

Interview with an Alchemist: “Bear: Owsley, LSD Chemist Extraordinaire In Conversation with Bruce Eisner

Owsley Stanley or “Bear” is a legendary figure with his roots going back to the 1960’s psychedelic movement. Timothy Leary, in his ‘Sixties anthology of essays, *Politics of Ecstasy* predicted, “The television folk heroes of today are the merry outlaws of the past. The Television Robinhoods of the future, the folk heroes of the twenty-first century, will be the psychedelic drug promoters, A.O.S. 3, acid king, LSD millionaire, test-tube Pancho Villa, is the best-known of a band of dedicated starry-eyed crusaders who outwitted the wicked, gun-totting federals and bravely turned on the land of the young and the free to the electronic harmony of the future.” A.O.S.3. was Leary’s acronymic code for the name that Bear was given at birth -- Augustus Owsley Stanley III.

No, the television program or movie hasn’t been made yet. But in Leary’s unique literary style, he was introducing us to the greatest LSD chemists who ever lived. Yet Owsley’s fame extends even further, because besides being the most venerable and celebrated of LSD chemists, Bear was also the soundman for the Grateful Dead during their early years and one of the key characters in Tom Wolfe’s best-selling *Electric Acid Kool-Aid Test* – which chronicles Bear’s history with Ken Kesey and the Merry Pranksters. There is also a lengthy description of his story in *Storming Heaven* --- Jay Stevens popular history of the psychedelic movement.

In 1997, I received an email from “out of the blue” by the one and only – “Bear” Owsley. He had read a 1977 article I had written called “LSD Purity: Cleanliness is Next to Godheadlines” (the *High Times* editor’s title, not mine) which I had first published in January 1977 and republished in the library section of Island Web (<http://www.island.org>) - the website of my non-profit educational organization Island Foundation.

Bear had read the article and had a few historical bones to pick with it. After a rapid exchange of email, Bear and I realized we were, in a certain sense, kindred spirits. I asked Owsley if he would do an interview with me for *Psychedelic Island Views* a publication of Island Foundation with a very limited circulation of about 4,000. Bear accepted.

The actual interview was conducted by telephone. Bear now lives with his second wife and children from that marriage on a homesteaded piece of land off the energy grid somewhere in Queensland, Australia. The interview carried on for over four and one-half hours and has been carefully edited and re-edited. The first portion of the interview was published in two installments in *Psychedelic Island Views*, with the last one appearing over a year ago. This is part three.

PART THREE.

B: In those days, the orientation was more toward that mystical experience. Today it's probably different, a lot of the kids don't even have that framework that people had back then, because there was an

intellectual tradition, people were writing books, The Beatles were singing about Magical Mystery Tour. There was a spiritual context for taking acid, and people shared information with each other about what to expect from the higher dosages.

O: I don't think so.

B: More so than now!

O: You think so? I don't know. I'm not out on the street anymore. But I did come across a very interesting program on television recently. I just tuned into the middle of it. It was about techno. Basically it was about the acid scene, the modern scene: the music, acid, ecstasy, etc. It was an in-depth. Some techno is very good, some of it's uninteresting to me, but some of it is so good, it's amazing. It's modern, complex, electronic music, and musicians usually do it in real time. So it's sort of like performances that resemble in some ways John Cage, Berlioz and Sobotnik. Real cutting edge, heavy duty. I've been thinking of trying to contact Phil Lesh about this, I was really impressed. It started in Goa.

B: With Goa Gil.

O: Yeah, it started in Goa, this whole thing.

B: That's what Goa Gil claims.

O: I don't doubt it. Some of the strangest parties I've been to here, and we're talking 13 years ago, I went to a party that people who had come from Goa were running, and it was full of the strangest, heaviest, most psychedelic music. I was stoned myself, so I tried to find out later what records they used. They showed me this box full of records. I said what did you play, he said man I don't know, and whatever I thought was good at the time! There was a lot of African stuff, techno stuff, an amazing mix, and all of it was good. I didn't connect the thing at all in those days. Until I saw the show the other night, I wasn't really that aware of the depth of the scene. It looked like early Grateful Dead, looked like the Acid Test. Images of parties and people dancing, and freaking to music. It's the same kind of stuff. It's Acid Test stuff. So if somebody tells me: "You were doing this then, but they're not doing that now", I'd just tell them, you might not be in contact with the scene, but that scene is very much alive.

B: A lot of these kids are taking ecstasy . . .

O: I think there's two branches. There's a branch that uses ecstasy and there's a branch that uses acid.

B: It started out with acid in the earliest days. The earliest acid house was in Ibiza in Spain back in 1987.

O: It moved to Ibiza from Goa, apparently, and from there on up into Germany, which is now practically the home of techno, from what I can tell.

B: In the early days, Goa Gil was playing Kraftwerk, and those kinds of groups. He was spinning DAT tapes, that's what he was doing.

O: I heard some incredible music on that TV show, I thought Jesus I'd like to get that, oh boy I'd like to get that, and then they didn't really explain the names of the groups they were playing.

B: We'll send you some tapes!

O: Thanks. The scene which runs on acid, I have no problems with that. I do have problems with the ecstasy scene, I have serious problems with that. I just don't think it's good stuff. I don't think any of the synthetics based on those multi-ring exotic oils are good. I think they're very bad and I think that you're creating a substance that the body has no way of dealing with because they don't occur in nature.

I actually read an article recently by someone who claimed that the body could actually "aminate", that is add the amine radical, to myristicin or saffrole and produce these compounds in your body. Now I know a bit about biochemistry, and as far as I know there is absolutely no way to aminate anything in the body. There are ways of de-aminating, in fact monoamine oxidase is used to de-amine compounds. It doesn't go the other way, that's like against the laws of entropy. You don't reduce compounds in your body to less oxidized forms, the body oxidizes things, it uses them as fuel, as building blocks (aminos), or it eliminates them.

B: Well, people could say the same thing about LSD, they could say there's sassafras and there's nutmeg in nature, and there is morning glories and ergot in nature, but you have to do the chemistry in order to make something that's effective.

O: No, that's not true. Ergot contains many natural, highly psychedelic alkaloids. Iso-ergine is one of them, hydroxy-methyl-lysergamide is another one, and in fact, is considered nearly identical to LSD in effect. Albert Hoffman told me so himself. They believe that it was this derivative contained in extracts of *C. paspalum* that was used in the Eleusian Mysteries.

B: It's true, they did a water salt solution.

O: I believe that they will find a plant which contains the exact diethylamide of lysergic acid in natural form. In alkaline alcoholic medium the isomers of the amines of lysergic acid will reach an equilibrium. This equilibrium will be a certain percentage of the iso compound, and a certain percentage of the normal compound. Of all the compounds listed experimentally by Hoffman, LSD has the highest ratio of active to inactive isomers in the equilibrated mixture, it runs 88-12. Of all the compounds, and it lists about 20 of them, it has the highest ratio of active to inactive. This means that nature favours the active form of LSD over the inactive by a considerable margin.

B: So you're saying that basically because there is not naturally occurring, I mean people supposedly get high . . .

O: Whether or not there is, you cannot say. With a planet that has literally hundreds of thousands of species of animals and plants yet to be discovered, you cannot definitively say that this compound

does not naturally occur. I mean, how long ago was it that they thought that ergot alkaloids only existed in various forms of fungus. When they discovered them in morning glory seeds, people thought there's got to be contamination in the laboratory, there's something wrong here. The fact of the matter is that there are probably hundreds of extremely powerful psychedelic plants that are just not yet known to modern science.

