
Accuracy-Based Politics:

The Quantum Politics of Human Intelligence and Inhuman Terrorism, and The Mathematics of Social Accuracy

by Neil Robert Miller, imagine9.com
United States
September 9th, 2002

previously entitled - The Darkies Didn't Do It, The Bullies Did It

This Acrobat *.pdf file is located on the world wide web at
<http://imagine9.com/accuracybasedpolitics.pdf>

The *.html version is located at
<http://imagine9.com/hpdm-gr1.htm>

Guide To This Document

1. Title Page *page 1*

2. Project Overview *page 3*

3. Consistency *page 6*

4. Proposal *page 8*

5. Listing of Other Relevant Papers *page 11*

6. Table of Contents for Accuracy Based Politics *page 12*

7. The Paper Itself – Accuracy Based Politics *page 13*

8. Further Relevant Papers *page 92*

9. “Time Line” for Logical Types and Paradigm From California *page 95*

This Project Illuminates Nature's Paradigm Of Human Operations.

It's high level description is as follows:

Nature's System - Consistent Math and Science

- A. Nature, And Basic Human Behavior Within It, Are Geared For Things Working Out Well For All
- B. Protection Flows Mainly Downwards Through The Hierarchies, And Anxiety Flows Mainly Upwards
- C. This Bioecosystem Works On A Singular Reality System, Fully Knowable To Every Human Being

I sometimes call the above three points, "The Three Commandments".

This in direct contrast to the terribly and tragically mistaken general idea that has come to be accepted and enforced throughout all large societies for the past several thousand years, which can be stated as:

Current Society's Mis-System - Smoke and Mirrors


Brand X A. It Is Inevitable Within Nature That Things Must Necessarily Work Out Poorly For Some People, Or Most People, Or All People

Brand X B. Protection Is Supposed To Flow Mainly Upwards In The Hierarchies, and Anxiety Is To Be Projected Downwards

Brand X C. There Is No Real Truth, Or There Are 'Many Truths', Or The Truth Is Unknowable To The Ordinary Mortal

I sometimes refer to the above three "Brand X Paradigm" points as "the child-abuse based" frame of reference.

The first side of my 2001 business card reflects this summary:



While the paradigm presented here, which is nature's paradigm, consists of some 1500 low level points, and some 30 high level elements, I have crystallized the description into just these three points, as I have concluded that these three represent the decisive contrast between the way things are, and the way they are supposed to be.

**'Geared for work out well for all', 'protection mainly downwards and anxiety mainly upwards',
and 'singular reality', all together as a system.**

The entire solution to the ten-thousand-year puzzle, in a nutshell.

The easy answer, the cure-all, the panacea.

**It seems to me that a first question that might arise in the mind of a reader is the
matter of:**

**'If nature and human behavior is geared-for-things-working-out-well-for-all' (which it is),
'and if societies have for so long operated on the work-out-poorly-for-most idea' (which they
have),**

'well then, what went wrong?'

From what I've figured out, when societies went from the scale of 'hundreds of persons', both in the earlier food gathering circumstance, and in the early farming societies that followed, to the scale of 'thousands of persons' and 'tens of thousands of persons' in the middle farming societies beginning some ten thousand years ago, and then to early civilizations, while a mathematics for technology advanced rapidly, the parallel mathematics for societal organization was not developed.

Why that needed societal mathematical system lay dormant, or was repressed, I'll leave aside for the moment, and here will just mention the consequences of that dormancy or repression.

I have crystallized the problems that therein arose into three points:

What Went Wrong - Ten Thousand Years Ago

Brand X A. Denial Of Damage and Pain, and Deliberate Misreport of Understandings

Brand X B. Human Infliction of Pain and Harm As Counterfeit 'Lesson' From 'Above'

Brand X C. Lots of Science For Technology But Zero Science For Society

Putting things right in this regard can also be summarized in just three points, as follows:

Putting It Right All Along and at the Present Time

A. Define Health As The Ability To Be Helpful, and Accurate Reports of Understandings

B. Quarantine In Health And Safety And An End To Punishment

C. The Logical Types System © NRM 1983, Intelligent, Advancing, Curing

I use this as the reverse, or the second leaf on my business card:

NAMING THE SYSTEM	
Current Society's Mis-System Smoke and Mirrors Inevitability Of Work Out Poorly For Some Or Most Or All Protection Flows Mainly Upwards, Anxiety Flows Mainly Downwards Multi-Truth, No Real Truth, Unknowable Truth	The Three Considerations Nature's System Consistent Math and Science Nature and Basic Human Nature Are Geared For Work Out Well For All Protection Flows Mainly Downwards, Anxiety Flows Mainly Upwards This Bioecosystem Works On A Knowable, Singular Reality System
Neil Robert Miller	imagine9.com United States

WHAT WENT WRONG AND WHAT NOW	
What Went Wrong Ten Thousand Years Ago Denial Of Damage and Pain Deliberate Misreport of Understanding: Human Infliction of Pain and Harm As Counterfeit 'Lesson' From 'Above' Lots of Science For Technology But Zero Science For Society	Putting It Right All Along and at the Present Time Define Health As Ability To Be Helpful, Accurate Reports of Understandings Quarantine In Health And Safety And An End To Punishment Logical Types System © NRM 1983 Intelligent, Advancing, Curing
tel 31035 9431 • 15478-4015	Lloyd Neanderthal, Affection and Cognition © 1962-2002

Consistency, Mathematics, and Social Affairs

September 8th, 2003

Truthfinding Via Combing For Consistency

This project has developed a method for looking for consistencies so as to figure out what is true, regarding social and political matters.

The 'Ultimate Inconsistency' Hoax

Up until now, it has been presumed that life itself is inconsistent, so any method that purports to figure out what's true by looking for consistencies, is, a priori, presumed to be unworkable.

People do not evaluate this system to determine if it is accurate and workable.

Rather, they presume that any method that sorts for consistency must, necessarily, be wrong, since people mistakenly think that life itself is necessarily inconsistent. Therefore a system that presumes consistency at the high level, must be wrong.

When Inconsistency Rules, Anti-Nature Horror Rules

Unfortunately, when inconsistency is the rule, then it is inevitable that those who operate on a fundamentally destructive and fundamentally deceitful basis, will rule the roost.

When deception is allowed then a person can invent a harmful situation and easily blame that harm on others. IN fact, this is the method by which bullies everywhere gain and maintain their power.

The Consistency Solution

Such deception and frame-ups become impossible when people confidently calculate via a combing for consistency.

Thus, because inconsistency is indeed, currently, the societal rule, those who rise to the most powerful and influential positions, at all levels of life, local, community, national, and beyond, are those who have learned to operate on the most fundamentally destruction and deceitful basis.

Again, inconsistency enforces deception, and deception leads to the most harmful and manipulative persons being in charge.

Such persons, and all who look to them for guidance, when faced with the possibility that people will be looking for consistency, feel that their whole mode of behavior, their credibility, their sanity, and even their life will be therein threatened.

Political Reaction

Thus, there is, on the part of the most powerful, and all who look to them for guidance, an instinctive reaction to suppress anything and anyone who uses consistency as a basis for figuring out what is true, which also necessarily exposes the "inevitable inconsistency" system as itself, out of tune with nature and basic human behavior, and highly and unnecessarily destructive.

Organized Public Comparison Vs. Private Conversation

In fact though, when, in public, organized conversation, a consistent view is placed next to an inconsistent view, the consistent view will always win out in a Public Audience.

In private conversation of course, there is no constraint on inconsistency, and people are entirely comfortable with the most profoundly absurd and inconsistent lines of conversation.

But in a public, organized conversation, again, when a consistent view and an inconsistent view are placed side by side, the consistent view will always win out in front of a public audience.

It is for this reason that all attempts to apply consistency and this paradigm in private conversation, under current societal circumstances, are always doomed to failure. Only public elucidation will bring forth an intelligent, enlightened, and work-out-well continuation.

In short, as things stand now, manipulative people, especially powerful manipulative people, are extremely threatened by consistent thinking and will withdraw support with anyone who so engages.

Thus no one dares to even attempt it, and as a result, most people presume that there can be no consistency regarding social affairs.

Mathematics To The Rescue

This problem is heavily aggravated by the fact that up until now, there has no math system for combining ideas in any consistent way.

So even those who would want to be consistent, have no way of going about it.

This “mechanical” problem is the one that this paradigm solves.

That is this paradigm/math-system provides a way for people to combine social ideas in a fully consistent manner.

The ability to recognize a factor as a governing system and distinguish that factor from the sort of factor that is merely reacting within that system, is the key to consistently combining social ideas.

The method for doing this is what “Logical Types © nrm 1983” is all about.

And again, the first problem, the reactivity of the powers that be, is handled by public, rather than private elucidation.

Copernicus

Perhaps reference to the most famous example of paradigm change would be useful here.

Nicolas Copernicus, the 1600’s Polish astronomer is the person who first discovered, or at least articulated for Europe, the understanding that the earth and other planets revolve around the sun.

Prior to that time, it was generally believed in Europe, that the earth was stationary, with heavenly bodies revolving around the earth.

Since no one could calculate where the planets were likely to be on the morrow, given a stationary earth, and such predictions were desperately needed for the increasingly common worldwide ship navigation, scientists were madly at work, trying to make some sense out of the planetary orbits, given a stationary earth.

Every theory, no matter how far out, or how complicated or involved, was carefully scrutinized and evaluated, except one.

Only one was outside the realm of what anyone would dare consider.

Copernicus’ idea that the earth was not stationary at all, but a revolving planet like the others, **was the one idea that was absolutely forbidden** from consideration or evaluation.

Everyone had made an a priori decision that the earth was stationary, and anyone who presented anything that contradicted that was, again, a priori, considered to be necessarily wrong.

Of Science and Denial

Similarly here. Inconsistency is considered the absolute gospel regarding social and political affairs, across all fields.

No one even considers inconsistency, because everyone just understands inconsistency to be “just the way things are”.

If someone presents a math system and method that

First, they think, ‘there can be no consistency regarding social and political affairs’. Therefore, any such idea is rejected, without any further consideration.

This idea that “there can be no consistency regarding fundamental issues of life”, is reinforced in the extreme, by the extreme threat felt by those who hold power via deception and harm as protected by the whole “inevitable inconsistency” system.

Thus, I think that one of the things that happens when a person begins to read any of these materials, is that they notice the absolute consistency aspect of it, they feel a sense that consistency is unacceptable among those that have power over them, and they instantly reject – without evaluation – any further awareness.

In sum, people have decisively accepted the tragically mistaken social rule that “unmitigated inconsistency is inevitable”, and reject – again, without evaluation – anything that smacks of consistency, again, regarding fundamental social, moral, ethical, or political affairs.

The Point, Now

"The Logical Types System", is the long fabled 'missing link' so to speak of human operations. It is the mathematics system by which work-out-well-for-all human operations can be accurately and universally sorted out, is in full conformity with the structure of this bioecosystem, and is entirely and easily understandable by any human being.

The single most important, current purpose of this project, is the propagation of "The Logical Types and Logical Levels Mathematical System © Neil Robert Miller 1983".

Since discovering this math system some twenty years ago, the primary focus of this project has been my repeated and ongoing attempts to make it publicly available, *Intact*, and *In Context*.

The present form of the proposal is contained in the Acrobat *.PDF file "[Locketts and Rockets](#)".

I also have a condensed version of that proposal, also in business card size form as follows.

Proposal	LOGICAL TYPES	Three Hour Talk	neil robert miller	LOGICAL LEVELS	neil@imaginene.com san francisco
Context Purpose and Focus I am Neil A System, Not An Anti-System Pearls, Reality, Stages, Heartbeats Coress, Math, Russell, and Arithmetic Diagrams, Connection, The Sky Buckle Type One, Type Two, Type Three	Discovery © nrm 1983 Math and Science Connecting Levels, Not Mixing Them Adaptive Range, Nurture Not Nature Good Intelligence Is A Learned Skill In Consort, In Complement, In Council Childhood Tasks and Personality Comprehensive, Accurate, Useful	Application © nrm 1984 Describing, Calculating and Solving Elements, Connection, System Combination, All Three, Type Two The Schema Definitions Emotions As Elements The Speed of Light ² , Luminosity ² Feelings ² , Tenors, The Number Nine	Conclusion Intact, In Public, All At Once Configuration, Protein, Oxygen Interaction, Hierarchical Flow Unprincipled, Principled, Heartbreak Issues, Conversation, Ideology The Committee, Democrats Yes <i>Dedication: For The Clintons</i>		
http://imaginene.com/schema.html			this.pdf">http://imaginene.com/its>this.pdf		

The Proposal

Thus, the primary current proposal involves a request to anyone in a position to do so, to be of assistance at providing either the infrastructure, or the funding for such infrastructure, so as to arrange the legal, technical, public relations, and web-site and other facilities that would allow for the planned three-hour talk as shown above and in the more detailed "silverloket-col.pdf" file, publicly exposing the Logical Types[©] System within its politically liberal and leftist, work out well for all context.

After all these years

.... the song remains the same . . .

... and, much love to all . . .

---- neil

Forward - October 26, 1995

The Grand Scale

It may seem grandiose to put it this way, but what is being presented here is a paradigm, indeed, a new paradigm.

It doesn't replace an old paradigm, because in this field, the field of why things have gone so badly for so many people these past ten thousand years or so, and what a world-going-well looks like, and how to put things right, world-wide and forever, in this field there is no old paradigm.

There is only what might be called a 'pseudo-paradigm' or 'mis-system', which is currently operative, and a group of "indefinable" "philosophies", vague "ways", and mystical religions for alternatives.

As regards paradigms in this field, Marx came the closest, but he did not understand the low logical level, the human 'attachment system', the 'unconscious', Marxism's long-fabled 'Achilles heel', so to speak.

This "Paradigm from California" is the first strict, scientific paradigm ever to appear in the field of Homo Sapiens Sapiens operations.

And for those encountering it for the first time, of course, it would have to be called 'a proposed paradigm'.

Paradigm Definition - Five Senses Based Mathematics

A paradigm, is a full-scale scientific understanding, with a simple, comprehensive, and accurate high-level description, with medium-level components and processes, and relying on a mass of low-level information, decisive portions of which can be checked via the five senses.

Regarding a paradigm, as the term is used here, decisive elements of it must be *physically* measurable against the ruler of this bioecosystem's singular reality, to the self-evident satisfaction of *the cognitive portion of every*, or almost every human's mind.

In order to qualify as a full-blown paradigm, it must be clear, well-defined, comprehensive, and, most important, thoroughly consistent, up and down the logical levels.

It cannot rely on the belief portion of the mind, but rather, as science, must rely on the alert, rational, fully conscious, five-senses portion, that 30 percent of everyone's mind that sees things in exactly the same way as everyone else; that 30 percent portion that sees things in conformity with this bioecosystem's singular reality.

That's what makes it different from a philosophy, a religion, or a belief system.

One can reach conclusions, and can reach the conclusion, that a particular paradigm is accurate to life, but one cannot "believe in" a paradigm, for that would be a contradiction in terms.

Copernicus, Lavoisier, Darwin, each had a paradigm; Jesus, Buddha, and Moses did not; they had something else, not in the direct pathway of this discussion.

I would remind the reader that science and reason constitutes only about thirty percent of the human thinking process, but, in the current human situation, at this time, that particular 30 percent is the make or break.

A list of "paradigm criteria", drawn up by this author, appears at <http://imagine-nine.com/start/nrm913.pdf>.

Science

I know very little about religions, and even less about philosophy; these are fields I have never seriously pursued and which are only tangential to my discoveries.

I do, however, know a good deal about the human attachment system, about adolescent development, and about psychiatry, in those cases, as a matter of provable/disprovable science.

In those areas, Drs. John Bowlby of the United Kingdom, Salvador Minuchin of Philadelphia, Harry Stack Sullivan of New York, and Paul Watzlawick of California served as intellectual attachment figures for me as I wrote the original paradigm volume.

It should be emphasized that I never knew any of them, and it was through their books, and through their books alone, that I learned what they had discovered.

A more comprehensive list of persons I look to, and pray to, life-long, appears above, as well as in the Attachment Figures slide and in the Bibliographical Text and footnotes.

Another Kind of Time

This has been a thirty year project, a life's work, so to speak, in the old, 19th century sense.

The first ten, 1960's and 70's, were purely research, the middle ten, 1970's and 80's, involved discovery and writing up this work-out-well-all-around paradigm, and the most recent ten years, 1980's and 90's, has involved attempting to disseminate the work intact, while advancing it, and especially, while attempting to protect it from distorted "bleeds" into the reactionary framework.

At the start of the second volume, in 1985, I said to the teenage research team then present, that, 'if we would be able to publicly disseminate this paradigm *intact*, then it was likely that the Soviet Union would actually become a communist society, the third world would develop the most brilliant social organization this world has ever seen, and America, particularly its youth, would solve all the great problems of the world'.

I also said, however, that 'if this paradigm remained hidden, or was "bled" out in little, distorted increments, then the Soviet Union would crumble bringing fascism in its wake, the last of the indigenous third world cultures, along with their rainforests, would be wiped out, and our entire generation of teenagers would be raped into oblivion'.

Although I was highly criticized for talking in such terms, nothing has happened in the last ten years to cause me to revise that judgment.

As best I can tell much the same sort of stakes still hold, but on an even larger scale.

Best Wishes To All

I would like to thank Mr. Bill Gates for arranging a 'market' climate which allowed me access to this computer I'm typing on, including this 'popularized' web/web-site facility, and also Mr. Bill Clinton for arranging a national climate of liberal development which allowed such projects such as this to survive.

And I'd like to thank my father, Dr. Israel Abraham Miller, MD, 1906-1989, whose pioneering efforts in pediatrics laid the groundwork for this paradigm, who was the only sponsor this project ever had, and to whom this site is herein dedicated.

. . . a lotta continua . . .

. and. . . Best wishes to all . . .

. --- neil

Neil Miller imagine9.com
San Francisco
October 26, 1995

Fifteen related papers by this author at - <http://imagine9.com>

[The Grand Unified Theory](#) – Einstein Would Be Pleased - *January 2003*

[Accuracy Based Politics](#) – Raising the Public's IQ by 25 Points - *September 2002*

[Neanderthal and The Locket](#) --- Affection and Mathematics --- *January 2001*

[The Silver Locket](#) --- The Proposal (*Acrobat *.PDF only*)--- *October 2000*

[Beyond the Wave](#) --- The Warm Caress of Deep History --- *November 1996*

[The Magic Sentence](#) --- In Pursuit of a Simple Equation --- *November 1999*

[It's This Or It's Nothing](#) – For The Democrats, and For Everyone - *June 2001*

[Schema](#) --- Science, Medicine, and Social Relations --- *March 1985*

[Flying Blind](#) --- The Politics of American Science --- *May 2000*

[The Sky Buckle](#) --- The Science of American Politics --- *March 2001*

[On Elections 2000](#) --- American Politics --- *November 2000*

[Summary](#) --- Science, Cognition and Frameworks --- *June 1992*

[Bibliography](#) --- 120 Book Reviews --- *1978-1999*

[Autobiography](#) --- Notes on Discovery --- *March 1994*

[American Pearls](#) --- 200 Word Summary --- *July 2000*

Section Titles for Accuracy-Based Politics:

- I. [Purpose](#) - 150 words p. 13
- II. [Election Season Plan](#) - 250 p. 14
- III. [Consistency And Knowing The Truth](#) - 1,000 p. 14
- IV. [A Math System For Self-Evident To All, Social Calculations](#) - 3,000 p. 16
- V. [The Grand Unified Theory: Bringing It Home](#) - 3,000 p. 22
- VI. [Attachment Judgment And Cognition Judgment: Sorting Out Fear And Truth](#) - 1,000 p. 34
- VII. [Hardball Politics](#) - 1,000 p. 36
- VIII. [Grenada - 1983](#) - 1,000 p. 39
- IX. [Of Gangsters And Covert Operations: Why The Bullies Win](#) - 2,000 p. 41
- X. [Franklin Roosevelt, Pearl Harbor, The Pacific Peoples, And Me](#) - 7,000 p.
- XI. [The Bullies, Across All Nations vs. The Rest Us Jerks, Across All Nations](#) - 2,000 p. 58
- XII. [You've Heard Of The One True God? Well, This Is The One True Conspiracy](#) - 2,500 p. 59
- XIII. [Fear Of Exposure Regarding Everyday Life, Is What Stops Everyone From Exposing Fascism Overall](#) - 200 p.64
- XIV. [It's Part Of The Song . . .](#) - 1,000 p. 65
- XV. [What Drives Fascism](#) - 500 p. 66
- XVI. [Robert Redford, Jack Kennedy, Elliot Ness](#) - 10,000 p. 67
- XVII. [A Famous Event, In 1963 . . . And Beyond](#) p. 76
- XVIII. [The Current, Right-Wing/Republican Party/Spy-Propaganda Terror Round Of Gangsters And Covert Actions](#) p. 87

total - 40,000 words

Accuracy-Based Politics:

The Quantum Politics of Human Intelligence and The Mathematics of Social Accuracy

by Neil Robert Miller, imagine9.com
United States
September 9th, 2002

Purpose

The Immediate Purpose Of This Project Is To Solicit Support For The Three-Hour Talk Described Above.

The purpose of this web-site is encourage support for me to elucidate, *publicly, intact, in context, and in a well-protected, organized manner*, a little mathematics system for determining accuracy and helpfulness regarding social matters.

This purpose has remained unchanged since May of 1983, some nineteen years, ten thousand queries, nine election seasons, and half a million words of manuscript ago, when I first proposed it.

"Logical Types © nrm imagine9.com"

The entire math system, officially named "The Paradigm From California Logical Types And Logical Levels Mathematics System For Social Calculations Copyright © 1983 Neil Robert Miller imagine9.com" , or "Logical Types ©nrm" for short, or just 'Logical Types', or simply logical types, as the term is used in the below, can be easily and reasonably explained in just three hours, as in the proposal above.

The Tenth Election Season Since 1983/84

Normal Human Intelligence, Twenty-Five Points Higher Than Present, Is The Only Solution

The public, intact, and in context elucidation of this math system would raise the IQ of the entire American public, that is, would raise the intelligence of the American people, by 25 points overnight.

Deception Becomes Moot

It would furthermore render deception by anyone regarding any social matters impossible.

Not because it would expose persons who are deceptive, but rather, because it would make both accuracy, and how any human mind perceives reality, self-evidently obvious to all.

Self-Evident

An analogy might be, if everyone is familiar with the simple arithmetic system as commonly understood, and if someone lays two same units (I I) down on a table and then puts three more same units (I I I) down on a table, and insists that there are now eight same units (I I I I I I I I) there, when everyone can see that there are five (I I I I I), no one is going to either believe them or disbelieve them. The statement is just greeted with shrugs.

Once "Logical Types ©nrm" is understood, deception rapidly becomes a thing of the past, overnight. It's not that anyone is believed or disbelieved. It's just that the whole issue becomes moot.

Consistency And Knowing The Truth

Absolute Consistency Is How Humans Know What Is True

The human mind learns what is true by checking for consistencies. When we touch a pool of water, we expect our hand to fall through, but when we touch concrete, we expect our hand to rest on the surface.

To Walk Confidently

Having checked for consistency throughout our lives, allows us to confidently walk forward down the street thousands of steps per day, and allows us to know what to expect when we step into a pool of water.

To Think Confidently

Having checked for consistency throughout the ages, allows us to know that simple arithmetic as commonly understood, works, again absolutely consistently.

It conforms to singular reality, and it conforms to the way every person's cognitive mind sees things.

1000-d Intellectual Vision (see "Lucy and Neandertal")

Regarding social matters, of course, we rely, for ninety or ninety-five percent of our understandings, upon information initially gathered by others.

Our brains were designed, through evolution, specifically to cull information from others, in figuring out what is true regarding social matters.

Noticing Consistency And Inconsistency Is Considered Ill Mannered And Feels Extremely Threatening To Most People, Indeed, Feels Even Life Threatening

However, even though we have to check for consistency, that is, accuracy, every minute of every day, just to remain alive while walking down the street, just to sit down on a chair instead of thin air, just to be sure that we are seeing an up staircase rather than a down staircase, if we automatically conduct ourselves in political or social conversation also going by consistency, we are considered, impolite, rude, ill mannered, and emotionally threatening.

This is because, regarding all social and political matters, an acceptance of deception regarding what another person understands to be true, is the iron rule throughout all society.

Obviously, when people are automatically checking for consistency in political and social conversations, as an ordinary, expected social convention, then obviously also, deception automatically evaporates.

Thus, to approach political or social conversations, by routinely noticing consistency, and therefore, routinely noticing accuracy and inaccuracy, also casually and routinely exposes deception, and as such, is experienced by deceptive persons as a threatening blow.

The ironclad rule *against* routine awareness of consistency and inconsistency in political and social conversations, results in people using as a basis for political calculations, massively inaccurate information, resulting in turn, in preposterous political and social conclusions taken as "what everyone knows".

Little wonder that **even though "nature and human nature within it is geared for work out well for all persons"**, as an obvious matter given consistent

conversation over time, still and all, given inconsistency as the heavily enforced rule, even life and death enforced rule of ordinary political and social conversation, **people generally, routinely accept the profoundly absurd notion that "it is inevitable that things will work out poorly for some"**.

All human problems, six billion persons wide, ten billion persons wide, or however many, can be EASILY solved, in health and satisfaction for everyone, no tricks, given social conventions that allowed a checking for consistency in conversation, just as we do all the time, throughout the rest of our lives. However, given a normal, standard, human conversation rule *that disallows* a checking for consistency, human problems could never, never, never be solved, not in ten thousand years.

Intact, In Context, IN PUBLIC

This, obviously, is why "Logical Types © nrm" could never work as a privately known system, since anyone who routinely thinks and talks in terms of consistency, is, in so doing, therefore *automatically* exposing the deception of others, and, of course is therefore considered impolite, rude, ill mannered, and emotionally threatening, and thus, is therein unceremoniously thrown out of any and every social or economic loop in current society.

Only when "Logical Types © nrm" is known **Publicly, To All, *only then*** is inconsistency and therefore deliberate deception, seen as impolite, rude, ill mannered, and indeed, harmful to all.

Deception Makes Consistency Impossible

At any rate, given that, regarding social and political matters, in current society, deception is the rule, it becomes impossible to check for consistency, as people routinely deliberately mis-report their perceptions, so there is no consistency regarding nature's singular reality coming into our minds.

The first-hand information that we gather through our eyes, ears, skin, and so forth is 95% to 99% likely to be

accurate, however, most of the information that we have regarding social and political matters comes in second-hand and third-hand.

If we had a way of checking for consistency, we could cull second- and third-hand information for accuracy, and as such, we would be drawing conclusions based upon accurate information.

However, with no way of checking for consistency, "conclusions" are not based upon how a human mind sees reality in the first place, but conclusions are instead based on wild fantasies, falsely presented as accurately reported information.

The cognitive portion of the human mind was designed to see singular reality, in large part by culling information from hundreds, even thousands of other people's cognitive minds.

But if so much of that information, is not cognitively perceived information at all, but rather, is the result of deliberately misreported renditions of how others see singular reality, then the information we wind up with, the information that we use to draw accurate

conclusions in our own minds, is not accurate to singular reality.

Tragedy

Thus, given all that deception as a basis, people cannot find any main consistencies, and wind up reaching the tragic, and unearthly conclusion that it must be that "nothing is really true", and certainly not in the "same for everyone", "constant for all time" sense.

This is not the case of course, but it would indeed seem to be the case, if one must rely on massive mis-reports of perception as a basis for thinking.

Consistency, Across The Board, As The Basis For Knowing

Once one can easily tell when another person's report of what they understand, conforms to what that other person actually perceives, or doesn't conform to what that other person perceives, then the person can cull only accurate information, they can see consistencies, and then use those consistencies as a basis to form accurate conclusions.

A Math System For Self-Evident To All, Social Calculations

Social Calculations

The real problem though, has been, that there has never been a calculating system for social affairs.

Even when you can get at least some consistent and accurate information regarding social matters, there is no math system for combining that information into consistently accurate conclusions.

"Same Units" Calculating System

There has long been a calculating system for "same units" type calculations, arithmetic, allowing us to figure massively consistently, regarding 'same units'

type calculations, which has allowed us to build huge technological structures.

"Different Types Of Units" Calculating System

But regarding social affairs, we must take into account "different types of things" for making calculations, and arithmetic can't take into account "vastly different types of things".

Arithmetic Works For "Same Units"

We know that we can get absolute accuracy, deriving from absolute consistency, when using "same units", because we have a proved, and self-evidently proved

through all the ages, math system for that, namely simple arithmetic as commonly understood.

Three And Two Is Five Across All Cultures, For All Time

Three same units (I I I) plus two same units (I I) results in five same units (I I I I I). Same for everyone, over all the world, self-evidently proved, and absolutely consistent with both singular reality, and with how everyone's mind sees things.

Some people might think it would take some special powers to calculate, with absolute, one hundred percent likelihood of accuracy, how many same units one would have, if, on the other side of the world, someone put three same units next to two same units, but in fact, any human can do it. In fact, it doesn't take any special powers to accurately make such calculations.

Singular, primary reality is part of the structure of our bioecosystem, through and through, and being able to see that singular reality, and calculate using singular, five-senses reality as the basis, is built into our human abilities.

Again, same for everyone, world-wide, through all time.

For Social Matters, We Can Get Absolute, Self-Evident To All Accuracy, But We Can Not Use Just Arithmetic

But, regarding social matters, people can not now calculate absolute accuracy, even when we do have accurate information to work from, because there is, as yet, no publicly known, self-evidently proved, absolutely consistent system for accurately combining and calculating "vastly different types of things".

Up to now, of course.

Arithmetic will work for combining "same units" things, but arithmetic will Not work for combining "vastly different types of things".

The singular reality basis of our bioecosystem runs through and through, but you need one math system for accurately combining "same units" things, and another math system for accurately combining "different types" of things.

Just An Analogy Or Metaphor

Perhaps a metaphor *and only a distant metaphor, please*, that might help clarify this matter, might be something like 'you need one type of transportation to cross a strip of land, and another type of transportation to cross a strip of water'.

In both cases, you can accomplish exactly the same goal, get safely and successfully from one place to another. You just need a different system for crossing.

Again, it's only a metaphor, which means it doesn't match up in any way beyond the basic idea of 'transport' from one place to another.

I feel compelled to implore the reader to avoid "running" with metaphors. I have to use them sometimes, we all do; sometimes they can be very helpful.

But their value is entirely lost, and worse, if a person mixes up the literal idea with the metaphor or analogy.

Without Being Able To Find Consistency, Deception Rules

At any rate, while we have a commonly known, publicly known, calculating system for getting absolute consistency regarding "same units" types of things, the lack of a commonly known, publicly known calculating system for combining "vastly different types of things" makes consistency regarding social issues impossible, and therefore makes deception easy.

False Low Level Information Yields Bogus High Level Conclusions

Again, the lack of a commonly known system for accurately calculating social matters, leads people to

the tragically inaccurate conclusion that there can be no real truth regarding social matters.

Arithmetic For "Same Units" Calculations;

Logical Types For "Different Types Of Units" Calculations

- In Both Cases, You Reach Self-Evident, Same-For-Everyone Accuracy

It is not the case that there is no real, same for everyone, absolutely consistent truth regarding social and political affairs.

It only seems that way, as long as there is no calculating system for combining "vastly different types of things".

Attempting To Calculate, Without A Calculating System Makes Accurate Conclusions Impossible

Without such a calculating system, people come to the tragically inaccurate conclusion that there is no real, same for everyone, never changing truth regarding social matters, which has the effect of encouraging massive deception, exabberating manyfold the problem of finding accuracy regarding social and political matters.

Both Arithmetic And Logical Types Yield Accurate Conclusions, But In Different Realms

Logical Types ©nrm does for social and political matters, where you're combining "vastly different types of things", what arithmetic does for technical matters, where you're combining "same unit" types of things.

Of Analogies And Metaphors

Perhaps it would be helpful to mention some analogies between logical types and arithmetic.

It must be remembered that, in using an analogy, or metaphor for something, there are two things being compared. One is the idea being described, and the second is the analogy or metaphor for it.

The two things match up in a few places, and don't match up at all in other places.

One uses an analogy, or metaphor, in order to explain something unfamiliar, by showing some comparisons with something that is familiar.

But, of course, it is important to remember that the two things do not match up in all ways; otherwise, the 'analogy' would be just a literal description of the original thing being explained.

The "Equals Sign" In Arithmetic And The "Sky Buckle" In Logical Types

One of the symbols commonly used in arithmetic is the 'equals sign' (=). Without it, there really is no arithmetic. You could say "three plus two", but without the equals sign, it wouldn't really mean anything.

Without the equals sign, the numbers would have no purpose. Three plus two . . . but so what?

Without the equals sign, so what? Pretty soon, the numbers would be floating all over the page, upside down, sideways, it doesn't matter. Without the equals sign, they don't mean anything anyway.

The Sky Buckle

An analogy to arithmetic's equals sign, in logical types, is the sky buckle.

It tells you where you're going, what the overall context is. It limits the factors that have to be taken into account as the calculations move on, and guides you to which factors are "governing" and which factors are "lower level" in any given context.

Without it, like the equals sign in arithmetic, the symbols just wind up floating all over the page, without any meaning.

Thus, the sky buckle in logical types is different from the equals sign in arithmetic, but it is analogous - it tells you where you're going, it guides you regarding the importance of factors, and it limits the calculations.

