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Wendy’s Risky Role-Play and the Gory Plot of the Okefenokee Man-Monster

Bo C. Klintberg

CHARACTERS:
Christianus, a satisfactionist
Katherine, a lawyer
Wendy, a waitress
Baldy, a player
Selma, an old lady
Thelma, another old lady

The scene throughout is at
a coffee shop in London; it’s 10:15,

SCENE I.
Too Late for a Lady of the Law

1 KATHERINE: Hey Chris . . . you’re late!

2 CHRISTIANUS: Well, what did you expect? This is not The Early Victorian, is it?

3 KATHERINE: No. But . . .
CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. I am sorry, Katherine. I didn’t plan coming late. But some last-minute matters came up.

KATHERINE: Nothing serious, I hope?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, national food policy issues are always serious. But personal ones are even more so. So here I am!

KATHERINE: That’s the spirit! I am really glad you could make it!

CHRISTIANUS: Likewise. So what do you think about this place?

KATHERINE: It looks great!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, and they have some a-m-a-z-i-n-g coffee!

1:1, you’re late: This meeting was scheduled for 10 a.m. See Christianus and Katherine’s discussion at xve:24–37 in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 97–98).

BO C. KLINTBERG (2008a), Katherine’s Questionable Quest for Love and Happiness in Philosophical Plays, vol. 1, no. 1.

1:6, national food policy issues: This comment may have been related in some way to the proposed change in screenplay writing and production standards suggested by the Republican FCC commissioner Deborah Tate, who, according to Brooks Boliek, in a move to decrease childhood obesity, ‘wants celery and carrots to get equal TV time with doughnuts and candy bars’ (Boliek 2007). Tate said that, ‘[t]he story line should include healthful messages and activities’ (Boliek 2007).

It is also interesting to note that although the article apparently was written by Brooks Boliek at 1 p.m. EST on 22 March 2007, it was not released (at least not with the same title) until 7:58 p.m. EST on 22 March 2007, after which it again was released at 2:54 a.m. EST on 23 March 2007, presumably with minor corrections. It may also be relevant to note that their UK archive [http://uk.reuters.com] has a similar article, dated 22 March 2007, 5:00 GMT, but only released once. Therefore, if this is the food policy issue that Christianus is referring to, there were many opportunities for him to see this information, just on Reuters.

BROOKS BOLIEK (2007), ‘FCC Member wants more fruits, vegetables on TV’. Reuters, Friday, 23 March 2007,
KATHERINE: So I’ve heard. The only problem is that it’s crowded!

CHRISTIANUS: Hmm, yes. But let’s go in any- way. You can’t see everything from the street.

KATHERINE: Sure, sometimes one has to investigate things from some other location or perspective to get the whole story. Or at least more of the story.

CHRISTIANUS: Thy words are wise, my dear Lady of the Law!

KATHERINE: No wiser than those that thou speak’st, my dear Sage of Satisfaction!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! You’re funny!

2:54 a.m. EDT. Online article retrieved from the Reuters website [http://www.reuters.com] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

1:6, food policy . . . always serious: If Christianus’s serious food policy issue was connected to the ideas presented in Boliek’s article (Boliek 2007; ref. supra, note ‘food policy’ at 1:6), Christianus might have responded to FCC’s representative something like this, having Table 37 (‘Modifications of public policies that would promote better food choices and more active lifestyles’) in mind (Nestle 2002, p. 367): ‘If childhood obesity, or any obesity, really is the issue, why propose equal TV time? Why not just prohibit the exposure of all unhealthy foods and practices on air, or at least decrease their time on air radically? And why not implement the rest of Marion Nestle’s Food Politics recommendations as well, while you’re at it?’


1:15, thou: The pronoun ‘thou’, derived from Old English (for OE pronoun paradigms, see Lockwood 1975, p. 184), is a word that might be understood as ‘you’. It has been used in Early Modern and Elizabethan English, and also in ‘most of the modern dialects of England’ (Wright and Wright 1973, pp. 159–160), although (most of) its later use probably should be understood as being ‘archaic’ and therefore mainly ‘poetic’ or ‘literary’. However, it is not immediately clear how
KATHERINE: You too.

CHRISTIANUS: Shall we?

KATHERINE: Sure. I am freezing!

CHRISTIANUS: After you, mademoiselle!

KATHERINE: Thanks, but why don’t you go first, since you know the place?

CHRISTIANUS: OK. Just be careful with the door here. It’s really heavy.

KATHERINE: Uff! Uh! You’re right. And squeaky!

CHRISTIANUS: Indeed.

KATHERINE: But still charming!

CHRISTIANUS: Well . . .

and when one might use it, since the word ‘you’ also might be used, but not always interchangeably. In fact, it is that (potentially) non-interchangeable aspect of these words that playwrights such as Shakespeare sometimes use to display, in a more explicit way, the shifting roles and relations that the characters are going through. Thus, Foakes is right to point out that speakers sometimes (e.g. in King Lear) do signal changes in their relationships when they suddenly start using ‘thou’ instead of ‘you’, or vice versa (Foakes 1997, pp. 7–8).

However, Foakes’s simple categorization of the word ‘you’ as ‘the common, more neutral form’ (Foakes 1997, p. 7) might be troublesome: for what does ‘common’ and ‘neutral’ mean? If, for example, we would take ‘neutral’ to mean ‘less emotional’ or ‘unemotional’ or ‘emotionally disengaged’, we would still not be able to explain cases such as the example in Abbott’s Shakespearian Grammar where one seemingly should use ‘you’ even in a more passionate (i.e., less ‘neutral’) utterance: ‘When the appellative “sir” is used, even in anger, thou generally gives place to you’ (Abbott 1883, p. 155).

Therefore, it may be better (at least in the beginning stages) to simply avoid Foakes’s attempt to offer a simple categorization and instead go directly to Barber (1993, pp. 186–187) or Wright and Wright (1973, pp. 159–160) for a better, but still not entirely unproblematic, introduction. The serious student can then continue to Abbott’s more detailed account and its many examples (Abbott 1883), after which he also may consider using the concise ‘thou’ entry in Onions as a convenient ‘Abbott reminder’ (Onions 1966, p. 255).
KATHERINE: *Aaah!*

CHRISTIANUS: What?

KATHERINE: *It’s warm* in here!

CHRISTIANUS: It sure is. With so many people, how could it *not* be?

KATHERINE: Right. But I’m not complaining. *I like* it hot.

CHRISTIANUS: *Me too.*

KATHERINE: *And I absolutely adore* that classical music!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, *it’s quite popular.*

KATHERINE: What is it?

Consulting these resources, it might then not be unreasonable to take Katherine’s usage of ‘thou’, in *this* particular context, *not* as a gesture of any ‘good-humoured superiority’ towards a servant, but simply as an ‘affection’ towards a friend (Abbott 1883, pp. 153–154; cf. Onions 1966, p. 225). But if *that* is the case, why does she — *and* Christianus — switch back to ‘you’ soon after? Is there no more affection on the table? Or are the times a-changing?


Too Late for a Lady of the Law
CHRIStIANUS: I am not sure. I wasn’t part of the music committee. But it’s definitely something late nineteenth-centuryish.

KATHERINE: How do you know that, if you don’t know what it is?

CHRIStIANUS: It just follows naturally.

KATHERINE: From what?

CHRIStIANUS: From the premises.

Classical music was very popular in Christianus’s time; for in the beginning of the twenty-first century, only a relatively small percentage of the population actively listened to classical music.

Also, one should probably not understand Christianus’s statement as having anything to do with the preferences of the general population in (late) Victorian times. Although classical music certainly was promoted in different forms by associations such as the Philharmonic Society in London (see infra, note ‘late Victorian classical music at 1:42’) and by the (in 1883) newly inaugurated Royal College of Music (with its 50 students, selected from 1,588 local candidates, studying pianoforte, singing, violin, composition, violoncello, organ, clarinet, flute, and harp; see Musical Times 1883), classical music was probably not the most popular type of music for the middle class.

The exact ‘composition’ of what the middle class liked may remain unknown, but there are still a few points one could make. In terms of commercial interest and ‘popular culture’, the (London) music hall and its nightly entertainment, including its ‘song, dance, comic rou-
tine, acrobats, and animal acts’ (Faulk 2004, p. 1) must be mentioned. Other popular music events were Gilbert and Sullivan’s playful operas at the Savoy, which, according to Wood, ‘will always be associated with the late Victorian age’ (Wood 1982, p. 285) and, according to George Rowell, their popularity so lasting that ‘for modern audiences Savoy Opera and the Victorian theatre have largely become synonymous’ (Rowell 1978, p. 95). But we shall not forget that also many late Victorian musical adventures simply were had at home, around the piano (Harwood 2009, p. 22), or in other small groups of people coming together in various locations, such as in those ‘singing classes’ and ‘temperance bands’ that Dave Russell mentions (Russell 1987, p. 18).


MUSICAL TIMES (1883), ‘The Inauguration of the Royal College of Music (1 June 1883)’. Reprinted (partly, with
KATHERINE: What premises?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you know that they must not play anything but late Victorian classical music, then what else could it be?

KATHERINE: Hmmm. No exceptions?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, when the place is closed, the staff can play whatever they want,


1:42, late Victorian classical music: What is the significance of the phrase 'late Victorian', in connexion with the term 'classical music' and the role it plays at the coffee house? One way to interpret this expression might be to propose that the kind of classical music that was played there was the one that was performed in the late Victorian era, whether it was composed in that era or not. One could then list, for example, the works performed by the Philharmonic Society at its First Concert (of the season) at St. James’s Hall on Thursday, 23 March 1876, as reported by the Illustrated London News (1876a, p. 310), including Mendelssohn’s overture ‘The Isles of Fingal’, Weber’s overture ‘Euryanthe’, Schumann’s symphony in C, and Beethoven’s pianoforte concerto in G. However, the full programme that Thursday evening, as Foster has recorded it (Foster 1912, p. 354), also included works by Mozart, Stradella, Chopin, Hiller, Taubert, and Brahms.

MYLES BIRKET FOSTER (1912), The History of the Philharmonic Society of London: 1813–1912; A Record of a Hundred Years’ Work in the Cause of Music. London: John Lane.


ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876a), Saturday, 25 March 1876, vol. 68, no. 1913.
if they just keep the volume down. But when it’s open, it has to be Victorian. Late Victorian.

KATHERINE: I see.

CHRISTIANUS: But now, ta-ta-taaa-ta-taaa-

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: I have a surprise for you!

KATHERINE: You do?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We just have to cross the room.

KATHERINE: How can we? It’s so crowded!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, I know. Which is why I’ll ask Baldy and his basketball buddies to move their butts.

KATHERINE: OK. Just be polite.

CHRISTIANUS: Sir?

BALDY: Yes?

CHRISTIANUS: Can you and your friends excuse us?

BALDY: Uh . . . ?

CHRISTIANUS: We just want to take a look at the wall over there, behind you. But neither of us is seven feet tall. So maybe we could trade places?

BALDY: Oh, I see! Sure, no problem! We can
hang out at the statue instead.

CHRISTIANUS: *Great!* Thanks, mate!

KATHERINE: Thanks!

BALDY: My pleasure.

CHRISTIANUS: Was I polite enough?

KATHERINE: Yes. *Very* nice!

CHRISTIANUS: Good. So here it is!
SCENE II.

Boy Lies with Girl

1. KATHERINE: A mural?

2. CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It’s apparently one of those Victorian fresco projects.

3. KATHERINE: Fantastic!

4. CHRISTIANUS: But not very off-the-wall.

5. KATHERINE: It obviously wasn’t meant to be.

6. CHRISTIANUS: That’s the problem.

7. KATHERINE: Problem? There’s no problem. It’s beautiful! What an artist! Just look at all that marble!

11:2, Victorian fresco projects: Christianus may, for example, think of some ‘representative’ Victorian art projects that involved murals. One such ambitious project involved the planned production of many murals in London’s Westminster Palace, ‘intended to give an impetus to a revival of the art of historical painting in general, and of fresco painting in particular’ (Kurzer 2006, p. 139). However, according to Ormond, the only frescoes produced having ‘any real expressive power’ — although their lustre faded rather quickly (cf. Kurzer 2006, p. 146), perhaps due to the ‘mania’ of trying to produce historically ‘authentic portraits’ (Strong 2004, pp. 91–93; cf. Vaughan 1983, p. 756) — were the panoramic military-history murals The Meeting of Wellington and Blücher at Waterloo and The Death of Nelson in the Royal Gallery, completed by Daniel Maclise, R.A. (1806–1870) in 1863 and 1865 (Kurzer 2006, p. 147), or, alternatively, sometime during the last twelve years of his life (Ormond 1968, pp. 691–692).

Another ambitious art project was the group of twelve wall paintings (eight of which are true frescoes, the others oil on canvas) in Alfred Waterhouse’s Great Hall of Manchester Town Hall, finished in 1893 by Ford Madox Brown (1821–1893) — in Farr’s estimation, ‘the most ambitious civic commission of its kind in the nineteenth century’ (Farr 1978, p. 328).

DENNIS FARR (1978), The Oxford Hist-

CHRISTIANUS: I’m looking.

KATHERINE: It’s very Italian, wouldn’t you say?

CHRISTIANUS: Or Roman.

KATHERINE: Right. And so horizontal!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Horizontal is the word.

KATHERINE: And romantic!

CHRISTIANUS: Boy lies with girl?

KATHERINE: Absolutely!

CHRISTIANUS: But do we have to conclude that there is romance at work here? Is that what you are pleading, Miss Lawyer?

KATHERINE: You mean there isn’t?

CHRISTIANUS: What if he is gay? Or she is les-

---

11:6, That’s the problem: The idea here might be that there is something unsatisfactory about art that is not, to some extent at least, off-the-wall. Maybe Christianus wants to say that art that is created to be ‘historically accurate’ does not guarantee that it is really satisfying — and perhaps especially so if also the motif is too ordinary, or otherwise ‘too easily digested’ by the audience.

11:12, Horizontal is the word: It is easy to imagine that the mural’s width would be greater than its height and therefore would be horizontal in a gross physical sense. But this comment by Christianus seems to suggest that there are certain pictorial elements of that mural that contribute to its ‘horizontality’.
bian?

KATHERINE: Well, I’m not . . .

CHRISTIANUS: Or what if she doesn’t like men with moustaches? Or with teal-coloured scarves wrapped around their heads?

KATHERINE: But . . .

CHRISTIANUS: Or what if it’s just the prelude

11:20, men with moustaches: Why has this artist chosen to equip the depicted male with a moustache? One answer, of course, could be that the artist himself just liked it that way, regardless of what any future audience might think.

Another answer could be that moustaches were quite popular in late Victorian times, and that the artist therefore consciously used that type of facial barbering to make his paintings more palatable for his potential customers. For if the frequency with which moustache-equipped men are found in the illustrations in the Illustrated London News from 1842 and onwards is indicative of the contemporary taste of the general population, we might take note of Dwight E. Robinson’s research (Robinson 1976, Fig. 1, p. 1135). His study shows that moustaches were rather steadily increasing in popularity from 1842 (3% of all depicted men had moustaches) until about 1917 (60%), after which the trend went the other way, ending in 1972 (6%). Noteworthy is also that sideburns (without moustaches) had been on the decline since 1842 (40%), and was down to nil at the time of the peak of moustaches in 1917.

For more on moustaches, see, for example, scene v (‘The Mustachio Man’) in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 27–32; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1).


11:20, teal-coloured scarves: The idea of ‘teal-coloured scarves’ may lead one in the direction of Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836–1912), who seemingly was fond of men with various pieces of cloth wrapped around their heads, as seen in, for example, The Triumph of Titus (see Ash 1989, frontispiece; Barrow 2001, p. 118) and Anthony and Cleopatra (see Academy Editions 1977, Plate 27).

Considering also Katherine’s and Christianus’s comments about the marble, the horizontality, the Italian-Roman milieu, and the potential romance at work, a fair guess would be that the mural is a reproduction of the scene in Alma-Tadema’s 1876 work Pleading (see Barrow 2001, p. 86; Standing 1905, plate facing p. 120; Kern 1996, p. 9). However, there are similarities between Pleading and his 1877 work A Question (see Academy Editions 1977, Plate 21) as
to a one-night, or perhaps in this case, a one-midday, stand?

23 KATHERINE: All right, all right. You made your point. But I still think the style is very classy.

24 CHRISTIANUS: Or at least classical. And clean.

25 KATHERINE: And very nice!

both Pieri and Barrow notes (Pieri 2005, pp. 69–70; Barrow 2001, p. 85), as well as between Pleading and his 1883 work Xanthe and Phaon (see Barrow 2001, p. 87) as Barrow notes (Barrow 2001, p. 85); but neither A Question nor Xanthe and Phaon features any teal-coloured scarf. And even though there also are similarities between Pleading and Alma-Tadema’s 1877 work Flora: Spring in the Gardens of Villa Borghese (see Ash 1989, Plate 7) as Ash notes (Ash 1989, p. facing Plate 7), the teal-coloured piece of cloth depicted in Flora is not wrapped around the head of a man.

Finally, one may here also add that if the mural does depict the Pleading scene, Katherine’s idea about it would be closer to the ‘proposal composition’ idea that Kern presents (Kern 1996, pp. 7–9) than to any of the considerably less romantic alternatives that Christianus seemingly has in mind.


PERCY CROSS STANDING (1905), Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, O.M., R.A. London: Cassell and Company.

11:24, classical . . . clean: Christianus seems to say that the scene of the mural, in some sense, is ‘classical’ and ‘clinically clean’, and, perhaps also, that it is that ‘cleaness’ or ‘classicalness’ (or both) that makes it not (very) classy from a satisfactionist’s point of view — a stance that may coincide somewhat with Peter Fuller’s, who notes Alma-Tadema’s ‘necrophiliac obsession with archaeological accuracy and marble surfaces’ (Fuller 1989, p. 179) and also quotes a correspondent in the Art Journal who not only thinks that Ruskin’s evaluation of Alma-Tadema’s works as vacuous is correct, but also goes on to explain that their vacuity are ‘due to their complete denial of spirituality’ (Fuller 1989, p. 180). On such a reading, Christianus might not be very shocked to learn that Alma-Tadema’s
CHRISTIANUS: If you don’t think too much about it.

KATHERINE: Hmmm. So who made it?

CHRISTIANUS: Owen did.

KATHERINE: Owen?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. He’s the boss here.

KATHERINE: Is he also a professional artist?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: An amateur artist, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Not even that.

KATHERINE: I don’t get it.

CHRISTIANUS: It’s simple. He has no artistic sense or sensibility. At all.

KATHERINE: But didn’t you just say that he made the mural?

CHRISTIANUS: I did. But it’s a long story.

KATHERINE: I have lots of time.

house in St. John’s Wood ‘seemed like a realisation of one of his own paintings’ (Denvir 1986, p. 8) with all the Roman paraphernalia imaginable, including so highly polished marble floors ‘that visitors were provided with slippers to avoid accidents’ (Denvir 1986, p. 9).


11:26, think too much: Alma-Tadema once laid forth some of his thoughts on art: ‘Art must be beautiful because Art must elevate, not teach; when Art teaches, in the common sense of the word, it becomes accessory to some other object’ (Zimmern 1886, p. 28) — a stance that seems intimately linked with his statements that ‘[w]e are no longer . . . the people of the religion of death’ and
CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But do you also have the stamina to stand up while I’m narrating the whole thing?

KATHERINE: Probably not.

CHRISTIANUS: So let’s find ourselves a table first.

KATHERINE: If we can. It’s so crowded.

CHRISTIANUS: It really is. In fact, I have never seen anything like it! Normally, at this time of day, there is always at least one free table in this room.

KATHERINE: Maybe it’s some public holiday or something?

CHRISTIANUS: Not that I am aware of.

KATHERINE: But are you aware of all of them?

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe not. After all, it’s Friday.

KATHERINE: I’m sorry?

‘[w]e now look out for cheerful things’ (Zimmern 1886, p. 28). His overall idea seems to be that the audience should not think so much (especially not about death), but simply enjoy the artwork, since that process (alone?) ‘ennobles the mind’ (Zimmern 1886, p. 28). Christianus’s comment may here signal that he is aware of Alma-Tadema’s philosophy of art, but dismisses it, wholly or partly.


11:29, Owen? It seems clear from the ongoing discussion that Katherine has not seen this motif before, neither in its original form nor in the form of a reproduction, with or without being legally licensed by Alma-Tadema (Verhoogt 2007, p. 443). So why is she hesitant here? Is it simply because she has never heard of Owen before? Or is it because she doesn’t believe that he, or perhaps anyone with
CHRISTIANUS: You should have been at my little brown-bag meeting yesterday. Then you would have understood it.

KATHERINE: But you said, very explicitly, that you didn’t want to see me yesterday.

CHRISTIANUS: Did I?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm.

KATHERINE: So what would I have understood, if I had been there?

CHRISTIANUS: That Friday is the day of Venus, according to the classical tradition.

KATHERINE: How is that relevant?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it’s just that my omniscience usually works quite poorly on venereal days, especially before breakfast. So it could be some sort of holiday today, even though I am not immediately aware of it.

KATHERINE: But?

such a name, (originally) made, or even could have made, that mural?


11:51, didn’t want to see me: Two days earlier Christianus told Katherine that he could not see her on Thursday, for he had already scheduled a meeting with Tim, a physics professor. And Katherine seems to remember that discussion well. See xvi:24–27 in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, p. 97; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1).

11:56, Friday . . . Venus: For more information on the connexion between the word ‘Friday’ and the word ‘Venus’, see note ‘Venus-day’ at 111:61 in TSG.
CHRISTIANUS: But even if it were some unfamiliar holiday, it still wouldn’t explain all those unfamiliar faces. I go here all the time, and I usually recognize most of the people hanging out here.

KATHERINE: But maybe it has to do with that special offer they advertised outside?

CHRISTIANUS: What special offer?

KATHERINE: The offer which I had lots of time to read, since you were so late.

CHRISTIANUS: Which was?

KATHERINE: The poster said, ‘Friday ONLY!’ And then, below that . . .

CHRISTIANUS: Yes?

KATHERINE: . . . ‘The return of the popular Cookie Monster Treat. Four home-made cookies and unlimited coffee refills for only £6.’

CHRISTIANUS: Ah! It’s one of those ‘Monster’

(Klintberg 2008b, pp. 27–30).


11:58, venerean: Though the word ‘venerean’ might be understood in a purely sexual way, one may doubt that Christianus is here using it in that fashion. Perhaps it rather should be understood in a more general sense, as ‘relating or pertaining to Venus or her service’ (Little 1980, p. 2460).

days! *That* explains it! Or at least *some* of it.

KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, last time they had it they got so many new customers that they almost doubled their sales.

KATHERINE: Wow.

CHRISTIANUS: So it’s a smart thing to do, business-wise. Once and a while.

KATHERINE: But it’s a little inconvenient for us.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. A little.

KATHERINE: So what do we do now?
SCENE III.

Backstage Drama

CHRISTIANUS: Let’s have a look at the other rooms.

KATHERINE: They have other rooms?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: How many?

CHRISTIANUS: Three. If you count the restroom.

KATHERINE: They only have one restroom?

CHRISTIANUS: Isn’t one enough? Do you need two? Or three?

KATHERINE: Not as long as one is working and no-one else is in it.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. So if you ever need it, it’s this Notting Hill-blue door here. Even if you’re not Anna Scott.

KATHERINE: No, I’m definitely not a Scot. But I am American.

CHRISTIANUS: But not a damsel in any orange-juice distress, I take it?

KATHERINE: Actually I am.

CHRISTIANUS: You are? But your sweater looks clean.
KATHERINE: Well, it’s an *internal* kind of distress.

CHRISTIANUS: Internal?

KATHERINE: Yes. I drank at least half a gallon of orange juice just before I came here.

CHRISTIANUS: Holy Krishna! I hope it wasn’t *commercially* produced, at least? With all that mold and stuff?

KATHERINE: No, no. I made a special order. They even had *organic* Florida oranges. Just like home! So I couldn’t stop myself.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, then, I guess, you really *are* in some sort of juice jeopardy, after all.

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: So what are you waiting for? Why don’t you go in?

KATHERINE: It’s *occupied*!

CHRISTIANUS: Oh dear!

111:9, *Notting Hill*-blue door: This is presumably a reference to the motion picture *Notting Hill* (1999), and to the colour of that blue front door, behind which one (still) may find William Thacker’s — and Spike’s, of course — somewhat messy apartment. The door pops up several times in the movie, both as an entry point leading Anna Scott (Julia Roberts) into William’s (Hugh Grant) more private life, as well as an exit point leading her out of it. On both of these occasions, it is Anna’s distressful condition that triggers her move through that blueish, wooden Stargate.

*NOTTING HILL* (1999), starring Hugh Grant, Julia Roberts, Rhys Ifans, Emma Chambers, Tim McInnerny, Gina McKee, and Hugh Bonneville. Roger Mitchell (director), Richard Curtis (screenplay), and Duncan Kenworthy (producer). A production by Polygram Filmed Entertainment, Working Title Films, Bookshop Productions, and Notting Hill Pictures. Released on DVD in 1999 (in Europe) by Universal Pictures UK.
KATHERINE: Well, at least I know where it is now.

CHRISTIANUS: It’s not that urgent, I hope? Can you manage?

KATHERINE: I’ll try.

CHRISTIANUS: Good. So let’s continue with our little inventory.

KATHERINE: All right.

CHRISTIANUS: So here’s the smallest room.

KATHERINE: It’s cosy. But all tables are taken.

CHRISTIANUS: Unfortunately, yes. But look around! What do you see?

KATHERINE: Ah! Nice wallpaper!

CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe on this wall.

KATHERINE: French design?

CHRISTIANUS: British, I think. But not from this era, obviously. And?

111:13, your sweater looks clean: In Notting Hill (1999; ref. supra, note ‘Notting Hill-blue door’ at 111:9), it is the orange juice that William spills over Anna Scott that becomes the ‘entry ticket’ to William’s world behind the blue door.

111:27, inventory: As we shall see, it is not without reason that Christianus is using the word ‘inventory’ here. He might have used the word ‘sightseeing’ (or ‘safari’) instead, but that might not have been as fitting as ‘inventory’, if the aim was to ‘count’ and ‘evaluate’ not only the available chairs and tables, but also the artworks.

111:32, wallpaper: One may note that the word ‘wallpaper’ is not entirely insignificant in the history of impressionism. Shapiro mentions that, both when it comes to pictures and wallpaper, the ground coat is called ‘impression’ (Shapiro 1997, p. 21). Also worth mentioning because of its potential relevance is that Leroy the critic once used the word
KATHERINE: And . . . a Renoir!?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The impressionist.

KATHERINE: Just my style!

CHRISTIANUS: I thought so.

KATHERINE: Is it the original?

CHRISTIANUS: Does it look like the original?

‘wallpaper’ when criticising one of Monet’s works (Shapiro 1997, p. 21).


111:35, this era: Even assuming that the word ‘era’ is to be understood *not* as ‘[t]he initial point assumed in a system of chronology’ (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362) or as ‘[a] date, or an event, which forms the commencement of a new period’ (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362), but more along the lines of ‘[a] historical period; a portion of historical time marked by the continuance throughout it of particular influences, social conditions, etc.’ (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362), one would still need to determine the type and extent of that historical period: whether it might coincide with, for example, a certain century, decennium, or other time period used by ordinary people; whether it might coincide with an ‘academic’ period that, for instance, scholars of general history, political history, economic history, or art history may have defined or documented in their publications; or, alternatively, whether the word ‘era’ *only* may be decisively deciphered by an intimate knowledge of Christianus’s own proprietary system of historical analysis.

Turning now to the word ‘this’, we may also ask the following question: What work does the word ‘this’ do in the phrase ‘this era’, and what can we conclude from it? Here are two scenarios. One scenario is that the phrase ‘this era’ might be meant to refer to the era of the year in which Christianus utters that phrase; and since the scene is set in 2007, ‘this era’ would point to ‘the era of 2007’. If we now take ‘era’ to mean ‘millennium’, ‘century’, or even ‘decennium’, then Christianus would, in effect, just be saying that the wallpaper is *not* from the twenty-first century; but if we take ‘era’ to mean, for example, ‘the post-9/11 era’, the wallpaper might very well be from 2001. However, in both of these cases, the word ‘obviously’ may signal the idea that the wallpaper really *is* from the Victorian or near-Victorian era, or at least, not from the twenty-first century.

Another scenario is that — since Christianus is at The Late Victorian at the time of this speech — the phrase ‘this era’ might be meant to refer to the era of the year, or period, that the interior design of The Late Victorian is trying to reproduce, replicate, or emulate.
KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: There you go.

KATHERINE: But it’s still very, very nice.

CHRISTIANUS: It’s not that bad.

KATHERINE: Well, I just love it! Even though it’s very famous.

CHRISTIANUS: You don’t find it cheesy? I mean,

If we now take ‘era’ to mean ‘century’ or ‘decennium’, then Christianus would, in effect, be saying either that the wallpaper is not from the nineteenth century, or not from one of the (late) decades of the nineteenth century; but if we take ‘era’ to mean, for example, one of the ‘academic’ periods of the late Victorian era (cf., for example, Harrison 1990, who puts it between 1875 and 1901), Christianus might be saying that the wallpaper either was made in 1874 or earlier, or in 1902 or later. Thus it seems fair to say that the word ‘obviously’ here plays a different role than in the first scenario: for in the second scenario it seems to indicate that there is some aspect of the wallpaper design that is not in ‘stylistic harmony’ with all the other style-creating environmental elements of the café.


111:37, The impressionist: Christianus’s statement can be understood in a variety of ways. Since Katherine is interested in art history, that comment does not seem to serve as an ‘educational’ comment, at least not in regard to information pertaining to Pierre-Auguste Renoir himself. But this phrase might serve to distinguish Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919) from his son, since Jean Renoir (1894–1979) was not a famous impressionist painter, but, among other things, an ‘author and producer of plays and films’ (Renoir 1962, p. 171). Alternatively, this phrase may serve the purpose of presenting a general stylistic term (‘impressionist’), not with the aim of clarifying which Renoir it is, but with the aim of making Katherine reveal whether or not she is into all impressionist painters, or just some small subset.

JEAN RENOIR (1962), Renoir, My Father. Translated by Randolph and Dorothy Weaver. London: Collins.

111:38, Just my style! This statement of Katherine’s seems to be in harmony with her taste for at least one other impressionist artist, as noted at 1:42–48 in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 6–7; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1). It is unclear, however, what attracts her the most — is
KATHERINE: Cheesy? The original? Or the reproduction?

CHRISTIANUS: Are they any different?

KATHERINE: I thought you were a philosopher?

it the colours, the style, or the motif? Or is it some combination of them?

**III:47, Au Moulin de la Galette:** This painting (oil on canvas, 131 x 175 cm; reproduced in colour in Broude 1990, p. 11; Courthion 1989, pp. 112–113; Schapiro 1997, p. 76; ref. supra, note ‘wallpaper’ at III:32) goes under several names: Le bal au Moulin de la Galette, Le bal de Moulin de la Galette, or simply Moulin de la Galette. It was one of the ‘two major works’ painted in 1876 by Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919), the other being Anna (Elgar 1966, col. 163). It was allegedly intended as ‘a historical painting’ (Musée d’Orsay 2002, p. 6), showing (some version of) a busy, contemporary open-air dance scene in the artist’s own (working-class) neighbourhood of Montmartre, seemingly without any cats (cf. Rubin 2003, pp. 111–125), but at least with many other animated beings, many of which include the artist’s own friends and models: Estelle, Lamy, Norbert Goeneutte, and Georges Rivière are found in the foreground; Gervex, Cordey, Lestringuez, Lhote, Solares y Cardenas, and Margot are on the dance floor (Courthion 1989, p. 112) — is, according to Distel, ‘without doubt the most perfect example of Renoir’s Impressionism’ (Distel 1996, p. 208).

But it was a relatively rough road to recognition for Renoir. Only after a series of ‘cheap’ sales in the first half of the 1870s, both at the public auctions at the Hôtel Drouot (cf. Bodelsen 1968) and at the first two ‘independent’ (Rubin 2005, p. 1109) Impressionist Exhibitions, did Renoir eventually decide to participate with this painting in the Third Impressionist Exhibition in 1877 — at a time when (at least some of) the participating painters now had accepted the label ‘impressionist’, and also were actively promoting it (Broude 1990, p. 12). This was in face of the silence after his submission of seven canvases (Dancer, The Opera Box or The Theatre Box, Parisian Woman, and others; Distel 1996, p. 207; Elgar 1966, col. 163) to the First Impressionist Exhibition in 1874 at the old studio of Félix Nadar (Gaspard-Félix Tournachon), ‘the greatest portrait photographer of the nineteenth century’ (McPherson 2001, p. 7); and, most importantly, after a major setback in conjunction with his submission of fifteen works to the Second Impressionist Exhibition in 1876 at the Durand-Ruel Gallery when Albert Wolff of Le Figaro criticized his Study (Nude in the Sunlight) as simply being a ‘heap of decomposing flesh’ (Distel 1996, p. 208).