B: Most recently, *Salvia divinorum*, they finally found the active ingredient.

O: Oh, that's interesting. What was it?

B: I forget the chemical name of it, but there is a new book about it.

O: There's lots and lots of references, people use this ritually, but we couldn't find anything in it to extract it. It is good that it finally was isolated. Who knows, maybe the extraction process destroyed it or something. But to categorically state that LSD is only a synthetic compound, I don't agree. I believe that it's so close to nature that if it doesn't exist, it hardly requires much of a stretch of the chemical imagination to produce it. If you take a polycyclic ring compound with a unsaturated side chain, and combine that chemically with nitrogen to produce a compound that cannot be found anywhere in nature, and then introduce it into your body and it produces bizarre effects, you can't be too surprised. If somebody was trying to compare styrene compounds with phenethylamines, you can't really do that either, because styrene is a conjugated, unsaturated side chain attached to an aromatic ring. It's a totally different kind of compound than what we're talking about, which is a saturated side chain with a nitrogen on it. alpha-phenethylamine is a compound which occurs in nature. It's quite common, in fact, it occurs in the human body...

B: So you think that MDMA and MDA are too close to amphetamine, which is not naturally occurring

O: Not really, there are several amphetamine-like hormones in the body, the troublesome part is the double ring. The side chain is amphetamine. There's a phenethylamine version that's inactive. The only active phenethylamine that has psychic properties is mescaline. Most of these double-ring analogs, amphetamine analogs, were produced along a reasoning series based on amphetamine.

B: There's a lot of phenethylamine analogs, like for instance 2-CB or 2-CI, or DOET or DOI, which are phenethylamines which are psychologically active. Shulgin's book is full of those things.

O: He started looking at mescaline and all these things which have like branches. Very few of them originated with him. Most of them were already synthesised by someone, he searched them out, made up samples and experimented with them. He's a very experienced experimentalist with these unusual compounds and derivatives, always trying to see where it would take him. I don't know if I agree with all this. Mescaline's fine, I like mescaline fine.

B: He made escoline, and proscoline . . .

O: That's getting into a lot of other things that are not . . . There are 23 major psychoactive alkaloids found in peyote and San Pedro cactus, and the actual effects of the plant are probably as dependent upon these other ingredients, sort of like my trace elements, as they are upon mescaline itself. So a

peyote high is distinctively and perceptively different from one induced by mescaline sulfate. I don't dispute that there are many different kinds of things which will affect your nervous system, I'm just not in agreement with synthetics. I've experimented with a lot of these different things over a period of years, and I sat down one day and said, you know I'm just bugging myself up with this shit, and it's not taking me anywhere that I can't get with psilocybin, DMT, LSD, and mescaline. These are naturally occurring. They work. Your body has a "history" of experience with them. People have used them for thousands and thousands of generations, and we've adapted to them because they exist in nature, they're there for us to use, they're the planetary hormones that allow us to bring our consciousness forward to the next level. They've always been used this way.

It always seemed I went into more cosmic shit with acid, with very little visuals. Usually blurring, a bit of a paisley outline. If I was very quiet in a dark room and closed my eyes, I would get little arrowheads and things. Often I would see things that implied the pattern, and had much more fantastic and complex shapes to them. But I never found that acid was great at creating images out of nothing. It always seemed to just modify what you saw.

DMT, on the other hand I found, could create the most fantastic shit completely on its own. You would have no idea where it came from. I find that DMT and its relatives like psilocybin are extremely body-heavy. Boy, they're body-heavy! LSD is not very body-heavy. But mescaline is also body-heavy. LSD seems to be one of the most benign of all of the psychedelics in its body effects . . .

- B: It's interesting, I just interviewed Terence McKenna before you, and he claims he never got high on LSD, that he never hallucinated off of it.
- O: Well, I don't much any more either. After a long experience with highly psychedelic compounds, you don't get visual shit much anymore.
- B: Why do you think that is?
- O: I have no idea. The mind just does other things with it. Because the visual stuff that you see when you take LSD is actually noise. It's stuff that's there all the time that you ignore, that you've filtered out. It's the background noise of the organization of your visual system, both in the eye and in the brain. When you take acid, it opens up all the portals and deactivates the filters. The first thing that happens is you're overwhelmed by all the sensory stuff. We're very visual animals, so the visual stuff is very impressive to us. But after you become experienced with it, your mind says, oh yeah well that's pretty noise, but still it's noise.
- B: It gets used to it and . . .
- O: It goes to another level. After awhile you get to point where if you really want a highly visual trip, you've got really only one option: You have to use a solution, and you have to drop it directly into your eye. I guarantee, you will find all the visual stuff you ever saw on any trip you ever took, it will pop right back into your consciousness if you do it this way.
- B: Why do you think it is, because it's interacting with the retina?

O: The eye is an extension of the brain.

B: So it gets in there fast.

O: It goes directly onto the brain.

B: Couldn't you do that with a much higher dose of LSD?

O: It didn't seem to do it to me! I noticed only the eyedrops worked. I mean, after a long lay-off you'd get a little more of the visual, but it always seemed that I went into more cosmic shit with bigger amounts of acid and with very little visuals, usually only some blurring and a little bit of a paisley outline, if I was very quiet in a dark room and closed my eyes. Often I would see things that implied the patterns, and had much more interesting fantastic and complex shapes to them, but I've never found that acid was great at creating images out of nothing, it always seem to modify what you saw. DMT, on the other hand, I found often could create the most fantastic shit completely on its own, you had no idea where it came from. It would be like nothing in your past experience.

B: In the current psychedelic scene, which they've tried to rename the entheogen scene . . .

O: I'm a little uncomfortable with that . . .

B: Yeah, well their big emphasis is on DMT and ayahuasca, and ayahuasca analogs which use MAO inhibitors to catalyze 5-methoxy. What do you think about all that?

O: The 5-methoxy things don't seem to be the ones, it's the 4-methoxy ones that do it. It's not the bufotenine. I can't find a single writer who claims psychedelic results from taking or ingesting bufotenine. There's even a story going around that people were using bufo marinus, a common, giant toad native to Costa Rica, that was imported into both Hawaii and Australia as an attempted control on the sugar cane beetle. It's one of the more stupid things people have done, because it's very easy to see that a totally nocturnal animal that feeds on the ground could hardly have any affect on a day-active beetle that stays in the upper parts of the plants that it's attacking. But nobody bothered to check it out, they just saw this big toad that liked to eat bugs. All that's great, I mean actually it's not all that harmful in either location because it still eats a lot of bugs, mostly night active harmful ones that are close to the ground, like cockroaches. Unfortunately there are some rarer kinds of beetles in Australia which have nearly disappeared. This is mostly of concern to entomologists. The "cane toad" is very common in a lot of places, and I know a lot of people who have extracted samples of their venom, and found that it's inactive. It doesn't do anything. Eating it'll make you sicker than a dog, but smoking it does nothing. But the story persists. There is an American native toad, bufo alvarius, called the Colorado River Toad, which indeed has a strong DMT-like venom, which can be smoked.

B: The 5-methoxy DMT occurs in . . .

O: 5-methoxy DMT is another name for a methyl ester of bufotamine. 5-methoxy is slightly active, but 4-methoxy DMT is very active.