Furthermore, because the sky buckle, at the highest relevant logical level - "Geared For Work Out Well For Every Person" - is in full conformity with how this bioecosystem works, it keeps all the calculations fully consistent with the singular reality of this bioecosystem, and in full conformity with how the human mind was designed, through evolution, to work.

Again, without the sky buckle, like deleting the equals sign in arithmetic, without it, everything just goes haywire; you never know what's more important and what's less important; what's governing, and what's elements; without it, everything just turns meaningless, inconsistent, and crazy.

A Psychiatric Aside

This, as it turns out, is a big key as to why no one else was able to crack this system.

Given that, for the past few thousand years, it has been considered an ironclad rule of success, that "**it is inevitable that things must necessarily work out poorly for some**", and that, as a matter of science, anyone who realizes that "**inevitability of work out poorly for some**", *bears No relation whatsoever* to how this bioecosystem works, is themselves considered crazy, and pathetic, not to mention "mentally unstable", well, then no one who aspires to societal success first and foremost, could ever get very far regarding solving the great problems of humankind.

Without the "geared for work out well for every person" sky buckle, then eventually, usually sooner rather than later, every attempt at solution to the great human problems, 'cracks up on the rocks', so to speak, goes haywire.

And again, no one who, first and foremost, aspires to success in society *as it stands*, can survive at all, while carrying and working through a scientific, "geared for work out well for all" frame of mind.

Once I realized that "**Nature And Human Behavior Within It Is Geared For Things Working Out Well For Every Person**", and I think I've had it goin' on, as

an "iron nut", so to speak, inside, since I was three years old, well then, as has been said about Einstein's $E=MC^2$, the rest is analogous to simple arithmetic.

Well, actually, there's nothing special about me in that way, as ***every child, without exception***, has that going on in the first place, when they're born. It's universal human nature. And it's supposed to be that way, throughout life; "**geared for work out well for every person**" as a frame of mind, which is in full conformity with nature's system, is what we're all designed for, again, throughout life.

And it's one of the most important reasons why we so desperately have to protect our children, not only when they're young, but as they grow older as well. And not only from being harmed, but perhaps even more important, from being driven to harm others

So I'm just like everyone else, having been born with that 'geared for work out well for all' sky buckle, built in, again, just like everyone else.

The only thing that may be a little different about me is, I never lost it, to this day, and survived, um, well, survived so far, anyway. And I'm 57 years old. And it's not that I couldn't lose it, I'm vulnerable, just like everyone else.

It's just that, even through the most violent century in world history, and a life replete with far more missed opportunities and extreme disappointments than most people could ever survive, for some reason, I haven't lost it, haven't lost that "geared for work out well for every person" sky buckle, which we're all born with. I haven't lost it, so far.

It stays with me; I don't even know why, really; maybe it was the extreme combination of science, and romance, in my mind, an extreme of both, '24/7' as they say, year after year, decade after decade, topped off with leftist politics from an early age . . . but I don't really know why, really . . . it's just what's happened with me.

Returning To The Math Of It

At any rate, if you're trying to figure out human solutions within this bioecosystem, **you don't fool around with the "geared for work out well for every person" sky buckle.** It's nature's law, all nature, indeed, God's law, numero uno, so to speak.

The way we know it's true, is that when it's used, and we sort information using the 'geared for work out well for every person' framework as the high level "ruler" so to speak, and, using that to check for consistencies and inconsistencies in the information that we receive, then, everything combs out with full consistency.

It becomes clear what's accurate and what's not accurate to singular reality, and it also becomes clear, or certainly clearer, just which reports that are coming in from others, are accurate reports of a cognitive mind's perception of reality, and which reports that are coming in from others are inaccurate reports of a cognitive mind's perceptions of reality.

You look for consistencies, just like you did when you found out the difference between concrete and water.

With logical types, you can understand consistencies with ideas, just as you can understand consistencies with the physical objects that everyone is familiar with.

Just A Little Bit Like A Jig-Saw Puzzle

With "Logical Types © nrm", solving social and political problems, getting accurate pictures of reality, is slightly analogous to putting together a large jig-saw puzzle - where all the pieces do indeed fit together consistently, "the more you know, the more you understand", and the big pictures come in very clear, and again, consistent.

Not "Believing", But Rather, Figuring Out

Figuring politics, becomes no longer a question of "believing" or "not believing" other people. With logical types, accuracies and inaccuracies become obvious, easy to check against all other information,

just like the solution to $3 + 2 = 5$ in simple arithmetic as we know it, is obvious, without believing or disbelieving anyone.

Mistaken High Level Framework

When you use a mistaken high level framework, such as "inevitable that things will work out poorly for some", then, because that does **Not** match nature's singular reality, then, you wind up mistakenly thinking that nothing regarding social and political issues is really, in the end, consistent, and therefore, mistakenly thinking that nothing is "really" true. Same for everyone, and constant for all time true.

Accurate High Level Framework

When you use the high level understanding that indeed, does match nature's singular reality, "geared for work out well for every person", then everything combs out, matches up.

Unlike the inaccurate to nature "inevitability of work out poorly for some" framework, where the more you know, the less you understand, with the accurate to nature "geared for out work well for all" framework, again, the more you know, the more you understand.

And unlike esoteric "belief" systems, with "geared for work out well for every person", "Logical Types © nrm", and using singular, five senses reality for guidance, you don't rely on "just believing".

Consistency, Cognition, Universal

You can check for consistency within your own cognitive mind, just like everyone else's cognitive mind. the way you can for $3 + 2 = 5$.

You can check against five senses consistency, in seeing when things do, and do not, match up.

So anyway, that's one analogy between logical types and arithmetic. The geared for work out well for all sky buckle, which tells you where you're going in the overall, which focuses the calculations, and which gives the overall context, is somewhat analogous, and

only analogous of course, to the equals sign in arithmetic.

Them Spooky Dukey Symbols, Gosh, It's So Complicated

Another analogy with arithmetic, is that both systems use symbols.

In arithmetic, there are ten digits, one through 9 and zero. Ten of 'em. Can you imagine keeping all that in mind at once?

361. Can you imagine automatically understanding what that means? Just in a flash? My God! You'd have to be a rocket scientist!

Well, logical types also has symbols, but instead of ten, there are only three. And instead of being called 'digits', they are called 'types'.

In fact, given that logical types has only three symbols, whereas arithmetic has ten, there's a lot less to memorize with the logical types system than there is with arithmetic.

In this sense, and in many others, logical types is actually easier to work with than arithmetic is; it comes more naturally to the human mind.

Placement

Yet another analogy with arithmetic is the matter of placement.

In arithmetic, where a digit is placed matters much. It might seem crazy, but in arithmetic, if a 3 is in the second column from the right, it means 30, but if that same digit is placed in the fifth column from the right, it means 30,000. I know; it seems nuts! But believe it or not, that's how arithmetic works.

Just a teensy little change in placement, changes completely what the digit means.

You'd think you'd have to be an Einstein to keep that in mind. If it's in the third column, it means three-hundred, but if it's in the seventh column, it means three-million.

Everyone's a Curie, or an Einstein, Easy

It's amazing what people can keep in their mind, just automatically. In fact, everyone's an Einstein, in fact, quite a lot smarter than Einstein ever dreamed of.

In logical types, too, placement matters. If something is lower on the page, it means it's an element in a system; if it's higher, it means it's "governing" to that element. Easy. Simple. Nothing to it, so to speak.

Similar, But Different

The placement scheme is different from arithmetic. It's similar, in that there is a placement scheme, but it's different, in that it's a different placement scheme.

Based In Five-Senses Cognition

Yet another thing that's like arithmetic, is that both the arithmetic system and the logical types system are based on five-senses reality.

You don't really have to believe anyone to notice that when two same units are placed next to three same units, you wind up with five same units.

There's no believing involved. Just self-evident, same-for-everyone, in-conformity-with-singular-reality truth. No believing involved. Your internal cognition is what you rely on for that.

Logical types is also based on five-senses reality. Again, no believing involved. It's math. Obvious, simple, easy. You figure things out in your mind.

The Grand Unified Theory: Bringing It Home

God, Limits, and Classical Science

this section appended January 18th, 2003

The Limits Of The Logical Types System

Another aspect of "Logical Types © nrm" that can be compared with arithmetic is the matter of limits.

Zillions

In arithmetic, as regards how high numbers can go, there are essentially no practical limits. Numbers can go into the billions, into the quadrillions, into the skillions, with scores of digits, or even hundreds of digits.

I recently read a book where the author found it useful, and it seemed right to me in that case, to write a number that consisted of three solid lines of digits. Fine. That's arithmetic.

Limits

Not so regarding calculations with logical types.

Logical types is a strictly limited system, bounded in three ways, the three boundaries defining the perimeter of life as we know it.

Time, Space, and Configuration

This paradigm is limited in time, in space, and in configuration.

Limits In Time

As regards time, it works only for life processes from four billion years ago to the near future.

Whether it works to describe what happened prior to four billion years ago, or beyond the near future, that is, beyond the time when the great human-harming-human problems become solved, I don't know, and I don't care either.

I discovered, the particular part of earth's mathematics, that works for solving the current, ten-thousand-year long, human-harming-human problem.

And it can be easily shown that this logical types system does indeed cover things comprehensively, again, from four billion years ago to the near future.

But that's it.

The Hick

Before four billion years ago, and beyond the near future, I don't know if it would work or not, but I doubt it.

Engendering healthy lives for six-billion, or ten-billion or however many persons, everyone, and combing out the currently terribly skewed political patterns of the world, is the be all, and the end all, of this paradigm.

Beyond, that, before or after, well, it's not my department. I don't care.

Call me a hick if you will, 'provincial', or whatever, 'a homebody' perhaps.

But in fact, it is true, that this paradigm is very strictly limited to relevance to solving problems of harm to life.

This is the paradigm of life; It is NOT the paradigm of the beyond, either prior to life, prior to four billion years ago, or what will come after these current terrible problems of harm to life are solved, that is, the near future.

For me, the six billion persons of this planet, living breathing human beings, girls and boys, are, Home. That's what I want, and who I've got, and who've got me.

Healthy, Vital, Life, For Everyone, Life On This Planet, Is The Point

At any rate, this Logical Types System, and this Paradigm From California, is the paradigm of life; it is not the paradigm of the beyond.

Logical Types, and Tenors, and this Paradigm, is what we need to know now.

Solving

Perhaps I should mention that when I use the term 'near future' it is with the presumption that this population will survive, which, I think, are the most likely and useful terms to think within.

And that presumes, that the great problems of harm will indeed be solved in the near future (obviously much higher likelihood given sooner, rather than later, public elucidation of Logical Types © nrm), and presumes that the great problems of life, particularly the "human-harming-human" problems, will be solved with minimal loss of life or other damage, no tricks.

I am certainly aware that the matter of what will come in the future is in the realm of probability, as likelihood, and not inevitability, is, to my knowledge, how this bioecosystem works.

Perhaps it would be well to remember that, for the millions of years of our overall history, the likelihood that our planet and species would survive intact another decade, century, millennium, and far more, was at a constant 99.99+%. That is the environment in which we evolved.

It was not until the obviously, heinously deranged attack on Hiroshima, that confidence in the long-term future was shaken for the first time, over millions of years.

This "destruction of everyone's 'maps' of the long term future", which the nazi bully-boys among the bourgeoisie so gleefully, *deliberately* arrange via toxic wastes, nuclear materials, global warming, deliberately arranged wars, bio-engineering, cultural destruction, and all the rest, is an entirely arrestable difficulty.

Given an intelligent population generally, again, given the 3-hour "Logical Types" "Talk" mentioned at the top of this Home Page, likelihood of correction is, I think, excellent.

At any rate, there is absolutely no question that we could return to 99.99+ percent likelihood of short-term, medium-term, and long-term survival of our planet and our population. Which was the condition under which ourselves, our minds and our hearts, evolved.

It's just a matter of loosening the grip of the tragically child-abused bully-boys among the bourgeoisie, who currently seem to have a stranglehold over finance capital, and the body politique.

So, all that is by way of explaining that this paradigm is limited in time. It works from four billion years ago, the birth of God, out to the near future.

After the "human-harming-human" problems are solved,

and solved forever via some sort of ordinary, garden-variety conversational 'immune-system', so to speak,

instead of the conversational-conventions-death-system which is currently operative,

then, once the great problems of harm to humans are solved, then, presumably, Logical Types will become only a lower level idea in something much bigger that will have to be figured out.

But what's relevant here, is that this paradigm is designed for operations, only from four billion years ago through

the near future, up through the time when the currently damaging problems are solved.

Those are the limits of this paradigm in time.

Limits In Space.

In space too, this paradigm is limited to "from protons to Pluto", as I like to put it.

Everything we need to know, *and certainly all the systems that we need to know about*, all the problems of life, can be combed out from protons, to Pluto.

Perhaps I should mention, that I count the nine planets as part of our planet's bioecosystem, mainly because the sun is so important to our bioecosystem. Thus, the full, top level *system of relevance* in space, is this solar system.

Teeny Teeny, and Huge Huge

So, I know that there are things going on below the size of a proton, and I certainly know that there are things that go on beyond Pluto, beyond this solar system.

The Hubble

And I think it's useful to know about them. I'm a big fan of NASA; I think it's the greatest thing since sliced bread.

The Hubble is a magnificent wonder, as was the Soviet Space Station, and the Mars Rover and all the rest. Double their budget, that's what I say, as long as corporate and military influences can be kept out of course.

But they are, ONLY, useful low level elements, *of low level use* in understanding what we need to know for solving problems of harm. Nuggets of gold, and more, wholly worth the money, but of a lower logical level all the same.

Deep space, and the seriously sub-atomic stuff, do not hold systems of relevance for solving the problems of harm to humans.

Near space, ok, maybe, to some small non-military degree. For right now, that's about it.

Organic chemistry, of course, chemistry, electricity, optics, quantum physics, sure, of course. But that's about it.

Will logical types work, below the size of a proton, or out in deep space? I don't know. And, I, don't, care.

And anyway, I doubt that the logical types system would work at those sizes.

Beyond Pluto, for example, logical types would probably operate as just one, low level element, of many, in some much larger math system. But it doesn't matter.

NOT 'Relativity', But Rather, Rock Solid Consistency and Certainty

I can't help but note that Einstein never liked his theory being called 'relativity', a low-level insult, and an anti-science misnomer if there ever was one, but instead, Einstein named it "The Theory of Invariance".

I myself would call it "The Theory Of The Consistent, Same For Everyone, Invariant Properties Of Physical Space."

In a word, bigger stability and certainty - that's what Einstein knew he had found for all humankind.

From Galileo To Nightingale

While Galileo figured out the constant, invariant properties of motion regarding things we can see everyday,

and Newton figured out the constant, invariant properties of motion regarding invisible forces,

Einstein figured out the constant, invariant properties of physical space itself,

each of them moving up one logical level from what had previously been understood.

No more "relative" than anything else -

Darwin, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of evolution';

Lavoisier and Dalton, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of the elements';

Freud and Bowlby, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of the unconscious';

Mendel, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of individual genetic changes';

Neil, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of human emotion';

Copernicus, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of the solar orbits';

Maxwell, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of electricity';

Piaget, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of cognition';

Marx, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of history';

Nightingale, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of recovery from illness';

Russell and Whitehead, 'the constant, same for everyone, invariant properties of arithmetic'.

They don't call those things "Relativity", although everything within each of those overall ideas, everything within them, are in some relation there too.

There is variation within those ideas, all over the place.

Indeed, needing to figure out how to handle those variations, is the reason why you need to figure out the constants, and invariables - 'the grounding' - in the first place.

If you don't know what something is grounded to, constant, baseline, comprehensive, invariant, clear and

testable properties grounded, you have no way of usefully organizing, whatever you're faced with.

Without some backbone common properties, without knowing what they are, consistently understood, nothing is ever going to fit together.

In fact, the great discovery, Einstein's or anyone else's, the discovery itself,

the great, always fabled, 'golden fleece', as it were, the solid-as-a-rock, same for everyone, basis that is established, for the entire field,

is, "the constant for all time, same for everyone, invariable properties", of the subject at hand, for all the world to lean on, in health, vitality, and cure.

The Bullies Among The Bourgeoisie, As Always, Deliberately Maiming Science, Intelligence, People, And Planet Alike

While Einstein's "Theory Of Invariance" itself, the theory itself (as far as I can tell) is obviously entirely sound, the Name of the theory, "relativity", is nothing but a huge, *anti-scientific* psywar hoax against the intelligence and intellectual self-confidence of the population at large.

The point is, Einstein didn't "pull the rug out from under certainty", far from it.

He discovered a larger, far more stable "rug", so to speak, and nailed it firmly in place.

Just as Darwin disliked and distrusted the term "survival of the fittest", Albert disliked the name "relativity".

'Stability and certainty and same for everyone rock solid consistency and constancy' was what Albert had in mind,

Albert and Mileva, Bringing It Home

In fact, Einstein tried to bring it home, right from the start. And thank you Mileva.

"The Theory of Invariance" as he called it, but his sensibility about what he had actually found, was crudely

disallowed by the war companies who control the world of physics, and of 'education', and the grotesquely Orwellian mass media.

Instead of allowing the theory to be understood by the general public within "the singular reality framework", which in fact IS the scientific framework,

Instead of allowing the theory to be called "The Theory Of Invariance" which was the name Einstein chose, the abused children of the big war corporations, grown-up or otherwise, and their satanic religionist mass media and universities, insisted upon the anti-science, "no real truth", "no solid ground" name, "relativity", which, insultingly to Albert - I presume it made him feel like he was being called a clueless airhead - ***and deliberately confusingly for the rest of us***, describes not the theory itself, but rather, some lower level consequences of it.

Naming it "relativity" (a low level consequence of the theory, primarily operative at hundreds of millions of miles an hour), instead of allowing Einstein to name it "The Theory of Invariance" (which is a description of the theory itself), was a destabilizing, deliberately imbecilizing psywar attack on the general public, bearing no relation to standard scientific nomenclature.

Seeing Things From Above, From Outside Is Helpful

At any rate, as regards the limits of the Logical Types © System - in space, it works from Protons to Pluto; that is the extent of this bioecosystem. For me, that's home, and those are the limits of this paradigm.

I haven't looked very much beyond our bioecosystem, and while I certainly find it useful to grasp a little higher level context for the system we are in, ***the system we are in being this bioecosystem specifically, and all of the six billion persons in it***, I haven't looked very much beyond that. And it's beyond the point.

Planet earth, all of us folks living in it, all the billions of girls and boys, our thousands and millions and billions of years of history, and our larger bioecosystem, our millions of songs and loves and wonders, is the home base of this Logical Types discovery.

"Of people, By people, and For people", to paraphrase how the great President once put it - of, by, and for, all of us, All Life.

Again, life as we know it. As regards this paradigm, that is what counts, and that's as far as it goes.

So. Limited in Time, from four billion years ago to the near future, and limited in Space, from protons to Pluto.

The Limits In Configuration

And, logical types is limited by configuration.

It goes from the smallest detectible wave or a single letter of the alphabet, on up to "geared for work out well for every person".

From chemistry and medicine, including the maths, to humans and communities and nations and regions; from affection, to health, to passion, to freedom, and satisfaction, and all the rest, on up to "Geared For Work Out Well For Every Person", all comprehensively covered by Logical Types.

What about after things are combed out in a work out well for all manner?

After 'geared for work out well for all' is "built-in", as automatics, like an immune system.

And no one pays it much mind any more, because it's solved. After that, what then?

Well, I presume that Logical Types will become a low level pillar of whatever comes next.

A low level support for the much larger understanding, that will have to be developed to handle whatever comes up next, what sort of things we are faced with after the great problems of harm to humans - particularly the problems regarding 'human-harming-humans' - are solved.

And when the great problems of harm to humans are solved, in health and vitality no tricks, six-billion, ten-billion, or however many persons wide, then my job is done.

And then they'll be a new situation. And bigger things still will need to be discovered, for the new situation.

Such is the way of things on this planet, that is, such is the way of things within our committee, "under God", so to speak, God, the committee of "the 30 or so basic forces of physics that make up life", the committee as a whole.

At any rate, as for configuration limits, "The Logical Types System © nrm" as it stands, only goes, again, "from the smallest detectible wave or a single letter of the alphabet, on up to "geared for work out well for every person". And a little more. Those are the limits of this paradigm.

Strict Limits

So unlike arithmetic, which can go on, technically, forever, logical types is strictly limited,

in time, "from four billion years ago to the near future",

in space, "from protons to Pluto",

and in configuration, "from the smallest detectible wave or letter of the alphabet", on up to "geared for work out well for every person."

The Famous "Grand Unified Theory"

It has occurred to me that this matter of limits, may have been the great problem with attempts to develop a "grand unified theory", or, "theory of everything" as it is popularly called.

God, Defined. Let Me Introduce You

After all, there are probably something like, say, 1,000 basic forces in the universe as we know it, and some 100 in the vicinity of this planet.

Probably only about, for example, 30 basic forces of physics -

forces such as Time, Space, Configuration, Attractiveness, Motion, Mathematics, Liaison, Form, Out-Of-The-Blue, Matter, Randomness, Waves, whatever else . . .

- probably only about 30 of them - 'basic forces of physics' - actually jostled together to make up this bioecosystem - that is, the thirty coming together to become God, or the God committee, as I sometimes like to call it,

The bioecosystem itself, and all of us in it, being the physical manifestation, at this logical level, of the combination of the thirty forces, the committee as a whole, God.

the 30 forces that found that they could get along, out of the perhaps 100 in the area, the 30, "rubbing shoulders, bumping hips", so to speak, coming together to make up life and replication, some four billion years ago.

Voila . . . 'The Great Committee in the Sky', the God committee; taken as a whole, God. Four billion years ago, the birth of God.

Those 30 forces taken together as a whole,

again, forces such as Time, Space, Configuration, Attractiveness, Motion, Mathematics, Liaison, Form, Out-Of-The-Blue, Matter, Randomness, Waves, whatever else . . .

is what I understand God, the system that created us all, to be. The overall governing system.

And the committee, the committee of the 30 'basic forces of physics' that operate together to make up this bioecosystem, "The Great Committee In The Sky", operate together in certain patterns, or "rules", as we would put it, or "laws" - laws of physics, laws of biology, or whatever - in a word, "God's Laws". Seems kind of obvious.

The Committee Of The 30 Basic Forces That Make Up Life, Out Of The Hundreds Present

So, of the 30 or so basic forces of physics that make up life as we know it, we can identify perhaps 15 at most.

The basic forces that come to my mind, for example, 10 or 12 of the 'committee members', so to speak, members of "The Great Committee In The Sky" are:

Time, Space, Configuration, Attractiveness, Motion, Mathematics, Liaison, Form, Matter, Randomness, Waves, whatever else . . .

which is probably a good third or half of our little Committee, which, taken together, is itself just one little group of forces, among the thousands of different "types of forces" goin' on out there, and different "groupings of forces" going on out there, in space, in deep space, and beyond space as we know it.

And again, out of perhaps 100 'basic forces of physics' in our area, 30 of them became organized together some four billion years ago, to make up our bioecosystem.

And those 30 'basic forces of physics', that four-billion-year old grouping, which makes up our bioecosystem, taken all together as one, is, I think, what people have long referred to as "God".

I find that terminology convenient as well, and in this context, entirely scientific.

The "Atheism vs. God" Hoax

The explanation here, as far as I can tell, is in absolute conformity with what is known in the formal 'hard' sciences, very much including mathematics, provable or disprovable by standard scientific reasoning, requiring no "just believe" ideas, and relying on ordinary, self-evident, same-for-everyone, five-senses, logic.

The only reason scientists have not generally defined God this way in the past, is because they didn't apply Russell and Whitehead's "class/member" distinction to what they already know of the physical world.

Put the two together,

put together the standard scientific understanding of "basic forces of physics";

put that together with the standard, mathematical "class/member" distinction, and the above explanation is obvious!

The "basic forces of physics" are "the members" of the system, in Russell's terminology,

and "God" is "the class", "the system as a whole."

What's the problem? In full conformity with all formal physics and mathematics as currently known. Self-evident. Obvious. No?

The difference between science and religion has nothing to do with an awareness of God as a reasonable name for the overall system, the "collection of basic forces of physics as a whole".

As regards an awareness of the existence of an overall system, with consistent 'patterns' or 'laws' - it's exactly the same in science and religion.

The difference between science and religion has nothing to do with an awareness of "a collection of forces of physics" which governs this bioecosystem, that collection of forces also known as 'God'.

I think it would have to be seen, that the "high level laws of physics and biology", and "God's laws", are, one in the same. I can't see how anyone could see any difference in that respect.

The Big Difference Between Science And Religion

The difference is that in science, the cognitive, rational, testable, five-senses, alert, critical, intelligent portion of one's brain is used to arrive at conclusions,

and in religion, the entire cognitive portion of the mind is closed down, and one runs on "just believe", a different portion of the mind entirely.

The difference is in how one arrives at their conclusion regarding how that 'top level' force operates,

regardless of whether they call it "a committee of forces of physics as a whole", science, or whether they call it "God", religion.

"The Group Of Basic Forces Of Physics Taken As A Whole That Makes Up This Bioecosystem", and "God" - they're both the same thing.

The difference is in the mental processes used to arrive at conclusions,

whether a person is fundamentally relying on their "Just Believe" judgment, and therefore, whether a person can be led around by the nose by any convincing fakir, ready to "believe" any preposterous, and even deadly, and deadly-for-all, nonsense, which is how religion works,

or reach conclusions via a critical, conscious, reasoned, logical, mathematical, five-senses process - figure it out according to the cognitive, five-senses lights of the rational, human intelligence portion of the human mind - which is how science works.

There is no scientist in the world, **NONE**, who would ever suggest that there are no overall patterns. In fact, science is, **BY DEFINITION**, the investigation and study of those patterns!

Again, the only difference between religion and science, is whether you **Just Believe** things, turning **OFF** your cognitive, five-senses, intelligence, which is the religion method,

or whether you reach conclusions, **At All Logical Levels** via your critical, cognitive, comparative, rational, five-senses, intelligence, which is the scientific method.

That's the fundamental difference.

And again, the entire "atheist vs. God" "debate", is nothing but yet another of the huge, and blatantly anti-intellectual *hoaxes* that riddles Western history.

As Einstein once mentioned, far more literally, and scientifically, than anyone seems to understand, 'I want to know the mind of God'.

In other words, scientists are God investigators; God Himself is under investigation. Scientific investigation. Not in a hostile sense, but in an educational sense.

Scientists investigate the basic forces of physics, and reach conclusions about how those high level patterns work, how God's laws work, and how they work together - the basic laws of physics, and biology, and more,

in a word, god's laws - or God's Laws, same thing,

and scientists do it via the critical, conscious, mathematical, rational, five-senses-based portion of the human mind.

The Apocalyptic "God Hates People" Idea, As The Product Of Unmitigated Child Abuse

Some grown up child of an apocalyptic bully boy might not like it, a Republican, or whoever; 'investigating God' might feel like genuine terror to such a person,

who might well be suffering under a tragic "confusion of logical levels", between an abusive parent (low level), and The Almighty (high level).

An inability to distinguish metaphor, from literal reality; born of the trauma of child abuse.

Because their attachment figures beat them up, or threatened to harm or kill them, *and they never figured out it was wrong*, they wind up thinking that God hates people, and by the way, God's also got this psychiatric thing about privacy - doesn't want anyone to see inside Him.

While that is indeed the way a child-abusing parent would work, it's got *nothing whatsoever* to do with how God works!

God Himself, loves that scientific investigation stuff;

that **Curing, helpful only, life giving, life strengthening** scientific investigation. To the highest logical levels necessary.

That's what He Himself has been doing, via DNA, for three billion years. Now it's done via the neurons of human intelligence. Even more adaptable; even better; as always in our bioecosystem.

God loves it, loves that investigation stuff, of all the forces with which we have to contend, *high and low*. That's what He gave us brains for. Kinda obvious, no?

I mean, in the common vernacular, "that's what God gave us brains for", to figure out how to be helpful;

scientifically put, "that's why human intelligence turned out to be so helpful in the course of evolution", to accurately understand the forces of nature, so as to solve the great problems of harm that we're faced with.

In short,

Religion - "God gave us brains", so we could be increasingly helpful to one another, and all the world around, all, the manifestation of Him;

Science - "The mathematically organized forces that make up this bioecosystem evolved human intelligence", for strengthening the bioecosystem, and all within it.

Getting In Touch With Our Inner Nun

This bioecosystem, over billions of years, evolved mechanisms for strengthening it's world, which necessarily means, strengthening all within it.

We're supposed to be strengthening each other, and the world around. NOT cutting each other 'down to size', so as to grab what they got!

What's unscientific about that? Perfectly normal scientific logic, and reasoning. *Even though* it might happen to match up with what a Catholic nun might think. Even though, it's still science.

But in the science formulation, we can put aside the mercurial 'morality', 'ethics', or whatever, vagueness; that's like the old pre-Einstein 'ether'.

The literal reality, science, is better. Clean, clear, same for everyone.

Einstein put aside the matter of a soupy ether, and identified the structure of physical space itself, the space that held the supposed ether.

Here, we're putting aside vague 'morals', and orwellian 'ethics', and identifying the structure of the bioecosystem itself. In a word, God's laws, or, if you prefer, God's Laws.

I suppose later, you can trace downwards what the 'morals', or 'ethics', of what's likely to work out well in any given context - society, or culture, or circumstance, or whatever. Sure. I suppose. But, then, it's not vague, slippery, orwellian anti-math.

It's crystalline, hard, cold science. Same for everyone, as self-evident to the most alert, critical, five-senses-based cognitive mind of any person.

An ordinary advancement in formal science.

Sure, it will get you blacklisted from every university, publisher, and professional organization in the country, ok, sure; they all work for the bully boys, I got that already,

but, in fact, it is excellent science, *very much by their own standards*, all the same.

In fact, far superior to what they got going now, *by their own standards* of traditional, straight-laced, science.

Anyway, the core meaning of the religion statements, "God gave us brains", "so we could be helpful",

and the core meaning of the science statements, "mathematically arranged DNA operations organized human intelligence", "for strengthening the world around",

seem to me to match up.

I mean, what's the diff? I really don't see no difference.

An Anthropomorphic Convenience

I should mention that I do find it difficult to picture in my mind 'a committee' of 'basic forces of physics', when I try to visualize "The Great Committee In The Sky".

I certainly know of their existence, as a matter of science, but it's hard for me to visualize.

So naturally, sometimes, I mean only sometimes, but still, when thinking metaphorically, I sometimes substitute in, persons from among my principle attachment figures, as shown at the top of the home page and in the bibliography.

It's not religion though, because I know that as a literal matter, that the people I look to, are only wonderful representatives of The Committee, especially godly manifestations, yes, but only manifestations, like you and me, and all the bears, and the birds and the bees, and not the committee itself.

The committee itself are the 30 (or however many) basic forces of physics that make up life, that jostled together four billion years ago.

It's just that things like "time", and "space", and "form", and "waves", and "attractiveness" are sometimes kind of hard to imagine, so, sometimes, for some general purposes, I just more or less elect representatives in my mind, from among my principle attachment figures, to stand for them.

In other words, when I pray to God Almighty, I pray to Malcolm, and Marilyn, and Pete, and Holly, and Joan, and so forth, a more personalized form of "The Great Committee In The Sky", easier to imagine.

Sometimes, for certain metaphoric purposes, I just find it a lot more convenient than trying to talk to 'time', or 'motion', or 'waves', or whatever.

It's a metaphoric convenience.

I presume that that's how scientists of indigenous peoples of 20,000 years ago handled it.

In other words, I presume that that, via evolution, is what we were all designed for. Or maybe close, anyway.

Ancestor Worship, And The Original, Indigenous Gods

Modern westerners may call it "ancestor worship", or some sort of spooky 'spiritualism'.

However for the original peoples who found the memory of, and the look of attachment figures from their history, to be a convenient metaphor for calculating and understanding how the world works,

using a metaphoric verbal and visual idea, this or that attachment figure, to "stand in" as a thinking convenience for the basic forces of physics, was, I presume, just a very useful *metaphor* for understanding "the high level forces and factors" that were scientifically known in literal nature, but were hard to picture specifically.

Using *metaphors* was, and is, part of the process of explaining and sorting out singular reality, that is, part of the process of explaining and sorting out singular-accuracy-based science as we know it.

As long as one clearly knows and maintains THE ABSOLUTE DISTINCTION BETWEEN literal reality, and a metaphoric, partial description of it.

then, the use of metaphors, again, **AS LONG AS THAT DISTINCTION IS CLEARLY MAINTAINED.**

let me repeat that a third time, **AS LONG AS THAT DISTINCTION BETWEEN METAPHORIC 'STAND-IN',**

AND SINGULAR, SAME FOR-EVERYONE, SCIENTIFICALLY KNOWN REALITY, IS CLEARLY MAINTAINED.

then, such metaphors can be an entirely reasonable, and sometimes even a necessary part of a standard, overall, scientific method of explanation.

"Sun God", "light beams", "collections of photon waves".

Or, "Wind Spirit", "air molecules in conformed motion".

And then, after you've got the force identified, you name a particular 'force of physics', or 'force of biology' for someone from history . . . "Euclidian Geometry", "Darwinism", "Lawrencium", and so forth.

You give the "God", the "Spirit", the "force of physics", a name, sometimes for a famous person, just exactly the way we sometimes do in standard science today.

