

Ruff Goings:
Shepherd's Study
of Warthog's
Yelp of Privation

David Laskowski

The division of labor, Warthog argues, is the primary unit of understanding in a canine-centered economy since the division of labor is the best indicator of that economy's gross accumulation. The primary categories of labor consist of those who serve as the alpha species of the beta-induced secondary cooperative market and those serving those who serve as the alpha species of the beta-induced secondary cooperative market. It is this division, Warthog argues, that serves to make the alpha species not only unique, but grossly overcompensated in regards to fund burial and the territorial marking of bushes and shrubs. The remedial systematization of such a division is based on quantitative analyses of market inducements such as treat acknowledgement and tummy stimulation, hence the seemingly obvious inability to grasp the conditions of the market by anyone but those in control of it.

The division of labor is, according to Warthog, a "naturally occurring" division based on the inherent "hackles" of those involved—"organization is due ferocity as calculated by the exertion

principle in conjunction with the muzzle fuzz and withers, or what is essentially a simple complex involving complex simples.” The key to understanding the formulas resulting from the simplistic complexity of the complex simples is knowledge of value, specifically value as it relates to how much something is worth, be it a bone or water (water, in most cases, is preferable since it is not only abundant, but free—at least to some). The division, Warthog writes, is vital not only to understand drastic shifts in the market, but to market shifts in the industrial drastic, a market indicator of the puppy crazies.

As to the placement of particular individuals within the separation, no one, Warthog surmises, really knows since “those who know will not tell those who do not and those who know probably are not sure why they know or if they know in the first place.” Warthog believes placement is most likely the outcome of chance, although he is sure luck has something to do with it. Whatever the cause, the separation is directly proportional to the suffering involved in the allocation of the profits flowing from the awareness of the benefits such a separation affords (profits typically the result of denial, disregard, and hardheartedness). It is likely, Warthog notes, qualities like these will take the form of platitudes such as: That’s the way it works; I work hard and I deserve it; and If somebody’s got to have it, it might as well be me.

Yet, Warthog notes, such actions do not “necessarily speak to the quality of the individual pursuing said interests in the market.” The decision to place one’s life in the service of the “economy” is, Warthog writes, typically the result of an overwhelming need to serve one’s fellow man (the accumulation of great amounts of wealth is simply a “benefit resulting from the investment in one’s faceless subordinates who without the aid of those who risk everything are destined to remain sub-subordinates.”) Suffice it to say, Warthog not only believes in the system as it is, but believes it’s “too kind” to those who “don’t have the stuff.” Exactly what the “stuff” is, Warthog never says, he only says he’s got it and he “ain’t giving it up.”

The irony of the labor division in the primary backyard market is that those who most engage in the “incessant crushing of a

subordinate's soul" were often once subordinates themselves (or had at least pretended to be when investigated by the authorities). As to how or why these subordinates can "lift themselves out of their subordinancy" is unknown, although Warthog claims it is most likely due not only to luck and chance, but to sheer doggedness on behalf of those who are able to "crawl over the gate of their own shortcomings." What typically differentiates one class from another is not simply hair color, hair thickness, and the length of ears, but "an air of superiority, a sense of accomplishment and self-righteousness that comes from the control or the feeling one can control the markets, resulting," Warthog notes, "in alphas walking as if they've bones stuck in places bones shouldn't be stuck."

Criticism of this particular market model, especially in regard to its "urinary" inflation of waste projections, are, according to Warthog, baseless, if not "downright crude," seeing that such criticisms are the result, Warthog thinks, "of jealousies resulting from the seizing of certain assets relating to the production of both number one and number two." For Warthog, critics are only able to show what is "inherently productive" about the system: "Essential is its dual nature—those who criticize it are the same who benefit from it whether they know it or not. No matter what position one holds in the system, they have some stake in it. In other words, the investment capacity of the common stakeholder is an inverse ratio of size per primary output and rate of consumption as defined by primary bowl accommodation. Although alphas and betas profess to differ insofar as to how they value the accumulation of kibble, what binds them inextricably is not simply their need, but their enjoyment of it." Warthog's colleague Sparky Trump-Card once described it as "bathing in a bath of gold."

