

Re: Latest News

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.cad/2004-11/0374.html>

From: R. Steve Walz (rsteve_walz@armory.com)

Date: 11/26/04

Date: Fri, 26 Nov 2004 07:24:07 GMT

Mark Ferguson wrote:

>

> *R. Steve Walz wrote:*

>

> *<snip Steve's incomprehension of his doublespeak infatuation*

> *with renaming dogma as "Truth">*

That's not a reasoned logical response, that's just cowardly
vacuous name-calling.

> >>> *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.*

Of course there is, or else we couldn't even be talking like this.

YOU just don't LIKE me arguing from WHAT WE BOTH KNOW because
it doesn't help YOU lie!

> >> *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.*

Quit deleting what I said and then it will appear precisely in your posts where you keep asking for it and make you look stupid.

> >>> *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 structured structure 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.*

A solitary statement that I'm wrong does not constitute any actual argument, nor even a conversation, let alone a debate!

> >>> *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.*

But you offer no actual argument to that effect, you seem not to grasp that any syllogism needs assertions prior to any predicate.

> > *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.*

Nobody is asking you to learn lies, because once you learn them they aren't lies!

> >>> *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.*

I just did.

> >> *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.*

No, just lazy and unwilling to be repetitious.

> >>>>> *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?*

There is no "objective" basis for anything that is transferable to an idiot like you. Truth is non-transferable, this is the reason for killing people.

- > > *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.*

If the only meaning my words have were what I assigned, you wouldn't even have grasped that I spoke, and you would not have responded.

- > > > *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.*

Everyone? You're lying to assert that.

- > > > > *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".*

He thought so at the time, so he wasn't lying. Lying is telling something you KNOW to be untrue.

> >> *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.*

Nonsense. Prediction.

> >>>> *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.*

He DID!

How long do you think program material for anything is in the pipes?

> >>>> *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.*

Nope, dictionary.

When you KNOW something isn't true, you're lying.

Until you do, you're NOT LYING!

> >>>>>> *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.*

No, you simply don't receive tacit appointment as arbitrator of truth.

> >>>> *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.*

No one needs "evidence" for much of anything. Fully 99.9% of what people do and believe they do based on the structural argument in favor of it, not "evidence". History has been based on what people did because they liked the idea, not because it was "proved".

And whether some "evidence", which is falsified half the time, and mistaken most of the other half, is useful is a very spurious concept.

> >>>>> *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).*

You questioned it, show us you're not blowing it out your ass.

> > *Betcha won't, or that you'll try to gloss over it*
> *disingenuously!*
>
> *Give it your best shot.*

As I said. You're blowing it out your ass.

> >>>>>>> *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".*

Nonsense, Kerry has virtually nothing to do with me anyway,
your disingenuity and slander are irrelevant.

> >> *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.*

According to principles easy to state.
And you REALLY don't like how easy it is to do that!
That's why you've hung on this long with your disingenuous failure
to actually address any issue.

> >>>> *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.*

The fact that American democracy is partially subverted has
nothing whatsoever to do with the rest of it that is not.

The fact that American issues are misrepresented by
Republicans has nothing to do with their actual Truth.

> >>>>>>>>> *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.*

Leftists don't bother, they simply destroy what you fancy as "economics". You see, what you call "economics" is merely the machinations of organized crime to us, which should be rooted out like cancer. Any scientific approach to what we will replace it all with is so entirely different than your grasp of economics that it bears no appreciable resemblance. Gone is "investment", "interest", "principle", "speculation", etc.

> >>>> *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?*

Whenever that is, no one can stop an idea whose time has come. One guy promoting it is irrelevant till the people want it, and then they'll hunt it up like discovering a rock star in Omaha!

> >>>> *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?*

Now you're just lying and threatening to lie again.

> > *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.*

Nope. Cost is labor, nothing else.
Labor is the constant, the "speed of light" to economy.

- > > *Wage *IS* labor-hours. That's NOT irrelevant.*
- >
- > *So is price, according to you. Yet you have an*
- > *irresolvable situation above.*

Liar. Price is cost is labor hours. Period.
The only actual exchange between two humans that is possible is
equal labor hours, hour for hour, all else is theft.

- > >>>>>>> *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, advanced Boolean algebra.*
- >
- > *Right. I lie, I'm Evil. You lie, you're not, _by your*
- > *definition_. Boole never said anything like that.*

What I said was advanced Boolean which says that something must
exist BEFORE it has a value, ala Claude Shannon.

What you mischaracterized was unrelated to anything.

- > >>>> *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.*

I make no claims other than obviousness. If the shoe fits...
If you are not egalitarian, then you're a criminal, there is nothing
else you can be.

> >>>>> *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.*

Decided by the whole Majority.

> >>>> *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?

You have to train your replacement. People have to live.

> >>>> 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 Sociialism allow for volunteerism, or does
> it "volunteer" your services to The State for you?

If you volunteer to study to be a doctor, or volunteer as an emergency worker, then you are subject to the State, without which that work for you could not exist and care of everyone could not be offered. The State sometimes has to draft people.

If you work at a hospital to this day and a national, state, or local medical emergency is declared, I guarantee you will go to work and remain there or they will come and get you with police and give you the choice, work or jail. And it won't matter if you try to quit, what your family plans were, or whether it's your vacation or your day off. That's the LAW NOW! If you don't know about this ask a cop! He has to as well!

> >>>>> *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.*

Agreeing with me particularly is unimportant.

Ceding to people what they deserve by rights is their business, and they will finally extract it from 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.*

Whether I exist or am a response engine written by a committee is unimportant to the content I am promoting. California can do fine, as can most areas. Trade with other regions is a luxury, not an absolute need.

- > *BTW, have you reconsidered your claims about the*
- > *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.*

No, guess again, Diablo Canyon, San Onofre, Avila Beach, and San Clemente. And 2% of our power comes from wind farms.

- > *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.*

You could starve and turn all your lights on.

- > *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*

Costs are passed to consumers, even foreseeable future costs. But that's not profit, that is cost. And new facilities are costed by increase to current prices for everything. If it were profit it would go to the rich for NO WORK. It doesn't.

-Steve

--

sci.electronics.cad: Re: Latest News

-Steve Walz rsteve@armory.com <ftp://ftp.armory.com/pub/user/rsteve>
Electronics Site!! 1000's of Files and Dirs!! With Schematics Galore!!
<http://www.armory.com/~rsteve> or <http://www.armory.com/~rsteve/Public>