

## ‡5 Scrawlings

### A How You Too Can Write a Scrawlings

**A1** You know, I can hardly walk down the street anymore without being pestered by fans who come up, deliberately fall in my path, grasp piteously at the hem of my garment, and beg me to explain: how-do-you-do-it? — tell us, how do you put together a *Scrawlings*?

**A2** Waaaal, m'boy, it's all in the wrists — oh, sorry, wrong sport. Awright, soooo — you want to know how to do a *Scrawlings*? OK, I have this big computer wastebasket, see, which I toss junk-whims into. And it's so crammed with what any sane observer'd agree is oaffal offal, that only a whiff of a wisp of it could have any worth. Now we come to the hard part: as a (nonexistent) *DIO* deadline approaches, I slosh, sift, swim, and finally snorkel through this slagheap, with gnashing eye and eagle tooth. The process crescendos in a blurry tornado of workworkworkworkworkworkworkworkwork, as I carry all before me, with the **hefty bombmentum of a RUNAWAY RHINO** — yet with butterfly-delicate discrimination — braving the turbid ASCII-cesspool boiling all about me. Yea, at the last, I have deftly gleaned in triumph *every single one* of this infernal stew's rare coherent morsels.

**A3** And then the remainder goes right to press.

### B Germs

**B1** Politics' & religion's success-secret: masking colossal implicit conceit as humility.

**B2** Whatever our pride sees as wise planning's achievement is chance at its root.<sup>1</sup>

**B3** Labor's ultimate strike: what if they gave an election and nobody came?

**B4** Humility is essential to discovery: let evidence instruct you, not the reverse.<sup>2</sup>

**B5** If there were an eternal life after this one, we'd certainly<sup>3</sup> be in it already.

### C If Only There Survived a Gospel-According-to-Judas

**C1** Suppose a member of a group or a cult sees misbehavior within: hypocrisy, fraud, and-or waste of funds on personal highlife. If he protests the dishonesty, what will happen to him? (I have some experience in this regard. See, e.g., *Fate* 1981 Oct. Also *DIO* 4.3 ‡15 & *DIO* 6 ‡3.) Answer: the jilted cult will defensively and vindictively slander him.

**C2** So I'm skeptical of the hitherto universally accepted historical portrayal of turntoga-disciple Judas Iscariot as a wicked man. A look at John's gospel<sup>4</sup> makes it obvious that Judas was upset at Jesus' persistent (if sometimes tempestuous) relations with tax-collectors, rich pals, money-changers, & female consorts — including such a luxurious private life that Judas asked whether the funds squandered to support it could not perhaps be better spent on alleviating poverty. Jesus' sensitive reply regarding the poor (those trusting folk looking to Jesus for salvation): poverty is incurable; but, meanwhile, since life is short, I'm looking after Number One.<sup>5</sup> So, was Judas actually not the worst of Jesus' disciples but instead: the sole incorruptible idealist among them?

<sup>1</sup>Both the ability and the concern to plan, grow from one's (lucky) cultural & (unearned) genetic heritages, atop eons of natural Darwinian teleologically-random processes. And see *DIO* 4.3 ‡13 §B8.

<sup>2</sup>*DIO* 7.2 ‡9 fn 42.

<sup>3</sup>See below at §L3.

<sup>4</sup>John 11.1-12.9 (Lazarus Massage Parlor). Variants: Matt.26:7-16, Mark 14.3-11, Luke 7.36-50.

<sup>5</sup>Jesus' "Parable of the Talents" (Matthew 25.14-30, Luke 19.12-27) might not be a parable at all. (Possibly misfiled by early admirers.) By one speculative interpretation, it can be seen as the advice of the CEO of a canny corporation or racket, telling his various franchise-operators that if there's no profit coming into the hub, the weak limbs get cut off "into outer darkness". But Jesus' knowledgeable mention of usury suggests that the "parable" is also a canny reflection of investment realities: the

## D Bumper Stickers We Could Have Seen

**D1** Reagan Out in '84. NO MORE RON.

**D2** Bush '88 to Bush '92: from BigMo to Rigmo.

## E Bumper Stickers We May Yet See

**E1** A Congress Not Half Female Is Sham Democracy.<sup>6</sup>

**E2** Rape Is Pro-Life.<sup>7</sup> (Is Celibacy?)

**E3** Cuba: Sugar to Rot Your Teeth, Cigars to Rot Your Lungs, Marx to Rot Your Mind.

**E4** Female Programmers Are Boole Dykes.

**E5** MCPs Are Homos.

**E6** Put Another Public-Defender Lawyer on Fat Gov't Welfare: Shoot Somebody.

**E7** State-Funded Abortions: Moms Who Can't Afford Abortions, Can't Afford Kids.

**E8** The More Capitalist a Nation, the Higher Its Murder Rate.<sup>8</sup>

**E9** Female Muslims, Catholics, & Mormons! What's Next? Black Confederates?

**E10** Stop Paroling Killers to Lower Jail-Crowding. DO THE CRIME, DO THE CRAM.

**E11** Nobody For Mayor. This City's Been Mayored Long Enough.

**E12** Two Wrongs Don't Make a Right. But Two Wrights Make an Airplane.

## F War's Benefit, The Eternal, & How to Detect Causation

**F1** If we wish to ensure that our innocent current potential cannon-fodder will not be subverted by the outrageous (and probably un'mer'c'n) notion that all wars are wasteful folly, we must be prepared to preserve the hardwon fruits of war. I must therefore sound an alarm: the sole solid beneficial upshot of World War One (WW1) is now in severe danger.

**F2** We remember that WW1 was "The War to End War".<sup>9</sup> Was it? Welllllll, not quite. But, hey, how 'bout: it was the war to save democracy? Hmmmm — not unless the postwar creation of Mussolini, Stalin, and Hitler was pro-democrat.<sup>10</sup>

**F3** However, WW1 did notch a single firm achievement, **one that has now lasted to virtually the end of our century**. To put that astonishing feat into context, recall that the other creations of WW1 have disappeared or are unrecognizably altered: the Versailles Treaty, Yugoslavia, the Polish Corridor, East Prussia, Czecho-slovakia. So, thank-god one WW1-outcome still stands solid & unblemished, though it has heretofore — until *DIO*'s announcement at this moment — gone outrageously unrecognized. What is this grand accomplishment?

well-off have enough of a cushion of wealth to invest the risk-capital that can lead on to far greater riches; while a poor guy is understandably afraid to gamble his last penny. (Which helps explain why it's mostly the richer who get richest.) Jesus obviously knew his way around the intense world of Jewish money changers: John 2.14-16. And he is known to have visited Phoenicia in the region of Tyre (an ancient Zürich) and tried to keep the visit secret (Mark 7.24). Did he have the equivalent of a numbered account?

<sup>6</sup>See *DIO* 2.3 ‡6 §D.

<sup>7</sup>This is a nutshell version of the implicit defense of tilted, jilted, and wilted jailhouse-mom Mary Kaye LeTourneau. (See *DIO* 4.3 ‡13 fn 16.)

<sup>8</sup>See *DIO* 4.2 ‡9 §L2.

<sup>9</sup>Which is why WW1 was once optimistically called just "The World War". Until 1939.

<sup>10</sup>But, in a serious vein: it is notable that the top three European absolute monarchies (Germany, Austro-Hungary, Russia) all were kingless by the end of WW1, while the main three victorious nations (England, France, & US) were all constitutional gov'ts both before&after WW1. This supports the conclusion that: "democracy" is a more powerful illusion than monarchy, since people will fight harder for something they (think they) share in. (See §K2 [b].) But, if wars become a thing of the past, will now-fashionable wealth-sharing-with-the-public shrink from even the modest generosity of current advanced gov'ts? — since its usefulness to rulers will be less immediately compelling.

**F4** Yes, Virginia, the First World War did one<sup>11</sup> thing right: it totally ended<sup>12</sup> baseball World-Championships in Boston and Chicago.

**F5** These 2 cities' 4 teams had won 2/3 of all the 15 World Series [& the last 5 in a row] preceding 1918/11/11 (Armistice Day): Chicago Cubs — aka Cubbies — 1907, 1908; Boston Braves 1914; Chicago White Sox — aka Chisox or Pale Hose or Chisose — 1906, 1917; Boston Red Sox — aka Bosox or Crimson Hose or Bosose — 1903, 1912, 1915, 1916, 1918. (Moreover, none of these 4 teams had ever lost a Series except the Cubbies, and even then almost always to other Boston & Chicago teams: the Chisose [1906] or Bosose [1918], the sole deviation here being the Cubs' 1910 loss to the Phila As.)

