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Letter from the Editor:

Linacre is such a unique college in comparison to some of the other colleges at Oxford. I feel so very blessed to be here with such fantastic friends who have really become like family to me. Serving on the Common Room Exec has been such a fun and challenging experience. As I handover this position to Jen, I have the utmost confidence that she will put together a great group of submissions that will give you a full representation of the common room opinions.

Thank you for such a great experience, Linacre!!

All my best,

Jeanne Erickson  
Editor

Linacre College  
Oxford, UK  
OX1 3JA
The Form of the Good

by Benjamin Outram

The scientists had been working hard. It had been a problem for as long as man has been able to think. How is it that physical stuff can create the qualia of experience? In 2145 the scientists solved the problem, and in 2146 a scientist ran a simple proof of concept by creating the first synthetic experience. For historic reasons, experience of the colour red was chosen as the first to be created.

The monumental discovery of the true nature of experience answered age old anthropological questions. Why should it be, for example, that compassion should be such a widely adopted virtue among exactly every civilisation? In the old times, people were slaves to their egos; individuals striving to better their own experience. Their thoughts were fleeting reflections of evolutionary struggle for genetic survival, with the slightly distasteful illusion of being due to acts of some sort of localised will. It is a necessary requisite of transcendence that there be something to transcend from, which of course is that which allows evolution in the first place. Nothing perfect ever changes and therefore cannot evolve.

The key was in identification. Once the ego was seen for what it was, the great Elucidation happened. Consciousness is itself without form but manifests through sentient beings, the ego being a by-product. Only goodness knows why it took so long for people to realise that.

There is no difference between when I see red, and when you see red; the experience is indistinguishable, and such is the nature of all experience. When we are greedy, when we deceive; we are actually only harming ourselves, by taking, stealing or whatever from other bits of this ultimate self. In the deeper realms of experience, obscured from our egos, this truth has always been understood, and its manifestation has been in the virtues of the great religions.

Hence, when the scientists created the experience of red in the lab, it was the equivalent of resurrecting all people of all time who had ever had eyes to see. Furthermore, the scientists had created the simplest version of the experience possible, and hence it was not attached to any sort of experience of time. It was timelessly vast in a see of infinity, with no past, no future, just pure contextless red.

After more months of careful calculation and dedication, they created the experiences of pleasure, of love, and of compassion. A natural progression. Finally was created the experience of infinite understanding. All was good, and the scientists were pleased. What wasn’t realised was what would happen next!

The scientists kept the experiences under a close watch to observe what other phenomena might have arisen when they had been created. Synthetic experience was completely unexplored, and really it was a bit like landing on the moon. The moon could have had moon people! They had no idea of what would happen, though what was discovered was far more amazing than even moon people would have been. Between the experiences created, there were resonances that formed an extremely complex topography. It was like a holograph. Something existed in these experiences. It wasn’t until a few years later, as the technology got better and the resolution with which they could see it got greater that they figured out the full extent and significance of what had been achieved.

The first observations showed that, although pure love and compassion and understanding had been
created, which are considered good experiences, there seemed to be a component of negative ones coming out. Pain, anguish, guilt, humiliation, shame. This was far from what was expected. Then they took some higher resolution spectra. The first ones they extracted seemed to bare a very close resemblance to quantum gravitation, and on further investigation they discovered the correct formulations of pre-inflationary theory which had been a problem that physicists had been having no luck with at the Heavy Graviton Collider since it had gone on line. No one suspected that looking at experience would answer questions about physics! Although by the 22nd century no one really cared about physics any more.

The scientists realised the full extent of this slowly. Some denied it at first. What had in fact been done was that within the love and compassion had been created a universe; complete unto itself and timeless. A universe with exactly the laws of physics as ours, and indeed, like ours in every way! In fact, it was, in its indistinguishable nature actually ontologically the same universe.

Love and compassion necessitate the existence of the universe, and that love and compassion are the source of all our being, from our love to our despair. Peace is upon those who practice what they know beyond the clouds of ignorance, the true light that shines from beyond form. And ever since the existence of the universe has never been a mystery. Welcome to Eternity.