Nowadays, however, Renoir’s paintings are extremely well regarded, and are sold at top prices at quality auction houses. One example of this is the Au Moulin de la Galette, which in 1990
CHRISTIANUS: What do you mean? Shouldn’t philosophers ask questions?

KATHERINE: It’s not that.

CHRISTIANUS: What is it, then?

KATHERINE: Well, you seem to say that the

was sold for a respectable $72,000,000 at an auction at Sotheby’s in New York (Wood 1997, p. 216), after their auction catalogue initially had estimated it at ‘$40,000,000–50,000,000’ (Sotheby’s 1990). And that was only the smaller version of this painting (78 x 114 cm; nicely reproduced in Sotheby’s 1990) — the full-scale version is still (in 2012), since 1986, hanging at the Musée d’Orsay in Paris (Musée d’Orsay 2012).


SOTHEBY’S (1990), Pierre-Auguste Renoir: Au Moulin de la Galette. From the Collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Hay Whitney. Auction: Thursday, May 17, 1990 at approximately 8:00 pm. Production coordinator: Nina Marin
original and the reproduction are non-different.

CHRISTIANUS: Aren’t philosophers allowed to say that?

KATHERINE: Of course they are. But aren’t you a friend of Plato’s?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. In an Aristotelian sort of way.

KATHERINE: And didn’t Plato say something about originals and reproductions in art?

CHRISTIANUS: He certainly did.

KATHERINE: And that is not interesting to you?

CHRISTIANUS: Of course it is. But what I can recall, he didn’t mention anything about cheesiness.

KATHERINE: But you don’t seem to be very in-

Moore; photographer: Louis Romano; cover design: Barbara Olejniczak; consultant art director: Alan Hartwell; color separations: Toppan Printing. New York: Sotheby’s.


111:57, Aristotelian . . . way: Although Christianus very well may be acquainted with Aristotle’s ideas of friendship, it is unlikely that Katherine would have any deeper insight into such matters. In any case, a passage in Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics says: ‘Still perhaps it would appear desirable, and indeed it would seem to be obligatory, especially for a philosopher, to sacrifice even one’s closest personal ties in defence of the truth’ [Gr. doxeie de’ an isôs beltion einai, kai dein epi sôteriai ge tês alêtheias kai ta oikeia anairein, allôs te kai philosophous ontas] (1096a14–16; Aristotle 1982, pp. 16–17). But also cf. a passage in Plato’s Republic: ‘Yet all the same we must not honour a man above truth’ [Gr. all’ ou gar pro ge tês alêtheias timêteos anîr] (595c2–3; Plato 1946, pp. 420–421) — a passage that both Camerarius and Cousin think is the origin of the famous
interested in talking about any cheesiness, either.

CHRISTIANUS: It’s just that it reminds me of food. And I am hungry! And I desperately need some coffee.

KATHERINE: Me too. But I just want to know this. Are you saying that it’s just as cheesy to own the original painting as it is to own this reproduction? Or any reproduction?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s much worse than that.

KATHERINE: Much worse?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that is a long story, just like the one about Owen. So before we get into that, let’s check the next room first.

KATHERINE: OK.

Aristotelian passage above (Cazac 1889, p. 11).

For a nice overview of Aristotle’s ideas on friendship, see Guthrie (1981, pp. 384–390); and for more general introductions on the topic of friendship, including also what other philosophers in the history of philosophy have thought about it, see, for example, Badhwar (1998) and Sherman (2005).


HENRY-PIERRE CAZAC (1889), Polémique d’Aristote contre la théorie platonicienne des idées. Tarbes: Émile Croharé.


NANCY SHERMAN (2005), ‘Friend-
CHRISTIANUS: *This* way.

KATHERINE: I’m right behind.

CHRISTIANUS: So what do you think?

KATHERINE: Oh, a *yellow* room! And all these photographs! And things! How *charming*!

CHRISTIANUS: I guess . . .

111:72, all these photographs: Though the distance between the poor and the rich continued to grow in the late Victorian era (Harwood 2009, p. 20; ref. supra, note ‘it’s quite popular’ at 1:34) — as we perhaps can symbolize by the increasing concern for that ‘large element of slum dwellers who lived in a state of near-starvation’ (Wood 1982, p. 284; ref. supra, note ‘it’s quite popular’ at 1:34) — there was a relatively prosperous middle class on the rise. And that middle class seems to have been very fond of the idea of a ‘Home Sweet Home’ (Harwood 2009, pp. 22–23).

This interest for the home as a meeting place and ‘life-world’ sometimes manifested itself in the form of heavily ornamented rooms and spaces, not only packed with photographs but also with other things. According to Roger Hart, some distinguishing features of such Victorian living rooms were: ‘[t]he curtains and wallpaper would be heavily patterned; gilt and silver framed watercolours, cameos, and later in the century, photographs would be hung on the walls, and placed on flat surfaces such as tables, dressers and pianos (which were themselves covered in lace cloths)’ (Hart 1971, p. 88).

So if The Late Victorian coffee house is designed to emulate some such popular Victorian style, it could very well be that Katherine and Christianus here are experiencing (some aspects of) an interior milieu like the one in, for example, the 1895 photograph of a late Victorian sitting room (Hart 1971, p. 88); or, perhaps, something like the one seen in the photographs by Frank Connor of the sitting room scene in David Lynch’s film *The Elephant Man* (1980), in which John Merrick is having tea with Dr. Frederick Treves and his wife Anne (Kuhn and Connor 1980, pp. 58–60) — a scene that may have been inspired by the ‘real’ John Merrick’s (1860–1890) visit to Treves’s ‘small house’ in Wimpole Street (Treves 1980, p. 23; Howell and Ford 1992, p. 114).


JOY KUHN AND FRANK CONNOR (1980), *The Elephant Man: The Book of the Film*. 
KATHERINE: But no tables.

CHRISTIANUS: No. But at least there’s a decent piece of art. Over there!

KATHERINE: Aah! Wonderful!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, it’s quite good.

KATHERINE: Watercolour?


111:75, decent . . . art: There is a possibility that a vegetarian or pacifist-inclined art critic might object here and say that there is nothing ‘decent’ about that painting, since it seems to depict a hunting party looking for animals to kill. One (quick) way to respond would be to suggest that Christianus might not here be referring so much to the contents of the painting as he is to the manner in which it has been painted. But even if that is Christianus’s ‘stance’, it is not entirely unlikely that there is more to the story. So another way to respond would be to say that Christianus indeed is referring to the story in that painting, and comparing it to the story in the Renoir; and in doing so, he is finding the French one less decent.

However, Christianus’s own preference for a vegetarian lifestyle certainly complicates the issue: for how can he find this scene more decent than the French one, where there is (seemingly) no killing going on, or planned? One possibility is that it is the portrayed ‘seriousness’ and the ‘sobriety’ of the hunting scene that makes it more ‘decent’, even though the scene also contains some characters that Christianus himself would not mingle with. Maybe Christianus finds the French scene ‘too gay’ in the sense that it is too much focused on immediate bodily enjoyment and gaiety and too little on spiritual things and (perhaps) on the idea of ‘duty’. If that reading of Christianus’s comment has some merit, it is probably a good idea not to understand it as an expression of some simple Victorian propriety, even though Christianus very well may agree that, for example, the open-air consumption of alcohol, or at
CHRISTIANUS: Definitely. And pencil.

KATHERINE: I just love the elephants! Are they Indian?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Or from Nepaul. Like the turban-equipped mahouts.

KATHERINE: Mahouts?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. They steer the elephants.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see. Drivers.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: And the men in those white-grey-ish casks?

least of hard liquor, would be a bad idea for anyone seriously committed to a satisfactionist way of life.

**111:81, Nepaul:** Many Asian geographical names from the time of the nineteenth century, mentioned in publications such as the *ILN*, are hard to find on modern maps. Even so, it is not an impossible task for a modern person to deduce — even without any historical maps at hand — that the word ‘Nepal’ might be a possible stand-in for ‘Nepaul’. And it is this ‘deductive ease’ by which one might move from ‘Nepaul’ to ‘Nepal’ that Christianus here presumably is counting on. So even if Katherine doesn’t know, for instance, that Nepal, unlike India, was not ruled by the British at the time of the ‘elephant painting’, Christianus still probably thinks that Katherine, in all likelihood, will be able to morph that old proper name into its modern variant.

**111:81, mahouts:** According to Simpson and Weiner, the word ‘mahout’ — also spelled ‘mahote’, ‘mahoot’, ‘mohaut’, ‘mahouht’, and ‘mohout’ — is derived from the Hindi word *mahaaut*, *mahaawat* (*mahâvat*), and means ‘An elephant-driver’ (Simpson and Weiner 1989b, p. 206). Chaturvedi and Tiwari, for example, define *mahâvat* as ‘a mahaut, elephant-driver’, and lists it as ‘nm’ (Chaturvedi and Tiwari 1981, p. 586), indicating that it — unless it is one of the ‘large number of words’ which are victims of some ‘incredible’ gender ‘anarchy’, in which case its listing is that of the usage ‘in the western Hindi region’ (Chaturvedi and Tiwari 1981, p. xiv) — is used as a masculine noun. McGregor also lists *mahâvat* as a masculine noun meaning ‘a mahout, elephant-driver’, but also traces it back to ‘mahâmatra’, allegedly an OIA (Old Indo-Aryan) source word/construct (McGregor 1993, p. 800).
CHRISTIANUS: They are the European visitors.

KATHERINE: No women?

CHRISTIANUS: Apparently not. Unless they are unusually flat-chested and wear bogus beards or mock moustaches.

KATHERINE: Hmmm. And what’s that black thing there, in front of all the elephants? A dog, or something?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: European too?

CHRISTIANUS: No no. It’s a wild one.

111:88, No women? Although no women are portrayed in that scene, some women in India, at least nowadays, are very much into elephants: Mark Shand has, for example, produced an interesting travel documentary about Parbati Barua, the ‘Queen of the Elephants’ (Shand 1995). As for women in India in the late Victorian era, one may note the 1876 article called ‘The Women of India’ published in the Illustrated London News, which covered some of the daily routines of Indian women, including their dealings with animals such as cows and buffaloes (ILN 1876a, p. 302; ref. supra, note ‘late Victorian classical music’ at 1:42); and on the immediately preceding pages, in a set of pictures labelled ‘Costumes of Western India’, a handful of portraits depict how some of the Indian women were dressed at that time (ILN 1876a, pp. 300–301).


111:93, a wild one: From this statement we can be reasonably sure that the painting in question has some kind of connexion with the ‘two-pager’ scene published in the special attachment to the ILN named ‘Extra Supplement to the Illustrated London News, March 25, 1876’ (ILN 1876a; ref. supra, note ‘late Victorian classical music’ at 1:42). There is no other illustration in the ILN during
KATHERINE: Wild?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. All black dogs in Nepal are wild. Didn’t you know?

KATHERINE: Nooouuuu, I didn’t. So, who made it?

the first half of 1876 where we can find white-casked men and mahouts on their elephants, with a black dog running in front, whether wild or not. The reason why ‘the first half of 1876’ is significant will be seen in a later footnote.

111:95, knooouuuw: Although it is very common that speakers emphasize certain words in different ways, a philosophically inclined person — especially one interested in ‘practical’ epistemology and the idea of distinguishing, for example, ‘truth’ from ‘falsity’, or a ‘joke’ from a ‘serious statement’ — might find it interesting to note that Christianus here modulates the very word that represents the idea of ‘knowing’.

111:97, God . . . makes dogs: Cf. a passage in Plato’s Republic, where, in a discussion about a ‘natural’ couch (as opposed to a couch made by a painter or a cabinet-maker), Plato writes that one would seem to think that it is one which ‘God produces, or who else?’ [Gr. theon ergasasthai. é tin’ allon:] (597b5–6; Plato 1946, pp. 426–427; ref. supra, note ‘Aristotelian . . . way’ at 111:57).

111:99, anonymous artist: As can be seen in those (two dozen or so) issues published in the first half of 1876, the editor(s) of the Illustrated London News had different ways to cope with captions. Some illustrations had a caption that only described the scene, without mentioning any artist, such as ‘A Hindoo Mendicant Pilgrim’ (ILN 1876d, p. 156) and ‘The Queen Opening Parliament: Procession in the Peers’ Corridor’ (ILN 1876d, p. 161). Other illustrations had a caption that both described the scene and mentioned the name of the original artist: ‘The Railway Accident at Abbots Ripton, Near Huntingdon: Working Parties Removing the Injured; From a Sketch by Mr. Gompertz, a Passenger’ (ILN 1876c, p. 97) and ‘Life on the Crozet Islands; From Sketches Supplied by Mr. Spencer Josten’ (ILN 1876f, p. 389). Many other illustrations, however, were accompanied by a caption that did not mention the artist by name, but still acknowledged him indirectly: ‘Inundations at Rome: The Ghetto Submerged; From a Sketch by Our Special Artist’ (ILN 1876b, p. 8) and ‘Tame Elephants Hunting a Wild Elephant; From a Sketch by One of Our Special Artists in India’ (ILN 1876e, p. 329).

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876b), Saturday, 1 January 1876, vol. 68, no. 1901.
ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876c), Saturday, 29 January 1876, vol. 68, no. 1905.
ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876d), Saturday, 12 February 1876, vol. 68, no. 1907.
ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876e), Saturday, 1 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1914.
CHRISTIANUS: God, I guess. *Who else* makes dogs?

KATHERINE: No, the *paaainting*, stupid!

CHRISTIANUS: Aaaaahh! The *paaainting*! Some anonymous artist, hired by the *Illustrated London News* (1876f), Saturday, 22 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1917.

**ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS** (1876f), Saturday, 22 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1917. 

**111:99, Illustrated London News:** Described by some as ‘that bland old grey thing’ (Waller 2006, p. 144) and by others as ‘the world’s most venerable pictorial news magazine’ (Robinson 1976, p. 1134; ref. *supra*, note ‘moustaches’ at 11:20) and ‘probably the most important single pictorial source for the social history of any age or country’ (Bryant 1995), the *Illustrated London News* started its road to fame and glory already on Whit Saturday, 14 May 1842. Herbert Ingram and Nathaniel Cooke ran the operation from their office in Crane Court, close to 10 Fleet Street, where Palmer and Clayton had their ‘steamy’ printing machine (Smith 1995, p. 9). Its first sixteen-page issue was filled not only with thirty engravings (depicting Queen Victoria’s Magnificent Fancy Dress Ball at Buckingham Palace, the Conflagration of the City of Hamburg, etc.) as their widely distributed *ILN* prospectus already had advertised would be their weekly minimum quota, but also covered other interesting news: a Parliamentary Report, the Royal Academy Exhibition, Paris Fashions, etc. (Smith 1995, p. 9). While the sale of the first issue of the *Illustrated London News* ‘only’ amounted to 26,000 copies, the demand seems to have been greater; and already by the end of December that year, after almost having doubled the number of engravings, the sales reached 66,000 (Smith 1995, p. 10). By 1863 at least 300,000 copies were sold each week — an amazing number, considering that the *Times* (in 1861) sold no more than 70,000 (Hibbert 1977, p. 14) or ‘60,000 or more daily through the sixties and into the early seventies’ (Best 1979, p. 248), the *Daily News* just 6,000, and the *Morning Post* a bleak 4,500 (Hibbert 1977, p. 14).


**PHILIP WALLER** (2006), *Writers, Read-
London News.

KATHERINE: Anonymous?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, at least to many of the casual readers of the *ILN*. But not to


111:101, *casual readers* . . . *ILN*: The idea here seems to be that this artist might remain anonymous to casual readers of the *Illustrated London News*, since such readers may simply look at the illustrations and perhaps quickly read the short captions (where this particular artist’s name would not be mentioned; but cf. *supra*, note ‘anonymous artist’ at 111:99), but not attentively read (all of, much of, or any of) the considerably longer body copy (where the artist’s name sometimes were to be found).

In the case of the particular illustration under scrutiny (see *supra*, note ‘a wild one’ at 111:93), the original artist’s name was mentioned in the body copy (*ILN* 1876a, pp. 305–306; ref. *supra*, note ‘late Victorian classical music’ at 1:42), and also accompanied by his own description of this scene (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306) and other events (*ILN* 1876a, p. 307). Therefore, he would not have been anonymous to a non-casual reader.

111:101, *ILN* . . . editors: Who among the contemporary *ILN* editors would have been able to identify the artist who provided the original artwork to that previously mentioned ‘two-pager’ illustration in the *Illustrated London News* (cf. *supra*, note ‘a wild one’ at 111:93)? This is not an easy question. But perhaps we can say this. If we may think of George C. Leighton as the ‘general’ editor, in virtue of his role as a ‘Printer and Publisher’ after Herbert Ingram passed away in 1860 (Smith 1995, p. 12; ref. *supra*, note ‘Illustrated London News’ at 111:99) and onwards, then it seems fairly certain that he would have been able to say who this artist was, if not for any other reason than that this artist’s name appeared in the body copy of that issue, together with a story (which one might presume that Leighton would have read and understood) describing the scene of his original sketch.

A similar, perhaps even stronger, argument could be made in regard to John Lash Latey, the (copy) Editor who took over after the previous editors F. W. N. Bayley (until 1846), John Timbs (until 1852), and Charles Mackay (until 1859) had left the scene (Smith 1995, p. 10). John Lash Latey (1808–1891), one of ‘several editors who never became well known’ (Maidment 2009, p. 303) — and not to be confused with his son John Latey (1842–1902), editor of the *Penny Illustrated Paper* (Plarr 1899, p. 623) — would continue editing the *ILN* after Ingram’s death until 1890 (Lee 1912, p. 412), and presumably was somewhat more actively involved in the integration of this artist’s texts (mostly describing the scenes of his own artwork) into the body copy, blending them with other snippets of text.

As for the Art Editor, Mason Jack-
some of its editors, of course.

102 KATHERINE: Do you know who he was, or is?

103 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. A freemason.

104 KATHERINE: A freemason?

son, we can be almost cent per cent sure that he knew who the original artist of this illustration was; for the artist himself mentions ‘Mr. Jackson’ several times in his Autobiography in situations where his ILN assignments were discussed, and where Jackson seems to have been one of his main contacts, if not the main one.


111:103, freemason: Based on the preliminary information hitherto presented by Christianus, one might here deduce — after some historical research — that the freemason in question is William Simpson, an ‘almost entirely self-taught’ artist ‘with an appetite for work’ (Theroux 1987, p. 2). That he was an ‘ardent member’ of a freemason lodge is mentioned by George Eyre-Todd, the editor of Simpson’s Autobiography, in the preface to that book (Simpson 1903, p. xi). It is also practically demonstrated by Simpson’s own publishing efforts for the Quatuor Coronati Lodge, no. 2076, in London (Simpson 1890). And if Eyre-Todd’s account and Simpson’s own publishing example would not constitute enough evidence, then one might simply go to the beginning of that very same AQC issue and inspect the record from their (then) last meeting. It will then be obvious that Simpson was not just some sort of ‘passive outsider’ that submitted freemason-friendly articles to that journal, but, on the contrary, was present, in an active role, at their meetings, as, for instance, on Friday, 20 December 1889, at 6 p.m., when he joined Pratt, Lewis, and some other committee members for a meeting at 12, Kensington Gardens Square, W., and where it also was announced that ‘the Lodge’ had accepted five new ‘brethren’ during ‘Bro. Simpson’s year of office’ (AQC, vol. 3, part 1, p. 3).

However, we do not know for certain whether or not Christianus himself had access to all of the above sources. But being a serious student of people, and perhaps also having read the research done by Stephen Knight (1985; ‘impressively researched’, The Observer) and Martin Short (1990; ‘it is doubtful if a more conclusive book could have been written’, Times Literary Supplement), Christianus might rather easily have applied a principle such as ‘the rather typical freemason search for societal honour, prestige and power’ to identify freemason-sounding passages in Simpson’s
CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Who else would get a Monday opportunity like that? Hanging out with royalty?

KATHERINE: Royalty?

_Autobiography_, without ever having read Eyre-Todd’s preface or the _AQC_. Christianus may therefore have found such freemason tendencies in the passage where Simpson says to Haghe — in an attempt to try to make their ‘new’ society [Institute of Painters in Water-Colours] more honourable than the ‘old’ society [Royal Society of Painters in Water-Colours] — that the Crown Princess of Germany was ‘a possible empress in the future, and if we could secure her as an honorary member, we should be a long way ahead of the old Society’ (Simpson 1903, p. 289). Alternatively, Christianus could have identified some similar tendencies in the passage where Simpson laments over a work on India which the financially troubled Day & Son could not publish, whereupon Simpson says, in no uncertain terms, ‘I lost the honour and reputation which would have been due to me if such a work had been properly produced and published’ (Simpson 1903, p. 78).

Still another possibility would be that Christianus deduced that freemason character from Simpson’s 1896 work by observing its overall design and focus on religious symbolism, in combination with some well-chosen passages such as ‘The Masonic craftsman may here be asked to recall the ritual of installing the new W.M.’ (Simpson 1896, p. 204) as well as ‘The Dervishes are said to have initiatory rites, secret words and signs like the Freemasons. If this is so, the matter deserves more careful investigation than it has yet received’ (Simpson 1896, pp. 136–137).


WILLIAM SIMPSON (1890), ‘The Mummers, or Guisers’ in _Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, Being the Transactions of the Lodge Quatuor Coronati, no. 2076, London, vol. 3, part 1, pp. 81–82_.


WILLIAM SIMPSON (1903), _The Autobiography of William Simpson, R.I. (Crimean Simpson)_. Edited by George Eyre-Todd. Illustrated with Many Reproductions of Simpson’s Pictures from the Collections of His Majesty the King, the Duke of Newcastle, the Marquis of Bute, the Earl of Rosebery, the Earl of Northbrook, the British Museum, South Kensington Museum, The Palestine Exploration Fund, etc. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. He’s with the Prince of Wales and his imperialist hunting party.

KATHERINE: Well, just for the record: I am no great fan of either royalty or freemasonry.

III:105, Monday: Another indication that the previously mentioned illustration seems to depict the very same scene that Christianus has been talking about, is that he here says it took place on a Monday. This fits well with the description in the text that accompanied the ILN illustration, provided by the ‘anonymous’ artist himself, William Simpson, wherein he says it happened ‘[o]n [a] Monday’ (ILN 1876a, p. 306; ref. supra, note ‘late Victorian classical music’ at 1:42).

The problem, however, is that Simpson does not mention any specific date; and his ILN text is also not dated as a whole. So which Monday was it? Well, we know that his text was published in the ILN on Saturday, 25 March 1876. And we also know that his sketches could not be transmitted via any telegraph lines, neither via any land lines, nor via the (then) rather recently completed India ocean telegraph (Parkinson 1870). Furthermore, the transit times from England to India at that time, at least for the transportation of people (and possibly also for some packages containing sketches and manuscripts), were around a month or, perhaps, at best, three weeks (‘I left London ... on September 28, 1875, and arrived in Bombay on October 30th’; Simpson 1903, p. 270; ref. supra, note ‘freemason’ at 111:103). Therefore, it seems problematic to suggest that the event should have happened later than, say, the first week of March — and this is even without taking into account the time needed to produce the ILN articles, and especially the illustrations; for even as late as in the 1870s it still ‘took at least another week for drawings of a scene to be transferred into an engraving’ (Lake 1984, p. 153), once the sketches finally did arrive in London.

Another important piece of information is that the depicted scene seemingly took place on Nepalese territory, as mentioned by Simpson (ILN 1876a, p. 306). And we also know that the time spent in that territory was limited: the Prince of Wales crossed the Sarda river into Nepal in time for dinner on Sunday, 20 February 1876, after first having waited to break up from his temporary camp at ‘Bunbussa’ (cf. modern ‘Banbasa’ in India’s Uttarakhand) until 3 p.m. (Russell 1878, p. 428; also cf. Simpson’s account in ILN 1876a, p. 307); and after having spent a few weeks there, laying down all those Terai tigers, he ‘crossed back again ... into British territory’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 331) on Sunday, 5 March 1876, via the Sarda, which was as ‘bright, clear, and blue as the Rhone at Geneva, but twice as broad’ (Russell 1878, p. 451).

Therefore, we have only two Mondays left to choose from: 21 February and 28 February. But the reports of the 28th seem to fit badly with a number of points that Simpson mentions, and in particular with the ‘partitioning’ of
They just don’t interest me.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. But I think it’s the wrong approach.

the day into two ‘heats’, with one tiger killed by the Prince in the first session, and six others by himself and others in the second. For I have found no reports in the non-Simpsonian accounts of any ‘heats’ on that day, at least not of the hunting variety. This might have something to do with that they, that day, also moved their camp to a new location at Mooza Pane (Russell 1878, p. 447) — a location that seemingly was ‘further on into Nepaul, a distance of three miles’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 330) — and therefore may have had little time for anything other than a single run. And even if they had two hunting ‘heats’ that day (i.e., without reporting it), the total number of tigers still doesn’t add up. For Simpson mentions explicitly that, on the day of the painting, they shot ‘seven in that one day’ (ILN 1876a, p. 306). But on the 28 February they only ‘shot four tigers’ (Wheeler 1876, pp. 330–331), and only one of them on the account of the Prince of Wales (Russell 1878, p. 447). Also, that frightening and ‘hard-to-forget-to-mention’ event on the 28th, when a tiger jumped up on the Prince’s elephant (Russell 1878, pp. 447–448), had not yet been explicitly reported in ILN issue no. 1913; it was only a week later, in issue no. 1914, that this event would be thoroughly covered in the ILN, both in the form of a story told by ‘one of the gentlemen of his [the Prince’s] party’ (ILN 1876e, p. 330; ref. supra, note ‘anonymous artist’ at 111:99), as well as in the form of that impressive ‘two-pager’ illustration in the extra supplement at the end (ILN 1876e, after p. 336), which was based on Simpson’s original sketch (Simpson 1903, facing p. 271).

The Monday event that Christianus is mentioning seems therefore to have occurred on 21 February 1876. For all sources confirm that a total of seven tigers were killed that day (Russell 1878, p. 431; Wheeler 1876, p. 322); and they confirm that this was accomplished in two ‘heats’ — the first one starting ‘[a] little after eight’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 321) and finishing ‘just’ before 12:30 (Russell 1878, p. 430), with the Prince killing one tiger, first firing ‘both barrels’ and wounding him, and then ‘two more shots’ to finish him off (Wheeler 1876, 322); the second one starting ‘[a]fter luncheon’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 322). Furthermore, all writers, including Simpson (ILN 1876a, p. 306), especially mention that event which ‘men see but once in a lifetime’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 322) and which the ‘afternoon’s sport was inaugurated by’ (Russell 1878, p. 431), namely that very impressive procession of at least 700 elephants (with ‘600 elephants belonging to Nepaul’; ILN 1876e, p. 330) forming a single line (Wheeler 1876, p. 321) in an apparent move to hinder any local tigers escaping — a move that seems to fit well with the information that Sir Jung Bahadur and his servants had worked diligently, for weeks, trying to entrap as many tigers as possible into a very small area, using ‘large fires’
KATHERINE: *What is?*

CHRISTIANUS: *To say that it doesn't interest you.*

KATHERINE: *Why?*

(Wheeler 1876, p. 321), presumably in an attempt to provide the best possible Nepalese hunting experience for his British guests.


J. C. PARKINSON (1870), *The Ocean Telegraph to India: A Narrative and a Diary.* Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.


111:105, *opportunity:* Although the scene occurred on a Monday, and thus may be thought of as a 'Monday opportunity', Christianus must have been aware that this was not just a quick, one-day opportunity, but only a small sample of the many days that Simpson accompanied the Prince of Wales on his India tour — an experience that Simpson himself describes as 'four months of Lord Mayor's Show' (Simpson 1903, p. 270; ref. *supra*, note 'freemason' at 111:103). But Simpson's memory of the Terai tiger-hunting experience was different — equipped with a private tent and his own elephant, it was 'the only pleasant time I had during the four months' (Simpson 1903, p. 270).

111:107, *He's with the Prince:* As can be seen both in the *ILN* illustration named 'The Prince of Wales Tiger-Shooting with Sir Jung Bahadoor' (*ILN* 1876a, 'Extra Supplement' attached after p. 312; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42) and in Simpson's beautiful watercolour, signed 'H.R.H. The Prince of Wales in the Terai with Sir Jung Bahadoor, in Feb. 1876' (Christie's 1996, p. 52), there were seven elephants in the foreground and many others in the background on that Monday; and those in the background were, according to Simpson himself, only 'a portion of the long line of elephants coming up in close line behind' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). The Prince of Wales is seen in the foreground, seated on the second elephant from the right, wearing a light brown coat and a white-greyish cask. In the back seat is, almost certainly, Mr. Peter Robertson, since W. H. Russell assures us that 'the Prince always takes Mr. Robertson behind him in the howdah' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). This fits well also with the 'tiger attack' scene a week later, on Monday, 28 March 1876, when the Prince's elephant was attacked by a tiger, and 'tore the cloth on which the howdah rested, coming very close to...
CHRISTIANUS: It’s like saying, ‘I am not interested in the plague’.

KATHERINE: What does that have to do with royals? Or freemasons?

Peter Robertson’ (Russell 1878, p. 448; ref. supra, note ‘Monday’ at 111:105), as seen both in the ILN illustration of that event (ILN 1876e, ‘Extra Supplement’ attached after p. 336) and in Simpson’s own sketch (Simpson 1903, facing p. 271; ref. supra, note ‘freemason’ at 111:103). This confirms that Mr. Robertson’s (usual) position (still) was that of sitting behind the Prince.


111:107, Prince of Wales: In the late Victorian era, Albert Edward was the Prince of Wales. He was born on 9 November 1841, was made Prince on 8 December 1841, and was baptized on 25 January 1842 (Hopkins 1910, pp. 31–32). After Victoria’s death on 22 January 1901 (Strachey 1931, p. 268), he was made king, and ruled England during the Edwardian era until 6 May 1910 (see frontispiece in Hopkins 1910).

But it is also important to know, especially if one wants to understand Christianus’s comments in regard to freemasons and royalty, that Prince Albert Edward was Freemasonry’s ‘main man’ in England, in virtue of having been initiated as its Grand Master on 28 April 1875 at the Royal Albert Hall, where ‘more than ten thousand members of the craft’ were present (Hopkins 1910, p. 181; cf. Beresiner 2002, p. 6; Wheeler 1876, p. 376; ref. supra, note ‘Monday’ at 111:105). The idea that members of the royal family were freemasons was, at the time, nothing new: ‘between 1737 and 1907, sixteen princes of the blood were freemasons, and four of them became kings’ (Roberts 2008, p. 44); and between 1782 and 1843 the English Grand Mastership ‘was held continuously by three members of the Royal family’ (Roberts 2008, p. 41): 1782–1790 by the Duke of Cumberland, 1790–1813 by the Prince of Wales [later George IV], and 1813–1843 by the Duke of Sussex (Roberts 2008, p. 381; cf. Banvard 1875, p. 206).


CHRISTIANUS: That’s the question.

KATHERINE: How do you mean?

CHRISTIANUS: Only when you have researched those topics extensively can you determine...
whether or not they in any way resemble the plague.

118 KATHERINE: Why the plague?

119 CHRISTIANUS: Because it’s deadly.

120 KATHERINE: So?

121 CHRISTIANUS: So even if you are not overly interested in the plague as a scholarly sub-

111:113, the plague: It seems relatively clear here that Christianus’s objective is not to bring the discussion in such a direction as to talk about any specific plague, neither in a typological sense (e.g., bubonic plague, pneumonic plague, etc.) nor in a historical one (e.g., the Great Plague in London in 1665, the Ural plague in late Victorian times, etc.), but simply to use it as an example of a threat with potentially very severe consequences, not just for people in general but for Katherine in particular.

However, even if this evaluation of Christianus’s usage of the phrase ‘the plague’ is correct, it does not, of course, lead us to conclude that he is not capable of bringing up some interesting points about various aspects of plagues. One might very well imagine that he, in another place and time, might have put forward thrilling theories, facts and figures related to, for example, the protractedness of the decline of the English population in the two centuries following the 1348–1349 Black Death (cf. Hatcher 1982, pp. 55–62); or might have chosen to talk about the potential dangers of antibiotics and pesticides and the prospect of emerging superbugs and superplagues (cf. Rewald 1998); or perhaps might have entered into a more literary-focused discussion on Albert Camus and Daniel Defoe and their pseudo-historical writings on plagues (Camus 1947; Defoe 1990).


DANIEL DEFOE (1990), A Journal of the Plague Year; being Observations or Memorials of the most Remarkable Occurrences, as well Publick as Private, which happened in London during the last Great Visitation in 1665. Written by a Citizen who continued all the while in London. Edited by Louis Landa. With a new Introduction by David Roberts. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.


ject, it is still prudent, from a personal health perspective, to carefully observe exactly who has it. Then you may avoid that disease simply by not associating with them.

