

# Alfred Korzybski Memorial Lecture

By Robert Anton Wilson

## The Map Is Not the Territory: The Future Is Not the Past

Note: This address is printed without censorship, as it is *Bulletin* policy to record these events as they happened. — ed.

At the Harvard Club of New York City, November 7, 1997

Well, first I did meet my wife through the New York Society for General Semantics, but her name is not Ann [as given in the introductory remarks]; it is Arlen. That is of absolutely no importance to anybody here except to me—I'd like to get her name right. The only other person I know named Arlen is Arlen Spector, who is a man who invented the magic bullet theory, which explained the Kennedy assassination by the bullet turning 360°.

Where do I live? That's a very interesting question. According to the post office I live in Santa Cruz, California; that's Spanish for *holy cross*. If Jesus had lived later, it would be *holy lethal injection*, I assume. The post office claims I live there. Everybody around that area claims they live in Capitola. Well, virtually everybody; as a matter of fact, if I walk a half block from my house I am definitely in Capitola because there is a shopping center there, and all the stores in the shopping center advertise as being in Capitola. How come I'm in Santa Cruz? Because the post office put me there. A couple of years ago the post office sent out ballots saying, "We are thinking of rezoning, how many of you would rather be counted as part of Capitola?" And it seems almost everybody voted that they wanted to be part of Capitola. And apparently the post office decided that was too much work, because they sent out a notice

saying, "Apparently our questionnaire wasn't worded properly and 80% of the people would rather be in Capitola, but we don't think they understood the question so we'll send you another questionnaire later." That was about three years ago. We haven't gotten another questionnaire. I think the post office doesn't want to go to the trouble of changing all their forms.

But, whether I live in Santa Cruz or Capitola became even more confusing when something was stolen out of our car. And since the post office says we are in Santa Cruz, I called the Santa Cruz police. When they got our address they said you're not in Santa Cruz, you're in Capitola. So we called the Capitola police, and when we gave them our address they said you're not in Capitola, you're in Live Oak, call the sheriff. So we called the sheriff and he said, yeah, you're in Live Oak. So now I know I live in Live Oak according to the sheriff, Santa Cruz according to the post office, and in Capitola according to the Santa Cruz police. This is not a trivial matter. It's actually quadrivial.

Back in the seventies I was involved in the Physics Consciousness Research Group, which included Jack Sarfati, who has the wildest Web site you can find on the World Wide Web; Nick Herbert, who has written *Quantum Reality*,

*Faster than Light*, and other interesting books on quantum mechanics; Fritjof Capra, who wrote *The Tao of Physics*; Fred Wolf, who has written so many books on quantum mechanics that I can hardly begin to list them all (*The Body Quantum* and several others). I was the resident science fiction writer. You see, my first book, *Illuminatus*—not my first book, but the first book to get any attention (I had three books before that which nobody paid any attention to—now they are all back in print again, but that is another story)—the first book that got a lot of attention, was published by Dell. And it was such a strange book even I admitted it was strange. It was something utterly unique. I was very proud when Timothy Leary compared it to *Ulysses*, because that was actually what I had in mind—something equally revolutionary in a different way. Dell didn't know how to package it and promote it, so they called it science fiction. So nobody bought it but science fiction fans. It took about ten years before other people began to discover it.

Meanwhile, because the first one was called science fiction, all my books landed in the science fiction section, including my nonfiction which made me wonder, am I writing science fiction when I think I'm writing science fact? Well, it's a matter of how you define what is a fact and what is fiction. After a while, when more and more of my books didn't seem to belong in science fiction, I wrote a detective story, I wrote three historical novels, and I wrote a lot of books on psychology and semantics; so I suddenly found myself in the New Age section, God knows why, and there I was next to Von Daniken, just because my name begins with a "W", and I suffered from that indignity for years. I just heard recently that Barnes & Noble has moved me from New Age to Philosophy. So I am now next to Wittgenstein, which is where I'd much rather be than next to Von Daniken.

The fact that according to one model or grid or reality tunnel I live in Santa Cruz and

according to another one I live in Capitola and according to a third I live in Live Oak has helped me immeasurably in understanding the problems of quantum mechanics that we used to discuss in the Physics Consciousness Research Group back in the seventies. Of course, what it all comes down to . . .

I don't speak in E-Prime. I've been writing in E-Prime a lot lately; I've written two books in E-Prime, and most of my recent articles in E-Prime. I haven't yet learned to speak E-Prime, so if you hear an "is" now and then, none of us are perfect. There was another lapse; there was an "are" in there.