**F6** Yet, *not a single one of the almost eighty World Series since the First World War has been won by any of these teams.* (The Braves' post-WW2 Series wins occurred only after they departed accursed Boston.) [Boston-Chicago had just won 5 straight Series: 1914-1918.]

**F7** That's an impressive record. Had the Germans announced this plan from the start (the sneaky devils didn't of course — that's war for you), the odds on the plan succeeding (until 1998) by chance would be ordmag a billion-to-one.<sup>13</sup>

**F8 Top-Hun Slaughtered?** Now that we have lodged this hypothesis, we will adhere to good philosophy of science, by searching for confirmation through further evidence. And an astounding temporal confluence appears, which puts the causal connection beyond doubt. Hermann Göring was Germany's most decorated surviving WW1 air ace: Top Hun. (The Red Baron ranked higher but died in battle.) Now, when he saw that baseball seasons following WW1 kept ending with no Boston teams even getting *into* the World Series, Göring realized that another dose of the original efficacious medicine was required (i.e., another world-war disaster for Germany), in order to bring Beantown's humiliation to full&final flower. So, he devoted himself in the 1920s to getting industrial funding for Hitler, so we could have WW2. After it was over, at the Nürnberg trials (1945-1946): while most defendants were trying to save their skins, Göring sneered at death. For, he was now imbued with the exaltation, known only to few men, of dying for a higher and lasting purpose, verily of knowing that, while departing this transient life, he was — as other patriots & saints before him — partaking of The Eternal.

**F9** Through his contacts with US soldiers, Göring could from his jail cell slyly keep track of the 1946 World Series: Bosose-vs-St.Louis Cardinals. In the 7<sup>th</sup> & final game, Cardinal Enos Slaughter's legendary 8<sup>th</sup> inning dash (all the way home from 1<sup>st</sup> base, on a short Harry Walker double) with the winning run, brought a last smile to HG's flabby face, as: success loomed. The game shockingly ended in heavily-favored Boston's first-ever Series loss (after 5 previous victories in 5 appearances).<sup>14</sup>

**F10** The Series ended at 3:47 CST or 10:47 CET. At this very moment (roughed to 10:45 CET in the *NYTimes*), Göring — knowing that his life's work was finally accomplished — took poison and expired in ordmag a minute. The precision of the coincidence (exact, within reportorial rounding error) renders it undeniably significant.

<sup>11</sup>Semi-pacifist DR (*DIO* 1.2 fn 42 & fn 45) is reminded of a slightly analogous immortal 1980s moment when Johnny Carson spoke reverently of the person who insisted on the 1861-1865 War Between the States, President Abraham Lincoln, "without whom, we would not have the dunk-stuff."

<sup>12</sup>The common explanation of the decline in the Bosose' fortunes is that (soon after WW1) the team sold Babe Ruth to New York. But Ruth returned in 1935 to Boston, with the Braves — who responded by diving from the 1st division (1934) straight into last place with one of the worst records ever (losing over 3/4 of their games).

<sup>13</sup>That's for 4 pre-specified teams losing for a third of a century in a 16-team situation, followed (the Braves moved out of Boston in the early 1950s) by 3 specified teams (Cubbies, Chisose, Bosose) losing for nearly a half-century in an environment of roughly two dozen teams. (Note to mathematicians: of course, there was no such pre-specification. Accounting for this factor [as, e.g., at *DIO* 4.1 ¶3 §E7] will seriously lower the odds — though not to anything like chance-level.)

<sup>14</sup>The Chisose at least lost their first post-WW1 World Series deliberately (Black Sox, 1919). The Bosose haven't even that consolation.

**F11** However, since National League TV-revenue obsession<sup>15</sup> has (a few years ago) successfully extorted out of the Cubs that team's assent to night baseball at Wrigley Field (Cubbies' home park, the last major-league stadium to resist the installation of night-lights) the Cubs will no longer be prevented<sup>16</sup> from participating in the World Series. (Stuck in a deep Cubbie-hole, the team has not even been *in* a Series for over a half-century — since 1945.) They might win one. (I trust we can count on the Chisose & the Bosose not to do so until the Third Millennium.) Don't let it happen. Do we want our kids to think that the 10 million WW1 dead died in vain?<sup>17</sup>

## G Call of the Wild Coincidence

**G1** If the foregoing romp doesn't leave the reader wondering how DR has remained unsuperstitious, the following may.

**G2** In the 1960s, I was lucky enough to have a chance encounter with J.C.Adams' 19<sup>th</sup> century paper establishing as in slight *excess* of 33', the period of the Leonid meteor shower, which had flared spectacularly in 1833 and 1866. This led me to hope for a big 1966 Leonid shower despite the poor 1932 & 1965 showings. So, on 1966/11/16-17 at 4 AM (having seen nothing in the city), I drove out into the country to look for the mutedly-pre-publicized 1966 display. And stayed for an unforgettable 1<sup>h</sup>1/2 of brilliant, trail-leaving meteors — more than I've seen in all the rest of my life put together.

**G3** But the improbabilities of this date do not stop there. For, just a few hours earlier, at 7 PM of 11/16, my wife and I had happened upon a shower of abandoned grey kittens on the street. We took all three of them home. These Leonids (as we always called them) were soon named Reggie, Chortle, and Restless, after stars in the very celestial cat which is the radiant of the meteor shower: Leo's *alpha, delta*. And *mew*.

**G4** The last of our Leonids died on 1982/3/5 — on the same day my mother and step-father moved out of the home our family had lived in since mid-1947.

<sup>15</sup>Baseball is clearly hoping that its well-publicized 1998 chemistry-enhanced 1-year homer-record — 70 by Mark McGwire — will help save the sport from oblivion. Comments: McGwire is probably the 1st one-year Homerun King who will (if steroids don't kill him quicker than the usual) live to see someone else break his record. (Baseball seems doomed to addiction to a perpetual homerun-craze, to survive its ongoing depression, and make good the debt incurred by its recent demented strike.) Previous records: N.Williamson's 27 in 1884, B.Ruth's several records, peaking at 60 in 1927, R.Maris' 61 in 1961. Leagues' one-year RBI records: H.Wilson's 190 in 1930, L.Gehrig's 184 in 1931. Except for Williamson (info not known to writer), all these men took drugs — tobacco (Ruth, Gehrig, Maris), alcohol (Ruth, Wilson), or better. Ages at death: Williamson 36, Gehrig 37, Ruth 53, Wilson 48, Maris 51. Not a healthy line of work. (But, as bulked-up track-star FloJo's fate shows: when glory beckons, any abuse of the body seems worthwhile to some.) Incidentally, an argument for oldtime heroes' superiority is afforded by these men's World Series batting averages. (Williamson died before there was a Series.) Oldies: Ruth .326, Wilson .319, Gehrig .361. (Each above regular-season average, if we eliminate Ruth's years purely as pitcher.) Moderns: Maris .217, McGwire .188. (Each well below an already unimpressive regular-season average.) Possible explanation: increasingly fast & tricky ace pitchers have made hitting such a delicate art that celebrity hitters' reliability suffers (which inhibits legend-building). Also, year-round run-production increasingly depends on violent macho-power home runs, which lowers the import of bunched singles, doubles, & triples and the artful on-field scrambling action that originally made the game so popular. (One hopes baseball will not attempt to match the violence underlying other sports' appeal, as typified by the joke about the disappointed guy who went down to the Civic Center to see a fight, but a hockey game broke out.)

<sup>16</sup>To drive the point home, the baseball commissioner's office haughtily informed the Cubbies that, in case the team ever did qualify for a Series, their "home" games would have to be played in another park! — which swiftly produced lights-on compliance at Wrigley.

<sup>17</sup>One must not permit a "World Series Syndrome" (more relevant to youth than the Vietnam Syndrome, given the jock angle) that would have to be depressurized before we could convince idealistic youngsters to be generals' willing boytoys once again.

**G5** Only recently did I learn of an even more far-fetched family coincidence. My stepfather's only living sibling, James Avirett, married on 1942/10/16. This was the same day my father died, widow my mother, who would marry my stepfather John Avirett (see *DIO 3* inside front cover) five years later (1947/7/22).