KATHERINE: So you are judging people? Is that what your crazy satisfactionism is all about?

111:117, resemble the plague: Although Christianus’s point about research seems reasonable, it does not seem to be confined only to, as in this case, freemasons or royalty; it also seems necessary to engage in a thorough analysis of the plague, from different historical, sociological, epidemiological, and philosophical perspectives. So even though some of Christianus’s previous speeches perhaps may have led Katherine to believe that she wouldn’t have to engage in any plagueish scholarly studies, it is hard to see how she could avoid it, if she wasn’t already fully conversant with it. For only then — after having discovered the ‘standard’ plague stories and their rats, fleas, and blood (cf. Cartwright 1977, p. 61; Winslow 1980, pp. 357–359), as well as some of their competing theories (cf. Lindemann 1999, pp. 42–48) — may she, perhaps, be in a better position to appreciate Christianus’s comparative mood.


111:121, avoid that disease: One should probably assume here that, whether or not he accepts such a theory himself, Christianus’s explanation rests on some version of a ‘germ theory of disease’ — ‘one germ, one disease’ (Playfair 2007, p. 34) — since this is the dogma taught in the modern schools, and the dogma that Katherine most likely would subscribe to. For an overview of the development of different germ theories, see, for example, Gale (1970), Porter (1996, pp. 184–185) and Dwork (1981); and for an interesting observation on Kircher’s alleged role in that development, see Winslow (1980, pp. 146–151; ref. supra, note ‘resemble the plague’ at 111:117).

CHRISTIANUS: No. But you have to understand — a satisfactionist is generally also something of a chartist.

KATHERINE: But weren’t the Chartists rather


weren’t the Chartists: Is it realistic that Katherine, an American lawyer, so immediately can answer Christianus in this way? Maybe we should think of this passage simply as an example of ‘non-illusory’ theatre, a (rather counter-intuitive) term connected with ‘implausibility’ and ‘infinite flexibility’, where, for instance, one might ‘leap from this earth to the clouds’ (Styan 1975, p. 181)? Or is it, nevertheless, still possible that this is some sort of ‘realistic’, ‘plausible’, and ‘illusory’ theatre that we are dealing with here (Styan 1975, p. 180; cf. Boulton 1971, p. 162; Bowman and Ball 1961, p. 179)? Maybe Katherine did study nineteenth-century British (social, political, or legal) history in school?


Victorian Chartists: The (early) Victorian Chartists have been portrayed in many ways. Some scholars have seen them as (very) violent: ‘in many places Chartism took on the menacing aspect of a terrorist organisation’ (Ward 1973, p. 120). But even though Royle also notes some violence, for instance at Norwich in 1841 (Royle 1981, p. 82), he still thinks that ‘Chartism was . . . born out of the tradition of articulate, politically conscious artisan radicalism in London, with the encouragement of radicals among the higher classes. Though conscious of class, it was not a document conceived in hatred and conflict’ (Royle 1981, p. 19). And Mather seemingly accepts that there was a class-struggle aspect to the Chartists, but still thinks that ‘the first [aspect, the self-reliance of working men] was more pervasive’ (Mather 1982, p. 35). And even if ‘daily meetings and riots’ in London had occurred (Brown and Daniels 1984, p. 125), how
relevant and representative were these in regard to the picture that Katherine and Christianus are looking at? Or, put in another way: ‘What evidence is there that O’Connor and the Chartists on that day in April had any intention of causing a revolution?’ (Browne 1999, p. 97). Thus, there seems to be some scope for Christianus’s ‘not-so-very-violent-looking’ comment.


I11:125, old daguerreotype: A person well-read in the history of photography might here object and say that the usage of the modifier ‘old’ in front of the noun ‘daguerreotype’ does not do very much, since the overwhelming number of extant daguerreotypes are old; so why add a superfluous ‘old’?

One response to such an objection could be that Christianus here wants to be kind to Katherine. By adding the adjective ‘old’ Christianus also adds an ‘excuse’ for the otherwise so modern-minded Katherine not to be intimidated or ashamed if she doesn’t know that the old word ‘daguerreotype’ either might refer to the daguerreotype camera that Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre (1787–1851) introduced in 1839, or to that metal-plate portrait that it produced (Harrison 1887, pp. 21–27; Tissandier 1877, pp. 53–63). Thus, it may be seen as a potential invitation to a discussion on early photography, where Christianus then, for example, might have presented his take on the quality of that very early picture that Daguerre’s business partner Joseph Nicéphore Niepce (1765–1833) had produced with his heliography process already in 1822 or 1826 (Ohlman 1990, pp. 731–733); or raised some points in regard to that ‘negatives-producing’ paper-and-silver-nitrate-and-salt method that the classical-language-and-mathematics-trained William Henry Fox Talbot (1800–1877) had developed in 1835 together with his assistant Nicho-

Another way to respond to that objection could be to say that Christianus here not only might have wanted to indicate that this daguerreotype would be considered ‘old’ as seen from a modern perspective, but also as seen from the perspective of a person living in the era that The Late Victorian coffee house represents. So for a late Victorian, that daguerreotype would already
here, do they? Or plagueish?

KATHERINE: No. They look rather peaceful.

CHRISTIANUS: And organized.

KATHERINE: Yes. But maybe it isn’t them? What does the caption say? I don’t have my reading glasses.

be 30–50 years old, since it was taken in the early Victorian age (cf. speech at 111:29). But it was also old in another sense. Because of the gradual disappearance of daguerreotypes in general — after the introduction of the colloidion wet-plates in the 1850s, the dry-plates in the 1870s, and, not the least, Kodak’s handheld camera in the late 1880s (Chapman 1988; Schranz 1993, p. 72) — daguerreotype technology was, by then, old technology.


111:128, caption: Though the word ‘caption’ many times may be used in the sense of ‘text passages that accompany photographs and illustrations’, it may also carry various legal meanings, such as, for example, ‘a part of a legal instrument, such as an indictment, showing where, when, and by what authority it was executed’ (Guralnik 1978, p. 211; cf. Morris 1973, p. 201; Marckwardt 1966, p. 199) or ‘a heading showing the names of the parties, court, and docket number in a pleading or deposition’ (Guralnik 1978, p. 211; cf. Marckwardt
CHRISTIANUS: It says, ‘The Last Great Chartist Rally, Kennington Common, 10 April 1848.’

KATHERINE: 1848? But that’s not late Victorian!

CHRISTIANUS: Of course it isn’t. And the horses...
weren’t actually facing left, either. But as an ‘atmosphere builder’, I think this reproduction works. It sets the stage for later Victorian developments.

took at least two daguerreotypes of that Chartist meeting at Kennington Common on 10 April 1848, since Prince Albert acquired them and they ended up in the Royal Collection: D1 with one flag in the mid-foreground (Kilburn 1848a), and D2 with two (or three) flags (Kilburn 1848b). The trouble is just that those two daguerreotypes — just like the one Christianus and Katherine are looking at — are reproduced the wrong way, with the horses facing left instead of right.

Though it may be tempting, without researching the matter more thoroughly, to quickly conclude that the big (dark) numbers on the bright-coloured flags must be directly readable (i.e., not be reversed, or horizontally flipped), there are other, less prominent, texts to be found in these pictures that also must not be reversed, including a text that covers one side of the big car. And since a person present at Kennington Common would not have been able to go behind the car to read any of its text (since the text is on the non-transparent side of the car itself), it is more likely that that text should not be seen reversed on the daguerreotype than the numbers on the flags (which very well could have been readable from the opposite side).

Therefore it seems necessary to follow (some aspects of) Goodway, who has claimed (though perhaps a little too optimistically) that the (whole) text ‘LABOUR THE SOURCE OF ALL WEALTH’ can be seen on the car (Goodway 1982, p. 141). However, a closer inspection of D1, using maximum magnification, only reveals the word ‘SOURCE’ in the middle and a final ‘H’ in the rightmost word; the other words are not clearly visible, partly because of a handful of gentlemen with high hats who are standing close to the car, blocking the view, and partly because of the too low resolution (but maybe Goodway was able to inspect the original daguerreotype, and thus could see more detail?). In any case, once we have identified the word ‘SOURCE’, regardless of what other words may be surrounding it, we can be pretty sure that this is the right orientation, and that, therefore, the numbers on the flags should be reversed, and that the horses should be facing right, on both daguerreotypes. This may be even further corroborated by considering also other factors, such as, for example, the approximate time of the picture, the shadows generated by the sun, and the location of the industrial buildings in the background.

And there is also additional pictorial evidence, apart from these two daguerreotypes, that further corroborates these observations. For on Saturday, 15 April 1848, the Illustrated London News published a picture of that same event called ‘The Meeting on Kennington-Common.—From a Daguerreotype’ (ILN 1848, p. 242), where the number ‘3’ on the light-coloured flag in the mid-
KATHERINE: OK. But what does all of this have to do with you?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I made it.

KATHERINE: You made it?

foreground is reversed, and where one horse is facing right, and where Kennington Common and the buildings in the background are all oriented in the same way as they are on the two corrected, horizontally flipped daguerreotypes (D1f and D2f).

Although the ‘orientation issue’ of the two daguerreotypes now might be considered resolved, there is seemingly yet another issue, pertaining not only to the ILN illustration and a possible third daguerreotype, but also to D1f.

For Goodway claims that the ILN illustration was ‘derived mainly from the first daguerreotype (Figure 10) [D1f], but presumably a third, destroyed photograph provided the detail for its left-hand portion’ (Goodway 1982, p. 141).

But Goodway’s statement is problematic. For the right-hand portion of D1f simply doesn’t look like the right-hand portion of the ILN illustration: in D1f there is no man stepping down from (or up on) a horse; there is no flag with the number ‘3’ (reversed, or otherwise); and the crowds are not in the same place or arranged in the same way. Consequently, it seems far-fetched to propose that the artist should have used D1f in this way. And although the idea of a D3 is sound, why propose that D3 did not cover the whole scene of the ILN illustration? Would it not be more natural to simply suggest that D3 covered the very same scene as that of the ILN illustration, especially since the ILN caption did not say ‘From two daguerreotypes’? But perhaps Goodway thought that D3, for some reason, could not, by itself, have covered a greater area than any of the two other daguerreotypes? But what if the D3 photographer wasn’t Kilburn? Or, even if he was, what if he used a different camera? Or what if the photographer simply located himself at a slightly greater distance, and thus were able to cover a slightly greater area? The tentative conclusion must therefore be that if D3 existed, it covered the same area as the ILN illustration; and if Goodway does not have any factual evidence that D3 is ‘destroyed’, then it may very well still exist somewhere.
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WILLIAM EDWARD KILBURN (1848b), View of the Great Chartist Meeting on Kennington Common. RCIN 2932482 [Daguerreotype D2: two (or three) flags in the mid-foreground: one with a ‘3’ not reversed, and one (or two) with some other...
CHRISTIANUS: Sure. I made a copy from my old Morgan history book. Owen neither had the time nor the book, so he asked me.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see. But I was more interested in hearing about your chartist activities.

CHRISTIANUS: You just did. Isn’t photocopying good enough for you?

KATHERINE: Sure it is. But I mean, other than that? Are you part of a political movement? With a list of demands?

CHRISTIANUS: There are always demands, in every sphere of activity. Whether you are a chartist or not.

number(s)]. Scanned daguerreotype retrieved from The Royal Collection website [http://www.royalcollection.org.uk] on Thursday, 8 March 2012.

III:131, It sets the stage: It is interesting to note that Christianus keeps the discussion in the temporal realm, continuing talking about historical developments in the Victorian era, instead of taking it in a more philosophical direction. It appears that he here otherwise had an excellent opportunity to lay the groundwork for his (allegedly) discoverist-laden satisfactionism, and therefore could have said, for instance: ‘It sets the stage for a discussion on discrepancies, which we can find in every nook we look’, after which he — not always being a very ‘tough-minded’ philosopher (Hanson 1958, p. 58) — might have continued talking about things such as ‘anomalies’ (Kuhn 1996, pp. 52–65) and ‘saving the phenomena’ (Popper 1968, pp. 82, 246–247). So why didn’t he?


III:135, old Morgan history book: Since ‘old’ is not very precise, and ‘Morgan’ not an altogether rare name, and ‘history’ also not a very rare (part of a)
KATHERINE: Well, that may . . .

CHRISTIANUS: But a modern chartist, especially of the satisfactionist variety, does not think that his own demands are for everyone. So he doesn’t have a political agenda like the Victorian Chartists did.

KATHERINE: But what does a modern chartist do, then?

CHRISTIANUS: He demands.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: A map.

KATHERINE: How do you mean?

CHRISTIANUS: He maps people.

Title, many books may fit Christianus’s description. Nevertheless, I think it would be difficult to find many such books that also had a daguerreotype of the Chartist gathering at Kennington Common on 10 April 1848 and where the horses (and all other objects) were reproduced the wrong way, facing left instead of right. Therefore, I would suggest, it is highly probable that the book in question is Kenneth O. Morgan’s The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain, in which such a ‘wrong-headed’ daguerreotype can be found (Morgan 1989, p. 443). One may also note that the daguerreotype in Morgan’s book is accompanied by the exact same caption that Christianus reads to Katherine. Note, however, that Morgan’s caption does not end after that sentence; there are two more sentences to go. But perhaps Christianus consciously chose not to reproduce those last two sentences when he photocopied it, to make ‘his’ caption extra short and sweet?


111:138, list of demands: As Katherine seems aware of, the Victorian Chartists had a list of demands. Those demands, the famous ‘Six Points’ of the People’s Charter, were — as paraphrased from a handbill published in 1838 (reproduced in Finn 1992, p. 14; Rees 1995, p. 8) — the following: (1) Every sound-minded man twenty-one years of age (who also was not presently undergoing punishment for crime) should be able to vote. (2) Voting should be done with the help of a ballot system, to secure the anony-
KATHERINE: Maps?


KATHERINE: What is he drawing? Or charting?

CHRISTIANUS: I just told you. Arrows. Colours. Don’t you listen?

KATHERINE: But what are the arrows and colours for? What does the chart, or map, show?

CHRISTIANUS: People’s propensities.

KATHERINE: Propensities?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Including their propositional and emotional position, speed, and direction.

KATHERINE: You mean what people think? And feel?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And do. And what they did think, and feel, and do. And what they most likely will think, and feel, and do. And so on.


KATHERINE: So he’s some kind of social science statistics stud?

CHRISTIANUS: I would say more student than stud. Or, if you like, less studdish than studious.

KATHERINE: But social science is right? And statistics?

CHRISTIANUS: To an extent. But he’s more personally pragmatic than most social anthropologists are.

KATHERINE: How so?

CHRISTIANUS: He normally doesn’t waste his time writing long, tedious papers for publication in sterile, peer-reviewed publications.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: Because then he wouldn’t have time to actually use the information that he has compiled.

KATHERINE: So he is not only a hunter-gatherer, but also a consumer, one could say?

111:149, Draws. Charts. Arrows. The general idea behind these staccato utterances seems clear enough. But one may wonder about what type of words these are. One possibility is that Christianus intended them all to be verbs, perhaps because he wanted to stress the idea that there is a lot of action involved, as opposed to some endless amount of passive armchair philosophizing or telly-watching. Another possibility is that this is yet another occasion where Christianus’s word-play tendencies are surfacing, and perhaps are intended to demonstrate how a ‘true’ language-wizard can softly and seemingly seamlessly go from a verb to a noun via a verb-noun — and still make (some) sense.
Of information?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And of people.

KATHERINE: But only certain people, right?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. A very select group.

KATHERINE: So we’re full circle.

CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

KATHERINE: You’re judging people!

CHRISTIANUS: No. I am researching them. So that I can determine with whom I want, and do not want, to associate. That’s the issue. I am not judging them, or cursing them, to go to hell, or even to a cell. That would be a tremendous waste of time and energy.

KATHERINE: Damn!

CHRISTIANUS: What did I . . . ?

KATHERINE: No, no, it’s not you . . . Oh, my goodness! U–u–u–h–h–h!

CHRISTIANUS: Katherine! What’s the matter?

KATHERINE: I just h-a-v-e to go to the re-stroom. Now!

CHRISTIANUS: Go, girl! Go! It’s right here!

KATHERINE: But keep your eyes open — u-u-u-h-h-h — for a table!

CHRISTIANUS: OK, OK, I will. Just go!
SCENE IV.

*A Really Relaxing Rendezvous*

1. CHRISTIANUS: Everything OK, juice girl?
2. KATHERINE: Yes, yes. *Finally!*
3. CHRISTIANUS: Good.
4. KATHERINE: Any free tables yet?
5. CHRISTIANUS: Nope.
6. KATHERINE: Any waitresses?
7. CHRISTIANUS: Nope.
8. KATHERINE: But *look!* Baldy just *scored!*
9. CHRISTIANUS: *Rats!* A *slam-dunk!* Just when I didn’t *look!* I can’t *believe* it!
10. KATHERINE: *We needed* that table! *Irritating!*
11. CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Do I hear a *lawsuit* coming up?
12. KATHERINE: Ha ha! No, not today.
13. CHRISTIANUS: Tomorrow?
14. KATHERINE: No.
15. CHRISTIANUS: Why not?
16. KATHERINE: He actually *helped* us, earlier. Re-*member?*
17. CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But that wouldn’t stop a *lawyer,* would it?
KATHERINE: Of course not. But I’m not in the mood. And I really do think it was fair play.

CHRISTIANUS: You do?

KATHERINE: Yes, he was first.

CHRISTIANUS: First?

KATHERINE: Yes. He apparently saw the table first, and then he also swiftly took action before anyone else did.

CHRISTIANUS: Like a weasel!

KATHERINE: Well, quickly, anyhow.

CHRISTIANUS: But weasels . . .

KATHERINE: And, if that’s not enough, there is also another thing.

CHRISTIANUS: What?

KATHERINE: He also was first inside.

CHRISTIANUS: Are you sure?

KATHERINE: Positive. I saw him go in, just before you arrived. Late, I may add!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Sorry.

Although Christianus here could have said just ‘ifs’, it seems more likely that he instead would be a little extra clever and say ‘iffs’. The vibratory difference would be minimal, and it is therefore quite unlikely that Katherine would pick up on it and thereby ‘ruin’ the flow of the dialogue by inquiring about it, particularly since Christianus also adds the well-known word ‘plaintiff’ right after — a word that Katherine must know so well that it may act like a magnet on her (mind), and thus ‘atten-uate’ the importance of the preceding word ‘iffs’. And since it seems possible to understand (one dimension of) Christianus’s rhyming ideas just by using one of the two words, the pragmatic-mind-
KATHERINE: So I actually think he is less to blame than you.

CHRISTIANUS: So it’s fiffs?

KATHERINE: Fiffs?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Rhymes with iff’s and plaintiffs: F-I-F-S, FIFS.

KATHERINE: What’s that?

CHRISTIANUS: First In, First Seated.

KATHERINE: Ah! Yes. But there’s also another rule.

CHRISTIANUS: Oh?

KATHERINE: M-L-M-H-R-M.


CHRISTIANUS: Real Men? You mean Baldy?

KATHERINE: Yes. The Mural Lady now has a Real Man under her, in the right posi-

ed Katherine may very well (quickly) decide to decipher the sentence simply using the word ‘plaintiffs’, without worrying about any ‘iffs’ or ‘ifs’.

iv:37, First In, First Seated: The expression ‘First In, First Seated’ seems to be some kind of algorithm, whose initial condition (‘First In’) somehow or other determines, or is connected to, the result (‘First Seated’). Those with a computer science background, or with an interest in algorithms and queues, may here think of FIFO (‘First In, First Out’), FILO (‘First In, Last Out’), etc.

iv:44, Real Man under her: In order for Baldy (the Real Man) to be ‘under’
tion. Just in time for a potentially potent midday session, as you suggested earlier.

CHRISTIANUS: But I didn’t suggest Baldy.

KATHERINE: Maybe not. But I’m just protecting the interests of My Lady.

CHRISTIANUS: Your Lady?

KATHERINE: Well, aesthetically speaking. In spirit.

CHRISTIANUS: I see. So now she’s your domina? Your mastress?

the Mural Lady in any close physical sense, (at least) two conditions seem necessary: first, that he sits rather close to the wall of the mural; second, that all, or at least most, of his body is under hers, and, perhaps in particular, below the level of the seat of that very horizontal marble bench that is so prominent in the Pleading scene (cf. supra, note ‘teal-coloured scarves’ at 111:20).

One example of a mural and a sitting arrangement that might have enabled Baldy to enter into such a physical relationship with The Mural Lady — and which also might resemble the arrangement in The Late Victorian coffee house in terms of how these physical objects would be located — can be seen in the photographs of the (modern, peopleless) Oscar Bar & Restaurant located in the Charlotte Street Hotel in London (Firmdale Hotels 2012, pp. 4–5; but note that, probably unlike the mural in The Late Victorian, the Oscar mural continues from one wall to another).

Another example, seen in a photograph not only filled with people but also (seemingly) from the Victorian period, illustrates more clearly the idea of the positioning of Baldy’s body, and especially his head: it should not touch, or just barely touch, the lower part of the mural (Briggs and Miles 1989, pp. 94–95).


1v:49, domina: While the English version of Cambridge University’s Latin textbook simply proposes that domina means ‘mistress’ or ‘madam’ (Greig 1996, p. 213), the American version provides an important extra piece of information when it suggests that it also can mean ‘lady (of the house)’ (Phinney 2003, p. 216) — a suggestion that more
clearly establishes the *domestic* aspect of this word and its historical relationship to words meaning ‘house’ or ‘home’, such as Lat. *domus*, Gr. *domos*, Russ. *dom*, Skt. *dama-* etc. (Buck 1988, pp. 457–459). And together with the idea of *power* (over someone or something) that is implicit in words like ‘mistress’ (e.g., ‘A woman who has the care of or authority over servants or attendants, and, in early use, of children or young women’; Little 1980, p. 1337; ref. *supra*, note *venerean* at 11:58), one may easier appreciate the *domination* aspect of the relationship between such a ‘lady’ ruler and her household slaves (cf. Fowler 1965, p. 138) — an aspect also found in the closely related word ‘dominatrix’, which seems to have been in use at least since the time of Cicero (106–43 B.C.) (Lewis and Short 1891, p. 608).


iv:49, *mistress*: This word is not found in most dictionaries. And even though ‘mistress’ *does* appear in various forms
KATHERINE: Just look at him! That's what I'm talking about!

CHRISTIANUS: You mean his fake Rolex and ridiculous Ray-Bans?

KATHERINE: They are neither fake nor ridiculous. And neither are his expensive bad-boy-black leather jacket or his delightfully delicious designer jeans. Or his perfect smile!

CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe there is something to it. After all, dental care is expensive. Especially in Britain.

KATHERINE: So you agree?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Unless, of course, he simply is one of those golden-goose guys who doesn't need a dental job. Or any job.

KATHERINE: OK, OK. I get it. So let's just skip the job requirement.

CHRISTIANUS: Skip it?

KATHERINE: Yes. It wasn’t my main point, in

in the Shorter OED, with the meaning ‘mistress’, Little does not mention any specific literary works in which it occurs (Little 1980, p. 1288; ref. supra, note ‘venerean’ at 11:58). However, one might, for example, find the word ‘mattress’ in an English translation of Pedro Calderón de la Barca’s Life Is a Dream (Calderón de la Barca 1910, p. 65).


1v:59, dental care is expensive: Christianus’s statement seems to fit well with a 2008 article in The Independent,
any case.

CHRISTIANUS: I am surprised, Katherine! Really surprised! So Social Security checks are OK?

KATHERINE: Are you insane? Absolutely not!

CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

KATHERINE: He must be able to take care of himself.

CHRISTIANUS: But he can!

KATHERINE: And his family.

CHRISTIANUS: What family?

KATHERINE: And not just survive, either. Have a life! A real life!

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm.

KATHERINE: So he needs to provide!

CHRISTIANUS: Goodness. Poor Baldy.

KATHERINE: Some real money.

CHRISTIANUS: But what if the checks were generous? Or even very generous?

which reported that a study done at the department of health management at the Berlin University of Technology had found that — of the nine European countries surveyed — Britain was the one with the most expensive dental treatment (Laurance 2008). Including the cost of all the materials and resources needed (such as x-rays, drugs, and the time of the dentist), a regular filling was €156 (£117) in England but only €8 in Hungary.

KATHERINE: Not a chance.

CHRISTIANUS: So what are we talking about? A million pounds sterling in a respectable bank, inherited from an equally respectable father? Or two? Would that work?

KATHERINE: Make it ten, and we’ll talk. And you can skip ‘respectable’, if that’s a problem for you. I’m not Victorian.

CHRISTIANUS: Ten million?

KATHERINE: And without a prenup, of course.

CHRISTIANUS: It’s a bargain!

KATHERINE: Chris, I’m just representing My Lady. It’s not for me!

CHRISTIANUS: Right. I forgot.

KATHERINE: Anything else?

CHRISTIANUS: But what about Love? How much is that worth?

KATHERINE: As I said, ten million.

CHRISTIANUS: What about some extra serenades at night? No discount?

KATHERINE: Dream on, Romeo!

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm.

KATHERINE: And time is running out.

CHRISTIANUS: A countdown, too? You’re good!

KATHERINE: Well, it’s just that there’s a time and place for everything.
CHRISTIANUS: At least we can agree on that!

KATHERINE: So what do you say: shall we leave her alone, for now?

CHRISTIANUS: Already?

KATHERINE: Well, I don't sense that we have an agreement.

CHRISTIANUS: I don't sense it either.

KATHERINE: And it's also almost noon, and My Lady needs to prepare Herself for a really relaxing rendezvous.

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Sure. And with Baldy no longer at the statue, our next destination is quite clear, isn't it?

KATHERINE: Absolutely! Let's go!
SCENE V.

Baldy’s Barbie-Babes

1 KATHERINE: We made it!
2 CHRISTIANUS: At last! Good ol’ Maggie!
3 KATHERINE: Maggie?
4 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Magdalene. Didn’t you take art history?
5 KATHERINE: I did. But we didn’t cover any white marble statues. In any coffee shops. In London.
6 CHRISTIANUS: Oh. So you only took an intro course, then? Modern Miami Crap Art History 101, or something? Or the more specialized South Beach variant, perhaps?
7 KATHERINE: That was almost funny, Chris.
8 CHRISTIANUS: Good. But isn’t she beautiful? With her gaze?
9 KATHERINE: I’m not so much into statues.

v:8, her gaze: If Kern is right, there may be something very important to be said about the Victorian gaze (Kern 1996; ref. supra, note ‘real-coloured scarves’ at 111:20). However, the extent to which Christianus is appreciating Kern’s ideas is hard to estimate. But it does not seem unreasonable to propose that Christianus at least (partly) would accept the more general idea that ‘seeing is not an unbroken gazing’ (Summers 1991, p. 197).

Especially when they have such a lofty, philosophical look. There’s no *romance* there. Just *brain waves*.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmm, yes. Magdalene *does* seem to be a thinker of sorts. But you have to agree: her *pose* is much better than Rodin’s!

KATHERINE: Absolutely. And her *complexion* too. But she’s still *too bulky*!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, space is always a concern with *live sculptures*. Which is why the interior decorator said the whole air conditioning system had to be placed *under* her, if they at all *should* have one.

KATHERINE: Hmm. I hope she doesn’t get a cold, though, *sitting* on it?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, the AC isn’t always working, anyways.

KATHERINE: But it’s humming along, isn’t it? And not so discreetly, either.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. It’s *definitely* a Hummer.

*Magdalene . . . pose:* After comparing many different statues of potential (Mary) Magdalenes, one may come to the conclusion that Christianus and Katherine are looking at (a reproduction of) the Magdalene sculpture that currently resides in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge University. This beautifully crafted marble sculpture of Magdalene was made by Pompeo Marchesi in 1832, and was apparently acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1974 (Fitzwilliam Museum 2012). However, it seems rather unlikely that Christianus (and Katherine) would agree with Fitzwilliam Museum’s statement that this sculpture of Magdalene depicts her as ‘glamorous yet contrite’ (Fitzwilliam Museum 2012).
KATHERINE: Definitely.

CHRISTIANUS: But who knows if it’s actually working?

KATHERINE: I would worry more if I didn’t hear it.

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. But vacuum cleaners are also noisy. And they don’t always work either. Or produce very clean air.

KATHERINE: Chris, you worry too much.

CHRISTIANUS: I do?

KATHERINE: Yes. About the wrong things!

CHRISTIANUS: Really?

KATHERINE: Yes. Really! And you neglect all the important stuff!

CHRISTIANUS: Such as?

KATHERINE: The air outside!

CHRISTIANUS: What about it? We’re inside!

KATHERINE: All that carbon dioxide! And global warming!

More details about the Pompeo Mar-chesi statue can be found in one of the exhibition catalogues of the Heim Gallery, in which it is called ‘The Magdalen’ (Heim Gallery 1972, no. 49).


V1:10, pose . . . better than Rodin’s: If Christianus is not thinking about Rodin himself, he is most probably talking about his work The Thinker — something which Katherine seems to under-
CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! You’re funny, Katherine! Really funny!

KATHERINE: Funny?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. You really should get up on that little mini-stage over there! Don’t be shy! Go for it! Miami’s Got Talent! Yeah!

KATHERINE: I don’t follow.

CHRISTIANUS: To be really funny, one has to, on occasion, be able to be very serious. As if one really meant it. Like Seinfeld. He knows. And apparently you do too! Splendid performance! Just splendid!

KATHERINE: But I really meant it, Chris! I am serious!

CHRISTIANUS: You are?

KATHERINE: Yes. Man-made global warming is absolutely nothing to joke about. I would never think of it. It’s a real problem!

CHRISTIANUS: Are you still joking? Because if you are, it’s really, really good! Larry

stand, even though the reference in such a case, in a somewhat mysterious way, first would pass through Rodin, and then continue onwards to the ruminator and his pose.

For a reproduction of the smaller (70 cm high) version of The Thinker, see, for example, Reynolds 1992 (p. 41).


v:38, Larry David . . . ecstatic: It may be difficult to visualize the idea that Larry David would have been (externally) ecstatic here, especially since one of his shows was named Curb Your Enthusiasm. But maybe that is (part of) Christianus’s point?
David would have been ecstatic!

KATHERINE: I am sorry to disappoint you, but I'm serious. Dead serious.

CHRISTIANUS: Then we have a problem.

KATHERINE: Finally!

CHRISTIANUS: Sorry, but I should have said ‘you’, not ‘we’.

KATHERINE: I have a problem?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If you believe those jokesters at the BBC and the NYT.

KATHERINE: Jokesters?

CHRISTIANUS: They’d make anything up to get better ratings. And to keep their jobs. So why listen to them? Anthropogenic global warming is just another scam, long in the making. And so are many other news stories.

KATHERINE: Scam? Have you lost your mind? Shall I call the men in white?

CHRISTIANUS: Go ahead! You can even call those in black, if you want. But not for my sake! I am not gay, or alien! Ha ha!

KATHERINE: I don’t see anyone else needing emergency treatment!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Relax, Katherine. Relax!

KATHERINE: How can I? I’m still freaking standing! Next to an annoyingly noisy
marble Hummingbird. In a crowded café *without* waitresses or coffee. Or anything to *eat!* And then — after an eternity of in-house touring — Chris the conspiracy theorist starts!

CHRISTIANUS: I am not a conspiracy theorist.

KATHERINE: You certainly have fooled me!

CHRISTIANUS: I think of myself more as a *fac-tualist.* Or, perhaps, even better, as a *fic-tionalist.*

KATHERINE: Well, at least it *sounds* better. But what does it *mean?*

CHRISTIANUS: That global warming very well may be true.

KATHERINE: Oh? Really? *Good!*

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I mean, not necessarily *right now.* But it certainly *may* be, at *some* point.

KATHERINE: Hmmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: *Man-made* global warming, however, is a different story. It’s not only a piece of *ill-crafted* fiction, but also a *scam.*

KATHERINE: You’re not giving up so easily, are you?

CHRISTIANUS: *Why would* I? For the sake of some mishy-mousy ‘political politeness’? It’s not *my* game, *that’s* for sure! Ha ha!
KATHERINE: I get *that*. But what would the *motive* be? Why would someone simply *make up* a story?

CHRISTIANUS: Why don’t you ask one of the latest Nobel Prize Laureates?

KATHERINE: I am sorry?

CHRISTIANUS: Or just *anyone*.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: Because they *like* it.

KATHERINE: Like *what*?

CHRISTIANUS: The story. The play. And the way they can *position* themselves in it.

KATHERINE: Position?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Because they are *unhappy*. With their *position*.

KATHERINE: You mean with their *life*?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, *without* those stories.

KATHERINE: So they create *stories*? To get *happier*?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Those who are *satisfied* don’t *need* such stories.

