

Psychic Dictionary: A Tale of *Aurauthority*

M. Hattie Hein

“It was thereby entirely correct when Aragon [...] declared, ‘The revolutionary intellectual appears first and foremost as the betrayer of his class of origin.’ This betrayal consists [...] in conduct which turns him, from a supplier of the productive apparatus, into an engineer who sees it as his task to adapt this apparatus to the purposes of the proletarian revolution.”
—Walter Benjamin, *“The Author as Producer,”* page 268

The game of Psychic Dictionary exists 1) as it has been consistently performed, 2) as it is remembered by me, and (perhaps) others. For the purposes of this exploration, the congealing of these two definitions—indeed their existence as two separate, inimical entities—will be entirely ignored. Reproducing the game in good faith, as sincerely as possible, I will then attempt to make an honest case for the game’s social/transcendent capabilities using terms and concepts drawn from the fertile tradition of the Frankfurt School scholars and writers.

The game of Psychic Dictionary is a process, a *spiel*, and a ritual, through which knowledge and morals (wisdom) are transmitted. Walter Benjamin’s essays should be useful in examining this aspect of the game. Psychic Dictionary is most at home during lulls—those periods of boredom Benjamin finds so pregnant with potential. “If sleep is the apogee of physical relaxation,” he writes in “The Storyteller,” “boredom is the apogee of mental relaxation. Boredom is the dream bird that hatches the egg of experience” (91). Whether Psychic Dictionary effectively organizes and rationalizes this downtime and liquidates it of its potential, or acts as a storyteller did during those times before “the gift for listening [was] lost and the community of listeners [disappeared]” remains to be seen (91). Psychic Dictionary’s negotiation of authority and

expertise certainly opens it up to critique by critical theorists, including Herbert Marcuse, who notes in his essay on “Some Social Implications of Modern Technology” that even as “the masses” gain potential power, “they are transformed into a conservative force which itself perpetuates the existence of the apparatus” (150). It is hoped that the game may prove to negotiate those issues in such a way that they are exposed and transformed to worthwhile ends rather than simply reproduced.

What is Psychic Dictionary?

1. There is a Psychic Dictionary theme song. It sounds a lot like the theme song of the popular television show “I Dream of Genie.” The only words to the song are its title, “Psychic Dictionary,” repeated over and over.
2. Psychic Dictionary is an exciting game that you can play using any dictionary in your own home, but there is only one Psychic Dictionary. The hosts do not pick words to read out of the dictionary. Nor do the hosts intentionally pick a definition out of the many in the Psychic Dictionary.
3. No.
4. The hosts lift the Psychic Dictionary aloft and psychically divine a definition from the many therein. They pronounce the psychically selected definition aloud. Other participants in the game shout out the proper, correct answer, the word that the Psychic Dictionary aligns with the pronounced definition. Participants are ignored by the hosts until one of them shouts out the proper, correct answer.
5. If the entire definition has been read, pronounced, and no proper, correct answer has emerged from the non-hosting participants, the hosts may note that although the rules of Psychic Dictionary (which are very strict and may not be broken under any circumstances) do not permit hinting or guessing, it is entirely possible for participants to observe the point in the binding at which the Psychic Dictionary is opened, and psychically divine the first letter of the word being defined.

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

6. When the hosts hear the correct word shouted, spat out, they point to the emitter and identify him or her: “You, young lady,” or “You, young man, what did you say?” The participant who has stated the correct word is encouraged to take the stage amidst the applause and encouragement of those assembled.
7. Congratulations, congratulations. What is your name young man, or What is your name young lady? Congratulations. No no, don’t go yet. It falls upon you to psychically divine and read the next definition from the Psychic Dictionary. But first, you must share with us a song, a story, a joke, a limerick, a haiku or interpretive dance: anything having to do with or using the word “_____.”
8. The Psychic Dictionary theme song? This is a good time for it.
9. A vast majority of the time, the participant says or does something sort of interesting, vaguely impressive, or mildly amusing, having to do with, or using the word that he or she had previously called out, shouted, pronounced.
10. This process is repeated twice. There are three answerers on stage. The hosts ask other participants to decide, with the warm sounds of their hands, which answerer and word they prefer.
11. After listening intently to this response, the hosts declare either the least popular or the second-least popular participant the winner.
12. All three answerers receive awards culled from the hosts’ pockets. Occasionally a dollar bill or a pack of cigarettes is part of the prize coffer; sometimes all three awards are odd trinkets or old record albums. Everyone is thanked. All are reminded that they can play Psychic Dictionary using any dictionary they might find in or around their own homes, but that there is only one Psychic Dictionary.