B: People have been experimenting with all kinds of subvariants, even using DMT and a straight MAO inhibitor.

O: I only know of the combination with harmaline or harmine. These are the active ingredients of ayahuasca.

B: Do you think any of this stuff has any advantages over LSD for people?

O: Not really. I find that the effects of the tryptamine, the DMT and its relatives like psilocybin are extremely body heavy, boy, are they body heavy. LSD is not so body heavy. Mescaline is body heavy because of its effects on the liver. LSD seems to have the least body effects of all the psychedelics, and it would be my choice for most people.

B: Because it's such a small amount . . .

O: I may be right or I may be wrong, I don't know, but it was always my opinion that LSD itself wasn't the active material, that it was simply a catalyst/agent that caused your body to release something that actually did the job. That was the reason why you couldn't take it several days in a row, because you had to recharge this "body-battery" or capacitor that you were discharging. The reason that the intensity was proportional to the amount, was that the larger amounts caused a rapid and more complete discharge of the stored material. This is just a theory that I have about it, whether it's true or not I don't know.

B: Getting back to the Dead. The Dead were part of an overall hippie movement, you might call it, back in the 60's, or psychedelic movement. But the Dead kind of preserved the spirit of that time, they were the carrier of the torch you might say. As all the other 60's bands dissolved or turned into warm-up bands at Las Vegas shows or something, the Dead became larger and larger and gained more and more of a following, and you've compared that in some ways to a tribe. Can you talk a little about that?

O: The structure of the group of people following the Grateful Dead around was very complex. In fact there's a professor at North Carolina who has made not only a study of them, but teaches a class in this particular cultural phenomenon. She presents it in a rather academic way, but she has agreement amongst her sociologist colleagues that it is indeed a unique identifiable social phenomenon worthy of such study.

I found that as a tribe it had a lot of problems. One of the problems was it was absolutely no organization at all, and yet it was in a situation where it was at war with its "neighbors" all the time. This tribe was at war with the people in the towns, who thought they were messy, weird and so forth, and they had trouble with the authorities over the rights of the free trade within the parking lots. They had troubles with the cops about who was getting high and using drugs. They had trouble with the noise and disorder that they made where they passed through places on the way to one place or another. The "tribe" had a lot of trouble.

And yet, as far as I could determine, no one in the scene had made any efforts to organize and present some sort of protective action, like an immune system in a body. It was like an animal with

no immune system, which had no way of identifying things that were a threat to it or producing actions that would take care of it. Like, it didn't have a team that went ahead to get permits for camping, and cleared the ability to sell small amounts of materials freely in the vicinity of the shows. It didn't have a group of people whose specialty was to identify narcotics officers and to tag them as they came past the edges of the scene, so that people wouldn't inadvertently do things that they shouldn't while under observation. The group didn't have any of those things. It had no spokesman that could interface with the band. There was no spokesman for the Deadheads to talk to the band about what was going on, to determine what the band could or couldn't do. There was no-one the band could talk to about the things people were doing that the band didn't like. The band would issue pronouncements every so often, but... It just lacked any power or force.

The Dead were just doing what they did, they were just making music and having a good time and they were very, very grateful that they had such staunch support that it enabled them to tour around and live the way they wanted to. They didn't go to Europe much, they didn't go to Australia ever, they didn't go to a lot of places they could have/should have gone. They didn't do the world tours, and they went back to much the same towns, the same venues, year after year, tour after tour.

B: So you think that was a mistake too?

O: Well, I think it was, but you know, they'd gotten older, they'd stopped taking psychedelics, and it all just stopped meaning what it once meant to them. Maybe the adulation had done its damage, as it does to most people who become celebrities, I don't know. But I don't think music is about money, as nice as it is. The majority of musicians don't really make a good living off it. The Dead were indeed lucky in this way.

B: No I know, it's like any other art, there's a handful that make a whole bunch of it, and then there's a lot of them that are starving artists. Rock music became a big business. Wasn't the Dead, by the time Jerry Garcia passed away, like a \$50 million dollar corporation.

O: Well, they were large, and obviously most all of the musicians by that time had made quite good investments and have an income from it, a lot of income. Not just from the re-release of old material, but they own property and stocks and different things. They all have security. Of course, if the stock market crashes, or property values crash, or people stop buying their stuff anymore, every single one of them could wind up in a position of great discomfort in their living arrangements. For now they are not very active, but I firmly believe the band will reform.

I don't see much reason for not continuing to exist as an organization, finding another guitar player and whatnot... Garcia was unique, there's no doubt about it, a Grateful Dead without Garcia would be a different Grateful Dead. But as far as I was concerned, the Grateful Dead without Pigpen was a different Grateful Dead. Grateful Dead without Keith was a different band. And certainly Brent, by the time he killed himself, was a remarkable and central contributor to the Grateful Dead. So you know, I cannot find any reason to believe that adding a musician of the caliber of say, Jorma Kaukonen, to the remaining members of the Grateful Dead wouldn't produce an extraordinary band that would certainly be accepted by all of the Deadheads with a great deal of pleasure. In one of my hallucinations they add Jack Casady as well. They could do it on whatever terms they wanted to,

they could tour as much or as little as they felt like it, they could do whatever they needed to do to feel comfortable with their lives, but not playing just doesn't seem to be an option I feel is right.

B: A friend of mine who is the web programmer for Island Web says the Dead seed lives on in some of these derivative bands like Phish.

O: Well, I personally find Phish puts me to sleep. Most of those “clone” bands bore me. But then even Garcia's band bored me shitless. There's a new album just released that you might find interesting. It's called "How Sweet It Is," and it was recorded and mixed by John Cutler, who was Garcia's soundman. And they did it out of takes they made over at the Warfield Theater in San Francisco.

Personally I think the Warfield Theater is a bit of a nightmare acoustically, so I never thought it was a very good venue for music. It wasn't even what I would call a great venue for seeing plays, because of the sort of munched-in on itself environment it had. I never thought it was even usable acoustically, and yet John has come up with a pretty good sounding album. He's captured a lot of the spirit that Garcia's tried to put into that band. Most nights I didn't go, but I did go to some of them and I went to see Dead Heads. Some would say: “I want a buckle, I'll meet you at the Warfield”, so we'd go. I think Cutler's done a really good job and it presents a side of the band to people that I think will prove to be important. You can get it from Grateful Dead merchandising, like a lot of other records and stuff. There is also a GDM record of the Allman Brothers at Fillmore East, made from my tapes. They are considering releasing more from my archives. You know, I recorded a lot of bands when I was with them, because I recorded everything that went on on-stage when my mikes were there. I called the tapes my “sonic journals”.

B: Do you sell stuff off your web site like that?

O: Not really, I've had a few inquiries about buckles and stuff, but it's intended to be informational. If it resulted in a few sales, that would be gravy for me, I don't have much income right now. But I intend the web site basically as information, so people can see my work. I don't have a forum for discussions, I've never felt a great attraction for getting involved in Usenet or anything, so it gives me a place where I can stick a bunch of stuff I've written, and people can go and get it and read it if they like. If it leads to something else, fine, it can lead anywhere it wants to. It's not like a homepage: “Look at me, here I am, this is who I am, etc”. It's just: Here's some art, if you like it fine, if you don't, then go somewhere else!

B: Now let's talk about some of the other ideas that are up on the web site. You have some ideas about ecology and global warming that's different than the popular wisdom.