Things I hate about Linacre

by Andrew Duncan

It’s mainly doors. Let’s start outside. I hate having to open the white door by the canteen as you have to punch in that code, momentarily revisiting your roman numerals. This is especially difficult if you have only one hand available; that brew you just made may be spilt as you try to switch your hand from the code buttons to the handle underneath at speed. You have the same code issues with the bike shed door, but the real annoyances come from whether it decides to communicate with the light sensor and flood the bike shed with light, or if it won’t shut all the way after you’ve swung it on your exit. The aristocratic Blue Door has a high opinion of itself - probably due to the fact it has its own signs with directing arrows. The Blue Door is the oldest door of the lot, painted Tory blue and resolutely grumpy, missing the Convent days and the times before full suffrage – and thus curses the modern age choosing when it is locked, and when it is not with an air of seniority (it takes weekends off I’ve noticed). I’ve definitely sensed disapproving groans from The Blue Door when returning late at night with a polystyrene-wrapped Hassan’s in hand on my way to the CR.

Let’s go inside (you’re doing well if you get in). The library door is bloody noisy when left to swing shut (clu-TACK!), and that loose, fake-gold scuffed handle is so unsatisfying to grasp on your way out. The small-CR-come-TV-room white-gloss door has had a hard time of late, awkwardly positioned next to the big posh new telly. I hate how it tentatively peeps open, seemingly on its own, hiding the person behind it who wants to interrupt your international football fixture with Neighbours (is that still on?) or a documentary about potatoes, but rightly thinks better of it upon hearing John Motson’s passionate commentary. The small CR door’s big brother up in the large CR is a poor relation if we’re honest, cutting a wiry figure framed economically with white painted wood. I hate how this runt is narrow - why is the right hand door so uselessly small? The OC Tanner main doors –they’re alright but I hate how you have to ascend those hypochondriac steps which sometimes
wobble underfoot and constantly are dressed with construction tape while being repaired. Come to think of it that secretive door by the bar itself is a bit dodgy if you ask me, tucked away watching the goings on at lunch and in the eve, before it will swoosh open interruptingly revealing the dark echoes of the stone spiral staircase.

I’m sure that Linacre’s doors have caught on to my door-antagonism as even my own door has made its own bid to inconvenience me, that grey Yale lock teasing, locking me out or demanding I use two hands to operate it.

I hate how the tea and coffee is served in the CR. The provision of such beverages is fantastic, but it’s often an ordeal trying to extract a cup and tea bag when they are out of sequence; you have to dash back and forth before drawing the hot water, risking scolding someone who is also navigating this logistical mess. And I hate how sometimes the hot water isn’t hot enough, or how it sometimes has that slight cloudy scum in it. I hate how tea cups and saucers are left on the tables and how you have to put them away, bending down and sorting them by cup, saucer and spoon. I hate it how on Thursday evenings there is no tea and how on Fridays it is down in the canteen. I hate the times when the tea and coffee is wheeled away too; 1.53pm and 7.48pm, sad times, sad times.

I hate it how the sun cremates you in the library in the afternoon if you sit on those desks near the end. I hate how the ducks make the fountain dirty in the summer – fowls aren’t so foul. I hate the play of the new football table and the fact I lose so much at it, 20p coins, pride and sometimes my trousers. I hate the ugly stare of the neighbouring science buildings and the animal rights protesters outside them on Thursdays. And I hate the fact that vehicles crash into college’s walls relatively frequently.

But - notice I haven’t said anything about Linacre’s people? I love you all. They’re the best part. As I leave through Linacre’s doors for the last time in June, I’ll be thinking “Thanks for having me, and goodbye”.

Sports Report: Michaelmas Term
by Elizabeth Ashley

Rowing got off to a fantastic start with the men and women fielding boats at both the Nephthys and Christ Church Regattas. At Nephthys the men’s team lost their first and only race, however the novice crew took experience from the race which showed in the subsequent Christ Church regatta. The women’s crew at Nephthys fared better, winning their first race against Mansfield, before succumbing to Brasenose.

The following week at Christ Church the men were able to field two teams, and the women one. The Men’s B (who were aided by Gwen in stroke seat!) lost their first race against Green Templeton A, moving into the reprachage and loosing to Somerville A. The team were unlucky coming up against two formidable teams early on in the competition.

The Women’s A team were fortunate to have a bye in the first round, and so started their Christ
church competition on the Thursday. They raced against Teddy Hall on the Thursday and with a
good start made it through to Friday’s racing. Their first race on the Friday was against St. Peter’s
Hall which they won strongly putting them through to the afternoon races where they rowed against
Pembroke. This was by far the girl’s best race of the competition crossing the finish line before
Pembroke had cleared the boathouses. Having made it through to the last day of the racing, and the
last sixteen they unfortunately came up against a strong Univ A which proved to be too much – the
boat struggled in the middle of the race and lost by a length.