Psychic Dictionary: A Critical Taxonomy

M. HATTIE HEIN

So what can we say about this Psychic Dictionary? What are its constituent elements? It is a quiz show, but its prizes are not fabulous. It encourages “audience participation” both by commanding the presence of selected participants on stage, and by seeking participant input as to the (purely nominal) victor. Of course, this latter audience participation seems to be subverted by the apparently random selection of a victor by the hosts, but in fact the most popular participant never wins: The “audience” is always denied, and thus consulted (Q.E.D!).

The game seems to promote active participation by participants. This suggests that it has engaged in one aspect of *Umfunktionierung*, as relayed by Benjamin in “The Author as Producer”:

What matters therefore is the exemplary character of production, which is able first to induce other producers to produce, and second to put an improved apparatus at their disposal. And this apparatus is better the more consumers it is able to turn into producers, that is, readers or spectators into collaborators. (265)

This demand might appear naïve in the present cultural climate of controlled “interactivity” and “reality television” were it not for Benjamin’s crucial requirements that the “apparatus” must be “improved.” This caveat returns the discussion to the question of whether Psychic Dictionary’s participants are interchangeable models taking turns in authority’s gaze or truly empowered producers.

Both their liberty (they’re free to pick their format) and their constraint (they must be brief and their contributions must involve the words they pronounced) are emphasized continually, as the rules are repeated *ab initio* to each answerer. Repetition follows on its own heels so clearly and obviously that it becomes repetition of itself; repetition moves from an aesthetic mode or delivery

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

system to an object. What effect does this have? No. What potential and actual effects might it have? It gives the constant stream of verbiage an overt rhythm, making it more pleasing, entertaining. It offers the opportunity to approach the repetition itself as a phenomenon liable to inquiry and investigation, possibly transformation.

Apart from the repetition of the patten and the spiel, there is very little consistent content to *Psychic Dictionary*. This hems in the critical investigator to some extent; I am not able to provide a classic literary close reading of a text that distinguishes itself primarily by its format. Because the cultural item under purview is in this way hollow, however, I can consider it solely in terms of its structural shell. Theodor Adorno might find this focusing of critique more useful than disabling, as his nominal concerns tended toward extracting, exhuming, and exposing the consistency of seemingly diverse cultural products.

If one accepts Adorno's intimations along those lines (backed by Benjamin and pretty much any other cultural analyst who one would identify as a critical theorist rather than a critical reviewer), the next logical step for the analyst of *Psychic Dictionary* should be to situate the particular game within some larger organization: species, genus, family, order. The species is the particular event—one game is different than the last is different from the next, is unique. The genus is the game *Psychic Dictionary* as performed, instigated, consumed by people sharing company with the *Psychic Dictionary* itself, of which there is only one. The family of *Psychic Dictionary* is the game as scrabbled together in dorm rooms and cottages around the world, both before and after the uttering of the words "*Psychic Dictionary*" regardless of slight differences in method, structure, and rules—both the folk game and any commercial application of the educational entertainment. But to what order does *Psychic Dictionary* belong?

The game may be a quiz show, a homespun version of a mass media/culture industry phenomenon that reached its initial apex in

M. HATTIE HEIN

the very early days of television. To the folklorist or the cultural studies critic, the roots of all family members require investigation. A genealogy demands formation. From what springeth which? Although the quiz show found immense popularity with the institution of grand cash prizes, quiz shows with modest awards followed. The allure of these shows resided in the lure of the host's personality, colorful contestants, or the intellectual status of identifying with contestants in terms of intellectual capacities (as defined by their success in the game at hand) rather than in terms of vicarious enjoyment of the fabulous awards. Self-examination plays a part in audience engagement with both of these shows. *Psychic Dictionary* only challenges this ethos insofar as it refuses the logical and rational courses of abiding by its own rules, declaring a victor based on commonly held standards, and awarding the victor with superior spoils. Depending on how the amateurism of the hosts is taken, the game's mocking of commercial formats may either demystify its models or accentuate the latter's superiority. *Psychic Dictionary* may leave itself open to revolutionary critique in its mockery/mimicry of established mass culture forms.