The map is not the territory. In quantum physics, you set up one experimental apparatus—build up a mathematical theory to fit the results you get—and you have proven that light travels in waves. You set up another experimental apparatus and another theoretical system to account for what you get, and you prove that light travels in particles. Back in the twenties there was a big argument—well, actually it goes back to the previous century, but it heated up in the 1920s—does light travel as waves or as particles; is light waves or is it particles? And the answer seems to be that light is waves when it feels like being waves, and it's particles when it feels like being particles. Light is waves and light is particles. That leads a lot of physicists to promulgate the theory that the universe is irrational—which I think is the worst identification, 'is' of identity, that has come up so far in this discussion.

Supposing you reformulated in E-Prime as Dr. Bourland would have us do. You can't say that the photons are particles; you'd say, under certain experimental conditions photons behave like particles. And you can't say photons are waves. You can only say, under certain experimental conditions photons behave like waves. Now there is no contradiction, no paradox, no problem, and no need to say the universe is irrational. It is just the "is of identity" which makes the universe appear irrational.

I think the importance of E-Prime came home to me very strongly when people started shooting up abortion clinics—well, usually they were actually women’s centers which did all sorts of women’s medicine besides abortions, but they did do abortions, too, so they got to be called abortion clinics. People would go in and shoot people, set off bombs and whatnot. This was all over the philosophical disagreement: Is the fetus a human being or is it not? Which is like, do I live in Live Oak or do I live in Capitola, or do I live in Santa Cruz? In E-Prime you can’t even ask the question. In E-Prime, the closest you can come is, “Under your present philosophical and scientific understanding, do you classify the fetus as human?”; or, “Under your present philosophical and scientific understanding, do you classify the fetus as not human?” Well, the answers to those questions are, “Under my present philosophical and scientific understanding, I classify the fetus as human,” and “Under my present philosophical and scientific understanding, I do not classify the fetus as human.” If people would learn to talk in E-Prime, they would be much less passionate, it seems to me, and they’d be much less likely to shoot guns at one another.

There are many other examples, but I’m just doing a rough rundown on how Korzybski continues to influence me. All the events that are going on in the world I tend to see through a Korzybskian grid. He made a bigger impression on me than just about any writer I have ever read.

When I was going to high school, the civics and English teachers and all the humanities teachers—I was in a technical high school, but we had to take some humanities courses in those days; I don’t know if they have to take any courses in anything these days (my general impression is that everybody who graduated since 1970 doesn’t know anything, but maybe that just shows I am getting old)—all the physics, all the social science and humanities

teachers made it very clear to us that Hitler made a terrible mistake in making generalizations about miscellaneous groups of human beings. He took a large collection of human beings and he said these people, the Jews, have the following characteristics, all of them. That’s what Korzybski meant by “allness” and that was what lay behind the Holocaust. And anybody who thinks Korzybski’s ideas are not very, very important, just remember what the Holocaust was, what happened. And it all resulted from ‘Jews are such and such’. How many Jews did Hitler meet in his life? One hundred, two hundred, three hundred? How many Jews are there in the world? Fifteen million, twenty million? I don’t know. He thought he knew all about all the Jews in the world. He only knew a few things about a few of them, and probably the only ones he remembered were the ones who had hurt his feelings some time or another by saying his paintings weren’t very good. Someone said, “Adolph, that painting sucks”, and six million people died later on because of allness.

I don’t want to be too controversial, but I would like to ask, How many men does Gloria Steinem know well enough to make allness statements about the male sex? Does she know 200, 300, 500? Is that enough to generalize about two-and-a-half billion men on the planet now?

The paradoxes of quantum physics, to return to them, all result from confusing the map with the territory. We make maps, and we find out the different parts in quantum physics may need different maps. We find the maps don’t exactly fit together into one picture, so we find we need different purposes, which shouldn’t be a surprise. You don’t look at a weather map to find out political divisions. You don’t look at a political map to find out weather divisions, and so on. Confusing the map with the territory, you begin to get the impression that the world is rather irrational. We don’t realize that we put the lines there. There is still a lot of confu-

sion about this, even among professional physicists, many of whom I have gotten to know intimately. When you get three physicists arguing about the Copenhagen interpretation, it is like three socialists arguing about what is real socialism. It's enough to melt the Polar ice caps. But this doesn't happen with Capitola, Santa Cruz, and Live Oak because we know we put the lines there. But generally we forget we put the lines there and we think the lines exist outside of us. We think our belief system is an exact reflection of an objective and unchanging world, which is the hallucination that Korzybski tried to cure. I have tried to popularize this in my own way by the two mantras "Don't believe totally in anybody's BS (belief system)," and the second commandment is like unto the first, "Don't believe totally in your own BS." Because, after all, when you begin to believe in your own BS, you enter the state that I call self-hypnotic, ideational trance, and pretty soon you've got a headful of self-hypnotic ideational trance, or s-h-i-t. People who go around with their heads like that . . .

