasure and consequence. Death is Dead cultivates an eroticized indifference to consequence. Consequence becomes hence an opportunity to reify a deliberate referral to self as true current (the imminentization of the ontological eschaton -- which is to say that selfhood is conceived of being actualized only at the moment of its end as a psychoanalytic concept and its subscription to bio-electric paradigms). It is lifestyle as an unimpeded unfolding of self as motion - as momentum.

It is thus selfhood or personality, or Being, as the surfer and the surf - it is a gerund; it is surfing. Other analogies could be: electricity and digital processing (that is, a digital relation which dispenses with analog refusal, i.e. non-dialectical, because the analog is not an alterior - or ulterior - method but rather a procedural method whose movement is commensurate - or complicit - with digital trajectories, so the thrust is not upon digitalization per se but rather the interface between organic and mechanic - mechanization - as a symbiosis between human and machine, as a relationship which is stimulating and generative). The erotic of envelope modification.

Self thus, is not strictly embodied, it is a collusion - interstitial: it is apparent, yet only inferred, like the center in sampler music. It is oblique.

(As an aside, it allows for an aesthetic vernacular concerned with parameters).

Death is Dead was next sighted at the performance of a play entitled Terminal. The title allows for electrical analogies and the structure of the play fits an oblique agenda. More or less a walk through a kind of occidental Book of the Dead, laid-out in 21 tableaux without a narrative through-line (despite the organizing thematic) or resolution: its presentation is multifaceted and illustrates a distribution of death as that which can be informed by/with a range of visceral 'takes': grueling, funny and a turn-on and more. Death, then, as a fractal calculus or algebra set up for interfacing.

Suddenly I noticed a cultural production of death everywhere. Death-core music groups; another theater piece to come which is a funeral procession. I thought about all the intellectual death parties: Death of the author, meaning, et. al.; of trend proclamations: the death of jazz, punk, etc. A killing spree which seemingly left nothing alive. Mass cultural genocide. Then I thought about the mysteries of the interface between David Karesh, Waco and the F.B.I. — Death as battleground. All of which is yet to be flushed out.

But the kicker came when I went into a comic store and noted that the hype was on three things: the death (and resurrection) of Superman; Death the three-part comic (who is depicted as a benevolent young woman in Goth punk attire) and all its merchandising (dolls, posters, T-shirts, etc.); and issue #497 of Batman, which was being restricted in its sale to 2 per customer — the attraction being therein that the invulnerable vulnerability of the hero is ended when an old man breaks the Batman's spine over his knee. The Batman is therefore paralyzed. Granted, a symbolic death, yes, and I realized this was the generative point. For with so much death around, its distribution was inevitable, and that is a symbol which is very efficient in distribution. With so much death around, I surmise that it is the sign of its total exhaustion, like so much before it.

Death then, is Dead. But it has resurrected (or at least come to be regarded) as a machine to interface with. Death as cybernetics, and as virtual. Life and Death therefore, as misnomers. Death as the new wave, the new life, the new lifestyle.

Are you laughing yet?

Are you crying?

Are you nothing?

Waiting?

Of course. Of course.

LEXICON

I recall very little of what I learned then; the ideas didn't really cling. Rather they seemed to seep into my skin and belly and condition rather than fill me. It was as if I were just modifying the shape of my hunger rather than appeasing it.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

ALPHABET:

The series of letters which make-up the written form of a language. It is the parts. The elements. In the esoteric cosmology of Qabalah (mystic Judaism) each letter has a meaning. Each letter stands for a thing (e.g. Aleph = window) and has a numerical value (Aleph = 1). This numerical attribute figures into calculations meant to reveal the hidden meanings in words (amongst other things) and their relationship to God. In Tarot (a system of divination using cards with a variety of attributes divided and subdivided progressively - in both the sense of movement or journey and development or attainment) the 22 cards of the Major Arcana (cards with the 'highest' spiritual import) correspond with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet (as well as astrological, masonic, alchemical and other 'arcane', 'esoteric' or 'mystical' sciences) which in turn corresponds to a location on the cosmological glyph or icon of Qabalah called The Tree of Life (specifically, they are attributed to the paths - which are modal philosophical mergers and becomings between the specific qualities of spheres). Other systems of divination more numerological in character also make correspondences between the meaning and value of letters and numbers.

The standardization of an alphabet in the wake of printing presses or writing systems in general has been subject to political confrontation, and even as recently as this century was exemplified in the attempt to revise the spelling standard in the

English language - Notable adherents to this plan were George Bernard Shaw and American President Franklin D. Roosevelt?

The alphabet can be considered atomic and subjectifiable to a physics metallurgical or paralinguistic, as well as prima orthographic. Useful politically, philosophically, religiously, sociologically and otherwise, it can be mobilized as a map/ping of the structure of being of the world, and indeed, of structure itself. A map. An alphabet can be a map.

ABSTRACTION:

A 'taking-out', but from what? - as if that were the only question it begs or allows. In discourse, or here, it can behave or describe different intensities or concentrations of language (in the sense of vernacular). As a star can become more dense in its mass - sometimes so much so that it implodes and becomes a black hole (a kind of local vacuum which 'magnetically' sucks-in matter) so can writing/thinking /talking. Different levels of abstraction can mean different styles of writing ranging from the quotidian, or common daily vernacular of the amorphous public 'on-the -street', or on-the-radio or TV - to specialized discourses of academic disciplines like political science, psychology or physics.

Sometimes abstract means hard to read or comprehend or it can mean difficult to imagine the materiality of its interest.

Abstract in this latter respect can be opposed to Concrete.

Philosophically, if you can't put yourself in the picture being

They're all ideas we need. The question shouldn't be whether they're real or not, or whether we believe they're real. I mean, I can't tell you how impossibly 'mundane' that all is, all these ridiculous endless arguments about what's reality and all. They're such imbecile restraints upon our thinking. Empiricism isn't a way of thinking; empiricism is a way of being. Of being a dickhead, anyway. Be we 'believe' we need the idea, that's what interests me.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

drawn by the philosophy/er than you might consider it to be abstract. An explication, for instance, of the vast number of correspondences and attributes of the alphabet and their relation to the square root of -1 (which is an imaginary number represented either as 'i' or, as in engineering, as 'j') could be considered abstract at the moment that the discussion/writing/thinking becomes more and more reflexive, systemic and reticulated with regard to its interest and the definition as its interest as an interest, i.e. when its concern is understood as the understanding of understanding or structures and systems of understanding without the image of the body or the recognition of the actor/the person involved/engaged/living the understanding understood.

Abstraction can be syntactic.

Abstraction can be the flow of language that you are not used to.

Abstraction can be that which has no cathartic effect upon you.

Abstract writing can be writing which can be taken to be glib yet voluminous.

ADDRESS:

Could be where you live. That could be literal or figurative.

Could be the way you speak (talk or write or gesture or whatever) to someone. That could be a matter of manner of style. It could be form, like etiquette or protocol. Could be subject matter - what one wants to speak about. A topic. Could be a way of saying: "attend to", "pay attention to", "focus on"...

ACCELERATION:

Speed. Motion.

In quantum physics, the observation has been made that with respect to sub-particle behaviour it is difficult to get a fix on something's position without losing your fix on its momentum - and vice versa.

In some examples of contemporary social and political thought and theory, acceleration is the movement of paradigms in tandem with or by way of developments in technological research, design and implementation. This movement, apparently, not only goes faster but often does so toward some kind of radical mutation or transformed condition. It frequently appears to be teleologically consigned to some sort of demise or unfortunate rupture, ironically enough, as the consequence of a supposedly new socio-political organizing paradigm called Post-Modern which has as its operative feature the quality of confounding so-called Modernist agendas towards realizable 'horizons' or goals - achievements or realisations or completions, as-it-were - by emphasizing the intentional impossibility of such (as) ending(s) for the sake of exposing a power primarily arbitrary and territorial in character. Paradigms drawing toward their intended (actual?) state as forces (i.e. enforcements). Acceleration in this sense might be thought of as a hurrying-up of the inevitable. But it is ironic if one considers this assessment a consignment because such a gesture is itself territorial and final. Or at least it could be.

But it could also be thought of as any paradigm/idea/thing in motion. That is, traced or tracked - clocked, if you will - with

regard to its momentum. Which might mean - as with quantum particle physics - that you lose sight or a fix on its position. Unless one could allow oneself to imagine movement/motion as position even if it varies. That might be too abstract. The famous physicist and relativist Albert Einstein conjectured that 4 measurement of a body of water by 4 moving objects doing the measurements while moving at 4 different speeds (with certain differentiations) would produce 4 different measurements. Speed could be thought of as a variable of analysis.

ADOLESCENCE:

This could be the years of age between 12-21. This could also be a state of mind or being. Sometimes it is conceived of as a bridge or passage between childhood and adulthood. In this respect it could be considered exemplary of the very idea of an in between. It 'is' passage or Hegel's movement upward to an improved or more evolved (balanced) state. Process 'itself'. Chronic adolescence, then, would be 'not growing up, in the common vernacular, or not being/taking-on responsibility, not behaving maturely. It could be the state, also, where completion or coming into one's own, or become X is always imminent but never realised. This might be like saying it's a post-modern condition. This sometimes is looked upon approvingly but it seems that often, or 'overall' it is not. Recently (c/o The Lost Boys, a teenage Vampire movie) adolescence was figured as the desire for a permanent condition of flux, appetite, lust, movement, flight, intensity and expenditure.

Indeed, adolescence might be traced here as a cataloguing of desire itself - including its termination - and adulthood might be, therefore, to some extent, the gauge of the value of that termination and the temptation to reactivate. Adolescence as current. Energy. Voltage. Passing.... Through or towards... Adolescence as virtual reality, i.e. when reality is what you figure-out, 'seek' to determine but not necessarily succeed - or having succeeded, not necessarily rest there but test other versions. This also is the case with respect to identity. A state (many). (See also TEENAGER)

AESTHETICS:

Grammar of the beautiful. Beauty of the grammatology of form. The preferred image. The controlled structuration. The appeal for/of the disciplined act of creation. Rule book for making and for recognizing the making. Appreciation. Appreciation of recognition, of the recognizable. Correctness. Novelty. Innovation. Style. Form

Beauty. Social/individual. Beheld. Determined. The rules of the game.

Aesthetics can be what you say was done in order for you to say something is creative and make some other modifying adjectival comment concerning your like or dislike for it and aesthetics can be the logic and it can be the idea of being creative, of being a creative thing.

Once something is decided to be beautiful you can decide how it came to be so and then make a recipe. Aesthetics can be a recipe.

Aesthetics can be a way of saying something was attended to with regard to its form, its structure. And it can be meant to be appealing. It can mean to be seductive. It can mean to con you - to fool you, trick you - like the Sirens in Greek mythology who, with their beautiful voices, promise only pleasure but bring only ruin; or like a predator which entices its victim into becoming its meal.

Aesthetics can mean a preferred image. Image repertoire could be the dress closet of an aesthetic.

AFFIRMATION:

Yes. To say yes to something one could say no to. To say yes to what one has been tricked or forced into saying no to. Or maybe. To orient to saying yes as a practice of reorganizing, referring to and realising what has sought to be so but has been cast into doubt or contained by an oppressive force (this can be an internal force and an external one).

Affirmation can be a socio-political act of liberation.

Affirmation can be an idea and practice and a strategy and a plan and a programme and more. If one can imagine that there is modality of being could be considered fortuitous, progressive, open, providential, increasing of potential, and really better - that is, if one can imagine a way of being that seems to be a better way and that the way is blocked somehow for some reason one could imagine to be repressive - to be bad, as it were, then one could imagine that such a way is in need of being affirmed. It needs to be recognized and realised. It needs to be a clear way. The way

needs to be made clear, available. And affirmation could be a practice, endeavour, operation, etc. which does that.

Affirmation can be an enactment which aligned with an interest in advantage, self-improvement and personal evolution.

AGENCY:

To be an agent. To be someone who acts. This could be with knowledge of social import and meaning.

An agency is a service company which finds work for people at a price, usually based on commission.

Agency could also be program or practice based upon the affirmation of one's capacity to have specific intentions, reasons, beliefs and philosophies for carrying out certain tasks, behaving in a particular way, speaking in a chosen manner and making specific decisions.

Some people believe that the reality of agency as reality is wholly contingent, and that in effect, agency is a myth. This could mean that one can't really do anything because one can never actually be 'one'. Instead one is really someone or something else tricking one into thinking one is 'one'. There is so much mixed up into being 'one' or defining one as 'one' that it is too difficult to differentiate where one's gesture is truly one's own and where it is just someone or something else's.

But if this is always the case, then others say that it doesn't matter because that is what is peculiar to saying that one is 'one' and is one doing something?

In other words, that agency is precisely that complex nexus of

You know what America is, don't you, guys? It's a big black hole that sucks everything in. You know who founded America, don't you" People who could pretend they were anybody they wanted to be, because that's what America is. Anything you want to be. America's the frontier that's never been conquered. America's motion, America's always somewhere else. If we can't go other places, we can be those other places instead. - America's the dialectic. It's what Hegel talks about in "The Phenomenology of Mind." The dialectic.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

things in a certain tension which allows one to say that 'one' is doing something.

Agency can be a platform for people to express their commitment to affirming the saying of "I" without embarrassment or really making any kind of issue of it at all.

AMERICA:

A geographic and a cognitive location.

America is: "What is America? and Disagree always."

AND:

And could be part of a commitment to include. It could be a preference to saying 'or', as in this or that. You could prefer to say this and that. It also could be a preference to say this and this and this and this and keep adding but stop any time you feel like it.

And, then, could have a philo-political import in discourse, it could be considered as functional of a commitment to expressing continuation and continuance as preferred to expressing finality.

ARRANGEMENT:

Putting things together in a certain way. Putting things together to be taken as a whole thing. In music an arrangement can be a course, an itinerary. A moving thing which is more than one thing put together. This can be seen as a relationship between things. Some say that any time there is more than one thing put together that they can be seen to have a relationship. A relationship can

be qualified in a number of ways. An arrangement can be made in order to exemplify specific relations or to predict effects from those relations. An arrangement can have different degrees of control exercised over it. Because any number of things moving and coinciding together, simultaneously and sequentially and contrastively can be determined as meaning a number of different things regardless of whether they were intended to be taken or noticed that way or not, then an arrangement can be said to exemplify a beyond intent and to also exemplify an element of chance. Some arrangers can make accommodating gestures to that fact and even factor it in as a privileged aspect of it.

Of course, some present chance operations (e.g. John Cage) as a preferred strategy and as one opposed to intent and expressiveness, and of course, some say that such a preference and opposition is exemplary of intent and expressiveness itself (of at least the fact of such a preference) and that there is no need to introduce chance inasmuch as it's going to be there anyway.

In writing arrangement can be a descriptive term and it can be an operative term as part of a methodology of writing and reading and analysing. One could think and speak of writing as arrangement as a way of indicating one's orientation to writing as a practice is one which means to emphasize multiple relations and association. This could be considered different from writing oriented to presenting a proposition (e.g. $x = y$) presenting its parameters ($x = \text{if } A \text{ then } B$; $y = \text{if } C \text{ then } B$) presenting its proof (do all cases of $x = y$?) and maybe some further possibilities. These could be considered different if the former could be

said to be more interested in everything and less interested in privileging a single thesis. In analysis, concentration upon arrangement could mean a preference for associations over the final outcome.

AVAILABLE:

Able to be had. Open. Vulnerable. There. In stock. Generous. In house. Here. Present. Consultable. At someone's disposal. Ready. Willing. Accommodatingly. To let. For rent. Open to suggestion. Here I am, come and get me. Whatever your intent - so be it. Automatic writing - writing without premeditation except to write whatever comes out of one without censorship. Available then to subverting one's own censorship. Available to what is suppressed. Exposure. Letting it be heard. Letting. Allowing. Permitting. Refuse nothing.