Stuart Ewen connects the auto-examinatory impulse with a nationally enforced relentless self-consciousness thrust upon the American populace during the rise of scientific advertising. Some promotional strategists implied that users of their products were perfect in every way, while other campaigns emphasized the possibility that success in one particular commodity-defined area could supercede shortcomings in others. In the case of the quiz show, trivial—or at any rate inessential in the occupational or domestic realm—knowledge, combined with an aptitude for performing under pressure, won the day. Is it surprising that the quiz show still stands as one of the most powerful examples of television sponsorship boosting a company's sales? In the cases of both the quiz show and *Psychic Dictionary*, the hosts pose as examiners at the same time that they are examined by the camera or audience. Walter Benjamin is right to make a distinction between live theater and cinema, but the lights and boundaries of

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

the stage present their own technologically mediating forces. When he writes in “Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” “[t]he camera director in the studio occupies a place identical with that of the examiner during aptitude tests,” his words suggest an intriguing dialectical aspect of quizzes performed for entertainment (246). The quizmaster/host is the object of the camera and audience’s gaze, and relays this objectification/subjugation onto the contestant. In a game of Psychic Dictionary, audience representatives are brought on stage, and so doubly subjugated (to the rule of the hosts and the glare of the apparatus).

The other genre to which Psychic Dictionary belongs is that of mere entertainment. As practiced by the genuine hosts, the game’s role is as a time-killer, a dead-air-filler. In between musical acts or in the midst of technical difficulties, Psychic Dictionary encourages those present to keep their senses attuned to the stage. The pregnant moments of boredom invaded by the entertainment may otherwise have led to conversation, meditation, or disenchantment. Benjamin suggests that in a society outside the reign of “technological truth,” (Marcuse 147) the moments of boredom would have eventually been filled with casual, meditative storytelling, but that the information age has proved “incompatible with storytelling” (89). Accepting this diagnosis, Psychic Dictionarians take action and (authoritatively) create a space for potential boredom that would-be participants may only escape by participation in the (albeit regulated) exchange of wisdom.

Charismauthority: Another Word Not Found in the Psychic Dictionary

A lot depends on how one views the distillation of paying customers into audience members into participants into answerers/performers. As paying customers, they are responsible for very little, just that which is dictated by law and custom. It is not their responsibility to become participants, but it is their likely

inclination, considering their intentions in paying (at least partly) to be entertained (at least somewhat). The hosts both figuratively and literally “take the stage,” with all its technological mechanisms of control and manufactured *charismauthority*. The microphone is the visible signifier of control, the metallic proof that its holder has the power and right to speak and be heard or temporarily cede the electronic conch to another. The microphone is synecdochal for the mass of chords, mixing board and speakers that result in performing power’s quantifiable manifestation: decibel level. When the hosts consent to pass the microphone to answerers, their doing so in no way amounts to a revolt, resignation, or abdication.

The hosts perform the impenetrability of their authority. See how much giving we can take? They show their power with their mercy. As Nietzsche puts it, “[t]he ‘creditor’ always becomes more humane to the extent that he has grown richer; finally, how much injury he can endure without suffering from it becomes the actual *measure* of his wealth” (72, italics Nietzsche’s). They display their largess by freely dispensing with it. Of course, the parsimonious nature of the prize awards declares that this largess is primarily gaseous, theoretical, idealistic. It is the spiritual shell without the material kernel, but no less real for all that. Their power is emphasized by the hosts’ insistence on both the answerers’ absolute liberty (a joke, a song, a story, a haiku, an interpretive dance) and their subject status (state your name; keep it brief; speak into the microphone; include the word you pronounced; you will be judged; for the moment you have been declared a winner). The game is omnivorous, and wishes to encompass both rebellion and assent.

In Immanuel Kant’s formulation, the hosts stand in for Frederick the Great, King of Prussia—as well as the structure supporting and supported by him. Kant declares, “[i]n some affairs affecting the interest of the community a certain mechanism is necessary in which some members of the community remain passive [...]. Here arguing is not permitted. One must obey” (386). In the game analogy at hand, an essential acceptance of the structure and rules

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

of the game is required. Along the same lines, Kant notes that once general intellectual consensus on progressive change has been reached, such change should only be instituted insofar as it can be done “without, however, hindering those who want to remain true to the old institutions” (388). Those in attendance need not actively participate, but must refrain from interfering with its workings. What answerers choose to do or say when given the microphone reflects Kant’s conceptualization of “the public use of one’s reason” and creative ability (386). The hosts’ deferral of absolute authority to the book itself is analogous to Kant’s suggestion that the King ought to allow religious ideas to be exchanged freely and openly without his own input. The compiled learning of the learned = the scientifico-rational-impartial dictionary definitions; the King = the hosts, benign enablers, umpires.