Peter Bogdanovich, like Jean Luc Goddard, started out as film critic, and later became a film director, and a very good one, I think. He was persuaded to become an actor in a movie that Orson Welles made that has yet to be released, called *The Other Side of the Wind*. And the way Orson persuaded Peter Bogdanovich to become an actor was when Bogdanovich said, "I'm not an actor, I don't know how to act." Welles said, "Everybody is an actor." How's that for an allness and an isness statement? Bogdanovich said, "What do you mean?" And Welles said, "Every conversation is a performance." We draw the line, we say this is acting and this is conversation, but every conversation is a performance. Read Goffman's *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. We are always putting on a persona to deal with the world around us. Everybody is an actor in a certain sense. Or at least we can use the model of acting to describe a great deal of human

behavior. So therefore don't be afraid if anybody asks you to appear in a movie.

I just came back from appearing in a German movie called *Drei und Zwanzig*, which for those of you who lack Deutch means "twenty-three". And for those of you who don't know why the movie is called *twenty-three*, you haven't read enough of my books yet, obviously. *Drei und Zwanzig* is about a guy named Carl Koch who read my novel *Illuminatus* (which I intended to change the mind of everybody who read it, to mutate them totally into new levels of consciousness and awareness). As it says near the end of the book, "This book is part of the only real conspiracy it discusses"; and it changed Carl Koch's mind—certainly not quite in the direction I was expecting—but the message he got out of it is [that] the world needs to be free of secrets, so "Let's burrow into all the secret files of all the governments and publish what we find." Once he got going on that, he found out he was very good at it. He got into the U.S. Naval database in Norfolk; then he got into Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, where, as Buckminster Fuller once said, "Most of the best minds of the American scientific community have devoted themselves, for 50 years, to the single project of delivering more and more explosive power over longer and longer distances in shorter and shorter time to kill more and more people." Now this is a remarkable use of human intelligence. Apparently if the Cold War hadn't ended they would have reached the point where they could kill everybody in one nanosecond, and then they would have achieved the goal of American financial policy in the last 50 years.

He got into Lawrence Livermore Laboratory; he got into everything, even to the FBI, the CIA; he was all over the shop. And then because he was more interested in cocaine than in the kind of drugs I think are beneficial, which I shall not name, lest I get hauled off and arrested (you might make a few guesses after reading some of my books)—Koch got an

even more wonderful idea, at least it seemed wonderful to him. His idea was, instead of just distributing this information for free, let's sell it. So he contacted the KGB. Pretty soon he had more cocaine than anybody in Germany. He was rolling in cocaine. The more cocaine he had, the more time he had to spend at the computer, sniffing and searching, sniffing and searching—finding out more and more secrets, selling them at higher and higher prices—sniffing and searching, sniffing and searching. The KGB knew more about what was going on in Washington than the president did, probably—certainly more than the Armenians knew. Then Carl was found dead in the woods at the age of 23, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of the month. He was fascinated by 23s as a result of *Illuminatus*. Apparently my books affect different people in different ways. Anyway, they wanted me to appear in the movie, playing myself. I thought it over, and I said yes. I figured like Orson Welles said, every conversation is a performance. All I had to do was be myself. I didn't have to do a lot of method acting and asking what is this character really aiming for, what is his true motive, and so on. I know pretty much what my motive is, most of the time, or at least part of the time.

You know, when somebody mentioned the Roosevelt Hotel in one of the speeches, I was wondering which Roosevelt Hotel was he thinking about. There must be . . . you know there is a Columbus in every state; there may be a Roosevelt Hotel in every big city. When he mentioned the Roosevelt Hotel my mind went at once to the Roosevelt Hotel in Beverly Hills, because I have taught there at a couple of neuro-linguistic programming workshops with Richard Bandler and his staff. The Roosevelt Hotel in Beverly Hills is a very interesting place because lots and lots of people have seen Clifton Webb's ghost wandering around the halls. I did not get to see Clifton Webb's ghost. Very few hotels have an atmosphere like that, where you think you might run into the ghost

of an actor you remember from your childhood. And the other thing about the Roosevelt Hotel is that Charlie Manson worked in the lobby as a pimp about 20 years or 30 years ago. That gives another atmosphere. Charlie was up for parole again recently, and was turned down as usual, as I hope he always will be; and he gave an interview to the *San Jose Mercury*. The first interview in years. One of the most interesting things Charlie said was, "In my day being crazy meant something; now, everybody is crazy." So you see, when you say a simple thing like Roosevelt Hotel, you don't know what it is activating in the person listening to you. It also activates memories that the Roosevelt Hotel double-billed. They made the Institute of Neuro-Linguistic Programming and me both pay for the same room. That's enough of the Roosevelt Hotel.