The Men’s A team won comfortably against Merton on the Wednesday and went through to the
Friday’s racing by way of a bye. They then had a strong win in their first race of the Friday before
coming up against St Hilda’s A on the Friday afternoon – they beat St Hilda’s with a huge push on
the bend up to the boathouses finishing a length and a half ahead and charging into the final day. The
first race of Saturday was eventful to say the least – after a huge crab in the Linacre boat in front of
the boathouses, the Trinity boat veered into Linacre crashing blades. No klaxon sounded, and the
Linacre crew finally detangled themselves to win by a comfortable two lengths. The eventful race
can be seen on youtube at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NgE-bBBkRUA. This win took the
men into the quarter finals, where they were finally unhinged by a strong and composed Brasenose
to whom they lost by a mere three quarters of a length on a short-course… we are left to consider
what the outcome would have been had the course not been shortened due to delays. All teams raced
fantastically over the regatta and we look forward to seeing what they produce at Torpids.

For those that are interested there are coxing opportunities to join these fantastic teams in the com-
ing year – if you think you have the enthusiasm to cox these teams down the river at Torpids contact
the boat club!
“Stop Ruining Our Country”: UK Students Protest Browne
by Aaron Hanlon

Across the UK, students are up in arms over the implications of the Browne Review’s recommendations for funding higher education. While undergraduates cringe at the thought of significant annual fees increases that effectively shift the burden of tuition costs from the state toward the individual, postgraduates are not without ire: though addressing postgraduate research funding issues was well within their remit, the Browne board has remained conspicuously silent about such issues.

Channeling Paris ’68 and effecting their best Guy Debord impersonations, Oxford students have taken to the streets in protest, brandishing picket signs with slogans like “FUCK FEES” and “Stop ruining our country.” Students have good cause to be restless about the state of higher education funding, but what protesters are calling “free” education won’t solve ongoing funding problems, nor will it keep the UK’s top universities competitive with the rest of the world’s best. A little nuance, however, could go a long way in student fees discussions. It’s imperative that students understand not simply the immediate benefits, but the long-term pitfalls of state-funded higher education. But before jumping right into UK higher education politics, let’s take a quick detour to the land that many hold up as an example of the absurdum in their reductio ad absurdum arguments against increases in tuition fees: the USA.

USonian higher education faces two formidable and related crises. First, higher education in the US is facing a bubble moment not terribly dissimilar from the housing bubble that resulted in the recent mortgage crisis. With the annual cost of a university degree ranging from roughly $10,000-$50,000 per year, and student debt ballooning with ever-increasing tuition fees, the cost of a university degree is starting to outweigh the financial payoff (earning potential) of having a university degree. At the same time, just as public policy decisions once pushed the view that everyone should be a homeowner, regardless of financial circumstances, public policy continues to push the notion that everyone should have a university degree. As a consequence, students are compelled to take on tens of thousands of dollars of debt to finance degrees that lead to decreasing financial returns, especially in situations where students who might otherwise have had interests in more lucrative trade careers were pushed into university without will or purpose, and underperformed as a result.

Concomitantly, the brutal job markets that await this overproduction of under-willing and over-indebted university graduates have caused politicians both left and right to pressure universities to vocationalize their curricula more overtly. Mistaking the problem of overproduction for the problem of under-preparation, and fueled by angry students and families who went into considerable debt to finance an education that they mistook for a formality en route to a high-paying job, US politicians have come to vilify the university and its faculty. Whereas the “Culture Wars” narrative once blamed the lefty academics for politically indoctrinating first-years, it now blames the lefty academics for filling students’ heads with “useless” knowledge instead of “useful” how-to. The university reels under the pressure of know-nothing politicians while its students have come to dread graduation day, a Day of Reckoning that signifies the ability of lenders to start collecting on student loans from jobless graduates.
In the UK, quite frankly, it’s even worse. The same types of know-nothing politicians that play political (American) football with US higher education policy exist in the UK. Only in the UK, they don’t use their hands, not because of the round-ball tradition, because their hands are preoccupied in a firm clasp around the higher education purse strings. UK politicians continue to advertise the grand idea that everyone should have a university degree, including, as in the US, people who have no interest in obtaining a university degree. How to finance all of these degrees, however, becomes a problem. When the economy goes under and the government decides to bail out certain industries while slashing higher education funding, it becomes the politicians, not the universities, who decide what types of study universities should support, and how universities should execute their curricula. In a system in which universities rely on the state so thoroughly for funding, they necessarily rely on the whims of the political climate as well. The political climate dictates that, on one hand, there should be higher education for all, while on the other hand higher education funding must be cut.

