I'm thinking about a newsletter at some point. I won't be surprised if you don't hear from a single reader. But if I do, he or she will be warmly welcomed.
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Langan believes that a good editor would understand the material printed in Noesis. With me as editor, you are not getting that. I give the material what I presume to be more attention than does the average reader, but I don't study the material as if I'm going to be tested on it.

Because I used to write questions for a satirical game show, and because I used to own every single issue of Mad magazine (and 15 of 24 issues of its precursor, Mad comics), I feel that my role as editor is to make gentle fun of the contents of Noesis and to make embarrassing personal admissions. As you've noticed, even lame humor is rare in IQ journals. I haven't felt obligated to become more knowledgeable to be a better editor.

I don't have the background or the focused attention to fairly evaluate Langan's theory. He raises some peripheral issues I feel comfortable talking about, and I don't feel bad joking about the idea of an all-encompassing cosmology. Such a theory would have to contain its own punch line, and as Krazy Kat says, "A cat can look at a king."

In Noesis, there's lots of stuff, some good, some not-so-good, which I don't understand. Part of this is my fault, part of it is the fault of the material. If you agree with Langan that my lack of understanding is a serious shortcoming, let me know.
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CONSISTENT within the paradoxiform basis of logic itself. PERIOD. Other. "HLMs-nonlogical" realities may somewhere exist, but they are utterly irrelevant to physical reality or any metaphysical extension of it, and cannot be included in any theory thereof. Anyone still feel cheated of "interesting results"? If so, here's a few more for you.

MATHEMATICS AND REALITY ARE AUTOMATICALLY IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE CTMU (MIND = REALITY) EQUATION. The recent spate of soul-searching over the "inexplicable way" that logic and mathematics "somehow happen to work so well" is understandable. But you can't get away with it. No differentiate information can ever possibly exist between them in terms of which to formulate such a "reason". The CTMU empyreon treats mathematics as the HSCS-embodied inductive limits. The only thing separating them are taut restriction and interpretative quails.

DUE TO THE SAME EQUATION, THE UNIVERSE IS A GENERALIZED FORM OF INTELLIGENCE. Therefore, any test which purports infully to measure intelligence is being implicitly identified or associated with a valid theory of global reality. The only person currently qualified to do that is... well, let's just say you haven't intentionally taken any IQ tests by him. You might be in a self-congratulatory mode over your high IQ test scores. But things aren't quite that simple. Some of you are doubtless very smart, but no amount of intelligence entitles you to ignore truth.

DUE AGAIN TO THE SAME EQUATION, THE IDENTITY OF THE UNIVERSE IS A GENERALIZED MENTAL STRUCTURE WHICH, FOR WANT OF A MORE FAMILIAR NAME, MAY BE CALLED "GOD". You can, of course, argue about the name; it's one of the issues rather rarely at stake, unless you're talking about the structure or its functionability, at least logically. "God" sometimes seems to "ignore" you (and those who suffer "needlessly") because that is the price for free will, a basic aspect of teleology. It gets to me too, frequently. But that, as they say, is life, and philosophy, and cosmology, and group consensus.

Incidentally: if any of you has your own theory involving these phenomena, I hope you understand that you need to interpret them in some coherent mathematical model for your theory to be worth anything, for instance, I had to invent transductive algebra and discover the various concepts and principles which allow it to be physically interpreted in the given ways. Do anything less than that, and you're merely speculating about already-known phenomena without making their relationship any more exact or complete than it already is. I happen to know that you need transductive algebra, and thus the CTMU, to do this. So if all of this has been some kind of "race", I won it a long time ago. Also, there has been some talk in the past of the necessity for "interesting results" before a theory becomes acceptable. That's...

Dear Rick: I'm not sure when my subscription expires. Here's $10 for a 6-month extension past that date, whatever it may be. By now, you're aware that I reacted negatively to your remarks on my letter to you in Noesis '76. That's only natural; when someone takes it or our energy to explain such clearly and comes up endlessly dry, his reservoir of patience goes dry as well. You must have expected it sooner or later.

Ever since you became editor pro tem of the journal, your remarks concerning my contributions have been out and out condescending nonsense. No differentiative information can ever possibly exist between them in terms of which to formulate such a "reason". The CTMU empyreon treats mathematics as the HSCS-embodied inductive limits. The only thing separating them are taut restriction and interpretative quails.

I may be permitted to say so, you and Ron seem to function as a team for some purposes. At least, that's what one might infer from the way both of you disregard the same logical arguments in order to oppose the same logical theses. In any case, Ron is on record as saying that he "wishes he were as intelligent" as you, and may be relying on you to stop my views from carrying at the expense of both yours. Yet, you seem just as unwilling as he is to read about them. I know that Ron wrote the admissions test and that you "edit" the journal. But what does that have to do with metaphysics, cosmology, or group consensus?

I don't want to make anybody eat crow. But I feel I've had neither you nor Ron can fight me using logic on my level of discourse (don't feel bad; that's something you share with many philosophers and cosmologists). All you could possibly do is continue to play rhetorical cat-and-mouse games at the expense of bad reasoning. You don't really want to be guilty of that, do you? How much more time can you afford to waste? While I may not be giving you credit for vast knowledge, I do give you credit for some degree of intelligence. How about returning the favor? If you say 2 + 2 = 4 and I say 2 + 2 = 5, and you reply that... a point so crucial that, having lost it, you might as well hang up your guns. Your opposition to me has been shown to rely on that whatever is physically relevant is logical. In any case, since your judgment of rational conversations; let's not lose the knack. Regards,

Chris L.
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Greetings Fellow Intellectuals:

We, the members of Thinkers Consulting, are tired of being equated with others, who can barely read, just because their "credentials" are equal, or even superior, to ours. We are tired of having credentials considered more valuable than intelligence and knowledge. We are tired of finding that, whatever we say, there's somebody with a Ph.D. who says the opposite.

We are tired of being told that making a living in this society is a matter of "playing the game," and of everything except having something in your head. We are tired of watching others get paid $100,000 a year because they do those things, rather than because they know anything, because they "earned" their credentials and their titles, rather than because they know a preposition from a verb, because they're "well-rounded" rather than because they know a cosine from a logarithm, because they have "discipline" rather than any desire to do anything right, because they know anything, because they "earned" their credentials and their titles, rather than because they know. We are tired of being told that two and two are four after we've just been told-twice-that Mr. Smith has decided that they're five.

Well, now we have decided that, whether anybody likes it or not, we're going to do something about all this. It's time people realized that an "authority" is one thing and an expert is another. We are forming an organization whose members are certified by us as experts in specific subjects-absolutely without regard for their education, experience, or "credentials"-solely on the basis of evidence of thorough mastery of the subject, demonstrated before our eyes.

Our standards will be super-high, "perfectionist" standards, and we will not lower them for anybody. They will also be absolute, as opposed to relative, standards-in other words, no marking on a curve. If 1000 people take our algebra test and only three of them pass, then we will not certify the other 997 as experts. Of course, this means that there won't be a lot of people out there who need the services of our members—but that's all right, because we won't have a lot of members either. We are interested in quality, not quantity. We believe in high standards, and we will not compromise.

Prospective clients will be guaranteed correctness-in grammar, in math, or in whatever the subject is. In return, they will have to promise-in a written contract-that they will let us work up to our standards of excellence. Before the contract is signed, the member and the client will agree upon a fee, part of which will go to the organization.

The term "MU", standing for multiplex unity, is a "paradoxiform" term representing the nature of telesis. I.e., telesis is perfectly and infinitely self-distributed. In the CTMU, this attribute is called hology (a logical analogue of "holography"), and is derived from the triality attribute of the STO "core symmetry" of transductive algebra (see paragraph 2 above). Paradoxes of infinity are resolved by redefinition of "infinity" in terms of transductive syntactical restriction (i.e., empyreonic stratification). MU also represents (the transfinite inductive limit of) empyreonic closure, which is effected through the virtual identification of SCS-ambiguous definitive terms.

Spatiotemporal information, or spatial-temporal information a = et, is clearly energy-dependent. Energy is just a manifestation to physical transducers of the "atemporal" component of undecidable future action...i.e., active telesis. Thus, telesis - the ultimate, universal component of reality - unavoidably drives the temporal collapse of spatio-temporal information. The universe, being built of it, cannot be sustained, in any other context. Since the empyreon is necessary to model reality as transduced information, any attempt to define spatial-temporal information in terms of informational dynamics would be prima facie absurd.

The CTMU, through its fundamental mind-reality equation, defines reality strictly subject to limitations by the human subjective cognitive syntax. i.e., HSCS observational limitations defining D distribute over R^ as limitations on relevancy. Anyone who tries to lift HLM restrictions on relevancy, attempts to detach science and metaphysics from the human mind. Since you are using our minds in any such attempt - or at least in your attempt - you are using our minds. The universe, being built of it, cannot be self-invalidating and worthless. Don't bother looking for a "trick" to use here; there isn't any.

"Relevancy" is thus a direct generalization of "observability". If something is not relevant, then it has no observable ramifications and thus (to circularize) is not relevant. In other words, R^ is inductively equivalent to R. Relevancy is constrained by cognition and cognition is constrained by logic.

SUMMARY: THE UNIVERSE IS ESSENTIALLY LOGICAL, AND SO ULTIMATELY
a "channel" for the "instantaneous transmission" of spin correlation. Space itself, through its literal identification with invariants like that of spin conservation, can convey such information instantaneously yet locally (i.e., consistently with Einstein locality; the \(\Gamma\)-deterministic invariance and maximality of lightspeed quantifies the rate of \(\Gamma\)-metacognition). Thus, what seems like "empty space" consists of the vacated shells of past events and retains the same transmissive characteristics as the original events with respect to quantum-holoric information. A set of holor-correlated merates collapses "within" the image of their interaction. This image, having been "pointlike", retains "pointlike" ability to convey instantaneous dependency among its "parts". It is as though this dependency "linearly" as "completed, already existing" timelike arborization which regresses from each merate to the point of interaction in spacetime and through the "past" interactive event itself, there connecting with the other merate-trajectories. Since this arborization is already completed, it acts as an "open channel" without temporal resistance, i.e., without answerability to the locality principle which governs the flow of physical time from past to future. The volumetric spatial expansion of the event is just the \(\Gamma\)-nondeterministic ad/propter hoc version of this post hoc (and therefore deterministic) linearization of the conserved quantum attribute. To put it in an even simpler way, space need not "transmit" information when it is the information to be "transmitted". Every part of space reflects the distributed empyreonic identity; it is the pastwise-determinate part of this identity which transduces the information. The only information for which nonlocal transduction is irrelevant is that reflecting physical independence of its merates. \(\Gamma\)-space is thus an artifact of hological quantum entanglement in \(\Gamma\)-nondeterministic spacetime, or a projection of the empyreonic identity. Looking backwards through time, it consists chiefly of unused, symmetrically distributed action-potential in a \(U_1\)-parallel, pointwise-independent homologically-programmed relativistic computation. This parallelized independence is enforced by the locality principle (c-invariance/maximality), which thus functions - as it does in Special Relativity - as a "partitioner" of space and time...i.e., of the spacetime holor. 

SUMMARY: THE CTMU DEFINES SPACE AND TIME IN TERMS OF COSMOLOGICAL CLOSURE IN SUCH A WAY AS TO SIMULTANEOUSLY EXPLAIN BOTH QUANTUM NONLOCALITY AND QUANTUM WAVEFUNCTION COLLAPSE. 

This explanation also serves other purposes. E.g., it transforms so-called "empty space" to a set of overlapping informational fields like those used to explain certain aspects of biological morphogenesis and evolution. The partial inaccessibility of such information to physical transductive syntaxes requires merely that the overall physical syntax exceed them in scope, which is indeed a CTMU verity. Information transmitted "nonlocally" by means of this mechanism must be forwardly nondeterministic and must impinge on nondeterministic receptors; otherwise, it is dominated by \(\Gamma\)-deterministic physical invariants. Thus, this explanation in no way crosses or attempts to supplant the gradualistic and complexity-theoretic aspects of growth and evolution, but follows from the model on which their own logical consistency depends. 

SUMMARY: THE CTMU INCLUDES AN EXPLANATION FOR "NONDETERMINISTIC" ASPECTS OF BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES. THE SAME MECHANISM SUFFICES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL PROCESSES (including, to the extent of its validity, the Jung-Pauli "synchronicity" concept).
A MODERN VIEW OF POGO

Everyone is familiar with the political side of Walt Kelly’s comics. But where in “Pogo” can you find animals boasting about being good to eat? Pogo asserting that his uncle, also a possum, was Porky Pine’s father? Pogo behaving as if intoxicated? A little turtle saying that the soup tastes good because it was made from him? Pogo eating a bar of soap? Churchy implying that Howland is gay? Albert the Alligator protecting Pogo and others while admitting that he wants to eat them? Chuchy, a turtle, bragging that his grandfather was a cat?

These and many other outrageous gags are to be found in Kelly’s comic books—the forgotten portion of his work—which were not political and require quite another kind of analysis, such as this book provides.

“In this unique, non-political perspective upon Walt Kelly’s Pogo comics, Norman F. Hale, contributor to Another Rainbow’s Little Lulu Library, focuses upon the Dell comics which were the medium of Pogo’s earliest appearance. He sees the behavior of Kelly’s animals as the way people would behave if guided more by nature and instinct instead of man-made custom. He analyzes the characters’ casual attitudes about eating each other; the way morality and leadership develop among them; their frequent lapses into nonsense or fantasy; the occasional bawdy aspects of their behavior; and their relationships and feelings toward each other, based on a delicate balance between instinct and intelligence, between morality and logic, between fantasy and truth.

“Walt Kelly’s place in American culture has not been clearly defined, but Hale’s study goes a long way towards helping us understand his contributions to American thought.”

Professor M. Thomas Inge, Randolph-Macon College

Author of “Comics as Culture”

illustrated with 128 panels of Kelly’s art from the comic books, most of them never before reprinted.

Just $9.95, including postage! Send check, money order, MasterCard or VISA (card number and expiration date) to:

Thinker’s Books, 70-A Greenwich Avenue, Suite 433, New York, NY 10011
universal inductively-stratified identity operator of "trialistic" empyreonic algebra that quanta must be interpreted, and by virtue of which they exhibit "quantum duality". SUMMARY: THE CTMU EXPLAINS QUANTUM WAVE-PARTICLE DUALITY IN A WAY RELATING IT TO PHYSICAL DYNAMICS AND ALGORITHMIC RECURRENCE. The metaphysical transductive algebra, or empyreon, is described by a relevancy relation \( R \) which is the combinatorial expansion of a base-relation \( R^* \) (where \( R \) is the "inductively completed" physical universe). I.e., \( R^* \) contains all possible abstract relations on \( R \), including all possible spatiotemporal evolutions of \( R \) with respect to any vantage in spacetime. \( R \) and \( R^* \) are closed, or reflexive. As \( R^* \) is identified by definition with the distributed empyreonic identity, it distributes temporally as a reflexive identity operator which, like the empyreon itself, is inductively stratified. On the physical level, the most general form of this relation expresses the closure of physical spacetime. This is logically equivalent to what cosmologists describe as the "primal singularity" (where a singularity is a telic state devoid of \( U_j \) apparent differentiative information, \( U_j \) a cognitive class). The associated "big bang" and "big crunch", both identically distributed over physical reality as opposing, mutually cancellative "directions of time", are understood to mark only the distributed, closely-identified extremities of \( R^* \) and not any "pre-existing" \( R \)-irrelevant steady-state background. The "completion" of \( R \) is possible only within deterministic parameters; \( R \) and \( R^* \) are nondeterministically open relative to physical cognition at any given spacetime location. \( R^* \) thus regresses, through levels of potential dependency, to an infinite-valued parallelism relative to the local SCS-relativized perception of \( R \). This transverse-invariant parallel limit of \( R^* \) is defined as telic. Telesis is self-restricting relative to any two-valued subsystem through active-tellic feedback; converses, telesis not involved in restrictive feedback is irrelevant to the two-valued subsystem in question. This is why \( R^* \) is called a "cosmically-invariant relation" on the two-valued physical universe \( R \). Telic "feedback loops", including those interpreted as quantum waves, are just temporal images of the closed topology of \( R^* \), and so conform specifically to the global empyreonic identity operator.

In the absence of any possible informational distinction between them, spacetime and invariance are literally equated by the CTMU. In other words, spacetime is seen as provisionally identical to the nonlogical invariants governing its structure. This implies that time, being interpreted by an essentially substitutive nomology, involves a form of "spatial substitution" identifiable with quantum wavefunction collapse. I.e., matter continually "shrinks and collapses" within a "spatial image" of its former self from a metrically-invariant viewpoint, this shrinkage appears as spatial expansion, which then gives rise to a cosmic redshift. Physically interacting systems stabilize the relative distances and velocities of their components by virtue of physical proximity. To whatever extent the global metatransductive syntax computes them "from without", they display metrical stability. But where it computes them "from within", they are cosmologically diffuse and therefore "expansive" from the physical viewpoint. Once we invoke the universal quantifier over reality in order to theorize about cosmology, it becomes a logical holor to which all informational metrization is internal. This implies, as stated in the above paragraph, that "spatial expansion" dualizes as a reciprocal collapse of matter. This, of course, is the 2VL (2-val-

A NEW AND MODERN PARABLE
From Robert Dick

The Kingdom of Heaven is like a computer programmer who searches his code for bugs. When he finds one he immediately repents of it and rejoices that it did not escape him any longer than it did.

Comments: God too is capable of repenting and feeling sorry for what He has done. See Genesis 6:6, for example. Repentance, whether for a large or a small thing, is joyful. We should all therefore continually seek out things to repent of, just as a good computer programmer seeks out bugs, knowing there is no such thing as "the last bug."

MORE SHORT FORM PROBLEMS
Peter Pompfit
20. Stamp: Philatelist :: Toilet Paper: ?
21. Radar: Acronym :: Cabal: ?
22. Find the next number in this series: 5 4 9 7 5 8 1 9 ?

THE QUEST TEST AND THE SIEVE OF KNOWLEDGE
Chris Cole

Each of us goes through life learning various facts, and the structure of these facts is like a sieve -- full of holes. Any particular question is more than likely to fall through one of these holes. But if we take two more individuals and overlap their sieves, the odds of finding an answer becomes better. When you get a lot of individuals together and they cannot answer a question, there is probably something wrong with the question. This is how I view much of philosophy, but that is another story...

In the December Omni magazine, Scott Morris published subscriber Daryl Liman's Quest Test -- which should be familiar to readers of Noah's. I decided to apply my "sieve theory" to this test, and contacted a number of members to see if they knew the answers. In order to test my theory, I asked the members I contacted not to spend a lot of time on the test. I was looking for knowledge that they already possessed -- not something they recently acquired from a directed search of the literature. The annotated solution set produced below is the result. My conclusions are given thereafter.

If there is more than one word that fits the analogy, we list the best word first. Goodness of lit considers many factors, such as parallel spelling, pronunciation or etymology. In general, a word that occurs in the answer, we mark it with a question mark.

1. Mother: Maternal :: Stepmother: Novercal (STEPMOTHER, pen.)
2. Club: Axe :: Claviform: Dolabriform, Securiform (AXE, -shaped)
3. "Claviform" is from Latin "clava" for "club"; "securiform" is from Latin "secure" for "axe"; "dolabriform" is from Latin "dolabra" for "to hit with an axe." Thus "securiform" has the more parallel etymology. However, only "dolabriform" occurs in Merriam-Webster's Third New International Dictionary is superior to one that does not. If we are unsure of the answer, we mark it with a question mark.

Most of these answers can be found in Herbert M. Baus, The Master Crossword Puzzle Dictionary, Doubleday, New York, 1981. The notation in parentheses refers to the heading and subheading, if any, in Baus.
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22. Find the next number in this series: 5 4 9 7 5 8 1 9 ?
International Dictionary.
3. Cook Food: Pressure Cooker :: Kill Germs: Autoclave (PRESSURE, cooker)
4. Water: Air :: Hydraulic: Pneumatic (AIR, pert.)
5. Prediction: Direct: Proof: Anderson (POSITRON, discoverer)
6. Raised: Sunken: Canoe: Intact (GEM, carved)
7. 1: 14 :: Pound: Stone (ENGLAND, weight)
9. Sexual Intercourse: A Virgin :: Bearing Children: A Nullipara
11. Guitar: Cello: Segovia: Casals (SPAIN, cellist)
14. 100: Century: 10,000: Myriad, Banzai? (NUMBER)
15. Surface: Figure: Mugus: Klein
16. Logic: Philosophy :: To Know Without Conious Reasoning: Thesosophy (MYSTICISM)
17. Alive: Parasite: Dead: Saprophyte (SCAVENGER)
18. Ave: Parasite: Dead: Saprospyle (SCAVenger)
19. Moses: Fluvial: Noah: Diluvial (FLOOD, pert.)
21. Opossum, Kangaroo, Wombat: Marsupial::
22. Bars: Leaves:: Eagle: Stars (INSIGNIA)
23. Sculptor: Judolca :: Fine: Martial (SELF, -defense)
24. Dependent: Independent:: Plankton: Nekton (ANIMAL, free-swimming)
26. To Know Without Conious Reasoning: Theosophy (MYSTICISM)
27. 2: 3:: He: Li (ELEMENT)
29. Pathogen: Thermometer:: Lethal Wave: Dosimeter? (X-RAY, measurement)
30. Surface: Figure:: Mobius: Klein
31. Involuntary: Sternutatory :: Voluntary: Expectorant, Sialagogue? (SPIT)
32. Russia: Balalaika:: India: Sitar, Sarod (INDIA, musical instrument)
33. Unusual Hunger: Bulimia::
34. Russia: Balalaika:: India: Sitar, Sarod (INDIA, musical instrument)
35. "Century usually refers to one hundred years, while "myriad" refers to 10,000 things, but "century" can also mean 100 things. "Banzai" is Japanese for 10,000 years.
36. Excessive: Sternutatory :: Voluntary: Expectorant, Sialagogue? (SPIT)
37. Some Miscellaneous Implications of CTMU Structure
It occurs to me on the basis of my experience with the group that I can't rationally gamble on its ability or inclination to track all the major implications of previous mathematical descriptions of the CTMU as given in Noesis. Accordingly, I offer the following remarks. If you're able to understand them, then you'll know what you have to do in order to come up with a "original" (but incorrect) theory about the matters on which they bear (the cosmic redshift, the Big Bang and "Big Crunch", quantum duality, nonlocality and collapse, evolution and morphogenesis, etc.). If you aren't, then your claim of originality for any duplicative theory will be "excusable" only on grounds of unregenerate ignorance.

Still another caveat may be necessary. If something is true on logical grounds, then any counterintuitive aspects it may exhibit are secondary. They don't "invalidate" it. In other words, it must be resolved in ways determined by it. If this seems to violate the Popper criterion for scientific theories - which states in essence that to be called "scientific", a theory must be formulated such that it can be disproven if it happens to be false - then this hypothesis has simply been exceeded. For example, it has typically been suspended for both metaphysics and cosmology. What follows is on much firmer ground; being verified by logic, it would otherwise have been ruled out by logic. Don't waste time (mine, yours or the group's) by doubting or criticizing it on any lesser basis.

The triality attribute of the STO (space-time-object) holon which defines the CTMU empyreon Γ (see Noesis 47, 71 and 76) predicates the perspective interchangeability of these three terms relative to the human subjective cognitive syntax (HSCS). As space and time are relativistically inseparable, so are human subjective consciousness and objective reality. With allowance for the oscillatory nature of quantum source-dynamics, this explains the so-called wave-particle duality principle of quantum theory: "wavepackets" of oscillating spacetime are just STOs in the non-deterministic universal universe. In the CTMU, it's just that simple: quantum duality devolves to a mathematical principle, reflecting the CTMU equation of (objective) physics and (subjective) mathematics through the universal empyreonic (transductive-syntactical) identity. The oscillatory nature of spacetime relative to the characteristic transductive syntax of its HSCS-inclusive) transductive-algebraic identity. I.e., cosmological information and human cognition are recursively defined; the CTMU Telic Principle expresses their complete interdependence (where the formalization of their jointly-defined infocognition, a term expressing the inseparability of cognition and information). The quantum transducer is syndyfeonic in structure, and the temporal (temporal) component of syndyfeonic equates to "oscillation" within the parallel (spatial) component. Spacetime, which equates to quantum-collapsative potential over which the deterministic physical metric is pastwise-superimposed as the two-valued limit of empyreonic many-valued logic, thus oscillates as so-called probability waves. The potential-waveform algebra is perfectly correspondent to the quantum empyreonic structure and thus exhibits hology. "Hology" expresses the trialistic self-similarity of the invariant root-conceptual quantum transducer, and can be apprehended as a logical analogue of graphical holography. The resulting picture of nested syndyfeonic cycles, forming a model for the oscillatory nature of spacetime, is perfectly adapted to all levels of nondeterministic and deterministic information including complexity and chaos. It is through the

50. Some Miscellaneous Implications of CTMU Structure
It occurs to me on the basis of my experience with the group that I can't rationally gamble on its ability or inclination to track all the major implications of previous mathematical descriptions of the CTMU as given in Noesis. Accordingly, I offer the following remarks. If you're able to understand them, then you'll know what you have to do in order to come up with a "original" (but incorrect) theory about the matters on which they bear (the cosmic redshift, the Big Bang and "Big Crunch", quantum duality, nonlocality and collapse, evolution and morphogenesis, etc.). If you aren't, then your claim of originality for any duplicative theory will be "excusable" only on grounds of unregenerate ignorance.

Still another caveat may be necessary. If something is true on logical grounds, then any counterintuitive aspects it may exhibit are secondary. They don't "invalidate" it. In other words, it must be resolved in ways determined by it. If this seems to violate the Popper criterion for scientific theories - which states in essence that to be called "scientific", a theory must be formulated such that it can be disproven if it happens to be false - then this hypothesis has simply been exceeded. For example, it has typically been suspended for both metaphysics and cosmology. What follows is on much firmer ground; being verified by logic, it would otherwise have been ruled out by logic. Don't waste time (mine, yours or the group's) by doubting or criticizing it on any lesser basis.
Hunger for the Unusual: Allotriophagy, Pica (HUNGER, unusual) These words are synonyms.
35. Blind: Stag :: Tiresias: Actaeon (STAG, changed to)
36. River: Fluvial :: Rain: Pluvial (RAIN, part.)
37. Country: City:: Tariff: Octroi (TAX, kind)
38. $/Dollar. Logogram :: 3, 5, 14, 20/Cent Cryptogram (CODE)
39. Lung Capacity: Spirometer
Arterial Pressure: Sphygmomanometer (PULSE, measurer)
40. Gold: Ductile :: Ceramic: Fictile (CLAY, made of)
41. 7: 8 :: Uranium: Neptunium (ELEMENT, chemical)
42. Judaism: Messiah:: Islam: Mandi (MOHAMMEDAN, messiah)
43. Sight: Amaurosis :: Smell: Anosmia, Anospluesia (SMELL, loss)
These words are synonyms.
44. Oceans: Cousteau :: Close Encounters of the Third Kind: Spielburg, Truffaut
Steven Spielburg was the person most responsible for the movie; Francois Truffaut was a French person appearing in the movie.
45. Diamond/Kiinherlite: Perimorph
Fungus/Oak: Endophyte, Endoparasite (PARASITE, plant)
An endoparasite is parasitic, while an endophyte may not be. Which answer is best depends upon the kind of fungus.
46. Compulsion to Pull One's Hair: Trichotillomania
Imagine Oneself Ma Beast: Zoanthropy, Lycanthropy
Neither word is exactly right: "zoanthropy" means imagining oneself to be an animal, while "lycanthropy" means imagining oneself to be a wolf.
47. Cross: Neutralism :: Hexagram: Zionism (ISRAEL, doctrine)
48. Wing: Tail:: Fuselage: Empennage, Engines, Waist? (TAIL, kind)
"Empennage" means the tail assembly of an aircraft, which is more a synonym for "tail" than "wing" is for "fuselage." The four primary forces on an airplane are: lift from the wings, negative lift from the tail, drag from the fuselage, and thrust from the engines. The narrow part at the end of the fuselage is called the "waist."
49. Bell: Loud:: Speak: Hear?
The Sanskrit root of "bell" means "he talks" or "be speaks"; the Sanskrit root of "loud" means "he hears".
50. Benevolence: Beg :: Philanthropist Mendicant, Mendicate?
If the analogy is attribute: attribute:: noun: noun, the answer is "mendicant"; if the analogy is noun: verb :: noun: verb the answer is "mendicate."
51. 10: Decimal:: 20: Vigesimal (TWENTY, pert.)
52. Five-sided Polyhedron: Pentahedron ::
Faces of Parallelepiped Bounded by a Square: ?
Does this mean a parallelepiped all of whose faces are bounded by a square (and what does "bounded" mean), or does it mean all six parallelograms that form the faces of a parallelepiped drawn in a plane inside of a square?
53. Motor: Helicopter :: Airflow: Autogiro (HELICOPTER)
54. Man: Ant :: Barter: Trophallaxis
55. United States: Soviet Union :: Cubism: ? (ART, style)
If the emphasis is on opposition and collapse, there were several movements that opposed Cubism and that died out (e.g., Parisian, Suprematism, Constructivism). If the emphasis is on freedom of perspective versus constraint, there were several movements that emphasized exact conformance with nature (e.g., Naturalism, Realism,

So here are the 12 new problems:
23. Space: Hyperspace :: Vector: ?
24. Image: Idea :: Hallucination: ?
25. Wind: Rain :: Typhoon: ?
26. Inward: Outward:: Infection: ?
27. Column: Row :: File: ?
28. Humbug: Bach :: Seek: ?
29. 38: Pyongyang :: 49: ?
30. Often: Factor:: Of magnitude: ?
31. Say: Hear :: Imply: ?
32. 2.54: Inch :: 3.26: ?
33. A, AB, B, BO, O :: BO :: A, C, E, G, T: ?
34. Eggs: Grading :: Wounded: ?

In the next issue, we will present the spatial questions selected from Ron's tests, as well as all the other questions that will no doubt begin pouring in from the members who have been inspired by Ron's generosity.
On the whole, I think the membership's sieve did pretty well. While I don't have any really numerical questions that remain. So, if you can, please surprise me.

It is interesting to note how well Haus crossword puzzle dictionary does on this test. I think this is mostly because it's hard to make all those words fit together!

It is important for the test takers to understand that the problems are not amenable to exhaustive reference work or tedious calculation. Otherwise, they will abandon the test as too time consuming. This explains, I think, the sharp drop off in takers between the Mega and Titan Tests. I think the audience of potential test takers was "burned out" by the Mega Test. With the Ultra Test, I hope to reinvigorate that audience as well as attract a whole new audience. There are many people who could qualify for the Mega Society if we could just get them to take the damn test!

In order to get a test published anywhere, it will have to be normed. This means it will have to be tried by a sample population. The only sample population readily available is the readership of Ron's journals. Ron and I would like to publish the Ultra Test in the September issue of Ron's journals. This will give us adequate time to collect and norm answers by early next year. Therefore, this is the deadline: all candidate problems for the Ultra Test must be received by September 1. So, please start thinking of "aha!" type verbal and math problems and submit them.

Ron picked the 41 most discriminating verbal analogy problems from his trial tests. Ron calculates the percentage of high scorers who correctly answer a question and subtracts from this the percentage of low scorers who answer correctly. Thus, easy problems and hard problems have a low discrimination value. I further culled this list of 41 problems down to the following 12. The criteria I used are these:

1. Avoid reference exercises.
   Example: Short: Long :: Sickle: Scythe
   Example: Skull: Phrenology :: Face: Physiognomy
   Example: Enlightenment: Illuminati :: Knowledge: Cognoscente
   Example: Far: Near :: Stratosphere: Atmosphere

If the definition of the word is obvious from the analogy, but the word is obscure, the problem becomes a matter of searching reference material. This is not a test of intelligence; it is a test of who has the biggest thesaurus. I encourage all members to obtain a copy of Herbert M. Baat's 'Master Crossword Puzzle Dictionary.' This book is the standard reference book of the National Puzzlers League and was able to answer 80% of the Quest Test. Barnes and Noble recently stocked up on these and sells them for $15. You can also order one from their 800 number.

2. Avoid idioms.
   Example: Once: Twice :: Bitten: Sly
   Example: Penny: Thrift :: Pinch: Spend
   Example: Focus: Hocus :: Pokery: Jiggery

Idioms are not familiar to people for whom English is a second language. Native English speakers are a minority of the world's population. We should strive for a test that has a wider audience.

3. Avoid mythology and religion.
   Example: Strong: Herculean :: Polyphemous: Protean
   Example: One-eyed: Cyclops :: Two-faced: Janus
   Example: Tom: Harry :: Gold: Myrrh

We should expect Chinese speakers of English to know as much Western mythology as we know Chinese mythology. I know next to nothing about Chinese mythology. By the way, lest anyone think this is an overly harsh criterion, did you know that there are more students of English in China than there are speakers of English in the US?

4. Avoid word play.
   Example: Sophisticated: Wised :: Wrinkled: Wizened
   Example: Scene: Picturesque :: Roughish: Picturesque
   Example: Hairpiece: Wig :: Party: Whig
   Example: Amphibian: Salamander :: Political district: Gerrymander
   Example: Split apart: Cleave :: Stick together: Cleave

A play on words is biased toward native English speakers.

5. Avoid quotations, titles, etc..
   Example: Coals: Newcastle :: Rough Beast: Bethlehem
   Example: Tall, Dark: Handsome :: Nasty, Brutish: Short
1. Avoid reference exercises.

If the definition of the word is obvious from the analogy, but the word is obscure, the problem becomes a matter of searching reference material. This is not a test of intelligence; it is a test of who has the biggest thesaurus. I encourage all members to obtain a copy of Herbert M. Baus' *Master Crossword Puzzle Dictionary*. This book is the standard reference book of the National Puzzlers League and was able to answer 80% of the Quest Test. Barnes and Noble recently stocked up on these and sells them for $15. You can also order one from their 800 number.

2. Avoid idioms.

Idioms are not familiar to people for whom English is a second language. Native English speakers are a minority of the world's population. We should strive for a test that has a wider audience.

3. Avoid mythology and religion.

We should expect Chinese speakers of English to know as much Western mythology as we know Chinese mythology. I know next to nothing about Chinese mythology. By the way, lest anyone think this is an overly harsh criterion, did you know that there are more students of English in China than there are speakers of English in the US?

4. Avoid word play.

A play on words is biased toward native English speakers.
5. Avoid quotations, titles, etc.

Again, these are culturally biased.

6. Avoid "A: synonym of A :: B: ?" or "A: B :: synonym of A: ?."

This is a catch-all criterion, meant to include analogies that do not fall into any of the above categories exactly, but which still are not so much analogies as they are definitions. The relation of synonymy is not a good basis for an analogy.

So here are the 12 new problems:

23. Space: Hyperspace :: Vector: ?
24. Image: Idea :: Hallucination: ?
25. Wind: Rain :: Typhoon: ?
26. Inward: Outward :: Infection: ?
27. Column: Row :: File: ?
28. Humbug: Bach :: Seek: ?
29. 38: Pyongyang :: 49: ?
30. Of ten: Factor :: Of magnitude: ?
31. Say: Hear :: Imply: ?
32. 2.54: Inch :: 3.26: ?
33. A, AB, B, BO, O: BO :: A, C, E, G, T: ?
34. Eggs: Grading :: Wounded: ?

In the next issue, we will present the spatial questions selected from Ron's tests, as well as all the other questions that will no doubt begin pouring in from the members who have been inspired by Ron's generosity.
International Dictionary.

3. Cook Food: Pressure Cooker :: Kill Germs: Autoclave (PRESSURE, cooker)
4. Water: Air :: Hydraulic: Pneumatic (AIR, pert.)
5. Prediction: Dirac :: Proof: Anderson (POSITRON, discoverer)
6. Raised: Sunken :: Canoe: Intilgo (GEM, carved)
7. 1: 14 :: Pound: Stone (ENGLAND, weight)
8. Malay: Amok :: Eskimo Women: Pilikto (ESKIMO, hysteria)
9. Sexual Intercourse: A Virgin :: Bearing Children: A Nullipara
11. Guitar: Cello :: Segovia: Casals (SPAIN, cellist)
12. Bars: Leaves :: Eagle: Stars (INSIGNIA)
13. Roll: Aileron :: Yaw: Rudder (AIRCRAFT, part)
14. 100: Century :: 10,000: Banzai? (NUMBER)
15. Surface: Figure :: Mobs: Klein
16. Logic: Philosophy :: To Know Without Cautious Reasoning: Thesosophy (MYSTICISM)
17. Alive: Parasite :: Dead: Saprophyte (SCAVENGER)
18. Sea: Land :: Strait: Isthmus (CONNECTION)
19. Moses: Fluvial :: Noah: Diluvial (FLOOD, pert.)
20. Remnant: Whole :: Meteorite: Meteoroid? (METEOR)
21. Opossum, Kangaroo, Wombat: Marsupial::
22. Twain/Clemens: Allonym :: White Home/Resident: Metonym (FIGURE, of speech)
23. Sculptor: Judolca :: Fine: Martial (SELF, -defense)
24. Dependent: Independent:: Plankton: Nekton (ANIMAL, free-swimming)
25. Malaysia: Amok :: Eskimo: Pilikto (ESKIMO, hysteria)
26. Luminous Flux: Lumen:: Sound Absorption: Sabin (SOUND, absorption unit)
27. 2: 3:: He: Li (ELEMENT)
29. Spider Arachnoidism :: Snake: Ophidism, Ophidiasis, Ophiotoxemia
30. Epigram: Anthology
31. Pathogen: Thermometer :: Lethal Wave: Dosimeter? (X-RAY, measurement)
32. Russia: Balalaika :: India: Sitar, Sarod (INDIA, musical instrument)
33. Involuntary: Sternotomy :: Voluntary: Expectorant, Sialagogue? (SPIT)
34. Epigram: Anthology

Some Miscellaneous Implications of CTMU Structure

It occurs to me on the basis of my experience with the group that I can't rationally gambles on its ability or inclination to track all the major implications of previous mathematical descriptions of the CTMU as given in Noesis. Accordingly, I offer the following remarks. If you're able to understand them, then you'll know what you have to do in order to come up with an "original" (but incorrect) theory about the matters on which they bear (the cosmic redshift, the Big Bang and "Big Crunch", quantum duality, nonlocality and collapse, evolution and morphogenesis, etc.). If you aren't, then your claim of originality for any duplicated history theory will be "excusable" only on grounds of unregenerate ignorance. Still another caveat may be necessary. If something is true on logical grounds, then any counterintuitive aspects it may exhibit are secondary. They don't "invalidate" it; they don't resolve in ways determined by it. If this seems to violate the Popper criterion for scientific theories - which states in essence that to be called "scientific", a theory must be formulated such that it can be disproven if it happens to be false - then this criterion has simply been exceeded. For example, it has typically been suspended for both metaphysics and cosmology. What follows is on much firmer ground; being verified by logic, it would otherwise have been ruled out by logic. Don't waste time (mine, yours or the group's) by doubting or criticizing it on any lesser basis. The triality attribute of the STO (space-time-object) holor which defines the CTMU empyrean Π (see Noesis 47, 71 and 76) predicates the perspectival interchangeability of these three terms relative to the human subjective cognitive syntaxis (HSCS). As space and time are relativistically inseparable, STO duality. With allowance for the oscillatory nature of quantum source-dynamics, this explains the so-called wave-particle duality principle of quantum theory: "wavepackets" of oscillating spacetime are just HSCS re-nondeterministic re-deterministic objects. In the CTMU, it's just that simple: quantum duality devolves to a mathematical principle, reflecting the CTMU equation of (objective) physics and (subjective) mathematics through the universal empyreonic (transductive-syntactical) identity. The quantum transducer, by definition, is the remains of a meteoroid after it has partially burnt up in the atmosphere. The original meteorite may have come from an asteroid, comet, dust cloud, dark matter, supernova, interstellar collision or other sources as yet unknown.

A better word would be an agent that tends to cause snorning or exsufflation, which is the voluntary, rapid expulsion of air from the lungs.

A Unusual Hunger: Bolivia ::

It is through the
universal inductively-stratified identity operator of “trialistic” empyreonic algebra that quanta must be interpreted, and by virtue of which they exhibit “quantum duality”.

SUMMARY: THE CTMU EXPLAINS QUANTUM WAVE-PARTICLE DUALITY IN A WAY RELATING IT TO PHYSICAL DYNAMICS AND ALGORITHMIC RECURSION.

The metaphysical transductive algebra, or empyreon, is described by a relevancy relation R* which is the combinatorial expansion of a base-relation R (where R is the “inductively completed” physical universe). I.e., R* contains all possible abstract relations on R, including all possible spatiotemporal evolutions of R with respect to any vantage in spacetime. R and R* are closed, or reflexive. As R* is identified by definition with the distributed empyreonic identity, it distributes temporally as a reflexive identity operator which, like the empyreon itself, is inductively stratified. On the physical level, the most general form of this relation expresses the closure of physical spacetime. This is logically equivalent to what cosmologists describe as the “primal singularity” (where a singularity is a telic state devoid of U*-apparent differentiative information, U, a cognitive class). The associated “big bang” and “big crunch”, both identically distributed over physical reality as opposing, mutually cancellative “directions of time”, are understood to mark only the distributed, closively-identified extremities of R* and not any “pre-existing” R-irrelevant steady-state background.

The “completion” of R is possible only within deterministic parameters; R and R* are nondeterministically open relative to physical cognition at any given spacetime location. R* thus regresses, through levels of potential dependency, to an infinite-valued parallelism relative to the local SCS-relativized perception of R. This closure-internalized parallel limit of R* is defined as telic. Telesis is self-restricting relative to any two-valued subsystem through active-telic feedback; conversely, telesis not involved in restrictive feedback is irrelevant to the two-valued subsystem in question. This is why R* is called the “dualizing parallel universe” R. Telic “feedback loops”, including those interpreted as quantum waves, are just temporal images of the closed topology of R*, and so conform specifically to the global empyreonic identity operator.

In the absence of any possible informational distinction between them, spacetime and invariance are literally equated by the CTMU. In other words, spacetime is seen as provisionally identical to the nomological invariants governing its structure. This implies that time, being described by an essentially substitutive nomology, involves a form of “spatial substitution” identifiable with quantum wavefunction collapse. I.e., matter continually “shrinks and collapses” within a “spatial image” of its former self. From a metrically-invariant viewpoint, this shrinkage appears as spatial expansion, which then gives rise to a cosmic redshift. Physically interacting systems stabilize the relative distances and velocities of their components by virtue of physical proximity. To whatever extent the global metatransductive syntax computes them “from without”, they display metric-al stability. But where it computes them “from within”, they are cosmologically diffuse and therefore “expansive” from the physical viewpoint.

Once we invoke the universal quantifier over reality in order to theorize about cosmology, it becomes a logical holor to which all informational metrization is internal. This implies, as stated in the above paragraph, that “spatial expansion” dualizes as a reciprocal collapse of matter. This, of course, is the 2VL (2-val-
Everyone is familiar with the political side of Walt Kelly's comics. But where in "Pogo" can you find animals boasting about being good to eat? Pogo asserting that his uncle, also a possum, was Porky Pine's father? Pogo behaving as if intoxicated? A little turtle saying that the soup tastes good because it was made from him? Pogo eating a bar of soap? Churchy implying that Howland is gay? Albert the Alligator protecting Pogo and others while admitting that he wants to eat them? Churchy, a turtle, bragging that his grandfather was a cat? Pogo behaving as if intoxicated? A little turtle saying that the soup tastes good because it was made from him? Pogo eating a bar of soap? Churchy implying that Howland is gay? Albert the Alligator protecting Pogo and others while admitting that he wants to eat them? Churchy, a turtle, bragging that his grandfather was a cat?

These and many other outrageous gags are to be found in Kelly’s comic books—the forgotten portion of his work—which were not political and require quite another kind of analysis, such as this book provides.

"The brilliance of Norman Hale’s far-reaching monograph on nature, naturalism, leadership, philosophy, ethics, politics, and morality in the early Pogo comics is in his fearless treatment of these issues."

From the introduction by Mark Burstein,
Series editor of “The Complete Pogo Comics” and author of “Much Ado The Pogolenoke Trivia Book”

In this unique, non-political perspective upon Walt Kelly’s Pogo comics, Norman F. Hale, contributor to Another Rainbow's Little Lulu Library, focuses upon the Dell comic books which were the medium of Pogo's earliest appearance. He sees the behavior of Kelly’s animals as the way people would behave if guided more by nature and instinct instead of man-made custom. He analyzes the characters’ casual attitudes about eating each other; the way morality and leadership develop among them; their frequent lapses into nonsense or fantasy; the occasional bawdy aspects of their behavior; and their relationships and feelings toward each other, based on a delicate balance between instinct and intelligence, between morality and logic, between fantasy and truth.

"Walt Kelly's place in American culture has not been clearly defined, but Hale's study goes a long way towards helping us understand his contributions to American thought."

Professor M. Thomas Inge, Randolph-Macon College
Author of "Comics as Culture"

illustrated with 128 panels of Kelly’s art from the comic books, most of them never before reprinted.

Just $9.95, including postage! Send check, money order, MasterCard or VISA information (card number and expiration date) to:
Thinker's Books, 70-A Greenwich Avenue, Suite 433, New York, NY 10011
a "channel" for the "instantaneous transmission" of spin correlation. Space itself, through its literal identification with invariants like that of spin conservation, can convey such information instantaneously yet locally (i.e., consistently with Einstein locality; the \( \Gamma \)-deterministic invariance and maximality of lightspeed quantifies the rate of \( \Gamma \)-metacognition). Thus, what seems like "empty space" consists of the vacated shells of past events and retains the same transmissive characteristics as the original events with respect to quantum-holoric information. A set of holor-correlated merates collapses "within" the image of their interaction. This image, having been "pointlike", retains "pointlike" ability to convey instantaneous dependency among its "parts". It is as though this dependence exists "linearly" as "completed, already existing" timelike arborization which regresses from each merate to the point of interaction in spacetime and through the "past" interactive event itself, there connecting with the other merate-trajectories. Since this arborization is already completed, it acts as an "open channel" without temporal resistance, i.e., without answerability to the locality principle which governs the flow of physical time from past to future. The voluminary spatial expansion of the event is just the \( \Gamma \)-nondeterministic ad/propter hoc version of this post hoc (and therefore deterministic) linearization of the conserved quantum attribute. To put it in an even simpler way, space need not "transmit" information when it is the information to be "transmitted". Every part of space reflects the distributed empyreonic identity; it is the pastwise-determinate part of this identity which transduces the information. The only information for which nonlocal transduction is irrelevant is that reflecting physical independence of its merates. \( \Gamma \)-space is thus an artifact of hological quantum entanglement in \( \Gamma \)-nondeterministic spacetime, or a projection of the empyreonic identity. Looking backwards through time, it consists chiefly of unused, symmetrically distributed action-potential in a \( U_1 \)-parallel, pointwise-independent nonologically-programmed relativistic computation. This parallelized independence is enforced by the locality principle (\( c \)-invariance/maximality), which thus functions as it does in Special Relativity — as a "partitioner" of space and time... i.e., of the spacetime holor.

**SUMMARY:** THE CTMU DEFINES SPACE AND TIME IN TERMS OF COSMOLOGICAL CLOSURE IN SUCH A WAY AS TO SIMULTANEOUSLY EXPLAIN BOTH QUANTUM NONLOCALITY AND QUANTUM WAVEFUNCTION COLLAPSE.

This explanation also serves other purposes. E.g., it transforms so-called "empty space" to a set of overlapping informational fields like those used to explain certain aspects of biological morphogenesis and evolution. The partial inaccessibility of such information to physical transductive syntaxes requires merely that the overall physical syntax exceed them in scope, which is indeed a CTMU verity. Information transmitted "nonlocally" by means of this mechanism must be forwardly nondeterministic and must impinge on nondeterministic receptors; otherwise, it is dominated by \( \Gamma \)-deterministic physical invariants. Thus, this explanation in no way crosses or attempts to supplant the gradualistic and complexity-theoretic aspects of growth and evolution, but follows from the very model on which their own logical consistency depends.

**SUMMARY:** THE CTMU INCLUDES AN EXPLANATION FOR "NODETERMINISTIC" ASPECTS OF BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES. THE SAME MECHANISM SUFFICES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL PROCESSES (including, to the extent of its validity, the Jung-Pauli "synchronicity" concept).

Let us now return to the relevancy relations \( R, R^* \). \( R^* \) is an induc-
Greetings Fellow Intellectuals:

We, the members of Thinkers Consulting, are tired of being equated with others, who can barely read, just because their "credentials" are equal, or even superior, to ours. We are tired of having credentials considered more valuable than intelligence and knowledge. We are tired of finding that, whatever we say, there's somebody with a Ph.D. who says the opposite.

We are tired of being told that making a living in this society is a matter of "playing the game," and of going through the motions," and of "telling people what they want to hear," and of "getting paid to show up," and of everything else except having something in your head.

We are tired of watching others get paid $100,000 a year because they do those things, rather than because they know anything, because they "earned" their credentials and their titles, rather than because they know a preposition from a verb, because they're "well-rounded" rather than because they know a cosine from a logarithm, because they have "discipline" rather than any desire to do anything right, because they know nothing, because they "earned" their credentials and their titles, rather than because they know anything, because they "earned" their credentials and their titles, rather than because they know anything.

We are tired of being told-twice!--that Mr. Smith has decided that they're five. We are tired of being told that you have to be a phony to make money, and that you can't make a living if you're for real.

We are tired of being told "If you want your degree/ paycheck/promotion, just do what you have to do in order to get it," and invariably finding that you "have to do" is behave like a mindless vegetable.

Our standards will be super-high, "perfectionist" standards, and we will not lower them for anybody. They may get a Ph.D., but they can't get our certificate. And that's why our certificate will mean more than a Ph.D.--to those who really need an expert on algebra.

We are interested in quality, not quantity. We believe in high standards, and we will not compromise. Prospective clients will be guaranteed correctness-in grammar, in math, or in whatever the subject is. In return, they will have to promise--in a written contract--that they will let us work up to our standards of excellence. Before the contract is signed, the member and the client will agree upon a fee, part of which will go to the organization.

SUMMARY: THE UNIVERSE IS ESSENTIALLY LOGICAL, AND SO ULTIMATELY
CONSISTENT within the paradoxiform basis of logic itself. PERIOD. Other. "HLMS-nonlogical" realities may somewhere exist, but they are utterly irrelevant to physical reality or any metaphysical extension of it, and cannot be included in any theory thereof. Anyone still feel cheated of "interesting results"? If so, here's a few more for you.

MATHEMATICS AND REALITY ARE AUTOMATICALLY IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE CTMU (MIND = REALITY) EQUATION. The recent spate of soul-searching over the "inexplainable way" that logic and mathematics "somehow happen to be so well" is surprisingly similar to what happens in the world. No differentiative information can ever possibly exist between them in terms of which to formulate such a "reason." The CTMU empyrean treats mathematics as the HSCG-embodied inductively limited "math of physics". The only thing separating them are taut restriction and interpretative qualia.

DUE TO THE SAME EQUATION, THE UNIVERSE IS A GENERALIZED FORM OF INTELLIGENCE. Therefore, any test which purports infallibly to measure intelligence is being implicitly identified or associated with a valid theory of global reality. The only person currently qualified to do that is...well, let's just say you haven't intentionally taken any IQ tests by him. You might be in a self-congratulatory mode over your high IQ test scores. But things aren't quite that simple. Some of you are doubtless very smart, but no amount of intelligence entitles you to ignore truth.

DUE AGAIN TO THE SAME EQUATION, THE IDENTITY OF THE UNIVERSE IS A GENERALIZED MENTAL STRUCTURE WHICH, FOR WANT OF A MORE FAMILIAR TERM, MAY BE CALLED "GOD". You can, of course, argue about the name, if it is needed, rather merely at the inner or physical level. But you can't argue about the structure or its functionality, at least logically. "God" sometimes seems to "ignore" you (and those who suffer "needlessly") because that is the price for free will, a basic aspect of teleology. It gets to me too, frequently. But that, as they say in any university, is a basic aspect of teleology. In any case, since your judgment and comprehension with which CTMU ideas have thus far been met by this group. Blessed are those who suffer for teleology, for they pay its price in the name of all who benefit from it.