O: Mostly what people know or think about “global warming” stuff, and the other questions that I address, comes from the media, the public media. Most of them are reporting on scientific work that's been done, but they often only report on one side of it. There's a lot of discussion going on in the scientific literature about each of the various points that I address, unlike the seeming united front the media present. For instance, there are several ways in which researchers can measure the temperature of the planet. One of the ways is by taking all of the reports from weather station readings, which are mostly in the populated areas of the Northern Hemisphere, and averaging them.

Another way is to use the global satellite information, which accurately records the temperature of the entire Earth's surface from outer space. The coverage is quite extensive, and the data goes back to 1979. The problem is that careful calculation of the corrected satellite data from complete coverage of the planet indicates that the planet has one of the most remarkably well-buffered and stabilized thermal systems known. In fact, they have detected a drop of 0.05 degree Celsius per decade in that period. The planet is extremely stable. But the weather station data indicates that in most places where people live, it is getting warmer a few tenths of a degree. So you have two different databases that you can access, you've got world temperature average, based on the weather station averages, and you've got the global mean temperature from the satellite data. The global mean temp is indicating a cooling. The global mean is the only one which can indicate whether the planet is actually undergoing global warming or not. But "world temperature average" gives another indication entirely. So you have a problem, and significant number of scientists are standing up and saying look, we can't find the evidence of this warming you guys are jumping up and down, screaming and yelling about.

The global warming people are telling you there's a problem. This problem consists of two things: One thing is the carbon dioxide level. They absolutely insist that the "problem" is caused by our pumping up all the oil, which is trapped carbon, out of the ground and burning it. This is probably the best thing that man's ever done, I sometimes think we might have been evolved by the oldest and largest organism on the planet, the blue-green algae of the oceans, to do this, because it's carbon that's been lost to the life system on this planet. The algae, or plankton, in the ocean fall to the bottom, die and are buried, and all the oil from their little diatom bodies eventually migrates into oil deposits. It's carbon that's lost, there's very little carbon left on the surface of this planet, there's only 300 parts per million in the bloody atmosphere, it's microscopic. Actually, 99.99% of all the free carbon dioxide on this planet is to be found in one place: The ocean, it's dissolved in the ocean. Carbon dioxide, of all materials, has one of the steepest solubility curves known, which means that cold water dissolves a lot of gas. Warm water doesn't hold much at all. The slope is very steep. Everyone knows the difference between opening a warm Coca-Cola, and a cold one. You immediately experience this dramatic solubility slope.

A storm cloud forms and rain starts to fall. Rain is very, very cold, close to freezing point when it starts to come down. It's a very excellent scrubber. Scrubbers designed very much like rainfall are used to scrub chemicals out of gasses in industry. So virtually all of the carbon dioxide in the air under the raincloud is dissolved in this freshly formed, pristine, and very cold water, and carried down to the surface of the planet. Much of it falls into the ocean, which is already saturated. It must be, because it is in contact with the atmosphere, and there's an equilibrium between the ocean and the atmosphere, a certain percentage is in the atmosphere and it is in balance with the rest dissolved in the ocean at the given temperature. Well, if the rain has more than that amount, some of it will evaporate back into the air. If it's got less, of course it all will remain dissolved. But it always has more, because it is cold and has dissolved some of the atmosphere's carbon dioxide, and most likely has more carbon dioxide in it than the equilibrium amount with the warmer ocean..

The actual carbon dioxide found into the atmosphere is therefore determined by the temperature of the sea. The majority of the data that people use when quote increasing carbon dioxide levels is produced by a single measuring point, especially built for this purpose, on the top of Mona Kea, on the Island of Hawaii. The measurements taken at this place show a gradual rise in carbon dioxide

levels from about 200 some odd parts/million when they first started making the measurements, up to 300 or so now. This means a very microscopic amount has only become slightly less microscopic. However, it is still a 50% increase in the measured carbon dioxide. A close examination of these carbon dioxide level graphs reveals a very interesting thing. They're not simply a straight, rising line. This line is very irregular, it goes up and down, it is cyclic. This variation is in step with the seasons. During the summer, the carbon dioxide content goes up, during the winter it goes down. You would naturally think, winter... summer... it must have something to do with temperature. Well, you'd be truly surprised at the ways in which people have tried to explain this variation, "It goes up and down due to plant growth etc." This is pretty odd, since the summer is when there is greater growth, and if plants were the answer, the CO₂ would go down, not up. The Hilo Observatory, part of NOAA, located at the very foot of Mona Kea takes regular sea surface temperatures, and publish them. Lo and behold, these charts have the same types of irregularities as the carbon dioxide chart, and if you look more closely at them, you will find that also the sea surface temperatures in the vicinity of Hilo have been slowly increasing. If you go a step further and take identical graphs of the carbon dioxide levels and the sea surface temperatures drawn to the same scale, and superimpose them, they correspond exactly. Sea surface temperature rises, carbon dioxide rises. Sea surface temperature drops, carbon dioxide drops. The sea surface temperature has slowly been increasing over time by an amount equal to the amount of increase in carbon dioxide. The mystery is solved. The temperature of the sea surface is what is controlling carbon dioxide, not how much carbon you're burning or anything else. So man's carbon emissions are unimportant. Or to place them in the true context of the paramount importance of CO₂ as a food for plants, our actions to produce more CO₂ are so well buffered as to only be of benefit to life on the planet.

B: So that's an ecological red herring then?

O: You've got to say, well gee whiz, who benefits from this? There's only one major industry that will benefit from this: The nuclear power industry. Because one of the major uses of fossil fuels is to generate electricity, and there's only a few ways of generating electricity where you don't burn fossil fuels. You're limited to how many rivers you want to stuff up. Solar is completely controlled by the petroleum industry, so the cost of solar has not changed much in the last 15 years. Lastly you've got wind. Effective wind generation requires a good location with high wind levels, and the investment is pretty high, and they only work a certain percentage of the time anyway. The only other source of generation of electricity is nuclear energy.

B: So it's the nuclear industry that's trying to push it.

O: That would be my conclusion, by eliminating all other possible groups who could possibly benefit from this. You have to follow the money. Everything seems to boil down to who is getting a benefit, who is gaining a financial advantage, and only the most naive people think that money's not involved in all of this. Money is involved in all things.

B: And the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer.

O: Exactly but then, that is also planned. We've gotten into a runaway condition with this. It's a way of continuing the elitist structure. There are still princes and commoners. Keep the commoners down, and build the princes up.

B: So what do you think we can do about all this?

O: I don't know. I know that we can't fall for scams like, our refrigerator is affecting the ozone, or our cars are causing smog, or we should stop burning fossil fuels because we're destroying the planet in some way. None of these things are true, they're all benefiting a small group of people, the owners of the businesses that can benefit by whatever changes are imposed. Now this is weird: There is absolutely no experimental evidence conducted in the part of the stratosphere where ozone is formed, the main reason for it is that you can't get instruments up there except with a rocket, and a rocket doesn't stay long enough to really do much. No one has actually produced an experiment that incontrovertibly proves the reactions the anti-ozone people are claiming take place. No one has been able to demonstrate the actual presence of any Freon molecules above the troposphere. The most amazing thing is that an international meeting has promulgated a dictum which has now been adopted worldwide, banning the manufacture and use of chlorofluorocarbons. Against the objections of a vast army of scientists who have said: Look, there's no evidence this is happening. This is the best refrigerant ever discovered, it's cheap, people in the Third World countries need this, etc, this entire class of refrigerants has been totally banned

A group of volcanologists recently signed a protocol in Heidelberg, objecting to this emphasis on an "ozone hole" against all evidence, and wasting people's attention and money, thereby diverting attention from the real problems that the planet has. Because the volcanologists all know that the chlorine in the atmosphere, 90-some odd percent of it, comes from volcanoes. Or from degradation of the sodium chloride in the sea. Chlorine in the atmosphere is very common, and Freon could have only have contributed a tiny amount to its content, that is if you can prove that it breaks down, which is not at all clear happens. It is one of the most stable organic compounds known. You have to say, who's going to benefit from it?

