

## Re: Latest News

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.cad/2004-11/0348.html>

---

**From:** Mark Ferguson (*nunya\_at\_biz.ness*)

**Date:** 11/23/04

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 2004 15:02:17 -0700

R. Steve Walz wrote:

<snip Steve's incomprehension of his doublespeak infatuation with renaming dogma as "Truth">

<interspersed unmarked brevity snips>

>>> *Nothing I say needs any proof at all, it's all structural argument*

>>> *that is based only on the common human experience.*

>>

>>

>> *Yet another unsubstantiable claim.*

> *It needs no "substantiation", it is simply what I said I always*

> *intend to do. It is statement of my own principles.*

"Principles". IOW assumptions not relatable to objective reality. You will not define "common human experience" because there is no such thing.

>> *Your experience is not*

>> *mine, and vice versa. Be extremely careful trying to refute*

>> *that statement; you'll be reduced to using "spurious factoids".*

> *I need no such thing.*

Then attempt to do so without them. Explicate precisely what your and my experiences have in common.

>>> *In fact I personally refuse to believe or even hold anything to be*

>>> *important that cannot be argued solely from structure without any*

>>> *assertion of spurious factoids.*

>> *That's nice. That kind of "reasoning" must rest on  
>> untestable assumptions. That kind of structuredstructure an  
>> "opinion".*

> *At some point all rests on assumptions. I consider mine  
as necessary  
> and part of the fabric of existence. You have been warped  
by your  
> upbringing so as to deny them.*

Your assumptions are fantasies not based on reality.

>>> *Anything that is merely evidenciary can always be  
disingenuously  
>>> contradicted by anyone Evil enough to wish to do so,  
and any kind  
>>> of evidence can be undermined by enough repetitious  
deceit unless  
>>> offered in a majority-respected peer-reviewed setting  
where Evil  
>>> is simply denied a voice.*

>> *Since you accept no evidence at all contradictory to your  
>> position, I must assume that since there is also none valid  
>> to support your position, that it is exactly equal to any  
>> other such position; namely, it's an "opinion".*

> *Opinion is what you have. Certainty is what I have.*

"Certainty" based on fantasy. You have nothing else to  
base it on.

> *It's like knowing how to count and do the arithmetic. You  
won't learn, and so you speak in inequalities  
> and haven't the vaguest idea why those are unacceptable.*

I refuse to "learn" to lie and call it truth.

>>> *The only cure for Evil is to stifle or kill it.*

>> *Yep, since you can't out-argue anyone, stifle or kill  
them.*

> *I simply say that it is futile to argue with an  
oppressor, since he isn't really listening.*

You most certainly are not.

>> *Say, I was wrong; you're not a fan of Lenin at all.  
>> Actually, you're a fan of Stalin.*

> *Nonsense. He has nothing in common with me except a means that you*

> *wouldn't want me to use, but which all humans finally have to.*

You've already said you prefer to watch it on TV rather than dirty your own precious hands. How typically elitist.

>>>> *Examine what is said and why, not who says what.*

>>>> *Great. Provide cites to support your opinions in future.*

>>> *Disingenuous. As I have said, that is disreputable and invalid.*

>> *Then your opinion has exactly no greater weight than anyone else's, by your own criteria.*

> *By my criteria, mine does.*

Your criteria have no weight other than what you give them; since you've provided no objective basis for determining their validity, why should anyone bother to take you seriously?

> *You misdefine "doublespeak" to suit your ends. Nothing I say is*

> *confusing or confounding to anyone. YOU simply don't LIKE it, and*

> *are LYING because you don't like me besting you so easily with my*

> *words!!*

Your words have only the meaning you assign to them. Hence you see them as unassailable. The rest of us take the trouble to agree on what "true" and "false" mean first.

>> *Of course, for this to work, you must continue to*

>> *characterize anyone who disagrees with you as "evil". You*

>> *sound more and more like a preacher.*

> *If preachers speak against obvious evil, sure, you'd probably think*

> *that. Your chosen sin is inequality and oppression of others, you*

> *really know you are supporting Evil, and you even know WHY it's*

> *Evil, you just wish to continue to DO it ANYWAY! If you dislike*

> *people pointing up your crimes, you sure won't like me!*

You are so very pompously full of shit. You completely fail to see your substitution of rational discussion with the assumption of evil on everyone's part but yours.

>>>> *This is the difference between religion and science. In the latter, agreement comes from the presentation and examination of \_all\_ evidence for a given POV, both supportive and contradictory.*

>>> *Any Peer-Review forum that permits your intentionally creative mischaracterizations violates all principles of Science and Truth.*

>> *Yet your preferred "intentionally creative mischaracterizations" such as Rather's,*

> *He didn't use any such thing. Liar.*

He most certainly did, specifically when he characterized his sources as "unimpeachable".

