

Notes on the Pleasures of Neutrality

Because we have reached a point in the “progress” of our culture in which it is socially viable to suggest that we have reached a theoretical impasse, we have reached a theoretical impasse. It is impossible to “progress” beyond this notion, and any criticism of it, no matter how analytical, is a step backward. Those who do not understand this simple paradox will waste endless energies digging their tombs in the graveyards of art, politics and philosophy.

We know the truth. The truth has always been and will always be. It is unchanging. In a state of perpetual progression, the shadow of darkness which came with the industrial revolution is drawing back, forced away by the light of timeless rationality. The lies of the last two hundred years may have been attractive, but they are nothing compared to the lies of the last two centuries. Every illusion must pass through itself before becoming true. If, in this process, it is written down, it becomes true much more quickly.

Death is the spectacle of repression. The “image of death,” the darkness at the end of the tunnel, when reified by authority, is a much more efficient form of repression than the religious heaven/hell complex which came before. “Individuals” in the West realize that their lives are “meaningless,” and this “existential” realization drains from them the desire to do anything other than get it over as painlessly as possible. Naturally this precludes substantive rebellions and the constructions of new forms of “meaning.” The infinite potential of every second of tactile experience is given up for the apparently less difficult life of consumer-drone, the “meaningless” existence. But meaning is an abstraction created by and for the justifications of the current power structure, the reality of a living death.

The spectacular moment divides an illusionary past from a non-existent future. Our memories are ideologically organized by the “master-narrative” of power in order to give substance to the total compromise of the present. Each second spent remembering the past is a second which could have been used to construct the future. “Revolutionaries” frequently believe that revolution will take place when the master narrative is in the hands of the proletariat, but this is a load of crap. The destruction of the master narrative and the continuities it represents is the rightful demand of all those who demand the destruction of the master narrative and the continuities it represents.

The systematic extremism of this philosophy is not a cure for boredom. It is a reaction to the sadness of the “human condition” as market for general consumption by those human beings who stand to profit from the idea that we are living in a post-referential world, the “avant-garde” of literature, art and politics.

We know the truth. The truth has always been and will always be. It is unchanging.

Consciousness is the negation of tactile experience. When you see something, you cannot at the same time “imagine” it. This is because consciousness is a second order activity which acts as a parasite to experience, a caricatured re-creation of the physical world. This is the space between the repression inherent in memory and the freedom of oblivion in which ideology first materialized. We must do away with the

abstraction of consciousness if we are to heal the wound of separation between past and future which gave rise to capitalism.

Progress is inevitable, plagiarism implies it. The tautological is no more or less easily understood than anything else—it is simply what it is as opposed to being what it is not.

The current trend towards “demystification” in art, literature and politics is one of the most effective mystifications practiced by “marxists,” “feminists,” and other ideologists. Surely the rewriting of history is no more interesting in the final analysis than the banality of its construction in the first place.

We know. The truth doesn’t change. It has been around for a long time.

Why would Samuel Beckett go on writing long after having repeatedly articulated the non-validity of the role of author, and of writing itself? Perhaps his alcoholism caused him to mistakenly associate the death of creativity with physical death of the body and mind. In fact, nothing could have been further from the truth—the cessation of alienating over-production in intellectual labor (“creativity”) is the most alive act that human beings can engage in: the sum of all our desires and the realizations of all potentials. Throwing off creativity is the first step towards real equality between (wo)men and the destruction of time itself.

Ideology is not the only thing which makes life worth dying for. Other forces, such as perversity, laziness and “generally liking people,” while no more meaningful, make do equally well as revolutionary motivations. In the time previous to the implementation of these principles, it is our duty to make them appear as heroic and ideological as possible, so that those with a penchant for the ideological will also be attracted to our philosophy. This is called the “sales pitch.” The “trick” is to always seem to be contradicting yourself so as to attract those individuals who might find the ideological nature of your thinking unattractive.

“Post-modern” artists who hypocritically produce art which continues to condemn the role of the artist and suggests the non-viability of creativity should get the death penalty. After all, death should not frighten them as it is the ultimate illusion which supports the established order for whom they are the most effective publicity agents.

Meaning is a purely social phenomenon, and society is an unrealized project. The individual does not need a “truth referent,” but without one, the society would be only a series of individuals. The realization of the social project will take place with the redistribution of meaning, with the truth referent moving from the social to the personal. This act of communist revolution will be equal to the perfection of “meaning,” which will no longer function as a means of repression to be employed by one group of people on another, but will instead repress all individuals equally. What might be considered from our point of view to be a slight recontextualization will seem a drastic change in the human condition to those in the future who have “progressed” beyond the radical push through and cessation of all forms of creativity.