Do you really think that, in the minds of the original indigenous scientists of 20,000 years ago, there was such a big difference between what spooky westerners translate in indigenous stories as "Gods", and "Spirits", and what we understand to be "general forces of physics"?

You think there was a difference? I mean, in the original?

Frankly, were we to learn exactly what they had in mind, I think they'd translate out, exactly the same.

In the original, nothing spooky about it. Just science, as we know it.

And again, in the original (that is, prior to ten thousand years ago), they had, no doubt, well, obviously, a good deal of excellent, high level science as we know it, they no doubt had a good deal of excellent, singular reality, Science.

Science Relies On Cognition, And NOT On Belief,

While Religion Relies On Belief, And NOT On Cognition,

They Are Opposites At Base - But Both Have An Identical Awareness Of The Existence Of God

Anyway, no matter what metaphors you use, the scientific process I describe here, is Not religion, because the basic ideas of science,

that is, some specific sense of the basic forces of physics that make up this biosystem,

are derived from what makes the most logical sense, scientifically speaking, as self-evident to the alert, critical, five-senses, same-for-everyone, cognitive portion of anyone's mind, rather than from some "just believe" base.

And religion is, by definition, a matter of "just believe"; take things "on faith". This bears no relation to the science-based ideas I am presenting here.

A Word On The Numbers That I Use For How Many Basic Forces Of Physics There Are

I suppose it's important to emphasize, that the specific numbers I'm using here (I have no way of counting them) - 30 forces of physics in our system, or 100 in the area, or 1,000 in deep space, or whatever, hopefully obviously, are not meant as literal amounts, but rather are used to give a basic idea of proportion.

There are a specific number of them, and the proportions I use here, are, I think, as reasonable as any, scientifically speaking. But what the exact, or even approximate numbers actually are, I would have no way of knowing.

The numbers I'm using here, establish the framework for understanding what's going on. Another set of numbers, fewer here, or more out there, or whatever, would work just the same, regarding this explanation.

Best I can tell, it's a fully scientific, entirely reasonable framework. The best scientific explanation of the subject of God that I know of; in fact, the only one that I know of, maybe the only one altogether, for all I know.

At any rate, whatever the exact numbers would turn out to be, would change nothing regarding the general explanation given here.

Everything Everything vs. Clear Limits

Anyway, if by "Theory of 'Everything'", they mean the 1,000 or so forces that make up the known universe (let alone the 10,000 in the far beyond), if that's what they mean, "a theory of Everything Everything", why, it's a little silly, and certainly not a very scientific idea.

I mean, we're made up of about 30 forces or so. Of which we can currently identify about 15, again

forces of physics such as Time, Space, Configuration, Attractiveness, Motion, Mathematics, Liaison, Form, Out-Of-The-Blue, Matter, Randomness, Waves, whatever else

...

Those twelve, and maybe another ten or twenty more, are close to the limits of what our bodies are designed to see

and understand. One percent, tops, of what's goin' on out there. Maybe a little bit more than one percent. Maybe. And maybe a lot less.

But, theory of "Everything"? Whaaa . . . ??!!??

You mean the whole 1,000 forces?, including the 900 that don't even exist in our vicinity? And the other 70 that are around and are not included on our particular God Committee?

You want a theory of the whole thousand? Or, including the far beyond, the whole 10,000? Whaaa . . . ??!!???

It seems a little silly to me.

Certainly for this paradigm, the limits are clear.

The Theory Of Everything Everything

This is NOT "The Theory Of Everything Everything" paradigm. That's just silly.

This is, however, "The Theory Of Everything Of Relevance To Solving The Problems Of Harm To Life".

It is 100% that, and it is very very much limited to that.

Now, if that's what's meant by "**The Theory of Everything**",

namely, "**The-Translation-Factor-For-Everything-We-Need-To-Know-To-Solve-The-Problems-Of-Harm-To-Life-As-We-Know-It**",

if that's what's meant by "**The Grand Unified Theory**", then, "**Logical Types © nrm 1983**", and "**Tenors ©**", and this Paradigm, may well comb it out.

Naturally, those who run the industries employing the physicists, who crave, and depend, on sucking white the world's people, will tolerate no such limits, *because if we take the grand unified theory out of deep space, and bring it back to earth, then it becomes obvious that they themselves, the bullies and war-makers of finance capital, and their whole capitalist system, are in fact, the real problem.*

As such, for them, distracting both their captive professionals, and the university population, and the population at large as well, by any means necessary, distracting from the actual, overall solutions in the here and now, is their purpose.

Our Old Friend Albert

Of course, I cannot really say what Einstein himself would have thought, since he's been gone a long time,

but in my opinion, as regards limiting "The Grand Unified Theory", to the forces relevant to solving the great problems of humanity, and of life, well . . .

I think Einstein would love it.

end of January 18th, 2003 appendage

The Return

Similar, But Different

But to return to the subject at hand.

All this is by way of comparing Logical Types to another math system, in this case, showing that logical types is similar to arithmetic, but it's not the same as arithmetic.

Like arithmetic, it's got symbols, placement, purpose, and is based on five-senses reality.

Different symbols, different placement, and different purpose - a sky buckle, instead of an equals sign.

And in comparison with the 'goes on forever' quality of arithmetic, Logical Types is a limited system; limited in time, in place, and in configuration.

In any case they're both just math. It's just that logical types is a little easier than arithmetic, and it comes a little more naturally to people than arithmetic does.

But the big difference of course, is that with arithmetic, you can only combine "same units" things. With logical types, you combine, with the same sort of precision and accuracy, "vastly different types of things".

That's why, you can't rely on arithmetic for accurate calculations for social and political matters, but you can get the same sort of self-evident consistency, certainty, and accuracy as you get with "same units" arithmetic, when you use logical types for social and political matters, combining "different types of things".

So, Politics, Of Course, I Mean, It's Me Talking, So What Do You Expect . . .

Perhaps it would be well to mention something about the political significance of a public, intact, and in context awareness of the "Logical Types ©nrm" system.

Attachment Judgment And Cognition Judgment: Sorting Out Fear And Truth

First, The Work Of The Great Committee In The Sky, God's Work, Evolution

In evolutionary times, built in, over millions of years, all mammals, and in a certain sense, all organisms, had to know certain things, for guidance.

Fear And Safety

In earlier mammals, before humans, one of the main things you had to be aware of, was what to move towards, and what to move away from.

If something made you feel scared, you'd move away from it; if something made you feel secure, you'd move towards it. I call this "the anxiety/security" guidance system. All mammals, including humans, have it.

An analogy, and again, *only an analogy, please!*, an analogy would be, like a magnet. Attracting, or, repelling.

And it is only an analogy, because there's a lot more to it than that.

With human reactions to danger and safety, it is really not so simple as "run away from", or "move towards".

Danger, Results In Us Moving Towards Protection

In fact, when we sense the presence of danger, rather than move away from it, we tend to, first and foremost, move towards protection.

Security, Results In Us Exploring Outwards

And when we are in a secure situation, then we tend to explore outward from base. Very different from simply an attracting and repelling 'magnet'.

Only A Metaphor

I only use the 'magnet' analogy to convey a sense that there are forces that work between us and the world outside us, that are, *analogous to* the force of a magnet.

"Tend to move away from", "tend to move towards", "tend to move outwards"; in life, especially among people, these things operate as a much higher logical level 'system', than

the simple "snap" of a magnet. With life, there's a lot more to it.

Still and all, there's something about that 'magnetic force', some small property of it, that does seem to be a perhaps distant metaphor, for what goes on between a person, and circumstances outside, and what goes on between people generally, and circumstances outside.

Something New

At any rate, in humans, an additional guidance system developed, in addition to the "anxiety/security" guidance system.

In humans, there evolved what we popularly call "brains", that is, human intelligence.

This is another kettle of fish, so to speak, entirely.

Affection, Communication, and Intelligence

In the evolution of humans, over the last three million years, there developed the ability to put together many different "points of view", many different "vantage points", many different ideas and emotions from many different people's experience, to put all that together and see nature's wonders from many different angles all at once.

Our minds evolved to allow us to coordinate information, ideas, feelings, and the like, of all sorts, from many different vantage points.

Remember And Combine

This allowed people to comprehend "systems" for figuring out how to build warmth, controlled fire, how to build shelter, how to fashion clothes, how to ward off large carnivores without having to fight them, how to survive in all sorts of climates and terrains, with just present body structure. And how to remember, and combine, across generations, across hundreds of generations.

Grace, Music, Nutrition

Eventually, how to figure, and remember, by representing the world in artwork, dance, music, and, how to grow

food, how to create (!) food, and all sorts of nutrition, and good health, how to live together, in large, vital, warm, loving groups, among many people. Secure, vital, advancing.

Understanding

"Brains", for understanding reality, far beyond an immediate "what to move towards and what to move away from".

Brains, for creating secure, vital, loving, cooperative lives, for all. Wow.

We, us humans, we have another judgment system, besides just the anxiety/security judgment system that all animals have.

We have, a cognition system. We have, human intelligence.

It's different from the old anxiety/security judgment system. We still have that too. In a big way.

But we have another system entirely, in addition to the anxiety/security judgment system.

Figuring Out What Is True, And What Is Helpful

We have the ability to figure out, to calculate, in our own minds, using our five-senses in combination with singular reality around us, to calculate what is true, singular reality true, far beyond merely what to immediately fear and avoid, and what to immediately want and move towards.

We have the ability to figure out what is true. And figure out, what is helpful, in the overall, and for all, over time.

We have the ability to put together many memories, from many people, and from many places, and from many things, so as to build, astounding vitality, astounding security, and astounding things of wonder.

This is, what I call the "cognition judgment" system.

Each Person Has, Among Other Things, Two Different Judgment Systems In Their Mind

And it is a different judgment system entirely from the "anxiety/security judgment" system.

We were designed, through evolution, to use our cognition system for figuring out what is true.

Very very different, from just knowing what to avoid, or what to move towards.

Attachment Judgment

Without getting into it here, I should mention that I generally refer to our "anxiety/security judgment" system as the "attachment judgment" system.

The reason is, that the way mammals, and especially humans evolved, when we become frightened, we tend to not so much move away from the danger, but rather, towards someone, or something that is, or that appears to be, protective.

This is especially true in young children, as shown, and proved, in exquisite detail by the British theorist John Bowlby in the second volume, "Separation", of his great three volume work, "Attachment and Loss".

Attachment Judgment - Fear

He shows, that the normal, immediate human reaction to the presence of danger, is to "attach" to the most familiar, protective figure available.

Bowlby didn't deal explicitly with cognition. As a matter of psychiatric study, it was not his specialty. But attachment was. Par excellence.

And again, he shows conclusively, certainly to my mind, that the normal human reaction to danger, especially extreme danger, is to move towards a protective figure. This is most obvious in the case of children, but in fact, it is the case, in one way or another, throughout all life.

Attachment Judgment - Security

When we feel securely attached to protective persons, and reasonably secure in that regard, we tend to feel like exploring outward, further and further from our secure base, and in fact, we can become very brave.

When we feel frightened, and especially when we feel terrified, the normal, healthy human reaction, is to 'run', or move, or turn, towards a strongly protective person, or to someone who appears to be strongly protective. In a word, to unthinkingly, attach.

Politics

Although Bowlby never delved into it, *the political implications are absolutely enormous.*

Hardball Politics

Hidden, Harmful Manipulations

The technique of, via hidden "back door" manipulations, creating horrible harm and terror, and then presenting oneself as the 'savior' protective figure, is the number one technique - as a social, as a professional, and as a grand

political matter. It is the number one technique, by which bullies and fascists through all time, manage to achieve their false credibility, and their so very much hated power.

How do they do it?

The "Fight Or Flight" Hoax

As it turns out the "fight or flight" hoax, so infamously portrayed in the world of psychology "teaching" as the normal reaction to fear, is one of the most insidious frauds in all American education.

In fact, "attach to protection", "*or to apparent, fraudulent protection*" is the actual, normal human reaction to terror.

Those Who Destroy, Tend To Be Quick-Witted, "Bang Bang"; Those Who Create, Tend To Be Slow-Witted, "Building", And "Figuring Out", Takes Time"

The right wing knows this so well; as usual, progressives are totally in the blue.

You arrange, via a back door, hidden manipulation, some terrifying event or circumstance, and then present oneself as the great protector, out front. For most of the population, they just attach to whatever, or whoever seems protective under the frightening circumstance; right now, that's all they know.

Pimps, child abusers (including bible thumping child abusers all across "The Bully Belt"), apocalyptics, serial killers, mafiosas, right-wing political consultants, spy strategists, pornographers, political aides, secret agents, paramilitaries, social service administrators, agents provocateurs, broadcasters, publishers, Nazis, and of course, US Republican Party tacticians, are the leading masters of this field.

That's how the British got the drop on Joan, it's why Hitler 'gets the drop on' Weimer, why Dulles gets the drop on Roosevelt, why Hoover gets the drop on Kennedy, why Nixon gets the drop on McGovern, why Pinochet gets the drop on Allende, why Zebrinski gets the drop on Carter; it's how Bailey gets the drop on Clark, how Renquist gets the drop on Clinton, how Bush and Sharon get the drop on those 3,000 ordinary working people at the WTC and Pentagon, and on all the rest of us, and all else, a billion times and more, before, since, throughout all everyday life, everyday, and on up to the highest levels of world power.

That's what them vicious, nazi smirks are all about; that's how they do it.

You arrange, via back door channels, some anxiety-producing circumstance, and then, stepping out front, present oneself as the savior.

It is a technique that is just not open to helpful persons, for obvious reasons.

Frame-Ups

And in fact, again, for obvious reasons, the most helpful persons usually bear the brunt of the loudly proclaimed blame for the terror manipulations.

'Anxiety Judgment' Is 'Attachment Judgment'

At any rate, this matter of a very normal "attaching to protection", or "apparent protection", when faced with terror, is why I refer to the "anxiety/security system" of judgment, as "attachment judgment".

But, But, How Do You Tell, Who's Who, And What's What, Especially In Times of Terror???

Enter, Cognition Judgment

It was in fact the Swiss psychologist, Jean Piaget, through whom I (and Bowlby as well) first thought of specifically identifying what I came to call "the cognition system of judgment", or "cognition judgment", which is an entirely different component of the human judgment system.

I never studied Piaget with the sort of long-term concentrated, attention that I gave to Bowlby's work, in part, because I learned of cognition from a wide variety of sources, certainly not only Piaget.

As a photographer, as a social sciences high school teacher, and as a political theorist myself, how cognitive understandings are arranged, became one of my own specialties throughout my life.

And in fact, as far as I know, this very clear distinction

between "attachment judgment" which we exercise when we're terrified,

and "cognition judgment", which is easiest to bring forth when we feel confident that we have ready access to resilient protection, that is, when we feel generally secure,

that distinction between "attachment judgment", and "cognitive judgment,

is, as I use the terms anyway, my own formulation.

The point is, that what I refer to as "cognition judgment", is where the ability to reason out the singular reality truth regarding the world around us, resides in our mind.

Two Different Judgment Systems, As Components Of Overall Judgment

Thus, among other things, we each have two different sorts of judgment system, in our mind, which together, along with other sorts of processes, make up our overall judgment system.

One is our security/anxiety judgment system, which I prefer to call, our "attachment judgment system", or just "attachment judgment", which informs us of danger and safety, informing us of the presence of danger, and the presence of security.

And two, we have a cognition system, which we use to figure out what is true, and which guides us in figuring out what is helpful in the overall.

Using The Wrong System For Figuring Out

The great problem arises when we use our anxiety/security system to identify what is true, or what is helpful in the overall.

It's a mix-up.

We're supposed to use our attachment judgment, to learn that danger is present, and that security is available. That's what it's for.

But we're not suppose to use our attachment judgment to determine what is true and what is not true. That's Not what it's for.

Humans have a different judgment system, a cognition system for determining what is true.

We were not designed to use the system that was designed for simply knowing that there is danger present, or that there is security present, as though it were a calculating system for knowing what the actual danger is, or figuring out what the solution is, or for what is true, or what is not true.

Using The Right System For The Right Purpose

When there is danger present, we certainly are supposed to pay attention to our "security/anxiety" judgment system, our "attachment judgment", to understand and know that danger is indeed present.

However.

To find out exactly what is dangerous, and to find out how to arrest the danger, and cure the dangerous circumstance, in humans, AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT judgment system is called for.

We were designed to use our attachment judgment to know that danger is present. Yes indeed.

And we were designed to figure out the source of that danger, NOT by using our attachment judgment, but rather, by using our cognition judgment, a different portion of our overall judgment system entirely.

Cognition Judgment, As Different From Attachment Judgment

The problem we face in modern societies, is that people are constantly led to believe the mistaken notion that there is no such thing as "cognition judgment", as different from "attachment judgment", really.

Tragically, it is falsely claimed that, in the end, it all comes down to "who you believe", and "what you believe".

This is not, in any way, how the human mind was designed to work.

But in current society, the major projection of all major institutions, is that knowing, is all about "belief", and "believing".

All this "cognition judgment" talk, it is falsely claimed, is just another "belief" system, or even "belief scam".

Grenada - 1983

An Example From Everyday World Affairs - Grenada, 1983

I remember that the example that we used in the original Paradigm volume, was from the then recent invasion of Grenada, a small Caribbean island nation, in 1983.

In Grenada, near the beach, was a medical school, attended by medical students mostly from The United States. Essentially, it was an American medical school, regarding ambiance, curriculum, and attendees.

The students there had, by all accounts, a more or less idyllic life as they attended medical school, being most welcomed and encouraged by the Grenadans.

Comes the 1983 invasion, and even a cursory glance at the newspapers showed that the US Armed Forces, had initiated the invasion by deliberately bombing the school (not in error, but on target), instantly and traumatically shattering the students' customary security.

Old Glory To The Rescue

The students, of course, dove for cover, in shivering, traumatic terror.

Then they looked up, and, can't you just hear that fife and drum music in the background, then they looked up and saw a troupe of United States Marines, flags waving in the breeze, come storming up the hill.

Well, naturally, the students were immensely relieved to see US troops charging in to save them from this

extremely traumatic attack, and all the media was filled with bubbling, breathless reports of the students, about how wonderful it was to see Old Glory, their savior.

Meanwhile, the comatose media viewers, identified strongly with these clean cut American, would-be doctors, subject to such terrible danger, terror, and trauma, and therein, media viewers "understood" that a storming American presence, invading this little nation, was the greatest thing since sliced bread.

Since absolutely zero reasonable argument could be made for the invasion of this tiny literally defenseless country, which was attempting to organize a cooperative political and economic system, so the media turned to splashing this "Savior of Defenseless Americans, Saving Innocent Kids Who Are Just Trying To Do Good In The World", tweet tweet, saving them from the terrible terror and savagery of the local circumstance, presumably, the crazed, mentally unstable, darky Grenadans.

EVEN THOUGH!!!

Even though in the actual circumstance - it was the Navy who bombed them in the first place - even though the actual circumstance was part of the public news story, STILL AND ALL, because it "felt right" to people to identify with these students, being so totally grateful for seeing The Marines and The Flag come racing up the hill, comatose viewers, just assumed that it was the Army that was the saviors and the Grenadans that were the savages.

Again, EVEN THOUGH they had contrary, hard information as part of the story.

"Saviors Of Innocent American Kids" was the best justification that the Republican Party could find for the invasion.

How Come?

So. How come people fall for it? Even when all the required information for assessing the actual source of the danger, is directly in their face?

See, First They Throw A Rock Through Your Window, Via Vicious Technicians And Mindless Puppets, From Behind Your Back, And Then They Offer Themselves As Your Saviors, Out Front.

See? Get It? Get It? My God, What Does It Take . . .

I Thought I Was Slow Witted, But It Took Me From About The Time I First Heard About It, After The First Tower Was Down, Till Just Before The Second Tower Went Down, To Figure That Out . . . I Mean Cheeezzze . . . What Does It Take . . .

So, back in Grenada in '83, how come the part about the Navy bombing the school in the first place, seems disassociated, but the part about the marines and the flag saving everyone, is associated, and then, what naturally comes to mind, is the (non-existent) local savages creating all this terror, as attested to by the exhausted, and oh so genuine ("up close and personal"), such terribly genuine relief and gratitude, expressed by the Grenada medical students about being saved by that glorious flag? Sigh.

The train of thinking doesn't make any sense, but this is exactly the sort of thinking by which people reach conclusions!

How come?

Well, You Know, Nothing "Really" Makes Sense Anyway. I Mean, They "Learn" This At Harvard!!! I Kid You Not!

Because people are encouraged to think that nothing, "really", in the end, makes sense anyway, people then think that the best you can do is to just "believe", the strongest apparent "ally" around.

People don't even know that they have a cognition system, for figuring out what is true and what is not true, and what is helpful and what is harmful.

Feels Good, Must Be Right; Feels Bad, Must Be Wrong. What Else Is There?

So, naturally, well, the only basic guidance they have, is "if it makes me feel safe, then it must be true and right", and "if it makes me feel scared, then it must be untrue and wrong".

No figuring out, based on cognition and consistency, what is true and what is false, and what is helpful and what is harmful.

No no. No cognition judgment, for political and social matters.

Only "attachment judgment".

"If it scares me, it's wrong", and "if it feels safe, then it must be right". "What else could a person ever go on?" most people seem to figure.

The "Allies" View Of Accuracy, The Darling Of Academia And Media Everywhere

"Are they on my side?" "Oh." "Then it must be true".

"Are they on the other side?" "Oh." "Then it must be false". "What else is there to go on?", most people figure. Only "attachment judgment".

That is the number one judgment system projected by all academia, by all media, by all professional organizations, and by all political consultants and aides.

And, and this is crucially important, And, *by almost all liberal and leftist 'opposition' as well! Can you imagine?!!!*

"In the end, it all comes down to attachment judgment", is the universal, and tragically sociopathic claim. Who you believe, and what you believe. That's all. End of conversation.

The Cure. One Size Fits All

Obviously, the three-hour "Logical Types © nrm" talk mentioned at the top of this home page, is specifically

designed to give people access to their cognition system, to allow them to assess matters, for overall, long term, through and through, consistency and accuracy, and helpfulness.

Of Gangsters And Covert Operations: Why The Bullies Win

The Good 'Ole, 'Rock-Through-The-Window/Demand-Protection-Money' Charade

What all this means politically, is that, the way things are now, with people having no access to their cognition, it works so well for those who think they must live, fundamentally, via harming and deceiving others, to simply arrange, via "back-door" manipulations, a traumatically terrifying operation, get the general public to identify with it, as fellow terror-ees, and then, the most powerful harmful, deceiving manipulators, are presented as the savior.

And, to top it off, they warn darkly, that we must have absolute, secrecy, "to protect you even better"!!!!

Can you believe this?

Of Gangsters And Covert Operations - Exactly The Same Dynamic; Just Different Wording

Hasn't anyone seen this movie? about a zillion times? When I was growing up, they replayed this theme on every gangster show, a thousand times a week. Was I really, the only one who saw it?

Then they called it gangsters; I think now they call it "covert operations" (!!!) I mean, doesn't anyone notice???!!!

Da Plot, And I Don't Even Watch TV, But I Know Everyone's Seen This One

See, first they hire some darky - in the old days it was an unshaven, hunchback, shifty-eyed Italian stevedore type, probably one'a them darky anarchists - they hire 'em, sometimes putting a gun to their head if necessary, to throw a rock through the poor store-keeper's window, and pause just long enough for his sinister, slobbering profile, and them shifty-eyes, to be glimpsed by all, before scampering away.

Den, da next day, a smooth talking "insurance salesman", wid a couple of beefy sidekicks come by, offering 'protection', against the sinister darkies, if you'll just pay some protection money.

I think they, the big spy/propaganda agencies, the Republicans, the media, the academics, are laughing uproariously all the way to the blood bank, at anyone who takes their idiot cover stories seriously.

I think, they're laughing at anyone, who seriously falls for any of it!

That's what I think.

"Believing In", Or Figuring Out

If the members of the general public are relying on a "believing in" regarding true or false, and are relying on a "believing in" regarding helpful or harmful, all based upon "security/anxiety judgment", "attachment judgment", well,

then obviously, the most harmful and deceitful will prevail, every time.

Attachment Judgment Is For Knowing That Danger Is Present;

Cognition Judgment Is For Figuring Out From Where The Danger Actually Comes.

It's A Very Very Very Different Process, And A Very Different System

"Where There's Smoke, There's Fire" - But That Says Absolutely NOTHING About Who The Arsonist Is

If, however, the general public is using their "attachment system" to indeed know that danger is present, yes,

BUT is using their "cognitive judgment", *which is a different judgment system entirely*, to figure out just wherefrom the danger and trauma actually emanates,

and what the pathways to actual good security actually are,

then the harmful, and the deceitful, lose all their harm and deceit power, in a flash.

Frame Ups, Of Joan, Bill, and A Billion Times In Between, Before, And Since. Frame-ups; The Main Stock In Trade Of The Deranged Ones

As long as "attachment judgment" for figuring truth prevails, then the most criminally sociopathic will prevail.

And under that circumstance, the most helpful persons, who, *by definition*, could never pull such manipulations in the first place, then the most helpful persons, will not only be without standing, but will often enough, be framed up for the crimes of the deceitful, harmful ones.

Straightforward, At Last

On the other hand, when cognition judgment, for figuring out accurate from inaccurate, and helpful and harmful, when cognition judgment prevails, then harmful manipulations are automatically, accurately exposed, via

anyone's and everyone's cognitive process, from the first moment of their unfolding, making such operations, so counter-productive to the manipulator's purposes, that they just simply don't take place anymore.

Why The Bullies Win, As Things Now Stand

When "attachment judgment" prevails through a population, then the bullies, the most deceitful and harmful, will prevail, and the most helpful, anti-harming, and intelligent, will be destroyed.

Et Voila. Holocaust. There, Here, Everywhere

The Bullies Dissolve, In The Clear Light Of Day

When "cognition judgment" prevails throughout a population, then the bullies will be exposed so rapidly and automatically, that they will cease to exist as a large-scale force, and the most helpful, anti-harming, and intelligent, will, again as an obvious to all matter, have the most general influence.

'Blueprints', 'Graph Paper', The Structure Of Intelligence, In From The Blue

Thus, the point of the three-hour talk, the point of it is, to give the general population access to their cognitive judgment.

"Logical Types © nrm" presents the 'blueprint' so to speak, the 'graph paper', again so to speak, of the actual structure of human intelligence, and the means by which to employ it to find and identify consistency, accuracy, and helpfulness. Across all social and political matters.

And that "blueprint", that "graph paper", so to speak is "The Logical Types And Logical Levels System Of Social Calculations © 1983 Neil Robert Miller imagine9.com"

The Big "Shock Events" In Politics

In fact, as it turns out, every traumatic shock event in politics for the past century as an example, was the

specific, conscious, planned, operation of the highest level, most powerful bullies in the area.

From The Maine To The WTC

From the battleship Maine, blown up by American spies, presumably using Cuban front men, to the assassination of the Archduke, presumably arranged by the Hungarians using Serbian front men, to the Reichstag fire, obviously arranged by the Nazis using an allegedly communist front-man;

Assassinations

every single shock assassination, Patrice, Jack, Malcolm, Martin, Bobby, Jock, Walter, and the two or three dozen others of the era;

Bombings, Provocations, And Other Disasters

every shock event, Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, and later on, the Hungarian manipulation provoking the Soviet invasion ('56), U2 ('60), Tonkin ('64), the 'Czech Spring' manipulation, again provoking a Soviet invasion ('68), 'Iran Hostage' ('80), KAL007 ('83/'84), Kuwait invasion ('91/'92), the Simpson case ('93/'94), AA800 over the Long Island shore ('96), that Yemen Navy bombing ('00), the WTC/Pentagon mass murders ('01/'02); the 'Anthrax' scare ('01/'02), and whatever the Republicans and their allies, Israeli and otherwise, are going to put forth next, in this run-up to the big '02 elections,

Almost Without Exception

every single one - every big shock event, almost without exception, and perhaps without exception, is specifically planned, arranged, and implemented by the bullies among us, who operate at the highest levels of the biggest spy agencies of the area, which very much includes those very media agencies themselves, who are also ruled at the top, by sociopathic bullies.

The "Autonomous Event" Hoax

Shock events are always presented by the media as "just" this random, "lone", autonomous, event, until proven otherwise, while, in fact, they are fully aware that every

last one of those politically significant, traumatic shock events, are, in fact, the specific, conscious, and deliberate plan of the most powerful spy agencies in the area.

The Simpson Murder

But . . . the Simpson killing? How?

I know very little about the case, having followed it almost not at all at the time. I know less about it than most people do, and I certainly have no special investigative information of any kind.

He Never Woulda Dared

However, just as a theorist, it seems obvious to me that Simpson never would have dared such a thing, essentially, in effect, in broad daylight, that is under what he knew would be under the major, constant, media Klieg lights, if he had not had prior assurances.

'No Real Truth' Is Anti-Cognition, Attachment Judgment Propaganda, Republican Electoral Tactics

The right wing needed to blanket the TV watching public (the electorate) with "no real truth" (which means, directly, no cognition) in the year long run-up to the '94 elections, and I presume that Simpson was assured, that if he'd play his part, and play his cards just right, then the right-wing assured him that he would receive the most powerful legal, media, and juror's community support that the biggest of the big money and spy agency connections could arrange.

Simpson played his part, played his cards right, and indeed, the reactionaries came through, got what they wanted through their media, and paid off Simpson through their powerful spy/provocateur connections throughout the black community.

History And Theory

For me, historically speaking, as a theorist, it just seemed like, and seems like, the most obvious thing in the world.

Deliberately Arranged

Again, every big devastating shock event, almost without exception, and again, perhaps without exception, is specifically planned, arranged, and implemented by the highest level bullies among us, who, operating at the highest levels of the biggest spy agencies of the area, have arranged, and continue to arrange every single one.

Exceptions? Maybe.

I know of no exceptions. How about a hurricane? Or a volcano? Ok. There might be some traumatic, mass events, of a climatological nature, maybe, I Said Maybe, that really are, "just one of those things", so to speak. Maybe.

But the ninety-nine percent of public traumatic events are not autonomous events at all, but are specifically arranged by the bullies of the biggest, most influential spy agencies.

There's an old joke, from my generation (the '60s), which I think I remember seeing in a movie from that period.

"Always . . ."

"Z" I think it was called. It was about the then current, violent and extremely ugly coup de etat in Greece.

At one point in the film, two hunted gentlemen are discussing the source of the coup, and one comments "Always blame the CIA." "Even when you're wrong, you're right."

Meaning of course, that if you peel back the front-men, you'll ALWAYS find as the high level planners and manipulators, the biggest and most vicious spy and propaganda agencies in the world, namely, headed up by the CIA.

What A Great Joke, Chuckle Chuckle . . .

Everyone took it as a great joke, "Always blame the CIA, even when you're wrong, you're right." Ha ha ha.

. . . ha ha . . . ha . . . uh . . .

But for myself, as a political theorist, I didn't take it as a joke, I mean, after I got through chuckling, I realized it's a pretty darn good general rule of thumb.

In the years since, of course, I have come to understand that it's not a good "rule of thumb" at all. It is almost a 100% rule.

Except these days, the manipulations have become so boastfully obvious, that, when one presumes that any traumatic shock event is the result of the planning of the big spy agencies, it's almost hard to be wrong in any way at all.

In Fact, The 95% Default Is, Political Trauma Shocks Are Arranged By The Highest Level Consortium Of Bullies

The fact that the bully-run media plays each event as though the default were, "well, just some weird, lone, autonomous, out-of-the-blue event", "life just must be, just basically evil" (it's so stupid!), the fact that the bully-run media plays each event that way, is obviously the most vicious terror operation of all.

When they played Patrice's assassination as 'darky troubles', *they were specifically arranging Kennedy's assassination;*

when they played the Kennedy assassination as "just some lone, freak thing", *they were specifically, arranging Malcolm's.*

When they played Malcolm's, as a local, Muslim dispute, *they were specifically arranging Martin's;*

when they played that as just some angry cracker's fault, *they were specifically arranging Bobby's.*

They were not accessories after the fact; *they were fully conscious and deliberate planners and implementers of the next one. Murder in the first degree, treason, capital crimes, sociopaths.*

Every Time!

Even though it is reasonable to investigate each specific case, to see if it is among the 95%, or whatever, even though, right from the start, indeed long before the start, *every publisher, every broadcaster, every editor, every*

even slightly alert academic and administrator, every major financier, KNOWS, SPECIFICALLY KNOWS, that every such event is specifically arranged by the largest, and most powerful spy or secret police agencies in the area.

Franklin Roosevelt, Pearl Harbor, The Pacific Peoples, And Me

Pearl Harbor

It's ridiculous to imagine that the Japanese didn't know what happens when you smash down on a giant's toes, and then run behind a tree.

Preposterous to think that, "well, they just didn't know that".

The Japanese/US Bourgeoisie/Military, Across All Nations, Hand In Glove

The Japanese military decided to traumatize the Japanese people with the sort of attack that would instantly put all Japan in terror, and attaching to their own, brave, biggest bullies, the Japanese military.

As a theorist, I'm guessing that Pearl Harbor terrorized and traumatized the Japanese people, far more than it did the Americans.

And, of course, the American military also, desperately desired a big trauma hit, so as to arrange a big war in the Pacific, .