In the UK system, the same political pressure to vocationalize higher education that US universities face is intensified by the fact that the politicians applying the pressure are also dictating the funding. Whereas Dartmouth College, for example, sits on a $3 billion endowment (yes, with a b) for its 5500 students, and can tell the US Department of Education that in a pinch it will still keep its classics department, thank you, even topflight UK universities like Oxford are forced to pinch pennies when the government hatchet falls. This vulnerability is a direct result of over-reliance on state funding and under-reliance on student contributions to the cost of their education. Unemployment rates among graduates in the fields most highly recommended by the Browne board for the lion’s share of funding—IT and computing, physics and engineering—are currently the highest among any degree group, demonstrating that though unemployment rates are lower for degree-holders in media studies and English, politicians would sooner flood already-struggling job markets with more computer scientists and engineers—a strong political play—than allow universities to take the lead in allocating their own resources.

When political pressure in the long term forces universities to cut back on their provisions—to severely gut or do away with altogether their less profitable or less vocational departments—it makes it tremendously difficult for such under-funded universities (including Oxford) to compete with richer universities throughout the world who offer a full range of courses and facilities to their students. Furthermore, when society as a whole, via the state, is picking up the tab for higher education, society as a whole, via its politicians, will want to have a strong say in what you choose to study and why; and, perhaps more importantly, what you’re not allowed to choose to study, and why not.
To be clear, these are questions of financial allocation, but not necessarily of financial access. Among the most powerful arguments for state-funded higher education is that it provides access to universities for low-income applicants, gesturing toward the important goal of need-blind admissions processes. But individual contributions to tuition fees need not undermine need-blindness and equal access. If a society values equal access to higher education (as it should), a state can provide tuition subsidies to needy students while charging full tuition to wealthy students. This is just another way of having the wealthiest in society subsidize the poorest, an underlying value that doesn’t fundamentally change from state-funded to student-funded higher education. Only instead of relying on the political whims of the state to fund (or de-fund) higher education in the former scheme, the latter retains the equal-access principle while bolstering university funding and providing a greater measure of financial autonomy for the university (much-needed autonomy in difficult times). As a consequence, academic programming can be run by academics and university administrators, rather than politicians. And when politicians decide to prop up underperforming investment banks, then cut higher education funding subsidies for poorer students, they can be forced to explain to the electorate, as they should, that their cuts will be disproportionately felt by the poor.

It would behoove our protesters, then, to think a bit more carefully about what “free” higher education really means, and what strings are inevitably attached. While the US relies too heavily on student contributions, the UK relies not enough on them. The best solution probably lies somewhere in between.

---

**Bluestocking journal: Recruiting members of the team and calling for articles for the March 2011 issue**

Bluestocking is an online journal that investigates the intellectual and artistic achievements of women throughout history. We publish insightful critiques of the work of female thinkers of the past and present and reflect on women’s contribution to the history of creative thinking.

[www.blue-stocking.org.uk](http://www.blue-stocking.org.uk)

We’re looking for editors, designers, PR enthusiasts and others for our March 2011 issue. If you would like to get involved, e-mail editor@blue-stocking.org.uk. Tell us what position you would be interested in and what makes you a good candidate.

If you would like to contribute an article to Bluestocking, send a short proposal (100 words or less) to the above e-mail address.
“The Senior Common Room”
by Tom Hoogervorst
Crossword by Monika Kreile

Across:
1. Nothing
6. White roses
13. In London, it's Big
14. Hawaiian greeting
15. 1980’s US popstar Abdul
16. “Per ____”, Marks & Spencer women’s clothing line
17. Gamer’s first degree
19. So far
20. Go by sea
21. Pale grey
22. Scarlett O’____
23. Opulent light intensity measure
25. Spray can
27. Gamer’s fourth degree
32. It has a pupil
33. Harvey of the Chicago Bears
34. Greek alcohol shots
37. Mmes, in Madrid
39. Be semi-quiet?
42. It is divided into South and North
44. Corporate tax designation
45. Mary __ Cosmetics
46. Gamer’s third degree
50. Believe wholeheartedly
52. Florida airport initials
53. Empire in pre-Columbian America.
54. “... and me too”
57. Criminal, slangily
61. Basque terrorist unit
62. Gamer’s second degree
64. Total defeat score
65. Having to do with the envt.
66. Mistake
67. Sushi fish
69. Jules of sci-fi fame