Yet Warthog recognizes there can be what he calls "bones without marrow" that "can often appear invertebrate." Take, for example, Warthog writes, the case of Harry Terrier, a sub-class subservient multi-share furious component trader or ordinate subordinate to Bill William Henry Bernard of the Hartford Bernards, owner of Akita Capita, LLC, a risk-sensitive risk management firm specializing in low-end high-risk alternative risk obligation derivatives. Terrier, a graduate of the Mastiff School of

Urban Warfare Management, was hired by Bernard to function as his secondary labial retriever in Bernard's new venture into the mid-risk, and relatively new field, of medial bone procurement, a want-centered capital venture of meat-infused chew capacity. With "hard work and dedication," Terrier was able to secure for Bernard valuable variables in the ever-changing chew toy market, something no one had been able to do for Bernard before.

Terrier, who had been born to a broken kennel, had always dreamed of becoming second fiddle to the "cat-in-the-middle," the result of an early engagement with Hey and Diddle-Diddle, other scrappers who shared the same pen. Terrier, like Hey and Diddle-Diddle, had "to work to get anything" and although both Hey and Diddle-Diddle said Terrier would "never amount to much," Terrier did and had both Hey and Diddle-Diddle "put down" when he made enough money. Unfortunately, Terrier made more than enough money and was thinking about leaving Bernard to start his own Alpha Run, an idea that Bernard found not only "itchy," but "sore." Bernard's difficulty with Terrier was the result, Warthog thinks, of Bernard's "tiny brain." In fact, Warthog thinks the size of the brain is the primary cause for the establishment of the system Warthog writes about—"the truth is the system is really the result of smell—our desire to find out what was on the other side. When we discovered what was there, we figured it was better than what we left." Bernard, finding Terrier both itchy and sore, had Terrier put down, a tragedy only insofar as Terrier was very good at his job.

It is this tendency towards violence (towards euthanizing the competition) Warthog, despite his own background, finds troubling about the system he otherwise concluded "ran better than a greyhound on methamphetamines"—"It would be nice if we could find a way of eliminating the competition without actually eliminating the competition. Then again, you got to get what's yours." Warthog finds no fault with Bernard since he feels Bernard was only taking advantage of the sole opportunity afforded him by the system. "Most interesting about the Terrier case is Bernard was simply acting out of his own self-interest. In other words, he had bitches and pups just like Terrier had bitches and pups. Why shouldn't he offer them the same opportunities Terrier was going

to offer his?" After all, Warthog concludes, it was not as if Bernard chose to be better prepared to excel in his chosen field, he was simply born that way. Birth, like ability, was for Warthog, the defining characteristic of one's life—"Without birth," Warthog writes, "we wouldn't be here. And it's because of it, we find ourselves pawing for every meal."

It is this pawing, Warthog believes, that is how we distinguish ourselves. To put it simply, Warthog argues the symbiotic dissemination of an osmotic seedling is co-productive with the interstitial imaginary (given that the imaginary is prime, but if and only if this prime is a derivative of the fiduciary mass). The market, Warthog writes, is what determines the extent of the division that, in turn, determines the extent of the market. In other words, the market can only go where marketers tell it to go. The market is not, Warthog insists, like an animal and "to think so would be just plain silly. To imagine it with two horns, red eyes, and a set of sharp teeth is, although fun, not productive. The market," Warthog continues, "is like a snowball in hell—it shouldn't exist, but it does." To avoid discussing the market in terms of a fantastical creature with seven legs and arms like machine guns that, although cool, would be kind of weird, Warthog frames his study of the market in terms specific to market economics, i.e., statistical fleecing, investment betrayal, or projectional screwing, all of which are areas of study invented by Warthog.