**G6** So why do I nonetheless remain utterly unsuperstitious? Because: many thousands of events are available to be compared; thus, it figures that a few one-in-10000 shots are bound to come up.

**G7** We have already, at *DIO 1.1* ¶8 §F4 (1991), pointed out a spectacular astrological coincidence. Still, I've experienced only one evidential datum that could've favored the truth of some kind of astrology: Daffy Duck and I were born in the same year. But, then it turned out that Chinese astrology doesn't even *have* a Year of the Duck . . .

## H BJ, SJ, & OJ — Oval Sex in the Oral Office

**H1** President Bill Jefferson Clinton is publicly, earnestly repentant for trying to hide all that fun he had with the ellipsoidal phallivore, Monica L. But: BJ won't say what he *did* with ML. (Just that it was "inappropriate". But never sexual. Even though his emission's DNA was found on her clothes.) So, get this, he's attempting to hide what he did — even *while* claiming deep-sincere-sorrow for: hiding what he did. (And: he's still hiring expensive legal talent to deceive the public into thinking he didn't deceive . . .)

**H2** Only the most refined conmen of history can pull off stuff like that. And, to pair such talent together with a lawyer's brain! — well, it lets you get to the core of the matter: i.e., you begin to understand why he's President. . .

**H3** I'm reminded of a legendary Old-West traveling fleece-artist who used to circulate from town to town in his sales wagon, peddling "Swiss Gold Watches" for 10 cents apiece. He was of course happy to find himself showered with dimes when his victims were so gullible as to believe this ridiculous-on-the-face-of-it pitch. But what took him from delighted glee to ecstatic shock was his followup discovery: when he returned to the same town a year later, he not only sold his Swiss-Gold-Watches just as briskly as ever, he found that he was selling them to the same people.<sup>18</sup>

**H4 FDR, JFK, & BJC.** There has been alot of yuppy-alibiing of the scandalous and randilouse careers of JFK & BJC by reminding the public of FDR's mistress. But, isn't there a difference between longterm-affection and feline-tommygun promiscuity? Given what we know of JFK & BJC, should we either: [a] Henceforth nominate no one under 70? (Is JP2 getting bored over there in VatCity?) or [b] Draw some wisdom from the caliphs and openly establish a permanent official White House harem? — [i] to ease our ruler's idle moments, & [ii] to enlighten the public openly regarding whether its elected leader is or isn't using people like throwaway paper honkerchiefs, without any regard for the effect on respect for the Presidency.

**H5** In defense of political reason's power, Lincoln said that you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but not all of the people all of the time. But that was before TV brought the Elvis factor into politics. If Lincoln were alive today, watching BJC's poll-ratings, he'd say: you can fool all of the people some of the time and you can fool 2/3 of the people all of the time — and folks, we can stop right there, 'cause that's a majority, so — BJ's stayin' on at the White House.

**H6** Who says Monica has no ethics? She felt just *awful* that BJ was cheating. On her.

**H7** Monica has said of herself that she's lied all her life. Yet the whole US knows (esp. after the FBI's DNA test) that her account of liaisons with the First Willy are more credible than his. And the whole US now knows its own ethical state when it finds that: about half the US public wants BJC to stay on in the Oral Office. I.e., they want as President a person *they know* is less trustworthy than a self-described lifetime-habitual liar.

<sup>18</sup>See *DIO 2.1* ¶1 §A1, *DIO 2.3* ¶6 §G, *DIO 4.2* ¶9 §S3.

**H8** BJC's defenders criticize the Starr report (not primarily for inaccuracy but) for containing too much sex (implying Starr is a stalker, since that lie didn't stick on Monica). And the Dems' chorus is that it's OK for BJC to lie about sex.

Slight problem here: BJC earnestly insists he "*did not have sex with*" Monica. (She didn't ingest.) Merely an "inappropriate" relationship. So we need a re-write: the Starr Report is too obsessed with Inappropriateness; and it's OK to lie about Inappropriateness, 'cause everyone does. (Pontius Pilate: "What is truth?" — John 18:38.)

**H9** This is how the Presidential brain works: sex isn't sex if it's not straight. And lying isn't lying if the truth is an even more embarrassing brand of what you're lying about.

**H10** Question which — outside of Hollywood (increasingly the US' Fifth Estate) — is not so easily answered: what about President BJ is so positive and so uniquely irreplaceable that it is worth throwing out national standards of truth and trustworthiness in order to retain him? Is an Al Gore Presidency so to be feared? — if so, why'd BJ pick him for Veep?

**H11** Suddenly, these days, we hear (can't imagine why . . .) alot of propaganda defending the idea that lying<sup>19</sup> is no big deal. (Gosh, an awful *lot* of these moralists are lawyers.)<sup>20</sup> Keeping a proven deceiver as head of gov't makes about as much sense as founding a corporation's economics upon counterfeit money.

**H12** Fresh off defending wife-killer<sup>21</sup> OJ's lies, Alan Douchewits has now transformed into a ubiquitously insistent defender<sup>22</sup> of BJ's lies. This is a *law*-prof at Harvard, the *alma mater* of *DIO*'s publisher — whose most indelible impression of his college years is Harvard's insuperable motto (which our class took seriously, believe it or not): *Truth (Veritas)*. Note well, there are no footnotes on the Harvard escutcheon — just: *Veritas*, a single word.

**H13** A shame some of that prominent University's most media-hungry professors (see also, e.g. *DIO 4.3* ¶15) can't comprehend that many words. (If their ox weren't being scored, feminist spokemen would be persistently boring in with boring packaged-snobbit humor like: what part of the word *Truth* don't you understand?)

**H14** Why are feminists and unions getting behind BJC on the theory that he'll remember his promises to reward their help? (See above under Swiss-Gold-Watches: §H3. In a classic horse-may-die routine [see §N], BJC hasn't yet gotten RU 486 to his loyal feminists. See *DIO 4.3* ¶13 §E2. And he went big for union-hated NAFTA & GATT.) Bottom line: of what value is the promise of a proven deceiver?

**H15** Flash-Flash! In a quickly convened special 1998/1/22 meeting, the Jokewriters Association of America unanimously recommended revocation of the Presidential-Term-Limits Amendment to the US Constitution.

<sup>19</sup>Lying is the crime here. If BJC needs hot&cold-running girlpersons in his off-hours, most of us wouldn't begrudge him his fun. But deception is another matter. And the public is being led (by the Fourth & Fifth estates) to suppose that BJC is lying just about Inappropriateness. And nothing else. . .

<sup>20</sup>What's the difference between a crooked lawyer and a crooked politician?

One you pay to lie to others, and the other you pay to lie to you.

What do you get when you cross a crooked lawyer with a crooked politician?

Chelsea. (Latter not *DIO* original.)

<sup>21</sup>Yes, *DIO* can even stoop to creating limericks:

There was a big jock named the Juice  
Who tortured his wife with abuse.  
When he got on his knees,  
She gave him the freeze;  
So he cut her head nearly loose.

*DIO* got good reviews for our ironclad proof (*DIO 6* ¶5) of the identity of the Real Killer of Ron & Nicole. (Kato the were-dog did it.) But by far the best sendup of the OJ case was Gary (*Doonesbury*) Trudeau's "The Framing of O. J. Simpson . . . a conspiracy unravels" (*Time* 1996/11/25 p.122). If you missed it, head for the library.

<sup>22</sup>Another is John Dean. (Question: why do most observers seem implicitly to have assumed that Watergate's Deep Throat was an older person?)

**H16** And, in case this revocation

Doesn't work out for now,  
There is a way  
To Keep BJ,  
Here's how:

BJC just keeps running as Veep (every 4 years) on successive Dem Presidential tickets headed by great comedians like Jay Leno, Jonathan Winters, or Maxine Waters, where it's pre-understood that the President-elect steps aside right after inauguration to let the public keep enjoying the lovable Elvis-clone it craves.

**H17** The press has joined the Dems in attacking Starr for investigating BJC. Question: what is wrong with scrupulously checking one's top leader? The Executive Branch's power is too disproportionately high anyway.

**H18** Question to the top gov't opponents of Clinton's coverup-conspiracy, lovable ex-homewrecker Henry Hyde & persistently anti-female-rights Edward Jekyll: How can the US gov't expunge a criminal conspiracy, when the gov't is itself a criminal conspiracy?