The Oval Office, In This Great, Attachment-Judgment-Based, 'Democracy' Of Ours

Franklin Roosevelt, of course, was also caught in the trap - he very much, and certainly very properly, wanted to join the war against the Nazis in Europe.

Europe Was Roosevelt's Primary Concern

I don't know for sure, one way or the other, but, let's just say, that Franklin was not real keen on engendering an apocalyptic, white man's race war in Asia.

Let's just say, that maybe he was not real keen on an annihilation of The Pacific Peoples.

Roosevelt Neither Wanted Nor Needed A 'Threat Of Exposure' Hoax Hanging Over Him

Let's just say that he was not real wild about the idea of pulling a major, extremely traumatic hoax on the American people, of catastrophic proportions, that would haunt him to his grave, and far beyond.

What's very convenient for liberals generally, is that what they're trying to do, does indeed match up with what people want, in Roosevelt's case, the New Deal, a far fairer economic and social circumstance for ordinary Americans.

This, of course, is in direct contrast to what Republicans and reactionaries want, which is directly contrary to what is in the interest of most people, and really, in the end, contrary to the interest of anyone.

Thus, while the major, big political hoaxes come absolutely naturally to Republicans, necessarily so, as natural as the day is long, it is the sort of thing that, for Roosevelt, was out of character, and to put himself in the position of having that huge "right-wing dagger of exposure" hanging over his head regarding something that

huge, is something that would delight the right-wing, and eventually would massively strengthen them, but is something that he had no need or inclination to subject himself to.

In this case, as can be seen below, his back was to the wall, regarding the fantastic grip that the reactionaries had over the mass media, and therein, over everyone's understanding of politics, particularly world politics.

He Was Acutely Aware Of The Very Powerful, Home Nazis

Roosevelt was quite rightly worried about the US Nazis among the ruling class breathing down his neck, and worried about the future of all the protections for the working people of the United States that he'd built, with The New Deal.

His Own Health, And America's Health

I must presume he was worried about his own health in the moment, and certainly, with Nazism on the triumphant march at the time, he must have had serious concerns about the future health of the American People.

Liberals, In A Reactionary/Attachment-Judgment World

It seems to me that that old American expression, 'caught between the devil, and the deep blue sea', does indeed apply in this case. In an almost archetype way.

If all that was the case, and I think it was, what might his circumstance, as a practical matter, have looked like?

The Big Spy Brokers For Finance Capital, Present Franklin Roosevelt With The Major Offer

Let's say, that the big US spies, the brokers for the bourgeois corporations, and the big banks, backed up by Churchill, offered him a deal;

If Franklin had any doubts, well, this is what I think he was faced with. Finance Capital doesn't mess around. This is the big time.

My Best, Very Educated Guess

I presume that there was Not a literal conversation like this; and I presume that this is Not written in the style of a White House conversation.

Without "Logical Types and Logical Levels © nrm", no one knows how to discuss, in literal terms, the things that matter most; and most political and strategic talk, as a practical matter, is therefore couched in a kind of hidden "attachment" code.

Here, I'm trying to bring out into the open, the main factors that I think the President was actually taking into account, and was actually faced with.

I do think that these were among the major factors, or *were* the major factors, running through Roosevelt's mind, when he made that Pearl Harbor decision. That is, indeed, my very educated guess.

I'm A Theorist, Not An Investigator

Perhaps I should mention, that I have no new low level information, nor any low level information that is not publicly known, of any kind, regarding the Pearl Harbor events. I haven't read anything about it in years, indeed, for the most part, in decades.

I'm not an investigator; I'm a research theorist, which is an entirely different field.

I put together thousands of bits of information, collected in my mind over many decades (see the bibliographies), and comb through and organize it all, for consistency, accuracy, relevance, and helpfulness, especially in the light of more recent events and dynamics.

There is very little low level information in the following account, that is not already well known to most people, and nothing at all at the low level that is not well known to virtually all scholars of the subject.

What I do best, is put together what everyone already knows into the **comprehensive, accurate, relevant, and helpful, "big picture"**, so to speak.

That's my specialty, and this understanding of the matter, as a detailed, historical, clearly spoken, **'big-picture-fitted-together-with-consistency' account**, so far as what I've heard, *is indeed, brand new.*

Proper Attribution For Significant New Pictures

Which means that any discussion of this material must be properly attributed to **imagine-nine.com** - that's all; just those fifteen characters will suffice.

No numerals, all spelled out, from The Beatles, like **John Lennon's 'Imagine'**, and, on The White Album, Ringo's **'Number Nine'**.

If you want to include my name, it's Neil Miller imagine-nine.com, or Neil Robert Miller imagine-nine.com, or just Neil imagine-nine.com. But as long as the web-site stays up, and I have been told that I officially have sole ownership of the domain name, then just, **imagine-nine.com** is fine.

High Level Vacancy Necessitates High Level Deceit

And the .com part is important, as I presume that, if the site ever became well known, then the vacant ones would buy up every variation in the book, as a confusion tactic. After all, what else have they got; if they do that, then obviously, they have nothing, which is why I call them, 'the vacant ones'.

Singular Accuracy, Plus Logical Types, Plus The Sky Buckle, Plus Non-fiction Books - Voila, The Big Picture

At any rate, the low level information is old news; I work with what everyone already knows.

I just fit it together better, that's all.

"A thin little sliver at the top"; one one-millionth of a million people's work, 'the thin little sliver at the top' as I like to call it, 'the big picture', the system of it.

That's the part I know about, the part where my particular skills, shine.

And that's because I use singular reality, logical types, and the sky buckle, *as automatics*, all the time, coupled of course, with the books and journals such as are listed in the bibliography.

And, **singular reality, logical types, and the sky buckle**, is the *only* combination that could ever bring *full consistency, up and down the logical levels*, within this here bioecosystem that we happen to be living in. The *only* one.

With any other combination, attempts at calculation break up into a 'round and 'round, mess of knarled spaghetti, and dissolve into nothingness.

It's like, I've 'cracked the code', in this case, 'the big code in the sky', so to speak, for solving problems of harm to life.

It's like, when I was a little kid, I wanted to have 'x-ray/telescopic' vision, like superman, to be able to see far away, and through walls and stuff. But when I got a little older, it was a little different; what I wanted to see, to understand, was politics. A little different, but maybe, *metaphorically*, similar in some way.

And again, **singular reality, logical types, and the sky buckle** is, *metaphorically*, akin to the "x-ray-vision/telescopic-vision" machine.

The important thing is that, for coming up with fully consistent and likely-to-be-true conclusions, with "Logical Types © 1983 nrm imagine-nine.com" becoming publicly and properly known, Anyone Can Do It.

Another Kind Of Time

Like the work of all the best research theorists - Marx, Darwin, no doubt Joan, had she lived, Lavoisier, Nightingale, Bowlby, H. Clinton if she ever got the room, Einstein, Curie, Malcolm, and the all the rest - theory-oriented research - earth science or social science (in the end, the same thing) - is a process that takes time, and that takes place over time.

It ain't "the frog's quick tongue", it ain't "catchin' the ball", **it ain't nothin' like that**, that's for sure.

For me certainly, except in the most thoroughly obvious, or repetitive cases, such as the WTC/Pentagon attacks, it takes me sometimes years, to put it all together in my mind, especially when working alone, pathetically isolated, and without resources, or even enough sheer nutrition.

Of Stimulation, And Answers

What stimulated me to put this together, was a remark I read somewhere, almost a year ago, of someone saying something like, "well, you know, the WTC/Pentagon attacks were like Pearl Harbor. What can you do? You gotta make war on 'em."

I knew of course, that war is not the answer, but rather, an intact and in-context, fully public exposure, of "Logical Types © nrm", and The Locket, that is, a massive raising of the public's intelligence and intellectual consistency, is indeed the answer.

So, in order to really answer the question, I started to search back, and sort out in my mind, 'just what did happen at Pearl Harbor, anyway?' This account, is the result.

Like the rest of this paper, and this web-site, and this entire project, and my whole life, this account is not really, in the end, about Pearl Harbor, or even about spy/propaganda manipulations.

It's about the crying need for an immediate, well protected, well organized, intact, in context, FULLY PUBLIC exposure of "Logical Types © nrm". That's what it's really all about.

In all events, the reader will have to assess for themselves how much of the general ideas expressed is consistent with what else has been reported regarding the history of the time, and will have to assess for themselves, the general importance of the factors.

Having an absolutely consistent, universal, self-evident to all, mathematical standard, "Logical Types and Logical Levels © nrm" for assessing relative importance of factors, would certainly be very helpful in making such assessments, but in the absence of public exposure of "The Silver Locket", the reader will just have to assess such matters as best they can.

At any rate, this is the way it looks to me.

The Oval Office Circa 1941

There's Franklin Delano Roosevelt, quite rightly, the most widely and deeply loved President of the United States in almost a century, sitting in The Oval Office.

Regarding the New Deal, his motivations, his rhetoric, and his actions, indeed matched up, as they often do for the best of the liberals.

Again, very different from the reactionary approach.

His Focus Is On A Fair Deal For Ordinary People, Which Also Necessarily Means Defeating Fascism In The West

He's focused mainly on Europe, not Asia. Fundamentally, it's the Nazis that he wants to defeat.

His great Presidency focused on a fair deal for ordinary working people, and the whole Nazi idea, in both its European and American incarnations, entailed the destruction, exactly, of every type of protection for ordinary people that he'd fought for and built.

Roosevelt well understood that the Nazis, both at home and in Europe, were out to fundamentally kill the whole New Deal type of society for ordinary people, that he'd struggled for, with it's job, health, income, labor fairness, old age, and other protections, *for all, across the board.*

In Asia though, it was unclear whether the ordinary people of Asia would have a better deal under the European Colonials, or under the more local Japanese Colonials. This was an unsettled question at the time, and at best, it still is.

But it was absolutely clear what happened to ordinary people under the Nazis.

It was also absolutely clear that a Nazi victory in Europe would strengthen enormously the already very powerful right-wing and Nazi forces among the ruling classes here, putting in jeopardy, and perhaps destroying altogether, his very progressive New Deal/Fair Deal for ordinary people.

The darkening clouds of Nazism in Europe, was his primary concern overseas, and regarding its power implications at home.

But The US War Effort Wound Up Being Concentrated In Asia

But in the end, the vast majority of the US war effort, wound up, not in Europe, but in the Pacific region, as the major US invasion of Europe stalled, until just the last few months of the bitter, and devastating, six-year war in Europe.

Not What He Wanted

I don't know that that's what he wanted.

I think it was not.

But given the power politics of the day, the deal, may well have been, what he found that he had to accept.

So

So this is my guess, at this time . . .

There's Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in The Oval Office.

Here he is, ready to hear out the big power brokers from US finance capital.

"Send them in."

Here's the pitch:

The Deal

Mr. President, you want a war against Hitler, in Europe.

Ok. You can have it.

You can get your allied war against the Nazis. Fine.

But, you have to give us Asia, that's the deal.

Churchill has set it all up. He has arranged with the Japanese, through the British/Japanese spy network in Shanghai, for the Japanese Navy to move on Pearl Harbor, which will bring us into Asia, which is what we want.

Everyone's just waiting for the word from you.

Interns

'Mr. President, let's talk turkey.'

'You know Franklin, you aren't the healthiest man in the world; it takes a lotta juice to keep you going . . . the plug can be pulled anytime,

. . . and we all know, that there's some Democrats, and Tom Dewey, with swastikas at the ready, just drooling in the wings.

Sit And Stew

"Pass this up, just sit and stew, and your veep can be taken out with an easy scandal, nothing to it; he hasn't got the backing that you have; he's an easy mark . . .

and in a few years, Hearst, The Times, Ford, and all the rest will see to it that Joe, and Dewey, with splendid 'bi-partisan unity', arm and arm with Hitler, Franco, and Mussolini, are all dancing a Nazi victory dance, all together, in the Rose Garden . . .

" You think it couldn't happen? You really want that?"

Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh, The Viet Minh Is Gonna Win

"Listen, the Japanese can't cut the mustard in Asia; The Japanese know it, we know it, everyone knows it.

. . . the communists, you should see that Eighth Route Army, barefoot, with sticks, even women, keep comin' at 'em, armored columns and all . . . health care, distribution of resources, literacy, equality for women, they got girls

running their villages . . . the reds seem to have what everyone in China wants . . . as things stand now, there's no stoppin' 'em . . .

Let me put it to you straight . . . finance capital's gettin' worried . . . Korea, Indochina, Indonesia . . . it's a whole new world over there . . .

and as it turns out, the Japanese, with that 'Asian nationalism' propaganda, turn out to be creating more revolution than they're stopping . . .

. . . listen Franklin, *the big boys want us in there, and they want it bad* . . .

And Churchill didn't like what happened in Malaysia; not 'atall, not 'atall, a hundred thousand British troops whipped cold, overnight, *by a buncha Ja ___ pu ___* . . . sorry . . . my apologies to Eleanor . . . very very sorry . . . but anyway . . . the Empire's capital is hoppin' mad . . . they're not used to that . . . Churchill's pretty hot for this Pearl Harbor operation;

Of Slit Skirts, School Ties, And The Fabled City Of Shanghai

the Brits got everything set up . . . through their people in Hong Kong and Shanghai . . . back and forth, 'tween Hong Kong and Tokyo . . . liaison spies all over the place, overt and covert, in skirts, in ties . . . the Brits know what they're doin' . . . they've been at it there for centuries . . . everything's ready to go . . .

the Japanese Navy's lower people think they'll be foolin' us, of course, but our counterparts in Japan, the top people, know all about it . . . it's all locked up, tight as a drum all around . . . it'll come off like clockwork, smooth as silk . . .

anyway . . . we'll be shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain; the public likes that, it plays good in the press . . .

Give Us Asia

"Listen; Give us Asia . . . in the end, *the big-money boys in Japan want us there, as much as we want to be there* . . . they're not real thrilled with the idea of communist

revolution jumping the Sea of Japan . . . any more than we are . . .

Interment

'But, what about all the Japanese in America . . . lynch mobs in California . . .'

'No problem . . . we'll take a leaf from your friends in The Soviet Union . . . they moved all their Jews behind the Urals, where the Nazis couldn't touch 'em . . . we'll do the same with the Japanese here . . . the sierras . . . no lynch mobs; they'll be ok . . . all quiet in California . . .'

'Military Secrecy' aka 'Covert Action'

But, what if word gets out, what if the cover's blown? I mean, it might be kind of obvious to some p . . .

Don't be silly . . . you have heard of 'military secrecy', haven't you?

Very very convenient for arranging attacks on the home country.

The Always Convenient 'Mentally Unstable' Rug Puller, Or Worse

Anyone in Japan, or the US, utters a word, well, 'mentally unstable', of course, or taken down, for 'treason', if necessary; easy.

The Allies

Anyway, everyone's pullin' for it. Churchill wants it bad, Stalin wants it, Mao wants it, even the Japanese want it . . . even those communist Jew friends of yours, they'll go for it too . . . like a ton of bricks . . . listen Franklin, we can all be on the same side on this one. How about it?

The only one that don't want it is Hitler, and the Japanese hate his guts, ally or no, and they ain't askin' him . . .

No cracks, no leaks, no problem . . .

The Military Commander

"Anyway, civilians won't be hit at Pearl . . . the Japanese Navy has agreed not to touch the city, they don't want to anyway . . . no civilians . . . just a few ships . . . that's all it's gonna take . . .

It's all arranged, just soldiers . . . the most standard military maneuver in the whole book, a decoy operation . . . just a tenth of a division of soldiers, that's what soldiers are for, isn't it?

There could be hundreds of thousands of soldiers killed in this war . . . this'll be the cheapest battle, with the biggest returns, of the whole war . . .

A few hundred soldiers go down now, heroes, generate the energy for a thousand ships, save a million lives later . . . that's what war's all about, ain't it? . . .

As commander in chief of the Armed Forces, you'd be militarily incompetent to pass this up . . .

Scout's Honor

'Hey, give us The Pacific, and the rim of Asia, and we won't say nothin', we promise, scout's honor . . . ' . . . and, we'll guarantee to keep the home Nazis, shut up, and shut out . . . we'll shut them down and shut them up . . . (. . . *for a while anyway, chuckle chuckle . . .*) '

You get your anti-fascist war, make up for Spain, and all the rest, and we get the Pacific, and the rim of Asia . . . How 'bout it?

The Press, Finance Capital, Crawlin' With Nazis . . . Then, As Now . . .

Mr. President . . . sit and stew, and well, three-quarters of the press is packed with Nazis right now, straining at the bit . . . you know that . . . just lookin' to pull something like this, but *if you pass up this chance, next time, it'll be with a Nazi tilt . . . remember the Reichstag?*

. . . Maybe . . . well, maybe, they'll take out a big building . . . say, . . . in New York City . . . (*Franklin shivers*) . . . they could front it with a red, the press'd go wild, round-

up time . . . call 'em 'mentally unstable', it worked for the Germans . . . at the Reichstag . . .

. . . you think the Nazis here couldn't do it? . . . pullin' strings from Palm Beach, Detroit, even Wall Street, you think they couldn't do it? . . . you think Hearst, and the banks, couldn't pull it off? . . .

. . . ok, maybe they couldn't do it, right now, impossible now, ok . . . that New Deal of yours got everyone too hip, too strong, ok, nobody'd fall for it, now . . . but maybe . . . a little more time passes, say, Moscow falls, well . . . if that happens, well . . . if the Soviets go down, anything could happen . . . you know that . . . then, maybe the Nazis could get away with it, easy . . .

Communists . . . Jews . . . darkys . . . they're an easy mark, everywhere . . . big 'ole 'bulls-eye' painted all over 'em . . . (. . . Franklin shivers some more . . .)

"Listen Franklin, *You think Hearst, and The Times, and Ford, and the Palm Beach crowd, and the banks, can't arrange it? Get real . . . they're strainin' at the bit for it right now . . . pieca cake . . .*"

You can grab it right out of their teeth, one chance, right now . . .

Chutzpah

Take this chance at Pearl, show a little "chutzpa", and you can shut the American fascists up, close 'em down, once and for all, for the duration of this war anyway. Whaddya say?

Hand-Wringing, And Hardball

Sit and stew, and you could lose it all . . . a swastika over America, snap, like that . . . you want that?

Bad Cop

The big boys are droolin' for it, you know that . . . have been since '29, that's why they crashed the market, wasn't it? . . . they figured 'brown shirts', 'militias' in the wake, people get mean, and ugly, like the end of Weimar . . . the Germans pulled it off peachy-keen, the Fords, Hearsts, got

what they wanted over there . . . but here, something went wrong with the plan . . .

Good Cop

. . . maybe that something was you, Franklin . . . maybe you're what saved us from the Nazis, last time around . . . you and your communist friends . . .

Bad Cop

You don't think the fascists would take it now, if they could? In a second? if they got the chance?

You think they couldn't? Are you kidding? The US Nazis in the banks, the newspapers, Palm Beach, they're breathing down your neck all the time . . . we all know that . . .

Good Cop

On the other hand . . . take this chance, and you get the whole country, ***United As One***, in your war against the Nazis . . . no questions asked . . . boom, like that . . .

And Later?

As for later, well . . . whatever will be will be . . .

Wait A Second

I want William O. Douglas, in '44, for insurance . . .

We'll see . . . (. . . *snicker snicker* . . . *snort snort* . . . *hiroshimaharry mumble mumble* . . .)

The Oval Office, In Our Fabled, Attachment-Judgment-Dominated, Anti-Cognitive, Democracy, With Its "Military Secrets" aka "Covert Actions"

Well, anyway, talk about An American President with his back to the wall . . .

The Only Way US Finance Capital And Their Media Would Agree To Joining The War Against Hitler

In that situation, in that overall context, I'm guessing that Roosevelt, picked up the phone, and, in effect, said to his

Japanese counterparts, or via Churchill and his British/Japanese spy liaisons in Shanghai . . . "Ok, ok. We'll clear the north Pacific . . . there'll be an empty highway . . . an open path straight through . . . a thousand miles wide . . .

"Deal us in."

Speaking As A

Political/Historical/Psychiatry/Mathematical Theorist, With Logical Types At My Command

That's what I think happened at Pearl Harbor, or something close.

The Fundamental Difference!

It Must Never Be Forgotten that the fundamental difference between Pearl Harbor and the WTC/Pentagon attacks, was that

Roosevelt, a liberal, 32nd American President, arranged Pearl Harbor, with far-away decoy soldiers, definitively, in an effort **TO DEFEAT THE NAZIS**, and **TO DEFEAT** the forces of horror, and reaction, and racism, and lies, and death, here at home, and world-wide,

in a nation ***that knew nothing but 'attachment judgment'***,

whereas,

Bush, the reactionary, 43rd American President, arranged the WTC/Pentagon attacks, against civilians, in the heart of New York, definitively, **TO PROMOTE THE NAZIS**, and **TO PROMOTE** the forces of horror, and reaction, and racism, and lies, and death, here at home, and world-wide.

in a nation ***that is straining at the bit, to understand things cognitively.***

This Distinction Must Never Be Forgotten!

And, of course, the anti-cognitive press, the "attachment judgment" nazi-dominated current academia and current press, strains in every way it can, TO BLOCK Americans from making that absolute distinction.

The Nazis of the current press, will no doubt wish to use such a story to insist, "see? the liberal did it tooooo . . ."

"Promoting Nazis, Defeating Nazis, why, it's all the same thing . . ." . . . they both deceived to bring about a war . . . ' which, in the context, would be the typical claim of the criminally sociopathic . . .

"let's just disassociate that one **DEFEATED** the Nazis, and the other **IS PROMOTING** them . . ." the filthy Nazis, the vacant ones, will of course, insist, that there is no distinction there . . .

Without "Logical Types © nrm 1983", who could tell what's more important than what . . . ?

An "attachment-judgment-based" population, might even fall for a Nazi-based scam now . . . might even be falling for it now, as they would have, in '42 or '43 . . . had Roosevelt not held the line, and gone out on that limb . . .

Then As Now, It's Democrats, Or It's Nazis, All One Way, Or All The Other, Every Vote Or Non Vote, In All Elections!

*But remember, and this is a point never to be forgotten!!!, Roosevelt, and the Democrats, had the entire communist party, the entire labor movement, and all progressive Americans, absolutely behind them, solid as a rock, and that was big indeed . . . big big big! . . . that's why he had the moxie to force an **Anti-nazi** deal . . . that's from where it came!"*

Without that kind of backing, the deal offered, if any, would have been far worse (a little war over the Philippines, leaving Europe to rot), and he might not even have had the juice, perhaps, even to survive . . .

A little more, broader, deeper, liberal and progressive backing, and he could have cooled down the war in The Pacific, an Eisenhower-type of general, principled, instead of Macarthur, a smarter war, far less casualties, no race-war bulls--t, definitively excluding the possibility for Hiroshima, and Gehlen . . . and he might have been able to get Eisenhower into Europe a little sooner, before the Jews

were completely destroyed, perhaps even arresting most of it, in time;

a little less backing from liberals and progressives, and there might well have been a Nazi takeover here; which millions of Americans, wouldn't have even survived, at all . . .

Had Roosevelt not had *absolutely massive* progressive backing, or had he turned the deal down, well . . .

A Republican Party Swastika over the Rose Garden, and The Red Carpet, for Hitler . . .

That's what I think might have happened.

No Wonder

And it's been almost sixty years since a liberal, Democratic Party had that kind of solid, progressive backing.

No wonder the Nazis are struttin' so tough . . .

And, again, without that kind of solid, progressive backing, had Roosevelt been too scared, and for darn good reason, or had the deal offered been smaller, or had he just sat and stewed . . . ***an "attachment-judgment-based" population*** might well have fallen for a variation on the Reichstag caper, in '42, '43, or '44,

and it certainly would have fallen for a Nazi-based scam, *as it is doing now*, had the Nazis among the US ruling class, and among the media, gotten their way . . .

So What Would I Have Advised

I have to say though, and I have thought about this more than once . . . "What would I, Neil, have advised?" Back there in the autumn of 1941.

Actually, it's a pretty tough question, for me. I mean as a communist, and a Jew, it seems clear, but, as a theorist, and one who knows the consequences of a racial war hoax, on that scale, especially knowing what it cost him in the end, a right-wing dagger, threat of exposure, hanging

over his head . . . it might have cost his confidence, and even his life . . .

Frankly, well, to tell you the truth, *man 'o man, it's the hot seat, in the big time* . . . I don't know that I've ever really quite sorted it all out . . .

I think of Poland, land of my grandmother, and I think of Gold Flower, *nineteen at that moment and struggling mightily against the armored columns of the marauding Japanese Army, on the desperate plains of China* . . .

Sometimes, I wonder if Churchill, and the big spies, wouldn't have had me too, in their back pocket . . .

What *would* I say?

Well, Wait A Second

Well, basically, we'd have to figure if it was the Neil *before* I had Logical Types, and The Locket, before '83, and '00 . . . or *after* I'd gotten Logical Types, and The Locket, after '83, and '00.

I mean, at the time, in the autumn of 1941, I hadn't even been born yet, not for another three years, and if anyone had come up with logical types by then, or anything like that, it no doubt would have been among the Jews of Poland, or thereabouts . . . at that moment, being burned, and burned alive, house to house, by the Einsatzgruppen . . .

Context

So there's two questions; a pre- '83 Neil, without Logical Types, or a post- '00 Neil, who has Logical Types, in The Locket, all ready to go . . .

Definitely two different contexts; two different sets of advice entirely.

Before I had logical types, and certainly before I was certain I could explain it briefly, well, facing the massive, 'attachment-judgment' 'molasses', and facing the onslaught of a withering, right-wing press, attempting to just explain in that circumstance, why we had to fight Hitler, in alliance with the communists, well, it just seems

exhausting to even think about. Maybe it coulda been done, but I imagine myself getting creamed by exhaustion and manipulation.

Sure, Winston, sure, back in the framework of those days, and without Logical Types in any form, I probably woulda said 'let's go for it'.

But as for what happened to The Pacific Peoples, and later, as a consequence of having to keep that hoax hidden, Gehlen, the CIA as we came to know it, and McCarthy, and the decades long Latin America horror, not to mention Vietnam, and all the rest;

well, yes, without Logical Types, *and a way to definitively alert the cognitive mind specifically of the American people*, I probably would have supported the decision.

Sure, but certainly, in the end, as the Pacific devastation became apparent, and as the years and decades past, *I, would, have, hated, the long term consequences*.

I certainly would have eagerly joined the war against the Nazis, would have been massively relieved to have an absolutely solid, uniform public solidarity against the Nazis, overwhelmingly pleased that our nation was a big factor in defeating them, but, I would have been scared to death, how that big, Pearl Harbor scam, was gonna come home to roost.

And come home to roost it did indeed, *with a vengeance*, a million Pacific peoples annihilated, the last of this planet's intact, matrifocal cultures, and at Hiroshima, and Gehlen, and more . . . not to mention Vietn . . . well, I'll leave it at that . . . *All 'snapping back' into everyone's daily life, for decades to come . . . right down to this very day*.

Roosevelt Understood Politics . . . Certainly As Well As Anyone, In Those Days

Perhaps the wisest advice I could have given him, again, without Logical Types at my command, would have been to say,

'Ok Sir. But we're going to have to find a way to get out from under this dagger, find a way to expose it ourselves, publicly, as just a war tactic maybe, try to work it out, publicly, somehow, and very soon . . . '

To which he might have said, 'You know, m'boy? . . . If we tried to do that, they'd cream us, with everything they had, which is plenty. And the worst might come to pass . . . '

To which, I might have been only able to say " . . . gulp . . . "

(As an aside, I might mention that, if the Republican Party and media reaction to Mr. Clinton's decision, in his August '98 deposition, to straighten out a matter that was of exactly zero policy significance to the country, the state, and the people, is taken into account, well, Mr. Roosevelt, if he had answered me as mentioned above, he would have been making the understatement of the century.)

BUT . . . There's More To It . . .

But that's the Neil of years ago. What about the current Neil? The post '00 Neil, with "Logical Types", and The Locket in hand?

Now that's another kettle of fish entirely.

Can we, metaphorically overlay my current circumstance, with Logical Types in hand, onto that 1941 circumstance . . .

Well, if so, in that case, maybe, if I'd had the moxie, *which of course means, if I had the backing and the protection to get that close to him, which I don't now*, but if I did then,

I woulda said to the liberal, Democratic Party President: **Franklin, Give Me Three Hours! We can beat this thing**

...

Let me talk it out, to you, to Eleanor, I Can Be Reasoned With!, We can smooth it out, it'll work, for Everyone . . .!

. . . cognition judgment, high intelligence, for everyone, across the board, **we can work it out** . . . For the American people, for the Japanese people, for the

Germans, the British, the Russians, the Chinese, everywhere . . .

As even Churchill himself once said, not war war, but, jaw jaw . . .

...

. . . well, all that's sixty years ago . . . it seems so far away . . . although, like so much of history for me, going all the way back to Joan . . . and even Lucy . . . sometimes, it also seems, 'right now' . . . kinda . . . 'seeing double' . . . or something . . .

The Point Here

Well, I didn't mean to go off about the Pearl Harbor circumstance so much; it's not the real point here; I got a little 'carried away' with it . . . WWII has always been something of keen historical interest for me . . .

I was born in '44, in mid-November, the gas chambers at Auschwitz reached their all-time peak the very day I was born, packed with Hungarian Jews, land of my father's father . . . the whole thing gets a little rough sometimes . . . since I was a child, I always wondered if I was that little boy, in the famous photograph, with his hands up, in Warsaw, reincarnated in Brooklyn shortly thereafter . . . it always haunted me a little . . . I mean as a metaphor, of course . . . let's not get carried away . . .

. . . but anyway, somehow, ever since I was a small child, I had this sense that I was supposed to do something about it, that, somehow, or in some way, I had more room than they did, and I was supposed to use it . . . or something or other . . . like, the boxcar door at Auschwitz swung open, and that little boy saw what lay ahead, and demanded, inside . . . 'someone better deal with this . . . !' . . . not as a Jew, But, Because, It, Was, Wrong . . . the wrongest thing there could ever be in this world! . . . occurring to me again and again, the whole time I was growing up . . . I don't even know why . . .

. . . I had that same sense in the wake of the '73 Chilean coup . . . that sense was heavily renewed . . . like, I was the 'shadow on the wall', in the Kissenger/Pinochet/Nixon

torture chambers of Chile . . . the last thought, out of the corner of her eye, that that girl saw, before succumbing . . . it gripped me so hard at the time . . . and it's never left me . . . I don't even know why . . . I was all alone, and I'd never even met anyone from South America, then, and to this day . . .

Maybe it's because I'm an American, and maybe, just maybe, it's because, I'm Jewish . . .

Tradition

I can't help but mention, that when I was a small boy, my father explained to me the story of Abraham. The way my father told it, God boomed down an order for Abraham to kill his young son, but Abraham brought a sheep along, put the child aside, and killed the sheep instead.

According to my dad, Abraham 'fooled' God, hoping he wouldn't notice. But this is God. He noticed.

And for this reason, **because Abraham would not strike a child, because Abraham would not kill a human being!, no matter what some booming voice told him, because Abraham knew right, child safety, from wrong, killing, because Abraham knew right from wrong, knew health from harm, and knew it God or no God!, for this reason, and for this reason alone, God knew he could be trusted, as Patriarch of the chosen people.**

I've since heard it said that it has been written that Abraham said 'yeah boss', and was about to do it, when God relented. Since Abraham would follow an order to kill the child, then that meant that God could trust him. Think about it. What would make you so special, so as to be made a patriarch, about a willingness to kill a child, on orders from above.

Why would God make you a patriarch, **for that??!!**

I could see that Al Capone would, or Charles Manson would, or Adolph Hitler would, but God??!! What??!! I thinks someone's seriously confused here.

It makes no sense! No no!

Because Abraham knew, brains, intelligence, **because Abraham knew!, never strike a child, do not kill, no matter what some booming voice, fakir voice, or any other kind of voice told him, then and only then, God knew, he was to be trusted. An intelligent, caring human being, not a mindless murdering sheep himself.**

The way I was taught it, that's exactly why the Nazis hate us so much. Because we don't, just, follow, orders, because we solve with our brains, not with killing, because we solve with exposure and with skills, and **Not** with murder or harm.

And the right-wing '**fear of exposure of harm-doing**' is exactly what scares them the most, deep down. **That's why they hate us so much, but that very intelligence, health, Not harm, overall, that's what makes us Jews.**

In the end, that's what God meant by 'the chosen people' - know, to solve harm, **And**, know, not to kill, **across all cultures and religions, everywhere.**

Not what hat they wear, but what's inside, intelligent, helpful to all, human beings! In the end, that's what makes us Jews!

Family

In parts of Poland, the nazis sent out not soldiers, but untrained, middle-aged recruits, accountants and the like, with light uniforms, and simple firearms, to stroll through the Jewish towns, torturing and murdering everyone in sight and everyone who could be hunted down, presumably including my grandmother's family, with never a worry about a shot being fired in return.

Imposters

The problem is, that those who became the State of Israel, had a bright idea. Ding. Gee, maybe our big mistake was, we weren't like them. We didn't kill.

If only we'd been killers too, then we wouldn'ta got Holocausted.

Given the sheer stupidity of this 'formulation', it's certainly not very Jewish, but it is what passes for deep intelligence among the leading lights of the Israeli State.

Was it, that we're to solve the problem, Jewish style, from an overall look at things, solve the problem all around, for all, with, high level, intelligence? Advanced, progress, health, all around?