Down:
1. Great and Little Iraqi rivers
2. Rick’s Casablanca sweetheart
3. Places
4. Very hot pepper
5. Chinese dynasty
6. Imitates
7. Strip of wood
8. The B in FBI
9. Like a flare skirt
10. Flight carrier with headquarters in Sweden
11. Purchase a Japanese car?
12. January, in Buenos Aires
13. Birth-related
18. Demanding
22. Nonsense
24. Inuit knife
26. Upper surface of a building
28. Fire enthusiast, for short
29. “Answer the phone!”
30. The Red Cross or Greenpeace, e.g.
31. It’s often wrapped around a swimming suit
35. NATO, to the French
36. Qué ____? (Spanish for “What do I know?”)
38. Vintage photo tone
40. Until recently, a pan-European nationalist union
41. Eye spasm?
43. Luxembourgish village
47. Illinois town
48. Not appreciated by
49. Fully grown
50. Composer of “The Broken Melody”
51. Release, as a knot.
55. French for ‘wing’
56. Followers of I-J-K-L
58. Mister in Berlin
59. Popular Asian wheat noodles
60. Carnage
62. Sound like a cat
63. Tolstoy’s Russian name

Crossword answers on page 12
On the Threat Grid and the Everyday Grid
By Eric Makinen

The question before us is, what is the relationship between the understanding we have of our action and the world? We have before us the human condition. There are two modes of understanding it that I am concerned with here. They are separate but a unity, one never entirely separable from the other. But they are incommensurable, and to attempt to reduce one in terms of the other is meaningless. A person exists in one and can step to the other. I will call the two modes the threat grid and the everyday grid.

A person is of the threat grid or of the everyday grid. And though he may be of one grid, that does not mean that the world he lives in is of the same character. That is because there are two worlds: the world of the everyday and the world of threat. And specifically regarding this and the relationship between our action and the world, we should ask, what is the experience in being of one grid but experiencing the other world that does not match it, for example, being of the everyday grid, but experiencing the world of threat? How does one reconcile the everyday grid understanding with the world of threat? Can a person go back to the world of the everyday after the world of threat? Can he live in the world of the everyday with a threat grid understanding? And what happens if he tries to leave the threat grid to try to return to the everyday grid? And just what is the character of the threat grid and the everyday grid?

The threat grid is a world of threat. And only a fool does not prepare. There is no pleasure, and no humour. A person of the threat grid would be a dragoon, for-

The next evil to that of being dragooned is that of living dragoonable.

The animating principle behind preparation is:

A person who is not inwardly prepared for the use of violence against him is always weaker than the person committing the violence.

How a person understands himself in being of the threat grid, for example, would be an understanding composed of his experiences and the ideas he had learned. Perhaps he was even bequeathed a legacy. To know that at any moment you could be arrested, tried, and die in a foreign prison or labour camp is a heavy burden to carry. It would be meaningless for a person of the everyday grid to try to explain such to a person that the world really is merely the everyday, to argue them out of their experience- for that person of the everyday grid is a fool for not being ready and it is only a matter of time before he is dragooned. We should keep in mind other ideas about the world of threat that have been used to explain conduct, such as PTSD and survivor’s guilt, and instances in life we have come across, such as why Primo Levi killed himself, though it was years after the camps.