B: What I meant by what are we going to do about all this, I meant about this greed...

O: The only thing you can do is try to find a political solution.

B: Talk about some of your other environmental ideas.

O: Well, there was only a few things that I was covering in there, which were real noticeable ones. The ozone thing bothers me a lot because of the fact that the actual ozone thinning bit is a mechanical thing and it's a result of increased atmospheric turbulence, which we're undergoing right now worldwide. The law banning Freon only benefits one party. It doesn't benefit people in the Third World who need refrigeration. It doesn't benefit you if you've got an air conditioner in your car, and you've got to pay \$200-300 to convert it to the new R 134a refrigerant. It doesn't benefit the firefighters who can no longer use Halon to put out fires, (it's a very good fire extinguisher). It doesn't benefit people who dry-clean clothes, because the fluorocarbons that they use in certain dry-cleaning operations cannot be used anymore. There's so many people being disadvantaged by it, you have to say: Who is advantaged by it?

B: What do most of the environmental groups think . . .

O: It's as difficult to talk to environmentalists about any of this, as it is to try to explain to them that kangaroos in Australia are a plague. That they're eating all the grazers out of house and home, and they're multiplying at numbers that never existed prior to the setting of bore to supply water to stock. They would look at you like you're crazy, because of course they know you're not supposed to shoot kangaroos.

B: Didn't they have whole bunch of ecological misbalances in Australia.

O: Most eco-organizations are just like professional politicians. Their real reason for existing is to get money, only secondarily to pursue a cause. Raising money is most important to them, and they have to have reasons to explain to people why they should donate money to their cause. The classical example of this is the Red Cross. The Red Cross was examined closely, and it was found that 93% of the money donated to it went into administrative expenses. Any ex-military type will tell you the Red Cross is a lot of talk and little action.

Anyway, the only company that benefits from the banning of Freon is the company that originally patented it. Du Pont. Strangely enough, the same organization is credited with responsibility for the laws against cannabis, which eliminated hemp as a competitor to nylon and synthetic fibers. That's Jack Herer's story and I think it's possible it is at least partly true, it makes sense to me. They're just following an established tradition, they've probably done this with a lot of other things too, they just didn't affect us so we didn't know about them. For Du Pont, when the patent was in effect, Freon sold for about \$5-6 a pound. When the patent ran out, the price of Freon dropped to about 15 cents/pound, because it costs very little to make it. Now, there's no point in pursuing this line of reasoning too far, but the banning of Freon has led to alternative refrigerants like butane, which are known to be problematic and not as good. There's only one refrigerant that's better than Freon for efficiently transferring heat, and that's of course, ammonia. Ammonia is not a very safe or practical gas to use, in fact it is usually found in heavy duty equipment such as is used in large cooling plants, rather than the small household ones. Household refrigerants were, before the advent of freon, primarily butane and sulfur dioxide. Sulfur dioxide is not too good to get loose in your house either (as I discovered one time when I was defrosting an old refrigerator, and my tool punctured the coil. We had to clear out of the house for about four hours until it was gone.

Oddly enough, there's a new refrigerant, an "HFC" (which means it has fluorine, but no chlorine), designated R134a, that's now certified as the only refrigerant that you must use now in your car's air conditioner and in all new refrigerators. It is nowhere near as good as Freon, and it sells for about \$15 a pound. You know who owns the patent to it? Well, just guess?

B: Du Pont.

O: You've got it. So, you don't have to look very far. The only person that's going to benefit from banning Freon is Du Pont. If someone wanted to do some detective work on this, I think you'd probably find it. I doubt that they've hidden their tracks that well, because they didn't think they had to. When you go down to buy a car, you're going to pay at least \$30-40,000 for it. The same car model fifteen or more years back might have been expected to cost 8 or 9 grand. You're paying for smog control, a computer, maybe 40 extra pounds of copper wire running there and there inside this machine, and all these strange and exotic high-tech expensive engineering feats that have been put

into this machine to reduce hydrocarbon output. And yet, experimental data indicates that man's total contribution to the planet's hydrocarbon burden is just about 3 1/2 percent. Most comes from the oceans and forests.

B: So you think that the car's contribution to smog is also a myth?

O: It is. Because smog is a result of an interaction between hydrocarbon and ozone. It's an oxidative product resulting from ozone reacting with it. In fact, the common criterion for the severity of the smog alert is the "ozone count" that they measure in the atmosphere, and it was there from the very beginning of smog in 1947. There's no source for ozone at sea level. There's only one source really, other than lightning strikes, which do produce a small amount of it. The other source is what's called beta emission (high speed electron). The beta particle is a radioactive degradation product that's emitted by certain radioactive isotopes. The most common one, and it produces an ideal energy beta particle which is ideally suited for creating ozone, is tritium. There are a lot of other common elements that have beta emission as part of their degradation routine, often combined with gamma and other things, but tritium is very good for the right energy to produce ozone and tritium is produced in very large quantities by everything nuclear. Tritium is produced when a deuterium atom captures a neutron, and deuterium itself is produced by neutron capture by hydrogen. Since water is the most commonly used neutron absorber in the the nuclear industry, there is a lot of tritium being produced on the planet.

The worst smog attack ever reported was the one that occurred immediately after they tested a bomb in the Pacific Ocean in World War II. They dropped the bomb into the water, and it was submerged when it went off. Most people have seen the picture of a huge mushroom cloud coming up out of a fleet of ships. Famous. They never did that again. That produced such a humongous tonnage of tritium that the ozone level in Los Angeles rose so dramatically the use of smudge pots burning diesel oil to protect the orange groves had to be banned almost overnight.

B: So where is most of the smog coming from, you think it's coming from...

O: There is smog out in the middle of the ocean, you can see it when you take a trans-Pacific flight. There is smog in the Arctic, you have smog everywhere in the Northern Hemisphere. There is virtually none in the Southern Hemisphere, because there's very little nuclear activity in the Southern Hemisphere. So most of the nuclear activity and most of the things that are producing tritium are in the Northern Hemisphere.

B: Interesting, so you think it comes from nuclear...