I have been very involved in neuro-linguistic programming for three years now. I read a few books on it before. One day I was called up by the Institute, and they wanted me to teach at one of their seminars. And I said I've read a few books about it, but I don't know enough about it to teach. The person who does most of their recruiting said, "Dr. Bandler says you're an expert on neuro-linguistic programming; it's in all of your books." So I said, how the hell did I become an expert? I never thought I'd be an expert on anything. I can't even find my dick with both hands with the lights out. How can I be an expert on anything?

When I met Dr. Bandler, he explained. I use NLP in all of my books. When I began to understand it a little better, I could see Faulkner uses NLP in all of his books, too. Every book on NLP that Bandler has written that I have read, somewhere near the beginning there is a chapter called "The Map is Not the Territory". If it doesn't appear as a chapter head, it appears in a box in the middle of a chapter. That gives you an idea where the origins of NLP began. It is partly Korzybski and partly Milton Erickson's hypnotic work.

Bandler has carried it into entirely new dimensions. I have seen Dr. Bandler put people into deep trance in 30 seconds, which Milton Erickson was famous for. I think Bandler does it even quicker and more efficiently. He is very good with people who think they can't be hypnotized. He does this entirely by means of his understanding of language, how language controls people. When you begin to understand NLP, you realize that Korzybski did not state the case nearly as strongly as it needs to be stated. Korzybski said that those who control symbols control us. You might just as well say those who control symbols have the whole world hypnotized. You better become a controller of symbols yourself or you're going to remain in a trance, a self-hypnotic ideational trance that somebody else laid on you—some guru or perfect master, or enlightened being or teacher, or whatever. A perfect master (we've got a lot of them around California, around where I live) is only ideal if you want to be a perfect slave. The line between persuasion and hypnosis, like the line between conversation and acting, is not firm. We decide where we are going to draw the line.

For instance, the Pentagon sent a couple of officers to be trained in NLP, and they were the ones who went to Congress every year to explain why we needed to appropriate more money for this worthwhile project [that] America has devoted so much of its time to from 1945 to 1989—the project of delivering more and more explosive power over longer and longer distances in shorter and shorter time to blow up more and more people. They were trained in NLP so they could manipulate the Congress better. The question is, were they being more persuasive or were they hypnotizing Congress? It depends on how you draw the line. A couple of congressmen found out about this and went and got trained in NLP.

One of them was Al Gore. I saw him at the World Future Society in '89. He was the head of the Senate Committee on the Future then,

and he said, "I promise not to run for president again until I'm older." I thought, gee, that's a safe statement, he'll be older one day from now. He had a great debate on television with that guy whose name I have trouble remembering. When I grew up in Brooklyn it meant pussy or female genitalia—Quayle. Quayle was running with a guy named Bush. I couldn't see any of their commercials without giggling because it brought back my whole adolescence in Brooklyn. That's all we ever talked about in high school—bush and quail. Now we've got Bush and Quayle running for the top offices in the land. I felt like I was living in a surrealist painting. If you can get a tape of that debate, play it and watch what Gore does to Quayle. Quayle is continually attacking Gore and the Democratic Party in general as having socialist, left-wing tendencies, etc., being dishonest, crooked, corrupt and whatnot. Gore just comes ahead with various points that are entirely off that subject on to things that have to be done. And he always ends with, "And what do you plan to do about these problems, Dan?" So Dan Quayle is in the position that he can't go back to his attack; he's got to answer a question: "What are you going to do about this?"—he's got to start thinking, which is something he is not very good at, which is why Gore won that debate hands down. That's just a little simple application of NLP.

Another interesting thing about the 'is' of *identity* I wanted to discuss tonight. I have written, as I said, my last three books in E-Prime, which I find a very helpful discipline. Once in Mexico, I tried an exercise suggested by Aleister Crowley, the infamous satanist, black-magician, monster, sadist, etc., a man I admire tremendously because I don't think he was any of those things; I think that was all created by his enemies. Be that as it may, this exercise consists of banning the word "I" from your speech for one week. He didn't want you to ban it forever, like some of the more ardent proponents of E-Prime want you to ban "is" forever. But he