This deferment mirrors a society’s tendency to absorb what are called “the rules of the game” or “reality.” In Karl Marx’s writings, such absorption of superstructural apparatuses amounts to little more than the popular acceptance of the masked ideology or “ideas of its ruling class” (489). Marx might also note that *Psychic Dictionary* is extremely efficient in its coercive reproduction of labor. In the words of the “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,” he asserts, “Labour produces not only commodities; it produces itself and the worker as a *commodity*—and does so in the proportion in which it produces commodities generally” (71). It seems unlikely, however, that the role of the game participant is really as debased as the state of alienated labor Marx describes: “the worker sinks to the level of a commodity and becomes indeed the most wretched of commodities” (70). Nonetheless, the aspect of the game’s structure that requires answerers to rope in other participants, an aspect that encourages answerers to play the role of host themselves, presents an interesting way to consider the work of labor as the reproduction of its alienated self (and the strategies employed to encourage that process).

M. HATTIE HEIN

The game's moral armature need never be stated—its underpinnings are far too familiar to be spoken. Accessing both the dreaming and the logical Enlightenments (Adorno), the game relies upon the belief that learning is good, that an increased vocabulary is of some utility to both worldly and spiritual self-improvers. Sex, drugs, rock music, needless danger, hedonism, the horde, disrespect for the primary notions of education in the existing techne of vocabulary: these only enter the game's equation from the mouths of contestants and answerers. The game is good clean fun, a paean to the only desire more square than the wish for good clean fun—the dream that entertainment and improvement ideally coexist, working and playing toward an improved humanist state of affairs. It is the Sesame Street and Charlie Rose of its own milieu, the liberal apologist for a fundamentally untenable technology.

The childishness of the whole venture, its simplicity and naiveté, is the object of that hopeless ironic laughter so disdained by Horkheimer and Adorno. Yes, we will play (along) for the moment; because we are good sports; because we don't want to feel that our time and money have been wasted in coming here tonight; because it's fun to pretend you're still a kid every once in a while, when that imaginary moment occurs in a safe space; because there's nothing we can do about it and that's the way it is. The ironic detachment with which the game is approached suggests that participants are playing along with something they know is a relic of Girl Scouts or drama camp, some last remnant of the dreaming Enlightenment in today's public schools.

Gaining audience consent through application to these grudgingly ironic tendencies would strike some critics as a submission to the status quo that produced them (the tendencies, not necessarily the critics). Looking at the process as a technical skill, however, allows those who proclaim technology's (potential) neutrality to be marshaled on the behalf of this subtly coercive technique. Marcuse, who maintained belief in that neutrality throughout his writing career, noted in 1941 that even the broadly drawn

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

identification of “technics” “can promote authoritarianism as well as liberty, scarcity as well as abundance, the extension as well as the abolition of toil” (139). The talents of the vocabularians who pronounce answers are neither respected in their everyday lives nor reflected in the performers who will repossess the stage once their guitars have been tuned. Assuming that their participation amounts to some sort of approval (whether tacit or engaged), however, the game could emit a halo of goodwill around the evening’s entertainments, which would in turn acquire the air of virtuous value by virtue of their relationship with the wholesome Psychic Dictionary, a process Pierre Bourdieu describes as “exploiting symbolic capital” (145).

Fetish, Fetishize :: Aura, Auracize
Commodity, Commodify :: Aura, Aurafy

The fetishization of Psychic Dictionary—no, of *the* Psychic Dictionary—was attempted by me and mine. It may have failed, or it may have succeeded. There is a story (Benjamin). For five years, I traveled with the Dictionary. We made our way through Western Europe and Anglophone North America. Back in Portland, we became separated. I asked around: Have you happened to have seen the Psychic Dictionary lately? When the bar cleared out at the end of the night, the promoter and erstwhile mayoral candidate (a man of his word) looked at me, and in the voice of one who doesn’t make the rules, only enforces them, told me, “Well, you know, the Psychic Dictionary likes to travel.”

When it came time for Duchamp to take his wares on tour, he devised miniatures, tiny models of his found sculptures. Although Benjamin suggests that such activities may increase the aura’s rate of decline, he suggests no methods for promoting or adding aura. To a certain extent, aura’s demise is universal—whether the specific work actually gets reproduced or not isn’t as important as its potential reproducibility, causing “the quality of its presence” to be “always deprecated” (221). But there may still be enough general understanding of the combination and distance that

M. HATTIE HEIN

constitute aura for 21st century people to feel a shadow nostalgia for the presence of distance. Benjamin writes:

Even the perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place it happens to be. This unique existence of the work of art determined the history to which it was subject at the time of its existence. This includes the changes which it may have suffered in physical condition over the years as well as the various changes in ownership. (220)

Although the sort of dictionary most people have in their homes was never meant to be a work of art; although the conception of an original dictionary from which they were reproduced may be foreign and irrelevant to these people; the elements of aura described above remain powerful in relation to the Psychic Dictionary. The printing and dissemination of 300,000 copies of a certain dictionary affects the Psychic Dictionary no more than the efficient manufacture of canvas changed the conditions of reception encountered by Renaissance painters.

It's important here not to confuse the possession of aura with authenticity. As Benjamin points out, authenticity only becomes an issue with widespread reproduction. That which can potentially be copied and placed in Las Vegas (the Mona Lisa, Venice's waterways) assembles proof of its authenticity in a feeble and commodity-informed attempt to commensurate for the aura it loses. In Benjamin's words, "Precisely because authenticity is not reproducible, the intensive penetration of certain (mechanical) processes of reproduction was instrumental in differentiating and grading authenticity" (243). If one needs technology more precise than the human eye to discover whether a work is original or not, its authenticity should only matter to buyers, sellers, and insurers. The reproduc/ed/able piece, whether itself near or hidden away,

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

lacks the “unique phenomenon of a distance no matter how close it may be” so crucial to the congealing of aura (243).

Psychic Dictionary embraces the radical effects of aura’s demise. Benjamin’s concepts are not only “useful for the formulation of revolutionary demands in the politics of art,” they point to the issues which must be addressed by any critically engaged culture-producers (218). Working in an epoch of mass culture, cultural producers are faced with a beggar’s choice. They can either manifest the current state of art in their works, perhaps drawing attention to and implicitly critiquing it (Warhol); or they can attempt to eschew the reach of accepted dissemination models (several people working independently in their basements to whom few are exposed). Practitioners of Psychic Dictionary attempt to announce the ultimate reproducibility and commensurability of everything in the current state, but assert the possibility of a work which escapes these facts of contemporary life. (The nominal duplication of the game and its magical item hearkens to the epoch of ritual cult value, during which the item not only represented, but primarily engaged the abstract with which it was associated (Benjamin 223-225, 242). In a similarly dialectic vein, Psychic Dictionary is designed to exploit the authority of received systems while foregrounding its own apparatus: the stage, the ritual, the ritual item.

So, did someone actually fall for it? Someone out there must have been impressed enough by our constant remonstrations that “There is only one Psychic Dictionary” that he or she put a little time, effort, and techne into stashing the tome away. But who would believe such nonsense? Granted, the Psychic Dictionary holds certain charms.

What You Need to Know About the Psychic Dictionary

I. The Psychic Dictionary is not lost. It came into my possession through fairly honest means, and is certainly mine in a common-law sort of way, at any rate. The thought of the Psychic Dictionary

M. HATTIE HEIN

being mine first occurred a few years ago, in June. It was just sinking in that our little rock club would soon be closing, and that everyone was entitled to some sort of trophy. Tom wanted the Rolodex, but I don't think he got it. I said, "The Psychic Dictionary is mine!" That is when the seed of thought was first planted.

II. Inside the front cover, Sharpie black pen says, "Send the lost/ Psychic Dictionary/ to: 4534 N. Kerby/ PDX 97217." Now, never mind that *PDX* means Portland International Airport, and that the correct abbreviation for Portland is *Ptld*. Nobody lives at 4534 N. Kirby, at least nobody who has any connection with the Psychic Dictionary. At least not any more. And it's not lost.

III. Not inside the front cover, well inside the front cover, of course, but not *on* the inside front cover, more of the blank page before the copyright page, on that page is the torn bottom right corner where you can still make out the imprint of my name. What that says to me is that the Psychic Dictionary is from my library. The imprint maker was given to me for Christmas several years ago. Although the page is ripped in many places and is not in any way attached to the rest of the book, it is clear that that page is, indeed, a part of the Psychic Dictionary.