In some east-Asian esoteric philosophies availability is a being open to allowing things to pass through without threat. In Tai-chi Chuan, there is an expression which goes: "Soft style wins". And in Taoism there is a saying which goes: "That which is held in silence (contained) gathers force. Together these can be instrumental principles in a system of non-aggressive interaction which recognizes the circulation of power within it.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY:

One's own story always - it would seem - intersects - at least at the moment that it is a story - with other stories. So one's own story is never totally and exclusively one's own. Nevertheless,

legally it can be recognized as such, and reinforcement of propriety is quite possible, and a penalty of infringement can be exacted. Also, regardless of philosophical considerations of the metaphysical problematic within the laying down of this kind of onus, one can imagine a political functionality in making claim to, or issue of, what one might call one's own story.

In some areas of writing and speaking (telling, in effect) the use of one's own experience as resource is considered an offence to standards and protocol. Some like to be offensive and challenge the protocol - the status quo, as-it-were. Other metaphysicians insist that everything one tells (even someone else's story) is influenced, framed and infused by one's own story.

So, if the formula is: my story = someone else's story and someone else's story = my story, then to emphasize one or the other is gestural. Which is to say that it is a preference which is part of a way of being and living one's life. That can be important to someone.

Sometimes you want to do things and you can say you want to just because you do and that could be said about telling stories about yourself. You could also like the effect without wanting to explicate it.

This could be considered all a bit mystifying and that could be considered desirable for whatever effect it would produce.

Respect for and interest in one's own history as a source of critical thinking and understanding or our - and anybody else's - world.

Greater fiction. The seductiveness of stories.

ANGST:

Popular in the teenage variety.

Think of it, if you wish, as productive. To be so chronically upset as to turn it into a mode (style) of being (with - perhaps - a vengeance). Angst as the ground of social interaction and analysis. Angst as the fuel for assessing one's social position, situation, condition and consequence. In the movie Pump Up the Volume the renegade pirate radio DJ says to his teenage listeners: "Yes, you are screwed up - So be it! Now what are you going to do?"

Accept, affirm and actualize your state of being. Instead of the paralysis of analysis get on with it. A species of displacement of a certain self-indulgence.

Angst could be paralytic and it could be motivating.

Preoccupation with anxiety.

Worried.

Really concerned.

Being in a state.

ANXIETY:

Worry.

Being worried.

Some think that this makes it very difficult to live in a way that could be said to be desirable. Some think that technological development (which some call advancement) - especially when it is so rapid that it changes the way we live faster than we are able to adjust or accommodate ourselves to - is a major cause of gen-

eral social anxiety and that it is not a good thing when that happens because people begin to malfunction and if enough of them do that then the whole society is threatened to collapse into chaos and that - apparently - would not be a good thing. Some also think that the level of anxiety amongst the populace is equal or in proportion to the degree to which they can be controlled. Which is like saying the more you lose control the more someone else can control you. Now, if that someone else does not mean well you could get hurt.

Sometimes people get anxious about anxiety because they fear what might happen to them.

APPLICATION:

Sometimes some like to ask if you can't do anything with it what good is it? This sometimes is a rhetorical question - a disguised statement saying that it isn't any good if you can't do anything with it.

But others respond to this by saying you can do anything with anything, that is, anything can have something done with it.

There can be a great deal of consideration and deliberation over the process and meaning of the application of something. An idea can be applied, also a strategy, a solution, an ointment.

Application, the verb, and application, the noun. The appeal. The request. The suggestion. Dedication. Practice Discipline. How is/has/can it /be/been done? Utility Is it useful? X is usefulness for Y or A (where Y = person and A = institution/thing).

ANALYSIS:

Something you can go through. An ordeal. A process. A passage/way.

Unravelling.

Assessment.

Discovery.

Many styles, very contentious.

ANALOG:

In other words.

A trans - portation

- lation

- scription

- etc.

Another way of saying. It adds on. Augments sometimes

These days it is often opposed to digital. That is, specifically with regard to electronics. But if analogue has different senses, why not digital? A whole social dichotomy could be imagined.

Digital abstracts and re-ordains or manages. Analogue keeps the same basic forms, e.g. the french text is an analogue to its translation into English. Both are texts - same signal. But digital changes the form into numbers. Then it 'perfects' its. This alteration - homogeneity vis a vis an abstract ideal seems a bit fascistic sometimes to some.

A:

The first. Singularity. Definite. The best. Important things in our culture to some.

ANIMAL:

What people are said not to be, but apparently are. The idea of denying a basic truth.

Something to compare humanity to/with. An insult. An ideal.

Something to watch. Something to take care of. A metaphor.

APPLE:

A symbol of health, knowledge, temptation and the American way.

ASS:

An insult. A fool. An object of desire. Something to peddle.

Something to get in gear. Something to kick. Something to make of yourself. An area where discipline is focused. Something to rest on. Where a basic human truth lies.

ACID:

A corrosive

Could be a tongue type. That is, a variety of speech characterized by biting sarcasm and critical judgement of a caustic and ruthless - perhaps vicious - nature.

A chemical which causes one to fixate with wonder and with an overdetermined sense of absurdity. Can also cause feelings of paranoia and schizoid behaviour. Apparently good for brainwashing.

A term for a kind of music or dance party which is sympathetic to feelings of love, beauty, freedom, and the joy of intricate patterns and intense colours - often as generated by experience with the aforementioned drug. A sentiment despised by caustics, cynics, and acid tongues. "Experience the infra-red sound of corrosion" - a promo from the musical group Hydraulic Chaos.

AGONY:

Something to oppose to ecstasy. Something some people think is a necessary part of learning.

Not a pleasant feeling for many - although some don't mind and seem to court it often.

AGE:

This can be a pretty big preoccupation in America (including Canada). It would seem that there is a fairly high premium on youth. The predominant version of beauty is predicated largely on the features of the young.

Wisdom can belong to old age (although even here there is the notion of "out of the mouths of babes") but in a society which conceives of bodies and strength in terms of energy (See ENERGY), power and beauty are the predominant concerns, and it is to youth that the greater intensity (See INTENSITY) of these is attributed.

Getting old in this society is a failure and an embarrassment. Some people think that not enough people act their age. Some believe that there is certain behaviour which is peculiar and

appropriate to particular ages and age-groups, and to be in one age group and behave like another is a social crime. You can see this, for instance in rock and pop music where the celebrated practitioners are deemed to have overextended their profitable expression of their youth into an age more suited to other musical genres.

(See TEENAGERS)

BBBBBBBBBBBBBB

BECOMING:

Sometimes it's a short time, sometimes a long time, etc., and sometimes 'time' is not the issue. Becoming a doctor, writer, musician, teacher, accountant. Becoming an adult, a spouse, a parent. Becoming responsible, crazy, a jerk, a real human being. Becoming a leading member of the community, a werewolf, a vampire, a monster, a lone wolf, famous...

Becoming could be a commitment which insists on and revels in only partial completions. To be always becoming - continual movement. There could be a whole philosophy oriented to it. Indeed, see Gille Deleuze and Felix Guattari's A Thousand Plateaus for this. And less directly, you might consider Nietzsche's Will To Power in this way also, or even Ecce Homo.

Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes, The Lover's Discourse and The Pleasure of the Text; all by Roland Barthes.

And many other things.

"Becoming" is a kind of ontology which favours modes and models of being that some would say are not very Kantian. Which is probably short-hand (like all name dropping can be) for saying it is not very categorical and prefers multiplicity over the definitive.

"Becoming" could also be a strategy for keeping the possibilities of readings (and other things) open. Becoming Kantian, for instance, might present some challenges to the canonical reading of Kant by keeping Kant open for interpretation. It could, then, be exemplary of a reading practice unconcerned with the 'proper'

or 'correct' representation of an author's work In The Abstract Sense of Those Words, for it is the case for some that quibbling over the meaning of people's writings is a form of slavery to the propriety of the name. Kind of like patriarchy. (See Patriarchy)

BEING:

What it is

What it was

What it shall be

Life, the universe, and everything.

A movement.

A place. A manner, A strategy. A style.

Why are we here?

What should we be?

How did we get here?

How should we be? etc.

Some think we should think about it. Some believe we should just do it. Some prefer conscious being, some prefer unconscious being.

Some write being always with a capital 'B' when they want to distinguish being as existence without and existence with philosophy. Big B being (Being) is philosophical.

Some write being with an 'X' through it in order to indicate that it shouldn't be taken for granted what it means and that usually it means at least one thing and something else opposite to that thing.

Heidegger and Derrida are exponents of these considerations.

Ontology's what happens when you're hit by a bus. It's not something you can just disavow.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

Hegel's pretty big on being also. It has its own name as a study: Ontology.

People have been thinkinb about being for a very long time -thousands of years.

There are very many theories about it - anything you can imagine is pretty much fair game, and probably someone else has, does or will agree with whatever you can dream up about it.

BIOGRAPHY:

Story of a life. Gertrude Stein said that the story of an American was the story of all Americans. She also told her own story by using someone else's voice - as if it were a biography and not an autobiography. Perhaps she did this because it is difficult to tell someone else's story - even your own - without also telling the story of the story teller or someone else. Every autobiography, in this sense, is a kind of biography and every biography a kind of autobiography.

It might be as if someone else - a shadow figure - were implicated, were skulking around and insinuating, if not their presence, then their influence, upon any story being told.

Any story about any person is also the story of at least another person who is not necessarily mentioned as part of the story.

There is another theory which further says that any kind of story, or indeed, any kind of writing or speaking, is, after a fashion, a story about somebody plus somebody else.

Even writing about the stars in the sky and the rocks in the earth could be, in some way, the same as writing about people and

what they are, and perhaps also what they should be.

"The rock is in the ground," seems like an innocent enough sentence, but when you begin to wonder about it in different ways, when you begin to ask certain questions, such as: Why do you say/write that? What is your motive? Why say rock 'in' ground? Is there an implied ordered relation here? What is the investment in such an order or such a relation? Why specify the rock? Etc. Everything said can be socially implicated and can be made into a story - someone's or more.

BODY:

Something some people like to contrast with the mind. Property.

Private and Public.

Politic.

Not abstract but often abstracted.

A frontier.

Something to play with.

Sex.

Reproduction.

Some say the source of truth.

Some say the source of evil.

Some say the the house of pleasure.

Some say the the prison of the soul.

Some say a machine.

Some say a mystery.

Some say a blessing.

Some say a curse.

Some say the fortress of the mind.

Some say it is the mind.

Something "to-make-something-out-of".

A language.

Symbology.

Aesthetics.

The flesh made word made world made flesh.

Living and dieing.

Something that can remind you of things.

The origin, say some, of time and space.

The harbour of ancient and awesome power.

Something to organize.

Something to liberate from organization.

BODYWITHOUTORGANS:

Antonin Artaud and Gilles Deleuze/Felix Guattari suggest a few things about this. Some could be said to be:

A body (a person) freed of social impositions.

A body (a person) free to invent and re-invent themselves (see THEMSELVES).

The uninterrupted flow of desire. A process of this.

The (unconscious) direct force which could be within any structure and could be said to represent a desire within it that operates and proceeds to recapture and redefine its interests despite or in spite of its ostensible or surface definition of those interests.

BOTH:

And.

Either.

This and that. Black and white. Ying and yang. Do and don't.
Matter and anti-matter. Up and down. Winner and loser. Beautiful
and ugly. Agony and ecstasy. Body and mind. Surface structure and
deep structure.

The emphasis on the emphasis.

Ratio.

Economy.

Management.

Organisation.

Refuse noting even refusal itself.

BYWAYOF/VIRTUE OF:

Process. In transit. In association with, as a consequence of. In
collusion with. As a side effect of. Colaboration.

In tandem.

Spinning off from.

Plateaus in communion and open to influence from one another.

Allowing a degree of determination from elsewhere.

BELIEF:

Something to live by. The source of many disagreements. Some say
it is distinct from the truth. Some say truth is ever only
belief.

Something to enforce.

The predicant of behaviour.
Something to base things on.

BELIEF SYSTEM:

The organization, management and even enforcement - in effect, the total socio-political economy - of an idea or ideas about the way things are and should be. BS for short. Some are more accommodating of differences between belief systems than others.

Sometimes and oft times the source of war. And the resource of war also.

The pragmatics of believing.

BAD:

Some like it, some don't. Often a relative term. Can even mean good; very good actually.

CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

CIRCUMSCRIBE:

Write around. Frame. Enclose. Envelope. Fortress. Set up. Hold.
Sweeten the pot.
Contextualize.

COMPLICITY:

Sometimes an unwitting adherence or agreement to something someone has pretense to challenging.
Otherwise agreement, collusion.
It's sometimes a charge, though, of devious participation in or support of something claimed as antithetical. A ruse. Critics and governments are said to do it sometimes.
Something to be "in" - as: you are in complicity with the action you condemn.
Some believe that, by virtue of a rule of metaphysics, you are always deliberately or not consciously or not, in complicity with anything you condemn. This could be considered as something of a Freudian law of repression embedded in refusal. It also could be thought of as Shakespearian - as can be seen in the line: "me thinks thou dost protest too much."

CONDITION:

Stipulation. Contractual specification. Situation. Context. Shape.
Wear.
Environmental influence. Something to take into account.

Something akin to a notion of anything being considered always keeping in mind the context of the thing which helps in making the thing a thing, and a thing to be considered.

Something you have to do or pay attention to if you want to do something or let something else happen.

CONSIDERATION:

Necessary elements.

Politesse. Often something considered to be imperative.

Considered. Something thought of, accepted, believed, etc.

Subject matter.

What's on the agenda.

CONTESTATION:

Agreement. Disagreement. Fight. Competition.

Challenging proof or an idea. This can be serious.

Debate.

Particulars and generalities.

CONTEXT:

Once it was thought that people who thought a lot about things did so with too little regard for the relational aspect of those things. Which is to say without enough regard to what made those things, made them noticeable, made them not so noticeable, interact with them, are made noticeable by them, supported by and of them, influence and are influenced by them, etc.

In other words it was thought that important things were missed

when you considered something in isolation.

So it was recommended that the context be considered as equally important with anything else taken into consideration when trying to determine the meaning and nature of something.

Relational factors.

CONTRADICTION:

Something a lot of thinkers wanted to avoid for a long time.

Recently it was seen to be unfair and repressive and misleading to do so.

It has been considered that contradiction - the simultaneity or co-extensivity of opposing meanings - is a fundamental part of any structure. The consequence of such an observation has been that analysis favours a focus on the economy of meaning vis a vis any structure. Which is to say, to focus on the enforcement or privileging of one meaning over another.

However, it still remains a popular critical activity to discredit thinkers on the basis of some fundamental contradiction of their stated intent or interest. Citing hypocrisy is a very popular form of attack and dismissal of the work of critical thinkers. There are wars between critics. Contradiction is ammunition and artillery.

Those kind of critics often hate the kind who notice contradiction everywhere and focus on territoriality. And they can completely despise those who like contradiction; who like to play with the flexibility of meaning in a structure.

Saying against another saying.

CONTROL:

Some want it.

Some got it.

Some would like to lose it.

Some are afraid of losing it.

Some would like to take it away from some who have it.

Some would like to see the interest in it go away.

It could be a co-operative thing.

Often it is at the expense of someone else.

It can get you into and keep you out of trouble.

Manipulation

Means to an end.

End of the means.

Could be good. Could be bad.

Management.

Economy. Distribution.

COSMOLOGY:

Figuring out what makes the world tick. What its logic is. What the universe's pupose is.

Any arrangement of anything into something resembling an attempt to discern the order and mechanics of the universe.

Imagine treating a community or some urbain district like a universe.

The order of things.

Spiritual maps.