KATHERINE: How do you mean?

CHRISTIANUS: Take Baldy, for instance.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: And let’s assume that he is as
rich as you think he is. Or would like him to be.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: Why would a guy like that waste his precious time on making up stories about how rich he is going to be? He’s already rich!

KATHERINE: Maybe he has nothing else to do?

CHRISTIANUS: Unlikely. With his macho-magnetic appearance, and his custom-designed blue Ferrari rebelliously, and very visibly, misparked just outside one of those new, trendy bars, he can get any babe he wants, any day of the week. So why wouldn’t he have anything else to do? He’s already living the dream!

KATHERINE: Dating all those superficial Barbie dolls?

CHRISTIANUS: Actually, he’s not so much into dating. He’s more into variety. Continuous variety.

KATHERINE: A player?

CHRISTIANUS: What else could he be? And how do you know that those Barbies are superficial, or merely superficial? Or that they are more superficial than those who are not very hot?

KATHERINE: It’s just that . . .
CHRISTIANUS: So he’s already ruling. He doesn’t need to daydream very much about money or women. In those areas, he’s king. Everything just works. Automatically. No revision needed.

KATHERINE: But?

CHRISTIANUS: He has a health problem.

KATHERINE: But he looks great!

CHRISTIANUS: Nevertheless.


CHRISTIANUS: No. It’s his lungs. After a lifetime of smoking.

KATHERINE: That doesn’t sound that bad.

CHRISTIANUS: You obviously haven’t heard him cough yet. It goes on and on. And on.

KATHERINE: OK, but . . .

CHRISTIANUS: So whenever he has some spare time, he is doing his story-thing. How to proceed. How to become better. How to heal.

KATHERINE: You mean he’s trying to figure out his health options? How to survive? All by himself?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: Why doesn’t he simply go to some
expert doctor, so that he doesn’t have to waste his time dreaming up all these stupid stories? Is he retarded or something?

CHRISTIANUS: No more than I am.

KATHERINE: That’s a relief!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes. So as an expert player, he not only knows his way around the basketball court; he also knows exactly how to navigate in the so-called ‘real world’. With so-called ‘real people’.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: So he knows, from his own experience with thousands of encounters, that people never really act unselfishly, or without motives. It may just seem like that, if one doesn’t scratch the surface.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: So he is well aware that people always are very carefully managing their own position in their own, particular story-space. In a complex, multi-dimensional play-array of values, roles, motives and emotions.

KATHERINE: Are you talking about social norms?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that too. And since Baldy’s health is much more important to himself than to anyone else, he decided not to trust anyone, including those doctors. So he conducts his own research.
KATHERINE: So he’s not trusting medical science? Or the physicians? What a fool!

CHRISTIANUS: No. He is very bright and well informed. He now knows more about how to heal himself than most regular doctors do. In fact, he might even be eligible for next year’s local Ready-to-Role-Play Competition for aspiring satisfactionists. If he just can beat his lung cancer before February.

KATHERINE: Whatever.

CHRISTIANUS: Whatever? No compassion? Lung cancer!

KATHERINE: It’s just a stupid game!

CHRISTIANUS: There is nothing ‘just’ about this game. Or any game. It’s the real deal.

KATHERINE: And what does all this nonsense have to do with the BBC and the NYT, anyways? And with global warming? It’s science!

CHRISTIANUS: Science is a just a pile of stories. Just like literature is. Or the news.

KATHERINE: Come on, Chris! Grow up!

CHRISTIANUS: The main difference is simply how moving they are. Are the stories be-

v:118, There is nothing ‘just’: The word ‘just’ seemingly plays a very important role in this sentence. One way to understand its importance would be to regard it as a modifier that ‘blocks’ Katherine’s idea that games are not very important or that games are not ‘serious’, or something like that. On such a
lievable? Are they entertaining? And do we feel an urgency to act? Or not?

KATHERINE: Oh, my!

CHRISTIANUS: So we should not underestimate them.

KATHERINE: Who? The Eskimos?

CHRISTIANUS: For example. Or the Bar Council. Or the rappers down the street.

KATHERINE: Come on! Really!

CHRISTIANUS: Hold on, Katherine. Just hear me out.

KATHERINE: All right, all right. Here we go again!

CHRISTIANUS: It’s simple. People just love stories. Therefore people use stories to try to grab power. If you have the right story, you can get ahead. But if you have the wrong one, you might end up with nothing. Or even less.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: So everyone in the rat race needs a good story. A story that solves a problem. A story that moves. A story that pays. Either in dollars or, as in Baldy’s Barbie-Babes, the story pays in something else. But the story is what matters. Not the money. Not the power. Not the influence. Just the story.

reading we might then say that Christianus here is trying to tell Katherine that games are more important than she thinks they are. Another way to understand the word ‘just’ would be to read it in a more philosophical way, as having to do with some aspects of ethics and the philosophy of law. In that
dy’s case, in sensuous sessions with the hottest hotties.

133 KATHERINE: So it’s all about money?

134 CHRISTIANUS: No. But if you follow the money, you’ll see it. It’s about power. Who’s ruling, and who’s not.

135 KATHERINE: But why all this talk about stories? What does it have to do with my life?

136 CHRISTIANUS: In order to get anywhere, story-wise, you first have to learn how to rule your own body. So you need some narrative support for that.

137 KATHERINE: I’m not sure what you mean.

138 CHRISTIANUS: If you cannot even control your own body, how will be able to control the kind of hot guys that you want to impress on? So unless you want to end up as a slave, why try to allure someone whom you eventually won’t be able to control? Remember Roy in Vegas? Grrrr!

V:138, Roy in Vegas: The proper noun ‘Roy’ most probably refers to Roy Horn of Siegfried and Roy, the two magicians who had one of the most successful shows in Las Vegas in the history of show business (ABC News 2009): ‘We followed our dreams, for dreams were all we had. In the process our lives became magical’ (Siegfried and Roy 2012). Whether or not this ‘dream-following’ idea would fit into Christianus’s discussion on people who are searching for a better position is not entirely easy to evaluate. But we can at least assume that neither Christianus nor Katherine would say that
KATHERINE: I do. But that was a tiger!

CHRISTIANUS: That’s exactly my point. If you’re playing in Baldy’s league, there is a different set of rules. If there are any rules at all!

KATHERINE: I don’t think I can do it.

CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

KATHERINE: I am not interested in some lonely guru-in-a-cave type of life, if that’s what you’re saying.

CHRISTIANUS: Are you kidding? Am I in a cave now?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: Unlike you, I am not a nothing-ness philosopher. So why would I recommend some boring Buddhist monastery or mediocre māyāvādi āśrama? Or one of those encaved Himalayan hermits whose only ‘friends’ are the yetis and the neti-netis?

the ‘material’ position of Mr. Horn (in March 2007, three and a half years after that tiger incident) was a better or more ‘magical’ one than the one he had had prior to that gory event.


v:146, māyāvādi: The Sanskrit root √vad ‘speak’ (cf. Eng. ‘word’) is a building block that is used to create many other words, and parts of words, such as pratyayas, suffixes (cf. Whitney 1988,
KATHERINE: Actually, I have heard some spooky fairytales about Tibetan *yetis*. Are the *neti-netis* similar? Just as hairy and scary? And *imaginary*?

CHRISTIANUS: The *neti-netis* seem to be just adhering to such an illusory or nothingness-like doctrine — a doctrine that, for all practical purposes, boils down to impersonalism and atheism.

In this context it is also relevant to point out that, just as atheists seldom talk of themselves as atheists, proponents of *mâyâvâda* philosophy seldom talk of themselves as *mâyâvâdas* (cf. Klostermaier 2002, p. 109). Therefore, noting that Christianus here uses that very word, and also in the previous sentence has declared that he is not a nothingness philosopher, we may be quite sure that he himself is not a *mâyâvâda*.


as ‘real’ as the yetis are, and perhaps even more so. But they are, unfortunately, the proud proponents of a phenomenally foolish philosophy.

KATHERINE: How does it work?


v:146, āshrama: Although the word āshrama may mean different things, it seems fairly reasonable to read it here as ‘hermitage’ (Macdonell 1924, p. 43).

ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL (1924), A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary, with Transliteration, Accentuation, and Etymological Analysis Throughout. London: Humphrey Milford, for the Oxford University Press.

v:146, yeti: The ‘abominable snowman’, also known as the yeti, ‘features strongly in Sherpa mythology’ (Woodhatch 1997, p. 427). Some ‘inexplicable footprints’ were reported already in 1898 by Wassell in Sikkim (Woodhatch 1997, p. 427). Then Bill Tilman ‘tracked yeti footprints for over a mile’ in 1938, after which Eric Shipton photographed one on the Menlungtse glacier in the Himalayas in 1951 (Mayhew and Bindloss 2006, p. 353; photograph reproduced in Bradbury 1983, p. 111). And the 1985 Pilkington Everest Expedition reported that ‘they came to a line of large prints running across the glacier’, also noting that they knew ‘full well they were the first expedition there that year’, after which Jon Tinker, a climber and an Exeter University graduate, said ‘Saw what looked like Yeti prints’, while adding, casually, ‘and I ain’t a believer’ (Greig 1999, p. 107).


v:146, neti-netis: This most probably refers to those philosophers who are subscribing to, or are interested in, different kinds of neti-neti philosophy. For more on the neti-netis and their philosophical method, see infra, note ‘phenomenally foolish philosophy’ at v:148, and note ‘Sort of’ at v:152.
CHRISTIANUS: It’s very straightforward. Not this, not that — neti this, neti that. Neti-neti.

KATHERINE: Double negation?

CHRISTIANUS: Sort of.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: That’s it.

KATHERINE: That’s all?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. As I said: foolish!

KATHERINE: So what are you saying, then? I mean, about me?

CHRISTIANUS: About you? The long version, or the short?

v:148, phenomenally foolish philosophy: It may be significant that Christianus here uses the word ‘phenomenally’. Although it is plain that appearances and phenomena can be misleading, and that they, on their own, do not always indicate the exact underlying mechanism by which the universe operates, Christianus himself presumably still thinks that we must use these appearances to construct a positive theory of the complete cosmos (material and spiritual), and avoid theories that are built on mostly negative conceptual ground, such as those in ‘negative theology’ or ‘via negativa’, etc. (cf. Braine 1998). Christianus might therefore think that the neti-netis are foolish because they categorically reject the phenomena as a means to discover the greater cosmos, using their official excuse, ‘whatever we imagine it to be, it will be wrong’ — an unscientific attitude that probably would make Christianus categorize them as nothing but philosophical escape artists of the most insincere kind. For more on neti-neti philosophy, see infra, note ‘Sort of’ at v:152.


v:152, Sort of: Christianus’s response to Katherine’s idea of a ‘double negation’ probably indicates that this is not how he himself should have described it. First of all, we can be reasonably sure that Christianus is not referring to any double negation in ‘standard’ symbolic logic terms (but cf. Dummett 1998 on intuitionistic logic, pp. 178–179), where the two negations would amount to an ‘annihilation’, as in Hacking’s ex-
KATHERINE: The short one, please!

CHRISTIANUS: No. No. No.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: Too short?

KATHERINE: A little.

CHRISTIANUS: All right. If satisfaction is your soul-goal, then don’t follow the neti-netis. Don’t try to negate yourself into nothingness. Don’t do away with all desires, dreams, hopes, ambitions, and friends.

KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: Really. I mean, even if you

ample of the ‘double denial’ where ¬¬P and P are ‘logically equivalent’ (Hacking 1972, p. 126). Nor does Christianus seem to refer to the idea of ‘the negation of the negation’ that Zahner attributes to Hegel, and perhaps also to orthodox Christian and Sufi doctrine (Zahner 1971, p. 150).

But what does Christianus mean, then? It seems likely that the kind of negation that he has in mind is not actually limited to ‘double’. For the twice occurring term ‘neti’ (in ‘neti-neti’) simply signifies the general idea behind the philosophy, namely to negate whenever and wherever necessary; consequently, the neti-netis negate just as many times as they see fit. Dasgupta describes, in a section called ‘Unknowability of Brahman and the Negative Method’, how some philosophers mentioned in the Upanishads were propounding the ‘negative method’ when trying to describe what Brahman (God) is, or, rather, is not: ‘Yajñavalkya said “He the ātman is not this, nor this (neti neti)” (Dasgupta 1997, p. 44). The idea behind this kind of thinking is that ‘[w]e cannot describe it [Brahman] by any positive content which is always limited by conceptual thought’ (Dasgupta 1997, p. 45) — a stance that may lead some philosophers to recommend not just limitless negation, but absolute silence, as when Bāhva instructed Vashkali: ‘I teach you indeed [with my own silence] but you do not understand; the Ātman is silence’ (Dasgupta 1997, p. 45).


MICHAEL DUMMETT (1998), ‘The Phi-
were Robinson Crusoe you would have a friend on a day like this. After first having experienced some unsatisfying nothingness.

167 KATHERINE: I thought you were saying that I should avoid making new acquaintances?

168 CHRISTIANUS: No. The idea is simply that you should select them very carefully. So that they won’t interfere with your real desires, hopes, and ambitions. That’s all.

169 KATHERINE: Oh!

170 CHRISTIANUS: So you can be free to set some real goals for yourself. Personal goals. Higher goals.

171 KATHERINE: Higher goals? Come on, Chris! I’m hungry!


v:166, a day like this: After inspecting some archived weather reports and forecasts, one might argue that the London weather that day might not have been very much like the weather on one of the Caribbean islands on the day when Robinson Crusoe met his new mate. For example, the Dawn weather forecast suggests, under the heading ‘Today’, that the London weather on 23 March 2007 (Rabi-ul-Awwal 3, 1428) is, or is likely to be, a day with showers, 76% humidity, a min temperature of 5 °C, and a max temperature of 11 °C (Dawn 2007); and the WeatherOnline UK graphs show, for London City, a pressure of 1016 hPa (or millibar), 78% relative humidity, and a max temperature of 8 °C (WeatherOnline UK 2007a, 2007b, 2007c).

Thus, since the London weather may not have been very Caribbean, it is not impossible that Christianus here is not trying to refer to the weather when
CHRISTIANUS: Sure, but where to sit?

KATHERINE: What should we do, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Move on?

KATHERINE: You mean to another café?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: No, I really looked forward coming here.

CHRISTIANUS: But you are here!

KATHERINE: Sure. But I haven’t tried their famous coffee yet. Or the scones. Or even the chairs!

CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. So you’d like to stay?

KATHERINE: Yes.

he says ‘a day like this’. Perhaps he instead uses that phrase simply to point to the current day of the week? If that is, or was, the idea, then we might conclude that it certainly worked very well, especially since he uttered it on a Friday. But is this possibility — that his comment only would have worked on a Friday — a reason to think that this interpretation is wrong? In other words, is the existence of this once-a-week condition somehow decreasing the probability that the day-of-the-week interpretation is nicely in line with Christianus’s (original or revised) intention(s)?


SCENE VI.

*The Owen Problem*

1. CHRISTIANUS: Any ideas?

2. KATHERINE: Why don’t we return to the *mural*?

3. CHRISTIANUS: Literally?

4. KATHERINE: We don’t have to move, if that’s what you are afraid of. I’d just like to hear more about that mural. It’s so romantic!

5. CHRISTIANUS: The *mural?* I am not sure what to say. Especially if you are looking for something romantic.

6. KATHERINE: But didn’t you say that Owen didn’t have any artistic sensibilities? Or something like that?

7. CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

8. KATHERINE: But then you also said that he *made* the mural?

9. CHRISTIANUS: Right.

**vi:17, Vaishya:** When Christianus here is talking about some facets of a ‘caste’ system, he is most probably *not* referring to the *jati* (‘birth’) system in modern India (cf. Wolpert 1993, p. 41). It is more probable that he refers to the ancient Vedic *varna* (‘colour’) system, with its *brâhmanas*, *kshatriyas*, *vaishyas*, and *shudras*, and to the idea that one’s ‘caste’ is determined by what kind of (daily) activities one *actually* is engaged in, regardless of which family one was born into.

The classical definition of the kind of activities that a *vaishya* might be engaged in can be found in Chapter 18, Text 45 of the *Bhagavad-gîtâ*: ‘farming, cow protection and business are the natural work for the vaishyas’ [Skt. *kri-
KATHERINE: How could that be?

CHRISTIANUS: What is your question, exactly?

KATHERINE: How in the whole world could something so absolutely beautiful be made by someone who has no artistic sensibilities whatsoever? If that’s what you are saying?

CHRISTIANUS: Listen, Katherine: Owen is an almost pure vaishya.

KATHERINE: A what?

CHRISTIANUS: A vai-sh-ya.

KATHERINE: Is he some Hindu guru or something? A-a-o-o-u-u-m-m-m!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Owen the Scot? No, no. F-a-a-a-r from it. Vaishya simply means businessman. That’s all.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, a true businessman always ponders how he is going to get the money, right?

KATHERINE: Sure. I know people like that.

shi-go-rakshya-vâniyam vaishya-karma svabhâva-jam] (Prabhupâda 1986, p. 828; cf. pp. 238–239). But we may note, as Christianus himself indicates later on, that a potential ‘impurity’ also may occur; so although one may associate ‘vaishyas with mercantile activities . . . the match is imperfect’ (Smaje 2000, p. 15).


CHRISTIANUS: And a good businessman is one who actually ends up with a fair amount of money. Otherwise, he is not very good, is he?

KATHERINE: No, he isn’t. Or she!

CHRISTIANUS: Right. So by learning from other businesspersons who already have made it, one can learn to be a good one.

KATHERINE: Presumably. But one can, of course, also have a lot of natural talent? Right?

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. Some just have it in their blood, while others may have to be taught. And some end up as college professors.

KATHERINE: You mean those who can’t, teach?

CHRISTIANUS: Not exactly. It’s not just about who can and cannot do business; it’s also about who can and cannot teach. And there are other questions as well.

KATHERINE: Where are you going with this?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I wish I could say that we now would be going to our own table with this information. But I can’t see a single free one yet. Can you?

KATHERINE: No. It looks like we’re stuck here. No-one is moving.
CHRISTIANUS: At least not to the extent that they are leaving their tables.

KATHERINE: Right. But what about Owen?

CHRISTIANUS: Owen? He’s not here today. It’s Venus-day. Remember?

KATHERINE: Yes, but . . .

CHRISTIANUS: And even if he were here, he would not help us.

KATHERINE: Why not? Is he a monster?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, he does have some mean cookies.

KATHERINE: But a monster?

CHRISTIANUS: No, that’s probably an exaggeration. But I still think that it would be fair to say that some of his facial features would not be left untouched by a truly caring dermatologist or plastic surgeon.

KATHERINE: But surely he is no Elephant Man, is he?

CHRISTIANUS: Not exactly. But his business ethics is quite a monstrosity to behold.

KATHERINE: His business ethics?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It goes something like this: ‘No customer is special. Treat all customers nicely, without favouring any of them. And get their money as fast as you can. Cash is King Kong!’
KATHERINE: Hmmm. Talk about monstrosity!

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely! So even if he were here, we still would have to wait for a table.

KATHERINE: OK, but there’s one thing I don’t understand.

CHRISTIANUS: What’s that?

KATHERINE: What has Owen to do with college professors?

CHRISTIANUS: Not much, I’m afraid.

KATHERINE: Then why mention it?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s just that I meant something very particular when I said that Owen is an almost pure vaishya.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, Owen is not a theory person.

KATHERINE: You mean he doesn’t like to speculate, like college professors love to do?

CHRISTIANUS: Correct. But he also doesn’t like listening to other people’s speculations.

KATHERINE: I see. So that means he’s not interested in being or becoming a stock broker or commodities broker either? Even though he is — what did you call it? — a vahyischia?

CHRISTIANUS: Vai-sh-ya.

KATHERINE: Vai-sh-ya?
CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Good. Actually, I think he once had an internship at one of the big banks, years ago. But it didn’t work out.

KATHERINE: What happened?

CHRISTIANUS: They didn’t like him.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: Because he wasn’t very productive.

KATHERINE: What has productivity to do with it?

CHRISTIANUS: Everything. Especially in the currency markets, where he was.

KATHERINE: How so?

CHRISTIANUS: If you don’t make enough money even to pay for your own wage, how can they afford to keep you?

KATHERINE: But surely they didn’t just lay him off immediately? I mean, wasn’t it an internship? Some sort of educational program?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, they have their business ethics. And philosophy of education.

KATHERINE: Which is?

CHRISTIANUS: I think their motto was ‘No compassion, just business’. Or was it ‘Make money, not friends’? I don’t remember; I always mix them up. But you get the idea.

KATHERINE: Definitely.
CHRISTIANUS: But the ‘productivity’ thing was only a part of ‘The Owen Problem’.

KATHERINE: There’s more?

CHRISTIANUS: You bet.

KATHERINE: I’m listening.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, one problem was Owen’s attitude.

KATHERINE: Attitude?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, he’s not the smoothest guy out there.

KATHERINE: OK. But who wants a wimp, anyway?

CHRISTIANUS: Right. But Owen almost always says exactly what he thinks. On the spot. And he doesn’t take shit from anyone.

KATHERINE: Uh-oh.

CHRISTIANUS: And he’s also not one of those typical college brats you might find at the big commercial banks. Which is why he didn’t want to hang out with them.

KATHERINE: You mean he doesn’t come from a wealthy family?

CHRISTIANUS: No, that’s not the problem. Or at least not the fact.

KATHERINE: So he does come from a good family?

CHRISTIANUS: If ‘good’ is to be understood as
‘rich’, then you’re right on the money. But he’s *still* not one of those typical college brats.

---

KATHERINE: Are you trying to say that he never joined that whole Greek fraternity thing?

CHRISTIANUS: Something like that.

KATHERINE: *Is it* that, or is it just something *like* that?

CHRISTIANUS: He didn’t want to be *ruled* by his father. So he didn’t go to *any* university. Not even to the University of London.

KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that’s not all.

KATHERINE: There’s more?

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

KATHERINE: Yes?

CHRISTIANUS: He also refused to follow his father’s *other* recommendation.

KATHERINE: What was *that*?

CHRISTIANUS: To join his family’s ancient secret society.

KATHERINE: Which is?

CHRISTIANUS: So secret you’ve never even heard of it.

KATHERINE: I see. Is it in London?
CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But some rites are in Scotland.

KATHERINE: Creepy!

CHRISTIANUS: Definitely. Not to speak of all those sea monsters!

KATHERINE: Yes. And I definitely don’t like their dialect either. It’s s-o-o-o ugly!

CHRISTIANUS: I actually haven’t come across any reports about Nessie, or any of her friends, speaking. Where did you hear that?

KATHERINE: Don’t play dumb. It doesn’t work.

CHRISTIANUS: All right. And what shall we say about their kilts?

KATHERINE: Ohhh-Myyyyy-Godddd! Hideous!

CHRISTIANUS: And their bagpipes?

KATHERINE: Even worse!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It’s obviously some sort of demonic race, or something. I mean, who could stand all those diabolic sounds and visions all day long without thinking one were in hell?

KATHERINE: Absolutely! And we haven’t even touched upon their weather yet!

CHRISTIANUS: Excellent point!

KATHERINE: But tell me one thing, Chris.

CHRISTIANUS: What?
KATHERINE: If Owen is so ‘unqualified’ or ‘unsuitable’ as you seem to suggest, how could he end up with that internship in the first place?

CHRISTIANUS: His dad is, or at least was, on the bank’s board of trustees. So he fixed him in, somehow or other. To keep an eye on him. And also, of course, to try to mould him into something ‘usable’.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see. Hmmm. Difficult situation.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But Owen, of course, wasn’t — and still isn’t — overwhelmingly malleable.

KATHERINE: Right.
SCENE VII.

*Just Follow the Money*

1. KATHERINE: So what now?
2. CHRISTIANUS: Now we’ll just follow the money.
3. KATHERINE: How do you mean?
4. CHRISTIANUS: Well, wouldn’t you agree that a person’s consciousness may give us some information about the kind of actions he may perform?
5. KATHERINE: I am not sure. I haven’t heard your whole story.
6. CHRISTIANUS: Right. Well, as I see it, one’s ‘caste’ is, in many ways, *created*, from one’s consciousness.
7. KATHERINE: How so?
8. CHRISTIANUS: Well, one could think of it as a product of one’s emotions and beliefs. So if you are ‘internally convinced’ that you are afraid of spiders, how will you ever be able to accept that new position at the local zoo, requiring an endless amount of TLC for their new, horrendously hairy *poecilotheria subfusca* tarantula?
10. CHRISTIANUS: So if you *know* a person’s
consciousness, then you can guess his ‘caste’.

KATHERINE: I can guess his ‘caste’ anyway. Why do I need to know his consciousness for that?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I should have said, ‘guess it, and be right’.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see. That’s better.

CHRISTIANUS: And even if you cannot figure out everything about his casting potential, you may still get some insight into his approximate ‘range of action’.

KATHERINE: You mean like, for example, if we know that a man is a real soldier at heart, it wouldn’t be very far-fetched to predict that he might protect his own people in times of trouble, even without payment?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, something like that. Assuming, of course, that the kshatriya in question has very little vaishya tendencies, and also is endowed with a substantial amount of physical and mental strength, thus being fully committed to the idea of protecting the citizens in times of trouble, without worrying about any monetary compensation or even his own, personal safety. But how many soldiers are of that calibre today?
KATHERINE: Right. I see what you mean. *Ksha-tri-ya?*

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: So since Owen seemingly is more or less a pure businessman at heart, as you have said, we should simply follow the money? Is that your idea?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: So how do we do that, exactly?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, Owen knows that the amount of money he is going to get is more or less dependent on the number of paying customers. No customers, no money.

KATHERINE: Sure. As in so many other businesses.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So to get as many customers as possible, he would need some great coffee and some nice home-made sandwiches, buns, cookies, and so on.

KATHERINE: Why *home-made* cookies? And *great* coffee? I mean, wouldn’t he be making *more* money if he just *skipped* that, and lowered the quality?

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. Which is why I called him only *almost* pure. So even though he certainly *does* think about money all the time, he *also* thinks about his customers.
KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, believe it or not. And even if everything he is offering may not be super-duper high-quality stuff in terms of nutritional value and taste, it’s still home-made, fresh and good enough to satisfy most people.

KATHERINE: So he wants his customers to be happy?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, he likes that. When they are happy, he feels he is not cheating them.

KATHERINE: Oh, so he is not cheating them?

CHRISTIANUS: I didn’t say that. It’s just that happy customers, whether they are cheated or not, are returning customers.

KATHERINE: I see.

CHRISTIANUS: So it’s about a positive experience both for him and for the customers. And it is not just about taste either. He feels a responsibility to only use organic, non-GMO grains and coffee. That way he knows that even if some of his customers suddenly die, get sick, become sterile, or evolutionize themselves into human-size flies or lizards, it’s most probably not because of his products or services.

KATHERINE: I see. Guilt free.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And with a price tag that
many customers still can afford.

KATHERINE: Or at least are willing to pay.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. Also, of course, Owen recognizes the need for an attractive environment. He knows that customers are looking for nice, ‘homey’ places.

KATHERINE: Where they can have really relaxing experiences.

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. And he also knows that colours, textures, and materials really matter.

KATHERINE: As does music. And art.

CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. But here’s the problem: Since his aesthetic abilities and aspirations were, and still are, practically non-existent, he wasn’t sure which colours, textures and materials to choose. Or what kind of art and music to select.

KATHERINE: So what did he do? Arrange a poll?

CHRISTIANUS: Why would he?

KATHERINE: To get some answers.

CHRISTIANUS: Answers? He is not interested

vii:34, human-size flies: See, for example, the film The Fly (1986), where Seth Brundle the typical mad scientist, expertly played by Jeff Goldblum, develops into a human-size fly after a lab experiment on himself develops in a very strange and unsatisfying direction. 

THE FLY (1986), starring Jeff Goldblum, Geena Davis, John Getz. David Cronenberg (director, screenplay), George Langelaan (writer), Charles Ed-
in any answers. He’s neither a Gallup guy nor — as I’ve already pointed out — a college professor. He in it for the money. Remember?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: So he simply hired some artists, musicians, and interior designers. To produce results, not answers.

KATHERINE: So some artist painted that mural?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: But you did say that Owen made the mural!

CHRISTIANUS: Certainly.

KATHERINE: But he didn’t make it. Whoever painted it, did. Why are you so stubborn?

CHRISTIANUS: Because I am trying to make a point.

KATHERINE: What point?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, you’re right that whoever painted the mural made it.

KATHERINE: Obviously!

CHRISTIANUS: But Owen also did.

ward Pogue (screenplay), Stuart Cornfeld (producer). A production by Twentieth Century Fox and Brooksfilms. Released on DVD in 2005 (in Europe) by Twentieth Century Fox.

vii:48, results, not answers: This apparently means that Christianus is of the opinion that answers may not satisfy all people equally well. Christianus may also mean that answers are, taxonomically speaking, different, or even radically
KATHERINE: But you said he didn’t paint at all!

CHRISTIANUS: True.

KATHERINE: So how can he have made it?

CHRISTIANUS: He paid for it.

KATHERINE: Paid for it?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If you can only pay for it, what’s the difficulty getting it done? We are not talking about putting a man on the moon here.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: And even if it’s a really difficult project, like one of those multi-million-man-hour moon-landing-missions in the Apollo programme, it might still be realizable if you only have the money, the drive, and, of course, a sufficiently advanced technology.

KATHERINE: Sure. And Kennedy and Nixon...
had all that.

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.

KATHERINE: Maybe?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, maybe. But just imagine if NASA would have refused to pay the thousands of employees their salaries, or their contractors, or had not had a sufficiently advanced technology at the time: how many men would then have walked the moon that summer night in 1969?

KATHERINE: None?

CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. So money is, in some sense, and in some cases, a causal factor.

KATHERINE: Is anyone denying it?

CHRISTIANUS: I’m not sure. But Aristotle, for instance, didn’t list it.

KATHERINE: Is that a problem?

CHRISTIANUS: Not for me.


v11:66, multi-million-man-hour: Note that Christianus here is using ‘man hour’ as opposed to, for example, ‘man month’. It is possible that this has something to do with the experiences reported in Frederick P. Brooks's The Mythical Man Month (Brooks 1995).


v11:70, NASA . . . employees: In the mid-1960s NASA’s payroll averaged 36,000 people — and ‘for every NASA staffer, there would be ten personnel in the private sector’ (Bizony 2006, p. 79). The average yearly expenditure for the Apollo program was $4,000,000,000 (Nye 1997, p. 151).

PIERS BIZONY (2006), The Man Who
KATHERINE: So why did you bring it up?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it’s always interesting to notice what people don’t say.

KATHERINE: Chris?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes?

KATHERINE: I don’t feel very well.

CHRISTIANUS: Should I get you some water?

KATHERINE: Thanks, but I’ll be fine. I’m just so exhausted. It just came over me. I sometimes get these attacks.

CHRISTIANUS: Or should I call a cab?

KATHERINE: No, no. Don’t be stupid. Absolutely not. It’s just so god-damn irritating that we not even have a table yet. And no coffee. And nothing to eat. Jesus, have mercy!

CHRISTIANUS: With your sincere prayers, I am sure something will manifest quite soon.

KATHERINE: Chris, if you only would have come earlier! They had lots of free tables at ten o’clock.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. I am very sorry about that.

---


**VII:70, summer night in 1969:** The transmission of Armstrong’s ‘That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind’ (Ryan 1969, p. 120)
But it’s actually quite strange: I mean, it is never ever this busy here at this time of day. Even on a Friday.

KATHERINE: Unless it’s one of those Cookie Monster Treat days, of course.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. I just didn’t know.

KATHERINE: And where are all the waitresses? Or what do you call them around here?

CHRISTIANUS: I’m not sure.

KATHERINE: You’re not sure where they are? Or what to call them?

CHRISTIANUS: Normally, there are two cute little waitresses running around here, with their stylish mini-skirts and long, well-waxed legs.

KATHERINE: Doesn’t sound very Victorian.

CHRISTIANUS: I agree. But they are sexy.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: And very professional.

KATHERINE: Prostitutes usually are!

CHRISTIANUS: But I haven’t seen any of them.

— whether that message originally was transmitted from the surface of the moon or not — was received by the Washington audience at approximately 10:56 p.m. on 20 July 1969, and by the Londoners at approximately 3:56 a.m. on 21 July 1969 (Ryan 1969, p. 6).


v11:72, a causal factor: It seems rather safe to note that Christianus here is not saying that money is the ultimate causal factor,
KATHERINE: Maybe they are taking care of some of their more intimate customers? Or maybe their pimp has arrived, unexpectedly? Through the back door? And is giving them a hard time?

CHRISTIANUS: Owen, you mean? Could be.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: You’re OK?

KATHERINE: Not really. But I’ll survive.

CHRISTIANUS: Look! See those two stools over there, near the counter?

KATHERINE: Where the two old ladies sit?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: What about them?