**H19 The Most Surprised.** There's been alot of Dem chortling (albeit nervous) about GOP surprise at the public's mass-shrug at being straight-in-the-eye lied to. Comments:

[a] One wonders what kind of friends the average USer has, that this sort of treatment would seem so lightly taken & be so instantly forgivable.

[b] Despite the taking&airing of dozens of polls, the US Medium has not reported a single IQ-correlation poll on whether the First Ego ought to depart: how difficult would it be to check the intelligentsia's opinion vs. the semi-literates'? The former seem repulsed, while the latter feel: so-what? Among principled people, out&out lying is a crime that transcends politics. (DR is pro-womens' rights & pro-abortion-access. So he cannot stand the politics or the pseudo-piety of abortion-hater H.Hyde, who is the top GOper against BJC. But how does all that recommend clinging to an untrustworthy leader? The dreariest aspect of the saga is the extent to which citizens judge not by the criminal's crimes but by his promised principles [see Dave Barry at fn 26] and appearance.)

[c] There's a sharp irony here that no one has yet noted in the Medium (even though it's right in front of everyone), namely, *the* person most surprised at the public's shrug is (political-genius-Rhodes-Scholar) BJC himself. Why else would he have committed so many elaborate crimes and delays, to cover up his nocturnal submission (to ML's services), if he initially anticipated that the public wouldn't care?

[d] While the adoring public begs nasty old Congress to lay off lovable BJC, plenty of intelligent people are appalled at the idea of keeping a thoroughly-proven liar in office. Privately, this includes even congressmen<sup>23</sup> (especially Democrats, quietly). So: is this the first time in US history when Congress has been less corrupt than its public?

**H20** Of course, the real idea behind alot of BJ-protecting Libs is hysterically apocalyptic (neglecting the obvious reality that the corporate rulers of the US aren't going to let rightist loonies take over the gov't).<sup>24</sup> if BJC goes down, the Dem Party is finished! A religious Dark Ages looms! But, hold on. After all, the gradual ascent of often-dumb rightist rage (against, e.g., women's progress & abortion rights) is not going to be stopped for long by BJC posing as Horatius-at-the-Bridge. To the contrary, Dem<sup>25</sup> policies have encouraged the growth of drug&crime-ridden slums in city after city in the US, and thus helped create the very rightist reaction from which Dems now claim to be the US' best hope for salvation.

<sup>23</sup>Washington pols & insiders are aghast at Clinton's lying. To them. (See, e.g., Sally Quinn in *WashPost Weekly Ed* 1998/11/9 pp.6-7.) And their head-shaking chorus of disbelief is:

Hey, this is a matter of HONOR, here — he's supposed to lie to The People, not his fellow liars.

<sup>24</sup>Though the historical example of 1933 Germany shows anything is possible, this mistake itself warns rulers against repeating it.

<sup>25</sup>Have any among the Punditz ever wondered aloud at the anomaly that the favorite political party of university professors is also the favorite party of the mafia and its chief slum-victims? Does this suggest a slight downside to the sanctity of the US' two-party system?

**H21** On TV talkshows, Clinton's lies have for months made every rightwing commentator (even the most rabidly nutty) look honest compared to Liberals who've persistently defended a coreless-careerist,<sup>26</sup> pathological-lawyer, sex-addict President. [In extenuation: see §P11.] So Clinton's legacy and breastacy will be to give a gratis boost to the credibility of the very rightists he allegedly believes he's defending the republic from.

**H22** It is not surprising that BJ made a big hit with his Jesuit profs at Georgetown. So, it should be equally unsurprising that his 1998/8/17 mental-gymnastics exercise (the famous 4 hour videotaped performance) has lodged a spectacular intellectual achievement. After 2000 years of less able theologians' frustration, Father Clinton, SJ, has finally solved one of the most central of all Christian mysteries, namely:

how a mom could give birth without having sex.

**H23** Linda Tripp<sup>27</sup> and Kenneth Starr may indeed have the ulterior motives some impute to them. (The Starr & GOP connections to tobacco are suspicious.) But [a] their charges appear to be accurate, and [b] they have shown the courage to oppose corruption in the most powerful office on Earth — in the face of hyena-pack attacks that have made them lepers. (Isn't it a rule of the military academies that it is wrong not to report others' wrongdoing if it is known to you?) Neither has gotten a word of press-recognition for [b] — perhaps because a US scandal always tends (nudged in the direction favored by the wealthiest interests) to evolve into a script of rigidly pre-defined rôles.

**H24** Why is it that the Media pack-attack Linda Tripp (who was being pressured to follow a script and falsely testify in court — and who instead bugged to differ) for betraying-a-trust to one person — but are anxious to forgive Clinton for doing the same very thing to three hundred million persons? (And: why is a powerless lady who refused to commit perjury held in public scorn while the most powerful man in the world is kept in office after doing the crime?) The main difference is that BJ's betrayal was selfish (he's clinging to his job, & perhaps immunity from indictment), while Tripp nervily risked her job (and more) to establish the truth about serious national crimes (Presidential bribe-attempts, etc).

**H25** Alot of white observers who understandably condemned as ignorant bigots the jury which sprung an incredibly minor actor named OJ, are now defending keeping on BJ, even though he's a liar, coverupper, conspirer, briber and intimidator of witnesses — and a slanderer prepared (until unexpectedly brought up short by DNA) even to falsely smear ML as a fantasizing stalker. The public craves to retain BJ not in some obscure acting job, but in The holy of holies. The apogee of all apogees: *THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY* — *the* top acting job in the universe.

**H26** Why would the President of the US, who could've fooled around with alot of slim, attractive women, end up instead harpooning a sperm whale? (And then having his spineless spinvolk cater to the public's hope to blame it all on stalker-rapist ML — as if he were merely 50<sup>y</sup> old putty in a 21<sup>y</sup> old maw. Partial answers: [a] BJ had long been under "house arrest" (on Hilla the Hun's watch)<sup>28</sup> when the Monica affair occurred, so this limited his ranges in space and slime. [b] His approach is so dropflash-crude that most women (those

<sup>26</sup> [Dave Barry (1999/1/16): each of the contenders (for the 2000 presidential race) will spend 1999 trying "to develop a Vision of the Future, defined as 'around \$40 million in cash.' They will use some of this vision to pay for polls so they can find out what their [principles] are; they will use the rest for [TV ads] explaining these [principles] in terms that are understandable to the average American voter or cocker spaniel: 'Vote for John. You like John. John have same views as you. See John with family! See John wear dark suit! John very good. Other man very bad. Remember: John.' "]

<sup>27</sup>If Linda Tripp were part of a conspiracy, there'd be big money defending her; but nobody backed by major fiscal powers gets trashed by 100% of the media.

<sup>28</sup>This is said to be Clinton's own private nickname for his wife. (A partially-exonerating clue to BJ's wandering eye may be suggested by the F.Dunaway-W.Holden swiftie in the 1976 film *Network*.) On 1998/9/23 (NBC), Jay Leno asked Fred Willard: should our sex-addict President try going cold turkey? Willard's response: Now, Jay, there's no need to call the First Lady names. (It's odd that Hilla & the late Di are among the most popular women on Earth, without anyone asking an obvious question: if they're so admirable, how come their own husbands couldn't stand their company?)

of the slightest refinement or self-confidence) are repulsed. (His invincibly-enamoured female-majority supporters' minds seem staunchly able to avoid contemplating this point.)

**H27** It's amusing to see BJ-defenders on the toob attempting to deny the evidence that the White House was attempting to bribe Monica (*and* Tripp)<sup>29</sup> into silence, vigorously promoting a party-line denial — even while many of these defenders see themselves “influenced” by supping at the White House trough.

**H28** Feminist Erica Jong (1998/9/29): BJ merits a free pass for doing the very things feminism has been fighting because — his agenda<sup>30</sup> has helped feminism fight those very things. Or something. And she further thinks BJ should get this pass because: [a] He's an addict. [b] He's behaving better. (So far. [As we know.]) If there's an Annual Feminist-Consistency-Farce Award, Ms. Jong looks like a good bet, though in a strong 1998 field.

**H29** Others agree that poor BJ merely needs-help,<sup>31</sup> because he's addicted to Inappropriateness. Comments:

[a] BJ has a far more serious and incurable addiction. To deception.