I would sneak down the hall, down the back stairs into the backyard, where tall weeds towered over me, amber and dead. Morose spiders spun glistening webs in the moonlight, and the high power lines sizzled in the starless sky like Dad's voice. The power lines were filled with the voices of the world's other dads, calling their sons on the telephone. The world's other dads were real too. They were real people who dealt with real things in a real world. Sometimes they found bits and pieces of the world which were not real, and then they had to make them so, or dispense with them altogether. Things were never as real as they could be for the world's dads. Someday everything in the entire universe would be real, and the world's dads would finally prevail. When that day arrived, civilization and not nature would be rampant. When that day arrived, you could talk to everybody in the universe on the telephone.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

CONSPIRACY:

To breath together. (See Robert Anton Wilson's & Robert Shea's Illuminatus trilogy.) (See the movie Slackers.) (See The Holy Blood and The Holy Grail, by Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh and Henry Lincoln) (See The Occult and The Third Reich, by Jean-Michel Angebert) (See Michael Bradley) (See Robert Anton Wilson) (See Kerry Thornley) (See Semiotext(e)/The Foreign Agent Series) (See under J.F.K., C.I.A., U.S.A., I.R.A., M.L.A., R.C.M.P., South America, Knights of Malta, Knights Templar, Masons, Rosecrucians, Discordians, The Sacred Heart, Moonies, Scientology, The Vatican, The John Birch Society, The Illuminati, The Science Dept. of any University, etc.)

See elsewhere... Always

What's "really" going on.

"Every rumour is true." (The Player, a movie directed by Robert Altman)

CYBER-:

A misnomer. Cybernetics is a technological science researching and attempting to contrive and produce artificial intelligence; a science of systems of control and communications in humans (animals) and machines.

From the Latin Kubernetes: "steersman" ... a driver.

A prefix indicating, loosely, a technological entity; a machine; often a computer; the memory of a computer; the program; (See Tron, a Disney produced movie about life inside a computer/video game with large capacity memory) a machine mind (where "mind" can

mean consciousness and/or personality).

CYBERPUNK:

A subgenre in the literary genre of Science Fiction.

Science Fiction + Raymond Chandler "Pot Boiler" Detective stories + Hollywood Humphrey Bogart Film Noir + Punk Rock sensibilities (romantic anarchy, sex and violence) + Nihilism. Movies: Tron, Bladerunner, Robo-Cop, Hardware, Fantastic Voyage. Books: Semiotext(e) #14: SF; Nueromancer, Count Zero, Mona Lisa Overdrive, all by William Gibson; Mirrorshades: The Cyberpunk Anthology, a compilation edited by Bruce Sterling; My Cousin, My Gastroenterologist, by Mark Leyner; Crash, by J.G. Ballard; Nova Express, by William S. Borroughs. Magazines: Interzone (UK); Mondo 2000 (U.S.A.) Music: Hawkwind; Pop Will Eat Itself; Sonic Youth (Daydream Nation).
Largely a boy's thing.

CYBERSPACE:

The land of the abstract. Virtual reality (See VIRTUAL).
Something like the old Gumby cartoons. (He would walk into books and become part of the action.) Or like the Hollo-deck in Star Trek: The Next Generation. (Customers can program a situation-a fiction/scenario, if you will-complete with circumstances, characters and cartographics; like being able to make-up and live your own movie.)
The spacialization of the abstract. The colonization, also, hence.

An artificial intelligence system within which one can inject one's consciousness, and therein inhabit and move about interacting with its elements.

The anthropomorphication and geomorphication of mathematics.

The dominion of the abstract.

Space in abstraction.

17

CYBERTIME:

Time may already be considered to be abstract, so cybertime is not so much the abstraction of time, and nor is it a case of livable abstraction because living by any schedule or clock is quite simply that. Rather, cybertime is the relative (See RELATIVITY) agent of cyberspace. Cybertime is relative time; it is the area flux between interior and exterior time factors. So, it is not just interior time as opposed to exterior time (not just the feeling of the passage of time, for instance, against its mechanized tracking: "It's only 3 o'clock, gosh, it feels like 5 o'clock."; "Gee, the day went by like nothing." "Holy smokes, it's only been 2 hours? It feels like 10." but simultaneity of the accord and discord between these two movements; the awareness of the coextensiveness, coexistence and parallel passage of the two times.) Cybertime curves.

The mechanization of interior (phenomenological) time.

Rendering the mechanical unto relative flux.

CYBERMONEY:

Trading by computer.

Money which never materializes. Money in continual trade circulation. Money as potential. Digital money. Money as numbers representing potential exchange value.

Perhaps money has always been like this in one sense. The difference, then, could be the designation of a special place for it to be exclusively like this.

Money as bits of computer memory.

$E(\text{energy}) = M(\text{money})C(\text{trading})^2$ (increasing exponentially)

Where money, time and space have a co-relative existence.

Time is money. Money is time. Time is space. Space is money.

Space is time. Money is space.

Money is memory is money.

Virtual money.

CURRENCY:

Prevalence.

What is used as a means of exchange. Could be money. Could be body parts. Could be a service. Anything in demand can be used as currency. The materiality of currency is relative to the nature, character and interest of the exchange.

(See EXCHANGE)

DDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDD

DADA:

"Dada is our intensity." Tristan Tzara, Seven Dada Manifestos
The aesthetic of anarchic bravado.

It's art because you say it is. Or, it's anything because you say it is. Reminiscent of Humpty Dumpty's proclamation: A word means whatever I say it means.

It's antirational. This doesn't mean you could impose a rationale, but just precisely this; it is imposed. All judgement is an imposition. But, further, why not make an imposition? Fine. You make one; I make one. Meaning is war.

Art is anything is war. Artifice is the practice of a warrior.
Performance is an attack.

DEATH:

Since Nietzsche—at least—proclaimed God is Dead, and thus posited philosophically that 1) God is a concept; 2) Concepts die; and 3) In dieing concepts leave behind ghosts which can often be as effective and sometimes more dangerous than they were when they were alive.

Many things/concepts/lifestyles have been proclaimed dead in the last 30 years (1965-95), not, of course, without contention. Some of these are: Jazz; Rock n' Roll; Truth; Beauty; the Author; Radio and etc. Foucault said that the dead sometimes have very a specific power and are capable of a covert revenge (in the essay What Is An Author?). Things living—or still known to us at least—

may be dead—Zombies—but things dead are also sometimes proclaimed to be living. For instance: Rock Stars and Movie Stars (Elvis, James Dean); or lifestyles such as any of those recognizable as peculiar to another time (practically anything from the 1960's). If you think about it, this process of rendering the living dead and the dead living could be an active attempt to construct the world as a domain chiefly of ghosts. Any description can be considered an act of aggression, and—even under the auspices of a complaint—it can be harbouring an insidious wish for things to be as they are described.

In tarot the card for Death (#13) means transformation. Which is to say that it is a passageway, a movement. Like the phoenix, every death is the consumption of something by the flames of itself (its desire) by way of which it is capable of rising up from its own ashes into something else—something stronger than before.

If, truth, then, is dead, for example, and we think of it as a phoenix, then truth is not dead and gone, nor a ghost—although a memory of its past self remains and is clung to by some, perhaps nostalgically, perhaps obsessively—but something else; something new. And the implication of its being new need not be ominous, vindictive or imperious; like anything else, its meaning and use value remains up for grabs. So grab it if you like.

If life's what you make it — why not death too?

DEGREE:

Since measurement in science (notably biology and physics) is molecular and extremely refined, social measurement seems to consider itself beholden to follow suit. This could be taken to mean—apart from the initial observation of a social order, indeed, taking its cue from these sciences as if from a contemporary Vatican of thought and behaviour—that there are molar and molecular understandings of social concepts and concerns, and that nothing is strictly one thing or the other, but rather, something or something else to a variable degree. So, the question would be to what degree is something true, free, guilty, bad, good, etc.? And, in relation to what ideology or standard of measurement?

It also is indicative of a shift from object analysis to the measurement and management/economic (in the broadest sense) analysis of intensity.

DESCRIPTION:

As opposed to prescription. But, of course, the law of irony inevitably leads the motive of the one into the condition of the other. They—metaphysically—boil down to the same. Nevertheless, to say can be to mean, for one thing, and for another, description is not direct prescription and bows down to the freedom of interpretation; the determination of one's own prescription on the basis of the description. It is, thus, a persuasion, a seduction—perhaps.

Of course, it can just go on and on and on and on...

Supposedly, what science intends to do.

Descriptions can be mobilized like artillery.

DIFFERENCE:

Otherness. Strangeness. Movement away from. Amount or degree of unlikeness. Remainder after subtraction. Disagreement.

In Derrida (differance), the contradiction inherent in separate-ness, to wit: moving away from and surrendering unto.

Trying to be special.

Something to flaunt.

Something to hide.

Change.

DISTANCIATION:

Measurement of space between points. (See Space, Measurement and Degree)

Aloofness.

Coyness.

Perspective.

DISTRIBUTION:

Management.

To control distribution is, indeed, a very powerful position to hold.

Since, in publishing or the music business for instance, distribution is itself a private enterprise, anyone in charge is free to except or reject any item without having to explain themselves.

They, therefore, have a free reign on exercising judgement on the basis of personal ideals. This can cause some to lay charges of censorship on these people, but it doesn't matter; they can pretty much do what they like in this regard.

Think about it: whoever has control over who gets what and how much, when, has the ability to shape opinions and create or secure lifestyles. Their power could extend itself to the point of deciding whether or not people—as a consequence of such decisions—will live or die; will fight or rest; work or play; love or hate; and etc.

Distribution is the dessimination of power.

The more distribution you're responsible for; the more powerful you are.

Power, in this regard, is something which is moving, and which, in that movement, tends towards saturation of the area it moves through, across, in, on and over.

DIFFERANCE:

Derrida's (Of Grammatology, Dessimination) amalgamation of differ: "to be unlike" or "disagree"; defer(1): "to put off until another time"; and defer(2): "to yeild or make concessions", (see DIFFERENCE).

DO:

Or die.

Pragmatics.

Work ethic.

Just do it.

A party or get together.

Valorization of the active (i.e. socially acknowledged doing) over the passive (i.e. socially unacknowledged doing). (eg. sweeping is doing; daydreaming is not doing)

DISCIPLINE:

A way of doing something; often in order to get something done.

It can be "means" or "ends" oriented.

There is often contention over proper procedure. If someone doesn't like the way you do something (particularly because you have a certain degree of variation within the execution) then they might very well say that you are not—or not very well—disciplined. It can often mean a measurement of how well you are able to finish doing something with respect to a schedule. It can also be an indication of how well you are deemed to execute a task with a standardized display of a particularly designed technique.

The possibility of judgement and standardization of production and performance.

If you like, when someone asks you if you are disciplined, you could always say "yes"—and not be lying. A discipline could be the methodology that you have conceived as a good way to practice some form of production (whether process or goal oriented—or indeed, both).

Can mean punishment.

How to get people to do things they don't want to do.

Training or way of life.

Reminiscent of the word disciple (which, incidently, has a Latin root -DISCO- that means "learn". I like the implications of this for thinking about disco-dancing and discotheques)

Can sometimes mean the ability to be repetitious. This can sometimes be a very difficult thing not to be.

To be able to do something on command is somehow for some or many an admirable thing.

DEFICIT(-logic):

Everyone's got one; nobody wants one. Or at least so it would seem between 1980 and 1992.

Spending more than you 'actually' have—at least on hand.

Credit.

As an ideal: don't have one, i.e. reduce the amount of spending so that you—inevitably—only spend what you have... and when you do spend what you have, be sure that you can guarantee a good purchase (preferably one which produces the possibility of more spending in the future). The consequences can be dire for those who have a history of spending what they don't have (i.e. have, in fact, a deficit). For an individual this can be bad news, but for a country it can be really bad news.

Some people believe that it is fine for an individual (or even a family or small group—perhaps even modest tribe) to attempt this, but that for a country to give it a whirl would, they believe, be folly. This is partly because the number of people who would suffer the necessary program of restraint would be unfavourably dis-

proportionate to the aim and to the burden. That is, the burden would not be born equally, and would, therefore not be fair—inasmuch as everyone would be considered equally responsible for the problem in the first place. If everyone is equally responsible, then why should those who are already suffering, suffer even more? (Especially if, comparatively, others don't really suffer much at all by the restraints).

Of course, suffering and pain can always be claimed a relative designation, which is why a standard of suffering is contrived for judgement. It is against this standard—at least—that such claims can be made.

These appeals tend to take for granted the existence and adherence to a social contract, which may or may not actually be in existence or truly believed in. It may be enforced to a degree, but there may be many ways in which it is not enforced and equity, hence, is in some way expressed by manner of good will (i.e. if someone feels like it).

Because principles of business conduct can and have been integrated into principles of social and political conduct (especially between 1980-1992), the ideal of deficit reduction (or deficit-logic, deficit-aesthetic) translates into these domains with the result that behaviour is rendered similar to money. This can be discerned in the phrase: "Put-up or shut-up".

But in tandem with the general institution of deficit-logic is the production of a machinery of capital exchange that moves so fast that cold currency rarely materializes. In fact, it moves so fast, it doesn't have to materialize. Money, at that stage is

pure abstraction; merely numbers or "blips" on the computer screens of the global stock markets.

So, it can seem somewhat ironic to consider a rather old-fashioned materialist concern like balancing a bank, when what is being balanced barely ever has any existence anyway. Why reduce you deficit, some wonder hence, when money, spending and debts are all, more or less, illusions? (Or only have a virtual existence. Moving like vague quanti through the molecular chambers of the global exchange system, where money is not measured any more by volume as mass, but as volume as trading. That is, volume as the speed and frequency of exchange itself. Capital accumulation as duration potential; the ability to keep trading. Money is time. Money is duration. Money is momentum in quantum measurement. (See MONEY) It is not to accumulate; it is to circulate: distribute (See DISTRIBUTION).

In wake of such observations, deficit reduction seems, to such analysts, an absurd operation comprehensible only under the auspices of an ulterior motive. (See CONSPIRACY) Which is to say that they consider it all a hoax, a dupe-job, where the actual intent is to convince a large populace on the basis of anachronistic ideals that their suffering is necessary in order that they can benefit in the future, when the likelihood of that being really the case is never even meant to be slight.

DUMB:

Not speaking, which could be smart.

Not being able to speak, which could have its drawbacks.

Someone who speaks but says stupid things.

Ignorant, which sometimes is considered a state of bliss and
sometimes is frowned upon.

EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE

E=MC²

Energy (i.e. of motion) is equal to (a relativistic partical of) a Mass Constant (i.e. the speed of light) multiplied by itself. Mass and Energy are different manifestations of the same thing. This theory became popular and Einstein became a celebrity. He remains a cultural icon. His face adorns T-Shirts—those walking billboards of often vaguely socio-political expression.

Relativity as a science research concept became a social idea. It radically changed social conceptions and behavioural rationale.

(See RELATIVITY)

"But the creative principle resides in mathematics. In a certain sense, therefore, I hold it true that pure thought can grasp reality, as the ancients dreamed." -Albert Einstein.

ECSTASY:

Rapture. Joy. An overwhelming euphoric feeling.

The corollary of agony.

A drug originally designed for psycho-therapeutic purposes. Often refered to as a designer drug (in order to encapsulate both designer jeans and yuppies). Popular amoungst urbain professionals in New York city in the mid '80s, it gave birth to a revisionist musical music in England called the Manchester sound (after groups from Manchester england such as: The Stone Roses and Happy Mondays) in the late 80s. In the 90s it fuels what are called in England Rave-ons: huge dance parties which go on till

the early morn. One or two of these have taken place in Montreal in 1992 and one night club in this city is known for this kind of music and also has the sobriquet The Ecstasy Bar.

Something to avoid in many religious practices and to seek out in others. Can be spiritual or corporeal.

EXCESS:

Too much.

This can be favoured or frowned upon.

A sign that there are limits and that they also can be crossed.

A major trope in critical literature which takes repression as its take off point. Excess, here, can be representative of a reactionary (not bad just reacting to something) politics, i.e. reacting to a level of repression where excess is seen as a moment or movement of liberation.

EVIL:

The opposite of good.

