



Regardless of what you may believe, you will surely grant that a solipsist does not believe in the being known as Blotsplotch, for the solipsist, by definition, does not subscribe to the existence of any being beyond herself, including *your* existence. Yes, you there, reading this sentence. Knowing then what it is like to have your own existence wholly denied by another, while knowing full well that you do indeed exist, are you not obliged to believe in the existence of Blotsplotch along the lines of treating others as you would treat yourself? At the very least, is there an ethical duty *not* to deny Blotsplotch's existence? Lastly, if you believe such a duty might be universal, popular, or even remotely possible, are you not better off acting as though Blotsplotch *does* exist?

Regardless of what you may believe, you will surely grant that animists and pantheists believe in Blotsplotch. They may not acknowledge the being in question by that name, nor grant specific qualities to the being in question; however, the being denoted by the name "Blotsplotch" is to all intents and purposes the same being, that believed-in being, also known as the being in question. The animist may simply recognize the spirit of the being in question without the need for further qualification. The pantheist may recognize Blotsplotch as an incarnation or aspect of a universal being that exists comprehensively, whereby Blotsplotch is merely a small facet of the greatest whole. In either case, it is granted if animists or pantheists exist, then there exist groups of individuals who believe in the being in question. Consequently, we may speak of a culture of Blotsplotch.

(Blotsplotch only wants elliptical curves over number fields to behave.
Blotsplotch . . .)