CHRISTIANUS: Wouldn’t they be great?

KATHERINE: Do you want to chase away the old ladies?

CHRISTIANUS: Not if I can avoid it.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, aren’t they wrapping it up? Or am I just hallucinating?

KATHERINE: Actually, I think you’re right!

CHRISTIANUS: Should we?

or anything like that. For him, it seems, money (including, perhaps, also the promise of it) is just one of the possible causes. v11:122, Harrod’s: For those who have not yet experienced Harrod’s in ‘real life’, Harrod’s website [http://www.
KATHERINE: *Definitely!* Let’s grab them before someone else does!

CHRISTIANUS: But perhaps an *ordinary* table would be better?

KATHERINE: No, no. The counter is perfect. *Fiffs! Go!*

CHRISTIANUS: I am sorry to intrude, ladies, but are you two perhaps preparing to leave?

SELMA: Yes.

THELMA: *Definitely. We can’t sit here all day.* We have *lots* of very important things to do. Harrod’s is having a *sale!*

KATHERINE: A sale?

SELMA: Yes.

THELMA: With *lots* of savings! So we *have* to rush. But do try their home-made cookies. They are *very* delicious!

CHRISTIANUS: And the coffee?

SELMA: Good.

THELMA: Not *good*, Selma! *Excellent!* So you youngsters have something *really* nice to look forward to!

CHRISTIANUS: Great!

---

harrods.com] currently (Tuesday, 3 April 2012) offers ‘Harrods 360’ — a 360° virtual tour of its London store. Note especially the Egyptian escalator.
KATHERINE: Thank you!

SELMA: Good-bye!

THELMA: Bye-bye! It was nice talking to you.


KATHERINE: Bye.
SCENE VIII.

*Katherine Has a Heart*

1. KATHERINE: So what are you having?
2. CHRISTIANUS: I’ll probably have their special coffee blend.
3. KATHERINE: And?
4. CHRISTIANUS: Maybe two of their home-made scones, as usual. With marmalade and cheese. And what about you?
5. KATHERINE: Scones sound yummy. And some of that special coffee blend you always talk about.
6. CHRISTIANUS: Good. Wendy will appreciate it.
7. KATHERINE: Wendy?
8. CHRISTIANUS: The waitress.
9. KATHERINE: Old friend?
10. CHRISTIANUS: In a way.
11. KATHERINE: And?
12. CHRISTIANUS: Well, she is a really nice person.
13. KATHERINE: But?
14. CHRISTIANUS: But she sometimes mixes up orders. So it’s good that we order the same thing. It will be easier for her.
15. KATHERINE: Right.
CHRISTIANUS: Here she comes.

KATHERINE: At last.

WENDY: Hi Chris! How are you?

CHRISTIANUS: Hi Wendy. I am good. And this is my American friend Katherine.

WENDY: Hi Katherine! First time in London?

KATHERINE: No, but first time here, in this café.

WENDY: Aha! A virgin visit!

KATHERINE: I guess you could call it that. And I must tell you — I really love the atmosphere!

WENDY: Yes, it has a certain ambience, doesn’t it? At least when you don’t have to work here. (Sigh. . .) So what are you two having?

CHRISTIANUS: I’ll have your Creative Kilimanjaro, as usual. With cream, of course.

WENDY: Of course.

CHRISTIANUS: And then — u-u-u-h-h — two scones, with butter, cheese and marmalade.

WENDY: Very well. And for you, miss? Or is it Mrs?

KATHERINE: No, it’s miss. And I’ll have the same.

WENDY: Great. Thank you. Oh! And please
be patient. I am alone now.

CHRISTIANUS: Alone?

WENDY: Yes. Shelly fell in the staircase, just after we opened. On her way down to the kitchen.

CHRISTIANUS: You’re kidding?

WENDY: No. And we had to take care of her, and get her to the hospital.

CHRISTIANUS: Goodness!

KATHERINE: Is she all right?

WENDY: I don’t know. Last I saw her, she was unconscious.

CHRISTIANUS: Is that the new one, who started last week?

WENDY: Yes. She’s nice. But just a little too passionate. So have a little patience, OK?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure.

KATHERINE: What a ghastly story!

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. Especially if it’s true.

KATHERINE: You mean she is lying?

CHRISTIANUS: I mean Wendy is Wendy. Anyhow, let’s talk about you now.

KATHERINE: Me?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What did you do yesterday?

KATHERINE: Nothing much. I was at the hotel.
CHRISTIANUS: Sounds relaxing.

KATHERINE: Yes, it was. I actually slept until two.

CHRISTIANUS: Seriously?

KATHERINE: Yes. And I never do that. You know me.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Always on the go.

KATHERINE: Usually, yes. But now I’m desperately seeking sanity. And some energy just to stay awake.

CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. Depressions are like that.

KATHERINE: Actually, it was almost a miracle that I managed to stay awake and check in at the hotel after our pizza the other night. All that philosophy made me super-tired.

CHRISTIANUS: But that mercurian cab driver of yours must have taken you quite quickly to the hotel?

KATHERINE: Sure. But it was a rough ride. It was just as if he thought the street corners were made of cottage cheese or something.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, some coaches are operated by people who have a very vivid imagination. And a unique driving style.

KATHERINE: A style seemingly incompatible
with any regulatory framework. At least in traffic law.

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. But you made it to your hotel without any major injuries?

KATHERINE: No physical ones, at least.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Good.

KATHERINE: Anyway, so then when I woke up yesterday afternoon, I went down to the restaurant for breakfast.

CHRISTIANUS: Did you get any?

KATHERINE: Yes. The waiter was very helpful, even though I was so late.

CHRISTIANUS: Good.

KATHERINE: And then I went back to my room to read a bit and to take it easy. No phone calls, no internet. It almost felt weird!

CHRISTIANUS: I bet! But you really needed it, obviously.

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: So what were you reading? Some interesting book on the philosophy of law?

KATHERINE: No. They didn’t have any legal literature in my hotel room.

CHRISTIANUS: Really? How inconsiderate of them!
KATHERINE: Absolutely! How dare they!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! But maybe you brought some reading material with you from Florida, then? Or pick something up in one of the bookstores near your hotel?

KATHERINE: No bookstores yesterday. I had no energy. And I definitely didn’t bring any books from home. I came here to take it easy, not to work or study.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. I understand.

KATHERINE: And even if I had brought some of my books, they would all be gone by now anyway. I lost my luggage, remember?

CHRISTIANUS: Right! Your luggage! Has it materialized?

KATHERINE: No. And I haven’t heard anything from the airline either.

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe you should call them, yourself?

VIII:78, Your luggage! Katherine’s luggage problem was first discussed at 1:34–42 in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 4–6; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1).

VIII:86, The Yellow Book: One of the publications that specialized in literature and art was the quarterly The Yellow Book, a rather thick (Beardsley 1894: 272 pp.) and short-lived (1894–1897, 13 vols.) periodical, published in London. One typical cover (vol. 3, October 1894), clearly showing Beardsley’s overrated cartoonish style, can be found in Briggs and Snowman (1996, p. 176); but since it is a black-and-white reproduction, it fails to show that typical yellow colour seen on its original covers (see, for example, Beardsley 1894). However, even if The Yellow Book and its Beardsleyan artwork was rather well received at the time, Gallatin and Wainwright think that Beardsley’s best work was made from 1896 and onwards — ’[t]he
KATHERINE: Yes, you’re right. I should. But first I need to mobilize some more energy. After all, the whole point of me being here in London was that I wanted some time off from litigation and such things.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that’s perfectly understandable. I mean, who wouldn’t want to take time off from litigation and such things?

KATHERINE: Exactly. I need a few more lazy days, like yesterday, to recharge my soul-batteries.

CHRISTIANUS: So what did you read yesterday, then? The phone directory?

KATHERINE: No, I am not a numerologist. But I did find some other yellowish publications lying around.

CHRISTIANUS: Some old issues of the late Victorian The Yellow Book?

KATHERINE: No, just some new American magazines.

most resplendent period in the artist’s life’ — with, for instance, his drawings in The Savoy (Gallatin and Wainwright 1952, p. 2). For yet another (unimpressive) example of Beardsley’s artwork, see the reproduction in Spalding of Arthur Glimpsing the Questing Beast (Spalding 1978, pp. 76–77).


CHRISTIANUS: *American* magazines in a *London* hotel?

KATHERINE: Well, my hotel is owned by some *international* corporation. Maybe that’s why?

CHRISTIANUS: Could be. So what did they have? *Time? Newsweek*?

KATHERINE: No. Those are usually not very *yellow*, are they?

CHRISTIANUS: Not if they are *brand new*.

KATHERINE: But they *did* have some copies of one of the leading *geographic* magazines.

CHRISTIANUS: Oh, really? They had copies of *Globalist Geographic*? Or *United Nations Geographic*? Or maybe even of *One World Dictatorship Geographic*?

KATHERINE: No, Chris. Cool down. They only had *National Geographic*.

CHRISTIANUS: Oh, I see. Well, it’s basically the same thing, anyway.

KATHERINE: And they actually had the *latest* issue. How about *that*?

CHRISTIANUS: Really? Then you are ahead of me, reading-wise. I haven’t even opened my own copy yet.

KATHERINE: You *also* had your hands on it?

CHRISTIANUS: Not on *your* copy.
KATHERINE: Of course not. But I didn’t know you were reading *National Geographic.* *Any* copy.

CHRISTIANUS: Actually, I am a subscriber.

KATHERINE: You *subscribe?*

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: You must be *really* interested in geography!

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: Then why in *heaven’s name* do you subscribe?

CHRISTIANUS: Just to see what they are up to.

KATHERINE: Up to?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Politically.

KATHERINE: Politically? It’s about *geography!* And *nature!* And beautiful *photography!*

CHRISTIANUS: True. But there’s also a political propaganda message in it, as in most professionally produced publications and broadcasts. Do you think it’s a pure *coincidence* that it’s published in Washington, D.C.?

KATHERINE: I don’t know *what* to think. I haven’t looked into it. I just *read* it, now and then.

CHRISTIANUS: Very well. The *latest* issue, you said?

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Yes. That’s the one with a bunch of elephants on the front cover, right? And a Tiger on the back, with a fancy watch?

KATHERINE: I don’t remember any tiger, other than the Vegas one. Or any watch.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Maybe I am mixing it up with some other issue? Or maybe we just have different editions?

KATHERINE: Perhaps. But the elephants were there, for sure. Standing in the river.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. And the picture is quite dark, overall.

KATHERINE: Exactly. It’s either dusk or dawn.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Or underexposed.

KATHERINE: Sure. But some of the elephants are very bright. So he must have used a flash or some other extra light.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, I remember that. The picture simply looks a little faked.

KATHERINE: You’re right. It does.

CHRISTIANUS: In fact, it reminds me of some of the more funny-looking shots of the alleged Apollo moon landings.

KATHERINE: Alleged?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that is, of course, a
quite complex matter, which we can cover some other time. In any case, as far as the elephants-in-the-river photograph is concerned, we seem to be talking about the same picture, and the same issue.

KATHERINE: Perhaps.

CHRISTIANUS: So what was the angle?

KATHERINE: I am not sure how to describe it. Some elephants are in profile, while others are looking right into the camera.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But I meant, what’s the angle of the story that comes with that photograph?

KATHERINE: Ah, the story!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What was its focus? Its objective?

KATHERINE: I think the idea was that ivory poachers are evil.

CHRISTIANUS: What else?

KATHERINE: What do you mean? Isn’t that enough?

CHRISTIANUS: What I am looking for is not some intermediary premise or idea, but the final conclusion or call for action, as stated in the article. What was it? I bet it’s not that ivory poachers are evil.

KATHERINE: Well, I think the conclusion, if you can call it that, was that the project
needs its readers’ monetary support in order to succeed. So we can save the elephants. Together.

CHRISTIANUS: Just what I thought. It’s the same old story. How stupid do they think we are? Save the elephants, save the whales, save the atmosphere from carbon dioxide, save the planet! And, not to forget, save us from cancer! Just give us all your money! Ha ha!

KATHERINE: Chris, you don’t understand. There really are ivory wars down there in Africa. And the article writer — who is a bona fide conservationist, by the way — really tries to understand the situation. To track the elephants, he has even equipped them with radio-transmitting collars. And he has learned a lot from that. So he actually is trying to save the elephants. Don’t you get it?

viii:139, the conclusion: Katherine’s statement about the conclusion seems to be right. But she did not mention that there are actually two articles: one longer article, which is probably the one that she refers to; and then also a shorter one, which mostly consists of photographs and captions. The longer article not only states that ‘management must be extended throughout the entire range of the elephants’ (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 65), but also adds, as part of a special ‘note to readers’, that ‘[i]nformation networks must be strengthened, and collaboration with Chad’s military reinforced. In addition, an airplane is needed for daily surveillance. Turn to page 154 to find out how you can help’ (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 65). And the second article, despite its very limited amount of text, still has room to say, in its final caption: ‘Za-kouma’s future as a wildlife refuge depends on the continuing dedication of its guards—and support from the outside world’ (Nichols 2007, p. 77).
CHRISTIANUS: Sure I get it. They are trying to rip you off!

KATHERINE: But I have actually read the article, and you haven’t. I have seen the picture where the poachers had killed the elephant, leaving him there on the ground with only half a face left. That’s what poachers do. It’s absolutely horrible! Be human, Chris!

CHRISTIANUS: Be human? I am the vegetarian here, not you. I am not killing or eating anything that has, or has had, a head on it, whether it’s a fish, a chicken, or a cow. You want to lecture me on love and compassion for animals? I don’t even tread on ants, if I can avoid it.

KATHERINE: Sorry. But you don’t seem to understand the issue.

CHRISTIANUS: I think I do. But why don’t you tell me, anyway: what is the issue?


VIII:141, track the elephants: Christianus did not comment specifically on Katherine’s deduction, where the premise that the conservationist is tracking the elephants with radio-transmitting collars seemingly leads her to conclude that this would be some kind of proof that ‘he actually is trying to save the elephants’. But one could very well imagine that Christianus might say something like this: ‘Any object may be tracked for multiple reasons. Maybe the conservationists have pure hearts; but who else has access to that tracking data? Maybe some well-connected poachers are planning to use that tracking data against the elephants, to capture and kill them?’
KATHERINE: The issue is, of course, as I have already said, that we have to save the elephants.

CHRISTIANUS: Why? Can’t they save themselves?

KATHERINE: Save themselves?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Aren’t they among the biggest and strongest mammals out there?

KATHERINE: Maybe.

**VIII:154, amazingly fast runners:** Elephants can run quite quickly when they really have to. Cynthia Moss talks about two types of running: ‘floppy’ running and ‘panic’ running. In the ‘floppy’ variant, ‘the elephants put their heads down and let their ears and trunk hang loose so that they flap and wave about as they run’, and also ‘make the loud, pulsating play trumpet’ (Moss 1989, p. 171; cf. Payne 1998, p. 96). This type of running seems to be slower and more relaxed and playful than the other type, which is faster and more ‘serious’. For ‘panic’ running is ‘quiet and fast and smooth’ (Moss 1989, p. 171). When elephants sense danger, they can run ‘fast and silently with no trumpets or screams’, and some can do it at least ‘for three quarters of a mile before slowing to a walk’ (Moss 1989, p. 27). For a photograph of an elephant ‘on the charge’, see Meredith (2001; plate opposite p. 118); for a black-and-white version, see Douglas-Hamilton (1992; plate opposite p. 96).


**VIII:156, elephants... in musth:** Even though many people reject Charles Darwin’s *evolutionary* theories, it is probably rather uncontroversial to claim that Darwin got it approximately right when he said, ‘No animal in the world is so dangerous as an elephant in must[h]’ (Darwin 1871, p. 240). This is because of a very heightened level of aggression in those (African) male elephants that periodically experience musth — a
CHRISTIANUS: And one of the most intelligent?

KATHERINE: Perhaps.

CHRISTIANUS: And amazingly fast runners?

KATHERINE: I don’t know.

CHRISTIANUS: And, in spite of often being portrayed as cute and friendly, aren’t elephants, especially when they are in musth, also potentially very dangerous, even to humans?

‘s’ also can be identified by, for example, ‘the continuous discharge of urine’ (Moss 1989, p. 108; ref. supra, note ‘amazingly fast runners’ at viii:1354), ‘the swelling of, and copious discharge from, the temporal glands’ (Moss 1989, p. 108; for a colour photograph of ‘[s]wollen temporal glands oozing a thick substance’, see DiSilvestro 1991, p. 102) and the ‘green penis syndrome’ (Moss 1989, pp. 104–108; Poole 1996, pp. 41–46).

But what about their consciousness? Are bull elephants in musth (mainly) psychologically focused on mating during those days, weeks, or months that their ‘state’ lasts (Hollister-Smith 2008, p. 1830)? Or is musth not primarily about mating? Schmidt-Nielsen, for example, claims that ‘[a] male elephant in “musth”… is violent and uncontrollable, but he is not in rut (and, although some people think so, musth doesn’t mean that he ‘must’ have a mate)’ (Schmidt-Nielsen 1972, p. 86; my emphasis). However, Hollister-Smith thinks that ‘[t]he phenomenon of musth in male elephants involves increased sexual activity’ (Hollister-Smith 2008, p. 1829). And Ganswindt seems to favour the idea that musth has to do with ‘the reproductive context of African elephants’ and that musth males are moving long distances ‘to locate and associate with oestrous females’ (Ganswindt 2004, p. 4) — an idea that seems compatible with Joyce Poole’s observations that male elephants in musth exhibited ‘a positive association with female groups’ and that they ‘had higher levels of urinary testosterone and exhibited higher frequencies of aggression than did either sexually inactive or sexually active non-musth males’ (Poole 1982, p. ii).
KATHERINE: Dangerous?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Are they not willing to attack and kill people, and eat up all their crops, if they feel so inclined?

KATHERINE: Don’t ask me. I have never been to Africa.

John Wiley & Sons.


VIII:158, attack and kill people: Though (African) elephants often are portrayed as kind and calm animals by various organizations and media in Europe and the U.S., the reality is that they sometimes also are destructive, partly because their fondness of most crops that the Africans produce, and partly because of their huge appetite: each elephant requires ‘on average some 330 pounds of food and 21 gallons of water every day’ (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 19). It is therefore not very surprising to find that a 1993 survey in Kenya revealed that 97 percent of the farmers in one region ‘strongly dislike’ elephants, presumably because 229 of the 231 farmers had lost, due to invading elephants, more than half of their crops that season (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 20).

As for people getting killed by elephants, there are many reports every year. In Zimbabwe alone, between 1982 and 1989, at least 500 human beings were killed. Zimbabwean newspaper headlines such as these illustrate the extent of it: ‘Elephant kills man; Elephant kills woman; Woman killed . . . by an elephant while working in a cotton field on Monday; Jumbos turn on humans as forests vanish; Wild animals “culling people” in Binga; 10 year old girl trampled to death by elephant; Plea to help children orphaned by wild animals; Killer Jumbo; Jumbos kill; Elephant kills’ (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 21).

That elephants very well may exhibit violent behaviour is also illustrated by Joyce Poole, who describes the situ-
CHRISTIANUS: In fact, weren’t elephants also used in the Kurukshetra war between the Pândavas and the Kauravas? And in the battles of Alexander the Great and Hannibal? To fight?

KATHERINE: I don’t know. I’m not a history buff.

ation in June of 1992: ‘Elephants were on the rampage. They were eating their way through maize shambas, wheat fields, and forest plantations. They were knocking over papaya, coconut, and cashew trees. They were breaking fences, destroying dams, pulling up water pipes, pushing over grain stores and houses. They were preventing small children from going to school, and they were trampling people to death. The reports came in from Kwale, Taita-Ta
teta, Rombo, and Kimana, from Narok, Nyeri, Laikipia and Rumuruti; they came in from as close to home as Lim
turu and as far away as Nasolot, Maraleb, and Marsabit’ (Poole 1996, p. 241; ref. supra, note ‘elephants ... in musth’ at viii:156).


viii:160, Kurukshetra: The great war described in the Mahâbhârata — the longest epic in human history with its 100,000 stanzas (Klostermaier 1989, pp. 76-77) — was fought between the Pândavas (Skt. ‘the descendants of Pandu’; for a genealogical map of the Pandu lineage, see Narasimhan 1965, p. 218) and the Kauravas (Skt. ‘the descendants of Kuru’; for a genealogical map of the Kuru lineage, see Narasimhan 1965, p. 217) at the battlefield of Kurukshetra (Skt. ‘the Kuru field’), also called Tâne
shar (see al-Bîrûnî 2001, vol. 11, p. 147), a place of pilgrimage (Skt. ‘dharmakshe
tra’; cf. Bhagavad-gîtâ Chapter 1, Text 1; Prabhupâda 1986, pp. 35-37; ref. supra, note ‘Vaishya’ at vi:17). Kurukshetra is located in Northern India near the ancient city of Hastinâpura (Skt. ‘the city of the elephant’), approximately 154 kilometers (96 miles) north of Delhi, and approximately 327 kilometers (203 miles) west-northwest of the camp at Banbasa that the Prince of Wales broke up from in the afternoon of Sunday, 20 February 1876, just before he crossed the Sarda river into Nepalese territory for his two-week Terai tiger experience (cf. supra, note ‘Monday’ at iii:105).


CHRISTIANUS: But of course, in some of those wars, they were using Indian elephants. But you are most probably talking about the African ones. Aren’t you?

KATHERINE: Yes. They have the most ivory.

CHRISTIANUS: Not necessarily.

versity of New York Press.


vIII:160, Alexander the Great: Christianus’s statement about the involvement of elephants in the battle(s) of Alexander the Great may be understood in many ways. One way would be to read that statement as a representation of the idea that there were elephants present in the battle(s), but that those elephants not necessarily were on Alexander’s side. On such a reading the elephants could have been on Alexander’s enemy’s side, or on Alexander’s own side, or on both sides — a very broad and uncontroversial reading. For it seems firmly established that Alexander on several occasions was involved in battles with his enemy using war elephants. For example, in the battle near the river Jhelum (Lat. Hydaspes), king Porus lined up a number of elephants, which in the estimation of some commentators were ‘probably . . . 130 elephants’ [apparently from Diodorus of Sicily’s Bibliotheca 17.87.2] (Green 1970, p. 214), or somewhere around 85–200 elephants, based on the figures mentioned in Quintus Curtius Rufus’s Historiae Alexandri Magni 8.13.6 (85 elephants) and Arrian’s Anabasis (History of Alexander) 5.15.4 (200 elephants) (Heckel 2008, p. 161).

Another way to read that statement would be to regard it as a representation of the more controversial idea that the elephants necessarily were Alexander’s. For in an article on elephants in the Oxford Classical Dictionary Howard Hayes Scullard states, in no uncertain terms, that ‘Alexander himself did not try to use elephants for battle, but war elephants were exploited to the full by his successors, particularly the Seleucids and Ptolemies, in their mutual struggles’ (Scullard 1970, p. 380). The idea that Alexander did not try to use elephants for battle may have come from Quintus Curtius Rufus, who claimed that Alexander, after the encounter with Porus, in a speech had said that he ‘always so little esteemed them’ and that he ‘would never use them [in battle]’ (Kistler 2007, p. 38).

But there is still a possibility that Alexander used elephants in battles, or at least planned to do so. For in the estimation of Michael Grant, Quintus Curtius Rufus ‘indulges in many sensational distortions and inconsistencies’ and ‘included fictitious speeches’ in his history of Alexander (Grant 1997, p. 103); thus, the idea that Alexander did not have any regard for war elephants may be wrong.
KATHERINE: Aren’t the African elephants bigger in size compared to the Indian?

CHRISTIANUS: Not all of them.

KATHERINE: I am not talking about any baby elephants, Chris!

CHRISTIANUS: Neither am I.

If so, it would resonate well with Kistler’s proposal that Alexander was planning to use elephants all along, acquiring them both before and after the Porus battle: he already had elephants in his army when marching toward India, since one fell victim to ‘a large and clever hound for entertainment’ (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when ‘the troops left Babylon, he could include two dozen pachyderms in the column’ (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when he learned that there were thirty elephants grazing every night in the city of Assacenia, ‘he paid local “elephant hunters” to capture the creatures’ (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when Omphis of Taxila surrendered to Alexander, Omphis ’donated eighty-six elephants to the growing Macedonian army’ (Kistler 2007, p. 39); and after discovering fifteen abandoned elephants near the Indus, and hunting two of them off a cliff, the ‘thirteen surviving beasts were incorporated into his [Alexander’s] army’ (O’Brien 1992, p. 154).

Furthermore, even if Quintus Curtius Rufus had relayed Alexander’s speech correctly, this would not immediately disprove the thesis that Alexander liked the idea of war elephants, nor the thesis that he had used them, or had planned to use them, in combat. For he might have presented any derogatory statements regarding (the enemy’s) war elephants and their capability in an insincere mood, simply for political and military purposes (cf. Heckel 2008, pp. 120–125) — a move that perhaps was intended to motivate his men to keep on fighting under his direction, and to avoid any ‘[b]itter disillusion’ (Hammond 1997, p. 168) that might lead to a mutiny. For against the backdrop of the Jhelum battle, where he and his men only ‘narrowly’ had defeated Porus’s army and its 85–200 elephants (Kistler 2007, p. 40; but cf. Featherstone 1997, p. 183: ‘Porus had little chance against Alexander’), how could Alexander otherwise convince his army to face the new threat of four thousand elephants that Xandrames reportedly would mobilize (Kistler 2007, p. 40)?


WALDEMAR HECKEL (2008), The Conquests of Alexander the Great. Cambridge:
KATHERINE: I don't get it.

CHRISTIANUS: There are at least two types of African elephants: the bush elephant and the forest elephant.

KATHERINE: And you are saying that one is

Cambridge University Press.


**vIII:170, types of African elephants:**

It may be significant that Christianus here uses the word ‘types’ instead of ‘species’ or ‘subspecies’ when he talks about the African bush elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and the African forest elephant (*Loxodonta cyclotis*). For it is possible that he wants to avoid the word ‘species’, perhaps because he has studied the philosophy of biology and knows that there neither is (or was) any consensus in the academic community on the idea of what a species amounts to, nor on how taxonomy and systematics should deal with that situation (cf. Ereshefsky 2008, Futuyma 1998, Caplan 1998, Sterelny 1998, Simon 1971, Cook 1991a, Cook 1991b).

This ‘species non-consensus’ is practically seen in the (promotional, often pseudo-scientific and evolutionary) material published by some of the international organizations and movements that allegedly are dedicated to some variety of elephant ‘conservation’: some conclude that the bush elephant is a species under *Loxodonta*; others say that it is a sub-species. The third edition of Wilson & Reeder’s *Mammal Species of the World* database at the Smithsonian Institution website lists *Loxodonta africana* and *Loxodonta cyclotis* as two separate species under the genus *Loxodonta* (Wilson & Reeder 2012). The IUCN Red List database of threatened species calls *Loxodonta cyclotis* and *Loxodonta africana* synonyms (without mentioning the word ‘species’), but also notes that ‘there may be at least two species of African elephants, namely the Savanna Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and the Forest Elephant (*Loxodonta cyclotis*), while also mentioning a third possible species, ‘the West African Elephant’ (IUCN 2012). And the CITES Species database calls *Loxodonta cyclotis* and *Loxodonta africana* synonyms, just as the IUCN Red List database does (and also without mentioning the word ‘species’) (CITES 2012); but various CITES proposal documents call the bush elephant and the forest elephant ‘sub-species’ of the species *africana*, and thus, in effect, categorizing them as *Loxodonta africana africana* and *Loxodonta africana cyclotis* (CITES 1989, p. 1a; CITES 1999, p. 2). And even though one document says that the ‘pygmy elephant’ (*L. a.
smaller than the other?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: And that the smaller of these is even smaller than the Indian elephant?

CHRISTIANUS: That would be the idea.

_pumilio_ is generally not accepted as a valid subspecies’ (CITES 1989, p. 1a), its mentioning in a document like this might function as a type of hedging, just in case its status, against all odds, would change in the future; for who can be considered a ‘good (animal) ruler’ or a ‘good (animal) administrator’ if one is not capable of (correctly) identifying and categorizing all the different types of animals that participate in the current (taxonomical) ‘species’ race?

For an introductory discussion on the different types of African elephants described in classical literature, see Sculard 1970 (ref. _supra_, note ‘Alexander the Great’ at vv111:1160); for a short overview of some of the differences between _Loxodonta cyclotis_ and _Loxodonta africana_ in terms of their DNA characteristics and their possible ‘evolution’ or ‘development’, see Arnold (2006).


Katherine Has a Heart
KATHERINE: Is the bush elephant the smaller one? I mean, ‘forest’ sounds much bigger, right?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s true that a forest normally is bigger than a bush. But we don’t have that type of topographical resemblance naming in this case.

KATHERINE: So the forest elephant is the smaller one? Is that what you’re saying?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: But then we could at least say that the bush elephants have more ivory than the Indian elephants?

CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. And that’s not just because some of the bush elephants are bigger in size, and therefore, on average,
Katherine Has a Heart

have bigger tusks.

181 KATHERINE: It isn’t?

182 CHRISTIANUS: No. It’s also because the female Indian elephants, along with some of the males, don’t have tusks.

183 KATHERINE: I am sorry?

184 CHRISTIANUS: Amongst the Indian elephants, only some of the *males* have tusks. So if you are worried about ivory poachers and the *Indian* elephants, you can basically zoom in on the males only.

185 KATHERINE: Hmmm. I haven’t thought so much about the Indian elephants.

186 CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

187 KATHERINE: Well, the article didn’t mention

names of the two types of African elephants have not been given because they *visually resemble* a forest or a bush.

**VIII:184, ivory poachers:** Mark Shand notes that the *Asian* elephant does not suffer as much from poaching as the African elephant does, for ‘only certain males carry ivory’ (Shand 1995, p. 5; ref. *supra*, note ‘No women?’ at I11:88). This is confirmed by Eric Scigliano: ‘only Asian males, and not all of them, grow tusks’ (Scigliano 2004, p. 5).

But even if it is true that the Asian elephant suffers less from *poaching* than the African elephant does, there are *other* threats, one of which is the loss of habitat. For according to Shand, ‘[i]t is the loss of natural habitat on a vast scale, due to the massive increase in population, that is pushing the elephant towards extinction in Asia’ (Shand 1995, p. 5). And a similar situation is to be found in Africa. Robin Brown estimates that most of the severe loss of elephants in West African countries ‘can be blamed on habitat competition with humans’ (Brown 2008, p. 192).


them.

CHRISTIANUS: So if one article doesn’t mention them, you don’t do any more research?

KATHERINE: As you know, I am a very busy lawyer. And I normally need all the time in the world just to stay on top of all my cases.

CHRISTIANUS: But you are not at work now. You’re in London.

KATHERINE: True. But I came here to relax, not to start any investigations. I mean, I haven’t even dealt with my own luggage problem yet.

CHRISTIANUS: Fair enough. But when will you do all that elephant research then?

KATHERINE: I am not sure. I read that article only yesterday.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmm.

KATHERINE: And I’m not sure I want to, either.

CHRISTIANUS: So you’re saying that you are giving up the whole thing? That you no longer are in favour of ‘saving’ the African elephants?

KATHERINE: Are you kidding? Sure I am.

CHRISTIANUS: You are?

KATHERINE: I have a heart.
CHRISTIANUS: That’s great. Now we only have to detect some brain tissue somewhere.

KATHERINE: Chris. Be nice. Be human!
SCENE IX.

Elephant Friends Forever

CHRISTIANUS: So you still want to save the African elephants?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: Even though you haven’t read all the research reports?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: And even though you don’t know exactly what your potential ‘help’ organization is up to?

KATHERINE: Is up to?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What people are up to is very often a function of what their beliefs and values amount to.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: So if you have an organization called, say, ‘Elephant Friends Forever’, you need to investigate it.

KATHERINE: Well . . .

CHRISTIANUS: What beliefs and values do

ix:19, some sources: One cannot count on that Christianus is fully serious here. It may be that he is simply bluffing, in order to ‘control’ Katherine. Nevertheless, there are some sources that one might use to corroborate Christianus’s idea that the number of African elephants is, or has
their employees have? What silly salaries and porky perks do they get? And which external people, organizations, companies, institutions, and think tanks do they support?

KATHERINE: Sure, but . . .

CHRISTIANUS: And who controls EFF? Who started it, and owned it, and co-opted it, either officially or covertly? And which other organizations, companies, institutions, and think tanks are supporting it, ideologically, politically, and monetarily?

KATHERINE: Chris, this is too . . .

CHRISTIANUS: And what about the fact that the African elephants are actually increasing in numbers? While the Indian elephants are decreasing in numbers?

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it seems that the long-term trend is that there are more and more African elephants, but less and less Indian.

KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: At least according to some sources.

been, increasing: Shand claims that ‘it is doubtful if as many as fifty thousand elephants survive in the wild in the whole of Asia, compared with Africa’s growing population of over half a million’ (Shand 1995, p. 5; ref. supra, note ‘No women?’ at 111:88). And the 1991 reports by Ricciuti and Douglas-
KATHERINE: But that’s not the impression I got!

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Maybe you just read the article too quickly?

KATHERINE: No, I don’t think so. I clearly remember they said they found fewer elephants this year than the year before.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, even if that were true, what difference would it make?

KATHERINE: How do you mean?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s just one year’s data. To identify longer trends, you have to observe many years’ data, collected by multiple independent research organizations, preferably without any political affiliations. And the long-term trend seems to be that the number of African elephants is increasing.

Hamilton noted an increasing number of elephants in Kenya, as discussed by Sugg and Kreuter (1994, pp. 41–42; ref. supra, note ‘attack and kill people’ at viii:158).

ix:21, read . . . too quickly: Though Christianus has not yet read that article in the March 2007 issue of National Geographic, his idea (that Katherine may have skipped or skimmed parts of that article) is not unrealistic. For according to one passage, the elephant population in Zakouma increased: ‘At that time [in 1969], buffalo were almost extinct in the [Zakouma National] park, and there were about a thousand elephants. There are now 6,500 buffalo, and elephant numbers have steadily increased since the ban on international ivory trade in 1989, reaching 3,885 in 2005’ (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. supra, note ‘the conclusion’ at viii:139).

ix:22, fewer elephants this year: It is correct, as Katherine states, that Fay and Nichols wrote that they had found fewer elephants ‘this year’ than ‘last year’: ‘The final elephant count was 127 herds, with a total of 3,020 animals, almost 900 short of last year’ (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. supra, note ‘the conclusion’ at viii:139). Note, however, that the expression ‘last
KATHERINE: Hmm. I’m not so sure . . .

CHRISTIANUS: In other words, the newly reported short-term trend seems to go against the long-term trend. So how can it be trusted, without any further investigation? Where is the satisfaction?

KATHERINE: What are you saying?

CHRISTIANUS: Counting African elephants is difficult. So maybe these researchers made a mistake, or many? Perhaps they didn’t take into consideration that some elephants went off to some other part of Africa? Or maybe the elephants were hiding during those days when they were counted? Or perhaps the researchers just missed them anyway, even if they weren’t hiding? And what if the researchers falsi-

year’ presumably should be understood as the year of 2005. For the expedition reached Africa on 23 March 2006, and it seems as if the article manuscript was finished before the end of that year. Therefore, the ‘now’ of the article would translate to 2006, while ‘last year’ would refer to 2005.

1X:29, Counting African elephants: It is not an easy task to count elephants, whether one does it from the ground, or uses some aerial method (Douglas-Hamilton 1992, p. 178; ref. supra, note ‘amazingly fast runners’ at vii:154). Fay and Nichols, for example, reported some potential counting problems: ‘Luis was perplexed. Had we missed a large herd, or had we double-counted a herd in 2005?’ (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. supra, note ‘the conclusion’ at vii:139). And when the elephants are in the forests in west and central Africa, whether they are there because they are consciously hiding or not, it gets even more difficult. For at that time ‘it is impossible to count elephants directly’ (Kangwana 1996, p. 20); therefore one has to resort to some type of indirect counting, using, for instance, the method of ‘dung counting’.

fied their data, to create a problem, so that they later could ask for research grants to ‘solve’ it? It’s certainly not unheard of.

KATHERINE: Come on, Chris!

CHRISTIANUS: Or perhaps these researchers didn’t make a mistake or fake their data. Maybe it’s the other researchers, who previously reported an increasing population, that are wrong, or are faking the data.

KATHERINE: Yes, yes! Right!

CHRISTIANUS: Or maybe the new and old reports are not comparable. Perhaps all researchers are right in some sense, and wrong in some other. Maybe their investigations are overlapping in some respects, but not in others. Or maybe they all fudge their data. Who knows?

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: Therefore, without an elephantic amount of your own money, time, and resources, you will never truly know the exact state of affairs. So why engage yourself in it?

KATHERINE: What do you mean? Why engage . . . ?

CHRISTIANUS: Surely you must know that whenever and wherever there is money at stake, one has to be very careful. I hope you have understood at least that?
KATHERINE: I don't care so much about the money. I have enough. I just want to save the elephants.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I am not actually talking about the money, Katherine. Or about the elephants. I am talking about satisfaction. In general.

KATHERINE: What does that even mean?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, you can't buy real satisfaction.

KATHERINE: I wasn't trying to. I was just trying to save the elephants.

CHRISTIANUS: No. You were trying to buy some cheap, shrink-wrapped antidote for your guilt. That's all.

KATHERINE: Chris, I don't like your tone.

CHRISTIANUS: You don't have to like it, Katherine. I am telling you like it is. Or as I see it. You need to start taking responsibility for your own life and your actions.

KATHERINE: I thought that was exactly what I did when I decided to save the elephants.

CHRISTIANUS: The idea to save the elephants is not a bad one, assuming that they need to be saved, and can be saved. And assuming that it will be possible for you not only to verify that they were saved, if that ever happens, but also to verify
that that particular state of affairs was achieved *solely*, or at least *partly*, by the efforts of the very same organization that *you* supported. And also assuming, of course, that you can be perfectly sure that no innocent men, animals, or environment got harmed, killed, destroyed, or polluted along the way, either in Africa or anywhere else.

48 KATHERINE: Hmmm.

49 CHRISTIANUS: So if, for example, it turns out that some elephants were *not* saved, or someone got harmed, or something got polluted, along the way, you should request your money back. And perhaps even sue them.

50 KATHERINE: Are you kidding?

51 CHRISTIANUS: No. This is big business.

52 KATHERINE: So I have to *check* the organization first?

53 CHRISTIANUS: As always. Everyone in it, and around it, whether visible or hidden.

54 KATHERINE: But if I have to check and double-check everything and everyone all the time, when would I have time to do my *real* work, as a *lawyer*?

55 CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. So if you want to continue as a lawyer, then your best bet is simply to keep your money to yourself.
That way you can be sure that you do not support any potential criminals. Assuming, of course, that none of your clients are criminals, or so inclined.

KATHERINE: But I want to save the elephants!

CHRISTIANUS: Then why not just go to Africa, yourself?

KATHERINE: When would I have the time? I am working almost twenty-four seven.

CHRISTIANUS: Take a year off.

KATHERINE: Are you nuts?

CHRISTIANUS: Perhaps. But if you are really concerned about the elephants, you should go to Africa. That’s the only way to verify that you actually are saving the elephants.

KATHERINE: But I am not that concerned.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that’s the problem. In fact, you are not really concerned about anything. Except your job, of course.

KATHERINE: Well . . .

CHRISTIANUS: And that’s a problem. Unless, of course, you are completely satisfied with your job.

KATHERINE: You know very well that I am not.

CHRISTIANUS: So do something about it!

KATHERINE: But my job is all I’ve got. What can I do?
CHRISTIANUS: You could start by prioritizing your satisfaction, instead of so easily accepting being a mind-slave to the establishment.

KATHERINE: What the hell are you talking about now?

CHRISTIANUS: Why should you work at all, if you already have all the money you need? Who else but a fool would do that?

KATHERINE: Because that’s what people do in America. We are not a bunch of lazy European armchair philosophers. We are hard workers!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! That’s exactly what I mean. Brainwashed into accepting being a slave. No wonder you are so miserable. You watch w-a-y too much Law & Order! Talk about bad programming!

KATHERINE: I don’t watch that much television.

CHRISTIANUS: Perhaps not compared to other Americans. But it’s still a few hours a day, isn’t it?

KATHERINE: Maybe.

CHRISTIANUS: And you use it to escape from your gloomy job?

KATHERINE: No, it’s not like that. I like my job. To a certain extent. At least some days.

CHRISTIANUS: But you are not satisfied, are you?
KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: So you need to do something about it.

KATHERINE: You mean quit?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you haven’t been able to detect any substantial satisfaction after all these years, why continue? I mean, if satisfaction is what you want?

KATHERINE: But quit my job?

CHRISTIANUS: If you cannot do it immediately, do it gradually. That will give you more and more time to prepare yourself.

KATHERINE: For what?

CHRISTIANUS: For the ride of your life.

KATHERINE: Meaning?

CHRISTIANUS: Satisfaction.

KATHERINE: Yes, I got that. But what does it mean?

CHRISTIANUS: It involves the idea of the direct and honest empirical evaluation of all things connected to your existential situation. And then, as you discover new things, you simply adjust your own beliefs, values, and behaviour accordingly.

KATHERINE: But I don’t want to do that.
CHRISTIANUS: Do what?

KATHERINE: Change my life. Or my behaviour. At least not very much.

CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. It is tough to get out of the rat rut, especially if one has to do it voluntarily. It would be easier for you if someone just fired you. But that’s not possible in your case, of course.

KATHERINE: No. I am my own boss.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. And you also want to be successful, I take it?

KATHERINE: Sure. Doesn’t everyone? Isn’t it OK to make money?

CHRISTIANUS: It depends. Some people do not want to make money.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, some claim it destroys their character. But others simply say that they have better things to do.

KATHERINE: Are they satisfactionists?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, some of them. They know that they cannot bring with them anything material to the next life. So why work so hard?

IX:114, Knaus Berry Farm: The Knaus Berry Farm [http://www.knausberryfarm.com] is a popular place, located in Homestead, Florida, just south of Miami. Over 50 years ago this family-owned farm began its operation by selling
KATHERINE: *Lazy bums!*

CHRISTIANUS: So instead of watching *so much telly,* they lead a more down-to-earth kind of life, in a small, simple home, in a small, simple village. Where they prepare nice home-made meals with organic, non-GMO vegetables and grains from their local farmer. And where they engage in different spiritually uplifting activities, trying to satisfy both *their own souls and others’.*

KATHERINE: That sounds *really* unattractive.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, it might not sound very sexy at first. But how else are you going to prepare yourself for the next life? By buying *things?* And *property?*

KATHERINE: The next life? Why *waste time* worrying about something like *that?* I want to have a nice time *now!*

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that’s the usual attitude. Most people think they need immediate sense gratification, all the time.

KATHERINE: It’s the American way.

CHRISTIANUS: *It sure is.*

KATHERINE: Like one of those Knaus Berry

strawberries. Nowadays they also offer assorted baked goods, jams, vegetables, milk shakes, and ice cream. The farm is open all days except Sundays during the Redland farming season of Miami-Dade County (November through mid-April).
Farm shakes. Or an ice-cold Coke. With lots of sugar. Aahhh!
SCENE X.

Incommensurability

1. CHRISTIANUS: Actually, sugar is an interesting topic. It fits well with your current situation.

2. KATHERINE: How so?

3. CHRISTIANUS: Well, sugar can be exhilarating, just like a successful law practice can be when all the money rolls in. So whether one is engaged in chewing or suing, it may be hard to stop.

4. KATHERINE: Right. If one wants to stop, that is.

5. CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. Therefore we also have to understand that such sweetness, as well as the activities preceding it, may be counterproductive.

6. KATHERINE: Counterproductive?

7. CHRISTIANUS: Yes, especially if one is a satisfactionist and see things differently.

8. KATHERINE: But I am not. And even if sugar won’t give me ‘everlasting satisfaction’ or anything of the sort, it still gives me something positive that I can enjoy here and now.
CHRISTIANUS: Until you get that negative toothache, of course.

KATHERINE: Ouch! Don’t talk about it!

CHRISTIANUS: Or become so fat that no-one wants to date you.

KATHERINE: Hmm.

CHRISTIANUS: Or even wants to hire you as a lawyer. How about that, Miss Litigator?

KATHERINE: Hmm.

CHRISTIANUS: Listen, Katherine. Sugar isn’t good for the system, in the long run. That’s why a satisfactionist must skip it. It’s part of the training. Especially if one is overweight, like you.

KATHERINE: Sounds terrible. I could never do it. Ever!

CHRISTIANUS: Sure you could.

KATHERINE: No. I have such a sweet tooth.

CHRISTIANUS: I had too.

KATHERINE: Really?

x:25, maybe . . . incommensurability: When Christianus talks about ‘incommensurability’ he is most probably not just talking about some Kuhnian-like concept dealing with a ‘crisis’ and a breakdown of a ‘paradigm’ in the history of science (Kuhn 1977, pp. xxii, 206–209; Shapere 1998, Hoyningen-Huene 1996) or about ancient Greek mathematical concepts such as the diagonal of a square and the ‘irrationality’ of $\sqrt{2}$ as found in some Pythagorean-like arithmetic (Heath 1981, pp. 65, 90–91; Burnet 1948, p. 105), but rather about something more general, though, perhaps, it also may involve
CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Until I discovered that I could control it.

KATHERINE: How?

CHRISTIANUS: I started experimenting with opposites.

KATHERINE: Opposites?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe I should call it incommensurability instead.

KATHERINE: What’s that?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s the idea that certain things are incompatible with each other. In a certain way.

KATHERINE: What things?

CHRISTIANUS: I’ll give you an example.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: One evening, many moons ago, one of my neighbours upstairs had a party.

KATHERINE: How was it?

CHRISTIANUS: I am not sure.

some aspects of the basic ideas discussed in these two types of ‘incommensurability’ that modern philosophers often want to talk about.

Furthermore, it is probably significant that Christianus here appears to be saying that ‘incommensurability’ is almost like opposites, but not quite. So even though ‘incommensurability’ sometimes may include some sense of ‘oppositeness’, there could be other times when it may not. One example might be complementary colours: although two colours on the colour wheel might be positioned exactly opposite each other, a person with full colour vision and some
KATHERINE: Too many drinks to remember?

CHRISTIANUS: No. Of course not.

KATHERINE: Why are you not sure, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Because I wasn’t there.

KATHERINE: You weren’t there?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: So where were you? Yachting in the Mediterranean? Climbing K2? Or guest lecturing on Surf Philosophy at the University of Hawaii?

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! No. I was just downstairs, in my own apartment. Taking it easy.

KATHERINE: How come? I mean, if there is a party!

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But I wasn’t invited.

KATHERINE: Since when would that stop you?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, you’re right. But it’s complicated.

KATHERINE: Complicated? This sounds interesting!

artistic sensibilities would seldom experience any (aesthetic) ‘incommensurability’ between such ‘opposite’ colours, but rather a very striking compatibility and complementariness.


CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But all I can say right now is that I don’t know very much about the party. Just *some* details.

KATHERINE: All right.

CHRISTIANUS: And maybe you, as a lawyer, might even agree that knowing *less* details about a certain subject might actually be better than knowing too much, at least in *some* situations?

KATHERINE: Sure. But why don’t you try *that* on some of your professor friends, and see what *they* say!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! *Right!*

KATHERINE: So what *do* you know about the party?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I know that I *heard* a lot.

KATHERINE: Music?

CHRISTIANUS: *Some* would call it that.

KATHERINE: What *kind*?

CHRISTIANUS: The *loud* kind.

KATHERINE: Any particular *songs*?

---


**x:35, Of course not:** It is unclear what Christianus is saying here. Is he saying that he never drinks, or that he only drinks very little, at (some) parties? Or is...
CHRISTIANUS: Mostly Wendy’s favourite.

KATHERINE: Wendy?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. You just met her.

KATHERINE: The waitress?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: She was there?

CHRISTIANUS: Of course. She lives there.

KATHERINE: So close?

CHRISTIANUS: It used to be even closer. But that’s another story.

KATHERINE: Hmmm. So what song was it?

CHRISTIANUS: It was one of those popular American uptempo pop-rock songs.

KATHERINE: Oh, that one!

CHRISTIANUS: But there was also something quite British about it.

KATHERINE: As long as it wasn’t Scottish!

CHRISTIANUS: It wasn’t. I don’t think.

---

He saying ‘Of course not’ simply because he wasn’t at any party? Maybe one of his principles is that he doesn’t consume alcohol unless he is at a party, or is in the company of others, possibly as a way to limit his own consumption?

x:76, thousands of songs: Although it may be difficult to understand exactly how Katherine would know such a thing (unless one of her legal cases involved Billboard or the music industry), she does seem to have a point here. Currently (Tuesday, 3 April 2012) there are many different lists on Billboard’s free website [http://www.billboard.com], and even more lists on their professional website [http://www.billboard.biz]. Excluding the lists of artists and albums as well as the lists of the relative ranking
KATHERINE: Did it have a name?

CHRISTIANUS: I am sure it did. I just can’t remember it. But it definitely was on last year’s Billboard list.

KATHERINE: Great work, Sherlock! Billboard only lists thousands of songs a year.

CHRISTIANUS: I hear you. But it’s not really a problem.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: We’ll just ask Wendy when she returns. She knows everything about that song. So unless she has acute amnesia, or for some reason is unwilling to revisit her personal pop-rock memory bank, we will soon know all the details.

KATHERINE: All right.

CHRISTIANUS: So back to the party.

KATHERINE: Sure.

CHRISTIANUS: Or, rather, to the time just before the party.

between the different charts themselves, there were, on their free website, 35 lists of songs in five categories, containing a total of 1,255 songs (some of which were duplicates, though), representing just one week’s state of affairs. In category ‘Overall Popularity’: Hot 100 (100), Billboard 200 (200), Radio Songs (40), [Hot] Digital Songs (40), Ringtones (20), Social 50 (50), Uncharted (50); in category ‘Breaking & Entering’: Heatseekers Songs (15); in category ‘Genres’: Pop Songs (20), Adult Contemporary [Recurrents] (15), Adult Pop Songs (20), Dance/Club Play Songs (25), R&B/ Hip-Hop Songs (50), Rap Songs (15), Rock Songs (25), Alternative Songs (20), Country Songs (30), Jazz Songs (15), Latin Songs (25), Regional Mexican Songs (20), Latin Pop Songs (20), Tropi-
KATHERINE: OK. What happened?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, everything was very quiet at the time.

KATHERINE: Good.

CHRISTIANUS: So I thought I would listen to eine kleine Baaachische foooge.

KATHERINE: Bach?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But then I suddenly tripped over some annoying golden-braided book lying in my dangerously high Fahrenheit 451 fireplace pile.

cal Songs (20), Christian Songs (25), Gospel Songs (15), Holiday Airplay (25), Holiday Songs (25); in category 'International': Japan Hot 100 (50), Korea K-Pop Hot 100 (50), United Kingdom Songs (10), Germany Songs (10), Canadian Hot 100 (50); in category 'Web': YouTube (25), Yahoo Video (10), Yahoo Audio (10), MySpace Songs (15).

x:87, eine kleine: This grouping of words may or may not be significant. Perhaps Christianus simply thought these words sounded good together, or just uttered them because they came up in his mind. Or it might be that he already here prepares for the transition to another composer (by signalling ‘Eine Kleine Nachtmusik’). Such a transition would work well also in a temporal sense (cf. infra, note ‘Jupiter’ at x:100).

x:87, Baaachische foooge: It is hard to say whether or not this utterance is an attempt of Christianus to demonstrate his knowledge of German musical history. But we can at least be relatively sure that it is an attempt to sound German. For it seems rather likely that these (exaggerated) words have their origin in the German expression 'Bachische fuge', which in English may be rendered as 'Bachian fugue'.

x:89, dangerously high: What is the ‘danger’ in ‘dangerously high’ referring to here? We know that Christianus tripped; but we don’t know whether or not the potential danger was about tripping, or about something else. If the potential danger was about tripping, then we might understand ‘dangerously high’ as not very high at all: just one very thick golden-braided book lying on the floor would theoretically be enough.

But if the potential danger was about, for example, that the pile might fall into Christianus’s fireplace (if he has a fireplace), then one might estimate that the potential danger would increase with the height of the pile.
KATHERINE: Shocking! Whatever you’re talking about.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, all right. Maybe not so shocking. But I still took it as a sure sign that I should do something more significant.

KATHERINE: More significant than what? Tripping over it?

CHRISTIANUS: That too.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: So I picked Mozart instead.

And in this second interpretation we may also note — in the case of him having a fireplace, and books dangerously close to it — that it seems to indicate that he would have some potential floor space around the fireplace. Therefore, it is not impossible that Christianus’s living-room arrangement rather resembles, say, Derek Patmore’s more open and ‘spacy’ fireplace style (Patmore 1938, Plate 1, p. 31) than the more crowded style of Hayes Marshall (Patmore 1938, Plate 2, p. 32).


x:89, golden-braided book: A Google search for ‘golden-braided book’ returns, as usual, too many results. But out of the ten results appearing on the first page — in a search where Google [http://www.google.com] also decided, without being instructed to do so, not to use the search term ‘golden-braided’ but the shorter ‘golden-braid’— there is only one book that seems to fit the general context in which Christianus is operating; and that book appears in four of those results. And when we learn that the title of that book also includes the word ‘Bach’, we can be reasonably sure that Christianus most probably is talking about Hofstadter’s book Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid (Hofstadter 1979).


x:89, Fahrenheit 451 fireplace pile: What kind of pile is this? Should we think of it as a heap of books that includes Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451 and perhaps other books related to it, being located near the fireplace only because Christianus usually sits there when he reads (if Christianus has a fireplace, and if he usually sits there and reads)?

Or should we think of it more as a collection of books that has something
KATHERINE: Any particular work?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it was Thor’s day.

KATHERINE: You mean it was Thursday?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So it had to be Symphony number 41.

KATHERINE: Jupiter?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Good! In C Major. By the Scottish Chamber Orchestra, conducted by Sir Charles Mackerras.

KATHERINE: You remembered all that?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: Spooky!

CHRISTIANUS: Spooky?

KATHERINE: The Scots, remember?

CHRISTIANUS: Oh, right!

KATHERINE: But what does Thursday have to do with Symphony number 41?

CHRISTIANUS: Nothing.

KATHERINE: Nothing?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, nothing directly. There’s to do with the business of one of Fahrenheit 451’s German-sounding, Moon-day-named characters, who, at least in the beginning of that book, thought that ‘[i]t was a pleasure to burn’ (Bradbury 1985, p. 3)?


x:100, Jupiter: The artistic freedom that came with the personal initiative to write Symphony 41 in C Major (K551) — as opposed to it being commissioned — may partly explain why this work was named ‘Jupiter’ (Glover 2005, p. 161). But Mozart himself did not name it that way; instead it was (allegedly) assigned
another connexion.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: Thor’s day is also Jupiter’s day.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

to that work by Johann Peter Salomon, the man who organized Haydn’s concerts in London (Wilson 2003, p. 81; cf. Westrup 1970, p. 89) and who also once offered Mozart an opportunity there (Sadie 1982, p. 138).


SCENE XI.

The Fat Rat

CHRISTIANUS: But just when I was going to play the CD, I remembered the UPS guy.

KATHERINE: Which one?

CHRISTIANUS: The one who, a few hours earlier, rang my door bell just when I was about to play one of my other CDs.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

CHRISTIANUS: And who delivered a package which I, at the time, didn’t open.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: Because I suddenly realized that I had a meeting, elsewhere. So I had to run.

KATHERINE: What was in the package?

CHRISTIANUS: It should have been a bunch of Mozart books.

KATHERINE: Was it?

Mozart was a freemason: Mozart was 'a leading Mason' (Landon 1989, p. 229) and a member of a lodge in Vienna with the innocent-sounding name 'Zur Wohltätigkeit' (Glover 2005, p. 147; ref. supra, note 'Jupiter' at x:100), literally 'To (the) Charity' or 'For (the) Benevolence' (cf. Springer 1975, p. 1817). He was initiated on 14 December 1784 (Nettl 1957, p. 15). But Mozart also visited some of the other lodges in Vienna, which in 1784 were seven in number.
CHRISTIANUS: That was the question. So a few hours later, when I was back home again, and ready to play the Mozart CD, I first had to open the package and check.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: It turned out that all the volumes were there. And they were much better than I thought they would be!

KATHERINE: Good!

CHRISTIANUS: So then I thought it would be neat to do some improvised research before I would listen to the CD. To see what interesting historic information I could find about ‘Jupiter’ and about Mozart in general. To put things in perspective.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: But then I made a disappointing discovery.

KATHERINE: Yes?

CHRISTIANUS: I found a materialist.

KATHERINE: I’m sorry?

CHRISTIANUS: Mozart was a freemason.

(Gould 1887, p. 287); and recommended by his ‘home lodge’, Mozart received his second degree on 7 January 1785 in a ceremony at the 343rd meeting of the lodge called ‘Zur wahren Eintracht’ (Nettl 1957, p. 15), literally ‘To (the) True Harmony’ or ‘To (the) True Union’ (cf. Springer 1974, p. 465). Shortly thereafter, Mozart’s father Leopold also joined ‘Zur Wohltätigkeit’: he received his initiation on 6 April 1875, his second degree on 16 April 1875, and the third
KATHERINE: Really?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And since I don’t want to associate with any ‘Brothers’ or any demoniac, materialistic vibrations, I immediately bagged him, the CD, and all my new books, once and for all.

KATHERINE: You’re kidding?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: So you decided not to play anything?

CHRISTIANUS: No. I decided to play some devotional Govinda music instead. In C Major.

KATHERINE: How do you know that that composer isn’t a freemason?

CHRISTIANUS: Because I am the composer and the performer. And I am not a ‘Brother’.

degree on 22 April 1875 (Nettl 1957, p. 16; cf. Glover 2005, p. 147). A contemporary painting (allegedly) depicts Mozart seated at one of the freemason lodges, where an initiation ceremony is held, with Prince Nicholas Esterházy officiating (reproduced in colour in Mozart 1990, p. 206).

Mozart’s involvement with freemasonry is also easy to see in his output. In his correspondence he uses phrases like ‘Brother of the Order’ or ‘B.O.’ or ‘Brother’ when addressing fellow freemasons such as Michael Puchberg (Mozart 1990, pp. 206–209). And his musical works have many connexions with freemasonry: his cantata *Die Maurerfreunde* (K471) was composed to his freemason lodge (Glover 2005, p. 147); and his *Zauberflöte* (K620) is replete with freemasonry symbolism (cf. Jahn 1891, p. 369).

KATHERINE: OK, I see.

CHRISTIANUS: So it’s my own consciousness and vibratory state that comes back at me, and no one else’s.

KATHERINE: Sounds reasonable.

CHRISTIANUS: So then I turned up the volume, so I could hear all the details.

KATHERINE: Sorry to interrupt, but do you still have those nice JBL studio monitors that you picked up in Miami with me?

CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. They sound just as good as they always did. And they are just as ugly.

KATHERINE: Which is why you got them so cheap!

CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. Just my style!

KATHERINE: Absolutely! So you turned up the
volume, you said?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And then *all hell* broke loose.

KATHERINE: The party?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And Wendy’s *song*!

KATHERINE: Loud?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Just as loud as my Govinda.

KATHERINE: And how loud was *that*?

CHRISTIANUS: Enough to get us *both* evicted. *And* convicted.

KATHERINE: Not with *me* as your representative.

CHRISTIANUS: I thought you were mostly into *litigation*? In Florida?

KATHERINE: Sure. But I could widen my horizons.

CHRISTIANUS: How would *that* work?

KATHERINE: Well, we could start simply by suggesting that if they, for example, agreed *not* to evict you, then we would also *not* start preparing for a case against *them*.

CHRISTIANUS: Aha. *Blackmail*!

KATHERINE: I prefer to call it ‘business as usual’. And that would most probably be the end of it. Can we continue?
CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Where were we?

KATHERINE: Wendy’s loud song, I think.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. But that wasn’t the main problem.

KATHERINE: It wasn’t?

CHRISTIANUS: No. The main problem was that the Billboard Boys didn’t follow my lead.

KATHERINE: Why would they?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, my music is in another class.

KATHERINE: Maybe they didn’t know?

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.

KATHERINE: Or maybe they simply were a gang of rebels!

CHRISTIANUS: Exactly! That’s what I think.

KATHERINE: Or at least wanted to give that impression.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, yes. Perfect!

KATHERINE: So you played in C Major, but the Rebels didn’t?

CHRISTIANUS: Correct. And they also used a defy ingly different tempo.

KATHERINE: And vociferous vocals, I presume?

CHRISTIANUS: You got it. Which brings me to the crescendo.
KATHERINE: The crescendo?

CHRISTIANUS: Or, perhaps I should say, to the diminuendo.

KATHERINE: I am not a music major.

CHRISTIANUS: OK. But at least you know what ‘innuendo’ means?

KATHERINE: Of course.

CHRISTIANUS: In any case, I just couldn’t keep my own song on. It was too disconcerting.

KATHERINE: A clash of civilizations!

CHRISTIANUS: Well put!

KATHERINE: But tell me one thing, Chris.

CHRISTIANUS: What?

KATHERINE: Why didn’t you just use your headphones until the party was over? To keep The Rebels at bay, and away?

CHRISTIANUS: First because my headphones would not have masked out the Riot Rookies completely; so I could not have enjoyed my music.

KATHERINE: Anything else?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. I also felt that there was something else going on.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Something magical!
KATHERINE: *Magical?*

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

KATHERINE: You mean like *Love?*

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: Are you sure?

CHRISTIANUS: Reasonably.

KATHERINE: How do you know?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, at that time Wendy and I weren’t exactly on speaking terms. If *that’s* what you thought.

KATHERINE: No, I didn’t think *anything.* Or at least not *that.*

CHRISTIANUS: So there was something *else* in the air that night.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Some otherworldly promise.

KATHERINE: Otherworldly promise? What *in heavens name* are you talking about *now?*

CHRISTIANUS: A promise of a revelation. That would give me clarity.

KATHERINE: About what?

CHRISTIANUS: I didn’t have the *faintest* idea.

KATHERINE: *Great!*

CHRISTIANUS: So I had to put myself in true ‘observer mode’, and *not* try to interfere with *anything.* *Whatever* was about to
happen.

KATHERINE: *If something was about to happen, that is.*

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Exactly.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: And *that’s* when I got the *impulse.*

KATHERINE: What *impulse?*

CHRISTIANUS: The one connected to the almost intolerable incommensurability that I was experiencing.

KATHERINE: You mean with your music and the Boisterous Billboard Rebels in the same room?

CHRISTIANUS: Precisely.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: *So my whole* system screamed *‘Turn OFF the player!’*

KATHERINE: No wonder!

CHRISTIANUS: But since I was in ‘observer mode’, I couldn’t do it.

KATHERINE: *Couldn’t? Or wouldn’t?*

CHRISTIANUS: Take a pick.

KATHERINE: Do you have a point?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Be patient.

KATHERINE: It’s soon 2008.
CHRISTIANUS: You’re exaggerating. It’s not even April yet. Or noon. And my point is ‘Be Patient’.

KATHERINE: That’s nothing new.

CHRISTIANUS: No, but it’s still relevant, nonetheless.

KATHERINE: How so?

CHRISTIANUS: For if I hadn’t been patient, I wouldn’t have discovered what I discovered.

KATHERINE: And what did you discover? If you don’t mind me asking?

CHRISTIANUS: I don’t mind.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, at first I discovered nothing.

KATHERINE: Who would have guessed?

CHRISTIANUS: More than that almost intolerable inconvenience of the incommensurability itself, of course.

KATHERINE: Of course. Which is why you had to be so extraordinarily patient.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: Then it happened.

KATHERINE: What?
CHRISTIANUS: The light went out.

KATHERINE: The light?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And my CD player with it.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Destiny, I suppose.

KATHERINE: Come on!

CHRISTIANUS: Well, the problem was that I had something brewing in the kitchen.

KATHERINE: More coffee?

CHRISTIANUS: No, I don’t drink coffee in the evening. If I do, I can’t sleep.

KATHERINE: So what was it?

CHRISTIANUS: My little physics experiment.

KATHERINE: Brewing?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. My cold fusion project.

KATHERINE: What about it?

CHRISTIANUS: I left it on.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: It suddenly stopped.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: I didn’t know. It was dark!

KATHERINE: But didn’t you have some matches or something?

CHRISTIANUS: No. But after a while I finally
found one of Wendy’s old lighters lying in my bedroom.

KATHERINE: Wendy’s? In your bedroom?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But it’s not what you think.

KATHERINE: I don’t care. I really don’t. Sheeesh!

CHRISTIANUS: Good.

KATHERINE: And then what?

CHRISTIANUS: Then I found it.

KATHERINE: Found what?

CHRISTIANUS: The fat rat!

KATHERINE: You’re kidding?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: How big?

CHRISTIANUS: Big enough not to fit comfortably in my left shoe. See?

KATHERINE: Goodness! But how did he end up there? Did you have some old cheese lying around?

CHRISTIANUS: No. I never leave cheese ‘lying around’. I’m much too fond of it myself.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: So, somehow or other, our furry friend got stuck in the midst of my experiment. And was instantly electro-
KATHERINE: How terrible!

CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. I would never have hurt the poor fellow otherwise!

KATHERINE: I would!

CHRISTIANUS: Well, you’re a lawyer. I’m not.

KATHERINE: True. So what did you do?

CHRISTIANUS: The only thing I could do.

KATHERINE: Which was?

CHRISTIANUS: I opened the window.

KATHERINE: And threw him out? From the third floor?

CHRISTIANUS: No, that wasn’t the plan.

KATHERINE: But you did it anyway? Is that it?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: What was the plan, then?

CHRISTIANUS: To clean the air.

KATHERINE: You were worried about oxygen? At that point?

CHRISTIANUS: You would have been too. The smell was absolutely intolerable! We’re

**XI:150, What about it?** Katherine’s not-so-very-surprised attitude might be explained by her educational background and interests: she is a lawyer and business woman, and not so much into physics and lab experiments. Therefore, she may not be extremely eager to understand the potential complexity of the kind of laboratory setup that Christianus here might be alluding to.
not talking about nine volts here.

KATHERINE: But what about your first experiment? Weren't you already in ‘observer mode’, or whatever you called it? Didn't you say you must do nothing? Nothing at all?

CHRISTIANUS: You’re right. I did say that.

KATHERINE: But?

CHRISTIANUS: But I thought that the unfortunate fate of the fat rat was the secret sign. Pandora’s noxious Fox-Box unlocked, so to speak.

KATHERINE: Whatever gave you that idea?

CHRISTIANUS: That it was Pandora’s?

KATHERINE: No, that it was the secret sign.

CHRISTIANUS: Ah! Well, when you get a clash of two incommensurability pairs — one musical pair and one scientific pair — how can you not act?

KATHERINE: Hmmm.

CHRISTIANUS: So I acted. And opened the window.

KATHERINE: OK.

xi:189, not . . . nine volts: When Christianus here is describing the circumstances around the intolerable smell of the rat, saying that he does not talk about any ‘nine volts’, we may be reasonably sure that this is not a reference to a lower voltage. But it is unclear whether his setup is based on an old concept (e.g., Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons’s version of cold fusion), or whether it is a completely new design.
CHRISTIANUS: And it was very liberating to get rid of that smell!

KATHERINE: I bet. But where did the *incommensurabilities* go? Out the window, too?

CHRISTIANUS: I’m coming to that.

KATHERINE: Good. But first I need to visit the Blue Door again.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. No problem.
SCENE XII.

Localization or Globalization?

KATHERINE: Sorry about that.

CHRISTIANUS: There is nothing to apologize for. We should get rid of any unnecessary tension and pain, if we simply can. For if we are relaxed, our systems work better.

KATHERINE: I agree. But please go on with your story.

CHRISTIANUS: OK. So there I am. With an open window and a roasted rat behind my back. And some reasonably fresh air gently blowing into my needy nostrils.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: And then I suddenly realize that I now hear more of the Bad Boys from upstairs.

KATHERINE: Did Wendy and her friends turn up the volume?

CHRISTIANUS: No. The ‘moreness’ wasn’t about volume in that sense. It was more about frequency distribution.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: Since we now both had our windows open, I also could hear higher frequen-
cies, not just the bass, or the midrange.

KATHERINE: So what?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I wasn’t finished.

KATHERINE: You never are!

CHRISTIANUS: Just hold on. It’ll be OK.

KATHERINE: If you insist!

CHRISTIANUS: So the problem was that there was another incommensurability building up.

KATHERINE: Another one?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Interacting with itself.

KATHERINE: I don’t follow.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, when my window was closed, I only heard the bass, didn’t I?

KATHERINE: Yes. And some midrange.

CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. But then, after I had opened my window, didn’t also the higher frequencies make themselves known?

KATHERINE: They did.

CHRISTIANUS: And didn’t all of these frequencies come from the same song?

KATHERINE: I guess.

x11:34, trebellian sound: The adjective ‘trebellian’ is not found in most ordinary English dictionaries. So we should probably assume that it is another one of Christianus’s home-made studio productions, in which he has mixed the two nouns ‘treble’ and ‘rebel’ and added some extra sound effects at the
CHRISTIANUS: So how could there be any in-commensurability?

KATHERINE: I haven’t got a clue, Chris. And I have a headache.

CHRISTIANUS: It will soon be over. It’s simple.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: But there is a delay.

KATHERINE: Delay? I thought you said it would soon be over?

CHRISTIANUS: Don’t worry. The ‘delay’ is just part of the explanation. So it’s not an estimation of how long it takes me to explain it. Unless, of course, you ask too many questions in between.

KATHERINE: All right, all right.

CHRISTIANUS: So the trebellian sound from Wendy’s open window reaches my open window a little bit later than the bass sound does, creating a comparatively long ‘short delay’ effect, almost like it had gone through a digital delay in a recording studio.

KATHERINE: How come?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, the bass goes rather
quickly right through her floor down into my apartment; but the treble must first bounce off of the wall of that other apartment house before it finally reaches my open window.

37 KATHERINE: So?

38 CHRISTIANUS: So even though Wendy and her friends upstairs may experience the Re-

**x11:36, bounce . . . the wall**: According to Christianus, the treble sound originating from Wendy’s apartment bounces off of the wall of another apartment building. But how far away is that building?

Our first step is to calculate the time it takes for Wendy’s (bass) sound to reach Christianus’s apartment in a direct way, through the walls, floors, and ceilings of their own apartment building. First, let us guess that Christianus and Wendy’s apartment building is an old-style building with high-ceiling apartments, and that the vertical distance between Christianus and Wendy’s apartments (and their respective windows) therefore would amount to something like 3.5 meters. Furthermore, let us assume, for simplicity’s sake, that Wendy’s speakers are placed relatively near her windows, and that her windows are right above Christianus’s windows. We will also assume that the indoor temperature is normal, and that the quickest sound propagation between Wendy’s and Christianus’s apartment occurs in the walls, floor, and ceiling, with some propagation also in the indoor air; and since we know that the speed of sound in typical building materials is approximately ten times greater than the speed of sound in air (wood: 3300 m/s; brick: 3600 m/s; concrete: 3700 m/s; Grondzik 2010, p. 740), we may estimate that the sound will travel at approximately 3000 m/s between the apartments. Therefore, since the distance is 3.5 m, the sound will propagate down to Christianus’s apartment in 0.0012 seconds (3.5/3000).

Our second step is to determine the total time it takes for Wendy’s (treble) sound to travel in the outdoor air to the opposite wall of another apartment building, where it will bounce and return to Christianus’s open window. This time is dependent on the ‘short delay’ that Christianus mentions at x11:34. Since Christianus talks about that ‘short delay’ in music recording terms, we may estimate that a ‘typical’ such delay (applied to, for instance, vocals or guitars) might be anywhere from 3 to 30 milliseconds, with 15 milliseconds (i.e., 0.015 seconds) as a mean value; but since he also mentions that the short delay is ‘comparatively long’, let us use 30 milliseconds (i.e., 0.03 seconds) as our estimate (cf. Savage 2011, p. 189). Furthermore, we also know that the sound originally was transmitted 0.0012
bellious Riot Boys in a perfectly synched fashion, someone else in another location may experience incommensurability, or out-of-synchness.

KATHERINE: And this is perfectly natural?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It’s what I call a ‘localization’ incommensurability.

KATHERINE: Why?

seconds earlier from Wendy’s speakers; therefore, the sound has been travelling 0.0312 seconds (0.03 + 0.0012) in the outdoor air.

Our third step is to calculate the distance that the sound has travelled in the outdoor air. Since Christianus says (at 11:21) that Wendy’s party took place ‘[a] year ago or so’, let us assume that the outdoor temperature that evening in the late winter or early spring of 2006 was around 5 °C. Then, knowing that the speed of sound in air is 331 m/s at 0 °C and 343 m/s at 20 °C (Cutnell and Johnson 2001, p. 468), we can make a quick linear estimation and use 334 m/s as the speed of sound in air that has a temperature of 5 °C. This will then result in a travelled distance of 10.4208 meters (0.0312 · 334).

Now to the fourth and last step. Assuming that there is only one ‘bouncing spot’ (down) to Christianus’s window. Then, assuming that \( d_w \) and \( d_c \) are equal, \( d_w = d_c = 10.4208/2 = 5.2104 \) meters. Finally, using the Pythagorean Theorem to calculate the horizontal distance \( b \) between Christianus’s (or Wendy’s) window and the wall of the opposite apartment building — using \( d_w \) (or \( d_c \)) as the hypothenuse, and half the apartment height (3.52) as one of the legs of the triangle — we would get \( h^2 + 1.75^2 = d_w^2 \) (or \( h^2 + 1.75^2 = d_c^2 \)), resulting in \( h = \sqrt{(d_w^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(d_c^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(5.2104^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(27.483 - 3.0625)} = \sqrt{24.4208} = 4.9077 \). The wall of the opposite apartment building is thus approximately 5 meters horizontally away from Christianus and Wendy’s windows.


CHRISTIANUS: Well, there’s only one original player. And if you simply were closer to that player, localizing yourself properly, the incommensurability would automatically go away.

KATHERINE: I see. But the Govinda-slash-Bad-Boys incommensurability isn’t like that, is it?

CHRISTIANUS: No. There is something else going on.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it’s more of a ‘globalization’ incommensurability.

KATHERINE: Globalization?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When there are two or more players in the same room, or close by. And they all are playing different tunes.

KATHERINE: So there is no escape?

CHRISTIANUS: Not if you are simply an observer.

KATHERINE: But what if I just moved far, f-a-r away?

CHRISTIANUS: You could. But that wouldn’t solve the problem.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: For even if you would be able to lower the volume of the original incommensurability, new ones would al-
ways pop up at your new location. It’s *globalization*, remember?

55  KATHERINE: But what if I still were able to avoid any new incommensurabilities at my new location? Wouldn’t that then be a great spot?

56  CHRISTIANUS: Not necessarily.

57  KATHERINE: Why not?

58  CHRISTIANUS: It’s true that you do *not* want incommensurability. But you *do* want *something*. And that *something* is *not* silence. That’s the whole point. *Silence* is not on the table, right now.

59  KATHERINE: And our coffee and scones aren’t either.

60  CHRISTIANUS: I know. I am not sure *what* she is up to.

61  KATHERINE: Maybe it’s just because they are one man short? Just like she said?

62  CHRISTIANUS: I doubt it. We’ll just have to be more patient, I guess.

63  KATHERINE: But couldn’t we just *kick out* everyone in the room?

64  CHRISTIANUS: Patience, my dear. *Patience!*

65  KATHERINE: No, no, not in *this* room; I meant in the ‘globalization’ example.

66  CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?
KATHERINE: Well, couldn’t we just get rid of all players except one? To stop the incommensurability?

CHRISTIANUS: But some players are people, so it’s difficult.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Because people sometimes have legal rights. Or at least the appearance of it.

KATHERINE: So you mean, if you give people a green card, one can not just revoke it the next week and send them back to China or Antarctica, or wherever they came from?

CHRISTIANUS: That would be the idea. Or kick out people from their apartments in a random fashion. And certainly not just because they are playing a different song than their neighbours are.

KATHERINE: But what if we are not talking about people? What if we are talking about songs, for instance? What’s the problem?

CHRISTIANUS: The problem is not simply that you must get rid of all the songs playing except one. The problem is also that you may not want to get rid of all those songs. Maybe you like some of them.

KATHERINE: So even if I realize that there is incommensurability, I may still be too
attached to turn off the player?

66 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, just like Wendy. She didn’t stop playing the Rebel Rousers even when there was incommensurability in the air. Even though it may have been good for her.

67 KATHERINE: Too bad she works here, then. With all this lovely Victorian music.

68 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha. Right. Poor Wendy!

69 KATHERINE: But how does all of this relate to my sugar problem?

70 CHRISTIANUS: The idea is simple. Just like you have a memory of different songs and musical styles, you have a memory of different tastes.

71 KATHERINE: OK?

72 CHRISTIANUS: And with that memory, you can predict future incommensurabilities.

73 KATHERINE: So I know that, if the Rebel Jazzers are already playing, I will definitely experience incommensurability as soon as I put on some spiritual Govinda music?

74 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Which is why you may decide not to play it.

75 KATHERINE: Or play it very loud.

76 CHRISTIANUS: Right.

77 KATHERINE: So what do we have?
CHRISTIANUS: Well, the problem is that the Rebel Raiders are not quitting voluntarily.

KATHERINE: Am I Wendy now?

CHRISTIANUS: You mean with access to the Rebel music player?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: No. Wendy is Wendy, as I already pointed out. And the Rebel Band is the Rebel Band. But you can play me, if you like. Being in my apartment, when Wendy is upstairs.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: So the situation is this. We know that the Rebel Wreckers song, just like sugar, is bad, in the long run, for everyone.

KATHERINE: Is it? For everyone? Including Wendy?

CHRISTIANUS: We’ll assume it for now.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: And we also know that, just as we will be able to experience the Govinda-slash-Rebel incommensurability, and be able to predict it, so will Wendy.

KATHERINE: But?

CHRISTIANUS: But we also know that Wendy doesn’t like Govinda.
KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: So she’ll rather have a little in-commensurability than hearing Govinda ‘clean’.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: So what do we do?

KATHERINE: I don’t know.

CHRISTIANUS: I do.

KATHERINE: Yes?

CHRISTIANUS: Let’s hypnotize her.

KATHERINE: Are you crazy?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s not as difficult as it sounds.

KATHERINE: Maybe. But isn’t it illegal?

CHRISTIANUS: Could be. But we are very fond of her, and we are actually just making her a favour.

KATHERINE: We are?

CHRISTIANUS: So here’s the plan.

KATHERINE: But I’m not sure . . .

CHRISTIANUS: If you want to change someone’s behaviour, how do you do it?

KATHERINE: You mean like in the Manchurian Candidate?

CHRISTIANUS: Oh, you saw it?

KATHERINE: Yes. Talk about scary!
CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. But we have good intentions. And no drugs and guns. And no connection to any secret military or governmental intelligence or terrorist agency.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: But in order to impress her system, we need her to be relaxed.

KATHERINE: Is this where the hypnotization comes in?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it’s actually just pseudo-hypnotization. For we need everything to be on remote.

KATHERINE: On remote?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We don’t want any breaking-and-enterings, do we?

KATHERINE: Absolutely not.

CHRISTIANUS: So, we’ll just let her hypnotize herself.

x11:117, *Manchurian Candidate:* Since Richard Condon’s 1959 book *The Manchurian Candidate* has been adapted to film twice, there would *some* room for the possibility that Katherine and Christianus are *not* talking about the same version. However, since the *first* version was released already in 1962 (starring Frank Sinatra, Laurence Harvey, and Janet Leigh), it seems *more* likely that they both are talking about the *second* version released in 2004 (starring Denzel Washington, Liev Schreiber, and Meryl Streep).

For an interesting (but perhaps deliberately misrepresentative) account of a ‘Manchurian candidate’, see Streatfeild (2007); for a Tavistock introduction to ‘behaviour modification’, including theories of learning, assessment and evaluation, emotional reactions, stimulus control, response control, and ethical con-
KATHERINE: How? When?

CHRISTIANUS: When she goes to sleep.

KATHERINE: Sleep?

CHRISTIANUS: That’s relaxed enough.

KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: And then we’ll just start our music programming.

KATHERINE: Music programming?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Govinda. Not too high, not too low.

KATHERINE: Playing where?

CHRISTIANUS: In my apartment.

KATHERINE: And this will do what, exactly?

CHRISTIANUS: It will accustom her to Govinda, in a relaxed state.

KATHERINE: Hmmm. But isn’t there a problem?

CHRISTIANUS: What?

Considerations, see Sheldon (1982); and for an account of links between the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, the Stanford Research Institute’s Center for the Study of Social Policy, the Beatles, Alan Ginsberg, the New York Times, brainwashing and social conditioning, gang wars, LSD, and international drug trade, see Coleman’s well-researched book (Coleman 1992, pp. 99–112).


KATHERINE: What if she has her windows open, and you have yours open too? Wouldn’t there then be some incommensurability problem? Which would imprint Govinda badly?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, you’re right. We would then have the ‘localization’ variant. Which may, as you say, interfere with our plans.

KATHERINE: So then you must always be careful to at least have your windows closed, right?

CHRISTIANUS: No.

KATHERINE: No?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, it’s true that I would have to keep them closed whenever I would be playing Govinda. For we would not want to imprint any unnecessary incommensurability in that case.

KATHERINE: There’s another case?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We have another type of programming to do.

KATHERINE: We do?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We also need to gradually increase her disliking of the Rebel Rascals.

KATHERINE: So we use the idea with the open windows?

CHRISTIANUS: Exactly.
KATHERINE: But isn’t there a problem, nevertheless?

CHRISTIANUS: What?

KATHERINE: The winter?

CHRISTIANUS: What about it? It’s nine months away!

KATHERINE: Why would she have her windows open during the night in the wintertime? I mean, maybe she doesn’t even have them open in the summer? I don’t know her.

CHRISTIANUS: But I do.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: It may be hard to believe, but she just loves sleeping with her windows open. Even in the winter.

KATHERINE: Brrr!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes.

KATHERINE: But it’s of course a fantastic way to get an undisturbed and oxygen-filled good night’s sleep.

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

KATHERINE: But I still don’t see how this would solve my sugar problem. I mean we’re not talking about my music taste, are we?

CHRISTIANUS: Not directly.
KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: One thing we could do is to use some motivational tapes, and try to change your taste that way.

KATHERINE: You mean listening to ‘I love celery’ and ‘I hate sugar’ all night long?

CHRISTIANUS: Possibly.

KATHERINE: What if I don’t want to do that? Or what if doesn’t work? Aren’t there any hands-on-type exercises I could do? With my tongue?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. You could do the Govinda-type impression, but with live food-stuffs.

KATHERINE: But how is that possible? Eating while sleeping?

CHRISTIANUS: No, that’s too dangerous.

KATHERINE: Is there an alternative?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But we still have to follow the principle.

KATHERINE: Which one?

CHRISTIANUS: That we want to make an impression only when we are as relaxed as possible.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: The best time to do so is in the morning, immediately after awakening.
KATHERINE: Why then?

CHRISTIANUS: At that time our rational mind is not fully awake. It’s still a little groggy after sleeping so long. So at that time it will object the least to any new impressions that we may want to give it.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

CHRISTIANUS: Another reason is that, just as in the sleeping case, it will allow us to imprint things first, before we really start our day and do other things.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: And, just to recap, the idea is to find foods and drinks that are incompatible with each other. Or incommensurable.

KATHERINE: You mean in terms of their chemistry?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure, biochemistry is part of it. But I am mainly referring to the subjective, perceived sensation of taste that a person experiences when he or she eats or drinks certain things that ‘clash’ in taste, or go tremendously ill together.

KATHERINE: So it’s about perceived taste?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Subjective, perceived taste.

KATHERINE: So what’s your advice?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s simple.
KATHERINE: Yes?

CHRISTIANUS: There are two steps.

KATHERINE: And they are?

CHRISTIANUS: First you have to find a taste that is incommensurable with the taste you want to get rid of.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: And then you have to sit on it.

KATHERINE: Excuse me?

CHRISTIANUS: Remember fiffs?

KATHERINE: Sure.

CHRISTIANUS: So when Baldy found a free seat, did he then weasel his way over to sit on it, or not to sit on it?

KATHERINE: To sit on it.

CHRISTIANUS: And how many others will Baldy allow to sit on that seat, especially if they are incommensurable with him?

KATHERINE: None.

CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. And even if a very sexy and non-incommensurable Barbie-babe would want a seat, Baldy will say no.

KATHERINE: Are you sure?

CHRISTIANUS: Why would he say ‘yes’? There are no other seats.

KATHERINE: What if she is irresistible?
CHRISTIANUS: All right. He *might* tolerate some close encounters for a *short* while. But he still won’t *give up* his seat. And eventually he will have to kick her out so that he can *fully* enjoy his Cookie Monster Treat alone, *without* sharing.

KATHERINE: What a *monster*!

CHRISTIANUS: So once having *found* that incommensurable taste that you are looking for, you then just have to ‘flood your system’ with it, *before* you eat or drink anything else, with or without sugar in it.

KATHERINE: So if I want to get rid of my sugar cravings, I have to *locate* a taste that, for me, is *incompatible* with the taste of sugar? And then I just immerse myself in that taste, *before* I eat or drink anything else? Is that the plan?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: But isn’t your point that I should *stop* eating sugar?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure.

KATHERINE: So why are you saying ‘*with* or without sugar’? It sounds like I *should* be eating or drinking sugar. Or at least *could*.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: Yes *what*?
CHRISTIANUS: Since your mind is too conditioned in terms of enjoying sugar, it will object too much if you, or anyone else, present the idea that you, Katherine, must stop eating sugar.

KATHERINE: So?

CHRISTIANUS: So the idea is that we will recondition your system, not simply by issuing some prohibitive statements, but by carefully orchestrating certain sensory experiences that will bypass your argumentative mind, and lead you in the right direction.

KATHERINE: Any recommendations?

CHRISTIANUS: As I just said, it is a subjective experience. So any particular recommendations regarding the first part may or may not work for you.

KATHERINE: OK. But couldn’t you give me an example, anyway? I mean, how did you do it? Which incommensurable taste did you use?

x1i:230, three or four times: Christianus’s statement that he took one glass of lemon juice three or four times a day does not, at a first glance, seem to fit very well with his recommendation that one should drink such juice immediately after awakening. So how should we understand it?

One interpretation might be that he is suggesting that one should, already from day one, still try to drink another three glasses of lemon juice throughout the day, even though one has already taken one in the morning. But whether or not four glasses a day would be the end goal or not, it seems reasonable to
CHRISTIANUS: I discovered that lemon was very effective.

KATHERINE: Lemon?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So I started drinking a glass of lemon juice three or four times a day, to ‘push out’ my affinity for sugar.

KATHERINE: Three or four whole glasses? That must have been the juice of dozens of lemons!

CHRISTIANUS: No, no. It was diluted juice. Each glass only contained the freshly pressed juice of half a lemon. And then I simply added water. So my daily juice quota was, on average, only the equivalent of about two lemons.

KATHERINE: That sounds doable.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure it is doable. That’s not the issue. The issue is whether or not it is efficacious. For you.

KATHERINE: You mean efficient?

CHRISTIANUS: Approximately. As I said ear-

suggest that the more glasses of lemon juice one can drink, the better, even on day one.

Another interpretation might be that Christianus is talking about the later phases of his own experiences, even though he explicitly says ‘started’ in the beginning of the sentence. So on this reading the idea could be that one should begin the process by taking just one glass of lemon juice in the morning, and then, perhaps after a few days or so, increase one’s quota with another glass, say, at noon. And when one can drink four glasses, spread out during the day, the process would (perhaps) be complete.
lier, your taste buds and your nervous system may be different than mine. Perhaps lemon is not incommensurable with sugar, for you.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: So you just have to find something that works.

KATHERINE: And then it will automatically work for me? Come on, Chris!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, if it is a good theory, it will.

KATHERINE: Is it a good theory?

CHRISTIANUS: It hasn’t failed yet.

KATHERINE: Hmmm.
SCENE XIII.

Wendy’s Risky Role-Play

1. CHRISTIANUS: Ah! Here she comes!
2. KATHERINE: I can’t wait!
3. CHRISTIANUS: Coffee! Mmmm!
4. KATHERINE: And scones!
5. CHRISTIANUS: And lots of cream! Well done!
6. WENDY: Can I?
7. KATHERINE: Yes, but just half a cup, thanks.
8. WENDY: Cream?
9. KATHERINE: Only a little.
10. WENDY: OK.
11. KATHERINE: Thank you.
12. WENDY: Chris?
13. CHRISTIANUS: Just my usual one-oh-one routine.
14. WENDY: Sure.
15. KATHERINE: Chris, don’t forget the song!
16. CHRISTIANUS: What song?
17. KATHERINE: The Billboard one. Remember?
18. CHRISTIANUS: Oh! Right, right, r-i-g-h-t! How could I forget? Wendy?
19. WENDY: Yes, sweetie?
KATHERINE: *Sweetie?*

CHRISTIANUS: Remember that big party you had at your place? A year ago or so?

WENDY: You mean my *Girls Gone Mild – Not!* party? On my birthday?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And you played that high-energy pop-rock song over and over again? Your favourite?

WENDY: Oh, you mean ‘Dirty Little Secret’?

CHRISTIANUS: *Yes! That’s* the one!

KATHERINE: *With?*

WENDY: Which planet are you from? And century?

KATHERINE: I was just *asking, Politely!*

WENDY: It’s the All-American Rejects. *Duh!*

KATHERINE: Duh?

BALDY: *Wendy! Over here!*

WENDY: Sorry, my boyfriend is calling.

CHRISTIANUS: *Baldy* is your boyfriend?

WENDY: Well, not really. But that’s what he thinks.

CHRISTIANUS: So he’s *not?*

WENDY: No. But he’s *hot.* And I like his *Ferrari* very much. He even lets me *drive* it!

CHRISTIANUS: Sounds risky.
WENDY: Yes. Actually, I really need a time-out. He’s a big guy, and I’m starting to get a little nervous. Maybe you and I could get together, and talk?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. When?

WENDY: Tomorrow evening at seven? At our old place?

CHRISTIANUS: OK.

BALDY: Hey! Wendy! Come on! Bitch!

WENDY: Sorry, I have to run.

KATHERINE: Please do!

WENDY: Tomorrow, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

KATHERINE: ’Absolutely!’

CHRISTIANUS: What was that all about?

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: ’Please do!’ — ’Absolutely!’

KATHERINE: Nothing.

CHRISTIANUS: Nothing?

KATHERINE: As you already know, I haven’t been feeling very well lately. And I’m starving. So let’s at last have our coffee and scones!

CHRISTIANUS: And cream!

KATHERINE: Yes. But tell me something, Chris.
CHRISTIANUS: Sure.

KATHERINE: What’s that ‘one-oh-one’ routine you were mentioning?

CHRISTIANUS: Didn’t you watch Wendy?

KATHERINE: Sure I did. She poured coffee in your cream.

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes.

KATHERINE: But what does ‘one-oh-one’ stand for? Is it some secret code or something? Between you guys?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, in a way it is. But it doesn’t mean ‘5’, if that’s what you thought.

KATHERINE: No, I didn’t know what to think. I’m not so much into codes. At least not

XIII:62, it doesn’t mean ‘5’: The pronoun ‘it’ probably refers to the expression ‘one-oh-one’, which in turn might be understood as ‘101’. In such a scenario, one might then have been tempted to decipher ‘101’ using the ‘base-2 number’ (or ‘binary numeral’) system, where a ‘1’ in the rightmost (first) position would be carrying a value of $2^0$ (i.e., 1), and where a ‘1’ in the leftmost (third) position would carry a value of $2^2$ (i.e., 4), which, when added together, would yield 5. However, as Christianus is very careful to point out, this is not how to decipher it here, in this particular case.

XIII:64, intelligence free: Apart from the perhaps most straightforward rendering of ‘intelligence free’ as ‘really easy’ or ‘very simple’, Christianus may have had (at least) two other ideas in mind. One idea might be that the phrase ‘intelligence free’ should be understood in a very literal way, not merely as ‘really easy’ or ‘very simple’, but as requiring no intelligence at all. For it is possible that Christianus’s understanding of a Turing machine (see the illustration in Bechtel 2002, p. 10; cf. Crane 1991, pp. 91–102) simply echoes Fodor’s understanding of a Turing machine’s typical bottom-level tasks, referring to them as ‘unintelligent operations’, including ‘deleting symbols, storing symbols, copying symbols, and the rest’ (Fodor 1988, p. 23).

Another idea might be that the decoding of ‘101’ does not involve any secret intelligence people or resources,
non-legal ones.

CHRISTIANUS: That’s too bad. It’s fun and basically intelligence free. So you don’t have to be some new Alan Turing to decode it. Or old, for that matter.

KATHERINE: Alan Turing?

CHRISTIANUS: One of those brave British numerologists at Bletchley Park who helped decrypt the secret communication codes that the Germans used during World War Two.

KATHERINE: Oh, I see. And ‘one-oh-one’?

CHRISTIANUS: It just means ‘one hundred and one’.

KATHERINE: One hundred and one what? Tea-

neither at Bletchley Park nor anywhere else, since (in this case) the only deco-
ers would be Christianus and Katherine. So all computers — a word that in Tur-
ing’s writings means ‘computing human beings’, as Urquhart correctly points out (Urquhart 2002, p. 313) — would be construed as non-military civilians, not being part of any (secret) intelligence operation.


TIM CRANE (1991), The Mechanical Mind: A Philosophical Introduction to Minds, Machines and Mental Representa-

JERRY A. FODOR (1988), Psychoseman-
tics: The problem of Meaning in the Phi-

ALASDAIR URQUHART (2002), ‘Metathe-

XIII:66, brave British: Though history has seen many brave British men and women, it is not entirely easy to un-
derstand why the ‘shy, boyish’ (Hodges 2007) and ‘strange’ (Milner-Barry 1993, p. 90) Alan Turing would be one of them. Is there anything particularly brave to be found in, for example, David Cannadine’s evaluation that Tu-
spoons?

CHRISTIANUS: No. As you know, I'm not so much into tea.

KATHERINE: What about spoons?

CHRISTIANUS: Sometimes. But not in this case.

KATHERINE: What, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Per cent.

KATHERINE: So you mean 101% coffee? Slightly more coffee than cream?

CHRISTIANUS: No. The other way around.

KATHERINE: More cream?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: And that's it?

CHRISTIANUS: Not quite.

KATHERINE: I was afraid of that.

CHRISTIANUS: It's actually part of a theory that I am working on.

KATHERINE: How original!

ring's participation was so crucial that, without it, 'the German codes would probably never have been broken at Bletchley' (Cannadine 1998, p. 168)? Or in the fact that Turing was awarded the Order of the British Empire (Rootselaar 1976)? Or is Christianus simply joking? Or might he be aware of some secret details that could add a heroic and dangerous (personal) dimension to the code-cracking accomplishments of the otherwise (seemingly) rather comfortably Bletchley-Park-situated 'Prof' (Murray 1993, p. 114)?


ANDREW HODGES (2007), 'Alan Tur-
CHRISTIANUS: Anyhow, I call it ‘The 101% Anti-Darkness Principle’.

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s about how to courageously cope with life.

KATHERINE: And how does one do that?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s quite simple: when you get something in life that looks really, really dark, then you can attack that darkness by mixing it up with 101% of something else.

KATHERINE: Something else?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The ‘brightener’!

KATHERINE: What’s that?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, there are different ‘brighteners’ for different darknesses, of course.

KATHERINE: Of course. And?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, for coffee, the optimal ‘brightener’ is cream. By adding just as much cream as there is coffee and then


just another tiny one percent more, the coffee concoction will lighten up to become brighter than mid-gray — a very positive transformation indeed! No darkness left, just different shades of brightness!

KATHERINE: How philosophical!
CHRISTIANUS: And tasty!
KATHERINE: Mmmm . . . yes . . . the coffee is excellent. Even without all that cream.
CHRISTIANUS: And your scones?
KATHERINE: Delicious!
CHRISTIANUS: Just like mine. It’s amazing how so little somethingness can be so satisfying!
KATHERINE: Chris, can’t you just stop? And not talk philosophy? I’m trying to enjoy over here! Seriously!
CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Me too! Ha ha!
KATHERINE: You’re hopeless!
CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. But not in a literal sense, of course.
KATHERINE: How do you mean?
CHRISTIANUS: I am the one who has the most


XIII:94, cream . . . coffee: Christianus could here have gone even further with the idea of cream as a coffee ‘brightener’, to connect it with his previous mentioning of Alan Turing. For in an interesting book by Stephen Corteen Cowin and
hope.

KATHERINE: Of course. You’re in illusion! Ha ha!

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. But seriously.

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: How can you have any hope with your death-and-nothingness scenario? Everything is all over, any minute! Hello, darkness!

KATHERINE: Chris, please!

CHRISTIANUS: I just don’t get it. Why do you keep hanging on to it?

KATHERINE: Why worry so much about the future? Who knows what it will be?


KATHERINE: As I said . . .

CHRISTIANUS: But you won’t, because you know that there is a tomorrow. In all likelihood.

KATHERINE: Yes, but . . .

Stephen B. Doty (2007, p. 21), Turing’s theory on chemical reactions (Turing 1952) is (partly) explained with the help of cream and coffee.


CHRISTIANUS: So you plan for it. It’s in you.

KATHERINE: OK, OK. I do worry about death, since it’s the end of my life. But I don’t believe in any afterlife. So why plan for it?

CHRISTIANUS: So the question for you is whether there is afterlife for the individual soul, at all?

KATHERINE: It’s not a question. I just don’t believe it. Unless you prove it.

CHRISTIANUS: But I cannot prove to you on a piece of paper that you are an immortal soul and that you have an afterlife. If that’s what you’re asking.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: I don’t have a piece of paper.

KATHERINE: Come on!

CHRISTIANUS: All right. But even if I had it, I still couldn’t do it.

KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Because whatever I scribbled on it, you might say either ‘I don’t understand it’, or ‘I don’t agree’, or ‘I don’t have time’.

KATHERINE: Why would I do that?

CHRISTIANUS: Because you might not understand it, or agree, or have the time. Or
you might simply do it because your \textit{mind} freaks out.

131 \textbf{KATHERINE:} But surely, if I am \textit{very} interested in the topic, I \textit{wouldn’t} say any of those things.

132 \textbf{CHRISTIANUS:} But you’re \textit{not} very interested.

133 \textbf{KATHERINE:} Perhaps not. But I am a \textit{little} interested.

134 \textbf{CHRISTIANUS:} That doesn’t count for much. \textit{Anyone} can say that.
KATHERINE: Chris, why can’t you just quickly grab a piece of paper and prove that I am an immortal soul with an afterlife? I mean, if it is a fact, as you claim, it shouldn’t be that hard. So why not just get on with it, and prove it?

CHRISTIANUS: Ah! You want to play the ‘Proof Game’?

KATHERINE: Well, not really. But let’s do it anyway. So we can put that behind us, and do other, more enjoyable things.

CHRISTIANUS: Right. But the problem is just that immortality proofs are very, very tricky. And time-consuming. And boring. And I’m also a little tired. So why don’t we do something easier?

KATHERINE: What?

CHRISTIANUS: Do you have a piece of paper? And a pen?

KATHERINE: Sure.

CHRISTIANUS: Now, I want you to prove on that piece of paper that you are mortal.

KATHERINE: Are you kidding?
CHRISTIANUS: No. You can scribble *anything* you like on that piece of paper to prove to the reader, whoever he or she may be, that you are mortal.

KATHERINE: Anything?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Whatever scientific or non-scientific sentences, algorithms, phrases, words, symbols, or representations you can think of. And you can even draw pictures and use music notation if you like. So how would you then go about proving, on that very piece of paper, that *you* are mortal?

KATHERINE: Can I use a ‘direct proof’? With a conclusion, and a couple of premises to back it up? As I sometimes do in court?

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. As long as you can make it work.

KATHERINE: So where do we start?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, first of all, let’s get your *conclusion* up and running. What is it?

KATHERINE: How about ‘I am mortal’?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, Miss Miami, you’re on the right track. But there is a problem.

KATHERINE: *What*?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, when *I* read that sentence, I don’t think of *you*; rather, I think of *me*. So you have to change it. Remem-
ber, what I asked you to do was to prove to any reader, that you are mortal. So the task is then not to prove that the reader is mortal — unless the reader is you yourself, of course. So you have to figure out a way to identify yourself, in all cases.

21 **KATHERINE:** So then I simply write ‘Katherine is mortal’.

22 **CHRISTIANUS:** It’s better. But you are not the only Katherine in the world, are you? One of my friends, for example, has a battery-operated toy cat called Katherine.

23 **KATHERINE:** Well, what if I identify myself as ‘that Katherine who was born in Miami thirty-four years ago’? And if that isn’t enough, I could also fill in some more details: the exact hospital, my mother’s name, the exact date, etc.

24 **CHRISTIANUS:** But why would I believe you? You can’t just say that you were born that date; that’s no proof. Then you could just say that you are mortal, and we wouldn’t have to bother with this whole thing. No, you have to prove it.

25 **KATHERINE:** But I can show you my birth certificate and my passport!

26 **CHRISTIANUS:** Birth certificates and passports are easy to buy on the black market, so I need not accept that those are yours.
And even if they were authentic, they also have the further defect that they are not on this white piece of paper. Remember, your proof must keep itself on this white paper here.

KATHERINE: Then what if I refer to myself as ‘that Katherine who is right now sitting next to Christianus in a café in London’?

CHRISTIANUS: But that would only be applicable another thirty minutes or so. How can it be a real proof if it is only applicable for another thirty minutes? I didn’t ask you to provide a proof that is valid only while your coffee is still warm, did I?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: And there is of course also the identity problem. People’s bodies, including yours and mine, are always in a flux, since old cells are going and new cells are coming every second of the day. So how are you to uniquely identify yourself? Who, or what, is Katherine? Which cells are you, and which are not you? How many body parts can you have replaced and still be you?

KATHERINE: I am not sure.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, you can think about that until next time. Right now, we have bigger fish to fry.
KATHERINE: We do?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We need to haul in a pair of palatable premises. So we can cook ourselves a nice conclusion. Any suggestions?

KATHERINE: What about ‘Katherine is a human being’?

CHRISTIANUS: OK, that’s one. Do you have another?

KATHERINE: ‘All human beings are mortal’.

CHRISTIANUS: Good. So then we conclude what?

KATHERINE: ‘Katherine is mortal’.

CHRISTIANUS: Not bad. It’s a deductively valid argument, at least according to the modern materialist way of doing logic.

KATHERINE: Thank you. I am glad I could do something right.

CHRISTIANUS: But the proposition ‘All human beings are mortal’ is of course problematic. Validity doesn’t ‘guarantee’ soundness.

KATHERINE: It does ring a bell, but . . .

CHRISTIANUS: Well, validity does not ‘guarantee’ that your premises are true. It only

**xiv:40, materialist . . . logic:** When Christianus speaks of ‘materialist logic’ one probably should understand this to be a reference to the kind of modernized Aristotelian philosophical logic that is taught at modern
‘guarantees’ that if your premises are true, then your conclusion is true. So you must also show that your premises really are true.

KATHERINE: So how do I prove that, say, ‘Katherine is a human being’ is true?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s not so easy. So to save time, let’s just quickly accept the idea that you are a human being. For now.

KATHERINE: Thank you! You are most generous!

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I did have my coffee and cream now!

KATHERINE: And some scones!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, they were really good!

KATHERINE: I agree. So what’s next?

CHRISTIANUS: We need to revisit your problematic premise ‘All human beings are mortal’.

KATHERINE: What’s wrong with it?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, first of all we need to understand what ‘is mortal’ means. So if I claimed that it means, roughly, ‘must die’, would you then object?

universities, whether of an ‘informal’ (arguments expressed using natural languages) or ‘formal’ (arguments expressed using logical symbols) character.
KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: Good. And just to confirm: you are not dead yet, are you?


CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes, right! But then we have a problem.

KATHERINE: Why? Because I’m bored?

CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes! And because you’re alive.

KATHERINE: I don’t follow.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, according to your nonsense nothingness scenario, you can only be really alive and bored when you are in a physical body, not otherwise. Right, Miss Nothing Hill?

KATHERINE: Of course.

CHRISTIANUS: So, according to your not-so-nothingnessless speculation, you cannot be dead yet.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: So it follows that your proposition ‘All human beings are mortal’ is not proven.

KATHERINE: How so?

CHRISTIANUS: Only if all human beings really are mortal will that proposition really be
KATHERINE: Sure. So?

CHRISTIANUS: But all human beings have not died yet. Including you and me and a few billion more. So we have to wait and see. Until we have scientifically verified that all humans actually do die in an orderly fashion, the proposition ‘All human beings are mortal’ is just an unproven assumption.

KATHERINE: But surely all human beings have hitherto died?

CHRISTIANUS: How do you know that? For sure? Have you personally witnessed the individual lives of everyone in the history of mankind and seen that they all died?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: Or have you found some secret public records with authentic and comprehensive lists of all human beings that ever lived on this planet, that verify that they are all dead by now?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: And is the fact that most modern Western countries have extensive birth records for their citizens a guarantee that there are no unregistered illegal immigrants roaming about in the bushes, whose ages and whereabouts are not
KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: So there is no proof that they all die. In other words, the fact that some, or even most, human beings die is no proof that some other beings, born in another time and place and superficially looking like human beings, also will die. After all, perhaps some miraculous Darwinism has evolved some of us into immortals by now?

KATHERINE: Aren’t you a little unfair?

CHRISTIANUS: Unfair?

KATHERINE: Yes. To Darwin and his followers.

CHRISTIANUS: Would it have been better if I said ‘non-miraculous’?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: Katherine: Our discussion is about rigid proofs. It’s not about any pseudoscientific Darwinian speculations.

KATHERINE: Are you serious?

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. I am trying to make a very strong point. What you originally asked for was proof, nothing else. Proof is not just obtained by arguing positively or passionately for something, or being ‘well informed’ and having a thousand loosely linked arguments in your pocket.
Really proving something is to establish a conclusion in a very strict and rigid manner. So what is required for a proof is not just some sloppy statistics, or some casual ‘common sense’ argument, or some ‘general trends’, or some ill-chosen analogy, or some cheap rhetoric or theatrics; it’s something much more demanding.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: So when I said that I wanted proof that you are mortal on this piece of paper, I knew that it would be practically impossible for you to produce it. And so far you haven’t proved it. But maybe you want another stab at it?

KATHERINE: No. I think it might be too difficult.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But why do you think it’s too difficult?

KATHERINE: There are so many things.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, there are. But one difficulty is, of course, related to the conclusion itself: for in order to really prove that you are mortal, you first have to die yourself.

KATHERINE: Yes, I see what you’re driving at: it’s my personal dying that constitutes the ultimate proof that I am mortal.

CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. But that’s not an unsolvable problem on its own: after all, it
is quite possible — both in principle and in practice — to execute such a demonstration: you can either kill *yourself*, or you can ask *someone else* to do it for you.

KATHERINE: Yes. But I don’t want to die *like that*.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure, I can understand that. So your *life* is actually more important to you than the *proof* is?

KATHERINE: *Absolutely*. Proofs are just little *plays*; but my own life is real and precious.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that’s how many people feel.

KATHERINE: So *now* what?

CHRISTIANUS: One option is that we *first* decide to skip these boring proofs, and *then* order some more coffee and some of those *fantastic* home-baked blueberry muffins.

KATHERINE: And the *other*?

CHRISTIANUS: That we *first* order, and *then* decide to skip all talk about these boring proofs. That way we will get our coffee and muffins *quicker*.

KATHERINE: Sounds even better!

CHRISTIANUS: So let’s *order*!
SCENE XV.

*The Okefenokee Man-Monster*

KATHERINE: Ahhhh! These blueberry muffins are *sensational!* I can’t *believe* how good they are!

CHRISTIANUS: I know. That’s why I come here a lot.

KATHERINE: I would too. It’s a no-brainer.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

KATHERINE: But I have a question. And it’s *not* about any proofs.

CHRISTIANUS: I hope not. Only a *madman* would spend more than ten minutes on those!

KATHERINE: So what about that Okefenokee Monster story you mentioned at the pizza place? I need some *light* entertainment now.

CHRISTIANUS: Ah, yes! Oki! He’s low-key! And organically home-grown in Florida, just like you and your orange juice.

KATHERINE: Sounds good!

CHRISTIANUS: Which means it’s time for the body-bomb again. Remember?

KATHERINE: Unfortunately, yes.
CHRISTIANUS: And what about my response to your death-and-nothingness scenario? How to better ‘handle’ the body-bomb?

KATHERINE: Sorry. I don’t remember all the details.

CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Well, it was based on the idea that we are non-material spirit souls using our material bodies as instruments. And when our bodies die we simply continue our business elsewhere, without losing our ‘core’ individuality, perception, or ability to experience things and do things.

KATHERINE: That does ring a bell.

CHRISTIANUS: And then I said that this was a better theory than yours. For not only may it help us minimize our death anxieties in this life; it may also help us experience much more satisfaction in future lives.

KATHERINE: But what does this have to do with Oki?

xv:10, the body-bomb: The ‘body-bomb’ is a condition that all human beings are subject too. See scene xi (‘The Body-Bomb’) in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 65–71; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1).

xv:14, bodies as instruments: The idea is presumably that the spirit soul is the real living entity, and that he or she (i.e., the spirit soul) only temporarily, here in this (material) world, has entered into a (material) body, and uses it to act. This situation may be compared to the one in which twenty-first century commuting men and women enter into the body of a subway train,
CHRISTIANUS: Well, John is a friend of mine who is a professional stage actor. And he usually plays the Okefenokee Monster in the late afternoons at the local theatre here, before a crowd of very enthusiastic six-year-olds and their slightly less enthusiastic parents.

KATHERINE: So it’s a play for kids?

CHRISTIANUS: No. But most grown-ups simply prefer to view it like that. So they don’t have to bother trying to understand it.

KATHERINE: Right.

CHRISTIANUS: But it’s not easy playing Oki.

KATHERINE: How come?

CHRISTIANUS: For in order to enter into that swampy Floridian personality and give a truly credible performance, John must always put on that same heavy, smelly, sweaty costume before he goes on stage.

KATHERINE: Oh my God!

CHRISTIANUS: And it may even be someone else’s sweat!

bus, or car for the purpose of reaching a particular destination, after which they exit it — an experience that, in virtue of the repeated, prolonged time they spend in that vehicle, sometimes conditions them to think of that transportation instrument as ‘theirs’, even though they may not (ever) legally own it (e.g., ‘Here comes my bus!’).

For more on (material) bodies as instruments, see SCENE xi (“The Cartesian Theatre”) and SCENE xii (“Radha’s Microscope”) in KQQ (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 72–82; ref. supra, note ‘you’re late’ at 1:1).
KATHERINE: Yeah!

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But he still manages to do it every time, even though the costume is so incredibly inconvenient to wear. And the kids love it, of course!

KATHERINE: And?

CHRISTIANUS: And when the play is over, John steps out of that dreadful, heavy, smelly suit, leaves the theatre, and returns to his real life.

KATHERINE: In other words, John dresses and undresses. So what?

CHRISTIANUS: First of all, John does not think that he is the monster; he knows that he just plays that role some afternoons. It’s his temporary job to enter into that Oki outfit. Until he gets something better.

KATHERINE: So he plays the monster, but meanwhile experiences some demanding working conditions. Doesn’t sound very shocking!

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe you don’t think so; but I can assure you that the kids are screaming with fear whenever he goes on stage!

KATHERINE: I am sure they are. When are kids not screaming? Do you have a conclusion?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, of course. John does not spend his days worrying about that he
later in the evening will finally *step out* of his warm and uncomfortable monster costume. For he doesn’t consider it a *loss* to toss it away, but a true blessing.

37 KATHERINE: I would too.

38 CHRISTIANUS: Similarly, turning to our own lives, if we just view our own bodies as costumes, with our real selves inside, we will be in a *much* better satisfaction-position than in your unsatisfying, soul-less scenario.

39 KATHERINE: Why?

40 CHRISTIANUS: Well, even if we *know* that our body-bombs are ticking and that our bodies eventually *will* have to go, we have little reason to *worry* about their departure.

41 KATHERINE: We do?

42 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If our bodies are nothing but *costumes*, then departing from them will not cause us to *lose* our true individual selves or our abilities to experience and do things; on the contrary, their departure will *reveal* our real spiritual super-natures. Thus, when our current performances are over, we should, just like John, simply be very happy to step out of our smelly costumes, so that we can return to our *real life* somewhere else.
KATHERINE: But what if the body-bomb explodes and John is in the costume at that very time?

CHRISTIANUS: In a typical play, is the actor really killed on stage when his character seemingly gets a dagger in his chest?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: So then it’s just part of the play.

KATHERINE: Which means?

CHRISTIANUS: When your own body-bomb goes off, you the actor, you the observer, you the spirit soul, you the self, do not die.

KATHERINE: You keep saying that, but I don’t buy it. I mean, if someone gets a dagger in the chest, and the dagger is a fake one with some kind of push-sensitive and self-contracting blade, then it would be believable to think that the actor inside the costume is not hurt. But how could he be alive in the case of an explosion?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, explosions are always difficult to fake really well. As Hollywood knows, it’s hard to make them believable, without also hurting the actors or the crew at the same time, especially if it’s done without any computer graphics. But as Hollywood also knows, ‘difficult’ doesn’t mean ‘impossible’; just look at ILM.
KATHERINE: ILM?

CHRISTIANUS: Industrial Light and Magic — one of the first special-effects companies. So we just have to use our imagination a little. There are so many possibilities.

KATHERINE: OK. Shoot.

CHRISTIANUS: Let’s go back to the final swamp scene. This is where the handsome David mistakingly stabs the ugly but curiously kind Okefenokee Monster to death with a shiny dagger, whereupon Oki falls, seemingly thoroughly and irreversibly dead.

KATHERINE: What does that have to do with any explosions?

CHRISTIANUS: Please be patient. I am coming to that.

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: Now, let’s rewrite that scene so that Oki is not killed by a dagger, but by a powerful explosion instead, to really shake the audience up and produce an ending they will never forget.

KATHERINE: But should we really do that in front of all the kids?

CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely! The sooner, the better! It’s part of their real, live ‘prepare-yourself-for-death-NOW’ education. They need to see some serious
alternatives to all those wishy-washy performances they experience watching their favourite, establishment-controlled TV shows. It’s good for them to see more live explosions and deaths, so that they will start inquiring about what it means in terms of their own life. There’s no time to lose. Kids die every day.

KATHERINE: But don’t you think their parents will object?

CHRISTIANUS: I think we can handle an objection or two, if they should feel so inclined. And scandals are always good for the play economy, in any case.

KATHERINE: All right.

CHRISTIANUS: So how should we proceed with our explosive plot? Any ideas?

KATHERINE: What do you have?

CHRISTIANUS: Would it be all right if the explosion cut off the monster’s head in a more or less clean way, so that it just dropped to the ground near his left foot, with the blood slowly pouring out along his left side? Or would you rather that his head exploded more like some New Year’s Eve

xv:73, super-kapha: In Ayurveda, persons having a kapha bodily constitution normally are ‘blessed with a strong, healthy, well-developed body’ but ‘generally have a slow digestion and metabolism’ (Lad 1998, p. 25). For more information about the kapha bodily constitution in ayurvedic
crackers, followed by some high-pressure fountain of blood coming up from his aorta region? What do you think?

KATHERINE: I hate blood!

CHRISTIANUS: But it keeps you alive. How can you hate it?

KATHERINE: I get sick.

CHRISTIANUS: Well, you have to get over it. And the blood I am talking about is not real anyway. Think of it as ketchup, if you like. It doesn’t matter. It’s a theatre production. So, what say you?

KATHERINE: OK, then. I think the second scenario might be more striking from a dramatic standpoint; but it’s much messier: it will be blood absolutely everywhere, including on the audience. Also, sometimes too much blood, gushing out too quickly, is less believable. So I would vote for scenario one: I think it’s shocking enough for the audience to see Oki’s head pop off in clean way, with the blood pouring slowly down Oki’s left side.

CHRISTIANUS: I think so too.

KATHERINE: And it also fits much better
with Oki’s super-*kapha* temperament: he *thinks* slowly, *talks* slowly, and *walks* slowly; so why wouldn’t he also *bleed* slowly?

CHRISTIANUS: *Brilliant* analysis! Then it’s settled. Scenario *one*!

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: And while we’re at it, do we need to add any other flying parts? Maybe his right arm could fall off too, so that there would be some blood also on his *right*-hand side? Wouldn’t that be better, aesthetically speaking? I always hear that having the right *colour balance* is so important.

KATHERINE: Well, I am not an art director or production designer. But I just feel that we already have enough explosions and blood.

CHRISTIANUS: All right, you decide. But how shall we prepare the plot so that Oki’s head will end up on his *left* side? Must we then not arrange an explosion on his *right* side? But if we do *that*, will not all his blood also end up on his *right-hand* side, instead of on his left, as we planned before?

KATHERINE: Yes, that’s a worry. But maybe we can live with that?
CHRISTIANUS: Sure. It’s not bad.

KATHERINE: No, it’s not.

CHRISTIANUS: So maybe we can have the bomb hidden in a necklace, or something? Maybe Cassandra, who is an ex Vegas lion tamer, and perhaps even previously involved with Roy and his tiger, now has given the necklace as a gift to Oki to let him think that she cares about him? But secretly, of course, Cassandra just prepares to assassinate him.

KATHERINE: Ah! It’s devilishly devious! But where did David the daggerman go? Is he expunged from the final scene?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, I can’t really use David’s skill-set in the last scene; after all, he’s a daggerist, not an explosionist! So I need to let Cassandra do the really dirty work. She’s much more witchy, cunning and scheming than the handsome, courageous David ever could be.

KATHERINE: You are certainly right! Character really is everything. As you always say.

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And, just to be sure: you are still having a hard time accepting that the actor still may be alive after such a staged explosion?

KATHERINE: Yes.

CHRISTIANUS: All right. Before John leaves the
dressing room, Maria the makeup artist always applies some special matte black paint on his face, being especially careful not to forget his eyelids. A few moments later, after the paint has dried, he puts on a black fire-safe dress, including a hood, similar to the ones that professional racing drivers use when they race on Daytona. And then he jumps into the Oki costume itself, prepared to go.

KATHERINE: So what happens on stage, then? Is he really ready for a decapitation?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When Cassandra detonates Oki’s necklace bomb with her remote control unit hidden in her cigarette case, the necklace really does explode as it should. But it is only a very small explosion.

KATHERINE: So how could that make any impression on the audience?

CHRISTIANUS: Since John’s wireless mike is close by, it easily picks up the sound and amplifies it to a much bigger boom than it really was. Simultaneously, the Oki costume is rigged in such a way that the Oki head, which has a hinge on its lower left side, flips up from the right, over John’s head, and down on his left side, still hanging on the hinge, upside down. Then John just pushes a switch inside his
suit to manually release the Oki head, making it fall to the floor.

**KATHERINE:** So then the Oki head goes where it should. But what about the blood on the right hand side?

**CHRISTIANUS:** Well, the explosion also triggered the blood bags inside Oki’s costume. So the blood is flowing very nicely along his right-hand side.

**KATHERINE:** But what about John’s head? Is it still there?

**CHRISTIANUS:** Of course. And his face too. But it’s very dark, since he has both the black hood and the black face paint on. Also, the lighting technician doesn’t have a spot on Oki when it explodes; it’s on Cassandra.

**KATHERINE:** What else?

**CHRISTIANUS:** Well, it’s important to understand that the last scene is set in a very dark environment. Maybe it’s a coal mine, or something. So John’s head is not visible as a silhouette either.

**KATHERINE:** And?

**CHRISTIANUS:** You must also remember that John will be instructed to close his eyes as soon as the bomb goes off; and because of his black-painted eyelids, his eyes will, from where the audience sits,
almost magically appear to disappear.

KATHERINE: I’m sorry, but I’m not convinced.

CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

KATHERINE: Well, the apparent disappearance of John’s eyes was *almost* believable. But I didn’t like the explosion part. I thought it sounded unrealistic that John’s face was so close to Oki’s necklace. I don’t think he could have survived that explosion without any injury, even *with* that hood and everything.

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe you are right. But what if he had a Kevlar body-armour under the Oki outfit? Wouldn’t that cover it?

KATHERINE: Perhaps. But there’s still another detail that I am not completely satisfied with.

CHRISTIANUS: Which one?

KATHERINE: Well, even if the spotlight isn’t *directly* on John’s face, it will still be possible for those sitting in the front rows to see it. So I would very much like to have *no* face there at all, not even a black-painted one. How can we do that?

CHRISTIANUS: It’s easy. We’ll just have to call Andrew!

KATHERINE: What’s his specialty?
CHRISTIANUS: He comes when I call him.

KATHERINE: Great. But what does he do?

CHRISTIANUS: He always puts on a good show. You’ll see.

KATHERINE: I will?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When the script is done. And when we are ready to show it to you.

KATHERINE: So you’re not ready?

CHRISTIANUS: I am ready. To leave. I am very, very tired.

KATHERINE: Sure. But what about just a few minutes summing up?

CHRISTIANUS: All right. Just a few minutes, then. But let’s go outside. I need some fresh air!

KATHERINE: Me too.

CHRISTIANUS: After you!
SCENE XVI.

Some Conclusive Costume Talk

1. CHRISTIANUS: Ah, there it is! The ‘Monster Cookies’ sign! How did I miss it?
2. KATHERINE: Maybe because you were so late?
3. CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.
4. KATHERINE: OK. So what can we conclude?
5. CHRISTIANUS: Well, one thing is this. The fact that the Oki costume has been found to lie lifeless in the dressing room one morning is no proof that Oki will not return on stage in the late afternoon. For if John can’t make it, his stand-in James usually can.
6. KATHERINE: Anything else?
7. CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The fact that the Oki costume has been found to lie lifeless in the dressing room one morning is also no proof that John does not live; for John is just not in the costume at that particular time.
8. KATHERINE: But he could be dead.
9. CHRISTIANUS: Sure, he could be. But it seems unnatural to assume that he is dead just from the fact that he is not in the Oki costume in the morning time.
KATHERINE: Why?

CHRISTIANUS: Because John is one of the lead actors; and he comes and goes every day. But he *never* comes before lunch. So it’s nothing *abnormal* or *unnatural* about the fact that the Oki costume can be found to lie lifeless in the dressing room in the *morning time*; it *always* does! John just likes to sleep in.

KATHERINE: So what is the ‘moral’ of this analogy, if there is one? Should I think, whenever I see a dead body, that the dead body is actually just a costume?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes, at least if you want to do it the *satisfactionist* way. And there’s more.

KATHERINE: More?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It’s not just when you see a *dead* body that you should think ‘costume’; you should think ‘costume’ when you see *any* body — lifeless or animated.

KATHERINE: Your theory is a little hard to digest; it sounds very unscientific.

CHRISTIANUS: *Of course* it’s unscientific; it’s built on a *play!* Why would scientists be interested in talking about such things?

KATHERINE: Don’t ask *me*!

CHRISTIANUS: You have to try to understand things without being *attached* to mate-
rialist theories. You have to see things in such a way that you can enable your personal satisfaction. In other words, if you’re not satisfied with other people’s theories and world-views, then just throw them out!

20 KATHERINE: So if I am not satisfied with your theory, why should I adopt it?

21 CHRISTIANUS: I am not talking about the mind’s satisfaction; I am talking about the spirit soul’s satisfaction. The self.

22 KATHERINE: What are you saying?

23 CHRISTIANUS: I am saying that the greatest enemy to real satisfaction and to self-realization is your own mind. It always wants to argue. So you have to put it in place, so that you can start your satisfaction journey.

24 KATHERINE: How?

25 CHRISTIANUS: We just did it, right? The Mortality Proof. Where we both clearly saw that you could not prove that you are a mortal before you are dead.

xvi:34, No, I’m not: Katherine here not only seems to struggle against the idea of being ostrich-like, but also against the idea of going to the London Zoo — an attitude that Christianus also could have identified as being remarkably similar to the behaviour of certain ostriches. For after that popular ostrich at the Regent’s Park Zoological Gardens was ‘loved to death’ in 1873 and a dissection of it showed that it had ‘met its end by twenty-one penny pieces which it could not digest, although it was an ostrich’ (Walford 1878, p. 286), there was a sud-
KATHERINE: Well . . .

CHRISTIANUS: And then, using your cold-hearted *nothingness* scenario, we saw that you could not do it *after* you are dead, either.

KATHERINE: Cold-hearted?

CHRISTIANUS: So the conclusion is that your nothingness scenario is *useless*.

KATHERINE: Not to me.

CHRISTIANUS: That’s only because you don’t want to *see* the truth. You’re one of those ostriches at the Zoo.

KATHERINE: No, I’m not.

CHRISTIANUS: Or *on the way* to the Zoo, then.

KATHERINE: *No*, I’m not.

CHRISTIANUS: Of course you are. You don’t want to jeopardize your girlish little dreams about a cute little life, as a cute little wife of a cute little knight, whose fearless fight on a moonlit night made all your freight go out of sight.

den shortage of ostriches. So when the Prince of Wales returned to England from his India adventures in the spring of 1876, he brought with him ‘three large ostriches’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 363; ref. *supra*, note ‘Monday’ at 111:105), all of which seemingly ended up at the Zoological Society’s Gardens (*ILN* 1876h, p. 367; *ILN* 1876i, p. 518).

But those ostriches had not been very co-operative to get there. Just getting them on board the *Serapis* proved to be difficult, when that ship had anchored off Aden to take in two hundred tons of
KATHERINE: How poetic.

CHRISTIANUS: Thank you. So here’s the deal. If you adopt my scenario, you can verify that you once were a mortal. For when you leave your body at the time of death, you can see, with your spiritual senses and consciousness, your dead, cold, lifeless body lying there, whether on the operating table, or under a 24-feet truck in the middle of the road.

KATHERINE: Don’t talk like that!

CHRISTIANUS: Why not? Does it go badly with your chic Gucci bag? Or your colourful *haute couture* Chanel dress?

KATHERINE: I love my handbag and my dress. Unlike your outfit, mine has style.

CHRISTIANUS: I just have a different one.

KATHERINE: There is no doubt about that!

CHRISTIANUS: In any case, my scenario is much more attractive than yours.

can on Sunday, 19 March 1876 (Wheeler 1876, p. 363). As seen in the front-page illustration in the *Illustrated London News* called ‘The Royal Visit to India: The Voyage Home – Getting Ostriches on Board at Aden’ (*ILN* 1876g, p. 337), four sailors were needed to carry one hard-struggling ostrich up the ladder to the ship with ‘considerable difficulty’ (Wheeler 1876, p. 363); and there is no indication that the other two were any less ‘huge’ or ‘struggling’ (*ILN* 1876g, p. 354).

*ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS* (1876g), Saturday, 8 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1915.

*ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS* (1876h), Saturday, 15 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1916.

*ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS* (1876i), Saturday, 27 May 1876, vol. 68, no. 1922.

EDWARD WALFORD (1878), *Old and New London. A Narrative of Its History*. Its
KATHERINE: Why? It’s not the least romantic or colourful.

CHRISTIANUS: Yours isn’t either. In your scenario, you cannot ever verify anything about your own mortality, neither before death nor after. But in my scenario, I can directly verify, with my own spiritual consciousness, as soon as I am dead, that I once was a mortal.

KATHERINE: So what does that prove?

CHRISTIANUS: It doesn’t prove anything conclusively, on its own, of course, just as any argument doesn’t prove anything conclusively on its own — other than, perhaps, that it was possible to formulate that argument. So it strongly indicates, in conjunction with other pieces of information, that my scenario is more real than yours, since one can actually know more about oneself and one’s body.

KATHERINE: But what if I am blind? What if I

---


XVI:47, scenario . . . more real: Christianus’s point is apparently about ‘reality’ and the possibility of knowledge. He seems to suggest that the degree of ‘realness’ of a scenario is related to the (presumably gradualistic) level of knowledge (or potential knowledge) that one may have of objects in that scenario. So, for example, if an individual potentially can have more knowledge of the body from a spiritual ‘body-and-soul’ scenario than from a purely material ‘body-but-no-soul’ scenario, then, potentially, the spiritual scenario would be more ‘real’ than the purely material one.
can’t see?

CHRISTIANUS: Why would you be blind after death? Why would John be blind after he takes off his Okefenokee monster suit? Who would be foolish enough to hire a blind actor?

KATHERINE: No, no. I mean blind here, on earth. Now. In this life.

CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

KATHERINE: If I were blind since birth, and the sky were blue, I would never be able to prove, with my own perception, that the sky is blue. Why, then, would I therefore have to conclude that the sky is not blue?

CHRISTIANUS: You wouldn’t.

KATHERINE: I wouldn’t?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, since you are a little neti-neti philosopher, maybe you would. But I wouldn’t, that’s for sure.

KATHERINE: Why not?

CHRISTIANUS: All people are not blind, are they?

KATHERINE: No, they aren’t.

CHRISTIANUS: So some people — in fact most people — will be able to confirm by their own, direct perception that the sky is blue. If it really is blue, that is.
KATHERINE: OK?

CHRISTIANUS: So the proposition ‘the sky is blue’ can be verified in a very direct manner by those who are not blind.

KATHERINE: But?

CHRISTIANUS: But, in your nothingness scenario, the proposition ‘I am mortal’ can never be directly verified by anyone. So that scenario is extremely unsatisfying, from an aesthetic point of view.

KATHERINE: So you’re saying?

CHRISTIANUS: You must abandon your nothingness scenario.

KATHERINE: I don’t want to.

CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But do you have a choice?

KATHERINE: How do you mean?

CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you want to be unreasonable, you can. Is that your brilliant plan?

KATHERINE: No.

CHRISTIANUS: Or unintelligent?

KATHERINE: Of course not.

CHRISTIANUS: Or unhappy, then?

KATHERINE: No. But can’t we meet tomorrow to talk more about this?

CHRISTIANUS: No, I have Wendy.
KATHERINE: Oh, right. What about Sunday?

CHRISTIANUS: Sorry. Sunday is Sandy-day.

KATHERINE: Sandy?

CHRISTIANUS: Yes. She’s a really nice girl. Very co-operative. And sexy.

KATHERINE: So when do you have time? Monday? Tuesday?

CHRISTIANUS: No, probably not until the end of the week.

KATHERINE: What about Thursday, then?

CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. Email me on Wednesday, and we’ll see. OK?

KATHERINE: OK.

CHRISTIANUS: But I have to run now.

KATHERINE: Sure. Bye!

CHRISTIANUS: Bye.