Incidentally: if any of you has your own theory involving these phenomena, I hope you understand that you need to interpret them in some coherent mathematical model for your theory to be worth anything. For instance, I had to invent transductive algebra and discover the various concepts and principles which allow it to be physically interpreted in the given ways. Do anything less than that, and you're merely speculating about already-known phenomena without making their relationship any more exact or complete than it already is. You happen to know that you need transductive algebra, and thus the CTMU, to do this. So if all of this has been some kind of "race", I won it a long time ago.

Also, there has been some talk in the past of the necessity for "interesting results" before a theory becomes acceptable. That's

Dear Rick: I'm not sure when my subscription expires. Here's $10 for a 6-month extension past that date, whatever it may be.

By now, you're aware that I reacted negatively to your remarks on my letter to you in Noesis 76. That's only natural: when someone takes a shot at your energy to explain such clearly and competently dry, his reservoir of patience goes dry as well. You must have expected it sooner or later.

Ever since you became editor pro tem of the journal, your remarks concerned have been reductions of the many objections you possess a theory that intersects with the CTMU. Chris Cole confirms that you do indeed claim to have a theory of your own. Since you've been basing editorial comments on it for two solid years, there must be enough of it to describe. In any case, since your judgment and comprehension with which CTMU ideas have thus far been met by this group. Blessed are those who suffer for teleology, for they pay its price in the name of all who benefit from it.

I know that Ron wrote the admissions test and that you're a few more for you.

In any case, since your judgment and comprehension with which CTMU ideas have thus far been met by this group. Blessed are those who suffer for teleology, for they pay its price in the name of all who benefit from it.

Dear Rick: I'm not sure when my subscription expires. Here's $10 for a 6-month extension past that date, whatever it may be.

By now, you're aware that I reacted negatively to your remarks on my letter to you in Noesis 76. That's only natural: when someone takes a shot at your energy to explain such clearly and competently dry, his reservoir of patience goes dry as well. You must have expected it sooner or later.

Ever since you became editor pro tem of the journal, your remarks concerned have been reductions of the many objections you possess a theory that intersects with the CTMU. Chris Cole confirms that you do indeed claim to have a theory of your own. Since you've been basing editorial comments on it for two solid years, there must be enough of it to describe. In any case, since your judgment and comprehension with which CTMU ideas have thus far been met by this group. Blessed are those who suffer for teleology, for they pay its price in the name of all who benefit from it.

I know that Ron wrote the admissions test and that you're a few more for you.
Langan believes that a good editor would understand the material printed in Noesis. With me as editor, you are not getting that. I give the material what I presume to be more attention than does the average reader, but I don't study the material as if I'm going to be tested on it.

Because I used to write questions for a satirical game show, and because I used to own every single issue of Mad magazine (and 15 of 24 issues of its precursor, Mad comics), I feel that my role as editor is to make gentle fun of the contents of Noesis and to make embarrassing personal admissions. As you've noticed, even lame humor is rare in IQ journals. I haven't felt obligated to become more knowledgeable to be a better editor.

I don't have the background or the focused attention to fairly evaluate Langan's theory. He raises some peripheral issues I feel comfortable talking about, and I don't feel bad joking about the idea of an all-encompassing cosmology. Such a theory would have to contain its own punch line, and as Krazy Kat says, "A cat can look at a king."

In Noesis, there's lots of stuff, some good, some not-so-good, which I don't understand. Part of this is my fault, part of it is the fault of the material. If you agree with Langan that my lack of understanding is a serious shortcoming, let me know.

quite true, as long as you know how to define "interesting." For example, mathematical structures and relationships are interesting when they have been conspicuously absent in the past. Were you to attempt specific numerical calculations of physical quantities without first specifying those relationships, your calculations would inspire no confidence whether they happen to "work" or not. That has been the problem with relativity theory and quantum mechanics: they're great at producing numbers, but poor at establishing theoretical relationships broad enough to include each other. What has been missed and lamented by the scientific community is an overarching model which is both valid and of sufficient scope to unify GR, QM, and the other theories which play a part in describing reality. That is what makes the CTMU "interesting", and anyone who hasn't noticed, even lame humor is rare in IQ journals. I haven't felt obligated to become more knowledgeable to be a better editor.

I don't have the background or the focused attention to fairly evaluate Langan's theory. He raises some peripheral issues I feel comfortable talking about, and I don't feel bad joking about the idea of an all-encompassing cosmology. Such a theory would have to contain its own punch line, and as Krazy Kat says, "A cat can look at a king."

In Noesis, there's lots of stuff, some good, some not-so-good, which I don't understand. Part of this is my fault, part of it is the fault of the material. If you agree with Langan that my lack of understanding is a serious shortcoming, let me know.
either stand up on your hind legs and identify yourselves, or I have no choice but to treat you with the disregard your timidity deserves, and insist that the editor do the same. Spiro T. Agnew's "silent majority" routine only works when there exists some indication of what the "silent majority" really thinks. These are the days you day as Mega members. Logical criticism I can handle. Sneaky little political rat-races I can't. Ron wanted to find geniuses; huts off to him. Now, the dance being well underway, it is time to pass the hat and pay the band. Most of you have had since January 1990 to get your excuses ready. Kindly present them, or take your medicine. En passant...

Rick - just where do your "huge number of nonsingular states" hide prior to realization? In the CTMU, they exist as telesis. Telesis has a dual nature, being at once singular and variegated depending on accidental vantage, and its r-cosmogenesis. Why is it called multiplex unity, or MU? Sound familiar? Reread Noesis 71. As far as the probabilistic aspects are concerned, all problems disappear once you realize that probability and information are relativized to transductive syntax; (b) so is physical reality and the big bang itself. The "improbable" 0-information singularity of the cosmic identity-syntaxis "before" r-cosmogenesis - in fact, before the collapsative occurrence of any quantum event - exists only relative to human (or r), cognition. But neither this, nor nor the r-generalization, even existed "prior to" r-cosmogenesis. So the r-singularity of the r-identity "was" not r-improbable. Get it? (but you won't be reading this, will you?) It's a CTMU refinement of the much-maligned Anthropic Principle known as the Telic Principle. If you have a different, nonisomorphic explanation (or several other members) would really love to hear it. And Kevin, may I comment on your clever critique of free will? You cite an example - a man with a neurological disorder - whose conscious "will" is "tricked" into fabricating a reason for an artificially stimulated act. The same kind of subliminal stimulus could (so they say) be used on a healthy subject. But either way, all we can say is that the natural order of things, in which conscious volition operates as usual, has been short-circuited. In CTMU terms, a telic feedback loop has been interrupted and transformed by means hidden to the subject's cognitive syntax, which is "programmed" such that it must try to "complete" the loop post hoc. One kind of telesis has merely been replaced by another. If one were to put a blindfolded man unknowingly on a treadmill and transport the whole apparatus to some destination, would his false belief that he had walked there prove that his legs are (in general) useless? It is the very nature of active telesis, and exercises of free will, to displace or absorb other telesises. You don't need to examine the neurally-impaired to evaluate free will when it has already been logically justified (as it was in Noesis 71).

The CTMU is a legally incorporated religion...a religion of logic and freedom. This world, for all of its glib technologies and pious, politically correct hypocrisies, is mortally ill. To cure it, we must transcend our past and our present. To aid in this process, the CTMU replaces faith, a dying virtue, with a transcendental form of the resident language of human cognition, logic. If any of you freer, more logical souls would like to be a part of it, or would like more information on it, just write to me personally (I'm thinking about a newsletter at some point). I wouldn't be surprised if I don't hear from a single reader. But if I do, he or she will be warmly welcomed.