[b] The public also has an addiction. To Clinton. (TV 'snews has turned US elections into glamour<sup>32</sup> contests — and then scratches its head about why we get sex scandals . . . ) Which is the real reason (as against all the fancy Wisdom-of-the-American-Sheepie hymns straightforwardly peddled by the Medium)<sup>33</sup> that explains why Clinton's ratings stay solid, no matter how gross his behavior. For way too many women, this vicarious sexual addiction could prove alot more dangerous to democracy (than his own addiction) if it continues uncorrected — i.e., if women's affection for this Elvis-reincarnation<sup>34</sup> keeps leading them to set aside the trifling question of whether the love-object has a shred of ethics. (None of the original Elvis' band of shrieking fans ever gave a hoot about this little detail, either.)<sup>35</sup>

**H30** Womantrouble-RetroTransformation:

After indictment, OJ suddenly became black again.

And, after the public learned of BJ's subpoenas (Emily Litella, where are you when we need you?), and he got into deep bleep, formerly-union-snobbing & NAFTA-hustling BJ suddenly became a Democrat<sup>36</sup> again. (Why haven't there been more BJ-OJ comparisons<sup>37</sup> in the Medium? Simple: Dems never forgave OJ for Cochran's use of Louis F's anti-Jewish tan-klan, so few of the nimblest hired-tongues-for-BJ have a kind word for OJ.)

**H31** GOP critics of BJ keep spouting their favorite mantra-indictment: “obstruction of justice”. Most of them are lawyers, so they haven't the instinct to translate that blahblah

<sup>29</sup>What kind of youngster can afford on *her own* to bribe a friend by offering her a condo?

<sup>30</sup>In the BJ context, Shelby Steele emphasizes the modern-agentry ploy (so beloved of film-celebs — and even ex-royals) of ostentatiously supporting a few charities (breast-cancer & AIDS being particular favorites), even while living a worthless and-or amoral private life. In an age in which logic is lost in a swamp of visual stimuli & propaganda, this tactic has been unfailingly effective.

<sup>31</sup>One recalls the joke about the two sociologists who happen upon a mugging, and one says to the other: “oh, the poor man, he needs help” — as they race to hold hands with the mugger.

<sup>32</sup>See similarly *DIO* 4.2 ¶9 §F. Preachers like Jimmy Swaggert & the early Marjoe have long been dressing and acting more like filmstars than holy men. It seems odd to an educated outsider that these men's untutored faithful could so easily confuse sexual attraction with religion. JFK & BJ have now powerfully brought a similar (almost laughably pathetic) confusion to presidential politics.

<sup>33</sup>[E.g., *Time* 1999/1/4 p.108 (boxed-highlighted Wisdom): “Most people decided that Clinton at his most slippery is still less a threat to American values than Starr.”]

<sup>34</sup>How many women's dominant disappointment at BJ is simply that — Monica got to him first? Note our 1991/1/14 prediction (*DIO* 1.1 ¶2 §G4, well before Clinton entered the 1992 race), that the public would send a resurrected Elvis to the White House.

<sup>35</sup>In the people-in-love-will-say-anything genre, I'm reminded of the sad tale of a famous homosexual tennis champion whose chickenhawkery so dominated his later years that a friend recalled him chuckling (one morning at breakfast): Guess-what? Fritzie stole my watch last night. Isn't that cute?

<sup>36</sup>See *Wall Street Journal* 1998/9/2 p.A18.

<sup>37</sup>The best exception is Leno (who joked about Clinton's denying sex with ML, even as 36 boxes of StarrStuff were being stacked): hey, when the evidence is taller than you are, even OJ says give-it-up.

into plain English: **witness-tampering**. If the GOP is serious about getting BJ out of office (a big IF)<sup>38</sup> then it should start speaking English instead of legalese to the public.

**H32** A Blow for Freedom? If our Com'r-in-Chief is really pro-Affirmative-Action, why don't black women ever rate his otherwise record-setting-indiscriminate amorous attentions? (No wonder they call it the White House.) Yet another OJ-parallel<sup>39</sup> —

*Plutarch's Lives* lives.

**H33** The Ron “teflon” (nonexistent when he was a sub-average film actor) & Clinton's “escape-artistry” are self-protective press myths, invented to cover the central reality of politics in the US since the New Deal died away; the candidate backed by the most corporate power will win, regardless of his character or schemes: Iran-Contra, the Monica coverup, whatever. And that's because the nation's 4th-Estate thought-controller&kingmaker — The Medium — plays ball. (Not to use a more professional term.) Also: Reagan & Clinton both represent an unexpected coalition between [a] Hollywood<sup>40</sup> (whose power over US minds has never been greater) and [b] the US business community (ditto).

**H34** And this is the most ominous aspect of the Clinton spectacle: the impunity.<sup>41</sup> (There's no comment from the equally-immune Medium on this matter.) If you serve the powers-that-are (and BJ politically flowered in mobtown Hot Springs, Arkansas), there is almost nothing you can do that will cause your exit. It's a clear message to any remaining severely retarded child who still imagines the US is a just, accountable, rational democracy.

## I Media-Protected PC Mythology

**I1** A popular feminist myth holds that men dominate women simply because men are physically stronger. But, if so, then: why is the world run by older people, not younger?

**I2** Incessant daily gov't-business-Medium propaganda insists that the US is a racist nation and that this explains blacks' continued mass problems of coping. Comments:

[a] Outside the Klan's dimbos, there is relatively little hatred of blacks in the US. (Though, there may indeed be some irritation at the insulated lilywhite country-club-set's institutions — the increasingly seamless gov't-press combine — jamming ghetto culture into everybody else's schools and neighborhoods.) As stevedore Eric Hoffer, LBJ's favorite popular philosopher, perceptively noted long ago: hatred festers primarily in those who feel inferior in power or whatever. (Also: historically, blacks have gotten the raw end of every mass involvement with other groups.) Which may explain why most race-hatred in the US is coming from the social bottom — and not just at WASPs, but at Koreans, Jews, etc.

[b] If (as the Medium implies at every opportunity) hate-prejudice were the cause of blacks' depressing mean social status, then Jews would be at the US' lowest rung.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup>Is the Impeachment Show actually just standard Dembo-vs-Dumbo theatre? — a well-mounted Punch&Judy Act? Given the whipping-boy purpose he serves (*DIO* 4.3 ¶13 §B5): “Does the GOP really want Clinton out of the White House?”

<sup>39</sup>See §H30 and *DIO* 6 ¶5 §A2.

<sup>40</sup>See §H10. Anyone seeking an explanation of the homosexual lobby's rise from closet to media-sacred-cow might consider the phenomenon in the light of this superficially-incongruous coalition.

<sup>41</sup>The same has long been true of other wealthy showbiz celebrities. And: will (*can*) any President ever be ejected in the obsessively two-party US? Same question: when has either party held 2/3 of the Senate?

<sup>42</sup>§§I1&I2 are the sorts of ultra-simple analogies that TV 'snews moguls exist to keep off the air for decades in a row. Incidentally, §I2 is obviously not a justification of race-hate. (An arrogant poison that self-excused the aggression and sadism of the Nazis & Tojo's Empire of Japan — and which brought both gov'ts to ultimate grief. Everybody's.) §I2 merely points out that racial hatred is not necessarily the prime cause of the intractable woes of an allegedly-hated group.

## J Low Noon at Notre Dame

**J1** Hugh Thurston's paper (¶1) summarizes Robert Newton's large 1977 body of proofs of Ptolemy's consistently forged calculations (many of which can be checked by anyone, e.g., ¶1 eq. 1). These demonstrations have been prominently on the record for over 20 years. During this time, Ptolemy's enraged defenders haven't overturned a jot of it — responding instead with a grab-bag of incoherent<sup>43</sup> alibis along with coherently one-sided personal<sup>44</sup> attacks upon Newton. For the intellectual company such behavior places these cultists in, see *DIO 7.3* ¶9 fn 47 & §§C9-C10.

**J2** Despite Newton's massive, variously airtight demonstrations that Ptolemy's work is rife with (one might better say: *characterized by*) deliberate mathematical fraud, history-of-astronomy-political-center books (see, e.g., that cited in fn 44) keep imperviously puffing him as one of the greatest *astronomers* of all time — a spectacle which has long given real astronomers an eye-rolling upchuckle. After all, Ptolemy's fraudulence has been an open secret in the astronomical community for at least 4 centuries. (Tycho revealed Ptolemy's star-catalog theft in the preface to his own 1598 star catalog.) We note that astronomers' two great recent star catalogs are named successively for Hipparchos and for Tycho.

