

Dear Reader,

I wish to present you with a proposition that still concerns us, in the light of hypotheticology, an issue that you certainly did address yourself : « How is it that in the final analysis, there is no such thing as any clear evidence of Nomedia ? »

There can be no doubt that Bougainville's writings as well as La Perouse's and Juan Sebastian del Cano's, are so cryptic in their endeavours to evoke Nomedia that one feels having a right to wonder. Without being apocryphal (though this is not to be set aside) they are not substantial enough to be used as a strong basis for building up a thesis that suits the criterions of hypotheticology.

Lest we forget, and to put it briefly, hypotheticology is an inductive methodology enticing us, from an established proposition, to think about the hypotheses which led up to it. Hypotheses are thus presented in a line where each new one rises out of the former. Each hypothesis rules out the next one though never ruling out the former, resulting in, the further a developing hypothesis, the more likely it is, insofar as it encapsulates the probability of the ones that led up to it.

For these hypotheses to present some chance of getting close to a reality, we should use a reliable basis (ideally an indisputable one), which means a starting point that requires no proof whatsoever because it stands out as obvious. Let's put aside for a moment this continent "not quite in the middle of the great ocean" whose "winds pushed us and got us out from our way" (Del Cano's journal), these apparitions amidst "the thickest haze" of "the most extraordinary mist bank I've ever seen" which leads up to "the most complete illusion I have witnessed since my days as a navigator", as La Perouse states (as well as reckoning that "the discovery of islands is probably due only to nothing

but chance"). We are better off holding on to the least incipient of meanings among this realm of unutterable stuff and admitting once and for all that : "there is, at the moment, no clear evidence of Nomedie whatsoever." Why so ?

The **first hypothesis** is the most clear-cut as well as the least likely, since it alone rules out all the following ones : "*Nomedie doesn't exist*". And yet the very fact that we are talking about it proves that the hypothesis is debatable, for can one name a thing that does not exist ? Therefore Nomedie exists, if anything on a conceptual plane. Only its physical substance can be called into question.

**Second hypothesis** : "*Nomedie exists but nobody ever went there.*"

Some people might have had a glimpse of it. This hypothesis emerges after the reading of aforementioned writings and might explain the artistic haze within its descriptions, hence the lack of what we call "clear evidence".

As we see, the first hypothesis "Nomedie does not exist" rules out the 2nd "Nomedie exists but nobody ever went there." Conversely, that nobody ever went to Nomedie does not rule out that Nomedie does not exist. The 2nd hypothesis therefore adds up to the first and potentially integrates it, thus giving it a superior probability.

**Third hypothesis** : "*Nomedie exists, people went there but they never came back.*"

Such a hypothesis is compatible with certain people having had a glimpse of it and - as well as the former hypothesis - accounts for lack of clear evidence. Here are a few notable sub-hypotheses :

- the structural impossibility of coming back : living conditions on Nomedie may

not be compatible with human life, ensuing death for travellers in the short-term ; gravitational pull is too strong (as with Black Holes that no-one can escape from)...

- the physical impossibility of coming back : for inst., wrecked ships, hostile islanders condemning travellers to jail, disease affecting travellers' physical abilities...

- the mental impossibility of coming back : for inst., neurologic and/or psychiatric illnesses, amnesiae followed by one's forgetting their foreign origins...

- a desire not to come back : the traveller stays in Nomedica because he or she chooses to do so for some reason ; for inst., living conditions on Nomedica may be superior to the rest of the world, or one realises s/he has a compelling task to fulfill on the continent, or Nomedians of both sexes provide travellers with addictive sexual favours...

We see that hypothesis #2 "Nobody ever went there" rules out hypothesis #3 "people went there but never came back", while hypothesis #3 does not rule out hypothesis #2, inasmuch as it is possible to not return from a place after having gone there. Third hypothesis is thus more likely than the Second, who remains likelier than the First.

**Fourth hypothesis :** *"Nomedica exists, people went there and came back, but they bore no witness."*

A few sub-hypotheses :

- compulsion or oaths given not to give evidence ;
- personal choice (possibly to preserve the Misplaced Continent) ;
- amnesia.

Such a hypothesis does not rule out that people went to Nomedica and did not

come back, and is therefore more likely than the former.

**Fifth hypothesis :** *"Nomedia exists, people went there and came back, bore witness but their testimony did not get through to the rest of us."*

Such testimonies might have been lost, damaged, or concealed for possible secrecy reasons.

This hypothesis does not rule out that people went to Nomedia but did not bear a witness, therefore is more likely than all former hypotheses.

Eventually, there is a **Sixth hypothesis** ; being last, it does not rule out the former ones and is as such the likeliest of all. It is also the most enthralling by a long shot : *"Nomedia exists, people went there and came back, bore a witness, their testimonies got through to us but we can't recognize them for what they are."*

It should then be easy to assume that, if said testimonies are not recognized for what they are, it is merely for being unintelligible or abstruse. However, the most intellectually rigorous and true approach is to admit that we may very well be largely responsible for such a situation, the onus being on us to raise our own minds to a level which recognises and can then analyse testimonies regarding Nomedia.

Indeed, nothing prevents us from thinking that an unknown quantity of artistic works - major as well as minor ones - are not - partly or as a whole - an expression of such testimonies, their deep and hidden meaning having evaded us till now. It is thus proper to take a new interest at some literary, pictural, musical and other works, wondering to what extent they do not stand for testimonies more or less disguised about the Misplaced Continent.

In my next column, I will address an issue of some importance : *"How is it that to this day, Nomedica is not yet clearly located?"* We will dwell on the hypothetical analysis of Nomedica through Heisenberg's principle of indeterminacy.

*Dr Hubert McGregor*

*Providencia Laboratory of Applied Hypotheticology*