There are many examples of threat and the everyday in film. Danny Boyle’s 28 Days Later (2002) concerns a bicycle messenger Jim (Cillian Murphy), who suffers an accident and awakes in an apocalyptic world of infected killer zombies. He is saved by two survivors, Mark (Noah Huntley) and Selena (Naomie Harris). After the rescue and reaching their hiding place, Mark tells Jim a joke. Mark will die shortly thereafter; Selena, however, later announces to Jim if she thinks he is infected she will kill him ‘in a heartbeat’. John Irvin’s The Dogs of War (1980) is the story of a group of foreign mercenaries who overthrow the dictator of a West African country. One of the mercenaries, Drew (Tom Berenger), has a pregnant wife back home. During the difficult assault on the garrison where the dictator is, running and firing furiously as he enters a building in the garrison complex, Drew happens upon a woman with a crying baby. He sees her and stops. He turns to leave and she shoots him in the back. The leader of the mercenaries, Jamie (Christopher Walken), though, when he sees an image of a woman, opens fire immediately. Jamie survives; Drew does not. But that one can be of the everyday grid and then become one of the threat grid need not occur in war or in a zombie apocalypse. One of the only survivors of a plane crash, Max (Jeff Bridges), in
Peter Weir’s *Fearless* (1993), can only relate to another survivor, Carla (Rosie Perez), and not his own wife. That is because his wife can only see and understand the everyday grid- he has now entered the threat grid and only people of the threat grid get it. Little seems to be going right for a non-descript office worker, Wesley (James McEvoy), in Timur Bekmambetov’s *Wanted* (2008). He thinks he is of the everyday grid, but he really is of the threat grid- and this literally makes him continuously ill. The everyday is intolerable because it does not make any sense. But when he becomes what he was meant to be, through experiencing the world of threat, he rights himself. The experience of the world of threat never leaves Dieter Dengler, interviewed in Werner Herzog’s *Little Dieter Needs to Fly* (1997). Dengler, a U.S. Sandy pilot, was shot down in Laos during the war there and imprisoned by the Communists (the story was also made into a feature drama by Herzog starring Christian Bale). Fed meager rations and enduring brutal jungle prison conditions, he manages an escape with the other prisoners. Later becoming a commercial airline pilot, he shows the viewer, decades after the treatment and jungle prison, where, under the floorboards in his house, are buried fifty-five gallon drums of food. Will I ever need it?, he asks. Probably not, but I sleep better at night, he observes. These are examples of difficulty between the two grids and worlds.

There is, though, one person who is of both grids- James Bond. He can seamlessly move between both and is equally at home in both worlds. There is no situation that he cannot get into that he cannot get out of, and that is something to which everyone can relate.

But what of the children of people of the threat grid? They have the response to threat manifest itself differently from those who first experienced the threat. The children of people of the threat grid are bequeathed a legacy, that the world of the everyday is really the world of threat, but their experience of the world is not that of their parents. Those children will experience threat, and respond to it in a threat grid manner- they will respond aggressively to that threat. But they do not grow up in the camps. In the camps, to attract any attention meant death, whether by isolator or other means. And to respond outwardly aggressively to a threat would be to attract attention. So for those in the camps, to do nothing was to do something. But to their children, to do nothing is to do nothing. Both the parents and their children are of the threat grid, but they respond differently to threat.

I think many may understand how a person becomes of the threat grid from the everyday grid, after experiencing the world of threat. But we should ask, can one go back to being of the everyday grid, after becoming of the threat grid? For this we should consider Michael Cimino’s *The Deer Hunter* (1978). The film is the story of a three friends, Mike (Robert DeNiro), Nick (Christopher Walken), and Steve (John Savage), plant workers in a Pennsylvania steel town, who enlist for Vietnam and what happens afterward.

*It is an easie passage downe to hell,*

*But to come backe, once there, you cannot well.*

In Vietnam, Nick and Steve by chance meet Mike on the battlefield, and all are captured. They are forced with other prisoners by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong to play Russian roulette. Managing to overpow-
er their captors, they escape down a river and are spotted by a U.S. Army helicopter. In the rescue Mike and Steve become separated from Nick, who later disappears after a stay in a military hospital. Back home, Mike visits Steve in a veteran’s hospital. Stevie now is in a wheelchair, the result of injury he suffered during the rescue. During the visit, Stevie shows him envelopes he gets every month from Vietnam, containing $100 bills- Mike thinks it is Nick. Mike leaves for Vietnam to find him and bring him home- to keep a promise he made to Nick. Mike is able to track him down- Nick is now playing Russian roulette professionally. What is inconceivable to a person of the everyday is the person who has accepted the world of threat. Nick does not even recognize Mike. Mike repeatedly asks him, don’t you remember me?, and he tries to get him to remember- Nick spits in his face and pushes him off, and leaves to his game. Mike bribes the Chinese in charge to let him play Nick. Mike sits across the table from him. He tries to get through to him. A round is played. It is Nick’s turn and he goes to raise the gun but Mike stays his hand. He tries again, to get Nick to remember home, to remember the mountains of their hunting trips, the trees he loved so much. Nick does remember. But he cannot leave the threat grid. And his only action can be a threat grid action. He pushes Mike’s hand away puts the gun to his head and fires.

Crossword Answers: