

October 11, 2008

Don McNeil  
P.O. Box 312  
Wyalusing, PA 18853  
570-746-1646

Phil Henshaw  
680 Ft. Washington Avenue - #1A  
New York, NY 10040

Dear Phil,

I hope that you and yours are OK. As some pundit wrote rather recently:

“The strength of the cybernation of the current order of things going on is also its weakness, driving it to a precipice of self-destruction.”

The bad news about your concerns and mine being vindicated by the current systemic collapse is that it buries us along with the miscreants. The only certainty is that things are far worse than reported and worse than anyone knows. Your exhortations must be better heard now than they were when everyone was fat and sassy. Were it not so consequential, it would be hilarious to watch officials scramble to maintain the unsustainable status quo, i.e., as they cybernate like crazy. It's pretty funny anyhow ... pinstriped deer in the headlights with Mumbles W., The Decider, leading the way. Whatever may or may not be salvaged from the deepening mess, the world is going to be a different place henceforth. It is all very sad, and some of the trouble was unnecessary. As Pogo said, “We is met the enemy and they is us.”

I was away from here in June and July and have only now begun to catch up with some of the matters which have preoccupied me for so long. I hope that the materials which I sent to you in May were not too irksome. Upon reflection those editorial comments and essays still have value to me, at least, along my way to clarifying some systemological thoughts and capturing some of them in “Going On ...” (updated copy enclosed). Sometime before or after the May letter I was reminded of the Bateson/Harries-Jones message that goes on are less logical than they are *ecological* (in the broadest and deepest sense). That idea suggests that our tendencies to hypermathematize and to over-formalize make less sense than they are said to. Together with a renewed appreciation of “enoughness,” its relevance seems greater than ever.

I have enjoyed some cordial but brief correspondences with Stan. He has grown dismissive of communication schemes other than email, so I should feel fortunate to have got responses from him at all. If he and I were in closer touch, however, we would probably quarrel over the role of cybernation, etc., so at this point in our lives I would prefer simply to be friendly and let other matters rest in peace.

My Canadian correspondent Peter Harries-Jones is presently the one and only reader of “Going On ...” and has tried to find applicability for parts of it with his contacts in the “biosemiotics” community. A few years ago he didn't get it at all; now he wants more. At least I lived long enough to see that small glimmer.

Best regards,  
Don