

annoying silliness

The Urth list — 3 messages, 3 voices, 31 Jul 2002

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/3389>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Michael Andre-Driussi — 31 Jul 2002, 23:51

Hartshorn quoted blattid and wrote:

As for granting Orwell primacy in this matter, well, that's pretty silly.

Oh, pish-tosh.

Indeed.

We were drawn (or "suckered") into discussing Orwell because blattid expressed incomprehension as to why =anyone= would link Orwell to Ascian Correct Thought.

Was blattid unaware of the Newspeak notion (a top-down language reform that attempts to shape a new national character by design rather than the natural accident that has produced for example the stereo-typical Frenchman, Spaniard, German, Italian, etc.)? No, not at all -- so he is not strangely ignorant of Orwell (a relief, in a sense).

Was blattid aware that Mao's little red book had not historically been used across an entire culture the way that it had been used, anecdotally, by a couple of Berkeleyites in the 70s? Yes, he was aware (a relief, in a sense).

Blattid has presented an inscrutable position, and seems to relish it that way.

No matter: blattid was the one who asked for explanation; between us, hartshorn and I have presented the case. Case closed.

=mantis=

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 01 Aug 2002, 00:14 · follows Michael Andre-Driussi

Sigh.

Okay, let me clarify things here ...

I believe my original statement was:

I was quite certain, reading the utterances of Loyal to the Group of Seventeen, that Wolfe was pointing his barb at Maoism and the "Little-read Book." Others, I have learned on this list, have been equally certain that Wolfe is satirizing Orwell's "Newspeak," which I find simply implausible.

Okay, that was way too strong ... I think I had better have said that I find it implausible that "Newspeak" was the primary target of the satire.

I frankly feel that the insistence that it is, is an example of the parochialism of the SF

community; there is (imho) extremely powerful evidence, both biographical and stylistic, for Maoist-style Communism as the primary target.

I would also dispute one point of facticity in Mantis' latest post on this subject:

Was blattid aware that Mao's little red book had not historically been used across an entire culture the way that it had been used, anecdotally, by a couple of Berkeleyites in the 70s? Yes, he was aware (a relief, in a sense).

I said no such thing, nor am I convinced by any means that you are correct here. It is my understanding that a major aspect of Chinese Communist culture of the later Mao years, and probably through the next few years after his death, was the frequent quoting of Mao. I am unwilling to do the research to "prove" this right now, but will stick to my guns on the point unless and until strong counterevidence is posed; I admit this is stubbornness on my part, but it's stubbornness based on my memory of the period.

Andy Robertson — 31 Jul 2002, 00:02 · follows Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

----- Original Message -----

From: "Dan'I Danehy-Oakes" <ddanehy at siebel.com>

Annoying? Never!!! "pish-tosh" does not indicate annoyance!!