One of things Nietzsche writes about going beyond.

Some say what it is depends upon a dialectical management (i.e. one person's food is another person's poison).

Some like it, some don't.

What people the official government are sanctioning murder of are often called.

ENERGY:

Motive. Inspiration. Intent. Capacity for activity.

A way of referring to one's state of being: "I have a lot, not very much, need some, etc. energy."

Since science (that is, physics, and most specifically Relativity or Quantum Mechanics) can conceive of everything as some manifestation of energy (See $E=MC^2$), and since the social net is influenced in its conception of itself by science research's conceptions of the physical universe, then social organization and discourse (especially about social bodies through the discourse which determines notions of physical and social health) can allow itself to relativize power, the distribution of civil rights and behavioural ideology (morality), and thereby contrive a system of management which can phrase itself with terminology replete with affirmative inferences through references to production, generation, progression, increased capacity, free flow, open currents, etc., while at the same time arrange a more controlled social circuit board where people are like processed digital bleeps complicitly in motion in an ever increasing and accelerating drive through predetermined routes. New Age philosophy is complicit with this vision and its system of self monitored control.

An idea that people (bodies) are remote (i.e. moving and moveable) generators; ergons; capacitors; circuits; etc. That they can emit, collect, store, transmit, transfer and receive energy. That energy is a (the) lifeforce. That life, indeed, is energy, and death is a transformation (of transformers) predicated by a deminishing intensity of a particular manifestation of energy

into a different (possibly more amorphous) form. That life and death, then, are different manifestations of energy.

ENERGY VAMPIRES:

They who feed off the energy of others (and other things).

A defence against psychic attack, or warfare at the subtle level, which entails excepting or absorbing the "artillery"—the "weapon's volley"; the "discharge"—at its essential and most abstract level (striking it of all intent or meaning) in order to increase your own power (reinforce it with your own intent or meaning). (See BODY-WITHOUT-ORGANS)

ENTERTAINMENT:

A pleasureable and possibly fanciful consideration.

An industry.

A machinery for creating American royalty.

Something sometimes considered to be at odds with art (especially of the variety which pretends to serious aesthetic, social or political investment, inquiry or intervention).

A manner in which artists can make some money.

EXHAUSTION:

Something physically, philosophically, ideologically or semantically stretched and stressed—overused—to the degree that its energy (See ENERGY) or intensity (See INTENSITY)—or what might be called its force of significance—is weakened or diminished to the point of having a low threshold of efficacy or influence.

EXPRESSION:

Often a subject for civil libertarians' concerns.

Following a figurative model based upon species reproduction, something which brought forth from the interior of human being (from some level of consciousness in psychology; some notion of imagination in other disciplines) after some period of gestation (lived experience; rumination) and released into the social world (with or without some degree of motive) for public or private consideration or consumption (with varying degrees of ownership or creator responsibility or interest in critical judgement).

The free flowing and creative construction of desire and the human emotive response to stimulation or lived experience.

The sign of the semiotic aestheticization of the inside/outside trope within ontology.

The packaged idea.

What John Cage wanted to avoid in music.

Feeling.

EPISTEMOLOGY:

Theory of method or grounds of knowledge.

A variety of history which researches not only documentation, but the document itself. Also one which chooses as its interest political action based upon theories of human being from the humanities, the social and the physical sciences. A history then, of the "naturalization" of ideology.

Treating knowledge as organized and organizable units.

ECONOMICS:

Often considered the bottom line of social and political theory.
Household management.

Theories of money management.

(See MONEY, CYBERMONEY & DEFICIT LOGIC)

Any theory or instance of distributional organization or management of anything fundamental to anything. (eg. The Economy of Love)

ESOTERICA:

Arcane knowledge.

The romanticization and deliberate overdetermination of ancient cosmologies and anthropologies. The recuperation of Magic(k).

(See MAGIK)

The fusion of the natural humanities and the natural sciences.

The politicization of paganism.

The systemics, epistemology, socio-political cartography and strategics of the tacit, psychic (i.e. mental) and otherwise subtle plane (area, domain) of being (life).

The invisible but felt.

EXPLOITATION:

Taking advantage of something. Could be good, could be bad: exploitation of workers is bad; exploitation of a personal resource is good.

ENEMY:

Something which helps you define your sense of purpose.

EDUCATION:

Factory of the mind.

Industrial corporate training ground.

Process of indoctrination into the status quo.

Haven of the creative and intellectually dispossessed.

Used to be what you got in order to get a job; now it's what you get because there aren't any jobs.

The process by which those who don't or can't do what they always dreamed of doing become further entrenched in the production of more of the same.

Ideally, the investigation of and engagement with knowledge and systems of knowledge. A process of becoming a better person. The method of gathering wisdom. But, largely, too infected and directed by a militant and economically obsessed state political agenda to ever truly encourage that on a meaningful scale.

FFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF

FIGHTING:

This goes on a lot. In some ways it might benefit some to admit that this is necessary to acknowledge and get on with figuring out how to do it. For those who refuse fighting on ideological grounds and do so categorically deny—at the very least—the battle to succeed in this denial. Fighting could be considered fairly constant on a variety of levels with varying degrees of intensity—even just at the level of survival. Also there are some who consider the invisible psychic wars of difference critical to acknowledge and quite dangerous to ignore. In this respect, everyone is at war and everyone needs a strategy.

FREEDOM:

"I want it I need it and I ain't got it / I want it I need it and I ain't got it / I want it I need it and I ain't got it / I want it I need it and I ain't got it" - John Giorno
Release, or liberation from some constraint, restriction or refusal. The metaphysical inevitability given a system of constraint, restriction or refusal.

Open access. Given that something can be with-held, then the acquisition of that something is often called freedom. However, freedom is also the capacity or ability to determine the state or quality of something. This means that with-holding something can also be considered a freedom. Freedom, therefore, is a relative condition—it is a reactive alterity.

Choice.

A supermarket.

Variety.

Cable tv.

Expression.

Pornography.

Movement.

Tresspassing. A brand new car.

Information.

Confirmation. Gossip. Snooping. Control.

FLOW:

Something to go with.

One idea which focuses on flows has that there are a number of tendencies and inclinations which anyone can have and can have restrained or suppressed either by internalized cautions or externally imposed ones or both, and that this fact of restraint and suppression or oppression blocks these flows, these inclinations, and this causes certain body tensions and psychological depressions that result in a being under seige and imprisoned. Therefore, the interest in such theories is to unblock these flows and allow the person to be free in their expression and the pursuit of their interests.

(See Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus and A Thousand Plateaus, for a political theory of the economy of flows)

FLIGHT:

Direction. Desire taking off. Escape. Expression unimpeded by the super ego or the status quo or some oppressive self-imposed notion of what is socially (publicly) timely and expected or preferred. Ecstasy of self-absorption.

GENETIC:

The social construction of woman as a scientific fact. (Barbara Duden)

The ultimate region of human understanding and control.

The sentimentalization of scientific facts. (Barbara Duden)

God 101.

Philosophy and politics at the molecular level.

HHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH

HISTORY:

A story. Could be more or less true. Sometimes wishful thinking.
Sometimes self-fulfilling prophecy.

What it was.

A discipline which seeks to understand the formation of the present by the events which led up to it. Sometimes it tries to prevent the recurrence of mistakes.

HYPE:

What the American electoral process discovered to be more important and effective than the delivery of actual accomplishments or the revelation of accurate characterizations.

The aesthetics of prevarication.

HORIZON:

The modernist end which never comes and which was never really intended to arrive; it was just the organizing principle and motive for generating and securing the central concern, which is the process of working towards the end/goal.

HIERARCHY:

The belief that some thing, place, position or allotment is superior to another, and that any of these things can be identified as steps up to the zenith, where only the best can and do ascend.

An unfair system of social distribution which takes advantage of and treats poorly a majority for the benefit of a minority. Complicity on the part of the minority lies in the hope that they can rise above their lot.

IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII

INTENSITY:

Force. Capacity. Energy. (See ENERGY) Charm. Emotive Expression. Self-Absorption. Star-appeal. Sexiness. Magic.

An element for measurement in the determination of personal power and value.

The general application of a show-biz standard to the public at large.

The general application of a physical science attribute to a system of social (cultural) judgement.

(See JUDGEMENT)

Culture shock therapy.

The sign of prevalent apathy and emotional paralysis. What becomes entertainment currency for the numb.

A measurement standard for entertainment and creative-arts production.

Existing in high degree, violent, vehement; emotional; eager, ardent, strenuous; having a quality in a high degree.

The replacement for ideology in the twentieth century in the wake of the social construction of being (social life) as a quantum scientific fact.

The digitalization of life.

(See IDEOLOGY)

INVISIBLE:

Not seen by the naked eye.

Conspiracy.

Occult.

Hidden from view.

Molecular.

Subparticle.

Obscured

Disregarded

A way of feeling. Could be advantageous. Could be alienating.

IDENTITY:

Something teenagers have a crisis with.

Something the vague generation can't quite get a fix on.

A singularity which may have always been an elaborate fantasy.

A way of categorizing a person that was invented in the early part of the twentieth century with the advent of psycho-therapy.

Something urbanites became concerned with in the early twentieth century.

The notion that one can confidently express some ideomatic peculiarity which can stand as a kind of Newtonian fundamental of personhood. A modernist horizon.

(See HORIZON)

IRONY:

What goes around comes around.

That which is held in silence gathers force.

That which is repressed is guaranteed.

Absurdcomicparodictragicwellthereyougoaitntthatakickinthehead.

I:

Some people think it is out of place to use the first person singular when you are thinking if you are thinking in an official academic capacity (i.e. not a celebrity writer), with the exception of some branches of feminism, because they would prefer it if you would do someone else's thinking and not your own. Why do you think that might be? It must be because the university—and school, in general—is an institute of higher learning that wants you to develop your thinking capabilities and strengthen the degree to which you can figure out yourself and your world and the relationship between them. It couldn't be because it is preferred that you become a walking annotated bibliography with no real thoughts of your own, except as commentary upon the canon and great connected published masters (mostly men) of any number of disciplines (i.e. not thinking).

(See REACTIONARY)

"To reach not the point where one no longer says I, but the point where it is no longer of any importance whether one says I." -

Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

A convenient referent.

The mind was just a reaction of pure spiritual being to the world's material force. The mind was a whirlpool, constant and uncontainable, which spun off into the world knocking into other things, inciting other spirits to move. This was karma then, I decided: the constant push of objects which tried to make of spirit an object too - a sort of cosmic bullying, a rustling and herding of things into other things. These forces made life, death, people, pain, suffering, cities and, worst of all, human emotions.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

IDEOLOGY:

Some believe this is something invented by a fellow named Althusser. However, it has had a history as a word cited in any english dictionary well before his time.

Policy. Applied and legislated ideals. The theory and study of ideas as basis of an economic or political theory or system, or characteristic of some class, etc.

The notion that action can be predicated by idea, ideal, belief, philosophy, etc.

JJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJ

JOB:

Working for someone else as opposed to yourself. Work that you don't enjoy.

JUDGEMENT:

Some consider it ideal to be without this for most matters of social decorum and cultural morality. In other words, another thing which, in the twentieth century, has been digitalized and relativized in the sense of contriving its understanding under the auspices of physics and subjecting its character, its procedures and denotative/connotative meaning to a notion of degree. Judgement, now, is accepted, largely, as wholly contingent and often is seen as arbitrary or whimsical. Because it can be thought of in terms of degrees, its casting is a measurement; judgement is not so much enactment of rule or law as an application of relative intensity. This doesn't mean let the punishment fit the crime, so much as any instance of judgement is always judgement itself with a varying degree of harshness contingent not upon the crime so much as upon how much any case calls for or can allow for harshness or no; it is determined by matters ulterior to—but to some degree parasitical upon—the specificity of the crime itself.

(See JUSTICE)

JUSTICE:

Like judgement, a system transformed by relative physics into a quantum social function subject to application by degree. Not an ideology, rather, an intensity. And it's not just one justice for one set of people, another for another. Rather it's a justice contingent upon a number of factors. Fractal justice. Contingent upon publicity, economics, political climate, etc. It is not justice itself, but rather, how much justice.

(See JUDGEMENT)

(See IDEOLOGY & INTENSITY)

KKKKKKKKKKKKKKKKKKKK

KNOWLEDGE:

Some people think information. Some think wisdom. Some, understanding. A commodity. A thing which is to be discovered.

Something to be learned. Something which is inside all of us.

All knowledge could be considered knowledge of.

An organizing tool for social construction and control.

A war machine.

(See EPISTEMOLOGY)

KILL:

Or be killed.

The cessation (figurative or literal) of life—sometimes on principle. (See IDEOLOGY)

Practice of those at war (figuratively or literally, visibly or invisibly)

LLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLL

LOGIC:

Organizing system of principles abstract and concrete. Sometimes a system of justification and rationalization.

Paradigm.

Any system could have any number of logics or organized sets of fundamentals.

That which is applicable and explicable and replicable is likely a logic.

MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM

MONEY:

The bottom line.

Some say it doesn't exist anymore. (See CYBERMONEY)

Currency. (See CURRENCY)

Material manifestation of a: abstract representation of a medium of exchange. (See EXCHANGE)

Put it where your mouth is. That is, deliver the goods; practice what you preach; act, etc.

Material. (See MATERIAL)

MATERIAL:

Stuff.

Mass. (See MASS, & $E=MC^2$)

Consumer goods.

The physical appearance (representation) of the abstract. (See ABSTRACTION)

The physical universe.

Resource (which could also be abstract).

Matter.

Element.

It would seem sometimes that material is the thing that can be apprehended as exterior to consciousness (i.e. to the organ/s of perception).

Consciousness, itself, can be material (in the abstract sense) for study, but its physical materiality is consigned to mere

We're very much a thing-oriented culture - the West in general, I mean. We're into making things, changing things, moving things from one place to another. Sometimes I think it's best just to let everything lie. To not keep banging and bumping away at the world, to accept things for what they are. I guess in a way that might sound sort of escapist to you. I'm sure my friend Beatrice would probably be quick to agree. To imagine the world and all its suffering as a sort of necessary trial, one which presumably conditions us to understand our true 'being', is to imagine that the world itself doesn't matter, nor the conditions in it. That means, in a way, accepting the world's cruelty and its pain. That means just leaving it alone to get on with its own alien and material processes, however wrong and unjust they may be. I'm sure that could sound rather self-centered, even pretty ambivalent or smug. But I think there often comes a time in your life when you stop worrying about whether the way you think is right or proper or not. You just get tired, and start accepting the way of thinking that's easiest and least worrisome. (-) We find our way out of this world within this world, I guess that's what it all boils down to.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

traces. Some might consider this version somewhat egocentric insofar as that which is only traceable and hence has a physicality which is sheer speculation and possibly infinite in its capacity is reminiscent of God. The invisible, in this sense, is often privileged and valorized culturally (See INVISIBLE).

But—perhaps ironically—by virtue of this celebration of the invisible, the visible is also granted a chief importance on the basis of a belief that what can be physically apprehended can be manipulated and put to “good” use.

Embodiment. (The body, also, —still— can be the bottom line).

(See BODY)

MASS:

Church

Music

Science

Force

Volume

Energy

Flesh

Substance

Coherent but of indefinite shape

METAPHYSIC (S)AL:

That which is constructed or imagined to be constructed like the physical universe but is not strictly speaking the physical universe. That which is likened to the physical universe, or more to

You want to move into the unreal so you can turn it into property. You want to build houses there, motels and swimming pools, convenience stores and parking lots. You want to find escape, pleasure, pain, spirits, things. Things you can use, just like you use those chemicals, Phillip. You don't care about chemistry. You don't care about abstract knowledge - no matter what you say. You're just using those chemicals to kill your dad.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

the point, to theoretical constructions of the physical universe.

The application of laws of the physical universe (i.e. scientific observation and speculation about the constitutive form of matter in and of the universe and its behavior) to the human body, to social behavior and socio-political policy.