What Warthog calls pawing is "simply," he writes, "the scrapping, the fight, the scramble for crumbs. In other words, it's within our right to do what we have to do to survive. What's interesting," Warthog continues, "is how this scramble to survive is defined by those involved in it. In other words, what positions have been assumed by those alphas and betas beyond ordinate and subordinate positions?" Among the many positions Warthog identifies, in addition to "below" and "on-top," are the sit, the heel, the hump, and the tail-wag. However, these are really only the beginning of a list which also includes "the rib-spur, the back-break, the cash-lick, and the leg-raise," all of which, according to Warthog, result in injury. However, even these are really only general categories to describe the type of work most alphas and

betas engage in. Warthog had devised these general categories because, he claims, “identifying each and every job performed by the alphas and betas would simply have been way too much work. Besides,” he writes, “what’s more important is identifying the quality or the nature of the work performed as opposed to detailing their exact movements. What I mean is that an alpha-alpha, an alpha-beta, and even a beta-beta relationship all pretty much take the same form.”

Why Warthog’s theory of division incorporates the relationships between the divided is because it is the distance, for Warthog, between the separated that most clearly defines the success of the market system. To illustrate his point, Warthog devises a complex series of graphs based on complex mathematical formulas. Warthog’s most important graph—the Degree of Suffering—can best be described as what looks like a hand palm-side down with its four outside digits curled in towards the palm. The formula which accompanies this graph (and which is Warthog’s most significant contribution to mathematical theory) is: if $f(u) < 0$ (impossible!), then $f(u)^2$ as u approaches y (y being irrelevant) until $f(u) > 0$ approaching infinity. This formula predicts the success or failure of a certain quarter, success and failure that Warthog describes as either heads or tails.

Coincidentally, Warthog also uses the terms heads and tails in the final section of his analysis—a description of the parameters involved in limiting the market’s reach. “Typically,” Warthog writes, “what the market allows itself is what falls to the floor, so to speak. In other words, it is very difficult for the market to get what is on the table all by itself. Or, one could say, the market operates between what it can imagine and what it can get rid of.” Suffice it to say, Warthog finds the prevailing theories that the market’s limits are set by the distances the market can or cannot overcome “flea-bitten.” The market is, Warthog writes, at its core, already beyond questions of distance—“it’s inevitable the market will grow. What is not is the extent to which we can manipulate it to work for us. What is a market, after all, but the extension of how loud we bark? What is it but the realization of our instincts? Shouldn’t we, as the makers of this market, be able to rein it in?”

However, these questions for Warthog are merely rhetorical because the “market,” as it stands, is, in Warthog’s opinion, “much bigger than we are able to talk about here. The ‘market,’ as far as we can ‘know it’ is really nothing more than an attempt to understand something which only came into creation after it was created. In other words, one’s actions or policies only exist insofar as they effect another action or policy that is distant from the first actor. And although our conception of it tends to follow from what we believe is its natural context, we’re only dressing the doll we’ve managed to piece together.” Thus, his conclusion, Warthog admits, does not rest on “anything that actually exists,” but rather on impenetrable fantastical models that serve to “maximize gain while reducing loss ... The whole point of my exercise,” Warthog writes, “is to somehow convince those who already aren’t convinced they should be doing what they’re already doing. Questions of responsibility and consequence are really questions better left to fiction writers who don’t really care about profit anyway.”

The strength of Warthog’s analysis is its strength, specifically its strength. In other words, what Warthog manages to do in a short two-thousand pages is effectively outline or introduce the general tenets of the system that seems to have crapped almost everywhere in the yard. Although Warthog’s analysis does not always listen as it should, it is loyal and very loving. In addition, Warthog, who is himself obedient to a fault, has managed to justify the adoption of our particular system in spite of the integrity of all others. It is why he deserves not only a bone, but to sleep in the bed.