wanted you to ban it for a week. So, I tried going without using the word “I” for a week. Crowley suggested if you slip and use “I”, you carry a razor around with you, and every time you slip, cut your arm slightly to give yourself negative reinforcement so you don’t slip and say “I” again. I was not quite as crazy as Aleister Crowley, but then very few people could qualify for that; so instead of cutting myself with a razor, I bit my thumb. About the third day I had a very sore thumb. I was beginning to enter a state of consciousness in which “I” seemed like an obsessive/compulsive disorder. I thought I should go to the OCD people and say, “I’ve got this obsessive/compulsive disorder, I relate everything to myself; I see everything through a narrow perspective. How can I get cured of this terrible thing?” By the end of the week I was in a semi-Buddhist state, and I was beginning to think, “What the hell is wrong with the Western world that everybody is so hung up on their ego?” A very interesting exercise.

I am just pointing out that Korzybski did not discover all the traps in language. You can find traps in language; the more you look, the more you find. Getting back to the ‘is’ of identity, the book I am working on now is called (I keep wanting to say *Unsafe at Any Speed*; isn’t that odd, that’s a book by Ralph Nader)—my book is called *Everything is Under Control*. It’s in the form of an encyclopedia of conspiracy theories and heresies against consensus reality. I discovered you can’t write about conspiracy theories without using the ‘is’ of identity, or degenerating into the kind of convoluted prose that you only find in Henry James. Even though Henry James is regarded as a major American writer, I don’t want to get stuck sounding like Henry James. If I’m going to get stuck sounding like any convoluted writer, I’d rather sound like Faulkner.

Conspiracy theory can’t exist without the ‘is’ of identity. You really need to use it (which may tell us something very important about

conspiracy theory). We are living in a decade—well it began a couple of decades ago—it began with Watergate; it accelerated in the ‘80s, it keeps reaching new peaks every year throughout the ‘90s. Every time I think it has peaked, it doubles in intensity. More and more people have more and more theories about other people being up to no good. The general opinion of humanity has of other human beings has sunk to an all-time low. Everybody suspects every other group of being up to something nasty.

When you ask what caused this sociological phenomenon of this generalized distrust that people have of one another and especially of organizations . . . People fear unions, people fear government, people fear corporations, people fear churches, people fear one another, people fear all sorts of things. One of the reasons, I think, consists of the simple fact that there are an awful lot of conspiracies going on. The government lies to us all the time. They get caught constantly. The chief qualification to be a politician in modern America is that you have an absolutely shameless personality, which I believe is known in technical psychiatric literature as the “sociopathic personality”. Nothing can shame you, you can get caught in ten lies in ten days, and the eleventh day you’ve got a new lie and great hope that people will believe you. Remember Nixon’s last days in office? He was still telling new lies every day hoping that there was still somebody out there who believed him. Nobody believed him anymore, but he had faith. He had coned so many people for so long that he was convinced he could go on, he could con them one more time. Even when he resigned, he said, I am not guilty of anything, I’m just resigning for the sake of form. He was resigning so they couldn’t impeach him, or it sure looks that way from my perspective.

We had Iran Contra. In Italy they had the P2 conspiracy, which got a lot of publicity in the European press. I was living in Europe at that time. As a matter of fact, I was living in

Ireland, and in Ireland, as all the Catholic priests will tell you, the newspapers are run by a bunch of damned atheists. Well, they are all atheists who are educated by the Jesuits. There is nobody more subtle than an atheist educated by Jesuits. Like when the archbishop sent out his letter on God's plan for the family. One of them wrote to the *Irish Times*, "Would the archbishop kindly explain with what degree of metaphor a timeless being can be said to have plans?" Only an atheist educated by Jesuits could come up with a question like that.

P2 got a lot of publicity in Ireland and throughout Europe. It didn't get quite as much publicity here. Basically, leaving out all the speculation, there was a lot of speculation about P2 like [there is] about all conspiratorial activity. What was proven comes down to over 950 members of P2, which was a secret society within a secret society. Licio Gelli, who seems to have been the organizer, only recruited from third degree Freemasons, from the Grand Orient Lodge of Egyptian Freemasonry. Nine hundred of them had high positions in the government. They were accused of plotting a fascist coup. There were also a couple of them convicted of massive financial fraud. It was discovered that Gelli, in collaboration with Roberto Calvi of Banco Ambrosiano and Michele Sindona of the Franklin National Bank—and a guy named Hernandez Cartaya, of the World Finance Corporation in Miami—had set up 200 banks that didn't even exist except in their computers. And these 200 banks that did not exist made a very happy merry-go-round in which all the cocaine money was being laundered and ending up God knows where. Probably in numbered Swiss bank accounts.