Oh no. Don't be silly. To them, 'never again' means that if you keep killing off someone else, then it will never happen to you.

Apparently, all we have to do is become killers, and then we'll be winners too, like the Nazis.

From what I understand, this is apparently what passes for divine guidance in The State of Israel.

The problem is, then they're not Jews anymore; then they're Nazis, and, in case their mamma forgot to tell them, there's a difference.

The booming voice, the yarmulke, the gene, means nothing, nothing at all. Nothing! None of that makes you of the tribe of Abraham; None of that is in the soul.

The Real McCoy

Martin King, or Mahatma Gandhi, or the people of Palestine for that matter, have more Jew in their little finger, than there is in the entire leadership of the State of Israel!

And please don't shoot.

Ohmygosh

My gosh! How did I go off on all that? Lessee . . . Oh yeah, World War II, oh yeah, Pearl Harbor . . . Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt . . .

Czechoslovakia

So anyway . . . well . . . there's just soooo much more to be said about World War Two besides Pearl Harbor. . . Spain, Normandy, Leningrad, Polynesia, Munich, Finland, Treblinka, Italy, Odessa, Czechoslovakia, Okinawa, Norway, Serbia . . . *and, China!* . . . *in those days, the hope of the whole world* . . . not to mention those hundreds of thousands of rock solid kids from West Virginia, and everywhere, hitting the beaches . . . there's just so much more to be said . . .

. . . Pearl Harbor was just a teeny tiny little piece of a ten year world war, costing some hundred million lives . . .

The Point Here

But the reason I wanted to mention Pearl Harbor in the context of this discussion regarding the absolute, crying need for Logical Types © nrm to be publicly exposed,

the point here, is to show that Pearl Harbor was not an attack by the Japanese people against the American people. That's ridiculous.

Pearl Harbor was an attack, by Japanese and US finance capital, and their militaries, hand in glove, HAND IN GLOVE, against the Japanese and American people, us poor jerks, down here in the street.

It wasn't some 'out of the blue', 'the darkys are comin' to get us' type of situation. That's not what it was.

And Franklin was shouldering his way through the Nazi sharks, maybe as best he could . . . and maybe getting us all the best deal he could, under the circumstances . . . the best deal to be had, under the circumstances . . .

The Bullies, Across All Nations, Cultures, Classes, and Families,

vs.

The Rest Of Us Jerks, Across All Nations, Cultures, Classes, and Families

At The Top, They All Knew, All In It Together

But the point here is, Wall Street, Tokyo, Washington, Yokohama, Palm Beach, London, the people at the top, knew all about it, and HAND IN GLOVE, specifically arranged it, THE JAPANESE AND AMERICAN AND BRITISH BOURGEOISE, TOGETHER, AS ONE, and then followed by their famous media aftermaths, and the obviously planned continuations, the million-person size bloodbaths.

WWI, Replayed

Forcing the two peoples into a mass murdering war against each other, and against the millions of Pacific Peoples in "no man's land", *that neither people would, ever ever ever in a million years have wanted.*

Like all wars, We, The People, *the Japanese people and the American people as One*, were manipulated and forced into it, forced into killing, even mass killing each other, forced into it by the bullies at the top, ACROSS ALL NATIONAL, RELIGIOUS, GENDER, CULTURAL, LANGUAGE, AND EVEN CLASS LINES, against the rest of us, the whole world over.

That's how they do it. That's how it's done.

Ireland

Whether it's the British bullies DIRECTLY employing all sides in the IRA/Provisionals shadow play,

China

or the British bullies also, DIRECTLY owning and employing "The Green Gang", to, under the 'gangster guise', terrorize the cities of China, that is, the communists specifically, in the face of communist revolution,

Palestine

or the Israeli bullies directly creating and employing Hamas and Sharon bin Ladle, or whatever the idiot's name is,

WTC/Pentagon

or the American bullies, in turn employing the Israeli bullies and their services, for the WTC/Pentagon operation,

Street Gangs And Paramilitaries

or the American bullies, again, employing all sides of gang warfare, whether in old Chicago, or in Latin America, or Los Angeles, or anywhere else,

Yugoslavia

or the Germany bullies DIRECTLY employing ALL Yugoslav paramilitaries, "Croats", "Serbs", "Bosnians", or whatever, as ONE ARMY, against the Yugoslav people, again, Croats, Serbs, Bosnians, as one nation of targets,

Always

The big, political, traumatic terror events are ALWAYS the work of the consortium of high level bullies at the pinnacle of the big spy and propaganda operations.

I don't think that there are any exceptions.

You've Heard Of The One True God? **Well, This Is The One True Conspiracy**

Oh Yeah, Conspiracy Theories, Let's Check This Out

So, what do we make of this idea of "conspiracy"?

It astounds me that anyone gets away with this stuff.

Political Science, For The Rubes

When I was a little boy, in those days, everyone talked as if all of world politics was all about secret treaties, hidden alliances between nations, or royal families, all these big conspiracies of secret international deals.

WWI Wasn't About Killing Off The Entire European Working Class, To Thwart An Otherwise Certain Communist Revolution. Oh No! Don't Be Silly!

If you tried to talk about WWI for example, "secret treaties" was the standard establishment view. All these big-nation conspiracies, and royal family conspiracies, with their secret treaties, and secret protocols. That's what caused WWI, they always falsely claimed.

But, See? It's Really All About Race

Then, the standard establishment view turned into race. You see, there is just this "deep-rooted" drive, genetically ordained, indeed God ordained, towards race rivalry, leading inevitably to race conspiracy.

It's really all about tribe against tribe, black against white, even gene against gene. All these racial and cultural

conspiracies. Again, this is THE STANDARD ESTABLISHMENT VIEW!

Wait Wait! No No! It's Religion, That's It!

Oh no, of course, excuse me, it's really all about religious rivalries. Religious conspiracy. Yeah, that's it.

Imbecilizing Vs. Teaching

I'm telling you; this is what they actually "teach" in the Ivy Leagues, and in all the mass media.

The New York Times, [expletives deleted - nm] that they are, just loves all that racial, religious, tribal, gender, national, even class conspiracy "theorizing", just loves it all to pieces. As far as they're concerned, it's the only game in town. The truly sophisticated view.

It's all about "Alliances" they claim; racial, nation, class, gender, cultural, tribal, even our genes are out to get us, whatever, for them, 'alliances', aka conspiracies, well, it's the only game in town, as far as they, THE STANDARD ESTABLISHMENT is concerned.

However!

However.

Should you mention, well "ya know, maybe all those who have a **"work out poorly for some", "steal from the poor and give to the rich", "no real truth anyway"**, frame of

reference, the bullies, maybe they work together sometim .

..

"What!!!" . . .

Shocked! I Am SHOCKED!!! That You Would Ever Suggest . . . !!!

Should you happen to mention the big spy agency administered, right-wing conspiracy, Instantly, and I do mean INSTANTLY, they are Shocked, I mean SHOCKED!! that you should ever suggest such a thing!

Why, believing in all these conspiracy theories, why, you must be a paranoid, maybe naive, but probably, in any case, mentally unstable.

Why, there are no conspiracies! Ha ha. How naive and misguided of you to even suggest such a thing.

There is no right-wing conspiracy, because to even talk in terms of conspiracies shows that you are psychiatrically unstable.

Ok. Fine. No Conspiracies.

Ok, ok. Gee, I wouldn't want to lose my job . . . fine . . . There are no conspiracies. Fine. So, what is the problem out there?

Well Then . . .

Oh, that's easy. You see, it's a big religious conspiracy, and a secret treaty conspiracy, and a national conspiracy, and a tribal conspiracy, and a gender conspiracy, and a class conspiracy (see how hip I am?), and there's a big darky conspiracy, the Japanese, or the African Americans, or it's the Jews, or, it's the Arabs, or, the mafia, that's it, or some such . . .

Every type of conspiracy you can imagine will ooze from every pore of The New York Times, and Harvard University, as "explanation", all, stoutly insisted upon by STANDARD ESTLABISHMENT SOURCES.

Except One

Except one. There's only one conspiracy that's said to be impossible. Just one.

"A spy-agency administrated right-wing conspiracy?" "Oh, you're crazy. I'm shocked, SHOCKED! that you can even suggest such a thing!" "Maybe you need a psychiatrist" "Don't you know? There are no conspiracies!!!"

Can you imagine?

Dallas

It was in late November of 1963, some thirty-nine years ago, that I first noticed this phenomenon, and noticed too, that the entire conspiracy-crazed media and academia, turned to pious "no-such-thing-as-conspiracy" mavens when the slightest hint of "right-wing" conspiracy was mentioned.

As A Matter Of Fact . . .

There is indeed a conspiracy afoot in the world.

But, there is ONLY ONE Conspiracy, Just One, One Size Fits All, So To Speak

But there is ONLY ONE. And it ain't religious, national, gender, tribal, class, language, or anything else like that.

Surprise! No Surprise

Surprise, the only conspiracy talk that sends the establishment ballistic with "there-are-no-conspiracy" heeby jeebies, is mention of the spy agency administrated right-wing conspiracy.

Surprise, the only conspiracy theory that they rail against, is the only conspiracy that actually exists. THE ONLY ONE. Does that really surprise anyone?

The Master Conspirators

I mean, the most powerful publishers, broadcasters, and academics get to where they are, by being the ugliest and most criminally psychotic of all.

Whose Da Boss? What Else Counts?

So what's the surprise, if mention of the only conspiracy that there actually is, namely, da bosses' right-wing conspiracy, would send the heeby jeebys up and down the spines of the terrorized, mindless puppets of the media and academia corporations.

What's the big surprise about that?

While Pocketing The Loot . . .

I am shocked, SHOCKED! that you should even think of such a thing! Conspiracies! Ha ha ha.

Maybe you need a psychiatrist . . . says the French Inspector, or The White House Imposter, or the Israeli Nazi incarnate, while pocketing the loot . . .

It's like a joke, from a movie. Except, this ain't no movie.

And, I'm sorry, as it turns out, it's really not very funny.

Across All Class Lines

As it turns out, the bullies, maybe ten percent of us, *and as for the hard core, probably much less, maybe one percent, or much less than that even*, but anyway, maybe ten percent of us, across all class lines, ten percent of the brass in the pentagon, ten percent of the working class, ten percent of every family, ten percent of every office and school, ten percent of the administrators of corporations, ten percent of soldiers, ten percent of the ruling class, ten percent of each and every religion, ten percent of every nation, race, culture currently present, ten percent seem firmly "committed" to that bully frame of reference.

But that ten percent, currently rules, in our families, in our offices, in our factories, our social circles, and our financial and professional and 'entertainment' and academic institutions,

The bullies, so filthy and repulsive, the vacant ones, the grotesque ones, the scummiest, ugliest, most criminally inhuman, pathologically stupid, anti-human monsters this planet has ever seen, the oh so terribly clever, deceitful and harming manipulators, the right-wing and the nazis,

well, since anything bad that can be said about these folks is such severe understatement, I'll have to supplement with some sarcasm,

Sarcasm

so, for a burst of sarcasm,

let's go on a good 'ole fashioned, all-American witch hunt, check under your bed, in your underwear drawer, in your paper-clip tray, c'mon, let's roust out the bullies from their lairs everywhere, but this time, it ain't the communists, it ain't the Jews, it ain't the Africans, it ain't the immigrants, it ain't the poor folk we're lookin' for, no no, this time, it's the bullies we're hunting down . . . we'll start with the executive suites and work our way down . . .

Business

. . . naturally, as a literal matter, they're not to be "rousted", but rather, accurately understood, and bypassed, always in health and safety, in the course of working out helpful solutions . . .

. . . but that criminally diseased, bully frame of reference, *that anti-God, anti-life "inevitability of work out poorly for some"/"steal from the poor and give to the rich"/"no real truth anyway"* bully frame of reference, so despised and hated by all the world's peoples, through all time, everywhere --- the bullies, currently, seem to rule the world, from our families on up to our nations and beyond.

They rule our work places, our entertainment, our families, our social circles, the media that we watch, and the schools that we listen to. They rule the world.

Those who live by deceitful, harmful, hidden manipulations, whatever their stupid stance (often hypocritically 'progressive') whatever their stupid stance regarding the surface 'issues', and the right-wing, the

conservatives, the Republican Party, the bullies altogether, are filthy, hated, criminally stupid, and ugly, deranged, diseased and repulsive counterfeits of actual humans, and they rule the world.

How do they do it? How do they manage to rule the world? From our families on up?

Those Who Destroy, Tend To Be Quick-Witted, "Bang Bang", "Boom", "Quip"; Those Who Create, Tend To Be Slow-Witted, "Building", And "Figuring Out" Takes Time

The right wing knows this so well; as usual, progressives are totally in the blue.

Pimps, child abusers (including bible thumping child abusers all across "The Bully Belt"), apocalyptic, serial killers, mafiosas, right-wing political consultants, spy strategists, pornographers, political aides, secret agents, paramilitaries, social service administrators, agents provocateurs, broadcasters, publishers, Nazis, and of course, US Republican Party tacticians, are the leading masters of the whole field of hidden, harmful, often deadly manipulations.

That's how the British got the drop on Joan,

it's why the anti-communist Stalin got the drop on Lenin, and on all The Soviet Union's genuine communists,

why Hitler 'gets the drop on' Weimer,

why Dulles gets the drop on Roosevelt,

why Hoover gets the drop on Kennedy,

why Nixon gets the drop on McGovern,

how the bullies of the Red Guards got the drop on China's actual communists,

why Deng gets the drop on Mao,

why Pinochet gets the drop on Allende,

why Zebrinski gets the drop on Carter;

it's how Reagan got the drop on Lennon (shoot first, ask questions later, chuckle chuckle),

how Gorbochev got the drop on Kosygin,

how Bailey got the drop on Clark,

how Renquist got the drop on Clinton,

how the spies get the drop on their criminally violent puppets, who then get the drop on the rest of us,

how Bush and Sharon get the drop on those 3,000 ordinary working people at the WTC and Pentagon,

and on all the rest of us, and all else, a billion times and more, before, since, throughout all everyday life, everyday, and on up to the highest levels of world power.

That's how it's done. That's what them vicious, nazi smirks are all about; that's how they do it.

They *never* 'get lucky', as is so idiotically claimed by so much of the left. *Never*. God *hates* what they do, *despises it*.

They kill cognition, and they kill, specifically, the most cognitive humans, one at a time, and en mass, and then, with everyone in an intellectual coma, they arrange 'back door' manipulations, and attempt to convince everyone that they're 'just lucky' because the gods are with them.

They don't have the gods with them; it's preposterous, and they don't have one twit of 'luck' on their side, any more than an armed man who cheats at cards could therein be said to have just 'gotten lucky'.

And it must never be forgotten that, engineering hidden, harmful manipulation, trauma, terror, confusion, from behind people's back, and then presenting oneself out front, as the savior, is a technique ***that is just not open to helpful persons***, for obvious reasons.

But among an anti-cognition, and anti-intelligence population, ***among an attachment-judgment-based population***, without logical types at their command, the

"rock-through-the-window-from-behind/savior-out-front-manipulation," always works like a charm.

We Obviously Can NOT 'Take A Leaf From Their Book

Liberals and leftists can't 'take a leaf from their book', because then, they wouldn't be liberals and leftists anymore; then they'd become, *by definition*, filthy, nazis. It just doesn't work for liberals and leftists; "snapback" time, "death in the afternoon".

Remember Franklin, and remember the Hiroshima, Gehlen, CIA, Latin America, Vietnam, WTC/Pentagon horror continuations, and all the rest.

*I'm sorry Franklin; I was right there, by your side, shoulder to shoulder, **And I Still Am!** . . . but it's sixty years later, and I see more.*

. . . The Fabled Way It's Supposed To Be . . .

And, best I can tell . . . he's smiling . . . at last . . . from one generation to the next . . . the way it's supposed to be . . .

. . . the truth will out my friend . . . - Pete Seeger

*Yes indeed . . . **If** God gets his way, it certainly will.*

Crystal Clear

At any rate, certainly with a public exposure of "Logical Types © nrm", it becomes crystal clear **to all**, that hidden, harmful manipulations are techniques that are just not open to helpful persons, *by definition*.

And, of course, always being on the wrong end of other people's manipulations, is yet another turn on the story my life, and so many millions of others, including genuine liberals and leftists everywhere. I call it "counter-synchronicity" with society *as it now stands*.

How Do They Do It?

How do they do it?

How do the Nazis, the bullies, the hated ones, with their **"work-out-poorly-for-most-people/steal-from-the-poor-and-give-to-the-rich/no-real-nature's-truth-whoever-has-the-power-to-harm-has-the-only-truth-there-is"** - how do they manage to rule?

Being so hated, and so obviously, even BOASTFULLY, criminally sociopathic, operating in NO ONE'S INTEREST!

How do they do it?

Simple

Simple.

Just squash cognition, kill the cognitive ability to distinguish what matters from what's less important,

get everyone to run on attachment judgment only, certainly for the big, important things,

and then, arrange through dummies (doesn't matter how obvious, without cognition the rubes'll never catch on), arrange through dummy puppets, some terrifying manipulation, and then present oneself as the savior.

Hey, you're safe now. I'm the biggest, baddest bully in town; I'll protect you.

Hey, see my black skin? Or white skin?, Or female gender? or Jewish piety? Or American flag? See the symbol of power for your side?

Hey, says the bully, I'm on your side! What else counts?

'May The Force Be With You . . .'

Who needs brains, when you can just attach.

That's How They Do It

That's how they do it. Easy. Without the general public having an organized, overt, consistent system for cognitively sorting things out in an accurate, helpful, healthy, purposeful manner, why, there's nothin' to it.

Easy.

That's how the Nazis, and fascists, and The Republican Party, and the right-wing, and bullies of every stripe, come to power, and that's how they stay in power.

Kill high level cognition, keep everyone running on attachment judgment, and the rest is the proverbial "pieca cake!"

"Logical Types And Logical Levels © nrm imaginene.com 1983"; Just Three Hours

And, of course, it is that entire dynamic of hidden, harmful manipulations, that will be put to rest, once and for all,

and FOR ALL indeed, if I could get to present the three-hour talk, as listed in The Silver Locket, intact, in context, and in a well protected, well organized, FULLY PUBLIC manner.

Cognition turns on, FOR EVERYONE, and the power of hidden, harmful manipulations dissolves, in the clear light of day. *Forever!*

Fear Of Exposure Regarding Everyday Life, Is What Stops Everyone From Exposing Fascism Overall

Simultaneously, High And Low

I think that probably the greatest political problem that everyone faces, is that you can't solve the big, political, world-killing problems, without, simultaneously, solving the little family, office, social circle, work-place, personal and everything else, problems.

And I do mean simultaneously.

It's The Same Problem, And The Same Solution, Locally, And World-Wide

Bringing into the clear light of day, for all, the fundamental difficulty that is stifling us all on the grand

scale, simultaneously brings into the clear light of day the fundamental difficulty that is stifling us all one at a time.

It's the same dynamic; the use of attachment judgment for matters that cognition judgment was designed to be used for.

Fear Of Cognition

Thus, if people are real scared of being exposed at the low level, or of exposing their personal protectors, whom they depend on life-and-death every day, then that very fear is going to thwart any attempt to expose the harmful, hidden manipulations of fascism at the high level.

It's Part Of The Song . . .

The Tupamaros Of Uruguay, A Folk Tale, From My Generation

There's a famous story that I remember from a long time ago. I certainly wasn't there, or anyplace close, never knew anyone who was even remotely related to the circumstance, and perhaps didn't even read about it 'till years later, but I remember it like it was just yesterday, or even just now. And sometimes, in a daydream, it almost feels like I was there.

It's about the Tupamaros of Uruguay, from thirty or forty years ago.

Uruguay is a small country on the south-east coast of Latin America, itself generally rather advanced intellectually, and situated between two giants; Brazil to the north, and Argentina, to the south.

Both Brazil and Argentina were at the time in the throes of unspeakably brutal puppet regimes of the then Nixon/Kissenger/Republican Party dominated US military and spy agencies, themselves operating under the authority of the leaders of the big banks and multinationals, all in reaction to democratically elected governments, from Arbenz, to Goulart, to Allende, and many others, who were attempting to bring some economic justice to the hundreds of millions of desperately poor Latin Americans.

'School Of The Americas' Puppet Training

The brutality all around, via "School of the Americas" trainees, turned puppet 'generals', throughout Latin America - Chile, Peru, Columbia, everywhere - was manifest also increasingly in Uruguay, and the Tupamaros were Uruguay's leftist, revolutionary organization, mostly made up of students, teachers, artists, physicians, writers

and the like, from the city, who'd collected themselves together in the mountains to organize resistance.

Although the Tupamaros were lightly armed, they were acutely aware that they were, metaphorically, as a very small animal facing a giant steamroller, and they knew that their only possibility was in alerting the population at large, to the dynamic then increasingly engulfing Uruguay, in the hope that a fully alert population could arrest the danger, before it destroyed the nation.

As such, they used their small store of arms, not for offensive purposes, but to defend themselves during what they called "armed propaganda" sorties into the cities.

Ford, GE, The Big Stanks

In the end, it didn't really work, certainly at the time anyway, as the multinationals, Ford, GE, Chase Manhattan, and the like, and their spy, military, and international finance agencies, via their 'local', 'School of the Americas' puppets, were determined to exterminate, with as much overt and criminally psychotic brutality as possible, every vestige of intelligence or principle throughout Uruguay, as in the rest of Latin America, and in fact, as time went on, fully one third of Uruguay's population wound up fleeing the country for their lives.

And the Tupamaros themselves, like so many of their fellow citizens, were for the most part, viciously hunted down and brutally tortured to death in the most unspeakable of ways, along the lines of events in neighboring Chile, Argentina, and Brazil.

A Tale Spread Quietly, Across The World . . .

But there was one sortie in particular, tales of which spread quietly all across the world, and which I'll never forget as long as I live.

It seems there was a large discothèque down in the city, loudly packed with the sons and daughters of the ruling class, and their associates, bedecked in expensive jewelry, and the latest in fashionable garments, raucous with cocaine, carousing wildly to American discothèque music, as the nation was slowly succumbing to the military regime.

Suddenly, armed Tuparmaos materialize in the neighborhood, and occupy the discothèque, sweeping all the revelers down into the street.

They then painted, in huge block letters, across the front of the discothèque:

NOBODY DANCES

UNLESS EVERYBODY DANCES

Typical of the Tuparmaros of those days, the operation came off almost without a hitch, nobody captured, and at least the way I heard it, they did take a few injuries in a brief shoot out with soldiers during their escape, but nobody killed.

A One Time Metaphor, And A Metaphor Only

It was a metaphor, in the Latin American style, *certainly not to be confused with a literal overlay at the low level*. And for reasons given above, among others, the action couldn't really be duplicated elsewhere. In this sort of case though, once was enough.

And Entirely True, At The Highest Level Of History

Under the circumstances, in the context of that circumstance, Everybody knew, Exactly what it meant.

And not only in Uruguay, but for millions who'd heard tell, all over the world. And somehow, it's always stayed with me, *not as low level overlay, of course*, but as a high level understanding about the nature of revolution, and all human healing solutions, altogether.

Somehow, the story comes to me now, as I think about logical types, and the ability of the cognitive minds of the population at large, to displace the current round of terror manipulations of the Republican Party and their associated denizens in the big spy agencies, here and abroad.

What Drives Fascism

The problem is, that what drives the fascists, is not some special smarts on their part; in fact, the CIA, the Gestapo, the Mossad, MI6, and all their associated idiot agencies, are, fundamentally, imbeciles. Intellectually speaking, they are low lifes, certainly those at the top are intellectually sub-human, quite literally.

Without their constant stealing from the poor and giving to the rich, they couldn't find their way out of a paper bag.

No no.

The problem is, that what drives them, what fuels them, what keeps them afloat, is the whole, general convention of deception and deceit as an accepted social procedure, *at the lowest level of everyday life*.

The fact that everyone is so afraid of exposure of deceit at the lowest level of life, creates a fear of exposure of deceit altogether.

In other words, the only way to arrest fascism at the high level of societal governance, is to use a little math system that, *necessarily*, exposes deceit all around, including, *necessarily*, at the low level of everyday life.

Can't expose one without exposing the other, simultaneously! I know of no way around it!

This is the reason why no one can apply it *individually*, and expect to survive in society as it stands.

This is the reason why, the only way it can work, is in the context of PUBLIC EXPOSURE, intact, in context, and in a well-protected, well-organized way.

Logical Types By Itself Doesn't Prove Anything, It Is A Tool By Which Humans Can Figure Out Proved Accuracy Regarding Solving Problems Of Harm In Life

Please bear in mind that "Logical Types © nrm" Won't, Prove, Anything. It is not designed to prove anything.

It is designed to, and will, raise the IQ of all Americans 25 points, all at once, and therein turn on cognition judgment, giving everyone a way to self-evidently figure out the actual truth of this, or that, or any other matter of social or political significance.

Logical Types © nrm will not prove that my understanding of the story about Franklin and Pearl Harbor, or the WTC, or anything else like that is correct.

No no! It will give everyone the ability to figure ACCURATELY, what is true, and what is not true, about my understanding, whether I'm right or wrong, or any other version of anything of relevance to understanding anything about social matters.

It will give people the tools, 'the graph paper', so to speak, to be able to figure accuracy or inaccuracy regarding all social and political issues of relevance to solving human problems, rather than just rely on believing some honcho who seems to be on their side.

Robert Redford, Jack Kennedy, And Elliot Ness:

Don't Shoot, I Can Explain Everything

A Couple Of Metaphors

Perhaps it would help to recount a few fictional stories, metaphors, that the American general public may already be familiar with.

Three come to mind.

Let's start with a movie that was made, as best I can recall, back in the early 1970's. I haven't seen a movie, nor television, nor any videos, nor anything like that in ten or twenty years, and had seen very few before that as well, but I do remember seeing a few, here and there, a long time ago.

This movie was one I did see, and although it's maybe thirty years since I saw it, and I had a hard time following the plot then, and can't remember it that well now, and my memory ain't that great anyway, still and all, it must have

left something of an impression on me, as I do remember a little bit of it, and a recounting here may be of some value.

Of Fiction, Metaphors, and Reality

This was a fictional film; as best I can recall, there was no claim that it was based on any true story.

Still and all sometimes a fictional story contains metaphors that are, again sometimes, of some value in understanding things that actually are true.

But always, it must be remembered that any value of a metaphor is lost, if one cannot maintain the distinction in one's mind between something fictional, and something that is simply accurate reporting of literal reality.

Metaphors are a vital life nutrient, so long as one maintains a clear understanding of the difference between metaphors, and literal reality.

So.

"Three Days Of The Condor", Starring Robert Redford.

The name of this fictional film, as I recall, was "Three Days of the Condor", starring Robert Redford.

It takes place in New York City, in Manhattan, on a brisk and sunny autumn day, in the early 1970's or thereabouts.

Redford - I'll use the name of the actor, as I can't remember the name that was used in the film - Redford plays a man who is working as a routine researcher for the CIA, the famous finance capital coordinating and propaganda agency, with headquarters near Washington DC.

Redford plays a young, tall, good looking' fellow (I mean, it is archetype Redford), wearing those clear, rimless 'aviator glasses' which was part of the hip uniform of the day (1970's), maybe 35 years old, exuding intelligence, competence, and a quiet, subtle confidence.

"The Institute"

He, and the team that he works with, is located in what looks like a 'townhouse' type house on what appears to be upper Fifth Avenue, or Park Avenue maybe, perhaps around E. 65th street, or something like that, a most fashionable Manhattan neighborhood.

The townhouse, is one of those charming small buildings, sort of the type that you see that could be a home, but would have a little plaque out front, informing that it was a private library, or a small foundation headquarters, or something like that.

About ten or fifteen people work inside every day, doing various research projects for the CIA on various matters of concern to the organization.

The movie starts out with Redford quietly bustling about the place, looking into this computer printout, that journal, those documents, sort of putting something together in his mind.

He seems to be an intelligent, purposeful fellow, who seems to be on to something.

The "Takeover Group" And "The Insider Coup"

Apparently, what he's figured out, is that some right-wing fascist type group seems, from what he can puzzle together, to be in the process of taking over the CIA, which is the organization that he works for, in some sort of 'insider coup', or something like that.

Naturally, he puts this into his routine reports to his superiors down in Langley Virginia, the spy agency's headquarters, either by phone, or memo, or wire, or however they do it.

A few days later, in mid-morning of a regular working day, he goes out for an early lunch, via a back door of the place, that leads through a group of alleys that comes out in the street, a block or two away.

It's kind of fun, you can get away for a quick break, without having to go in and out the front door. He's not really a spy; he's just a researcher, but I suppose having a little back door passageway like that, makes you feel a little like a spy. What the heck.

The Primary Resource Available To The Vacant Ones

While he's gone, a group of three or four gentlemen, kinda slightly beefy, led by a dapper German sort of fellow, come in the front door of the townhouse and approach the receptionist. The receptionist smells a rat, doesn't really understand what they're doing there, and asks them to leave, but they close the door behind them, and ignore her request that they leave.

Then the three, well-dressed beefy men, calmly pull out automatic weapons with silencers on them, and promptly machine-gun the receptionist.

Led by the serene and dapper German, they go from room to room throughout the townhouse, calmly and efficiently shooting to death, each and every occupant.

The German gentleman counts on his fingers, and realizes that "there's one missing".

He decides, that to wait around would be too dangerous; after all, anyone might walk in the front door, see the secretary dead, and could blow the operation before they could get cleanly away. Unwise to wait around he thinks; so he figures he'll track down the last person later (which is Redford of course, who is away on a lunch break), he'll track him down later, and finish him off separately.

So the gentlemen re-conceal their weapons, and calmly walk out the front door, and make their way back into the street, disappearing into the city.

The Dawning Of A Nightmare

A few minutes later, Redford returns, through the alleys and the back door as before, only to find all his workmates and friends dead, in all the rooms of the house.

He runs upstairs, and there, in one research room, lies his girlfriend, in a pool of blood. And in a scene that, for some reason I've never been able to forget, he gently kneels down, holds her close to him, touches her face, and perhaps it dawns on him, either at that moment or shortly thereafter, that it was something that he'd figured out, that had gotten her killed.

He stands up, backs out of the room, and departs the townhouse, again through the back door and the series of alleys.

Naturally, he doesn't dare go home, and now he's all alone, on the streets of Manhattan, on a crisp, bright autumn day.

He goes to a public phone, and calls his boss, presumably at headquarters in Virginia, to report what's happened, and ask what he's supposed to do.

The Sporting Match

Strangely though, his boss seems bemused by his report, and even more strangely, by the fact that he's survived. As I recall, his superior has little to say about what is actually going on, and he gives Redford some strange instruction or other.

At the end of this very brief conversation, Redford backs away from the pay phone, and back out into the street,

obviously frightened, but always very cool (after all, it is Robert Redford), and still in-the-blue about just what is happening.

The Key

He then accosts a stranger in the street, a young woman that he senses he can get close to, I think she was played by Faye Dunaway as best I can remember, and forcibly pushes her into her car and, I think he has a gun, although I don't remember exactly, but anyway, he makes her take him to her Manhattan apartment.

She does indeed befriend him (again, this is Robert Redford remember), and after an intimate night's sleep, he is rejuvenated, and awakes to attempt to puzzle out the situation.

Contacting An Old Friend

At some point, he contacts an old friend, a co-worker in the CIA, to see if he can get a conversation going with his old friend, by which he can sort out just what is happening, why all his friends were killed, and what he should do.

He arranges to meet the friend in a Manhattan alley, but as he cautiously approaches the meeting place, the friend calls to him, shots ring out, there is the sound of running footsteps, his friend lies dead, and Redford, again barely escapes with his life.

Back at Faye's house, he sees on TV the incident reported as some standard NY mugging, or whatever, and realizes that whatever is going on, the killers seem to have the mass media heavily on their side.

James Bond

What happens next, is, I thought, a rather improbable scene in which one of the German's gunmen from the townhouse, manages to track Redford down at the girl's house, gains entrance, and attempts to kill him.

But Redford manages to club the guy, grab the gunman's weapon, and kill him instead.

Improbable, I thought at the time, because, all the James Bond books I read in my youth notwithstanding (I eagerly read every one of them as they came out), it always seemed to me, now even more than then, that the sort of high intelligence that Redford displayed is not really compatible with the sort of easy 'action killing' that Redford was able to smoothly pull off, albeit, in obvious self defense.

Now this is the third time he's managed to get away from the killings - first at the townhouse, then near his friend in the alley, and now with the gunman at the girl's house.

Fancy footwork and split-second timing, standard Hollywood fare.

Anyway, he again manages to get in touch with his superiors in Langley, via some untraceable technical phone manipulations, as he is still trying to figure out what is going on.

And then the plot then starts to sort itself out.

The Plot

Now it must be remembered that this is, as best I can recall, an entirely fictional film, a product of the imagination of its screenwriters. A metaphor.

I don't really know how close it is to the sort of thing that actually goes on among the high finance manipulators and master propagandists of the big spy agencies.

I myself have never studied the internals of the byzantine spy business in detail, as a matter of real life; I've always found it something of a bore, and I really don't know anything about the local ins and outs of how these people deal with each other.

Still and all, politically speaking, there did seem to be some sort of close metaphor involved, regarding high level political manipulations.

I just don't know though, just how close or how far away it is, to what actually goes on among those spy agency folks, in real life I mean. Maybe it's close, and maybe it's not; I just don't really know.