The study and theory of those elements of human social and spiritual life which are invisible yet effective.

Any theoretical philosophy of existence and knowledge.

In Derrida, the prevailing philosophical economy and distribution of ontology which was formalized by ancient Greek scholars (Such as Plato and Aristotle) that inform most of Western thought and is taken for granted as natural. This is particularly of interest for him with regard to the West's philosophical construction of difference (especially within dialectics) and its socio-political consequences.

MACHINE/MACHINERY/MECHANICS:

A popular way of thinking about things and of thinking about how things are thought about.

Given that things can go any number of ways and can be systematized, organized and economized with an interest in predictability and constancy, then it might not seem so odd to imagine an admiration for thoughtless automation—or even thoughtful automation, for the merger between human and machine (the android or cyborg) could be considered desirable in order to allow room for innovation. But because they can go any number of ways, and the

Officer Henrietta's distinct, often provocative questions never startled me or made me feel ill at ease. Instead they always implied what my own obvious responses simply had to be, responses I did not utter so much as activate, like functions in a computer. Graphs, data, production, profit, loss. Anger, love, resentment, sadness, pain. The world of the self and the world of machines. During these days and nights of slow, unhurried reflection, I began to realize that those were the two worlds I always seemed to be getting confused. The world of the self and the world of machines.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

machine (and its merger with the flesh either literally or figuratively in the manner of an ideology of mechanized behavior and thinking) can be romanticized, it is not unlikely that things have a tendency to be unpredictable and inconstant; that they can be undependable and subject to sudden breakdown. Indeed, the machine, for all its presumed efficiency, can be a very inefficient and fallible thing. The irony of this is that such inconstancy, instead of incurring an abandonment of the machine model, makes the machine all the more endearing and—dare I say—human, on the one hand, and only inspires the decided need to improve the model on the other. So, the machine could be considered either as some monstrous model of dehumanization and spiritual incarceration, or it could be considered as a scapegoat to the failure of certain civilizations' utopic technological visions.

MEDIATION:

The circuit board of cultural studies. The processor. The passageway. Dialectics. The space or line of transference. The juncture or collision of signals, symbols, and elements in a network. A filter. A frame. That which may in itself not be apparent, but which determines, suggests or guides the implication of certain reported information.

MAGIC (K) :

Aleister Crowley's variation on magic—Magik—was for the sake of recovering in the word the sense of the Magus (as in Matt. 2:1, the wise men). In other words, to resurrect a notion of wisdom

The occult is the relative half-world into which we journey to make our own world more real, (-) I don't think the occult dimension is necessarily more invalid than our own, or more valid either. It's just that big black gap of things we don't know. I think we should learn to accept the things we don't know on their own terms, without wondering things like, you know. Whether we're 'really' talking to our departed great-grandmother or not. Or whether it's the devil out there, or demons or goblins. We have to accept life's gaps and lapses as well as its hard promises. I think that's your problem, Phillip. I think you need answers to everything. I think something's not real to you unless you can use it exactly the way you want.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

into the practice of magic as it incorporated various arcane philosophies both theoretical and practical (such as Hermeticism, Theosophy, Kabala, Wicca, Freemasonry, Alchemy, etc.).

The belief that everything has a spirit and can, therefore, be communicated and interacted with.

The more than meets the eye.

The praxis of the will.

MODERNISM:

The school of thought and social orientation towards procedure which acts in the name of a rhetorical goal.

Social recipes without the product. Maps without locations.

Theories without actualizations. The rush towards an unreachable horizon.

(See HORIZON)

The institutionalization of the hidden agenda.

The virtually indiscriminate valorization of the new, innovative or novel.

The invention of progress and civilization.

MUSIC:

Of the 9 muses.

MIRROR:

Apparently, something you can see yourself in, but which distorts—however minutely—the view.

The recognition of one's self in difference to others.

Something which, particularly with the aid of smoke, can facilitate the creation of illusions.

Representation.

Simulacrum/simulation.

MOVEMENT/MOTION/MOMENTUM:

According to quantum physics you can't measure the momentum of a subatomic particle without losing sight of its position and vice versa. This has been extrapolated into a general social rule for political strategy which is constructed something like on the order of you can't hit a moving target.

Other scientific theories/observations have it that nothing (with consideration of the molecular) is ever at rest. This can be extrapolated to mean that nobody ever has an absolute position; that any claim to position is a convenient designation which ignores a complicated nexus of dependent factors which make that position (i.e. opinion, belief, stance, policy, etc.) appear to be tenable.

In the 50's U.S.A., mobility was partially defined by the development of the relationship between the sub-urban and urban space as mediated by the car.

Freedom.

(See Deleuze and Guattari's Nomadology)

(See The History of Luminous Motion, Scott Bradfield)

MULTIPLICITY:

The multi-verse, The pluri-verse. More. Add on. Do not diminish, increase. Manifold variety.

And, and, and...

(See AND)

MEANING:

Apparently, something which is dead. A ghost perhaps. If so, ghosts can often move a few things around, or put a few scares into people. If merely dead, perhaps its memory—a legacy, if you will—remains, and that, if you think of Jesus Christ, for instance, can have a pretty powerful and determining effect. So, its being dead does not necessarily dismiss it. And if the charge is that it carries on with only a pretense to presence and currency, it matters not, for if something has the same effect as it would if were alive regardless of whether or not it is, then it might as well be, and indeed, it might be considered all the more powerful if it isn't, or the whole idea of alive and dead might itself be considered somewhat spurious.

Michel Foucault in *What is An Author*, in response to pronouncements about the death of author, said that the dead have a very specific power, and thereby recovered what was, perhaps out of hand, dismissed, and indeed was valorized and exploited in its own way towards certain ends in the domain of literary analysis. He further managed this recovery on the basis of positing a notion of an author function; a kind of practice which is available and can be occupied at any time, and redefined in any number

of ways. So could it be said for meaning.

ME:

Myself and I.

The holy ego-centric trinity.

A generation typified by self-absorption, hedonism, accumulation of consumer goods, rampant psycho-social-therapy and a somewhat modernist romance with intoxication.

Number one.

The final frontier.

An entity currently immersed in vagueness.

MAP (PING) :

An alternative analytic practice; related to the descriptive/prescriptive dialectic.

(See DESCRIPTION)

Drawing an analytic itinerary. Could also be a way of documenting experiential data. Analysis without synthesis.

MAKE-A-LIVING:

A major incentive for compromise.

RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR

RELATIVITY:

$$E=MC^2$$

Context bound.

"Truth is an army of tropes" -Nietzsche.

Things are determined in relation.

Everything is determined by a variety of factors and forces which are interior and exterior and in transit between and beyond that.

The realization that cause and effect are not a guaranteed relation. The realization that beliefs (See BELIEF SYSTEMS) are often invented in the name of ulterior motives.

The observation that truths are often enforced beliefs.

Anything is the same as anything else.

If space is relative to time, and time is money, then space is relative to money. Also, cyberspace has, therefore, co-relatives in cybertime and cybermoney. (See CYBERSPACE, CYBERTIME, CYBER-MONEY, SPACE, TIME, & MONEY)

RICH:

What some people believe anyone in America (i.e. the U.S.A. or what could be called: "America of the mind"), can become. The nadir of existence. Nirvana for materialists. Even others use it analogically to indicate an abundance of wisdom, experience, etc. America's royalty.

Lifestyles of the rich and famous.

SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS

STOCK MARKET:

Mood ring of the nation. Very temperamental. Apt to take its ball home and stop the game, so to speak.

Because money can be a cybernetic entity (See CYBERMONEY), and trading volume is a measurement of energy more than mass (See RELATIVITY and $E=MC^2$), i.e. how much trading more than how much traded, because of all this, the stock market has a tendency to be petulant and rabidly cynical. It "rises" and "falls" according to how well events in the world mirror and maintain its ideal (whatever that is).

"The rumour (that U.S. president George Bush had an extramarital affair) has been circulating since the early '80s and occasionally surfaces in the papers, most notably (and explicitly) in a story in the LA Weekly during the 1988 presidential campaign. A few days later the stock market dropped 43 points on rumours that the Washington Post was about to do a similar expose." -Cecil Adam's The Straight Dope, Montreal Mirror, 7 May 1992

In the Canadian federal election of the late 1980s, the stock market moved down in response to the liberal candidates movement up in the polls in a bid to manipulate the public into supporting a free trade deal with the United States. (The liberals lost.) World markets plummeted in 1992 in anticipation of a labor party victory in England. (Labor actually lost even though all polls indicated it would be otherwise, thus casting the accuracy of poll-taking into dark suspicion.)

It's nothing to be ashamed of - business. Business convenes secret and ghostly ceremonies in the world. Ceremonies which the world needs, or else the world wouldn't have them. - It's as real as rocks, as organic as trees. - Business always works, even when nature doesn't. When plants stop photo-synthesizing, business will manufacture its own atmosphere. When other moons and planets crash into our seas and wreck the world, business will mine and redistribute them. Business is the world's real nature, Phillip. We are all fleeing nature and using what it has taught us about business to make our world vaster and more perfect.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

VIRTUAL (Reality):

That which is such for practical purposes though not in name or according to strict definition.

Virtual Reality. (See the movie Brainstorm) Lucid dreaming.

Seeing it, feeling it, living it, without "it" being actually there. An interactive hallucination.

Some people say business as usual. (See Jean Baudrillard, Robert Anton Wilson)

A simulacrum. A facade. A mock-up. A movie.

For all intents of purpose.

That which acts and stimulates as if it were real.

It doesn't matter as long as the effect is the same.

If mass and energy are just different manifestations of the same thing (Albert. Einstein) then virtual reality is a manipulation of energy in order to make manifest the effect of mass.

Flight simulators.

From the publication of William Gibson's Nueromancer (1985) a fad, first at NASA; more recently (1991) in video game arcades.

In 1992 a helmet has been marketed to simulate the sensation of moving around a standard North American household kitchen.

Computer generated graphics are keyed by a cybernetic glove worn by the user. Visual stimuli are responded to by the central nervous system (like watching a movie of a roller coaster shot from the audience's--the roller coaster rider's--perspective can make you feel as if you are actually there).

The hope is for something more elaborate - a totally interactive hallucination (like the holodeck on the TV Science Fiction program Star Trek: The Next Generation). This would be to the extent that the hologram could have an independent enough existence that it could, for instance, be sent somewhere as a surrogate; where it might interact with other holograms (indeed one proposal was multiple holographic personality representations of a single person interacting for pleasure or therapeutic engagement).

TV.

Daydreams visible and open to participation by others.

The irregularities of the world's body correspond with the map of our own brains. - We travel across the world and into the ways representation works. Trees aren't trees, roads aren't roads, moms aren't even moms. The history of motion is that luminous progress men and women make in the world alone.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

WWW:WWW:WWW:WWW:WWW:WWW

WORK:

Something some would prefer to do under their own volition and under their own auspices.

Job. Enterprise. Labor. Endeavour. Occupation.

WORLD:

Global politics and economics. New World Order.

Something to have war on.

When worlds collide.

Something geo-physical and something conceptual.

Something interior and something exterior.

Something to think about.

Something to lay claim to.

Something to worship.

Earth. A planet.

Where is the second world?

Where Mom had once lived her life in the world she now lived her world in the mind. It was a secret world filled with dark speculations and sober intricacy. Vast and comprehensive theories were worked out down there, enthralled by senseless reason. Complicated chiaroscuros of reflection like magnificent Venetian tapestries. Extensive logarithms of interpretation like sculpted white clouds. Mom's secret self sat there in its immaculate kingdom, merely dreaming of other kingdoms like mine.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

Value's generated the world, not consciousness, - The
trick is to take the world and its values and generate bet-
ter worlds inside. You've got a choice, baby, and it's the
only choice you've got. Either remake the world, or allow the
world to remake you.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

Sometimes it's hard to tell the difference between your
conception of the world and the world's conception of you.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The books on my shelves stared down at me like statues or awards, mementos of some former life. They seemed very cold to me now. Books were just the raw matter of education. They were stuff, like coal or minerals. They could be accumulated, quantified and known. I was no longer concerned with the known, but with the process of knowing itself; pure motion, which did not render things known or visible. It did not transport you to any fixed location on a map. It was into the very function of the self that I journeyed now, and like Mom I could only journey there alone. Misery enveloped me with soft black robes. They were warm and clinging. They held me in place so I wouldn't get lost. Misery was my map, my boundary. It held me in place in this world of constant motion.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

Sometimes I couldn't even remember which words were mine and which words Mom's. Whose voice was it, whose tongue and whose lips? Where did my flesh of words end and Mom's words of flesh begin? Was this Mom's face and stomach and beating heart, or was this mine? Was I becoming her, some mere reproduction of Mom, or had she so totally and unselfishly invested herself inside me that she no longer really existed at all? I tried to tell myself that I was still me and that Mom was still my mom, but never with any conviction. I am myself, I whispered again and again in the dark. I live my own life. I imagine my own worlds. That's what I kept telling myself.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

The following bibliography is organized partially in order to indicate the texts and authors that this book and author are in some way indebted to - if not for their ideas, then - for the confrontation with or consideration of their ideas or (more generally) their approach to thinking and analysis. It is, therefore, also modestly annotated for the purpose of identifying my interest with respect to them, or the manner in which I have been honored to be haunted by them.

It does not mean to be a comprehensive explanation of their corpus or an assessment of the import of their work as so judged by an academic or intellectual community. Nor does it intend to elucidate the particulars of their contribution to, or interpolation into, popular debates as may be pursued in various journals and at various conferences. And certainly it doesn't take on the conceit of revealing anything like an history of such matters - a chronology of intellectual development (it is not, then, strictly speaking, a "literature review").

No doubt, these are extremely worthy and important pursuits; but they are not mine. This is not the contribution I wish to make. And it is a curious fact that I must concede to the necessity of clarifying this; that it is presumed that such a relation to other people's thinking is primary and that it is incumbent upon any intellectual/thinker/analyst to ensure such a production, i.e. to assure its reproduction. Although this is a noble endeavor for others, for myself, when faced with it as absolutely ulterior to my motive for writing and thinking, I can only think of it as the oppressive insistence of membership into a factory of

the mind. I do not care about commentary.

Nevertheless, I can accede to an interest in a certain version of history which is predicated by curiosity regarding ancestry, lineage and legacy. This history is a very personal one. Its motivation is perhaps not unlike that which generates and drives one to read biographies and autobiographies. Or maybe it's the interest that makes people write/produce and read/watch travelogues.

In the end, I like to think that it does recognize the value of a peculiar protocol, but that it responds to it as if it had been asked in a friendly manner with genuine albeit not crucial interest: "Read any good books lately - oh - and what where they about?"

This, then would be something like a reply to that question.

As a technical note, the lay-out of the bibliography is more or less in alphabetical order, and there is some interchange between listing by author and listing by title (particularly when dealing with a journal, magazine or some kind of journal sponsored "series" - like Semiotext(e)'s Foreign Agent Series).

Annotation is deliberately inconsistent in order to highlight only specific things - a selective stain, or scar, or recognition.