Calvi, when he was indicted, fled to London and was found hanging from a bridge with his pockets full of bricks where the rising tide had covered his dead body, which is the thrust of the punishment given to Freemasons who betray their fellows in the craft—which indicates definitely that Calvi was killed by Freemasons

or by people who ardently wish us to think he was killed by Freemasons.

Michele Sindona was convicted in New York of 65 counts of stock and currency fraud; then was extradited to Rome after Richard Nixon's law firm put up a hell of a three-year fight to keep him from being extradited; and was convicted of murdering a bank examiner, and then was poisoned in his cell while waiting trial on charges of plotting a fascist coup and complicity in the Bologna 1980 railway bombing. You can see they were a busy and jolly bunch.

All the money from the cocaine in South America was going through that bank and disappearing into the 200 ghost banks that they had set up.

This case never dies; there are more investigations all the time. Just recently a mafioso in Palermo confessed to being the one who had murdered Calvi, strangled him and hung him from that bridge—which was the first theory put forth by the first book I read about the Calvi case—and it got superseded by all the people trying to prove Calvi was killed by the Freemasons, by the Vatican, by this group or that group. Frankly, he was killed by the Mafia for shorting them on a dope deal, or at least this mafioso confessed to that. All the investigating magistrates in Italy who were involved in the P2 conspiracy told the reporters that Gelli was not the head, though Gelli seemed to be the head. They had evidence that control came from somewhere else. One of them said, "I think it was another Freemasonic lodge in Monte Carlo"; another one said he thought it was the Grand Lodge Alpino in Switzerland.

Researching my book on conspiracy theories, I found an article that claimed that the real brains behind P2 was James Jesus Angleton, who was the head of counterintelligence for the CIA in 1954 to 1974, when he got thrown out for doing things in the United States that the CIA is only allowed to do in other countries. Angleton is called paranoid by so many writers that it is hard to separate the concept



Angleton and paranoia. The two are intimately related. He believed there was a Soviet mole high in the CIA and he had his own department and his own budget, and nobody knew what he was doing because he shredded all of his papers every night before he left. This started back in the '50s before anybody else in Washington was into paper shredding. He didn't want to leave a paper trail of anything. Nobody knew what the hell Angleton was doing, except Dulles maybe, and Dulles's successors, and they probably didn't know either because Angleton was a very private person and a very strange bird indeed.

A. J. Weberman—who has the biggest Web site you can find, it is three parts, the history of the CIA, the Kennedy assassination, and garbology; garbology is what Weberman discovered going through people's garbage, which was his first occupation before he started in on the CIA and the Kennedy assassination—he believes that he can prove that Angleton was the brains behind the Kennedy assassination. Be that true or not, everybody can judge for themselves after reading this extensive site (if you've got a year to take off, and go through all of the file, you might come to an educated opinion about that). My thought, as I plowed through this stuff, is that if Angleton was behind it, it was because he finally decided that Kennedy was the Soviet mole he had been looking for all those years.

You see, once the government stops trusting the people, there is no end to it. As Mailer points out in his novel *Harlot's Ghost*, every branch of the CIA is ignorant of what every other branch is doing. This is necessary because Angleton was very influential in setting up the structure. He set it up so that a mole in one department might find out a lot about that department if he or she got into it and got high enough, but they couldn't find out what was going on in any other department. So nobody in any department of the CIA knows what anybody in any other department is

doing. So nobody can learn too much by penetrating there. You need lots and lots of moles and getting even one mole in a high position is pretty hard. But the result of that is that everybody in the CIA suspects everybody else in the CIA of all the things that left-wing paranoids suspect them of.

In Mailer's novel, when they hear about the Kennedy assassination at Langley, he describes a scene where nobody can look at anybody else because they're all thinking the same thought: "Was it one of those departments I'm not supposed to know about?" Which is what a lot of other people thought later. Once you've defined an enemy that is trying to subvert you, then you need to spy on everybody more and more. The more you spy on everybody, the more nervous everybody gets. So as a government proceeds down the path of spying on the citizens (remember the government at one time was supposed to be our servant? We have completely forgotten about that—we got so used to thinking about them as our master), but the more they spy on the citizens, the more you get the citizens feeling anxious, nervous, paranoid, and a little bit hostile. That's why you see those bumper stickers that say, is your church BATF approved? in memory of Waco. The government is spying on all of us all the time. Kafka, who tried to write the craziest satire imaginable about the excesses that a bureaucracy could go, never thought of urine testing. Kafka could not imagine a country where the citizens were obliged to pee into bottles and give them to government agents to take it back and find out what was going on inside their bladder. As Bob says—you all heard of Bob, J. R. Bob Dobbs, short-term interim savior of the Church of the Subgenius—if they can look at your pee in your bladder, what the hell still belongs to you?

