

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-11/msg00270.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 26 Nov 2006 05:50:33 GMT
-

On Fri, 24 Nov 2006 22:21:17 +0100, peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=) wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 24 Nov 2006 20:18:09 +0100, peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=) wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 21 Nov 2006 23:47:24 +0100,
peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=)
wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 19
Nov 2006
16:05:09
-0500, Bob
Kolker
<nowhere@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Peter
Bjørn
Perlsø
wrote:

Michael
Scheltgen

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

<mjs818@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

And
it
is
the
Government
(aka
society)

Government
is
NOT
EQUAL
TO
SOCIETY!!!

This
is
a
common
error
among
the
the
Statist
and
the
pinko
stinko
liberal
commies.
They
see
society
and
government
as
one
and
inseperable.

Strawman. I
doubt you
can quote
anyone at
all making

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

such a
statement.
You are just
making
\$#!+ up
again.

No, Roy, in this case he is
right. Socialists and
collectivists
typically do not know the
difference between state and
society, and they
ultimately want them to be
completely overlapping and
united.

Unless you can provide some sort of direct,
verbatim, in-context
quotes to that effect, you are just pulling the
same old strawman \$#!+
Bob pulls.

I cant quote *every* conversation I have ever had with state
socialists
here.

Can you quote any that supports your claim? The quote at the top of
this post does not support it, because it has clearly been taken out
of context: Michael meant that government acts_for society, not that
it actually is society (i.e., he probably meant "IOW," not "aka,"
and was just being a bit sloppy), because without government, society
lacks effective means to act in its collective interest (which of
course by no means implies that government always does act in
society's interest).

Consider the analogy of a man using a hammer to drive a nail. When
describing the process, we might say "the hammer (IOW the man) drives
the nail." The man of course does not hit the nail with his fist, and
can't drive the nail without using a hammer. Likewise, without the
man, the hammer does nothing; but that doesn't mean a description of a
man's use of a hammer to drive a nail mistakes the man for his hammer.
And continuing the above analogy, just because a man needs a hammer to
drive a nail doesn't mean he will never hit his thumb with it.

You are going out of your way to rationalize what is at best sloppy

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

thinking.

If you are saying that Michael expressed himself carelessly, I would agree. But one must often interpolate poorly expressed ideas on Usenet or discourse would all but cease; and Michael's slip was very minor by comparison with many that others have made and not been reproached for. Including you.

-- Roy L

.