IV. In fact, if you hold that same page up to the light, you can see through the sticker that says "LiAR" (with a backward *R*) to the original printing on the page, a black printing which confirms that the page I've been going on about is obviously part of the Psychic Dictionary.

V. The "LiAR" sticker is probably part of a zine or rock & roll-affiliated media venture, which has nothing to do with the book, and is certainly not a commentary on my imprint or any of my ownership claims regarding the book.

VI. The inside front cover, the part that says what to do with the lost Psychic Dictionary, also has a recipe for Dutch babies. I will

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

try to reproduce it for you as completely as possible: *3 eggs; ¾ C milk; ¾ C floure; 375 or 400 F + ½ cube butter + 1 cast iron.* There is a drawing of a skillet labeled “skillet,” and there is a drawing of a box that is labeled “powdered sugar.” What it actually looks like is a book with the title Problem Sugar, perhaps a health or diet book, but since I have had Dutch babies before, I know that what the artist intended was for me to see that and say, “powdered sugar box.” It is due to my experience in the Dutch baby field that I am aware of this, and also that I am aware of the fact that the drawing with no writing is a lemon sliced in half. The other two parts of the recipe are as follows: *15 minutes; don’t jump around in the oven.*

VII. Also on the inside front cover is a taped or glued-on print of some sort. The design is at least vaguely symmetrical and does not lend itself toward being described as “native” or “Oriental” or anything except something done by an adolescent or adult with reddish ink.

VIII. I think I have proved my claim of ownership regarding the Psychic Dictionary strongly enough that I can be honest with you for a second and admit that that reddish ink design is one of the things related to the Psychic Dictionary that I really don’t understand at all. Not that I haven’t been honest so far. I have been nothing but. However, you’ve got to admit that I could have just left that little part out about not understanding the design and no one would have been any wiser. I could make a number of guesses. Maybe it was printed at a self-service photocopy shop. Maybe it was printed as a transparent sticker, and a second clear sticker was stuck on top of it in this particular instance to protect against peeling or theft. Maybe the person or persons who introduced the red ink design to the Psychic Dictionary knew the artist or artists. Maybe it is right side up; maybe it can be looked upon from any direction. To be honest, I don’t know.

IX. There is a purple sort of print of nostrils and a sketchy open mouth. It is completely, unquestionably, part of the Psychic

M. HATTIE HEIN

Dictionary. The page that the white and purple sticker is stuck on is the former title page, and unlike the page before the title page, the title page does not appear to be in any danger of falling away from its binding or tearing in an inconvenient spot. Don't ask me any more about the title page. I don't know any more about it, and it doesn't intrigue me, at least not the way the red ink design does. Maybe with DNA spotting and fingerprint technology the way it is today, somebody could find out whose face it was that got printed and stuck there, and maybe even who stuck it.

X. *Gimme a hunerd punkin samwiches.* The colored ink drawing of punkin samwiches beneath the (imploring?) command has been smeared by water. Although the Psychic Dictionary was in my, it is best to say, company, when its covers came off, the water damage that occurred to the *Gimme a hunerd punkin samwiches* and the pages following it was allowed when the Psychic Dictionary was under different administration. I tried to tape the cover together, but it was too late.

XI. The Psychic Dictionary is copyrighted 1978 and 1980. It can not be copied.

XII. I saw the Psychic Dictionary on top of the old piano that Tom had claimed from the club's wreckage. The book was much smaller than the piano, and easily fit into my bag.

XIII. Taped and laminated on the spine is a fortune cookie fortune, reading, "Simplicity of character is the natural result of profound thought." The Psychic Dictionary is over one thousand pages long.

XIV. One of the ways that I know the Psychic Dictionary better than Tom or any participant is that I've seen them use it and, naturally, they haven't.

XV. There is only one Psychic Dictionary.

PSYCHIC DICTIONARY

Works Cited

- Benjamin, Walter. "Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken, 1968.
- . "The Author as Producer." Trans. Edmund Jephcott. *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. Ed. Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt. New York: Continuum, 1982.
- . "The Storyteller." *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken, 1968.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996.
- Kant, Immanuel. "What Is Enlightenment?" *The Enlightenment: A Comprehensive Anthology*. Trans. and ed. Peter Gay. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973. 383-389.
- Marcuse, Herbert. "Some Social Implications of Modern Technology." *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. Ed. Arato et. al. New York: Continuum, 1982.
- Marx, Karl. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." Trans. Martin Milligan. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. 2nd ed. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: Norton, 1978.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage, 1967.