O: Well, it has to. Tritium is formed by deuterium, which is a stable isotope of hydrogen, capturing neutron. Neutrons are one of the biggest problems in the nuclear industry, you have to have something to absorb it. In fact, they have what they call Heavy Water Reactors, which involve the use of "heavy water" which is rich in deuterium, as a moderator. In ordinary water, when a hydrogen atom captures a neutron, it becomes deuterium. And then when the deuterium atom captures the next neutron, it becomes tritium, the isotope tritium is unstable. Deuterium and tritium and hydrogen all are forms of hydrogen, they're chemically the same, they make the same compound with oxygen: Water. All forms of hydrogen are highly diffusive because it's an extremely small molecule and is

difficult to confine,. It goes right through most containers, it goes right through concrete like going through a screen door. And because of the fact that the beta which has the correct velocity/energy as far as oxygen is concerned, it should definitely be captured by nearby oxygen, which then dissociates into two very energetic oxygen atoms, which immediately combine with two other oxygen molecules forming two molecules of ozone. The beta doesn't do much damage to the body. In fact, they use tritium as one of the indicators in the body in certain types of high-tech scans of the organs in the body itself. It's not particularly dangerous, it's more dangerous if you ingest it than it is outside of you, but it's not a real concern like other forms of radiation such as alpha particles or neutrons or gamma rays, which are really damaging. They monitor what's happening with those particles all the time.

I don't think anybody has taken any particular notice of the escape of tritium into the atmosphere, but I believe it goes on at a high rate all the time. In fact, the military have special reactors that are designed to make tritium, because it is used as part of the warhead in a hydrogen bomb. It's the "fuel" along with deuterium, of a hydrogen bomb. So we've got a situation where it's not only being made inadvertently as a result of the water moderation of atomic piles, and the water shielding all the high-level nuclear waste depositories, we've also got the military actually generating this stuff on purpose. A lot of it gets out, it gets away from all the sources and storage facilities. When it gets into the atmosphere it raises the ozone level of the atmosphere wherever it is found, and ozone doesn't belong at sea level. It's a highly reactive chemical, it almost immediately reacts with dozens of different things. It rots the rubber in your tires, it makes your eyes run, it ages and deteriorates virtually every kind of plastic (with the possible exception of Teflon). It is truly bad stuff to have in the air (except of course in the outermost layers of the stratosphere). It reacts with the hydrocarbons from plants, from the ocean, from cars, from anything. If you're in the city, of course, it's the exhaust pipe in the nearest car that's your major hydrocarbon contributor. We're all paying so that the city dwellers can enjoy better air. But only marginally better, and not all the time, because there are lots of other sources of HC's all around the cities.

We're not helping the rest of the planet in any way, because cars are not the major overall source of hydrocarbons. Atomic energy, however is the major source of ozone contamination in the lower atmosphere. But they don't want you to know that. Of course they don't! Popular opinion might stop them from playing with their toys! It's not good. The only real use of atomic energy is the bomb, and even then they are of no use militarily, only politically... as a threat. The rest of it's bullshit. It's the most expensive way to generate electricity ever discovered, and it produces wastes you can't get rid of. You can't even get rid of the generating plants when you finish with them, everything's radioactive. The whole generating plant becomes an unusable, radioactive mess of thousands of tons of metal and concrete and everything else. What do you do with it? It won't go away. It's bad news ... lasting for thousands and even hundreds of thousands of years. So what the hell are people doing messing around with this stuff? I can understand a nuclear reactor on a spaceship. I can understand a nuclear reactor on the moon. I can't understand a nuclear reactor on the surface of a planet as full of life as this one.

B: Let's go into your dietary thing. You've always made a big point of believing that people should subsist a lot more on meat and perhaps a lot less on vegetables.

O: People eat what they're raised to eat, you know, it's a social thing. Whatever your mother feeds you, that becomes the food you like. You're born with very little taste for anything, just an impulse to suck. Suck on your mother's tits, you get a sweet fluid, milk. Milk is quite sweet, it has a high lactose content. Almost every food that you experience for the first time is put in your mouth by your mother. Now, you may spit it out, but if she's persistent, eventually you give up and accept it, then you learn to like it. I mean, consider that some people love bitters! You can learn to like the taste of almost anything, I even know people who will eat turnips, and that is a real leap. So you can learn to like anything. Most children will accept milk, their mother's milk, and they'll accept meat, without much problem. There's something about meat that just tastes good, meat is immediately acceptable.

Looking at what we are and what we've evolved from, we're a carnivore. We have a very large brain. Our intestines are very short, in fact lab classes where the school cannot afford cadavers usually use housecats, because the feline intestinal structures are virtually identical to humans, and the relative length of the intestinal parts and the development in relative size of the organs is very similar. A cat is also an animal that's mostly brain, muscle and bone, and very little internal organs. For the digestion of meat, you don't need much gear. On the other hand, a man, who is about 75% muscle, bone and so forth and about 25% gut can be compared to a goat of a similar weight. You'll find that the goat is something like 75% gut and 25% bone and muscle. On the other hand, a panther, a leopard, or an animal with about the same body weight as a man, has a similar relative proportion as a man does. We're basically carnivores, in fact a 150 lb. panther's intestines is only about 6 inches longer than a man's. The length of your whole alimentary system from mouth to butthole is about as long as you are tall.

Yogis frequently tie a knot in each end of a string which is the same length as they are tall, hold one end in their teeth, swallow the other, and the first knot will appear at their butt. So that's the functional length of your intestines, it's not very long at all, 4-1/2 feet or so. A carnivorous cat with the same body weight, would have about 4 feet. On the other hand a goat's functional length is about 25 or 30 feet, and the actual length is over 100. You can stretch a human intestine out too, that doesn't really tell you its functional length, it only tells you something about its surface area. So in other words, with the short, functional gut, things pass through quickly. Food can go completely through you very quickly. It doesn't go through so quickly, if its hard to digest, like vegetables. Meat turns into a liquid in your stomach and is absorbed in the first few inches of your intestine very quickly. About an hour, if you don't have anything else in there.

I was on a boxing team when I was in junior high school, and we almost always won our matches. One of the things we had was an unorthodox coach and he insisted that we eat nothing the morning of a bout, and then an hour before the event, he gave us a steak, which we could not put salt on, and we were not allowed to drink any water with. The result was, of course, it was digested and all that energy was circulating around our system, all the fat and protein and everything else was all in our blood, there was nothing left in our gut, so we could take pounding on our gut, no worries and we had an enormous amount of power and endurance. It worked! That was very unconventional, that was back in the late 40s. Almost nobody thought much about that kind of stuff in those days. Nowadays, of course, they'd think you were an absolute heretic to suggest something like that. They want you to eat pizza!

B: Where do you think all of the vegetarianism and the low-fat thing

O: Follow the money. Same story. Agricultural business is one of the largest businesses in the world, and provides most of the food for people. If you want to raise cattle, you've got to have a mob of cowboys, a lot of land, a vet, and you have to follow the animals around, you have to round 'em up by hand, you have to take 'em to an abattoir where the work has to be done by hand. You have a lot of the expense because it's a perishable item, and has to be refrigerated. It must be carefully inspected, kept clean, and the animals have to be healthy. It's very costly and labour intensive to produce meat. A similar caveat applies to dairy products such as, shall we say, butter. It's got to be handled properly and carefully and so forth.

Now look at wheat. You can plant it with a machine. You can cultivate it with a machine, harvest it with a machine, process it with a machine. You can move it from place to place with virtually no human labour being involved. You can even grind it into flour and you grade it with a machine. It's exquisitely profitable. With oil seeds, you can do all the same things you can do with wheat or any of the other cereal grains, they're just other seeds. They produce vegetable oil, which can be sold as a substitute for other fats like butter and animal fat. They are not as good, nor as tasty, but if you can convince people that there is something weird or intrinsically unhealthy about butter and animal fat, you can convince them to use the oils, and the product has a much lower cost, thus bigger profit because it's more costly to produce any animal product. You will have to convince people that somehow this is a good idea. The lower price for the margarine is still hundreds of times the cost of production. This is a very, very profitable item.

