

We will try to answer your questions.

1. *Why does the collective write with a single voice ?* Setting aside the smaller reasons (like it's a fun challenge to pass around a file until we are all happy with it), we all agree that anonymity matters now, probably more than ever. This authorial voice (which sometimes uses the pronoun "I" rather than "we", is what de Man what call "literary." In other words, it tells you it is "lying." It is fiction, communicating indirectly even as it pretends to communicate directly.
2. *Did you intend your fictional philosophers to be convincing ?* Excellent question ! We absolutely do indeed hope that our fictional philosophers are even more interesting than certain mediocre real philosophers. Most of the views we give these fictional philosophers are views of this or that member of the collective. But he tried to spice up these philosophers by making them either perverse or pugnacious. In other words, we tried to make them just a little scandalous, but without completely overshadowing their messages.
3. *Do I recognize some of you (or the collective as a whole) in members of a popular online philosophy forum ?* Probably. Two of us especially concentrated on an early vision of the current project. Some of the views shared were our own, but the point was not essentially to present our own views but instead to have fun with a self-referential puppet, with a kind of Hamlet character on a stage soaked with vanity and arrogant incompetence. Our (self-confessing) "transcendental buffoon" was a success, but the forum mostly failed to provide an adequate foil. Our puppet was, in our view, plausible, even as we were playing. But others were implausible in their earnestness. The arctic artificiality of the internet is probably to blame. Our project (even just its anonymous collective elusive form) is an indirect response to the absurd situation of the earnest voice in such a mess.
4. *What is Duffenhauer hiding from us ?* We envision Duffenhauer as a fundamentally reasonable person on the level of concept. His consciousness personality is supposed to be defensible. But his work directly addresses and the style of its presentation incites the pro-

jection of evil on a voice so unapologetic. Our current protagonist H is a generalized continuation of Duffenhauer.

5. *Do I not get a generally sexist vibe from your work ? Is that just in the characters ?* It's just in the characters, but some extremists would probably call some of us sexists, even our female member. We believe that science or art is either genuine or not. The genitals or clothing of the scientist or artist won't damn or save the work. One of our many motivations for anonymity is the well-known tendency in our age to mindlessly echo a few key superstitions which, while treated by the unwary as sophisticated, are shamelessly and obviously regressive to anyone with an actual education (which involves a personal development and not just access to pages to stare at.) It would be wrong to read this response as the confession of affection for various, odious right-wing talking points. The collective shares something like a contempt for *most* political discourse. This connects again to the issue of what the internet does to conversation, and how it changes people.
6. *Why are you finally speaking in your own voice, or something like it, after so much indirect communication ?* I think we just wanted to try something new. But we also wanted our project to be appreciated but anyone who has enjoyed it without knowing quite what was going on. Hopefully our characters are deepened through this revelation. That we are actually a collective works pretty well as a symbol of the psyche, because perhaps all individuals are always already collectives, just stuck behind the same mouth.
7. *Besides the gimmick of the fictional philosopher, what sets you apart ?* While the ontological stuff is especially dear to some of us, we all agree that the ethical stuff is foremost. That's the issue that people *must* settle. Our characters stand out from other, otherwise similar philosophers, by emphasizing that *they do not have some cure for the world*. The ice-cold theoretical gaze is celebrated to an unusual extent in our work. As Duffenhauer might put it, he and our other creations is thinking outside the "matriarchy." Or outside of "ethical socialism." Max Stirner (a cartoon hero) and various purveyors of "The Irony" (like one of those Schlegels) said it all long ago. But their "laughing gas" is forgotten or misunderstood, because it's not easy to see around the basic prejudice of the talking class, that they are expected to save the world, peddle some cure for

all that ails us.

8. *Are you sure you are not trying to cure us of the hope for a cure?* Great question. Our work was made from the beginning that it would only appeal to a few. It's basically a "muted post horn" for those *already in the know*. We are trying to offer the pleasure of recognition to those who stumble upon the work. But the situation is more continuous than that, and we can imagine younger versions of ourselves, less self-consciously ironic, being empowered or transformed, to a limited degree, by what we've slapped together. What are we doing here? We are like Henry Miller giving his take on Heidegger. We think that maybe *Finnegans Wake* is a great work of science.

9. *How do you see yourselves in relation to a movement like dada?* Some members of the collective are friends in the real world, but much of our friendship and collaboration is virtual. We all keep our real names separate from the project. This is a huge difference. We all live in a world that has seen everything. We mostly try to amuse one another with our stuff. We believe that some of it is good, but we don't expect that it will get much attention, and it surely won't help us pay the rent. It's also important to note that most of our work is not public. We each throw whatever might be integrated into the public work in a kind of slush pile. Some of this is too dark, too silly, too obscure. Nothing sees the light of day without being worked over by at least two of us. That's a fundamental policy. No single member can take credit for anything we release. The average number of hands involved is 3. The maximum is 7. Because even this authorial voice is fictional, members never feel misrepresented. Because none of this is "really" us. But privately we know one another very as individuals, because we all show ourselves in the slush pile (though even there we have what de Man calls "literature.")

10. *Your texts often contain typos. How careful are you?* We are not that careful. Our work is either mostly about the ideas or mostly about the language. When the work is mostly about ideas, we think of the work like a cardboard applicator. No one is paying us, and only a few strangers ever see the stuff. Our "language work" is better in this regard, though we've had trouble trying to piece together a fragmentary output. This evolving project features the blurry protagonist "H". We've published pieces of this work from the beginning. This is where we are careful, and it's therefore slowgoing.