Reactionary Mass-Murder Verses Liberal Intellect

Apparently, in this fictional movie, what had happened, again, this was the 1970's, was that there was some sort of "power play" between the vacant ones, that is, the most rabid, reactionary sectors of finance capital on the one side, and the mildly liberal establishment that had been generally in place on the other.

As regards the real-life, early 1970's context for the film, actual real life politics, it should be recalled that Jack Kennedy, and the domestically liberal Lyndon Johnson had held power in The White House for eight years, through the 1960's, and the reactionary Nixon had only been in power for four or five, with a still liberal Congress in place.

Nixon's second election, in 1972, had been arranged by what was then becoming publicly known to be an illegal fix, via the infamous capers of which "Watergate" was just one of many.

The Routine Fix

Overtly fixed elections are, of course, the stock and trade of reactionaries through all time, as the right-wing, openly and proudly sociopathic, are generally roundly hated by the public at large and even hated by much of the ruling class, Reagan gaining his position through other fixes, the "Iran hostage" charade, and the infamous KAL007 fix, and the current Bush, via the vicious Renquist scandals of '98, and the infamous Nader and Florida fixes among other things, followed up for 'insurance', by the WTC horror, and the next even uglier one, presumably in the next few weeks or even days.

Right-Wing Fears Of Watergate

At any rate, at the time this movie was made, in the early 1970's as best I can recall, in real life at that time, the reactionaries were worried that the full force of a Watergate scandal might be exposed, weakening the power of the vacant ones, and allowing some silly liberal to get in, by an actually fair election, shiver shiver . . .

Presumably, the authors of this fictional Redford movie figured that, in real life, the reactionaries might head off the Watergate scandal, by taking full power in the CIA spy/propaganda organization, ensuring their propaganda power throughout the press.

The Occasional Wall Street Liberal, With Hollywood Connections

So the producers of this Redford film, presumably mildly liberal themselves, with connections in the mildly liberal "Eastern Establishment", and perhaps the liberal aisle of Congress, made a fictional film about how the reactionaries might try to stop the anti-right-wing Watergate scandal, before it got going.

So, they made a film about reactionaries, who were attempting to seize full control of the premiere national propaganda and spy agency, so as to prevent the big media splash about Watergate.

Puppeteers

After all, if the vacant ones, the right-wing of finance capital, can seize full control of the major national propaganda and spy agency, which is the CIA, then they, the right-wing, the vacant ones, fully control the mass media, and they therein control what everyone talks about, and how everyone sees things. Et voila, then they can get away with anything. Easy.

Including, in this instance, squashing the big media splash about Watergate, before it gets going.

From what I could tell, in my putting together the actual literal news events, and the fictional movie, that's apparently what the movie writers had in mind, when they wrote this presumably fictional film.

The right-wing was afraid that the still-liberal, Democrat Party Congress, were going to use the mass media to expose the recent, 1972 Nixon Watergate election-fix, and temporarily slow them down, via a Watergate scandal. That was certainly the case in real life.

So the vaguely liberal writers, made a fictional movie, based on the real-life overall political context, about a well-connected right-wing group, taking full command over the big spy/propaganda organization, the CIA, including hiring some gunmen to machine-gun any liberal leak about the take-over.

The Insider Coup

In this film, the right-wing of finance capital, tries to make a well-backed 'insider coup', hires the top gunmen they can find to machine-gun any leaks about it, therein taking over the propaganda agency, and therein quashing any Watergate scandal in the bud, and cementing nazi power over national life.

As long as they can keep it all quiet, and the public and Congress stays stupid and in-the-blue, no problem.

Why, It's Just, 'An Act Of God'

If the little coup works, well, when national life starts going fully Nazi, why, then everyone'll think it must be just an "act of God" or something.

"Hey, TV, and the newspapers, and the academics, and the cops, and the professionals, and everyone who watches television, why, they must 'know what they're doin'." Under current circumstances, that's about as far as the general public's thinking is going to go . . .

After all, if the mass media calls a reactionary trend, some great 'ultimate unfathomability/inevitability', why, then, it must be so. 'Everyone knows that . . .'

A little Byzantine, but really, as regards standard US-based-nazi political manipulations in recent history (not to mention in France, Britain, and Germany itself, throughout the last century), it's not really that far-fetched. In the overall I mean.

The key is keeping the public very stupid, running around in byzantine, contradictory circles, and fully in-the-blue; always making it look like a reactionary propaganda assault "just happened, that's all". "Must be just 'an act of God'", or something.

So, that's some actual, literal reality context of that time period (1970's), and it is what I presume the screenwriters had in mind when they made the film.

Now, back to the fictional story, the metaphor, the film.

The Spy Directors, Bemused, And Watching The Action

So anyway, in the movie, what Redford was facing, was that the directors of the CIA were watching this right-wing "takeover group", representatives of the most reactionary sectors of finance capital, flexing their power by attempting an "insider coup".

Who's Got The Power?

If the right-wing takeover group could successfully take over the big propaganda agency, in a shoot-em-up, but with the real story never coming out in the press, the CIA directors figured that would mean, that that right-wing group must have had the backing of powerful enough elements of finance capital, which are the spy agency's real bosses.

After all, the spy agency's Directors figured, you can't really pull off an operation of that scope, a major insider coup, including some shoot-em-ups, and keep it quiet, unless you have the major connections on your side, at the very top of finance capital.

On the other hand, if the right-wing takeover group's plans got messed up, that would show that they didn't really have the moxie, didn't really have the backing, couldn't cover all the bases, and so the takeover group, who'd hired these professional gunmen, would have to be eliminated, for the moment anyway, leaving the establishment's liberals, at least nominally in charge. Again, for the moment.

The "Fly In The Ointment"

And in this movie, Redford was the "fly in the ointment", so to speak, threatening to expose the work of the right-wing takeover group.

So the big CIA propaganda/spy agency brass was waiting to see if there was some liberal, democratic-minded guy, with the moxie to thwart the nazi coup, by blowing its cover.

The spy agency's directors didn't care who won, they just want to know 'who's the boss?'. Kinda like a sporting match.

A principled, intelligent fellow, a lower echelon person, Redford had gotten wind of the plot, a potential 'loose-cannon', and that's trouble for the right-wing takeover guys.

They kill his co-workers, who, they've figured, he's talked to about this plot, and they're now hunting him down to finish the job.

One Little Boy, Holding The Line (remember, this is just a movie)

Although Redford was an all-alone person, unaware of what he was really involved in, Redford, perhaps, was supposed to hold the line for the entire liberal establishment, not to mention, hold the line against nazism, for the entire 200 million person country, and the world.

So, in the movie, the directors of the CIA were watching this whole thing, kind of like a sporting match.

They seemed to be, just kinda bemused, waiting to see who would win.

Maybe the shoot-'em-up nazis would win, keep the whole thing tight as a drum, no muss no fuss, so then the CIA directors would turn the media right-wing, and therein quash Watergate, and the whole country could smoothly go nazi.

Then again, maybe there was some principled, intelligent, democratic-minded guy out there, on the liberal side, but all alone, with only his intellect (and sexiness and James Bond fancy footwork of course, this is Hollywood after all) to protect him.

Apparently, the CIA guys were figuring, that if Redford had the moxie to outwit the professional, shoot-em-up thugs, employed by the takeover group, who were, in turn, backed by all the might of the most reactionary sectors of finance capital, if Redford could outwit 'em, why, ok, then the country'd stay liberal a little while longer, maybe buy some time to splash the Watergate election-fix, deflate the reactionaries, and maybe even get an at least moderately fair election, thus winning the White House next time around, in '76.

Who's The Boss? The Vacant Ones, Or The Liberals

In this fictional movie, all the CIA spy/propaganda directors wanted to know was, "who's the boss?". Shrug. They were just "watching the 'game'", like a sporting match.

Anyway, in this movie, the right-wing group had the powerful connections, and the violence-power. That part certainly was true to life.

And for the liberals, going up against this right-wing takeover group, again, this was a fictional movie, was just one very alone guy, with no connections, and only his intellect backing him up.

The Major Key

Plus, well, it is Hollywood, so, plus, Redford had a couple of sexy, James Bond type instincts going for him. I mean, I suppose it doesn't hurt to have Faye Dunaway on your side.

An Aside

I mean, don't get me wrong, I have to admit I was pretty impressed with Redford's (and Bond's, in the books anyway, never saw those movies, never want to), but anyway, I was pretty impressed with Redford's smooth way of getting along, can't help it, I mean, I'm just an American, like everyone else, impressed and, to be frank, envious too, sure, I'm just a sucker for that stuff, like everyone else, sure . . .

. . . But, well, it's just that, well, the life and death of millions of people, the whole nation, and now the whole planet, riding on someone's smooth 'savior-faire', and split-second timing, well, there's just something terribly, terribly wrong with that. The whole idea of it.

The Directors - Langley, Wall Street, Arlington, Cambridge, Hollywood, all of 'em - not making their decisions based on helpful/harmful, but rather on, who's got the 'pumps', so to speak, whose got the 'power' - sex, violence, money, connections, it doesn't matter which - no sorting out helpful/harmful . . .

. . . just who's got it goin' on, in the moment. It's all wrong. All, all very very wrong.

Even if I could win things that way, which I can't, obviously, but even if I could, well, fun, sure, lotsa fun, but, even if I could win things that way, even if I did, well, bet you anything, I'd be suspicious as hell of it; it's a pyrrhic victory, gotta be. Fleeting, a wisp in the wind.

For work out well for all, which is nature's system, for the whole human system, there's an entirely different basis altogether.

'Catch the ball', 'the frog's quick tongue', so to speak, that's Not the way biology works, in the overall, it's not the way three billion years of evolution works, it's not the way humans, and the human world, was designed, via evolution to work.

It's gorgeous, sure, the foreground, beautiful, stunning, really stunning, nothin' like it, sure, but, well, in the end, it's the small of it.

I think, deep down, everyone knows that.

Sure, little things, yeah, sure, sometimes, in daily life, lotsa fun, in the foreground, sure, love it, envious of it, want want want it, sure, sure.

There may be no one on this planet that wants wants wants that dazzling picture, that sparkling moment, more than me. Sure.

I'm a pushover for that stuff. Totally. Sure. I mean, I was a photographer for twenty years; "The Decisive Moment", was what Cartier-Bresson called the photography genre within which I worked, sure.

But, to get the 'pictures', so to speak, that I really wanted, I mean really really wanted, I had to move on from photography. To, research, to politics, history, neurology, mathematics . . .

Because, 'in-the-moment', is NOT the way the big stuff works. Not for the big stuff, No no. Not at all, Not at all.

In fact, it's so tragically often, that that's the way the big stuff, the really important stuff, the background stuff, gets broken up, knocked out, destroyed . . .

. . . the explosion, the killing, the burst of fire . . .

. . . when 'in-the-moment' rules all, when split-second timing rules . . . I mean, for the big stuff . . . not in a play, or a photograph, where it does indeed count so very much, but in real, big-politics life, . . .

. . . well, then, anti-nature, and anti-life, rules as well . . .

. . . gotta have it, sure, can't live without it, sure, me too, but when it's everything, it's nothing . . .

For DNA, all those billions of years, and for humans all these millions and thousands, and every day, it is sorting out, helpful for all, over time,

and bypassing, and arresting, and rearranging, harmful to all, so that it's not harmful any more,

that's what we we're really all designed for, work out well for everyone, ongoing.

Not the flash in the moment, but, rather, work out well for all, and I do mean All, over time.

That's what counts; *That - And Only That* - is what makes the foreground stuff, so totally great.

That's the way life, all, life, going back three billion years, three million, three hundred thousand, thirty thousand,

that's the way all life was designed, and what it was designed for, what we were all designed for. Evolving, and sorting out, work out well for all. That's what it's really all about.

You think I'm just jealous, of Redford's flash, in this film?

Well, you got it half right. Of course I'm envious, don't be silly, of course I am, but, Not, Just, envious. I'm also right.

And I think, that that's the bigger part of it. Much much much bigger.

So Anyway, Redford, Slipping The Noose, Three Times

So anyway, in the movie, what finally happens is, the CIA directorate, watch Redford 'slip the noose' three times - at the townhouse, in the alley, and at Faye's house - they watch him avoid getting killed three times, and so the directors get tired of the game, and decide to call it a day, declaring the takeover guys, the right-wing, the shoot-'em-up vacant ones, the losers, this time around, anyway.

The spy agency directors then hire away the German, call him off the Redford-hunt, and have the German kill the takeover guys instead, the German's former bosses.

American 'Democracy' in Action

Due to Redford's split-second timing and sexy charms, the liberals, it seems, will survive, will get to splash Watergate across the media, and the nazis will have to wait for another chance, later, to take full control over the big propaganda/spy agency, and proceed onward with their criminally deranged monster mission of murdering the world.

Oh Well, There's Always Another Right-Wing Ace In The Deck - Khomoni, Waiting In The Wings In Paris

The nazis would have to wait a few more years for another chance, perhaps by other, but similar means (the "Iran Hostage" charade half a decade later) to take full command over the major propaganda and spy organization, therein puppeting the media, and the national consciousness, and the country. How charming.

Carter, For A Little While

But for the moment, due to Redford's fancy footwork, and his sexiness, the liberals still get to retain a little power at the top, get to do the Watergate trial, and therefore get, an at least nominally fair election, and so, get the liberal Carter in, for a couple of years anyway, 'till the next little 'sporting match' charade ('Iran hostage'), or whatever.

So anyway, in this early 1970's movie, Redford, the democracy-minded, lone-guy, survives, so the nazis are thwarted, for the time being anyway.

"How's Tricks?"

Towards the end of the movie, Redford happens to meet the ever-so-calm German thug-chief, face to face, no longer adversaries, the battle now over.

It's amiable, as the German tells Redford that the CIA spy Directors have declared Redford the winner, and that he, the German, has been called off the Redford-hunt, and rehired to kill the takeover group, the German's former employers.

Earlier, the German had gotten the nod from the Directors to work for the takeover group, but now that the Directors have declared the takeover group to be the losers, so, well, in the end, as a long-experienced, top professional in the field, the German well knows 'who's the boss'. Shrug.

So now, 'the water having passed under the bridge', so to speak, the two of them, Redford and the German, have an amiable, but tense (remember Redford's girlfriend, at the townhouse) little farewell chat, exchanging tips on getting along as a loner on the lam.

Redford tells him a little (very little) about how he got the girl, Faye, to help him, and the German tells Redford a tip or two about how to avoid getting snuffed by the CIA. And they part company, and go their separate ways.

The New York Crimes

But really, the whole point of this story, the reason why I'm telling it here, is the very last scene, one that is

certainly the punch line of the entire tale, and obviously the most relevant at this time.

There's Redford, the "game" is all over now, just three days after the initial townhouse killings, and there's Redford, walking down 43rd Street near Broadway, still a crisp autumn day, but just a little cloudier.

A car cruises by, with his former CIA boss inside. He motions to Redford to hop in, perhaps indicating that he's ready to hire him back, for another research job, with another team, in another townhouse, or perhaps even a big promotion, 'come join the board', for showing such sophisticated expertise.

'You passed the test', 'we can use a smart guy like you', or some such.

But Redford, having been warned by the German about getting into cars in such a situation, backs off, and the CIA man, impressed with Redford's James Bond instincts (again slightly improbable, as James Bond of course, was backed by the full might of the British Empire's worldwide finance capital network; but Redford is all alone), anyway, the CIA man steps out of the car, and delivers a little lecture about why it's a great thing, when the Nazis do win these little sporting matches.

'You see,' explains the CIA director, 'Americans are greedy, whiny little morons; they like Nazis'. 'Kick 'em in the ass and steal the gold, or the oil, or whatever, Americans like that'. 'Wise up kid', so to speak.

Our man, however, is unimpressed. 'Can it' he says, 'it's all over. I just spilled the whole thing.'

'You what?' exclaims the CIA man incredulously. 'What are you talking about?'

Redford motions behind him, 'I just spilled the whole rotten story, to them.'

And there, right behind him, some workmen are loading newsprint into the loading dock, of,

. . . The New York Times.

The CIA man laughs in his face, astounded at Redford's naïveté.

'Are you kidding??!!!', says the CIA man. Don't you know?'

'They are us!'

The Wake Of The Sixties

Back in those days, I suppose, we were all a little naïve.

Back in those days, we thought that the media was only "in on the 'game'." Some of us didn't quite realize that they weren't 'in on it'. In fact, they were, are, themselves, the major spooks - one in the same.

But anyway, one hellova punchline.

Redford goes a little pale, in the autumn afternoon.

And there, in his peacoat, in the brisk autumn afternoon, he turns to walk up the street, looking back over his shoulder just once, with a look for all the ages on his face, and with the wind blowing through his hair, he walks up Broadway . . . all alone . . .

And on that note, the film ends.

So that's the first fictional tale I'll recount for this paper. I don't think I got the exact wording of the dialogue right, but I do think I got the spirit of the thing pretty close.

Keep the story, *and especially the punchline* in mind, with these next two.

A Famous Event, In 1963 . . . And Beyond

This next tale is also a fictional story. Like the one above, it is also based on a general context in literal reality, albeit, a decade earlier, this time in the early 1960's.

Does Anyone Remember?

The setting is an event that, from what I understand, most people are familiar with, namely, the November 22nd, 1963, assassination of President John Kennedy, in Dallas, Texas.

Cover Stories Are The Major Bore

I've actually never read very much about the event itself. I did read a good deal about it in the days and weeks after it happened, back in late '63, and a couple of books about it in the next few months, but after that, I more or less lost interest.

Psychiatry

After the early months, what generally interested me about the subject was the rhetorical and psychiatric issues

surrounding those who claimed to dis-believe that the killing was an inside job.

Cognition And Absurdity

As I had concluded early on, that it was impossible for any rational human mind to conclude that it could have been some sort of 'loner/freak-event', impossible for any even vaguely informed person to dis-believe that it was an inside job, I did put considerable energy into attempting to understand just why so many people claimed to believe that it was just some 'freak/loner event', rather than the obvious-to-all awareness that it was an inside job.

No cognitive mind could actually have concluded that it was Not an inside job, so why did so many people claim to believe that it was a "freak/loner" event? That question plagued me for years.

Parrots . . . Uh, Well, Don't Mean To Insult The Actual Bird Parrots

I mean, certainly I understood why the perpetrators would brazenly put forth the preposterous version, but the other question, why so many seemingly ordinary people parroted this obvious imbecility regarding it being a 'freak/loner' event, just something 'out-of-the-blue', was a question that remained pretty much at the front of my mind for years, even decades.

Imagined Foreground; Real Life Background

Anyway, in this story, regarding the specifics of this aspect of the event, which I'm making up from my imagination, because, again, I know very little about the details of the spook/cop business, but in this story, I ask you to imagine a Secret Service Agent, preparing the automobile for Mr. Kennedy to travel through Dallas in on his last ride.

Mr. Bubbletop Man

In my mind, all these years, I've used the label "Mr. Bubbletop Man" when I think about it.

Mr. Jones

Perhaps it would be best, for these purposes, to imagine yourself in this circumstance.

Supposing you had a job in The Secret Service, in which you were one of the people protecting The President in that situation.

Five Minutes

The President is due to come down and enter the car in about five minutes.

There you are, among several other agents doing last minute preparations - checking the tires, the seats, in communication with others along the route. Then you realize that the 'bubbletop' is not yet in place.

Overt Threats Everywhere

As a well informed and professional agent, you are aware that the city has been blanketed with 'kill Kennedy' leaflets, threats against The President in that environment have been legion, and the standard procedure in that circumstance is to install a clear shield of some sort around the top of the vehicle, to deflect any possible incoming missiles.

Four Minutes

Four minutes. You turn to your partner, wondering where it is, and ask, 'hey, where's the bubbletop?'. But your partner seems to be busy inspecting this or that aspect of the car, and seems not to hear you. Three minutes.

Eyes Glazed Over

You're getting a little antsy, and turn to another agent, and mention it again, but he seems to be responding with something of a glazed expression on his face. Two minutes.

Barely Audible Whisper . . . Let It Go . . .

Finally, you meekly mention it to a third agent, perhaps a supervisor, and he seems uninterested, brushes by your shoulder, and you sort of hear a barely, almost unconsciously audible whisper . . . 'let it go' . . .

Flash

One minute. Flash. Unsure about exactly what is happening, you suddenly get the feeling that 'the fix is on'; you're part of an 'inside job'. In just seconds of real-time, you flash on a million things.

The Team Player - Loyalty, To Your Job, Your Family, Your Friends, Or Your Country

You're a team player, a cop, a top professional; you follow orders. Whatever's been decided higher up, it's not your department.

Caught Between The Devil And The Deep Blue Sea

You imagine attempting to slow everything down, maybe throw in 'a monkey wrench', maybe foil something. Absurd. These people have it together. To attempt something like that, would just kill off your career - you think of your wife, your children, your reputation.

The Good 'Ole 'Mentally Unstable' Rug-Puller

Even if you did make some sort of grandstand, either subtle or overt, you would have the rug pulled out from you in your whole life - be professionally manipulated into a 'mental instability', at best, although it would no doubt get worse, years of proud service entirely down the drain, loss of your mind, your friends, your family, your kids so proud of you, now disgraced and at loose ends. Shiver . . .

And whatever they're doin', the insiders, well, they'll do it anyway, you figure.

I Mean, 'Accidents' Do Happen

Whatever you do now, well, even if you are right, maybe it thwarts something in the moment, maybe and maybe not, but in any event, then they'll stop you, call you crazy, unstable (*who could you go to? - remember the punchline of the Redford story above*), maybe even have a seemingly unrelated off duty 'accident', tsk tsk, and the plan will go forward, perhaps under other circumstances later anyway. No one the wiser . . .

There's really nothing you can do, you figure . . . in the end, the insiders, the organization, the system, has it all covered.

Get With The Program

So you proceed with your job, kinda disassociate the situation, 'get with the program', 'go along to get along' - what else can you do? Nothing else, you figure . . . you go through the motions . . . the shots ring out, you do your job, protect the body as best you can . . . disassociation city . . .

The Interview

(As an aside, I might mention that once, I actually did get a chance to ask someone who was, perhaps, from one or another of those type of organizations about it.

The Bait, And The Delayed Response (I'm Very Slow-Witted, By Nature)

I'd been casually baited with a question about who I thought killed Kennedy, and, later on, I took the opportunity to ask if they knew if any procedures had since been put in place whereby an actually patriotic insider could thwart an inside jo

Boy! I've never seen anyone change the subject quite so fast . . .

I mean, it is something I've been curious about for thirty or forty years . . .

Don't Shoot! I Can Explain Everything

I thought it was a perfectly innocent question . . . but I guess I was wrong . . . or maybe the rapid change of subject did answer the question . . . one way or the other . . . I just can't tell about these things . . . I just don't really know much about that business . . .)

The Aftermath

But anyway, back in November '63, after the plaza chills, the deed is done, what's Mr. Bubbletop Man to do? You certainly can't go to the media, because, as in the above tale, "they are us".

Legal Muscle

Attorneys? Don't be silly . . . if they have any muscle at all, it would only be because they are insiders too . . . or well connected, one way or the other . . .

Alternative (Ahem)

As for 'the alternative press', everyone knows that their steadiest financial contributors turn out to be the CIA's cheapest propaganda assets . . . pressure, reliable

contributions, and spies keeps everything covered on 'the left'.

Kick And Scream

Anyway, the only thing that the broke, poorly connected ones can do, is kick and scream, and get called crazy . . . naaahhh . . . that seems out . . .

The Townhouse

You can't even talk about it to your wife . . . certainly don't want to put her in the line of fire . . . anyway, girls have to talk, it's a rule of good health . . . (and remember the townhouse . . . ?) . . . can't even write anything down.

Our Fabled Democracy

While the general public complains about 'wiretapping' and surreptitious break-ins, everyone who is anyone in Washington knows that their houses are routinely surreptitiously combed . . .

Mr. Naive

I remember once, in the days after we'd completed the paradigm in early '85, with all the original charts, I had occasion to ask a top Democrat Congressional aide who I'd had good reason to believe would be helpful to me, if he'd keep a copy for me, in his basement, or a safe or something, 'just in case' . . .

We had just been turned down by a major Democratic Party figure, of whom we'd asked for assistance on handling the copyrights, time was running out for us, and I was desperate to leave a few copies of the original paradigm, again, with all the original charts, behind, in Washington DC, leave it in a protected situation, but with liberals, in any way we could . . .

The aide, laughed in my face, 'don't you know?', 'around here, everyone's house is surreptitiously combed all the time . . . by, God only know who . . . you get used to it . . . it goes with the turf . . .'

'if it's hot, forget about it', I was advised . . . I got the message . . .

Help(!)

(I wound up leaving that copy, and another, at the Swedish embassy [and another with the Norwegians], but, whatever did happen to Olaf, anyway, and Alexi . . . well . . . whatever . . ., and another copy, of course, at the Library of Congress copyright office. . . officially registered . . .

The Anniversary

(Can't help it . . . did Olaf have an 'anniversary remembrance' . . . go to his safe, and mutter to the wrong person . . . 'maybe we should have a look . . .?'

(Poland and the Baltics were about to be shattered; a crowbar was being plunged deep in Yugoslavia, there was a nazi bulls-eye on all Eastern Europe, The Soviets themselves were deeply penetrated, even China (!). The decimation was all set. Ten million of this planet's most principled individuals were scheduled to die - suicide, violence, starvation, prostitution, despair . . . the major clean out . . . decimation . . .

Paranoia

(We'd finally gotten to the top in America . . . in several fields . . . nothing but straight arms and slammed doors . . . what was I supposed to do . . . I figured if I couldn't get anyone in America to have a look at our little math system, maybe the Scandinavians, supposedly all neutral and protected and 'above the fray', and NATO allies as well, would have enough presence of mind, and security, to just consider it, in safety . . . which is all I wanted . . . but . . .

. . . we didn't even address it to Olaf; it was addressed to the King, our general practice whenever applicable, just to try to get it a teensy bit more 'above the fray', so to speak . . .

. . . I guess I have these odd little fantasies sometimes . . . like . . . ' . . . I'm chicken little, the sky is falling, and I'm off to see the King . . . ' . . . I mean, what century is this anyway . . .

. . . I mean, isn't that sort of what Joan did? . . . Well, not really of course, she was way better than me, obviously; they all are . . .

(. . . anyway . . . did someone worry that a public, Logical Types explanation, via north Europe, might light up peoples' intelligence, maybe mess up the big bad plans?

(One year to the day after handing our extremely colorful, leather-bound, clay paper, highly polished, 600 page paradigm to the Swedes, officially, at their embassy . . . to the day, 2/28 '85 to '86 . . . bang bang . . . was the date itself a 'message' to me? . . . a 'condor' 'message'? . . .

(. . . the eleven of us all alone and isolated in a little hillside room, frantically researching and assembling this paradigm day and night, me feeling totally responsible for the 24/7 absolute safety of ten teenagers, for years on end, all of us struggling mightily to complete volume two [see 'Autobiography' elsewhere at this site] . . . talk about terror . . .

(I would love, really love to know that there's no connection there . . . that I'm just crazy on that score . . . what a relief that would be; being wrong on that one is certainly extremely what I wanted, and what I very much want . . . was I just crazy? or were the stakes really that big . . . maybe I was just wrong, boy, I would very much love to know that I'm all wrong about that . . .

(what's worse, I figured that if the, "across-all-nations-ten-percent-bullies-among-the-top-people", in the US, Germany, France, Russia, the UK, etc., succeeded in destroying progressive government in The Soviet Union, the US would be next . . . an eight year delay to the plans, with Clinton . . .

(it just all, sometimes seemed then, and most times seems now, just so far-fetched . . . I mean, too fantastic . . . like fiction . . . not to mention, just too scary to take seriously . . .

(I had, and have, absolutely no way of telling if there was any connection . . . just that silly date, and the overall context, nothing more at all . . . superstition, foolish superstition, that's all . . . I really really hope there wasn't

really any connection at all . . . but if there was . . . well, it haunts me, to this day; well, if that was the case, I mean, with Olaf, well, I'm just so so sorry, you have no idea, but what was I supposed to do?)

(Perhaps it would also help to mention that I have never gotten the slightest physical indication that anyone has ever been surreptitiously 'watching me', tracking me, or anything else.

(Twice, once in 1965, and once in 2000, I was officially, openly approached by properly identified officers, for a brief interview in connection with clearly signed writings I'd put forth. Both times, it was, questions, answers, thank you very much, you have told us everything we wanted to know, and more than we want to know, we have ascertained that you are no threat to anyone, goodbye, and that was it. Two, official, overt, brief, conclusive interviews, thirty-five years apart. That's it. There's a little more story to it, but that's an accurate jist.

(But the point here is, I've never had the slightest shred of physical evidence that I've ever been surreptitiously watched.

(So, if I seem unduly paranoid, you should take into account that as far as the lack of physical evidence goes, no one's ever heard of me, no one's interested, no one cares, and forty years of paranoia is just pure fantasy. One should take that possibility into account.)

Well, anyway, maybe I'm just crazy. But, actually, no, I know I'm not crazy. I certainly am wrong, that happens, definitely, sometimes. No question about it. Wrong sometimes, yes. But very very definitely Not crazy.

Mr. Wrong

I can be wrong - 'specially in a case like that, so far away, where I just can't see through, shut out, 'flying blind' so to speak, yes indeed I can be mistaken; it goes with the turf; Einstein coulda told you that.

The Life Scientist

I'm a theorist, a scientist, a paradigmist, not a guru.

It's a very convenient thing about being a theoretical scientist.

Unlike a guru, unlike an attachment-judgment-style attachment figure, certainly about low level stuff, a theorist is allowed to be wrong,

How Convenient

because as science, it's left to the reader, and the listener, to figure out accuracy, by, their, own, intelligence, and on their own responsibility.

That's very convenient for me.

It Matters, And, Responsibility Is Everywhere

I feel, it's very important for me to be right; that matters very very much to me,

I so very much want to be liked, and liked for being helpful, and accurate, specifically,

BUT, but, but,

I rely on everyone else's cognitive mind, to figure out if I'm right, if I'm accurate, in their minds, on their responsibility, which means, a thousand less tons that I personally have to carry, than if I was a 'guru', or something like that. I never ask for 'trust'. Never.

I think I am, in terms of what I do well, one of the most trustworthy people on the planet, yes, but that is explicitly because, I do Not rely on trust.

No contradiction; one hundred percent consistent.

Very, very, very convenient.

No Low Level Operations, And Anyway, I'm Too Clumsy

And I don't work in a lab; no investigations; no low level operations; I wouldn't touch that stuff with a ten foot pole.

Well, certainly without the general public having Logical Types to assess with, and without massive resource

backing, and without the Public clear light of day, all backing me up I wouldn't.

But anyway,

Everything I Know I've Learned From Books

I'm a theorist; I read books.

Straight As An Arrow

And I write, straight as an arrow, for the public. No bullshit.

It's all theory, and it's science. The real responsibility to determine accuracy, is on the reader.

Mistakes Are Part Of The Song . . . Einstein Could Certainly Tell You That . . .

So I can be wrong, certainly about low level things. Sure. This should never be forgotten.

Track Record Over Time - Consistency

But if you want to know how wrong, and how right, I am, generally, well, just as a rule of thumb, well, you'll have to read my stuff, and assess my track record, over time. I mean, to know about what to expect, of me personally.

That's a big reason why I leave my old stuff publicly available on the web-site. Sometimes, mistakes and all, sometimes, even, deliberately leaving in the mistakes, just so you can have something to check against. Sometimes.

Check out what I wrote, twenty years ago, fifteen years ago, ten years ago, five, whatever. That's what it's for. Assess my track record.

Schema

"Schema", at least a hundred major points that everyone said, "oh that's ridiculous" when I first wrote it, that, twenty years later, still, and presumably forever, solid as a rock. To this day, I can't find any cracks in it.

[The 1992 Summary](#)

The "92 Summary", ten years ago, same thing . . . I know of only one error (which I've left in), again out of a hundred or so new, big points, and even that one doesn't shake anything else. Easily repaired, leaving the whole thing stronger than ever.

[The Warm Caress Of Deep History](#)

"Beyond the Wave", six years ago, may have a couple of cracks in it, not sure, but the major substantial points are, still, as far as I can tell, unshakable. Much of it was new at the time, and it remains unshakable, as far as I can tell, to this day.

[Violence Against Women](#)

The "22 Books" file, has some things in it that I haven't entirely worked out - I have yet to gear down and write anything major about sex - I do have some ideas about it, but the subject it is not currently on the fire for a paper. But anyway, there are important things on the subject that I haven't worked out yet.

Even still though, that 22 Books file is still at least 95% accurate by my current lights, and the overall conclusions are, the more I learn, the more obviously accurate they seem to me, solid as a rock, as best I can tell.

[Pursuit](#)

And "[The Magic Sentence](#)", and "[Flying Blind](#)", three years ago, scores of new points, still looks entirely solid to me.

[The Magical Tomato](#)

"Neandertal", written just two years ago, has a couple of small cracks maybe, but nothing whatsoever that in any way shakes the massive, new, overall conclusions. That I can tell anyway.

[The Silver Locket](#)

And "The Silver Locket", also two years ago, still, absolutely pristine, as far as I can tell.

[The Royal Physician](#)

I mean, I found at least seven errors of thinking in John Bowlby's work (among 1,200 fairly dense pages), and, best I can tell, he's about as close to perfect as any human being's ever going to come.