"Well, then, I must have two heads, so to speak. The universe is inside my actually EXPERIENCED head, but that head and the universe itself must be both inside my logically necessary CONCEPTUAL head. Is that it?" "Yes. My conceptual head contains the universe, or a model of the universe to be strictly precise, and inside that model is the MODEL OF MY CONCEPTUAL HEAD, which is of course also my EXPERIENCED head." "Careful now. You're building up to an infinite regress." "I can see that, but it must be because consciousness itself is an infinite regress. I think that explains coincidences." "Are you sure you know what you are saying?" "Yes. A coincidence is an isomorphism between the contents of my conceptual head, outside the universe, and my experienced head, inside the universe." "And why should there be such an isomorphism?" "Because, damn it, my two heads are really only one head. I've just separated them for logical analysis." "But how can your conceptual head, outside the universe, be your experienced head, inside the universe?" "Because, because..." "Yes?" "Because concepts are experiences too. My conceptual head is experienced, and becomes my experienced head, whenever I think about mathematics or pure logic. Yes, by God. When I see a spotted dog, that is inside my experienced head, as Hume demonstrated. But when I think about the actual dog that creates that image in my experienced head, I must be expanding my conceptual head to include the actual dog, not the image of the dog. So the dog, and the rest of the universe, are actually in my conceptual head, not

in my experienced head, which only has their images." "But my experienced head is both inside and outside my conceptual head—which means it is both inside and outside the universe." "You're still in infinite regress." "I can appreciate that. By the way, am I talking to you or talking to myself?" "Is there a difference?" "Yes," Sigismundo said, feeling certain. "When you talk to others, an average group reality is maintained, as Vico says. When you talk to yourself, there are as many realities as you want." Then anybody who makes an impression on you, enslaves you. Total freedom is only to be found by keeping silent, sitting alone in a dark room, and making up your reality as you go along." "That sounds plausible," Sigismundo said "But somehow I think it would get lonely after a while." - The Historical Illuminatus Chronicles, Robert Anton Wilson

ALTHUSSER, LOUIS:

A political thinker whose work I have never actually read, although I have heard his work being discussed in class and have read Marxist review pieces which seek to situate his peculiarity within that category. As I recall, some of his concerns were: the oppressive nature of political ideology (i.e. dogma disguised as flexible idea) and cultural hegemony (government acting like huge corporations with controlling interest so extensive that it includes those which are allegedly or hopefully in competition). The later notion interested me if only to figure out whether this controlling interest really disarmed and rendered ineffectual any instance of defiance on the enemy's turf (i.e. when it turns out to be your turf). The proposition would be something like: if a newspaper is controlled by a political party whose policies are challenged by an editorial—or even a political cartoon—is such a challenge by definition innocuous? Is it the case that, because you are giving your time and money over to their product, you thereby are complicit with those policies and are strengthening the enemy despite your complaint; you are just blowing in the wind? But to accept such a proposition, for myself in any case, would be to accede to inevitable futility and consequent resignation on the basis of believing that power is only effective when it is in the hands of large capital intensive (military) industrial complexes. This is like saying only big power counts. Of course, motive for self-expression of personal beliefs need not be restricted to their enforcement and their conquest and replacement of other (possibly acrimoniously) differing beliefs.

The interest may not be so much in challenging as in seeking representation or the freedom of expression without acrimony or injury. But either way, this idea of hegemony as a political war machine of erasure and disablement does not account for certain ironic and contradictory factors which often are insistently and unavoidably present within any power structure. This is not to say that it is an incorrect analysis or observation but rather that it is inaccurate and too categorical; it's too big. In the writing of Deleuze and Guattari (See below), for instance, is an idea about the symbiotic relationship between a process of territorialization and deterritorialization which is somewhat reminiscent of the old adage about every action having a reaction, where in this case, thinking politically, every bid for a takeover necessarily leaves itself open for consequences which are inadvertently beneficial and advantageous for the possessed and which thereby allow for a certain displacement of the stability of the so-called owner. In applying this idea to the above notion of hegemony we might imagine—going back to the example of the editorial or cartoon in a newspaper against the interest of its publisher or arch-ideologue—that the territorialization of the newspaper's ideological mandate is deterritorialized by the inclusion of that which challenges it, but not because of the strict difference of opinion that is represented (this is reterritorialized by—if nothing else—a perceived magnanimity on the part of the owner), rather it is done precisely by way of the acknowledgment of a contradiction. For it is contradiction within an ideological struggle which opens up the ground for new claims. Ideology's

strength lies in its force of singularity; that which must be enforced is that which is already challenged, and that which is challenged is weakened when its strength is so articulated. Magnanimity is also deterritorialized by its own ulterior motive ; it's graciousness is a gesture. Magnanimity makes pretense towards allowing room for contradiction, but by definition it must remain outside of it; it accommodates it within its house. Its accommodation, then, is a renewed instance of the machinery of hegemony. It means to disarm by providing it a space. This is like South Africa's apartheid system which provided townships for its disaffected black civilians. It is also a very popular model of Capitalist power. It behooves political resistance to operate on the grounds of interpretation and personal investment. For if the ground is always available to contradiction, and to a contradiction which can always be accommodated (that any political power structure can bear to harbor contradiction) then political meaning and territory will not be forged or founded at the level of structure but by a superimposition upon it. This allows the editorial or cartoon to have an efficacy which is more indeterminate and all the more effective as a result; in that it does not signal particular ideas but works like a viral strain that has the potential for producing differing ideas or—even more likely and more effective—polluting or perverting the so-called stable ones. They are destabilizing viruses. They stimulate the mood of the people, and nowadays that can amount to a lot. (See Baudrillard)

It is perhaps amazing how much one can get from someone or some-

thing one has never actually read.

I also heard that Louis stabbed his wife in an argument over Hegel that she apparently won, and then had the gall to write a book entitle "The cut". Probably not the most agreeable person who ever became a political theorist hero.

ADORNO, W. THEODOR:

- Negative Dialectics (New York, Seabury Press, 1973),
- Philosophy of Modern Music (New York, Seabury Press, 1973),
- Prisms (London, Neville Spearman, 1969),
- (with Max Horkheimer) Dialectic of Enlightenment (New York, Herder and Herder, 1972),
- The Culture Industry, (Routledge, N.Y. 1991),
- Intro to the Sociology of Music, (Seabury, N.Y., 1976).

One of the major figures in the so-called Frankfurt school (who apparently are rarely-if ever-taught in Frankfurt schools).

Pretty much an unavoidable guy when it comes to reading lists in courses on cultural studies, or bibliographies of the same. This is also the case when it comes to critical analysis of popular music-and indeed, critical theory of contemporary music in general. Once, a particularly tyrannical student and acquaintance who loved to bait men and charm women insisted whilst I was in a drunken and pugnacious state of mind that I was wrong to not like this writer; that I should read him. He continued to question the credibility of anything I had actually read about music by anyone else on the basis that if I refused Adorno then automatically my

credentials were suspect. The man was, of course, an idiot, but he struck a chord that I believe is in sympathy with Adorno. He seems representative of an analytic aristocracy and musical elitism which thrives off highbrow/lowbrow distinctions of musical interest; ones which are actually thinly disguised announcements of taste masquerading as political analysis. Adorno, nevertheless, is interesting for the proposition that cultural forms of expression, although socially presented under the auspices of liberation and freedom can be captured and marketed by institutions which seek to profit and contain or restrict the liberating force of the form (or the creators) of the expression. This proposition is not unlike Althusser's theory of cultural hegemony (See Althusser), and at the time that I read it (particularly by way of his essays on music) I found it really annoying. Perhaps I am somewhat reactionary, but the more people insisted on the importance (if only as a progenitor of the field of cultural studies) of this guy and wrote innumerable theses about his work on the social production of music and the import of the twentieth century classical avant garde composers (e.g.. Schoenberg), the more I hated him and refused to read him any further. He may also be somewhat responsible for the ambivalent propensity of the so-called "politically correct" movement (often a gloss for fascism of the left). Still, he is undeniably an important contributor to the history and the debate (whatever that means) as well as the legitimation and academic institutionalization of the social and political critical content of the products of popular culture.

ARTAUD, ANTONIN:

- The Theatre and its Double, (Grove, New York, 1958),
- Selected Writings, (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1976).

An artist/madman who is pretty significant for making certain theoretical—yet extremely personal—mergers between desire, metaphysics, psychoanalysis, aesthetics, poetics, magic and power. He knew before Deleuze and Guattari about the power of incorporating the Oedipal myth into social life as a scientific fact; that the psycho pathology of the person and society was a map or blue print for control that would be accepted as necessary under the auspices of an ontologically informed natural science. By functioning as science, psychoanalysis manages to occlude its metaphysical, or magical, heritage (i.e. myth) and its vision of personal and social health as ideology. This disguise, for Artaud, is evidence of the workings of black magicians; of a power that works right at the level of the body. Apart from this critique, I find his aesthetics, theatrics and poetics of desire and intensity quite interesting. Again being very mystical, he formulates a notion of action as a coming into pure being; fluid manifestation of will—where will (or intent) is primordial and non-linguistic. It is expressive. This is to say that it is distinct from representational models of behavior in that the motivation is neither psycho-emotional, nor socio-economic. More, its determination is arch-genetic. It is not unlike Nietzsche's "instinct". Also, it is the Will-to-Power as 'Zen' or 'Tao', but more, for that Will MUST manifest itself as the expression of its intensity. A power,

then, which flows—which MUST move, MUST manifest—not towards control or overthrow; not as a power which imposes itself in relations; not as a social power; but towards its own vital signature—the body's power as expressivity itself. Deliberately empty of meaning apart from its registration of the force of meaning itself. The body's power is its mobility. Meaning diminishes its force—its mobility—and hence, its power. This formulation of power leads to a politics of ritual which dissolves the social order into energy. Any process of organization apart from ritual and worship of this primordial spirit—so vague yet so directed by the force of its movement alone—is enervating and repressive. All refuse of the prevailing social order is sacred to the primordial body. A scatological theosophy. This "religion" or "politics" of intensity prevails, indeed, through most "alternative" or "radical" art cum socio-political movements cum revolutions of the 20th century. Freedom, here (as the major investment), is pre(or proto)-linguistic, pre-social, and—yet, perhaps ironically, also—pre-ordained; it is a faith of imminence. This is true of dada, beatniks, free-jazz, yippies, and punk-rock.

ATTALI, JACQUES:

- Noise: The Political Economy of Music, (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1985).

Music as a representational order. Music agrees with established social conventions. Noise disagrees with them. Noise is by definition a disagreement. Today's noise is tomorrow's music. Music as a sign of state ideology and social convention. Music as the

medium of expression and recognition—the registration—of socio-political ideals. Noise as the sign of resistance. Resistance as heroic. Art as war machine, maybe, but definitely as a sign of the way things are and of the shape of things to come. I don't particularly like this book.

ACKER, KATHY:

- Blood and Guts in High School, (Grove Press, New York, 1984),
- Don Quixote, Which Was a Dream, (Grove Press, New York, 1986),
- Empire of the Senseless, (Grove Press, New York, 1988),
- Great Expectations, (Grove Press, New York, 1989),
- Hannibal Lecter, my father, (Semiotext(e), New York, 1991),
- In Memorium to Identity, (Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1990).

ADAMS, DOUGLAS & LLOYD, JOHN:

- The Meaning of Liff, (Pan Books and Faber and Faber, London, 1983).

The value of humor, of jest, and irony is great. It is disarming and revivifying. Recall the story of the American Editor who cured himself of a rare and enigmatic bone degenerative disease partially by laughing. He had movies of the Marx brothers &c. brought into his hospital room to facilitate this procedure. This book is interesting because, as a fake dictionary, it illustrates to me the arbitrary, and finally indifferent, relation that can be had with regard to anything that has meaning, i.e. as opposed to the meaning the thing itself has. For the gags, here, are dependent upon the contrast between the completely unrecognizable

words and the very familiar conditions, circumstances, and situations they denote (those events and things which are describable but which never have had a single word to indicate them). This bears a consistency with my work in that, likewise, the fascination rests in the description and associative recognition of things more than in the paradigmatic designation and signatory assessment into analytic lexis. But in the measure that there is that, it too, is somewhat arbitrary and symptomatic of an indifference. But, nevertheless, it is noted that the words are, when so unfamiliar, kind of funny. Perhaps, then, the sympathy is towards too much familiarity and conventional expectation.

ARENDT, HANNAH:

- The Human Condition, (Chicago, U. Press, Chicago, 1958).

ARISTOTLE:

- The Art of Poetry, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1951).

BARTHES ROLAND:

- Writing Degree Zero, (Boston; Beacon Press, 1970),

- Mythologies, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972),

- Elements of Semiology, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970),

- S/Z (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982),

- The Pleasure of the Text, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975),

- Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977),

- A Lover's Discourse: Fragments, (New York: Hill and Wang,

1977),

- Image-Music-Text, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977),
- Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1981).

I have to say that there are a few ideas in this man's writing that I have found provocative enough, certainly to continue to consider, and with some, to even adopt. Some things positively haunt me - but in a nice way. Like the opening quote (his own I believe) to his "autobiography" Barthes by Barthes which goes something like: "Read it as if it were a novel" (or was it The Pleasure of the Text? - it doesn't matter for the point, for it registers a sympathy consistent with both of those texts).

Indeed, this notion has kept me exploring and playing with the limits of facticity, on the one hand, and made me challenge my own motivation for attention to any text; it lead me to ask myself "If I do not enjoy this why am I reading it?" It lead me to consider the value of any writing, whether it be critical, descriptive, prescription, factual or fictional, for its entertaining (in the sense of fun and as a consideration), its seductive (its allure and its deceptions), and its critical (as potential for inquiry and instance of judgment) qualities. In this way I might read theory for predominantly aesthetic reasons; and I might read novels (any kind - refuse nothing) for edifying reasons. Also, in this way Barthes confirmed and articulated with political resolve for me the 'natural' tendency to read what I felt like, and not necessarily what was stated as important. In fact, through him (and also him by way of Nietzsche) I managed to

develop a theory of pleasure vis-a-vis social and political theory in particular, and academics in general (a monumental task at times), which (also with a bit of help later from Deleuze and Guattari) recuperated a notion of self interest under the auspices of development, progress and public good. Another useful notion came from his Camera Lucida: the studium and the punctum. Once again grounding a critical practice in a functionality of desire, he distinguishes two ways of looking at a photograph that I extrapolated for looking at anything. The first way (albeit they are not necessarily experienced chronologically or even sequentially), the studium, considers the obvious, the overtly stated, the ostensible information; the second, the punctum, considers the personal detail that one *irrationally* fixes on; the publicly irrelevant but personally fascinating element or aspect of any thing or one. The latter move, once more, legitimated attention to the 'subtle' realm. It allows for the critical faculty and function which is stimulated and guided by intuition and unreflective idiosyncratic interest. From this I developed for myself a methodology of film critique which, after (although I reiterate that it does not have to transpire chronologically or even sequentially) taking into account the "obvious" filmic issues (cinematic grammatology; narrative; symbology; thematic; production politics; etc.) engages and entertains the film as critical object vis-a-vis my experience with it as seductive (its seduction). For I found that I could experience films on at least these two levels; which meant I might enjoy it at the same time that I might disagree with it - or even despise it. This, for me,

meant that somewhere in my experience was a complicity or another order of viewing/experiencing the film. And, indeed, that seductive element could, after reflection, reveal to me an aspect or idea within the film which could be completely at odds with its ostensible "message", or even more fascinating, could recuperate or redetermine the whole sense of the film; it could determine a totally different paradigm. Best of all, remaining consistent with the interests (as I perceived them, that is,) of Barthes (as well as Derrida and Baudrillard) in this regard, this discovery or consideration would not discount the other prognosis but would create an interesting tension or war. The contradiction would not be collapsed or used in the service to do away with one or the other version; it would be sustained with all its difficulty - perhaps, finally, to preserve ambiguity and complexity as something existent in many things, and as a predicate to the continuing movement of critical discourse. There are many other things, but this is, after all, not a critical review of Barthes' work. Suffice, for now.

BATTAILE, GEORGES:

- Visions of Excess: Selected Writings, 1927-1939, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985).

This guy became very popular to read in the early 1980s at the university at which I was doing my MA. Although it is unfairly glib to say so, I would fit him into the genre of romantic scatology. Honor that which you disregard - sensational Freemasonry really. Interesting novelist (The Story of the Eye).

BRETON, ANDRE:

- Manifestos of Surrealism
- Nadja

The so-called Pope of Surrealism. A Hegelian, a Marxist, a Stalinist, a Trotskyite, a Freudian...An admirer of Artaud and a bitter (envious, I think) despiser of Dali (he put him on trial for the scatological imagery in his painting).