**J3** Hugh Thurston and I appeared at the 1997 University of Notre Dame Astronomy Workshop, and at the end of the first session (1997/6/20), moderator Steve Dick (US Naval Observatory), in response to an earlier DR proposal from the floor, stepped aside and left a little unscheduled time for a brief friendly discussion of the Ptolemy Controversy.

**J4** The guys were willing, but the dolls predictably refused to engage. Bernie Goldstein arm-waved us off as he turned his back on the scene. Noel Swerdlow bounded up the auditorium stairs and disappeared out into the hall. O Gingerich lowered his eyes and said nothing. James Evans followed suit.

**J5** DR, trashionably attired in a Damon-Runyon-mobster-style dark shirt and holster<sup>45</sup> finally said forcefully but not impolitely:

Gingerich, you've got us outnumbered 2-to-1 — what do you need?

**J6** Workshop gooroo & brave pro-Ptolemy warrior O Gingerich kept on staring silently at a point roughly 30° beneath where Thurston and I were. Later, when leaving the hall, Gingerich was heard to say (with creditable candor): when this conference is over, this is all anyone is going to remember.

**J7** [Addenda 1999:] Keith Pickering, Hugh Thurston, and DR repeatedly (in communications both to the Workshop and to the other side) offered to meet any number of Ptolemy's defenders at the next (1999 July) UND Workshop. No takers. (Similar earlier offers have likewise been refused for years.) The same clique continues not only to flee public discussion but insists on non-citing *all* of *DIO*'s years of novel contributions.

**J8** When DR proposed (1998/11/4 & 12/3) scheduling an encounter for the 1999 Workshop, its chiefs Dick & Michael Crowe required a written proposal. When that was sent (12/11), no reply was received. So weeks later (99/1/16) DR, Pickering, & Thurston wrote directly to Gingerich, Swerdlow, & Evans, requesting that *they* support the holding of such a public discussion. Instantly, the Workshop was galvanized — and (1999/1/21) cut off the idea (without even acknowledging receipt of the 1/16 *DIO* letter that caused belated reply only to DR's earlier letter). Swift action was obviously seen as assisting the covering threesome, obviating their need to reply — as if that would save them from yet another revelation of the level of their courage. (Question: since the Workshop knew that Ptolemy's brave defenders would not reply, where was the need to interfere? Other than as the sort

<sup>43</sup>See, e.g., *DIO 1.1* ¶7 fn 17, *DIO 2.3* ¶8 §§C20&C22, *DIO 4.3* ¶15 §F5.

<sup>44</sup>Some examples at *DIO 1.1* ¶1 §C7, and even (as noted at ¶4 §A19) in the Gingerich-&-Swerdlow-sponsored 1998 James Evans *text-book* (see *News Notes*) — only adding to the disgrace to Oxford University Press represented by this slavishly party-line volume.

<sup>45</sup>Caaaalm down — it's just for a palmtop computer.

of archon-brainkissing favor that no neutral body would debase itself by.) Since the Workshop's letter adhered to the cringers' party line that DR is too "strident" for them (an amusing alibi, given the defenders' slanders<sup>46</sup> — freely delivered, so long as the slandee's back is turned), DR pointed out that neither Pickering nor Thurston has ever said anything strong about Ptolemy's defenders. (And all of DR's public appearances have been polite.)<sup>47</sup> So, just the two of them have offered to take on the defenders. To this proposal: no reply from the Workshop. (There will probably be none until the program is frozen to specifications.) On 1999/2/9, O e-mailed Pickering that Evans & Swerdlow had decided not to attend the Workshop. Pickering e-mailed right back that he & Thurston (with or without DR) would be glad to meet O (& any other Ptolemy-backers) for a temperate public discussion of the Ptolemy controversy at the Workshop. As of press-time, the defenders are still hiding.

**J9** This information is here entered into the record because the academic community should be aware of it when evaluating: [a] Certain forums' legitimacy, integrity, and independence. [b] Hiding&shunning cliques' science, logic, & openmindedness. And believability — even to themselves. In a 30 year context of suppression, omertà, and unfaced central technical blunders (some<sup>48</sup> of the most astonishingly elementary nature), the fact that such a clique continues *unconditionally* to receive every diplomatic and fiscal mark of high respect and honor in the history-of-astronomy community, should serve as a measure and a warning as to just how seriously this terrified community should be taken.

## K Control-Delusions and Defusions

Speaking slightly less facetiously than in §O, we may point out certain revealing parallels between US trials, elections, and religion. (See also §B1.)

**K1 Diversion** All three serve as delay-depressurizers for human rage at injustice, by creating an illusion of deferred-but- eventual equity. They are thus powerfully effective buffers against armed revolution, which the public might well resort to if it knew how little reward is actually going to come true down the road.

**K2 Inversion** All three create, for a powerless individual, a convincing illusion of control. [a] The jury believes that it decides guilt or innocence, though it usually cannot even ask questions, and is quite easily manipulated into simply going along with the most expensive lawyer. Or judge. Moreover, most juries are innocently unaware that if the judge wants to throw out any guilty verdict, he can. (The recent Louise Woodward case shocked alot of folks who never knew this.) A rich person can afford better lawyers, judges, appeals — and, if all else fails, he can purchase a governor's pardon. (Thus, no wealthy man has been executed in the US for over a half-century.) [b] US elections are merely a choice between two wholly-owned subsidiaries (fn 57) of the very corporations that are underpaying the voters who think their vote might get them a better deal; the prosperous and warring history of the spread of democracy is largely due to the convincing nature of this delusion: the voter believes he is controlling the gov't when the precise reverse is true. (See fn 10.) And, analogously to the courtroom escape-hatches just enumerated: on the outside chance that the public happened to elect someone unapproved by the nation's corporate rulers, there's always the Electoral College. Why else do you think it's there? [c] As for religion: praying is akin to going over the heads of earthly leaders to ask for a someday-fair-shake, from an imaginary ombudsman. (No wonder all exploitive gov'ts promote religion.) Well, at least god isn't deceiving. You have to exist before you can do that. Which brings us to . . .

<sup>46</sup>*DIO 1.1* ¶C7 & fn 20, *DIO 4.3* ¶15 §§H4-H6.

<sup>47</sup>Dick has acknowledged this (98/12/3, regarding §J5) and on 99/1/6 said he'd received the 12/11 letter, about which he made no complaint throughout a friendly chat — though, by 1/21, the same 12/11 letter had become banworthy proof of DR stridency. [Note: Limited debate finally came off. See *DIO 9.1* p.2.]

<sup>48</sup>See, e.g., *DIO 1.3* ¶10, *DIO 4.1* ¶4 §A, or *DIO 4.2* p.56 Table 1.

## L Inverting Pascal's Wager

Blaise Pascal's argument for good behavior purports to be based upon what is in truth a generally valid principle: when making decisions, the wisest path is that with the highest associated product ( $S$ ) of probability  $P$  and value  $V$ . That is, if there are  $n$  behavior-path options then we simply compare the various options' smartness  $S_i$  ( $i$  running from 1 to  $n$ ), where

$$S_1 = P_1 \cdot V_1, \quad S_2 = P_2 \cdot V_2, \quad S_3 = P_3 \cdot V_3, \quad \dots \quad S_n = P_n \cdot V_n \quad (1)$$

and one then follows the path with the highest  $S$ . Pascal's Wager: no matter how small is the probability  $P_g$  of god's existence, the stakes  $V_g$  are infinite, so — since

$$S_g = P_g \cdot V_g = P_g \cdot \infty = \infty \quad (2)$$

— it is best to obey god (take-the-god-option sounds more business-like),  $S_g$  being the highest available smartness  $S$ . Many rationalists have an inherent revulsion to this (a math-gambling approach to ethics) — based upon their wish to face the world with bravery, as against craven submission to power. But, even aside from its calculating selfishness,<sup>49</sup> the Pascal argument has (unadvertised) inherent logical difficulties, as well.

**L1 Inversion.** From Pascal's logic (above), we can reason as follows:<sup>50</sup> satan, who clearly governs the real world (where rulers mouth religion merely as a hypocritical ploy to exploit subjects) will take all-future-time out (from his busy schedule of corrupting the rest of humanity), just to eternal-roast-torment you if you worship the anti-satan called god; and satan will provide satanic pleasure eternally for all who follow himself. However low the probability  $P_d$  that this scheme is true, the associated value  $V_d = \infty$  establishes (see eq. 3) that smartness  $S_d = \infty$ , which cannot be topped. Thus, the wise man must steel and psychically immure himself, in order to choose the strict satanic way of life — that is, to be naughty and have fun, just like he wanted to, before rulerships' lawyers-for-god addled his mind . . . .

To sum up pseudo-soberly: no matter how small are the odds on the existence of the devil<sup>51</sup> running the universe (rewarding sin forever in His Kingdom), the stakes are infinite, etc — that is, we consider an evil mirror-image of Pascal's god-argument (eq. 2). Again, we find that the smartness  $S_d$  of serving the devil is infinite:

$$S_d = P_d \cdot V_d = P_d \cdot \infty = \infty \quad (3)$$

However: since the two behavioral options ( $S_g$  &  $S_d$ ) are infinitely contradictory, the situation is impossible, and so neither these  $S$  nor any other claimants' bootstrap-self-proclaimed  $S$  can meaningfully equal  $\infty$ . (If a multiplicity of infinitely attractive options simultaneously pull at us, then life becomes an insane asylum. I.e., we have here a *reductio ad ∞ absurdum*.) But, by Pascal's eq. 1 logic, the only way these  $S$  values can be less than  $\infty$  is if the probability  $P$  of the truth of *each* theory (god-rule or devil-rule) is infinitely small — i.e., zero. Putting this mathematically: if  $S$  is finite, then it follows from eq. 1 that (for god's or satan's infinite  $V$ ):

$$P = S/V = S/\infty = 0 \quad (4)$$

I.e., the probability of the existence of either an omnipotent god or devil is zero. So, there's Good News & Bad News. (Since we already know how conventional forces will see this, I'll instead report it as the *Libertine Gazette* would.)

The Good News: Wet-Blanket God Doesn't Exist!

(The Bad News: Fun-Guy Satan Doesn't, Either. . . .)

<sup>49</sup>See *DIO 1.1* ¶2 §H2.

<sup>50</sup>Our 1<sup>st</sup> argument (the Blaze-Pascal Wager: §L1) seems closely related to our 2<sup>nd</sup> argument (§L2). Similarly, Newton's 1<sup>st</sup> Law is merely a special case of his 2<sup>nd</sup> Law, though I've yet to encounter a physics textbook that mentions this.

<sup>51</sup>See *DIO 2.1* ¶1 §A9 on the awesome Problem-of-Good.

**L2 Responsibility.** This discussion will just be a rough quantitative formalization of the unanswerable Problem of Evil.<sup>52</sup> In order to pseudo-refute-evade it, theologians' standard pathetic "free-will" shellgame argument (which ought to be transparent to a 10 yr-old) is to blame all evil on man's free-will choice, without pointing out that: since — as the same folks claim — god created man (& his purported free-will) and thereby created the evil in man which man "freely" chooses to emit, then an (omnipotent) god is still the ultimate creator of all evil. If you estimate rationally the odds that the observable human universe is the creative responsibility of a very(-but-finitely) powerful deity, it is obvious (given the patent imperfection of the production) that the odds are quite small. Indeed, the deduced odds for god's existence may be crudely estimated by using an obvious (normalized) equation expressing the lowness of misery  $M$  (in a world which this deity allegedly created), namely, the inverse of  $M$ :

$$1/M = p \cdot D \quad (5)$$

that is, misery-lowness ( $1/M$ ) equals the product of the hypothesized deity-power  $D$  (for effecting goodness) and the probability  $p$  that god exists. We may re-write eq. 5 as:

$$p = 1/(M \cdot D) \quad (6)$$

where, again,  $p$  is the rough probability of the god hypothesis. Now, with existing-misery  $M$  obviously substantial, probability  $p$  will not be low. But at least  $p$  won't be null — *so long as* the proposed deity-power  $D$  is finite. However, once this celestial power  $D$  is alleged [see below] to be infinite (as in the standard Christian theological contraption), the odds against its truth also become infinite:

$$p = 1/(M \cdot \infty) = 0 \quad (7)$$

i.e., the probability that God exists becomes null.

**L3 Time-Spans.** A prime reason the Pascal-wager stakes are infinite is the proposal-lure of eternal life. But, we can examine this spectacular bribe quantitatively by analogy to a simple problem: take two spans in time and ask what are the chance-odds of being in either; obviously, it's the ratio of their spans. (E.g., it's 1439 times more likely to be between 00:01&24:00 than between 00:00&00:01.) Therefore (§B5): *if there were an eternal life, the odds are infinitely high that we would be in it right now.* (I.e., if the two time-span options are  $100^0$  vs infinity, the probability of being in the former span is 100 divided by the sum of 100 and infinity — a ratio which equals zero.) Since we obviously are not in the hypothesized infinitely long life, one concludes that eternal life<sup>53</sup> is not our fate. We can re-phrase this as follows: if our finite terrestrial life were followed by an eternal afterlife, then 0% of all time resides in the former. If there were an eternal life after Earthly death, the probability is exactly 0% that Now would lie in our finite life here; but Now *is* in it.<sup>54</sup> A false consequent for a valid conditional proves the falsity of the antecedent; i.e. — there is no eternal afterlife.

<sup>52</sup>See *DIO 4.3* ¶15 fn 42. The Problem of Evil predates Jesus; see, e.g., Lucretius, Books 2&5.

<sup>53</sup>Nothing in this argument precludes an infinitude of serial finite-reincarnations. When considering this option, we find two opposing forces attracting our sympathies: [a] Our inability to comprehend our own nonexistence (*DIO 4.2* ¶9 §K13). [b] The (slightly nontrivial!) issue of how one's self escapes one's own brain, one's own skull. (How does even theologian-level illusionism convert personality-degeneration [with age — and especially with death] into personality-survival? And: is [a] an argument or merely a viewpoint-limitation?) Though others disagree (see *DIO 4.3* ¶13 §§G4-G5), I personally have little desire for a life other than this one, beyond its inevitable end. The probability that another life could be even nearly as exhilarating as being Dennis Rawlins is vanishingly low. [Thoughts. (i) All I ask is to be with my wife forever; and the rest of our lives on Earth is a kind of forever, since that span is all there is. (ii) One's own death is unreal, since it cannot be experienced. So, if infinity is redefined as meaning Everything, then our finite life is (in a subtle sense: see fn 54's citation) infinite to us.]

<sup>54</sup>See *DIO 4.2* ¶9 §K13 for the *DIO* paradox that is a sibling to §L3's here.

## M Afterthoughts

**M1** But, continuing §L into speculative regions: at death, does the experienced passage of time slow down? — to create the personal feeling that time has not stopped. This is not eternal life, but the lack of consciousness of one’s own extinction-moment may be the best substitute we’re going to get, in the real world. In the realm of ideals: the survival of one’s work and play is another type of immortality, which I am so vain and sentimental as to savour. As for actual survival: how can we place credence in this, when we consider that, at death, the brain’s nerve and blood cells (required for our consciousness’s remembering & reasoning) cease activity? In this connection, we may consider our own very early youth — when such cells were in as small supply as at any point we choose to imagine back to. Almost no adult, thinking person believes he was so (able to reason — or even see) before he was born. So we can temporally mirror-image, to examine the afterlife question: if we go backwards in time, we can consider the early-embryo or even zygote stage — when human thought is as impossible as for a protozoan. So, a human without his material equipment is as unconscious as a corpse. To be permanently without that equipment is not heavenly exaltation but eternal unconsciousness. Death.