[SMILE]

Plagiarism is dead; nothing is permitted.

**REJECT
EXPLODE
EXPLORE
UNLEARN**

Stealing Back and Forth of Symbols

The divine right of kings was first invoked by secular interests combatting the authority of the theocrats. It held that God appointed the king, rather than the church authorities, to represent the secular interests of "the people." Later, when the church made peace with established monarchs, the church adopted the doctrine as its own. And subsequently the bourgeoisie repudiated the doctrine, in repudiating both monarch and state. It did so in the name of "rights." Among these "rights" was "freedom." And Marx in turn stole this bourgeois symbol for the proletariat. The stealing back and forth of symbols is the approved method whereby the Outs avoid being "driven into a corner."

Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History* (1937)

An Obituary for the False Opposition

With the utter demolition of Marxism-Leninism and the fading away of other false opposition movements (e.g., Maoism, Castroism, Trotskyism), the opportunity arises once again for humanity to liberate itself from the domination of capital. Clearly, the hysterical ravings of laughable figures like Bob Avakian, Gus Hall and all the apparatchniks of similar left-wing nut cults are addressed to a system and a world that has left them on the dung heap of history. They deserve their deluded followers, all of them.

Such a result should not surprise anyone even slightly familiar with these twisted ideologies. The entire grab-bag of leftist slogans and theoretical formulæ existed merely as a mask to hide more concentrated forms of domination by capital. Marxism-Leninism never ever wanted to liberate humanity from the talons of capital. Rather their project was to simply manage capital and institutionalize its most oppressive modes of control: work, ideological hegemony, hierarchy, organization, authority, ad nauseam. For this reason Marxism-Leninism can properly be called the loyal opposition of capitalism and the best friend capital ever had.

All previous false oppositions merely aped the pre-existing forms

of social organization they hoped to replace. Thus the Bolsheviks in attempting to engineer a humanitarian responsive government finally succeeded in producing a tyrannical state that even a Tsar could love. Marxism-Leninism prevents the discovery by humanity of new forms of social organization which could serve as the vehicle for its self-emancipation from the domination of capital and all its categories and constructs.

Significantly, the failure of the Left in some sense portends doom for capital itself. Without a necessary opposition with which to define itself, modern capital, the undisputed champion of the cold war, may well knock itself out (potentially taking us with it).

We must now begin to see the system which dominates us as the *ancien regime*; a corrupt, despotic, moribund and boring mode of social organization, that we not only have the right to destroy, but the obligation. For the first time in a century social insurrectionists have found themselves without a leader, without ideology, but with a burning desire to extirpate the *ancien regime* and realize utopia. And that, of course, is the beginning of the end.

—MAXIMALIST INTERNATIONAL, *The Social War*, №3

DEAR YAWN:

...Thanks for your...interesting ideas. Most of which I can follow really well. Only the way the rules are set are "not my cup of tea." And as things are really changing here who wants to be on strike? Maybe in the USA it's a different situation, but here it's definitely the thing not to do! ... Why be part of a small esoteric group, saying no where even your very "conservative neighbor" is making excursions and searching new ways?...

Kassel, Germany

YAWN agrees: It certainly is true that being part of a small esoteric group seems a rather effective way of accomplishing nothing at all.

So it makes one wonder what all the shouting is about. The last thing the Art Strike wants to do is "convince" others to join the strike and then sit on their hands! Doing nothing is in fact *obviated* by the Art Strike, which *is* a really, really bad idea. But it is important that it be as bad as it is. It forces a clarification of one's personal views on culture in part by being very difficult to ignore.

DEAR YAWN: ...A "subjective" update on the Art-strike, art-strike & refusal of creativity here: For awhile the idea was batting around that since people who engaged in art-strikes etc. here were in such a minority that their engagement was highly individualistic &

tended to promote the idea of individual difference & thus would do better to just do a little creativity. However, recently it has become clear that there are lots of isolated 'maverick' art-strikers around, who have taken it seriously & aren't doing anything in an intentional way. The relative 'invisibility' of these people is isomorphic to their whole situation. So art-striking is ok again. Baltimore, Maryland **YAWN** says: It's really curious how these things work, isn't it?

DEAR YAWN: ...Yeah I agree so many artists say I'm so open minded and there is nothing *but their open minds*....

Venice, Florida

Cultural Workers in Support of YAWN

ASAC (United Kingdom), BM Senior, London WC1N 3XX, England

Lang Thompson, P.O. Box 49604, Atlanta GA 30359

Plaster Cramp Press, P.O. Box 5975, Chicago IL 60680

The Drawing Legion, 1103 3rd St SE, Cedar Rapids IA 52401

Dialectical Immaterialism Press, P.O. Box 22142, Baltimore MD 21203