Once people get more and more used to the idea of the government spying on them, everybody is more and more nervous about the government. They start forming committees and groups to fight back. So you get more and more

contributions to the ACLU, you get the militias taking another way of opposing the government, you've got the Republic of Texas trying to secede, you've got FIJA, the Fully Informed Jury Association, which is trying to make sure that every citizen learns eventually that ever since Magna Carta it has been repeatedly upheld that juries have the right to judge the law as well as the facts. If a judge tells you that even if you don't approve of the law, if you think this guy did it you gotta find him guilty, the judge is lying, he is distorting the law. The actual law upheld by the United States Supreme Court in many decisions, upheld in England ever since Magna Carta, you have the right if you think the law is unjust not to uphold that law. They lie to you if they tell you anything else. So FIJA is trying to undo this thing.

This means that as the government looks around, it sees hostility everywhere. There's the ACLU, there's FIJA, there's the militias, there are all sorts of right-wing and left-wing cranks. What is the answer? We have to spy on the people even more, let's have mail covers, let's have wiretaps, now they can listen on your phone even when you are not talking on it. They can put bugs in your phone and hear everything you are doing in your house. Do you think that you are not making porno movies? Every time that you have sex, we don't know how many government officials are watching. You're probably all porno stars and you don't know it. So as more and more people realize this, the hostility of the government escalates. The government gets more nervous and spies on the people even more. This cycle continues up and up and up until the point where either the funding runs out or divine intervention occurs. Otherwise the paranoia escalates further on both sides

I don't trust the government. I often try this, and I'll try it here tonight with a group largely of general semanticists. I've tried it with all sorts of other groups; I'll try it with

this group. How many of you are willing to hold up your hand and say that every time you have dealt with the government you have told them the whole truth, nothing but the truth, and held nothing back? You see, we've got one. My God, you are the first one I have encountered in about 20 years of asking that question. Here's a man who always tells the truth to the government and is not in jail. Amazing.

The plain fact is that almost everybody lies to the government all the time because they are afraid of what the government might do to them. That's why people lie to their bosses. They are afraid of getting fired if they tell too much of the truth. If somebody has the power to put you in jail, fire you, throw you out on the street, put you in a gulag or anything like that, you are going to say what they want to hear.

So the result is that people in power hear more and more what they want to hear and less and less of what is really going on in the non-verbal, extensional world out there. So the delusions get more and more deeply set because nobody ever contradicts them. If anybody does contradict them they get accused of being intellectual wisecracks and fired.

If you belonged to the FBI when J. Edgar Hoover was still alive, you had to see an almost infinite number of godless communists all over this country. If you couldn't see that many godless communists, you only saw about 5,000 of them, say, you couldn't stay in the FBI, because they knew there were millions of godless communists out there planning all sorts of mischief. So you either had to learn to become a talented liar, or convince yourself that what the boss believed was the truth and put yourself into self-hypnotic ideational trance and have a head full of shit so you were thinking just like J. Edgar Hoover. More and more the ruling class has a burden of omniscience. Nobody else is allowed to tell them anything of what they see, hear, smell, taste or otherwise sense of the existential continuum. And they have to, by telepathy or some other method, try

to find out what is really going on. While everybody around them has good motives to lie to them. Meanwhile, everybody not in the ruling class has a burden of 'niscience', which means that everything that they see, hear, smell, taste, or otherwise find out they can't dare talk about if it contradicts official policy.

So more and more we drift to the condition of "rigidus bureaucratic" or maximum snafu, in which no one knows what is going on, or if they do, they are careful not to talk about it. In such a situation it is inevitable that all sorts of conspiracy theories should proliferate and a large percentage of the American population should believe that Eisenhower made a deal with the extra-terrestrials in 1957: Give us your technology and you can have all the cowslips you want. This is no more fantastic than the situation we are actually in, in which everybody is lying to the government and the government is too dumb to know it, although they suspect it, so they spy on us more and more to see if they can catch us in any of our lies.

So conspiracy theories will always continue to proliferate, until the funding runs out and they can't supply us with any more, or until the power gets desovereignized, as Bucky Fuller used to say, into the Internet and we don't have governments anymore.