**M2** All the foregoing analyses §§L1-L3 invert the superficially infinite strength of Pascal’s argument — and thus not only overthrow it, but result in supporting conclusions which are the very contrary of his, namely, mortality and atheism. But these findings are merely part of a wider realization that religion is obviously based not upon logic but upon: [a] the incomprehensibility of extinction; [b] the utility (for rulers) of manipulating the ruled by the promise of invisible deferred rewards and-or punishments; [c] believers’ fear of death (or hell); [d] and-or their wish for laughably-exaggerated benefit-promises. Item [d] is the main psychological basis for the embarrassingly childish notions of organized religion’s (conveniently invisible) mega-entities: infinite god and eternal paradise. These are nothing but world’s-record sales-exaggerations. Such pseudo-products cannot be sold to the public by rational persuasion. They sell because: the bigger the promise, the better<sup>55</sup> the con, a theorem (as logical as religion isn’t) well known to experienced promoters throughout human history — from Las Vegas to numbers-racketeers<sup>56</sup> to Washington to VatCity.

## N The Original Horse-May-Die Deal

One of Henry 8’s favorite jokes: A king attended an execution for an afternoon’s entertainment and got a pleasant surprise when a thief on the block yelled out to the king that, if his life were spared for just a year, he could teach the king’s horse to talk! Well, the king figured he had nothing to lose by agreeing — since, no matter what, he would end up with either the world’s only talking horse or the same execution merely delayed a bit. After he announced the event’s postponement, he left on other business. As soon as the king was out of earshot, a friend of the thief scoffed that he’d gained nothing, since he could never make good on his promise. But the thief responded: well, at least I’ve talked myself a gain of a whole *year* of life. And, during that year:

The horse may die.  
Or the king may die.  
Or I may die.  
Or — the horse may talk.

<sup>55</sup>Thus, e.g., the posher the seller’s abode. See *DIO* 4.2 ¶9 §§H7-H8, & *DIO* 4.3 ¶13 fn 22.

<sup>56</sup>Which is what we used to call Dutch Schultz and Charley Lucky. But now, The Numbers are run by the gov’ts of those many states of the US who push lotteries — which can only be (inadequately) defended as a tax on greedy stupidity. See DR’s *Skeptical Inquirer* proposal (*Skinq* 2.1:62 [1977] p.79) to earmark state-lottery profits for teaching statistics to the young, aiming at wiping out the very innumeracy which lotteries live off.

## O Skew Stew

**O1** US Democracy: rulership by puppets elected-beloved by those too naïve to realize that voting<sup>57</sup> is not very relevant to their lives.

**O2** Demography of the several bunnyrabbit religions (all of 100% male rulership): numerical-political advantage to those too brainwashed and-or improvident to use birth control. [See *DIO* 4.3 ¶13 fn 8 & §E.]

**O3** US Jury System: governance by verdicts of 12 people too dumb to get off jury duty.<sup>58</sup>

## P Defynitions

**P1** MIM = 1999 in Roman-numerals. (You instead prefer MDCCCCLXXXVIII?)

**P2** 2001/1/20 = DLSWSHBJ Day.<sup>59</sup>

**P3** Democratic election = voting for a pol who seeks powers unequal to yours, by swearing that you and everyone else are his equals.<sup>60</sup>

**P4** “Middle Ages” = PC for “Dark Ages”.

**P5** Lead into battle = general’s expression for issuing orders from the rear.<sup>61</sup>

**P6** Ultimate lawyer ployer = Let’s rewrite WW2, since the Nazis at Nürnberg were’t pre-Mirandized.

**P7** Unsinkable Kate Winslet = changed our pronunciation of *Titanic*.

**P8** Death-row daily periodical = noosepaper.

**P9** French PETA = pourquoi pig?

**P10** Hitler Youth = Nazi Totsies. Or, the Goy Scouts. (Or, a few lucky-survivor septagenarians.)

**P11** Sex addict = male.

## Q Compacting & Clarifying Dates

**Q1** As noted at §P1, “MIM” is the roman-numeral expression for 1999. The alternate rendition there cited (MDCCCCLXXXVIII) reminds us to make the obvious suggestion: why not just cut out using roman numerals? They’re confusing & cumbersome. And they are almost never more efficient than the equivalent arabic expression. But, ironically, 1999 begins a rare stretch when the reverse is true: from 1999 through 2001. So, should we retain romans until the end of the year MMI?

**Q2** With the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium looming, we urged in 1994 (*DIO* 4.2 ¶9 §K6) a new international convention for compact writing of dates. The example there given to illustrate potential confusion was 3/4/2: does it mean March 4, 2002 (US convention) or 3 April 2002 (UK convention) or 2003 April 2 (astronomers’ convention)? We recommended the last as best, because all the digits are *in the same descending order* — the same order that they occupy in the writing of, e.g., the year 2002 itself: leftmost marks the biggest unit, and the further right one reads, the smaller the unit. Our challenge is to find a way of telegraphing to readers that we are definitely using the year-month-day system. Suggestion: separate the numbers with backslashes, so that 2002\04\03 will be universally understood to signify 2002 April 3. *DIO* has been using this convention (for the printing date) on the inside back covers of all issues and reprints since 1998.

<sup>57</sup> See *DIO* 2.3 ¶6 §C and fn 23. (Also here at §K2 item [b].)

<sup>58</sup>§O3 not *DIO* original.

<sup>59</sup>Divorce-Lawyer-Solicitation White-House-SwitchBoard-Jam Day.

<sup>60</sup>See §B1 and §K.

<sup>61</sup>See Redd Foxx at *DIO* 1.2 fn 52 on war: “I backed up so far, I bumped into a general.”



## R Oxymorons

- R1** Political science.  
**R2** Harmless crank.<sup>62</sup>  
**R3** Roman Catholic.<sup>63</sup>  
**R4** Anti-discrimination homosexual.

## S That's why the state bird is the loon [by Keith Pickering]

**S1** The recent election of pro wrassler Jesse Ventura as governor proves again that humor can be an important ingredient in winning elections in Minnesota. Ventura deployed a radio commercial featuring the candidate (in his own unmistakable basso voice) listing his political beliefs. In the middle of a litany praising lower taxes, public education, and the usual mom-and-apple-pie issues, Jesse "The Mind" inserted this item: "I believe that Led Zeppelin and the Rolling Stones are the two greatest rock bands of all time," and then rolled along to the next issue without missing a beat.

**S2** In a similar vein, Ventura ran a 3/4 page ad in the major papers on the Sunday before the election, contrasting his positions and background with those of Republican candidate Norm Coleman, in a list of over 40 items. (E.g., Coleman: pro-life; Ventura: pro-choice.) Amid this mostly serious political apposition was a scattering of loony tunes, ranging from the obvious (Coleman: Lots of hair; Ventura: No hair) to the venomous (Coleman: Professional wrestler of the truth; Ventura: Professional wrestler of other wrestlers).<sup>64</sup>

**S3** Ventura (of billionaire R.Perot's Reform Party) was apparently outspent 10-to-one by Coleman and 7-to-one by Democrat Skip Humphrey,<sup>65</sup> yet was able to cut through the clutter of election-eve ads with a campaign that was the talk of the state. The adman responsible for the campaign was Bill Hillsman, the same guy who masterminded Minnesotan Paul Wellstone's equally quirky campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1990. Wellstone too was a longshot to win, facing a popular incumbent, but squeaked out a narrow victory by not being afraid to come off as a real (and sometimes funny) human being in Hillsman's ads.

**S4** The most important (& underreported) implication of Ventura's win: perhaps public campaign financing can work. The \$300,000 Ventura received from the State of Minnesota financed his media blitz in the last two weeks before the election. Ventura's political philosophy leans leanly toward least-government libertarianism, but it's a safe bet that this is one government handout that won't be touched in the Ventura administration.

---

<sup>62</sup>Deception is not a harmless activity. And cranks all eventually become deceivers — because they have to evade, deny, distort, suppress, and/or ignore the evidence that proves them wrong. (See analogy at *DIO* 4.3 ¶13 §C2.) Moreover, many become vicious towards those persons whom they imagine are all that stand in the way of their pet view's acceptance. (See *DIO* 1.1 ¶1 §C7, *DIO* 7.3 ¶9 fnn 46-47.)

<sup>63</sup>"Catholic" means universal, i.e., non-local. And, oh yes, "catholic" also means: open-minded.

<sup>64</sup>Ventura has now achieved enviable success as actor in three different arenas: wrassling, film, and politics. In a recent Hollywood comedy, he was mock interviewed: Jesse, I've heard wrasslers don't use steroids anymore. Ventura replied: "Nor any less." (Delivered *sotte voce*. For him.)

<sup>65</sup>Ventura thus made a virtue out of a necessity, proudly proclaiming his refusal to take special interest PAC money. As if any had been offered.