[What's New?](#)

But anyway, of my own work, how about this new paper? This one, the one you are now reading?

[But How About The Stuff About The WTC/Pentagon Operation, Is That For Real? I Mean, C'mon . . .](#)

How about the stuff about the WTC? How likely is it really, that that stuff is all accurate?

I don't know what to say . . . a person is going to have to sort out, from the information that they've gathered, from many sources, and that they have in their mind, just what adds up, by their own cognitive lights.

A person has to go by what they have concluded is accurate, on their responsibility, Neil or no Neil.

I certainly have been known to be wrong in my life.

But, this how it adds up to me. How it adds up to you, is your department. No trusting involved. I won't have it.

I can present logical types, to make it easy for any person to sort out much better, what they already know, but then, it's even more on you, to figure it out one way or the other.

Once Logical Types becomes publicly and properly known, then, what I say about any given issue, any specific issue, comes to matter less and less, which is what I want, of course, it's the whole point, really.

[And The Part About Everyone's IQ Goin' Up 25 Points? C'mon . . .](#)

How about everyone's IQ going up 25 points, just after I publicly present Logical Types, if, of course, I ever got to publicly present it?

How likely do I think that really is?

Well, I don't know. Seems like it might be going out on a limb, but I don't know.

I might be mistaken, but it seems to me like I'm not mistaken.

I mean, certainly if we had a substantial sector of society, media influences, home influences, work influences, social group influences and all, that was encouraging everyone to think intelligently, for reals, like, *if that's what paid off through and through and all around*, 360 degrees all around, instead of the current circumstance, where everyone is encouraged to just 'go along', and consistently slapped down for thinking in terms of accuracy in the first place,

well, it might turn out that I'm understating, rather than exaggerating, don't you think?

Time Will Tell, If I Get To Properly Present It, That Is

I guess on the above two points, only time will tell, and if I don't get to present the Locket, not even then.

Anyway, there are some one hundred papers at this site, written over the last twenty, ten, five years, most of it chock full of conclusions that people, when I first mentioned it to them, said "oh, that's ridiculous", but that, certainly as far as I can tell, hold as accurate, stronger than ever, as time goes on.

The Sequence

In attempting to converse about any of these matters with people, with almost every new point, of hundreds and hundreds that I've come up with in the above mentioned papers, there is a uniform sequence of conversation, whenever I've gotten to raise any of them with anyone.

It goes something like this:

1. "Oh, That's ridiculous, I've never heard of such a thing."
2. "Ok. I can see what you're saying, but I think you're wrong."

3. "Well, ok, I could see how it could be, but I just disagree."

4. "Ok, I can see how that's probably true, but so what? It doesn't mean anything."

5. "Well, sure. That's obviously the case. I already knew that. Nothing new, and I haven't learned anything. Goodbye."

I think many people will recognize this sequence from their own experience, from either one side of it, or the other.

It used to be that it would take about half an hour to get from stage one, to stage five, on any given point in the above mentioned papers.

But now, it's down to under three minutes, of very quiet, very calm, very few words explanation, from step one to step five. Indeed, sometimes people run through the entire sequence in under one minute, which they can't help but notice, and which they find very very scary.

Which is why I've personally become more and more isolated.

The more clearly and succinctly self-evident my explanations become, the more isolated I become.

The problem is, that a person has to put together several accurate points to come to an accurate conclusion about anything.

Very quickly people realize, that if they are actually going to use their brains to sort things out, their 'cognition-judgment-system', as different from their 'attachment judgment system', then they'll find themselves edged 'out of the loop', among their employers, their co-workers, their friends, their family, and everyone else that they depend on for survival and sanity.

Conversations start out with "How fascinating, I want to know", and very quickly become, "how scary, I don't want to know".

"I want to get along, at work, at home, among friends, among fellow television watchers, I don't want to know too much; don't want to fall 'out of the loop'.

It's not that people are intrinsically dumb, no no, not at all; it's that the propaganda of society, and social conventions have it all locked up.

Everyone can sort it out; everyone has the physical, intellectual equipment for accurately, helpfully, and consistently, in a fully healthy solving manner, sorting out the great issues of life, but given the current, universal propaganda blanket over everything, no one feels that they can survive, socially and economically, sorting out, just about anything all out.

In an "attachment-judgment-only"/"no-cognition-judgment-allowed" type of society, everyone becomes "Mr. Bubbletop Man", even as regards their own safety and that of their families, that is, regarding the big political issues that we're all faced with.

The whole world and local situation is easily solvable, but it can only be solved in an environment where every person is encouraged to figure out what is actually true, and what is not true.

And that can only be done if "Logical Types c nrm" is presented publicly, intact, in context, and in a well protected, organized way.

Singular reality, plus logical types, plus the sky buckle. That's the way this bioecosystem works, and it's the only way human intelligence can work.

Otherwise, all anyone feels they can afford to run on, is what their friends and allies say. No matter how obviously preposterous, and even totally unnecessarily destructive, those "conclusions" are.

As For My Own Track Record, Regarding What Was Previously Unknown, But Turns Out To Be Accurate

When it comes to figuring out accuracy

Counter-Synchronicity

(as different from my minute to minute daily life operations in my own life, in which case, I'm usually wrong; stumble, lose, bump, sleep, miss . . . a counter-synchronicity . . .

(. . . a big, operational "countersynch" with the world as it stands . . . but at least astoundingly, I'm still alive, and very healthy . . . amazingly, well, so far anyway, of course . . .),

Assess My Track Record, In Various Contexts

but, the point here is, that when it comes to figuring out accuracy, in my work, in these papers, in these web-site writings, and the paradigm, especially the half-dozen or dozen or so more or less polished papers, I myself, would estimate my track record at maybe 95% at the low level (much higher for polished stuff), 98% or 99% at the medium level, and darn close to 100% at the high level.

That's my assessment, of course. The reader's, or listener's, or observer's assessment, again of course, is their responsibility, not mine.

But anyway, the overall point I'm trying to make here is, that what makes a person trustworthy, I mean through and through, is if they don't deal in trust in the first place; if instead, they rely on cognition, straightforward cognition, for reals, through and through, then, they become the most trustworthy of all.

It's not a contradiction; it makes perfect sense.

With Logical Types At The Public's Command, The Biggest Responsibilities Of All Shifts From The Leaders, To The Public

In fact, for me as a theoretical scientist, the real responsibility for assessing accuracy, is on you, and your cognitive mind.

In The Moment And Regarding Trivia, Is One Thing; Over Time, And For The Big Stuff, Is Something Else

In the moment, you might decide that I'm probably right, sure, that's fine. After all, I usually am right, more than usually even, in fact, a lot more than usually, especially about the big stuff. Sure.

I mean in the moment - I myself do that all the time. I notice people who are usually right, and I, for the moment, just believe them - I do that all the time. No problem.

I myself do that with people like Johanson, Bowlby, Eisler, Parenti, Patterson, Clinton, Near, Seeger, Armstrong, McCartney, Bresson, lots and lots and lots of others, I do that all the time. I need that; so does everyone.

People who turn out to be right a lot; well, that's a great starting place. Very very convenient. Wonderful in fact. Can't live without it. The stuff of the Gods. Totally.

The Slow Wit - It Goes With The Turf

Anyway, I'm slow witted; I don't always catch on right away. I need to depend, moment to moment, on people who I've determined have good clues.

And as for conversation, well, I'm even more likely than the next person to presume sincerity in anyone I talk to.

Even more likely than most people, in that regard.

Pretty often, I'll fall for anything.

Almost all the time, actually. In conversation in fact, I might be the world's most gullible individual.

You have no idea how much I want to like people, and how desperate I am to be liked by others. It makes me gullible, necessarily.

There's a part of me that's ready to believe just about anything . . . under certain conditions, look out . . .

But that's "at first", of course. It's part, I suppose, of "casting a wide net", perhaps a requirement for properly focused "1000-d vision".

But over time, and only over time of course, things do tend to sort themselves out in my mind, and it goes quite the other way.

I Have Never, Never Used The Words 'Trust Me', Ever, Nor Anything Like That. It's Not Part Of How I Work.

But, I don't use the word 'trust' very much, not part of my vocabulary. And certainly not for theory.

When it counts, and over time, I deal with my own internal assessment regarding other people's track records, and other information, Over Time.

When I take into account the statements of others, for then building overall conclusions, it's on my responsibility.

And, when you take into account my statements, it's on your responsibility.

Over time, the real responsibility to be accurate, is on the reader, or listener.

Whether that reader or listener is me, listening to others, or whether it is you. reading or listening to me.

Logical Types © nrm, makes that so obvious, and so easy.

The whole idea of 'trust' disappears, and is replaced by accurate assessment.

What a relief; an end to betrayal. It becomes an impossibility.

An End To Betrayal, For All

For this reason, with this paradigm, There Can Be No Betrayals.

It's an impossibility, by definition.

Very, very, very convenient, all around.

Especially, in politics!

Persons can, 'betray the human contract', as they say in Latin America, in trying to stop it, yes,

but within this paradigm, if it's correct to singular reality, and to how everyone's cognitive mind sees things -

nature is geared for work out well for all persons;

logical types;

consistency;

protection mostly downwards and anxiety mostly upwards;

singular, knowable reality up to the highest relevant logical level of life;

and all the rest;

and things comb out entirely consistent -

if a human being's most alert and critical intelligence, assesses, accurately, and with eyes-open, over time, no tricks, if a human being's most alert and critical intelligence assesses, that that is indeed the case, then, there can be no betrayals.

Mr. Wrong

So, I can be wrong. Yes. Definitely.

But NOT, Mr. Crazy

But, in any event, I'm not crazy. Wrong sometimes, sure, figure it out. But I'm definitely not crazy.

And, in the end, the assessment for accuracy, and helpfulness, is on you.

It can't be done, accurately, without Logical Types © nrm, ***but with Logical Types, it's easy.***

That's the point.

Back To Mr. Bubbletop Man, And Mr. Redford, And Mr. Air Traffic Controller, Madam Secretary, And Mr. Police Officer, And Mr. Firefighter Administrator, And Mr. Jones . . .

But all this, began with a discussion of Mr. Bubbletop man.

If he finds himself in a situation, on the job, or whatever, where he knows, I mean really knows, of some terrible, deadly treason, knows it as a professional matter, knows something that is hidden, and is killing us all, where is he to go with it?

Where's the backing?, in this attachment-judgment/bullies-are-holding-the-strings society?

It's All Locked Up Up There

Certainly for Mr. Bubbletop man, one way or another, it's all locked up up there . . . there seems to be nowhere for him to turn . . .

Of Prosaic And Prostitution

. . . if things disturb your sleep, just take a little prosaic, a few purchased women . . . whatever . . . forget about it . . .

It doesn't matter how patriotic Mr. Bubbletop Man might be . . . apparently, he has no place to go . . . just forget about it . . .

The Current, Right-Wing / Republican Party / Spy-Propaganda

Terror Round;

Of Gangsters And Covert Actions

The Silent Prayer

The point about this story is, in the days after the WTC/Pentagon horrors, it occurred to me that there must be 100,000 people that work in the CIA, the DIA, the NSA, not to mention related branches of secret State police agencies. And 'paras', 'private', or whatever, of one sort or another.

100,000.

Job Description - 'Covert Action' - Shhh Shhh, Big Secret

How many of them work on arranging various provocations of all sorts as part of their everyday job description? Everyday activities? Cops, academics, soldiers, psychiatric social workers, corporate infighters, office politics, you name it . . .

Just A Few On Any One Given Case

I mean, I have no idea how many local insiders would have to be actually in on it directly - CIA, DIA, Air Force, FAA, New York Times, FBI, ABC, etc., wherever - to pull something like that off. Something like the Kennedy Assassination, or the Redford riff, or the WTC/Pentagon operation. Ten? Fifty? A Hundred? More?

I have no clues, and I don't really care either.

I mean I presume at least hundreds in the overall, maybe thousands, I wouldn't know,

but I just mean locally, for the September '01 operation, in NY and DC and thereabouts. Presumably just a comparatively few.

Local Insiders On This Case - Just A Few

How many Mr. Bubbletop men, in the moment, "eyes glazed over", in the moment, "see no evil" - how many were local insiders on this one? Three, thirty, more? Again, I have no clues.

Secret Operations Are Just Not My Field

On the ground, I have no idea how this stuff actually works, at the operations level. Never had any contact with that type of person, I don't read about it, I'm not interested, and I really have no idea at all. Not my department.

Down the hall, and to the right, maybe the investigative journalists can help you with that.

I Read Books; Published Books; And I Know Some High Level Science

I'm a theorist. I read books, published books from events of years ago, and a just a few headlines from the current time. And a little science.

About the details of this sort of thing, I don't know nothin'.

How Many, Just Routinely Know About Such Things, As Insiders?

But, of much more relevance to what I do know, psychiatrically and politically, I can't help but wonder, how many, just general insiders, out of the 100,000, or more,

Recognition

would recognize Exactly what it was,

CIA, DIA, whatever it is, Insiders, working for the big, honcho right-wing sector of the US and Israeli ruling class, and the US Republican Party, pulling a **"rock-through-the-window-from-behind/savior-out-front" manipulation**, for the usual purposes of engendering a right-wing 'tilt' to the entire body politique, and to throw the next big elections comin' up, the big '02 congressional elections . . .

how many of those 100,000, would recognize Exactly what it was,

absolutely automatically, totally obvious to them, the moment those planes hit, in September of '01,

Not because they were in any way in on this specific operation, but because they are part of arranging exactly that sort of thing, all over the world, and all over America, both in big politics, and in local daily life, as their EVERYDAY ROUTINE.

How many of them would instantly recognize it?

20,000? More? In the CIA? the DIA? the NSA? various State Police agencies? and Para-militaries? Who understood exactly what had happened with those planes at The World Trade Center? Bam. Instantly.

Instantly, heard the words, "Arab hijackers", and, Instantly thought, 'ok, so the Israelis were the technicians and handlers', and heard the words "Air Force frozen over for an hour", and, Instantly thought, 'ok, so the Americans were the administrators and coordinators'.

I don't mean, from reading spy novels, or from routinely fabricating byzantine "conspiracy theories".

I mean, just because that sort of thing is a ROUTINE part of their OFFICIAL duties everyday, as Official "men in black" of one sort or another, or as informers or office support people for them.

How many people who are involved in these sorts of operations, Officially, "covert actions", EVERY DAY, as an Official, normal, everyday work routine, immediately flashed on that, Instantly?

I mean, I have no idea how these byzantine operations work; haven't read almost even one word about the WTC, just the headlines occasionally, not even one full article. And I certainly have no special information, of any kind. Absolutely none, whatsoever.

As A Theorist, It Seems Obvious

But just as a theorist, with a base of history, and psychiatry, and mathematics, and politics, and a little science, just as a theorist, it occurred to me, over the next few days after last September's horrors, that, perhaps, just perhaps,

10,000 Prayers

just perhaps, there were, maybe, ten thousand spy agency workers, federal, state, and para, 10,000, actually patriotic, once removed Mr. Bubbletop men,

who paused in their mid-morning routine, and with hands frozen on their keyboards, and with eyes glazed over towards their computer screen, no one would ever notice a thing, were praying to almighty God, and to all America, with all their might, 'Stop Us Before We Kill Again', 10,000 federal, state, and para workers, who know all about it, who make their living that way, and who hate it.

And, in this attachment-judgment-based population,

there is, no place for them to go, now is there. Eh?

So.

Homo Sapiens Sapiens Body, With Sub-Human, Attachment-Judgment-Only Social Conventions

What was Roosevelt to do?

What's Mr. Bubbletop man to do?

What's an actually patriotic CIA worker, or soldier, or civilian at the FAA, or anywhere else, who just happens to be in the operations line, who knows full well, that the hijackers were nothing but mindless thug-puppets, representative of ten percent, or one percent, or one-thousandth of a percent of their population, that the Israelis, Sharon's Mossad, were the technicians, who organized the groups, and put them on the planes, again, representative of ten percent, or one percent, or one-thousandth of a percent of their population, and that the ten percent, or however many, who think as bullies, of the FBI, the CIA, the DIA, and the Bush administration, were the overall, initiators and administrators of the operation; what is an actual patriotic insider, who just happens to find themselves in the operations line, to do?

We're dealing with an "attachment-judgment-based" population within the bodies of Homo Sapiens Sapiens "cognitive-judgment-based" human beings.

Within an "attachment-judgment-based" population, where no one has the tools, nor the social environment, for making actual, humanly natural, "cognition-judgment-based" judgments, there's just no place to go with it.

We know that encouraging an accurate view of what went on, so as to prevent a repetition, is patriotic, in the full sense of the word patriotic, 'the good health of the people',

and we know that deliberately encouraging an inaccurate view of what went on, so as to ensure a repetition, is treasonous, again, in the full, literal sense of the word treason, 'harm towards the people'.

To me, that seems a natural.

Just how that crying need, for the American people to have an *accurate* view of what went on, just how that

jives with "covert action" propaganda policy, is indeed left to the American citizen to sort out.

The way I sort it out, is that "covert action" propaganda policy, comes up treason, it seems, almost by definition.

I mean, doesn't it?

Am I mistaken?

What am I missing?

I mean, if you have to keep what you're really doing secret ('covert action'), and you have to say something about what's going on, (propaganda policy), then, it seems to me, that necessarily, lying to the public, about what caused what, and what happened, and who did what, is built in;

lying about policy, and about who did what, is part of the very definition of the words 'covert action'.

The term itself, is a BOAST of deceit. *By Definition!*

Doesn't anyone notice?

I mean, I thought *I* was thick, but . . . what am I missing . . . ?

That means, necessarily, that the public is going to be going to the voting booth, with a necessarily inaccurate understanding of what happened, and necessarily inaccurate conclusions, *ensuring a repetition of whatever the harmful situation is.*

But no matter how good, or not, that statement might look to you now, how you sort it out, over time, and the conclusions that you go on, is on your responsibility. Not mine.

Molasses

Gentlemen of the committee:

We can swim through the molasses of an "attachment-judgment-based" population, spinnin' our wheels forever, Joan, Tom, Karl, Abe, Charles, Florence, Big Bill, Eugene, Emma, Woodrow, Nick, Leon, Al, Franklin, Norman, Dwight, Adlai, Marilyn, Patrice, Pete, Ho, Malcolm, Jack, Martin, Mao, John, Bobby, Hubert, Holly, Jock, Fidel, George, Jimmy, Walter, Neil, Hillary, Paul, Mike, Mario, Bill, whoever else, *however many billions*,

but, no matter how far we get, sooner or later, the right-wing, the ten percent of bullies among those at the top, across the board, the type of person who is comfortable with, and gravitates towards that sort of thing, are gonna' pull a Reichstag, a Hiroshima, a Kennedy assassination, a Chilean coup, an Iran-Hostage charade, a Renquist keyhole operation, a WTC horror, and the population "attaches" to the biggest, baddest bullies around, who promise 'to protect them',

the old "protection racket", of Elliot Ness fame, the good 'ole "rock-through-the-window-from-behind/savior-protector-out-front" caper, the store-keeper shivering in his shoes, not caring who threw the rock, just, pays the protection money, 'that's all', end of conversation,

and all that liberal and leftist explaining, and pumping out, all that, well, so much of it anyway, goes down the tubes.

In the end, so far, the fascists win, again, and again.

And, **as long as the population keeps running on an "attachment-judgment-based", anti-human, anti-intelligence basis for figuring accuracy, and without "Logical Types © nrm" at their command,** the fascists are going to keep winning.

At home, at the office, at school, in the world, and everywhere.

Obviously!

HOWEVER

HOWEVER, given a "cognition-judgment-based" population, that knows the difference between "Inevitability of things working out poorly for some", and "Geared For Work Out Well For All",

given a "cognition-judgment-based" population that knows the difference between something that's more important, and governing the situation, and something that's an element in that situation,

given a "cognition-judgment-based" population, that knows the very clear distinction between singular reality, and absolutely necessary illusions,

and knows all that, and can tell those distinctions easily, automatically, applicably, as natural as the day is long, then,

then, no one exposes anyone, no need, what a waste of time,

as everything, is exposed, to everyone, all at once.

No accusations required, let's not waste our energy.

It's way too dangerous in private, and in public, well, no need;

for conversations conducted in public, well, it's all so obvious, to everyone.

In public, accuracy, consistency, helpfulness, purpose, is all so easily, 'second-nature' obvious, to everyone, that conversations just continue in a helpful, accurate, consistent manner;

too many people understand too much, for it to be any other way.

You arrange and re-arrange and arrange things helpfully, bypass harmful things when you need to, and quarantine (in health and safety) when necessary.

That's obviously what everyone wants, if they could get it.

Instead of scary things feeling safer to discuss in private, and more dangerous to discuss in public, which is indeed the way things are among an "attachment-judgment-based" population,

it changes a little with a "cognition-judgment-based" population, in which case, the scariest things turn out to be most safely discussed in public.

But first of course, you need a "cognition-judgment-based" population, because an "attachment-judgment-based" population, doesn't know how to handle scary things, and could well 'destroy the messenger', as they say.

Conversations comprehensively proceed towards work out well, and things that aren't helpful - *now that everyone, each person, has a way of assessing that*, things, or people, that aren't helpful, are simply *bypassed*.

No need to catch anyone, no need for big show trials. Counterproductive.

The point becomes proceeding towards continuations that are helpful, and simply bypassing, in health and safety all around, things, or people, that are not helpful, including quarantining, where necessary. (And certainly not harm or punishment.)

"Logical Types © 1983 nrm imaginenine.com" Is A System, Not An Anti-System

Logical Types © nrm is *Not* an anti-system.

It is a system.

It is a simple math structure, whose purpose is figuring out continuations that are helpful, all around, and are accurate, and relevant, and all the rest, while bypassing, ideas and procedures and people that are harmful.

And, if necessary, quarantining, always necessarily in health and safety, those dynamics or people that insist on being harmful and cannot, in the moment at least, be bypassed.

It has little to say about how to take things apart; it's not a "smash", or "punishment", or "tear down" idea.

It is a system for figuring out what is likeliest to work out well, all around, by everyone's cognitive lights, in full, through and through consistency with the ruler of nature's singular, five-senses-knowable reality.

Just three hours. Please.

and, as always,

Best Wishes, To All . . .

---- neil

Neil Robert Miller imaginenine.com
United States
September 9th, 2002

A List of Some of the 120 Files at this Site

Compiled in the Winter of 1998

Science

[The Medical Approach](#) -- [Schema](#) -- (updated, December 5, 1997)

[The Emotion Approach](#) -- [Backbone For A Cooperative Society](#) -- (updated, November 22, 1997)

[The Cognition Approach](#) -- [General Summary](#) -- (1992)

[The Women's Studies Approach](#) -- [Cooperative Origins of Society](#) -- (November, 1996)

[The Bibliographic Approach](#) -- [Books and Articles](#) -- (1998)

Sociability

[The Sanity Approach](#) -- [Sane and Sound](#) -- (April 7, 1995)

[The In-From-The-Blue-Approach](#) -- [Inner States as Transferable Substance](#) -- (1986)

[The Integrity Approach](#) -- [Integrity Rules, in Sixty Words](#) -- (April 7, 1995)

Politics

[The Democrat Approach](#) -- [Welcome Back](#) -- (April 26, 1996)

[The Presidential Approach](#) -- [Conversational Conventions](#) -- (November 13, 1997)

[The History Approach](#) -- [The Perpetrators and the Witnesses](#) -- (January 1, 1995)

[The Communist Approach](#) -- [Text Home Page](#) -- (November 15, 1995)

[The Political Science Approach](#) -- [Left and Right](#) -- (April 25, 1995)

The Scramble

[The One-Liner Approach](#) - - [50 One-Line Explanations](#) - - (1991, '97)

[The One-Page Approach](#) - - [Basic Elements, In Contrast](#) - - (June 1, 1995)

[The Philosophy Approach](#) - - [Defining What Truth Is](#) - - (January, 1996)

[The Moral Approach](#) - - [Good and Bad](#) - - (November 13, 1994)

[The Philanthropy Approach](#) - - [Criteria](#) - - [All You Need To Know](#) - - (November 17, 1994, August 1, 1997)

[The Desperation Approach](#) - - [Appeal for Funds](#) - - (October 15, 1995)

The Dictatorship of the Principled

[The Totalitarian Dictatorship Approach](#) - - [Rules for a Work Out Well World](#) - - (August 2, 1997)

[The Meglomanical Approach](#) - - [The Messiah Syndrome and Autobiography](#) - - (April, 1995)

[The Pants-On-Fire Approach](#) - - [What If... Nobody Lied](#) - - (October, 1995)

Daily Life

[The Poetic Approach](#) - - [Stop Rape](#) - - (1986)

More: ... [40 More Renditions](#) - - [See Home Page](#) - - (1963-1998)

A Few New Files Posted In 2002

The Doves of September

- a. [All New Web-Site Introduction: Da Darkies Didn't Do It, Da Bullies Did It](#), September 9, 2002 (html)
- b. [Red Star Over Devonia: Political History As I Understand It](#), May 28th, 2002 (Acrobat *.pdf 100k)
- c. [Robert Redford, Jack Kennedy, and Elliot Ness: Don't Shoot, I Can Explain Everything](#), July 27th, 2002 (html)
- d. [Of Angels and Tea Leaves: Web Logs As You've Never Seen Them](#), May to August, 2002 (Acrobat *.pdf 300k), also [more](#) (Acrobat *.pdf 700k)
- e. [The Bullies and The Rest of Us](#), July 8th, 2002 (Acrobat *.pdf 70k)
- f. [Academia, The Red Army, and The Class/Member Distinction](#), April 17th, 2000 (html)
- g. [Letter to my Congressperson](#), October 22nd, 2000 (two years ago) (Acrobat *.pdf 90 k)
- h. [The Nature of Truth reprinted with 21 spelling corrections \(eep!\)](#), 1996, 2002 (html)
- i. [She Loves You](#), circa 1994 (eight years ago) (Acrobat *.pdf 40 k)
- j. New Personal Autobiography Note - Terry, Marcy, and Marilyn, September, 2000, (in process)
- k. [Just in case](#), January 24th, 1999 (Acrobat *.pdf 40 k)
- l. [New Index Page](#), 2002
- m. [God, Limits, And The Theory Of Everything](#), 2001/2002 (in process)
- n. [The 'Independence' Hoax And The Criminally Violent](#), 2001/2002 (in process)
- o. [The Child Abuse Roots Of The Bullying Frame Of Reference In World Politics](#), 2001/2002 (in process)
- p. [A Few More - 'On Mental Instability', 'Of Secrecy and Treason', bibliography listings and tales, buncha other stuff](#), 2002 (in process)
- q. And Always, [The Silver Locket](#), October 16th, 2000

See [Index Page](#) for a more extensive list of current files.



Paradigm from California is the long-fabled,

and NEVER BEFORE ILLUMINATED

Paradigm of Classical Communism

Paradigm from California: Time Line

Project initiated - October, 1962

Formal research phase begun - November 20, 1978

'Type Two Logic' discovery- March 15, 1983

Paradigm text begun - April 10, 1984

Central paradigm discovery - 'Tenors' - August 20, 1984

Paradigm completed - December 12, 1984

First major manuscript mailing - 75 recipients: March 1st, 1985

Volume Two completed - December 1, 1986

Largest single manuscript mailing - 450 recipients: May 11, 1987

Third Comprehensive summary - June 1, 1992

Most recent manuscript mailing - July 30, 1995; total to date, 2,000 postal recipients

Internet Site opens: September 16, 1995

Basic Home Page revision - November 15, 1995

Recompiled - May 22, 2002, Revised and Posted - August 12, 2002

Internet Site most recent update - September 10, 2003

Between September 16th, 1995 and November 30th, 1995

there were approximately 500 visitors to this site,
mostly from about twenty individually crafted little essays
posted to internet newsgroups, and about a hundred
United States Postal Service postcards that I sent out.

That's not even a thousandth enough to make this paradigm publicly known,
but, it is enough to create a definite wisp, for the finely attuned,
and enough to dateprint this site.

Between 1995, and 2002, and not counting catalogue engines,

there were approximately 50,000 visitors to this web-site, ten percent of the above projection.

Visits generally for the current period, are running at approximately 1,800 per month.

Tragically, this work remains unpublished.

(From 'the cutting-room floor' of mailings past: . . . [. . . John is my copilot . . .]

You know . . . what would be especially nice is if a crack developed in such a way wherein I could just touch, just words, just touch, in the clear light of day, through the front door, during business hours, in the approved, expected way, with the proper postage, all neat and prim inside, and with plenty of accurate warning, and, well, just touch, and the whole glass bubble shatters, leaving six billion healthy, intelligent people, right in place, looking at me kinda funny, as if I'd just disturbed their afternoon. Wouldn't that be nice? Using just ordinary words and sentences too . . . neat, eh? Pretty unlikely though, as best I can tell; that sort of stuff only happened in ancient times, you know, the big times. They had all the fun. Oh well. Even so, it always seems to me like we still have a chance . . .)

. . . you may say that I'm a dreamer, but I'm not the only one . . .

--- j. lennon

. . . and, Best Wishes to All . . .