You definitely don't want to sell wheat at animal feed prices, if you can sell it at bread prices. So you create a shtick about it: Fat's (animal fat) bad for you, it'll make you fat, you've got to eat carbs, and you've got to eat vegetables... but mostly pasta. Veggies are good and meat is bad, especially red meat, etc. Because of course, it's much cheaper to raise turkeys or chickens, compared to the cost of raising a pig or a cow. So you want to get them away from red meat if they're going to eat meat at all. Fish, of course, is one of the most expensive meats you can buy nowadays, so you don't even need to worry about that. It's priced itself almost out of the market due to bad resource management. And your big agricultural business is funding lots of research, all to prove this is the best diet. You get articles in the press where the dietary "experts" are saying: "Gee whiz, you know, it's very funny, all my patients are eating much less fat, almost no fat, and their complex carbs have gone way up, but I'm getting an increased incidence of diabetes and almost all my patients have gained a bunch in body weight, and are fatter." Why am I not surprised? Because the only thing the body can make bodyfat from, is carbohydrates, dietary fat can only be burned, not stored. Basically they are telling a huge lie about the metabolism of fats and no-one is taking them to task (except me).

B: It seems like there's a new dietary regime that comes along every 2 or 3 years....

O: There's been a concerted effort against the eating of meat that goes back almost to the first World War, and it's well documented by Stefansson in his book, "The Fat of the Land." He tells about how even the military, around WW I, didn't want to use the most concentrated, complete food ever developed (by the plains Indians), pemmican. Later on, when they sent people into space, they didn't send them with pemmican, the most concentrated human food known, oh no, they sent them up there with canned peas! Now, would you want to be in a spacecraft with someone eating canned peas? Or beans? Give me a break! People explored the Arctic and Indians walked across the continent of

North America eating jerky and pemmican. But they send people into space with pea soup. I don't know, man, it's nonsense, this stuff. It doesn't work. People have always eaten a mixture of things, the women are very good at gathering stuff and the female body becomes infertile if it doesn't have a certain percentage of body fat. Men have always been hunters.

If you ask a tribal Aborigine what kind of food there is around, and he'll name all the animals. He won't name a single plant. If you ask him about plants, he says "oh yeah, they're good too, you can eat some of those." Even the women will hunt for animals if they can catch them, but the men make a concerted effort. The men won't normally gather plants as bush tucker except when they're on walkabout and they're surviving off the bush. The same thing is true in North America, the great plains Indian nations all depended on the meat supply. Out of the 200 or 300 Indian tribes, there were only a handful that were basically agricultural. The whites had to kill off all the bison to defeat them and put them off the land. Most of the things that people grow as agricultural items, the vegetables now eaten, were domesticated by South and Central American Indians, not the Northern tribes. Another thing that's not well understood, is that the cultivation of grains is the thing that broke down tribal culture, it created the hierarchical systems. It's also the thing that enabled high densities of people to grow up. It also is one of the principal, if not the principal reason that we're struggling with an extremely overpopulated planet today. Because as meat eaters, we belong at the pinnacle of the food pyramid, which means we should be eating the things/animals which are located directly below us, and our population would then be limited by the availability of the animals on which we feed. I like the concept of a lot of open fields of grass and cows much better than vast stretches of concrete and rice paddies.

All carnivore populations are strictly controlled by the availability of the prey animals on which they feed. And they're normally in balance, you know. The prey animals eat the vegetation, and if there are too many of the prey animals they'll eat everything in sight, and be hard on the environment, but when prey animals become numerous, the carnivores breed up to deal with them. If the prey animal populations crash, the carnivores would not continue to reproduce and some would starve. In our case we can manage the animals we eat through animal husbandry far better than by hunting wild populations. We're part of a natural cycle, but when we stepped out of that cycle, and started to eat the food of the animals that we are designed to eat, which is what happened when we started eating the grass, the cereal grains, which is the principal vegetable food that people eat, we upset the balance. Thousands of us could subsequently exist on land that used to support only a few, and this is actually talked up as great by the vegetarians. They're such fools that they can't see that the very trouble we've got today on our precious planet is because of too many people!

B: Too many people is the number one problem, don't you think?

O: Cows don't drive cars! Cows don't have nuclear plants, cows don't fly airplanes, cows don't chop down forests. All they want is something to eat, a place to rest, and water. And sunshine, you know. They're happy with this, but we're not. We have placed great strain on the environment, and we should be strictly limited in our numbers. I'm in favor of a total world population of around 50 million.

B: The Chinese have made some effort to do that . . .

- O: Controlling population expansion is a very serious and important principle in which every thinking human on this planet should consider. Many should simply have no kids, or they should have only one, and natural attrition will reduce the human population. Unfortunately, everybody doesn't agree with that. There are some groups, especially the superstition-religion groups that are losing members wholesale in today's era of science, who are adamantly opposed to any birth control, and want "everybody" to have as many kids as possible. Of course, they're talking mainly to their own parishioners, but that's the only motivation I can see for such an insane policy. And they're absolutely intransigent on it. Absolutely. People who live in relatively under populated areas think it's OK to have 12 kids, because there aren't as many people around. But then go a thousand miles in any direction and you find places where people can't hardly find a place to lie down. You've got to consider the planet as a whole not just your local environment, when taking such policies.
- B: Well, we've spotlighted a lot of problems. What do you think would be a good place to start about making some changes, you must have some ideas about that.
- O: Yes, I do. I think the place you can start is by trying to establish a truly democratic form of government which is responsive to the actual needs and will of the people. You've got to address that, you've got to find the way. We've got a system that doesn't respond to people, it responds to money. And it can convince people of anything it wants. People are holding office whose only job, the only thing they really know how to do, is how to gain office, and how to remain in office. They're governing by means of their advisors and by means of the permanent public service, which is the career part of the government. If you want a career in government, then you go and become a bureaucrat, because career people assure stability and that things keep working from day to day. When the government changes, you don't have a period of confusion for awhile while everybody new figures out how to get a secretary or something. The office already has them, the office is there, the secretary is there, you just move in.

The people at the top have to be just ordinary citizens, they have to be regular, working, respected, intelligent, capable members of the community. Whether or not they are very knowledgeable in writing laws, well then, there's the need for advisors again. But they need to be not owned by money interests, or by some other interests, where they will not implement policy that's difficult because it wouldn't get them reelected. The necessary policy is difficult, because it's the cure society needs. You have to somehow eliminate this loaded deck the political systems have been set up based the wording of the Constitution. A Constitution is like the foundation of a building. There's no point in trying to fix the third story, which doesn't isn't straight if the foundation is crooked.

All the laws, the Supreme Court and its decisions, and the form of Congress and the people elected to it, and everything else, all have the structure described in the Constitution. It describes who can run for office, who can hold office, how old they have to be, what rules and behaviors are expected of them. All of those things are laid down, and the structure of laws, how the laws are written and how the laws are interpreted and how they're put into effect and so forth, they're all structured according to the underlying framework which is laid down in the Constitution. If there's a problem with the framework, then there's a problem with everything that's built upon it. You can't make the corrections on the third floor, it all comes down to fixing the Constitution. So you can't say, "Gee the Supreme Court said such-and-such, there must be something wrong here". You can't fix it, you can't

correct the problem in the laws because the laws are written and interpreted only the way the Constitution allows them to be.