>> *and your insistence that anyone not agreeing with you is evil, are OK. Right. So much for Science and Truth under your watch.*

> *You who wish to twist perspective and deceive will receive the Truth, and you will NOT like it!*

Yet more baseless threats.

>>>> *Rather is comparable to a Baptist tent preacher pounding his Bible on a lectern, ignoring or shouting down doubters, then turning his flock against them with pitchforks and torches lest his lies be exposed.*

>>> *Rather told the Truth. He simply didn't yet have the evidence.*

>> *He lied. There is ample evidence of it, and exactly none to support the contents of the faked documents he presented.*

> *What he said was True, he simply didn't have evidence of it yet. He didn't know that at the time.*

To repeat, when he most certainly knew the documents were fakes because it had been independently proved so, he did not say so.

>>>> *You are one of his faithful because you believe his lies,  
>>>> and accept his excuses for lying.*

>>> *I don't like him or the media at ALL, \*I\* think they're  
WAY TOO  
>>> RIGHTIST!!!*

>> *Don't try to change the subject; we're talking about  
>> Rather's lies.*

> *He never lied. That you say he did is YOUR lie.*

Oh, right. Your definitions of "Truth" and "lie" again.

>>>>>> *The way we are changed from external influences is  
from within,*

>>>>>> *You used to say that we cannot change our minds from  
>>>>>> within at all. Lying again, or changed your mind?*

>>>>> *We cannot, through ANY act of supposed "will",  
change what we  
>>>>> believe, not even the smallest thing. But other  
things from within  
>>>>> and from without will change us, even if against our  
"will".*

>>>> *This is either your opinion or a lie.*

>>> *You do not specify the enumeration of our choices in  
that regard.*

>> *You already did.*

> *You don't GET to.*

I see. I am not allowed to participate. I am merely to be  
killed.

>>>> *Please present  
>>>> objectively verifiable evidence so I may discern which.*

>>> *You are not capable of such discernment, so it isn't  
appropriate.*

>> *Oh, right; I'm too stupid. That's a popular fallback in  
>> formal debating; oh, wait, no it isn't.*

> *This isn't a debate. That you're too stupid is merely True.*

I see. You have no evidence.

>>>>> *Nonsense. You cannot lift yourself into the air, and you cannot  
encompasse your own nature with your awareness. Any believed  
control is easily proved to be illusory.*

>>>> *Then kindly present a brief, concise proof.*

>>> *Goedel's Theorem, look it up.*

>> *I am aware of Godel's Incompleteness Theorem, and it  
simply does not apply to the real world as universally as  
you'd like it to.*

> *Nope, wrong. Take us through it, why don't you, and I'll  
point out how!!*

You cited Godel; present your proof. I'll show you your  
mistake(s).

> *Betcha won't, or that you'll try to gloss over it  
disingenuously!*

Give it your best shot.

>>>>>>> *Hold on, I did read it. It comprised four of the five  
points on the Bush site.*

>>>>>>> *Yeah, except in the opposite direction.*

>>>>>>> *Uh, no. Same identical points.*

>>>>> *So you'd like to pretend that there was no reason to  
see these men  
as adversaries? You're an idiot!*

>>>> *Of course there's no reason for them to be adversaries;  
they're from the same socioeconomic stratum, members  
of the  
same "secret society", and have much the same ends in  
mind.  
Their political platforms were conveniences of the moment  
and will have as much effect on their subsequent  
policies as  
past examples, which is to say none.*

>>> *Up to a point you're correct, but then you neglect  
their differences.*

>> *There are no significant differences between \_them\_. The  
only significant differences in their political lives is the*

>> *agendas of their handlers.*

> *Inspid nonsense.*

> *I wish Kerry HAD handlers, he needed some.*

The only time we likely heard from Kerry was his concession speech; it was the sole self-consistent statement he made during the entire election cycle. Oh, wait; self-consistency has no place in your "Truth".

>> *And where the hell do \_you\_ get off whining about*

>> *toss-off slurs, you Evil, posturing, deceitful,*

>> *disingenuous, lying, dogshitting, incapable of discernment,*

>> *nonsense-prating idiot?*

> *I use them against Evil, you against Good and Truth.*

> *That's the ultimate difference!*

According to your own, unrelatable-to-reality definitions.