--- neil

Comments about this manuscript and this project are highly encouraged:

e-mail:

neil@imagine9.com

United States Postal Service:

P.O. Box 31035

San Francisco, California 94131

Thank you.

writing - production: **neil**

comments - offers: **neil@imagine9.com**

Women - Struggle

- The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Riane Eisler* 203 pages Harper 1988
- Aman: The Story Of A Somali Girl** ○ ○ ○
by *Virginia Lee Barnes And Janice Boddy, editors* 350 Pantheon 1994
- Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence - from Domestic Abuse to Political Terrorism** ○ ○ ○
by *Judith Lewis Herman, M.D.* 236 Basic 1992
- Mothers of the Disappeared** ○ ○ ○
by *Jo Fisher* 159 South End 1989
- Witches, Midwives, And Nurses** ○ ○ ○
by *Barbara Ehrenreich* CCNY 1973
- Daughters of the Pacific** ○ ○ ○
by *Zohr De Ishtar* 253 Spinifex 1994
- Women of Smoke** ○ ○ ○
by *Marjorie Agosin* 109 Red Sea 1989
- Women In Exile** ○ ○ ○
by *Mahnaz Afkhami* 208 U Virginia 1994
- Notorious: The Life of Ingrid Bergman** ○ ○ ○
by *Donald Spoto* 436 HarperCollins 1997
- Love and Rockets** ○ ○ ○
by *Gilbert Hernandez and Jaime Hernandez* 50 Issues Fantagraphics 1983-1994
- Women In The Global Factory** ○ ○ ○
by *Annette Fuenten and Barbara Ehrenreich* 59 South End, 1983
- The First Time: Women Speak Out** ○ ○ ○
by *Karen Bouris* 203 Conari 1993
- Connexions** ○ ○ ○
by *Peoples Translation Service* 80 Issues PTS Collective 1975-1994
- And They Call It Help: The Psychiatric Policing of America's Children** ○ ○ ○
by *Louise Armstrong* 279 Addison Wesley 1993
- Daring To Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975** ○ ○ ○
by *Alice Echols* 395 U Minnesota 1989
- Fire in the Rain, Singer in the Storm:** ○ ○ ○
An Autobiography of Holly Near
by *Holly Near with Derk Richardson* 282
- Girl Power** ○ ○ ○
Young Women Speak Out, Personal Writing From Teenage Girls
by *Hillary Carlip* 343 Warner 1995
- Hysterical Personality** ○ ○ ○
by *Mardi J. Horowitz, MD* 399 Aronson 1977
- Norma Jean: The Life of Marilyn Monroe** ○ ○ ○
by *Fred Lawrence Guiles* 392 Bantam 1969
- Runaway: Diary of a Street Kid** ○ ○ ○
by *Evelyn Lau* 276 Coach House 1995
- Terry:** ○ ○ ○
My Daughter's Life-And-Death Struggle With Alcoholism
by *George McGovern* 208 Villard 1996
- We Shall Not Be Moved: The Women's Factory Strike of 1909** ○ ○ ○
by *Joan Dash* (non-fiction written for young people) 152 Scholastic 1996
- Women of the New Right** ○ ○ ○
by *Rebecca E. Klatch* 216 Temple Univ. 1987
- Out of the Shadows: Women, Resistance and Politics in South America** ○ ○ ○
by *Jo Fisher* 211 Latin American Bureau (LAB) 1993
- Reflections On The Way To The Gallows: Voices of Japanese Rebel Women** ○ ○ ○
by *Mikiso Hane* 252 U. of California 1988

Body Image

- Femininity** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Susan Brownmiller* 237 Fawcett Columbine
- Ophelia Speaks: Adolescent Girls Write About Their Search for Self** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Sara Shandler* 280 HarperCollins 1999
- Marilyn Monroe** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Donald Spoto* 611 HarperCollins 1993
- Spoken in Darkness: A Small Town Murder and a Friendship Beyond Death** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Anne Imbrey* 258 Plume/Penguin 1994
- The Body Project: An Intimate History of American Girls** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Joan Jacobs Brumberg* 214 Random House
- Little Girls in Pretty Boxes: The Making and Breaking of Elite Gymnasts and Figure Skaters** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Joan Ryan* 243 Doubleday 1995
- Survival of the Prettiest: The Science of Beauty** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Nancy Etcoff* 245 Doubleday 1999
- A Bright Red Scream: Self-Mutilation and the Language of Pain** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Marilee Strong* 215 Viking 1998
- Cutting: Understanding and Overcoming Self-Mutilation** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Steven Levenkron* 254 Norton 1998
- Female Adolescent Development** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Max Sugar, MD, (ed.)* 343 Brunner/Mazel 1979
- Girl, Interrupted** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Susanna Kaysen* 168 Random House 1993
- Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Mary Pipher, Ph.D.* 293 Ballantine 1994
- Sacred Pleasure: Sex, Myth, and the Politics of the Body** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Riane Eisler* 401 HarperSanFrancisco 1995
- Breasts: Our Most Public Private Parts** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Meema Spadola* 243 Wildcat Canyon/Circulus 1998
- What Society Does To Girls** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Joyce Nicholson* 72 Virago 1977
- Sex by Prescription** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Thomas S. Szasz, MD* 167 Penguin 1980
- Voices of the Survivors** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Patricia Eastel* 208 Spinifex 1994
- Kept Women** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Leslie McRay with Ted Schwarz* 214 Morrow 1990
- The Comfort Women: Japan's Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *George Hicks* 275 Norton 1994
- Date Rape: The Secret Epidemic; What it is, What it isn't, What it does to you, What you can do about it** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Marcia Mobilia Boumil, J.D., LL.M., Joel Friedman, Ph. D., and Barbara Ewert, J.D.* 151 Health Communications Press 1993
- Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Jill Radford and Diana E.H. Russell, (ed.)* 359 Twayne 1992
- The Montreal Massacre** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Louise Malette and Marie Chalouh (eds.)* 177 Gynergy 1991
- Women of the Asylum: Voices From Behind The Walls, 1840 - 1945** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Jeffrey L. Geller and Maxine Harris* 328 Doubleday 1994
- You Can't Drown The Fire: Latin American Women Writing in Exile** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Alicia Partnoy* 251 Cleis 1988
- The Civilization of The Goddess: The World of Old Europe** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Marija Gimbutas* 401 HarperCollins 1991
- The Girl Within** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Emily Hancock* 261 Fawcett Columbine

Special Violence

- Sex Crimes** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Alice Vachss* 284 Random House 1993
- Witchcraze: A New History of the European Witch Hunts** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Anne Llewellyn Barstow* 165 Harper
- Riding the Nightmare: Women and Witchcraft From The Old World To Colonial Salem** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Selma R. Williams and Pamela Williams Adelman* 208 HarperCollins 1978
- The Stoning of Soraya M.** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Freidoune Sabehjani* 160 Arcade 1994
- Child Slaves** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Peter Lee-Wright* 270 Earthscan 1990
- Tender Mercies: Inside the World of a Child Abuse Investigator** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Keith Richards* 280 Noble 1992
- The War Against Children** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Peter R. Breggin and Ginger Ross Breggin* 201 St. Martin's 1994
- The Scapegoat Generation: America's War on Adolescents** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Mike A. Males* 293 Common Courage 1996
- Brazil: War on Children** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Gilberto Dimenstein* 81 LAB 1991
- Interviewing the Sexually Abused Child** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *David P.H. Jones* 56 Gaskell Royal College of Psychiatrists [London] 1992
- A Modern Form of Slavery** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Trafficking of Burmese Women and Girls into Brothels in Thailand
by *Asia Watch*, 160 Women's Rights Project 1993
- U.S. Military Prostitution in Asia: Let The Good Times Roll** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Saundra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stoltzfus* 327 New Press, 1992
- The Traffic In Women** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Emma Goldman* 63 Times Change Press
- Women's Asia** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Yayoi Matsui* 159 Zed 1987
- Backstreets** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Prostitution, Money, and Love [Norway]
by *Cecilie Hoigard and Liv Finstad* 215 U Oslo / Penn State 1992
- Surviving Beyond Fear: Women, Children, and Human Rights In Latin America** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Marjorie Agosin (ed.)* 178 White Pine 1993
- Unchained Memories: True Stories of Traumatic Memories, Lost and Found** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Lenore Terr, M.D.* 247 Basic/Harper 1994
- Rape: The Ultimate Violation** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Judith Rowland* 353 Pluto 1986
- Crimes Worse Than Death** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Kate Shanahan* 138 Attic [Dublin] 1992
- Butterflies Of The Night: Mama-Sans, Geisha, Strippers, and the Japanese Men They Serve** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Lisa Louis* 208 Tengu 1992
- Night Market: Sexual Cultures and the Thai Economic Miracle** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Ryan Bishop and Lillian S. Robinson* 252 Routledge 1998
- Nightwork: Sexuality, Pleasure, and Corporate Masculinity in a Tokyo Hostess Club** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Anne Allison* 204 U. of Chicago 1994
- Ella Enchanted** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Gail Carson Levine* (fiction, written for young people) 232 HarperTrophy 1997
- Sing Down The Moon** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Scott O'Dell* (fiction, written for young people) 137 Bantam/Doubleday/Dell 1970
- The Talking Earth** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Jean Craighead George* (fiction, written for young people) 151 HarperTrophy 1983

Children's Books

- Lyddie** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 181 Penguin 1992
- The Girl With The White Flag** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Tomiko Higa* (fiction, written for young people) 127 Dell 1991
- The Dragon in the Cliff** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Sheila Cole* (fiction, written for young people) 211 Lothrop, Lee & Shepard 1991
- Girl in Buckskin** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Dorothy Gilman* (fiction, written for young people) 153 Fawcett Juniper Balantine 1956
- Bridge to Terabithia** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 128 HarperTrophy 1977
- Staying Fat for Sarah Byrnes** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Chris Crutcher* (fiction, written for young people) 216 Doubleday Dell/Laurel-Leaf 1993
- The Great Gilly Hopkins** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 148 Harper/Collins 1978
- Dancing on the Edge** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Han Nolan* (fiction, written for young people) 244 Harcourt Brace 1997
- Young Joan** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Barbara Dana* (fiction, written for young people) 340 Harper 1991
- Bat 6** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Virginia Euwer Wolff* (fiction, written for young people) 230 Scholastic 1998
- Homecoming** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Cynthia Voigt* (fiction, written for young people) 372 Fawcett Juniper 1981
- Jacob Have I Loved** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 244 HarperTrophy 1980
- Julie of the Wolves** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Jean Craighead George* (fiction, for young people) 170 HarperCollins 1972
- Rebels of the Heavenly Kingdom** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 277 Puffin/Penguin 1983
- Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Mildred D. Taylor* (fiction, written for young people) 276 Puffin/Penguin 1976
- Dacey's Song** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Cynthia Voigt* (fiction, written for young people) 196 Atheneum 1983
- Little Sister** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Kara Dalkey* (fiction, written for young people) 194 Puffin/Penguin 1996
- Mieko and the Fifth Treasure** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Eleanor Coerr* (fiction, for children) 77
- Morning Girl** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Michael Dorris* (fiction, for children) 74 Hyperion 1992
- Song of the Magdalene** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Donna Jo Napoli* (fiction, written for young people) 240 Scholastic 1996
- The Flip Flop Girl** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction, written for young people) 120 Puffin/Penguin 1994
- The Golden Compass** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Philip Pullman* (fiction, written for young people) 399 Knopf 1995
- The Slave Dancer** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Paula Fox* (fiction, for young people) 127 Dell 1970
- The True Confessions of Charlotte Doyle** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Avi* (fiction, for young people) 221 Avon 1990
- The Trumpeter of Krakow** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Eric P. Kelly* (fiction, written for young people) 208 Simon & Shuster 1928
- Walk Two Moons** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Sharon Creech* (fiction, written for young people) 280 HarperTrophy 1994
- Young Fu of the Upper Yangtze** ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by *Elizabeth Foreman Lewis* (fiction, written for young people) 255 Dell

HISTORY - THE PERPETRATORS

The Splendid Blond Beast: ○ ○ ○
Money, Law, and Genocide in the Twentieth Century
by Christopher Simpson 287 Grove 1993

War Without Mercy ○
Race and Power in the Pacific War
by John W. Dower 317 Pantheon 1986

The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia ○
by Alfred W. McCoy 354 Harper & Row 1972

The Rich And The Super-Rich: ○
A Study In The Power of Money Today
by Ferdinand Lundberg 934 Bantam 1968

Hitler's Willing Executioners: ○ ○ ○
Ordinary Germans and The Holocaust
by Daniel Jonah Goldenhagen 461 pages Knopf 1996

Killing Hope: ○
U.S. Military and CIA Intervention Since World War 11
by William Blum 383 Common Courage 1995

The Unknown CIA: ○
My Three Decades With The Agency
by Russell Jack Smith 259 Peramon-Brassey

Blowback: ○
America's Recruitment of Nazis and Its Effects on the Cold War
by Christopher Simpson 290 Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1988

Captains of Consciousness: ○
Advertising And The Social Roots of The Consumer Culture
by Stuart Ewen 220 McGraw-Hill 1976

Blackshirts and Reds: ○
Rational Fascism and the Overthrow of Communism
by Michael Parenti 160 City Lights 1997

The Little School: ○
Tales of Disappearance and Survival in Argentina
by Alicia Partnoy 136 Cleis 1986

A Miracle, A Universe: ○
Settling Accounts with Torturers [Uruguay/Brazil]
by Lawrence Weschler 282 U Chicago 990

Behind the Silicon Curtain: ○
The Seductions of Work in a Lonely Era
by Dennis Hayes 159 South End 1989

Crystal Night ○
by Rita Thalman And Emmanuel Feinermann 172 Holocaust Library 1972

Survivors: ○
An Oral History of the Armenian Genocide
by Donald E. Miller and Lorna Touryan Miller 1 U California 1993

The Holocaust: ○
The Destruction of European Jewry, 1933-1941
by Nora Levin, 713 Schocken, 1968

The Rise And Fall of The Third Reich ○
by William L. Shirer, Publisher, Year

A Lexicon of Terror: ○
Argentina and the Legacies of Torture
by Marguerite Feilowitz 255 Oxford 1998

19 The Science of Coercion ○
by Christopher Simpson 117 Oxford 1994

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass ○
by Frederick Douglass 126 Signet/Penguin 1845

Kosovo: ○
A Short History
by Noel Malcolm 356 NYU 1998

Castles Burning: ○
A Child's Life in War [Hungry]
by Magda Denes 384 Norton 1977

Round Up The Usual Suspects: ○
The Making Of Casablanca - Bogart, Bergman, And World War 11
by Aljean Harmetz 354 Hyperion 1992

We, Chile: ○
Personal Testimonies of the Chilean Arpilleras
by Emma Sepulveda, editor 187 Azul Editions 1996

HISTORY - THE WITNESSES

China Shakes The World ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Jack Belden Monthly Review 1949

The World of Henri Carter-Bresson ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Henri Carter-Bresson Publisher 1967

The Cold War And Its Origins: 1917-1960 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by D. F. Fleming 1,115 Doubleday 1961

Against the Current: ○ ○ ○
Bill Haywood's Book; The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood
by William D. Haywood 365 International 1983

JFK: ○ ○ ○
Reckless Youth
by Nigel Hamilton 804 Random House 1992

Labor's Untold Story ○ ○ ○
by Richard O. Boyer and Herbert M. Morais 380 United Electrical Workers 1955

The Autobiography of Malcom X ○ ○ ○
by Alex Haley Publisher 1965

Human Rights Watch Publication Catalogue ○ ○ ○
by Human Rights Watch 28 pages, 500 Books 1997

The Cartoon Guide To The Universe: ○
Volumes One, Two, And Three [only]
by Larry Gonick, Three Issues Rip off Press 1975

The Scapel The Sword: ○
A Canadian Surgeon With The Eighth Route Army

Away With All Pests: ○
An English Surgeon In Peoples' China
by Joshua S. Horn, MD 183 Monthly Review

The Wind Will Not Subside: ○
Years In Revolutionary China - 1964-1969
by David Milton and Nancy Dall Milton 379 Random House 1976

America and Lewis Hine ○
by Louis Hine, Publisher, Year

Bridge of Courage: ○
Life Stories of the Guatemalan Companeros and Companeras
by Jennifer Harbury 275 Common Courage 1995

Fear in Chile: ○
Lives Under Pinochet
by Patricia Politzer 245 Pantheon 1989

History of the Labor Movement in The United States, Vol. 4: ○
The Industrial Workers of the World
by Philip S. Foner 558 International 1965

The French Revolution, 1787-1799: ○
From The Storming of The Bastille To Napoleon
by Albert Soboul, Random 613 Random House 1975

The Sixties: ○
Years of Hope, Days Of Rage
by Todd Gitlin 440 Bantam 1987

Tune in Tomorrow ○
by Tom Tomorrow 119 St. Martins 1994

How Can I Keep From Singing: ○
A Biography of Pete Seeger
by David King Dunaway 311 McGraw-Hill 1981

Contested Terrain: ○
The Transformation Of The Workplace In The Twentieth Century
by Richard Edwards 216 Basic, 1979

We Wish To Inform You ○
That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories From Rwanda
by Philip Gourevitch 353 Farrar Straus 1998

Burn This House: ○
The Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia
by Jasminka Udovicki and James Ridgeway, Editors 316 Duke 1997

Dynamite: ○
The Story of Class Violence In America
by Louis Adamic 480 Chelsea House (1931)

SCIENCE - PSYCHIATRY

Attachment And Loss ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by John Bowlby, MD 1,171 Basic 1969

Families and Family Therapy ○ ○ ○
by Salvador Minuchin, MD 256 Harvard 1974

The Assault on Truth: ○ ○ ○
Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory
by Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson 192 Farrar, Straus, and Giroux 1984

Harry Stack Sullivan's Concepts of Personality Development and Psychiatric Illness ○ ○ ○
by A. H. Chapman, MD 189 Brunner/Mazel 1980

A Secure Base: ○
Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development
by John Bowlby 180 Basic 1988

Leaving Home: ○
The Therapy of Disturbed Young People
by Jay Haley, 274 McGraw Hill, 1980

On Killing: ○
The Psychological Cost In War And Society
by Col. Dave Grossman 332 Little, Brown

The Interactional View ○
by Paul Watslawick 396 Norton, 1977

Harry Stack Sullivan: ○
His Life and His Work
by A. H. Chapman, MD, Putnam, 1976

Psychosomatic Families: ○
Anorexia Nervosa in Context
by Salvador Minuchin, MD, 331 Harvard 1978

Betrayal Trauma: ○
The Logic of Forgetting Childhood Abuse
by Jennifer J. Freyd 199 Harvard 1996

Cults in our Midst ○
by Margaret Thaler Singer and Janja Lalich 367 Jossey-Bass 1995

Double Bind ○
by Carlos E. Sluzki, MD and Donald C. Ransom (editors) 332 Grune & Stratton 1976

Freud And Man's Soul. ○
by Bruno Bettelheim, MD 112 Knopf 1983

Reflections On Therapy and Other Essays. ○
by Jay Haley 254 Family Therapy Institute 1981

Schizophrenia: ○
The Experience And Its Treatment
by Werner M. Mendel 139 Jossey-Bass, 1976

The Making and Breaking of Affective Bonds ○ ○ ○
by John Bowlby 160 Tavistock 1979

The Manufacture of Madness ○ ○ ○
by Thomas S. Szasz, MD, 292 Harper & Row 1970

The Myth of Mental Illness ○ ○ ○
by Thomas S. Szasz, MD, Harper & Row, 1974

The Nazi Doctors ○ ○ ○
by Robert Jay Lifton 504 Basic 1986

In the Freud Archives ○ ○ ○
by Janet Malcolm 165 Flamingo/Fontana 1986

Pragmatics of Human Communication: ○ ○ ○
A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes
by Paul Watslawick, 271 Norton, 1967

The Treatment Techniques of Harry Stack Sullivan ○ ○ ○
by A. H. Chapman, MD, 227 Brunner/Mazel 1978

24 Paradox And Counterparadox ○ ○ ○
by Mara Palazzoli, MD, 171 Jason Aronson 1978

History as Mystery ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Michael Parenti 267 City Lights 1999

Maxim Litvinoff ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Arthur Upham Pope 498 L.B. Fischer 1943

Morning Breeze: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
A True Story of China's Cultural Revolution
by Fulang Lo 243 China Books 1989

SCIENCE - THE CURE

Paradigm from California, Volume I ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Neil Robert Miller 618 (unpb) 1984 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

The Lives of A Cell: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Notes of A Biology Watcher
by Lewis Thomas 174 Bantam 1974

Lucy: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
How Our Oldest Human Ancestor Was Discovered
by Donald Johanson and Maitland Edey 376 Touchstone 1981

Charles Darwin: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
A New Life
by John Bowlby 455 Norton 1990

Fermat's Enigma ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Simon Singh 285 Walker 1997

Longitude: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
The True Story of How a Lone Genius Solved The Greatest Scientific Problem of His Time
by Dana Sobel 175 Penguin 995

Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Clayton L. Thomas, M.D. 2,439 FA Davis

The Neuron: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Cell and Molecular Biology
by Irwin B. Levitan and Leonard K. Kaczmarek 507 Oxford 1997

The New Biology ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Robert Augros and George Stanciu 231 Shambhalla 1987

Bonobo: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
The Forgotten Ape
by Frans De Wall 184 U California 1997

Change: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution.
by Paul Watslawick 160 Norton, 1974

Exploring The World of Lucid Dreaming ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Peter LaBerge 313 Ballantine 1990

From Lucy to Language ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Donald Johanson and Blake Edgar 261 Simon & Shuster 1996

Green Backlash: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Global Subversion of the Environmental Movement
by Andrew Rowell 376 Routledge 1996

The Medusa and the Snail ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
More Notes of a Biology Watcher
by Lewis Thomas 146 Bantam 1979

Touching: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
The Human Significance of the Skin
by Ashley Montagu 414 Harpre 1986

Ancestors: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
In Search of Human Origins
by Donald Johanson, Lenora Johanson, and Blake Eadaar 328 Random House 1994

Freeing The Natural Voice ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Kristin Linklater, 210 Drama Books, 1976

Origins Reconsidered: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
In Search of What Makes Us Human
by Richard Leakey and Roger Lewin 360 Anchor/Doubleday 1992

The Construction of Reality In The Child. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Jean Piaget Basic 1954

The Fossil Trail: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
How We Know What We Think We Know About Human Evolution
by Ian Tattersall 207 Oxford 1995

Schooling In Capitalist America ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Samuel Bowles, and Herbert Gintis Basic 1976

23 The Structure of Scientific Revolutions ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Thomas S. Kuhn 210 Univ of Chicago, 1970

In this Proud Land ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
by Farm Security Administration Photographers, Publisher, Year

33 Humanity And Society: ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
A World History
by Kenneth Neill Cameron 436 Monthly Review 1973

WOMEN

The Chalice and the Blade:
Our History, Our Future
by *Riane Eisler*
203 pages Harper 1988

Witches, Midwives, And Nurses
by *Barbara Ehrenreich*
CCNY 1973

Sacred Pleasure:
Sex, Myth, and the Politics of the Body
by *Riane Eisler*
401 HarperSanFrancisco 1995

Femininity
by *Susan Brownmiller*
237 Fawcett Columbine 1984

Aman:
The Story Of A Somali Girl
by *Virginia Lee Barne*
And *Janice Boddy*,
editors 350 Pantheon 1994

Daughters of the Pacific
by *Zohr De Ishtar*
253 Spinifex 1994

Marilyn Monroe
by *Donald Spoto*
611 HarperCollins 1993

Girl, Interrupted
by *Susanna Kayser*
168 Random House 1993

Witchcraze:
A New History of the European Witch Hunts
by *Anne Llewellyn Barstow*
165 Harper 1994

The Stoning of Soraya M.
by *Freidoune Sahebjam* 160
Arcade 1994

Women's Asia
by *Yayoi Matsui*
159 Zed 1987

A Modern Form of Slavery
Trafficking of Burmese Women and Girls
into Brothels in Thailand
by *Asia Watch*,
160 Women's Rights Project 1993

U.S. Military Prostitution in Asia:
Let The Good Times Roll
by *Sandra Pollock Sturdevant*
and *Brenda Stoltzfus*
327 New Press, 1992

Sex Crimes
by *Alice Vachss*
284 Random House 1993

Spoken in Darkness:
A Small Town Murder
and a Friendship Beyond Death
by *Anne Imbre*
258 Plume/Penguin 1994

Child Slaves
by *Peter Lee-Wright*
270 Earthscan 1990

Tender Mercies:
Inside the World of
a Child Abuse Investigator
by *Keith Richards*
280 Noble 1992

Trauma and Recovery:
The Aftermath of Violence - from Domestic
Abuse to Political Terrorism
by *Judith Lewis Herman, M.D.*
236 Basic 1992

CHILDREN

Lyddie
by *Katherine Paterson* (fiction)
181 Penguin 1992

The Girl With The White Flag
by *Tomiko Higa*
127 Dell 1991

Girl in Buckskin
by *Dorothy Gilman*
(fiction) 153 Fawcett Balantine 1956

The Dragon in the Cliff
by *Sheila Cole*
(fiction) 211
Lothrop, Lee & Shepard 1991

Young Joan
by *Barbara Dana*
(fiction)340 Harper 1991

Bridge to Terabithia
by *Katherine Paterson*
(fiction) 128 HarperTrophy 1977

The Great Gilly Hopkins
by *Katherine Paterson*
(fiction) 148 Harper/Collins 1978

Staying Fat for Sarah Byrnes
by *Chris Crutcher*
(fiction) 216 Bantam/Laurel-Leaf 1993

We Shall Not Be Moved :
The Women's Factory Strike of 1909
by *Joan Dash*
152 Scholastic 1996

Dancing on the Edge
by *Han Nolan*
(fiction) 244 Harcourt Brace 1997

Diamonds

From The Hands Of The Gods

*What do you do when the only possible work-out-well-for-all solution
to the problems of the world, turns out to also be an alarming and piercing
personal insult to all those who are attempting to be successful in it?*

imagininenine.com/pursuit.html

startdate: January 27, 102000

PSYCHIATRY

Attachment And Loss
by *John Bowlby, MD*
1,171 Basic 1969 1973 1978

Families and Family Therapy
by *Salvador Minuchin, MD*
256 Harvard, 1974

The Assault on Truth:
Freud's Suppression
of the Seduction Theory
by *Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson*
192 Farrar, Straus, and Giroux 1984

**Harry Stack Sullivan's Concepts
of Personality Development
and Psychiatric Illness**
by *A. H. Chapman, MD*
189 Brunner/Mazel, 1980

A Secure Base:
Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy
Human Development
by *John Bowlby, MD*
180 Basic 1988

Leaving Home:
The Therapy of Disturbed Young People
by *Jay Haley*,
274 McGraw Hill, 1980

The Nazi Doctors
by *Robert Jay Lifton, MD*
504 Basic 1986

SCIENCE

**Paradigm from California,
Volume I**
by *Neil Robert Miller*
618 (unpub) 1984

The Lives of A Cell:
Notes of A Biology Watcher
by *Lewis Thomas, MD*
174 Bantam 1974

Lucy:
How Our Oldest Human Ancestor
Was Discovered
by *Donald Johanson*
and *Maitland Edey*
376 Touchstone 1981

**Taber's Cyclopedic
Medical Dictionary**
by *Clayton L. Thomas, M.D.*
2,439 FA Davis 1997

The New Biology
by *Robert Augros*
and *George Stanciu*
231 Shambhalla 1987

Schooling In Capitalist America
by *Samuel Bowles*,
and *Herbert Gintis*
Basic 1976

Away With All Pests:
An English Surgeon In Peoples' China
by *Joshua S. Horn, MD*
183 Monthly Review 1969

HISTORY

China Shakes The World
by *Jack Belden*
Monthly Review 1949

Against the Current:
Bill Haywood's Book;
The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood
by *William D. Haywood* 365
International 1983

The Cold War And Its Origins:
1917-1960 by *D. F. Fleming*
1,115 Doubleday 1961

Killing Hope:
U.S. Military and CIA Intervention
Since World War 11
by *William Blum*
383 Common Courage 1995

Mothers of the Disappeared
by *Jo Fisher*
159 South End 1989

The Wind Will Not Subside:
Years 1n Revolutionary China - 1964-1969
by *David Milton* and *Nancy Dall
Milton* 379 Random House 1976

Blackshirts and Reds:
Rational Fascism and the Overthrow of
Communism by *Michael Parenti*
160 City Lights 1997

Hitler's Willing Executioners:
Ordinary Germans and The Holocaust
by *Daniel Jonah Goldenhagen*
461 pages Knopf 1996

War Without Mercy
Race and Power in the Pacific War
by *John W. Dower*
317 Pantheon 1986

The Rich And The Super-Rich:
A Study 1n The Power of Money Today
by *Ferdinand Lundberg*
934 Bantam 1968

The Splendid Blond Beast:
Money, Law, and Genocide
in the Twentieth Century
by *Christopher Simpson*
287 Grove 1993

Human Rights Watch
Publication Catalogue
by *Human Rights Watch*
28 pages; 500 Books HRW 1997

Fear in Chile:
Lives Under Pinochet
by *Patricia Politzer*
245 Pantheon 1989

Labor's Untold Story
by *Richard O. Boyer*
and *Herbert M. Morais*
380 United Electrical Workers 1955

JFK:
Reckless Youth
by *Nigel Hamilton*
804 Random House 1992f

The World of Henri Carter-Bresson
by *Henri Cartier-Bresson*
Publisher 1967

Humanity And Society:
A World History
by *Kenneth Neill Cameron*
436 Monthly Review 1973

Diamonds from the Hands of The Gods among the fifty best of five hundred

E=MCsq.

A Biography of the World's Most Famous Equation
by *David Bodanis*
337 Walker 2000

Spare The Child

The Religious Roots of Punishment and The Psychological Impact of Physical Abuse
by *Philip Greven*
263 Vintage 1991

It Takes A Village

And Other Lessons Children Teach Us
by *Hillary Rodham-Clinton*
318 Touchtone 1996

The Silver Locket

by *Neil Robert Miller*
5 ../silverlocket.pdf 2001

History as Mystery

by *Michael Parenti*
273 City Lights 1999

Shanghai

The Rise and Fall of a Decadent City
by *Stella Dong*
294 William Morrow 2000

Joan of Arc Her Story

by *Regine Pernoud and Marie-Veronique Clin*
246 St. Martin's 1998

Unwanted Sex

The Culture of Intimidation and the Failure of Law
by *Stephen J. Schulhofer*
282 Harvard 1998

Women**I Know Why The Caged Bird Sings**

by *Maya Angelou*
289 Bantam 1969

Growing Up Female With A Bad Reputation

by *Leora Tanenbaum*
253 Seven Stoles 1999

Am I Thin Enough Yet

The Cult of Thinness and the Commercialization of Identity
by *Sharlene Hesse-Biber*
208 Oxford 1997

Don't Call Us Out of Name:

The Untold Lives of Women and Girls in Poor America
by *Lisa Dodson*
225 Beacon 1998

Red Scarf Girl

A Memoir of the Cultural Revolution
by *Ji Li Jiang*
HarperTrophy 1997
Written for young people

Deadly Persuasion:

Why Women and Girls Must Fight the Addictive Power of Advertising
by *Jean Kilbourne*
272 Free Press 1999

Sarah Bishop

by *Scott O'Dell*
229 Scholastic 1980
Fiction, written for young people

Zel

by *Donna Jo Napoli*
227 Puffin 1996
Fiction for children

Excellent**Art and Politics**

Beethoven's Hair:
An Extraordinary Historical Odyssey and a Musical Mystery Solved
by *Russell Martin*
200 Doubleday 2000

To Kill A Nation:

The Attack on Yugoslavia
by *Michael Parenti*
215 Verso 2000

Human Rights Watch Publications Catalogue

By *Human Rights Watch*
64 Human Rights Watch 2000

Math**The Universe and the Teacup:**

The Mathematics of Truth and Beauty
by *K. C. Cole*
202 Harcourt Brace 1998

Just Six Numbers

The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe
by *Martin Rees*
161 Basic 1999

Brain Sex:

The Real Difference Between Men and Women
by *Anne Moir and David Jessel*
203 Doubleday 1989

The Professor And The Madman:

A Tale of Murder, Insanity, and the Making of the Oxford English Dictionary
by *Simon Winchester*
237 HarperPerennial 1998

The Math Gene

How Mathematical Thinking Evolved and Why Numbers Are Like Gossip
by *Keith J. Devlin*
328 Basic 2000

The Triple Helix:
Gene, Organism, and Environment
by *Richard Lewontin*
129 Harvard 1999

Leonardo's Mountain Of Clams

And The Diet Of Worms
by *Stephene Jay Gould*
404 Three Rivers 1998

When Elephants Weep

The Emotional Lives of Animals
by *Jeffrey Masson & Susan McCarthy*
236 Delta 1995

Stardate

Lucy and Neandertal
Affection, Cogintion, and The Magical Tomato
by *Neil Robert Miller*

150 ../neanderthal.html 2000/2001

In Pursuit of The Magic Sentence

by *Neil Robert Miller*

23 ../pursuit.html 1999

Elections 2000

by *Neil Robert Miller*

3 ../elections2000.html 2000

The Sky Buckle

by *Neil Robert Miller*

50 words ../hpdm-gr1.htm 2001

Flying Blind

by *Neil Robert Miller*

5 ../maoand.html 2000

American Pearls

by *Neil Robert Miller*

200 words ../pearls.html 2000

../ = <http://imaginine.com/>

For Children**Pocahontas**

Powhatan Peacemaker
by *Anne Holler*
99 Chelsea House 1993
Non-fiction for young people

The Master Puppeteer

by *Katherine Paterson*
175 Harper Trophy 1975
Fiction for children

A Gathering of Days:

A New England Girl's Journal, 1830 - 1832
by *Joan W. Blos*
145 Aladdin 145 pages
Fiction for children

Ghost Horses

by *Pamela Smith Hill*
216 Avon/Camelot 1996
Fiction for children

The Night the White Deer Died

by *Gary Paulsen*
105 Dell 1978
Fiction for children

Running Out of Time

by *Margaret Peterson Haddix*
184 Alladin 1997
Fiction for young people

The King's Equal

by *Katherine Paterson*
HarperTrophy 1992
Fiction for children

Maura's Angel

by *Lynne Reid Banks*
150 Avon/Camelot 1984
Fiction for children

Susan B. Anthony:

Champion of Women's Rights
by *Helen Albee Monsell*
192 Aladdin 1954
Non-fiction, written for young people

Harry Potter and The Sorcerer's Stone

The Chamber of Secrets
The Prisoner of Azkaban
The Goblet of Fire
by *J. K. Rowling*
Scholastic 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000
Fiction for children

Sing for Your Father, Su Phan

by *Stella Pevsner and Fay Tang*
107 Random House 1997
Fiction for young people

Helpful**Science****Einstein In Love**

A Scientific Romance
by *Dennis Overbye*
380 Viking 2000

Galileo's Daughter:

A Historical Memoir of Science, Faith, and Love
by *Dava Sobel*
Walker 1999

The Face

by *Daniel McNeill*
346 Little Brown 1998

A History of Light and Lighting

Stage Lighting from Medieval Times to Present
by *Bill Williams*
escape.ca/~williams/history/hol.htm 1999

The Tipping Point:

How Little Things Can Make A Big Difference
by *Malcolm Gladwell*
259 Little Brown 2000

Biography**Nine Very Brief Biographies**

Saddam Hussein, Muhammad Ali, Mao Tse-Tung, Leonardo Da Vinci, King Arthur, Marco Polo, Florence Nightingale, Evita Peron, Benito Mussolini
by various authors
Parragon 1996

Deal With It!

A Whole New Approach
by *Ester Drill, Heather McDonald, and Rebecca Odes*
309 gurl.com/Simon & Shuster 1999

The Neandertal Enigma

by *James Shreeve*
342 Avon 1995

Rip Off, The Big Game:

The Exploitation of Sports by the Power elite
by *Paul Hoch*
212 Anchor/Doubleday 1972

Blond Like Me

The Roots of the Blonde Myth
by *Natalia Ilyin*
188 Simon and Schuster 2000

Not Yet Read**Sojourner Truth**

The Courageous Former Slave Whose Eloquence Helped Promote Human Equality
by *Susan Taylor-Boy*
68 Morehouse 1990
Non-fiction, written for young people

Harriet Tubman

Conductor of the Underground Railroad
by *Kate McMullan*
108 Yearling/Dell 1991
Non-fiction, written for young people

Alice Walker

by *Tony Gentry*
97 Chelsea House 1993
Written for Young People

Pablo Neruda

by *Joseph Roman*
Chelsea House 1993
Non-fiction for young people

Malcom X

by *Arnold Adoff*
41 Harper/Trophy 1970
Non-fiction, written for young people

Parzival

The Quest of the Grail Knight
by *Katherine Paterson*
127 Puffin 1998
Fiction, written for young people

One Little Boy

by *Dorothy Baruch*
242 Julian Press 1952
Fiction, written for adults

Speak

by *Laurie Halse Anderson*
197 Puffin 1999
Fiction, written for young people

Memory

From Mind to Molecules
by *Larry R. Squire*
256 Scientific American 1999

Dangerous Pleasures

Prostitution and Modernity in 20th Century Shanghai
by *Gail Hershatter*
398 U. California 1997

Good Natured

The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals
by *Frans de Waal*
218 Harvard 1996

The Scalpel, The Sword:

The Story of Doctor Norman Bethune
by *Ted Allan and Sydney Gordon*
319 Little Brown 1952

Foreign Relations

Under Lyndon Johnson
Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philippines
by *The State Department*
840 Government Printing Office (web distributed) 2001