The Constitution should very explicitly exclude things like the making of laws governing non-injurious consensual behavior, moral judgements. Also, it needs to exclude laws which create black markets. All commerce must be conducted openly in a legal forum. Disallowing monopolies would be a nice touch. The system should also require that laws be enacted only for a limited period of time, at the end of which they automatically expire. And cannot be renewed unless they are reintroduced. They have to be re-debated, reconsidered. All laws. It is not a good idea to allow people to go and become career politicians. An office holder is allowed to serve one term, or two terms, or specific periods of time in office, or a certain number of years maximum, at which time you're no longer eligible to hold office. No handsome retirement fund. While serving in office you're given a reasonable stipend to cover your costs, rather than a big salary, somewhat like pay for jury duty. You're expected to continue with your present business as well. You're just expected to devote a certain amount of time as a servant to your country, to help run the government, to help organize and pass legislation, and so forth. You're expected to be one of us, so that what you do is what you would do for yourself, not what you can do for such and such corporation or such and such moneyed interest, or because the media will show you in a good light for reelection if you do this, or anything else. It has to be because it's the right thing to do. I guess I am a bit too idealistic in all this.

I'm also upset about the edifices in which government is housed in virtually every country,. These buildings are intended to make government appear as massively powerful, unapproachable, dignified and absolute, and to belittle and to intimidate the individual who is observing them. You walk into the United States Capital Building and it dwarfs you, it's awesome in its dimension. And it says, We, the government are so big and so powerful, don't even think about fucking with Us. I say let's house them in a tin shed with a regular desk and a secretary, and if you wanted to go see one of them you knocked on the door. "Oh, Mr. Citizen, how nice of you to come see me, I would like to hear your comments." That's a little bit on the primitive side... I'm afraid I'm getting a bit too far out!

- B: There is a growing sentiment from both political angles against central government here in the United States, for instance . . .
- O: It's all rhetoric, though. They talk about less government, but simultaneously they're increasing the government's size. They talk about saving money, but the only programs they want to cut are programs that feed some tax moneys back to ordinary citizens. They cut welfare, health, education, any kind of support programs that help new businesses. The tax breaks all go to the big corporations. The poor guy with the little shop down on Main Street, he's bloody lucky to feed his family each week! 800,000 businesses do 3% of the business. 12 businesses do 90% of the business. The other 7% is the medium size guys. But the little guys, which are everywhere, it's like the donkey and the carrot. It's the carrot of capitalism. This is a great free enterprise system, you can start your own business. They don't tell you that you're going to work 60 hours a week, at an average pay that's below the minimum wage, and suffer from all kinds of stresses that will probably shorten your life, and you'll be lucky to be able to send your kids to college. That's the reality of small business. And not just in the United States, either, it's everywhere, it's the way it works. The rules are different for the little guy. They shouldn't be, you know.

The first four priorities that a government should take care of are: welfare, health, education, and protection (like from fire or violence). Those four are foremost, all the rest are immaterial if you can take care of those four. Then what's left over, you can spend on other things. As technology increasingly replaces human labor with machines, there has to be a way of transferring the wealth these machines produce back to the people. It all goes to the owner at present. If you can replace 5,000 people in a factory with 3 technicians and a bunch of robots that'll produce twice as much as the 5,000 did, if you don't drop the price of the product, where does the profit go? It doesn't go to the people who are put out of work. They now can't buy the things the factory's making. What happens when all the goods are made by machines and nobody has a job? Who's going to afford to live? Where's all that wealth going? Whose interest, and what purpose, does it serve? _There's not a single government anywhere in the world that can provide an answer. Most are not even looking for one.

The governments that are socialist have deteriorated into bureaucracies which eat up and absorb all the energy without creating any incentive for people. Those that are capitalist allow all the money to go into the hands of a few. The worst thing on top of all of this is the fact that, as far as I can determine, no economist anywhere has ever proposed a stable economic model. Every economic model I've ever seen is predicated on a certain minimum "level of growth." Growth means expansion. Something that is growing/expanding is not stable, any more than something that is contracting/declining is stable. Stable means it remains the same, and functions normally. It's a buffered system. It doesn't expand, it doesn't contract, it just goes along running perfectly. No one has ever proposed an economic model including this concept of stability. It's always predicated on growth. You can only grow so far before something, what happens, you hit the ceiling. Then what happens? You crash! So you get boom, bust, boom, bust. The economic history of mankind is boom, bust. Because the economic history of economists is everything must have growth. You've got to expand, you've got to have more people, more products, more this, more that. And there's a limit. There's only so much available in raw materials, there's only so much space that people can occupy, there's only so many products they can absorb. Eventually, growth must cease. Otherwise there will always be boom and bust cycles.

And yet, no one is prepared that. No one is prepared for the realities of it, it's what's valuable to you now, the money in your pocket today or tomorrow, don't worry about next week, next month, next year, your children or your grandchildren.

- B: Do you think there's any hope that we're going to improve? I guess we're going to have to, because things are going to get so out of balance that eventually shit's going to hit the fan, so to speak.
- O: In some ways the shit has already hit the fan. Look at Bosnia, look at Africa, look at where things are starting to break down. They're having sort of a slow-motion breakdown in the relationships between India and Pakistan. (More bloody bombs!). Russia is an 800 lb. gorilla who has broken into the stash of home brew, or something, no one knows what's going to happen. China's long history is that of personal enterprise and reward, with a rigid and very elaborate social and family system that evolved some of the best businessmen that this planet's ever seen. To become Communist, and to remain Communist for as long as it has, to me seems almost unbelievable. Already, we are seeing real Chinese capitalism starting to break out on the mainland. There's no way in the world that scene can remain stable very much longer. It's a monster, and it has to come to a crisis point. The whole

world is moving towards a social, economic crisis point. There are so many things that are stuffed up, and no one is doing a bloody thing to fix any of it. There's little in the way of constructive arguments going on about any of it either.

B: Do you think we're going to have to have some sort of world cataclysm before we wake up?

O: I don't know. I've always thought that probably no change of significance could occur in the United States. I can't really judge the rest of the world, it's a very complex picture. But my experience has led me to the conclusion that ultimately, the social structure would have to break down to some form of civil war before any significant political change could come about. In the case of the United States, there is an serious ongoing deterioration of the social structure, and a total retreat from any sort of rational action. Draconian laws are filling the prisons with non-criminals and no safety net is in place for those whose jobs are eliminated by technology. I don't quite see what is keeping the whole thing economically afloat, to tell the truth.

In the United States, also for some reason, socialism has become an anathema. If you even talk about socialism, you're a pariah of some sort. You don't have to call it communist, but when anyone stands up and says they think government has a responsibility to its citizens, these people are automatically considered to be a problem. They're considered a problem by everyone, not just the authorities, and are treated that way. The term: "Liberal" used to be a badge worn with great pride, by people in political life. It was considered absolutely one of the highest complements you could earn if you were said to be liberal in your outlook. It's now considered as one of the worst epithets that can be applied to you. To me, it's bizarre how they can twist the meaning of this term. Someone who is liberal is someone who stands for freedom, the word liberal comes from the same root as liberty. How can you possibly make that into an epithet? I guess it is now: "Liberty and Justice for those who can afford it." Or: "All men are created equal, but some are more equal than others...."

For those of you who want more about Bear, visit his web site at