>>>> *As for the name-calling, Steve, do you really take the*

>>>> *American political dog-and-pony shows seriously?*

>>> *I have one well beyond it that I do, of which the*

American version

>>> *is but a sick weak semblance. But the two sides are NOT the same,*

>>> *one is quite a bit better (less Evil) than the other!*

>> *Sigh. Care to be a little less vague?*

> *Your perception is vague, I was clear.*

Your first sentence is vague. To what do you refer, your "ideal Democratic vote"? That has nothing to do with the dog-and-pony shows I referred to. Try to stay on point.

>>>>>>>> *Tax the rich back to the level of the rest of us.*

>>>>>>>> *Require any business to pay each person working the SAME per hour.*

>>>>>>>> *Dammit Steve, do you have to keep repeating the same old*

>>>>>>>> *zero-sum bullshit?*

>>>>>>>> *Ain't bullshit. At any moment the economy is finite,*

>>>> *There's your problem, trying to apply calculus to*

>>>> *economics.*

>>> *Actually econonists have been doing that since shortly  
after Leibniz  
>>> and Newton.*

>> *Yup. And they're all wrong.*

> *Rightists are.*

So are Leftists, for the same exact reasons.

>>>> *You make the same mistake every economist from  
>>>> Adam Smith onward makes; you willfully ignore the fact  
that  
>>>> value and cost are in constant flux WRT each other.*

>>> *Labor is the only cost, value is that labor. Any other  
assertion  
>>> is merely connivance to steal.*

>> *In your fantasy world only.*

> *In the real world that will destroy yours.*

If, as you constantly indicate, you take no action to  
realize it, it'll remain a fantasy. Which channel will you  
watch your fantasy on?

>>>> *FTM, in your stated ideal economy, a made object's value  
>>>> must decline over time.*

>>> *Nope.*

>> *You said exactly that. Want me to Google it up?*

> *Whatever \*I\* said, YOU misinterpreted it.  
> Typical.*

I see. No point in showing you your own words. What  
will you do, claim I edited them?

>>> *Even though pragmatically most items decay/depreciate.*

>>>> *A house built last week would have  
>>>> less value than one built today, even if they're otherwise  
>>>> indistinguishable.*

>>> *Ever hear of dry rot? But nevermind, you're prating  
nonsense.*

>> *Don't be disingenuous. I said \_indistinguishable\_. Dry  
>> rot does not occur in a week.*

> *Drive it off the lor, and...*

Try completing the sentence; for that matter words. What is a "lor"?

> *Still, irrelevant.*

Ah, you also redefine "balloon-busting" as "irrelevant".

How do you redefine "indistinguishable"?

>>>> *This makes no sense at all. If you wish  
>>>> your system to be accepted, you'll have to resolve  
this kind  
>>>> of inconsistency.*

>>> *Nothing you maintain here is remotely my position.*

>> *Want me to Google it up?*

> *Misinterpret to your heart's content, you will anyway.*

I see. No point in showing you your own words. What will you do, claim I edited them?

> *Labor is equal, no matter the tools, and it must be paid  
equally per hour. THAT is the moral right! WHAT and HOW MUCH  
they produce  
> is irrelevant, they worked the same hours!*

Speaking of Godel...

Did you forget that we were talking about whether or not your ideal economy was "finite"? We now have two sets of otherwise identical objects, to be paid for in hour-equivalents. Yet the "cost" of making them is different.

> *Wage \*IS\* labor-hours. That's NOT irrelevant.*

So is price, according to you. Yet you have an irresolvable situation above.

>>>>>>> *So, why do Dems lie?*

>>> *Lies and Truth are NOT opposites. Most so-called  
opposites are NOT,  
>>> upon closer examination. When lies are told to oppose  
the Truth,  
>>> that is the only time they're Evil.*

>> *Doublespeak bullshit.*

> *Nope, advancee Boolean algebra.*

Right. I lie, I'm Evil. You lie, you're not, \_by your definition\_. Boole never said anything like that.

>>>> *You propose the same old thing; set up your Ideal  
>>>> Socialism on lies, and it will go the same way.*

>>> *No, that's merely you posturing disingenuously.*

>>>>> *Now you're merely parroting Kerry's wife.*

>>>>> *Irrelevant, she didn't run, and is mildly insane.*

>>>> *She claimed that anyone who disagreed with her husband  
>>>> was stupid, and you're doing the same for yourself. Simple  
>>>> elitism.*

>>> *She happened to be right.*

>> *The worst thing about your arrogance is that you can't  
>> even see it.*

> *Equality cannot BE arrogance. When we are all equal we  
can discuss  
> your fantasy of our "arrogance" in wanting what is OURS!*

You now claim to know what I want. What arrogance.