The other great cause of the popularity of conspiracy theories has to do with information and chaos, two subjects which have fascinated me for a long time. I got interested in information theory the same year I read *Science and Sanity*. I read Claude Shannon's *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. I got fascinated by the fact that information increases exponentially or logarithmically. A French statistical economist named George Anderla did a study in 1975 in which he tried to estimate the way in which information had increased from the birth of Christ. Why he picked that time to start, I don't know. I would have started a few thousand years earlier than that, but I think he

has a Western chauvinist viewpoint and could use a course in multi-culturalism. But, meanwhile, be that as it may, and it probably isn't, if you take about all the information that you might have possessed in the year 1 AD and ask how long it took to double it, it took 1,500 years, until Leonardo da Vinci was in his forties. The next doubling took 250 years and happened by 1750. The next doubling took 150 years and happened by 1900 when the first papers on quantum mechanics appeared, a few years later the Wright brothers got it off the ground. The next doubling took only 50 years and by 1950 we had double the information we had in 1900. Which means that my parents, and the parents of all of you around my age, were the first generation in human history to live through a doubling of knowledge. All the other doublings, nobody lived long enough to experience them. Now information is doubling faster and faster. Jacques Vallee calculated a few years ago that it is doubling every 18 months.

Meanwhile, Theodore Gordon, an expert on fractal mathematics, the mathematics of chaotic systems, has published a theorem, a paper showing that as information flow increases, fractal unpredictability increases, too. So as information flow increases, the world becomes more and more unpredictable. People without any training in or willingness to try to absorb the mathematical, scientific viewpoints can't see what is going on, they can't see how the information flow is changing everything because it is creating more and more unpredictability.

After information doubled the first time after Christ in 1500, in one breeding generation—seventeen years is a breeding generation throughout most of human history—seventeen years later, Martin Luther nailed his 95 Theses on the door of the church. That was the first successful Protestant revolution. Seventeen years later Henry VIII started the second successful Protestant revolution. For the next 200 years Europe was torn apart by religious wars

until Jonathan Swift was moved to say we have enough Christianity to hate one another, when will we have enough Christianity to love one another? An interesting question.

After the doubling in 1750 we got the steam engine, the Industrial Revolution, the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the United Irish Uprising, the Bolivar Revolution in South America, and the first Mexican Revolution.

In the last ten years, go back to 1987 in your imagination, to see how unpredictable the world is becoming. Nelson Mandela was in jail; it looked to most observers like the white minority in South Africa would never relinquish power. There would be bloodshed and bloodshed and bloodshed until they were practically wiped out because the blacks were not going to accept a subordinate position anymore, and that looked like a pretty hopeless and disgusting situation. Ten years later they are sharing power, and Nelson Mandela is the president of the country. In 1987 it looked like the Reagan and Bush policies were going to lead to nuclear war and there was no way out. Ten years later the Soviet Union has dissolved and our government is on a desperate hunt to find new enemies to justify spending more and more money on the major research project: delivering more and more explosive power over longer and longer distances in shorter and shorter time to kill more and more people. There is no Soviet Union; the enemy is gone.

In 1987 the Israelis were still saying, we will not negotiate with terrorists. You know what terrorist means? It is a media word to keep you from thinking. Terrorists are poor people who are fighting. Rich people don't fight, they hire governments to get armies to fight for them. Poor people have to go out and do their own fighting, so they are called terrorists. When a government says we don't negotiate with terrorists, they are saying we don't negotiate with poor people.

Well, what finally happened is that the

Israelis decided they had to negotiate with Yasser Arafat and now there is a Palestinian state. When that happened I said, by God, next Tuesday after lunch the British government will be negotiating with the IRA. Well, it did not happen that Tuesday after lunch, but it is happening right now. They are negotiating. For years and years the British were saying we won't negotiate with terrorists, meaning we won't negotiate with poor people. They have to; otherwise the violence will never end.

Ten years ago only scientists in universities were online and the World Wide Web was just dawning. The rate at which it is growing changes every time I read an article about the rate at which it is growing. It was doubling every eight months a year or so ago. Recently I read it is doubling every four months. It is spreading over the whole world. All of this happened in ten years. These are only a few of the aspects of the tremendous changes we are going through. People have been living in space in the Mir colony for a long time. Shannon Lucid: When she was a girl she told her teacher she wanted to be a rocket scientist. He said there never will be a profession of rocket scientist, and if there is they won't allow women in it. She has lived in space for 180 days on the Mir colony.

The world is changing faster and faster in more and more ways, and people cannot understand that this is the result of information flow changing technology, which changes business, which changes everything else. They have to look around for something to explain it, so they look for a conspiracy to blame. Aha, it is the elders of Zion after all, no, it's the Freemasons, no, it's the Jesuits, no, it's the Bilderbergers. That's because they haven't learned to think in terms of mathematics and information flow and chaotic systems.

I think I'll leave you with my latest Zen koan: Keep the lasagne flying over Roswell and the ravioli over Area 51.