BAUDRILLARD, JEAN:

- Cool Memories (Verso, New York, 1990),
- Seduction, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1990),
- America, (Verso, New York, 1988),
- Simulations, (Semiotext(e), N.Y., 1983),
- Forget Foucault, (Semiotext(e), N.Y. 1983),
- The Mirror of Production, (Telos, St. Louis, 1975).

Artists (North American mostly, and to a lesser degree British and German ones too) in the 1980's really seem to love this guy - and why not? After all, the abolition of reality and truth; the rendering of the sign as omniscient; the infinite refraction of representational models; the production of an epistemology that dissolves into simulation of simulation; and the infinite reversibility of all meaning under the auspices of seduction, the predominant social and cultural paradigm, all as observable events and conditions through a melancholia and nostalgia faced with no more history (i.e. therefore no historical ground; no basis; no referent; a pure metaphysical longing which has imploded) - and done so with a poetic fast talking quasi-apocalyptic

(despite its assertion of being critically post-apocalypse) rhetoric (which is itself deeply immersed in its own seduction)...all of this, is perfect and fertile ground for an aesthetic production which broaches on a utopic explosion. For without the conservative constraints of representational or symbolic models--or any other hermeneutic which seeks to secure final interpretation or meaning--all so-called creative production shifts from the conventional and established "disciplines" of the arts into pure serialized production itself AS AN AESTHETIC ENDEAVOR OR OBJECT. In other words, everything becomes fair ball. In other, words, everything CAN or COULD BE art. Precisely, because everything is nothing in particular. "It's art because I say it is." This, in the long run might not be sympathetic with Baudrillard's project (if he could be said to have one) or intent (ditto), but nevertheless, it could be said to be in tandem with the condition he describes; and in a certain ironic way, such a consequential mimesis or simulation in the long run (of the logic itself) will amount to what he is saying, whether he realizes or wants it to be so or not. It is the anarchy of the sign in a quickening pirouette towards its re-establishment within an order of the sensible and the status quo - and vice versa. And vice versa. If anything can be art and defended as such inasmuch as any statement can be defended as much as it can be refuted, then everything is gestural; all meaning is force; Humpty Dumpty rules; all production is war and let's get on with the fighting. And despite Baudrillard's own refutation of the collapse of meaning into desire ("that which you seek to repress is thereby

assured a place" - Tao) the force of his own logic can only be exemplary of a (melancholic) Will to Power, and—perhaps—of a desire in-itself. Pure desire. His refutation, therefore (naturally), implodes into his theory of seduction. This is apt, I think. You can't write yourself outside of yourself with out tripping on yourself and landing in your own shadow. Refuse nothing. Definitely an interesting and provocative thinker. Great entertainment. My personal favorites: America and Cool Memories. Jean Baudrillard is what is America is what is Jean Baudrillard is what is post-modernism is what is America and disagree always and now I am sad and I write so madly in poetic form to ask is to wonder what is the question or the answer and why bother, oh oh! oh boy! oh oh! Oh boy! oh oh, I think I see Disneyland...

Do you think he is upset?

BRADLEY, MICHAEL:

- (With Deanna Theilmann-Bean) Holy Grail Across the Atlantic: The Secret History of Canadian Discovery and Exploration, (Hounslow Press, Canada, 1988),
- The Columbus Conspiracy, (Hounslow Press, Canada, 1991).

"All conspiracies are true."

BAIGNET, MICHAEL; LEIGH, RICHARD; AND LINCOLN, HENRY:

- The Holy Blood and The Holy Grail, (Johanthan Cape, London, 1982),
- The Messianic Legacy, (Johanthan Cape, London),
- The Temple and the Lodge, (Johanthan Cape, London).

"All conspiracies are true"

BERGSON, HENRI:

- Matter and Memory, (Zone, New York, 1988).

BURROUGHS, WILLIAM S.:

- Cities of the Red Night, (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1981),
- Dead Fingers Talk, (John Calder, London, 1963),
- Exterminator! A novel, (Viking Press, 1973),
- Interzone, (Viking, New York, 1989),
- Junky, (Penguin, New York, 1977),
- Naked Lunch, (Grove Press, New York, 1959),
- Queer, (Viking, New York, 1985).

One of many who suffer the Nietzsche syndrome, namely: extremely interesting and seminal thinker and writer - except when he talks about women. "Language is a virus from outer space."

BUKOWSKI, CHARLES:

- Erections, Ejaculations, Exhibitions, and General Tales of Ordinary Madness, (City Lights Books, San Francisco, 1972),
- Ham on Rye, (Black sparrow, Santa Barbara, 1982),
- Hollywood, (Black Sparrow, Santa Rosa, 1989).

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL THEORY:

A journal under the editorship of Arthur and Marilouise Kroker from 1979-1991. Recently transformed into the publishing house New World Perspectives.

CAMUS, ALBERT:

- The Plague, (Penguin, London, 1977),
- The Myth of Sisyphus, (Penguin, London, 1975),
- The Fall, (Knopf, New York, 1966),
- Exile and the Kingdom, (Knopf, New York, 1958),
- The Rebel, (Vintage, New York, 1956),
- The Outsider, (Penguin, England, 1976).

CIXOUS, HELENE & CLEMENT, CATHERINE:

- The Newly Born Woman, (Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1988).

CAGE, JOHN:

- Empty Words/Writings 1973-78, (Wesleyan U. Press, Middletown, Conn., 1979),
 - For the Birds: Cage in Conversation with Daniel Charles, (M. Boyans, Boston, 1981),
 - Liberations: new essays on the humanities in revolution - Cage and others, Ihab Hassan, ed. (Wesleyan U. Press, Middletown, Conn., 1971),
 - M: Writings 1967-1972 (Calder and Boyars, London, 1973),
 - Silence: Lectures and Writings, (Wesleyan U. Press, Middletown, Conn., 1961),
 - X: Writings 1979-82, (Wesleyan U. Press, Middletown, Conn., 1983),
 - A Year from Monday: New Lectures And Writings, (Weslyan U. Press, 1967),
- (With Richard Kostelanetz ed.):

- John Cage, (Praeger, New York, 1970),
- John Cage, an Anthology, (Da Capo Press, New York, 1991),
- Conversing with Cage, (Lime light, New York, 1988).

I met this man once at the Ontario College of Art in or around 1978. I was somewhat surprised to see that he was a very gentle, and perhaps frail, but very pleasant man. I guess my surprise was a result of presuming that anyone in the avant garde music scene, especially someone so innovative and important both as a composer/performer and a music theorist/writer, would have to be austere. Indeed, many in this genre of music and philosophy are seemingly and singularly without humor. Yet this is not the case with Cage. He is a pretty funny guy. In fact, he's almost always laughing. He's like a happy little Buddha. I did not see this in his music at first, but after reading his writing, I did. Which said to me something about the effect of writing as a supplement to its object of interest, and it also said something about my presumptions and prejudices regarding the meaning of music genres. How I had framed the music of John Cage—and the avant garde in general—was already determined by who knows what. It was influenced, and hence altered, by his writing about it, which proffered a different perspective. It also put forth the very problem of music as an interpretive experience. The very question of music as language — particularly as an expressive language. Indeed of expressivity itself and its relation to production. The social economy of musical strategy. He almost amounts to an anti-Benjamin; taking control of the production not to assure its meaning but to make it as vague and ambiguous as possible.

CUMMINGS, E.E.:

- Complete Poems, 1913-1962, (Harcourt, New York, 1972).

COOK, DAVID:

- Northrop Frye: A Vision of the New World, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1985).

CROWLEY, ALEISTER:

- The Book of Lies, (S. Weiser, New York, 1970).

The Nietzsche of esoterica. Member of the Golden Dawn (along with such notables as Yeats). He really put Battaille's (and other's) notion of excess into a pragmatic format. Following, actually, from the traditions of Tantric Yoga, he believed that one could purge oneself and reach greater understanding and power by indulging in "that which we would refuse". Supposedly acting on the advice of an Egyptian God (as dictated to him and published as The Book of the Law), he lived the tenet "Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law." To wit, he garnered a degree of notoriety in his home town (England), where the tabloid press (Fleet street) referred to him as The Beast-666-and the most terrible man alive. Bi-sexuality and an immodest indulgence in heroin and alcohol- not to mention general histrionics, were for him part of the plan, but for the public at large (and, perhaps more significantly, his peers within the secret orders) made him a subject of scorn, derision, and animosity. "The nail that sticks out gets hammered in." His books are many and they have served to spread what was most guarded and held secret to the general pub-

lic. A rebel mason who wanted to reveal all to any who could benefit. For myself, they were instructive for psychological warfare. (See also works by Jan Cox - a Nietzschean Gurdieffe.)

CHOMSKY, NOAM:

- A Chomsky Reader, (Pantheon, N.Y., 1987),
- Selected Readings, (Oxford, N.Y., London, 1971).

DERRIDA, JACQUES:

- Of Grammatology, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976),
- Writing and Difference, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978),
- Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles, (Chicago, University Press, 1979),
- Dissemination, (London: Athlone Press, 1981),
- Positions, (London: Athlone Press, 1981),
- Margins of Philosophy (Chicago University Press, 1982),
- 'Signature Event Context', Glyph, vol. I (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), pp. 172-97.
- 'Limited Inc abc' (response to John Searle) Glyph, vol. II (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), pp. 162-254.
- 'Living On: Border-lines', in Deconstruction and Criticism (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), pp. 75-176.

A lot of people seem to be confused by this guy, and well, maybe I should be too, but I've always found him a pleasure to read. This is the way I see it: The signifier (the word, the painting, the piece of music, the political gesture, etc.) does not equal

(i.e. be guaranteed to equal) the signified (what it means or is supposed to mean; what is claimed as its intended meaning). Why? Because everything can be MADE to mean things which are completely opposite and at odds with one another. Everything contains (can be determined as) both its commonly known denotation and one which is its opposite. Likewise with the—already granted to be ambiguous and slippery— connotative order. The consequent observation of this is a politics of language and meaning right at the level of linguistics (but not exclusively so). This means that "meaning" (truth, justice, etc.) is decided and controlled, i.e. is a result of force and socio-political power. Rhetoric is a metaphysical territory of political authority, ownership, and legislation which is predicated by a philosophy which attempts to obscure or occlude such aims. The pretense of political neutrality at the level of structure, then, is exposed. To say something means something is to make a political act; one which is complicated with some kind of control. This is a "law" of metaphysics (of which, by definition, there is no outside; no escape). Of course, a thorough consideration of this guy's work would demand a dissertation in itself. This one aspect is interesting to highlight, for me, because it indicates the possibility of some articulate commitment—which simultaneously extends the possibilities for considering the nature, purview and potential scope of politics itself (I always found it curious that people would accuse Derrida of being non-political)—as politics grounded in (personal) philosophy; its is ironically, perhaps, less abstract a politics.

DELEUZE, GILLES & GUATTARI, FELIX:

- *Anti-Oedipus*, (Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press, 1983),

- *A Thousand Plateaus* (Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

These books were very important and formative for me. There are many reasons for this, but in particular, it is their capacity and potential for inspiration with regard to critical practices, socio-political strategies, and the self-oriented (despite their indifference, deeply, to the self as such - perhaps it would be better to say "personal", in the sense of familiar) distribution and redistribution of desire as a modality (actually, in their language a "rhizome" [i.e. a weed-patch-like movement and behavior]). All this resulted in (a) A FEELING of freedom with regard to approach, style in my writing/thinking, as well as with the choice of object(s) of interest. But this is not to say that it spurred me to do things in an odd way, that is, the show of that feeling of freedom was not merely gestural or taken as simple license to be eccentric. On the contrary, it displaced such rational opportunistic approaches, and favored instead a developed eloquence about and philosophical deliberation upon (actually "along with, or side of" would be better to say - which, incidentally makes me think of Salvador Dali's Paranoia Critical Method which is explained somewhat in *Dairy of a Genius* and *Confessions of Salvador Dali*) the uninterrupted idiosyncratic production of thought, will and desire (e.g.. where these resulted in critical/theoretical documents - which in their form could

Everything carries within it the fuel of its own driving antithesis, I thought. Anger is the stuff from which real love and knowledge grow. In order to grow and learn, we must permit the world to betray itself.

The History of Luminous Motion. - Scott Bradfield

be represented as anything from a gesture to a so-called art work or text). Since this flow of desire is like a weed patch that entangles things in its path, those things are also of interest.

(b) A "war" strategy of articulation and defense which, functioning on the precept "refuse nothing" through the notion of The Body Without Organs (the body/person [a body is not necessarily a person] which recuperates [reterritorializes/deterritorializes] charges [or labels, tattoos, categorizations, whatever] against it, and redefines their value in its favor [e.g.. taking a comment meant to be a slur and adopting it as a positive element - remember, all things can mean something and its opposite simultaneously?]) produces a kind of black hole politics. This is very effective for dealing with all manner of (especially verbal) critical attack. Meaning struggles can be power struggles. Differences of opinion can be territorial wars. All judgment can be an act of aggression. To study theory can be to study battle strategy. That which claims the most neutrality can be the most ideological, and that which claims to be the most ideal can be completely emptied of meaning. War machines. The machinery/machinations of desire. People machines. Nomads. The refrain. Rhizomatics.

DELEUZE, GILLES:

- Cinema One, (U. of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1986),
- Bergsonism, (Zone, New York, 1991).
- Masochism: An Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty, - includes text of Venus in Furs, (Braziller, New York, 1971)

- Nietzsche and Philosophy, (Columbia U. Press, New York, 1983).

DUCHAMP, MARCEL:

- Marcel Duchamp, Notes. (G. K. Hall, Boston, 1983),

- The Bride Stripped Bare of Her Bachelors, Even, (Lund, Humphries, 1960),

(With Arturo Schwarz, ed.):

- The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp, (H. N. Abrams, New York, 1970).

Art is art because I call it art. Any object can be interpreted in any way; celebrate this.

DELANY, SAMUEL R.:

- Dhalgren, (Bantam, N.Y., 1977),

- The Motion of Light in Water: sex and science fiction writing in the east village, 1957-1965, (Arbor House, N.Y., 1988),

- Nova, (Bantam, N.Y., 1969)

How to write science fiction and express or illustrate the ideas of French political philosophers.

EINSTEIN, ALBERT:

- The Meaning of Relativity; four lectures delivered at Princeton University, May, 1921, (Methuen, London, 1922),

- The World As I See It, (Philosophical Library, New York, 1949).

Think about the effects something can have in areas to which it isn't even directed.

THE FOREIGN AGENT SERIES:

JIM FLEMMING & SYLVERE LOTRINGER, EDITORS, PUBLISHED BY SEMIO-
TEXT(E), AUTONOMEDIA, NEW YORK:

- In The Shadow Of The Silent Majorities, Jean Baudrillard,
- On The Line, Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari,
- Driftworks, Jean-Francois Lyotard,
- Simulations, Jean Baudrillard,
- Pure War, Paul Virilio & Sylvere Lotringer,
- Forget Foucault, Jean Baudrillard,
- Behold Metatron, Recording Angel, Sol Yurick,
- Speed and Politics, Paul Virilio,
- Nomadology: The War Machine, Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari,
- Foucault Live, Michel Foucault.

FOUCAULT, MICHEL:

- Madness and Civilization (London, Tavistock, 1967),
- The Order of Things (London, Tavistock, 1970),
- The Archaeology of Knowledge (London, Tavistock, 1972),
- Discipline and Punish (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1977),
- Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, ed. Donald Bouchard (Oxford Blackwell, 1977),
- Power/Knowledge, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton, Harvester, 1980),
- The History of Sexuality, Volume 1, An Introduction (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1981).

Power is everywhere. Discourse production is the mobilization of
a war machine. The document as a quiet historical sign.

