



"I have a full time—and I mean full time—repair business."

more as if your familiarity with a scene had been improved. It provides background but does very little to immerse you in the context because it fails to put you into someone else's memory, not yours, and it serves only weakly your power to anticipate the future course of present action. But flash-forward is another matter. It puts you right into the scene because it allows you anticipation as an observer, demanding self-reference in your observations and imposing upon you the onus of identification with the process of becoming of the plot.

Let's go back for a moment and look at the diagram Paul Ryan included at the bottom center of his first page; he did so without much explanation of it. There is shown on the left THE SUN as a real entity. On the right there is a statement made about it: "THE SUN IS SHINING". Above all there is the "LEKTON", a name given by the Stoics to that "thing in your head like the fist in your hand". The Lekton may be identified with a real, neurological event, but its importance to the diagram is that it relates the other two parts. Together they make a minimal triad.

Paul's diagram was mislabelled in one aspect, so please do not be confused by it. Consider it as Pierce did. He said that THE SUN has *firstness* because it simply is; the statement was made and so it exists and has *secondness*, but it also may be true or false and on that account it has *thirdness*; likewise the LEKTON is (something physically happens in your head) and it may be true or false when it happens, but it also relates the other two and so, in addition to firstness and secondness, it has *thirdness*.

Look at another aspect of the diagram. The direct relationship between THE SUN and the statement about it is a strictly true or false one, and so it is the kind of relatedness with which science mostly chooses to deal. It's clean.

However, the relation between THE SUN and the LEKTON is subject to disturbances due to the ambiguities of perception: I may or may not have seen the event correctly. My camera may have been out of focus, or misdirected, or whatever. The relation between the LEKTON (which is the "that-which-can-be-said") and my actual statement "THE SUN IS SHINING" is further subject to the ambiguities of language—or editing, or presentation. This makes the Lekton damnably hard to study. When challenged to come out and reveal itself, it puts up a self-referent defense: "I think the sun is shining". The statement is looped back through the mental processes of the person making it; through the Lekton itself. There are many necessary and artful dodges available to an elegant mind that wishes to present its thoughts triadically. One of them is statements by negation. Start listening and looking for them.

I say again to you: A loves B. What is the negation of that? Aristotle would only have settled for one: A does not love B. But would you believe that there are 11 more? You can negate the individual parts of the statement, or the whole thing, or parts first and then the whole thing, but it's often hard to see precisely the effect of the particular combination chosen. Generally, a statement of an intentional relation does not have a clear negation but the great variety of those available allow great complexity to be conveyed. Think on it: A loves someone other than B. It is not B whom A loves. It is not A who loves B. etc. . . . and none of these say quite the same thing. The process of becoming for A that is being described is a little different each time.

I can go into the local pizza joint and ask for a combination mushroom, pepper, and onion pizza and for my trouble of spelling out the details I am charged \$1.75 for a customized job. On the other hand, if I yell: "Calabrese and hold the tomato", I can have what I want for \$1.45. By naming the broader context in the cook's experience and then modifying it through negation, my intention becomes more clearly perceptible to him, and it is quite irrelevant to him that the fragments of what I want are separate elements in another context. Description by carefully constructing a hole into which will fit the things you intend may be much more "real" than trying to describe its old kind of positive, contextless specifics. The common confusion for the listener at negation were a non-specific attack, rather than a working definition of that which is to become.

Let me put it more usefully into your terms (at the risk of a bump on the head) by likening the use of video to what goes on in a newspaper. Pick up any reputable newspaper and do a brief experiment. By "reputable" I mean one that clearly separates reporting from editorial comment. Look at both kinds of writing. I can virtually guarantee that it will not take you long to convince yourself that good reportage never uses negation in stating the facts—while editorials abound with negative refinements of positive statements. The purpose of the editorial is to explore relations, while reporting is supposed to give the simple facts without imputing underlying relations to them.

Think of the ways in which you use statements by negation on videotape. Some might call it editing; some will say that you haven't given all the facts. Others might point out that you have to degrade the message in order to draw your audience into an involvement in fleshing it out for themselves. McLuhan would recommend cool statements: It's what you don't say that counts.

Finally, let's loop way back into Paul Ryan's Part I where he talked of Guerilla Warfare in general terms. It seems to me that guerilla action derives its power versus "the establishment and its cultural automatons" through its ability to shift the context of their encounters. That's what really throws someone off base: it's the power of the punchline in a joke. Establishment forces with their hierarchical chains of command from Johnson to Meadlo must necessarily operate in a context-free modality giving positive, unambiguous orders from the top down with consequences which never can loop back to the originator. And that's what makes them vulnerable. Guerilla action has the flexibility and the redundancy of potential command to make negative statements possible and thus cause its adversary to exhaust itself where it is not being attacked but might be. Alan Paton pointed out in "Too Late the Phalarope" that the jailer must watch all potential avenues of escape while the prisoner need only watch one.

A conventional pyramidal chain of command must maintain its ambiguity levels below a narrow, tolerable limit or risk confusion and disassociation of its parts; guerilla forces must maintain a high level of ambiguity and must engage constantly in energetic, strongly self-referent explorations of the contexts of action—with attentive relaxation of those members not in the line of fire.

Lastly, let me comfort Paul somewhat in his wondering on what to do about deception as a tool of guerilla warfare—since deception is despicable. Think about it. In a society educated not to accept any statement simpler than a triadic one, the notion of deception is meaningless. Deception can only work when you can speak with a forked tongue: when the context of your words can be different for different hearers. If, on the other hand, your communications media can provide a rich opportunity for contextual explorations of your metaphors of expression, you need have no fear of deceiving anyone who is skilled in the perceptive arts. He will stand with you in the context you intend.

Anyone foolish enough to accept diadic statements of "truth" deserves to be deceived.

You can contact Avery Johnson at Ecology Tool & Toy, Armory Road, Milford, N.H. 03055.

"Lekton" = That which can be said

