

Three Fingers

The Urth list — 4 messages, 2 voices, 15 Jun 1998

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/790>

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.

adam louis stephanides — 15 Jun 1998, 11:41

On Sun, 14 Jun 1998 I wrote:

3) "Michael Mauss" is really Mickey Mouse (and is also sane, as in 2)).

Supporting this is that reserpine is now used as a veterinary tranquilizer. This is a cute theory, and it's undoubtedly true in a metaphorical sense.

My remark about Michael Mauss being Mickey Mouse in a metaphorical sense was just an afterthought, but thinking it over I realize that it is true and important. Michael Mauss, not the "suits" we see in the final scene (whether real or not) is the true "owner" of Mickey Mouse, since he, not they, is in touch with the mythical springs from which he derives, as the unmasking scene indicates.

Of course, you may all think I've already spent too much time on another of Wolfe's "oneiric jeux d'esprit," to use the phrase *alga* quoted from Clute.

--Adam

adam louis stephanides — 15 Jun 1998, 15:05 · follows adam louis stephanides

On Mon, 15 Jun 1998 Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

First and foremost, what on earth gives you the eyedeal that they're _pretending_?

"Captain Hook" tells Michael he will be suffocated with the bonbons, but Michael has no trouble swallowing the bonbon, and the "Wicked Queen's" final remark shows that that's what's supposed to happen.

And, similarly, the knowtion that they're "dressed up" as Disney characters?

Because they remove their masks, and are revealed to be "paunchy [men/women] in a business suit." This is all plainly depicted in the story; unless you've misremembered the ending, I'm missing your point.

You have to know how fiercely these people protect their trademarks to feel this story. We're talking about a company that brought suit against an urban daycare center because they'd hand-painted Disney characters on the walls.

To be sure, knowing the determination with which Disney defends its copyrights/trademarks adds resonance to the story. (I'm tempted to make a joke about how I would rather have Captain Hook et al. after me than Disney's lawyers, but I'll refrain.)

--Adam

Dan'l Danehy Oakes — 15 Jun 1998, 14:56 · follows adam louis stephanides

First and foremost, what on earth gives you the eyedeia that they're
pretending?

"Captain Hook" tells Michael he will be suffocated with the bonbons, but
Michael has no trouble swallowing the bonbon, and the "Wicked Queen's"
final remark shows that that's what's supposed to happen.

H'mmmm. I'll have to look at this again. I'm probably just plain wrong here. But see below:

And, similarly, the knowtion that they're "dressed up"
as Disney characters?

Because they remove their masks, and are revealed to be
"paunchy [men/women] in a business suit." This is all plainly
depicted in the story; unless you've misremembered the ending,
I'm missing your point.

My point (all together now: "And I do have a point") was, simply, that those suits _were_ the
Queen, Captain, and Wolf, or, perhaps, their instantiations in this-world.

Making that assumption, then, the failure of the bonbon to accomplish its intended task makes
sense; the Bad Guys hatch marvellous plots, but they never seem to work out. (The application
of this to Wolfe's moral conceptions is left as an exercise for the alert reader.)

(I'm tempted to make a joke about how I would rather have
Captain Hook et al. after me than Disney's lawyers, but I'll
refrain.)

Well, it's worth noting that none of Disney's villains ever seem to accomplish much of anything
-- as opposed to the aforesaid attorneys...

|||

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes	First Amendment Pop Quiz:
Staff Curriculum Developer	
Oracle World-Wide Education	Is it all right to shout
e-mail ddanehyo at us.oracle.com	"movie" in a crowded firehouse?
phone 650.506.0793	

adam louis stephanides — 16 Jun 1998, 10:17 · follows Dan'l Danehy Oakes

On Mon, 15 Jun 1998 Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:
My point (all together now: "And I do have a point") was,
simply, that those suits _were_ the Queen, Captain, and Wolf,
or, perhaps, their instantiations in this-world.

So your argument is that the characters who are portrayed on the surface as paunchy
men/women in business suits disguised as the Queen, Hook, and Wolf are really the Queen,
Hook and Wolf disguised, or manifesting themselves as, paunchy men/women in business suits
disguised as the Queen, Hook, and Wolf?

So where does this leave your earlier contention that "sometimes a pipe is just a pipe"?

--Adam