Repression as a "positive" force. This does not mean good. It

means progressive, expansive, developmental. Which is to say that it does not work by restriction so much as by specification. It is productive. It does not eliminate so much as emphasize. The repressive Victorian relation to sex, for instance has to be considered its surface restrictions alongside of its continual production and development of discourse and behavior which is progressively (i.e. accumulatively) sexualized. Not then, the clamp down on sex-talk, but its excessive proliferation and constant specification. The history and construction of the therapeutic state. Social management through discourse, and the creation of each citizen as their own prison, prisoner, guard and warden. The "you are your own liquor control board" theory and method of social control. Social control and management is most effective when each social member feels it incumbent upon themselves to survey and monitor themselves. Things may be "dead", but even the dead have a specific power. The FUNCTION of the author; of god; of truth; of reality; &c. The body as territory; a site of political struggle. The social production of Being (living) as a scientific fact. Science as a language of power.

FEKETE, JOHN:

- (ed.) Life After Post modernism: essays on value and culture, (St Martins Press, New York, 1987).

FRITH, SIMON:

- (ed.) World Music, Politics and Social Change, (Manchester U. Press, New York, 1989),

- Art into Pop, (Methuen, New York, 1988),
- (ed.) Facing the Music; a Pantheon guide to popular culture, (Pantheon, New York, 1988),
- Music For Pleasure: essays in the sociology of pop, (Routledge, New York, 1988),
- (with Andrew Goodwin, eds.) On Record: rock, pop and the written word, (Pantheon, New York, 1990),
- Sociology of Rock, (Constable, London, 1978),
- Sound Effects: youth, leisure, and the politics of rock n' roll, (Pantheon, New York, 1981).

FULLER, BUCKMINSTER:

- Nine Chains to the Moon, (S. Illinois U. Press, Illinois, 1963),
- I Seem To Be A Verb, (Bantam, New York, 1970),
- Intuition, (Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1972),
- Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth, (S. Illinois U. Press, Carbondale, 1969), - Synergetics; explorations in the geometry of thinking, (Macmillan, New York, 1979).

Wouldn't it be nice if the world were a co-operative place?

FREUD, SIGMUND:

- Beyond the Pleasure Principle, (Hogarth Press, London, 1961),
- Civilization and Its Discontents, (Hogarth, London, 1963),
- The Cocaine Papers, (Dunquin Press, Vienna, 1963),
- The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, (Norton, New York, 1966),

- *The Interpretation of Dreams*, (Avon, New York, 1965),
- *Three Case Histories*, (Collier, New York, 1963).

Mapping the interiority (which is a term that already indicates a mapping) of being. The conversion of being. Mapping the mind on the model of contemporary Capital intensive middle class state politics and sociology riddled with Greek mythology and metaphysics. Attempting to displace religion and develop a science of human behavior and consciousness, Freud actually created another religion and fathered the institutionalization of the mind police; a psychological power. Capitalism as the exploitation of schizophrenic distress.

FISH, STANLEY:

- *Is There a Text in This Class?*, (Harvard U. Press, Cambridge Mass., 1980).

GUATTARI, FELIX:

- *Molecular Revolution* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1984),
- An underrated contribution to the so-called anti-psychiatry movement. A thinker who is often cast into the shadow of his sometime writing partner Gilles Deleuze, although Deleuze speaks at some length of the greatness of Guattari's contribution, and indeed of his superiority in some areas (his quickness of mind, etc.).

GIBSON, WILLIAM:

- *Neuromancer*, (Ace, New York, 1984).

The Canadian godfather of cyberpunk. NASA's wet dream vis-a-vis

notions of cyberspace and virtual reality.

GRANT, GEORGES:

- Technology and Justice, (House of Anansi Press, Toronto, 1986).
The inherent ideological properties and consequences of technology.

HABERMAS, JURGEN:

- The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity (Oxford, Polity Press, 1987).

HICKENLOOPER, GEORGE (ED.):

- Reel Conversations, Candid interviews with Film's Foremost Directors and Critics, (Carol Publishing House, 1991).

HITE, SHERE:

- Women and Love: A Cultural Revolution in Progress, (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1987).

HOFSTADTER, DOUGLAS R.:

- Godel, Escher, Bach: an eternal golden braid, (Basic Books, New York, 1979).

HESSE, HERMAN:

- The Glass Bead Game (Magister Ludi), (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969),
- Narcissus and Goldman, (Farrar, Straas and Giroux, N.Y., 1968),
- Steppenwolf, (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, N.Y., 1966).

The story of the dialectics of reason and intuition.

HEGEL, GEORG W.F.:

- Philosophy of Mind, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1971),
- Phenomenology of Spirit, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1977).

How to become a big mouth self-righteous moralist. Dialectics. Transcendence. Merger. Discipline. Rigour. Master/slave." / ". Metaphysics. Etc. See Derrida.

HUSSERL, EDMUND:

- The Idea of Phenomenology, (The Hague, M. Nijhoff, 1964).

HEIDEGGER, MARTIN:

- Being and Time, (SCM Press, London, 1962).

Technology can be bad. One's sense of one's self and of history can be both interior and exterior, and they can differ. Public and private. The ecstasy of philosophy. Euphoria. Transcendence.

IRIGARAY, LUCE:

- Speculum of the Other Woman, (Cornell U. Press, New York, 1985),
- This Sex Which is Not One, (Cornell U. Press, New York, 1985).

JOYCE, JAMES:

- Dubliners, (Viking, New York, 1969),
- A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, (Modern Library, New York, 1928),

- Ulysses, (Random, New York, 1934),
- Finnegans Wake, (Viking, New York, 1959).

The crazier it is, the more controlled it is. Did ya drink me to be doornail? Is there no hope for the widow's son?

JUNG, CARL:

- Archetypes and The Collective Unconscious, (Princeton, N.J., 1968),
- Alchemical Studies, (Princeton, N.J., 1967).

Things can be thought of as meaning something else from what they are commonly thought to mean. Symbology.

KROKER, ARTHUR:

- The Possessed Individual: technology and the french postmodern, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1992),
- Technology and The Canadian Mind: Innis/Mcluhan/Grant, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1984),
- (With David Cook) The Postmodern Scene: Excremental Culture and Hyper-Aesthetics, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1986).

KROKER, ARTHUR & MARILOUISE (ED):

- Body Invaders: Panic Sex in America, (New World Perspectives, Montreal, 1987),
- Ideology and Power in the Age of Lenin in Ruins, (New World Perspectives, Montreal),
- The Hysterical Male: New Feminist Theory (New World

Perspectives, Montreal),

- (With David Cook) Panic Encyclopedia, (New World Perspectives, Montreal).

KEROUAC, JACK:

- On the Road, (Penguin, London, 1957),
- Desolation Angels, (Grafton, London, 1972),
- The Dharma Bums, (Penguin, New York, 1958),
- Lonesome traveler, (Grove Press, New York, 1970),
- The Subterraneans, (Grove Press, New York, 1981).

The pleasure of melancholy, disaffection, alienation, confusion, and—especially—movement (mobility).

KRISTEVA, JULIA:

- Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia, (Columbia U. Press, 1989),
- Desire in Language: A semiotic approach to literature and art, (Columbia U. Press, 1980),
- The Kristeva Reader, (Blackwell, Oxford, 1986),
- Powers of Horror: an essay on abjection (Columbia U. Press, 1982).

KEIRKEGAARD, SOOREN:

- Attack Upon "Christiandom", (Princeton, N.J., 1946).

KANT, IMMANUEL:

- Critique of Pure Reason, (Double Day, N.Y., 1966).

LOCK, GRAHAM:

- Forces In Motion: The Music and Thoughts of Anthony Braxton, (Da Capo Press, New York, 1988).

LITWEILER, JOHN:

- The Freedom Principle: Jazz After 1958, (Da Capo Press, New York, 1984).

LACAN, JACQUES:

- Television, (Norton, New York, 1990),
- Ecrits, (Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1966),
- Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis, (Norton, New York, 1978).

The unconscious is structured like a language. "Language is a virus from outer space." B. Burroughs "Remember all maps, whether of land or of, say, the unconscious, are DRAWN by someone, and are thus acts of aggression; they are land claims."

LAING, R.D.:

- The Divided Self, (Pantheon, N.Y., 1969),
- The Politics of Experience, (Pantheon, N.Y., 1967),
- The Politics of the Family, (C.B.C., Toronto, 1969),
- Reason and Violence: Three decades of Sartre's Philosophy 1950-1960, (Pantheon, N.Y., 1971),
- Knots, (Pantheon, N.Y., 1971),
- Self and Others, (Tavistock, London, 1969).

Leading exponent of the so-called anti-psychiatry movement.

Schizophrenia is a produced disorder; a familial sacrifice which serves to embody and make manifest the subtle or unspoken (secret) disturbance of the family (or group/community). The production of a representative of the "madness" within the group. An exorcism. Also, schizophrenia as a "journey" into one's anti-being; the socially constructed total alterity of self. The slip-page into an over determination of the poetry of the world as no longer a dialectic tension with its prose but (because it is covert) as the real truth of the matter.

MCCLARY, SUSAN:

- Feminine Findings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality, (U. of Minnesota Press, 1991),
- (Edited with Richard Leppert) Music and Society: The politics of composition, performance and reception, (Cambridge U. Press, Great Britain, 1990).

Madonna as musician. Semiotics of music.

MILNE, A.A.:

- Winnie-the-Pooh, (Dutton, N.Y., 1961).

MERLEAU-PONTY, MAURICE:

- Phenomenology of Perception, (Routledge & K. Paul, London, 1962),
- Primacy of Perception, (Northwestern, U. Press, 1964).

The revelation of the poetic investment of the body's place and movement in the world.

MARX, KARL:

- Capital, the Communist Manifesto and Other Writings, (Modern, Library, N.Y., 1959).

Economics determines the social fabric.

MAN, PAUL DE:

- Allegories of Reading, (Yale, New Haven, 1979).

NATTIEZ, JEAN-JACQUES:

- Music and Discourse: Toward a Semiology of Music, (Princeton, New Jersey, 1990).

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH:

- Gay Science with a Prelude in Rhymes, (Random, New York, 1974),
- Beyond Good and Evil, (Penguin, London, 1972),
- Genealogy of Morals, (Modern Library, New York, 1918),
- Thus Spake Zarathustra, (Dent, London, 1958),
- The Will to Power, (Vintage Books, New York, 1968),
- The Portable Nietzsche, Walter Kaufmann, ed. (Viking, New York, 1968),
- Beyond Good and Evil, (Penguin, England, 1972).

The godfather of all "alternative" (Dionysian?) philosophy (theory). The "begetter" of Artaud, Sartre, Camus, Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, Baudrillard... (certainly a fascination for the French guys wouldn't you say?). Impossible to summarize, and as Foucault said, why add to the already overwrote volumes of commentary? But there are definitely some ideas which are, for me,

pervasive and continually worthy of consideration: - Truth is an army of tropes. - Everything good could just as well be seen as bad. - God is dead. - There is more blood on the hands of Christians than any other religion. - To institutionalize a practice is to kill it. - Avoid saying no as much as possible. - Affirm what you are. - Live instinctively. - Philosophy with a hammer. Most obviously, I suppose, there is the issue of celebrating (affirming) that which is cast out by convention; the observation of rampant social nihilism; micro-fascism; the will to power; and the aphorism as a chosen method of writing.

NEWMAN, PETER C.:

- Company of Adventurers, (Penguin, Canada, 1986).

PYNCHON, THOMAS:

- Gravity's Rainbow, (Viking, New York, 1973),

- V, (Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1963).

Brilliant.

PAGELS, HEINZ R.:

- The Cosmic Code, (Bantam, New York, 1984).

PLATO:

- The Republic, (Everyman's Library, London, 1976).

Where I discovered that insults (e.g.. such and such a mode is "effeminate") can be ideologically loaded, and predicated by political difference (the mode was named after a Greek city state

which challenged the central authority of Athens).

ROBBINS, TOM:

- Another Roadside Attraction, (Ballantine, New York, 1971).

RICHLER, MORDECAI:

- Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!: Requiem for a Divided Country, (Penguin, Toronto, 1992).

REICH WILHELM:

- Discovery of the Orgone and the Function of the Orgasm in Sex, (Noonday Press, N.Y., 1961),
- Mass Psychology of Fascism, (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, N.Y., 1970).

That which is held in silence gathers force. Repression procures violence.

SEMIOTEXT(E) :

- #13, U.S.A., Jim Fleming & Peter Lamborn Wilson, Editors, (Autonomedia, Inc., New York, 1987),
- #14, SF, Rudy Rucker, Peter Lamborn Wilson & Robert Anton Wilson, Editors, (Autonomedia, Inc., New York, 1989),
- THE GERMAN ISSUE,
- POLYSEXUALITY,
- AUTONOMIA: POST-POLITICAL POLITICS.

EDWARD W. SAID:

- Orientalism, (Random House, New York, 1979).

SURREALISTS:

- Louis Aragon; Antonin Artaud; Andre Breton; Rene Char; Rene Crevel; Salvador Dali; Robert Desnos; Paul Eluard; Max Ernst; Marcel Duchamp; Pablo Picasso; Philippe Soupault; Tristan Tzara.

Search for the marvelous. Found art. Merger between the dream and reality. The becoming poem of the world.

SADE, MARQUIS DE:

- The 120 Days of Sodom and Other Writings, (Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1966).

The most terrible things said in the most beautiful way.

STEIN, GERTRUDE:

- How to Write, (Plain Edition, Paris, 1931),
- IDA, (Random, New York, 1941),
- Lectures in America, (Random, New York, 1935),
- The Making of Americans: being a history of family's progress, (Something Else Press, New York, 1966),
- Three Lives, (New Directions, Norfolk, Conn., 1933),
- The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas by Gertrude Stein, (har-court, Brace, New York, 1933),
- Everybody's Autobiography (Cooper Square, N.Y., 1971).

Cubist writing. "What is the answer? For that matter, what is the question? The influence of this writer upon my own thinking and

writing cannot be underestimated. Yet, it is a curious influence, in that it is not particularly ideological. It is, rather, an influence of voice. It is the discovery that to take on a voice can make you tend to say things about things in a peculiar way (i.e. in a way peculiar to that voice, even though that can't exactly be described or predetermined). A voice is a potentiality. It is not unlike the Egyptian (i.e. Hermetic) magic practice of god form mimesis (where the dress of the god is copied in order to become imbued with their specific qualities). Simulation can be the same as reality (especially when all reality is considered to be fabricated anyway).

SARTRE, JEAN-PAUL:

- Nausea, (Penguin, Canada, 1964),
- Iron in the Soul, (Penguin, England, 1950),
- The Age of Reason, (Penguin, England, 1964),
- Being and Nothingness, (Washington Square Park, New York, 1966),
- No Exit and Three Other Plays, (Vintage, New York, 1956).

What made Nietzsche joyful, made Sartre sick to his stomach. How can I help make things better for others?

SAUSSURE, FERDINAND DE:

- Course in General Linguistics, (McGraw-Hill, Toronto, 1966).

WILSON, ROBERT ANTON:

- The Historical Illuminatus Chronicles Vol.1-3, (Penguin Books Ltd. England, 1991),
- Cosmic Trigger, The Final Secret of the Illuminati, (Pocket Books, New York, 1977),
- Cosmic Trigger Vol.2 (New Falcon, Scottsdale, 1991).

If any instance of art is art because I call it that, then why not any instance of reality is reality because I call it that; celebrate this. Reality as hypnotic suggestion. Believe everything. Believe nothing. Conspiracies rule.

NAOMI, WOLF:

- The Beauty Myth, (Vintage Books, Toronto, 1991).

WITTGENSTEIN, LUDWIG:

- Tractatus, Logico-Philosophicus, (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1961),
- Philosophical Investigations, (Macmillan, N.Y., 1968).

FRANK ZAPPA:

- (With Peter Occhiogrosso) The Real Frank Zappa Book, (Poseidon Press, New York, 1989).
- A wise wiseguy.

"all my writings are fish-hooks...If nothing got caught,
that is not my fault. There were no fish..." -Nietzsche, Ecce
Homo "Beyond Good and Evil"