>>>>>>> *What will you do when  
>>>>>>> your local Committee decides you're best suited to  
carrying  
>>>>>>> nightsoil?*

>>>>>>> *Doesn't happen, ain't no "committee", just Majority  
Democracy, and  
>>>>>>> everyone gets the same work and the same chances.*

>>>>>> *What, you've revised your precious People's Committees  
>>>>>> out of existence? How will your State know what the  
People  
>>>>>> need to do?*

>>>>> *By Democratic vote, of course, the sub-committees are  
merely advisory  
>>>>> executive/research organs.*

>>>> *Ah, the "local committes" now pop back into existence,  
>>>> under a new name.*

>>> *Gee, now you're pretending that you're rewriting the future with*

>>> *your deceit. First you lie about what I said, then accuse me of*

>>> *changing my mind when I have to correct you.*

>> *No, I didn't. You claimed that your precious committees*

>> *will make all decisions "according to democratic vote",*

>> *including who does what for how long. I simply got the name*

>> *wrong. Don't be disingenuous.*

> *The Majority Democracy decides, the committees work FOR them*

> *and do their bidding!*

Yeah, we've been over that, except you left out the bit about local/whatever committees having to apply policy.

>>>> *And if their research indicates there are too many people*

>>>> *doing your preferred job, and not enough nightsoil carriers?*

>>>> *What will you do, move away? You never did answer me when I*

>>>> *asked you about that the first time. Suppose the committee*

>>>> *decides you're too valuable to allow to move away?*

>>> *Everyone gets to do SOME of their preferred job if qualified.*

>>> *They must also do SOME of the other things that need doing.*

>> *And who decides how much "some" is? Not the individual*

>> *involved; sounds like slavery to the committee-of-the-moment.*

> *Everyone gets their share, they sign up, it is divided equally.*

> *No committee is required, it is a principle.*

You still haven't addressd my basic question. Suppose you want to live elsewhere, and the local/whatever committee thinks you're too valuable to allow to leave. What happens?

>>> *If you are specifically skilled you will be required to train*

>>> *your replacement. Your education is a contract to use it for*

>>> *the society. Just like a student loan.*

>> *Ah, right. Nobody will be permitted to get an education*

>> *on their own hook obviously, else they can't be enslaved to*

>> *your system.*

> *You can go to the library if you please, but you will be paid only*  
> *if you take the tests, and then you are subject to the will of the*  
> *society that tests and certifies you if your skills are critically*  
> *needed. Even this society has laws that say that if you have been*  
> *notified that you're a critical worker, that you can be forced to report to work in all emergencies. Back when I was an EMT I was so*  
> *notified.*

No. At some point you had to volunteer for this duty. Does your Ideal Socialism allow for volunteerism, or does it "volunteer" your services to The State for you?

>>>>> *How can any State function if everyone does all the same*  
>>>>> *jobs? Shit's gonna pile up real quick.*

>>>>> *You're becoming confused.*  
>>>>> *The jobs are all different, but they just PAY the same.*

>>>> *Well, now that the "sub-committees" are back in*  
>>>> *existence, no problem.*

>>> *All you're doing now is attempting to confuse issues.*  
>>>  
>>> *The "committees" are unrelated to the topic here, but since you had*  
>>> *nothing else you simply decided to be deceptive.*

>> *You might simply have corrected my misnaming of your*  
>> *precious committees. But no, you have to feel superior.*

> *They are not "precious", and you misnamed them intentionally to be an ass.*

Yet again, I must be Evil since I do not slavishly agree with you.

>>>> *Please secede ASAP. Then try*  
>>>> *living on the resources within your borders.*

>>> *One: You haven't the vaguest idea who I am or what I do.*

>> *I don't give a flying fuck.*

> *Pretty well sums you up.*

Actually, it pretty much sums up your Ideal Socialism. Who you are and what you do has no bearing on whether or not California could subsist, much less prosper, on what resources exist within its borders.

BTW, have you reconsidered your claims about the "natural" weather conditions in the Imperial Valley, and the source of the Colorado River, and who has what rights to its water?

Which reminds me; what will you do for electricity? You do realize that across-national-border tariffs for power transmission are somewhat different from interstate case? The nearest Nuke plant to you is, I think, Palo Verde here in AZ. If you hypocrities had built it in your backyard instead of juggling regulations so it got built here, you could keep it. However, I s'pose AZ can find uses for its total output.

Oh, and had you no reply to this part:

>>> *But NON-profit, publically owned utilities span the nation.*

>> *Because they're prevented by law from making profit.*

> *A practice we need to expand to EVERY industry in the land!*

Then from where comes the added capital to pay for improvements? NOWHERE!

Mark L. Fergerson