

## Re: Engineers Pay, world wide

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-06/2080.html>

---

**From:** gwhite (gwhite\_at\_hocuspocus\_ti.com)

**Date:** 06/14/04

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 2004 12:10:46 -0700

He just spends his life, living in a rock 'n' roll fantasy  
He just spends his life, living on the edge of reality  
He just spends his life, in a rock 'n' roll fantasy  
He just spends his life, living in a rock 'n' roll fantasy  
He just spends his life, living on the edge of reality  
He just spends his life, in a rock 'n' roll fantasy  
He just spends his life, living in a rock 'n' roll fantasy

Look at me, look at you  
You say you've got nothing left to prove  
The king is dead, rock is done  
You might be through but I've just begun  
I don't know, I feel free and I won't let go  
Before you go, there's something you ought to know

— The Kinks

~~~~~

Setting new standards for woodenheadedness, Kevin Aylward wrote:

> *I have given you solid arguments to my view, so clearly I have the  
> tools.*

You've managed to fool me. You manufactured claims, to in turn counter, and went on with pointless prattle unworthy of review, where I suppose you enjoy hearing yourself talk.

I keep telling you I don't care what those views of yours are — that's why I keep snipping that junk out. Your "views" and arguments probably range from the rantings of a madman to true but trivial. Of course — and again — I don't know for sure, because I don't care. I thought you might want to challenge yourself for \*your\* benefit. You don't, because you are a know-it-all. Fair enough, it is your life, but keep you phoney "arguments" to yourself.

> *You have gave none to your arguments...*

I'm not making an "argument/claim" beyond "some respected folks disagree with you on a point." That's what you can't get pounded into your thick wooden head. I'm not going to attempt to "prove" that they "disagree," although I have before and will now provide some suggestion that they do.

sci.electronics.design: Re: Engineers Pay, world wide

The work is *\*your's\** to do, if you are interested. Again, I could not care less if you are interested, or not. I could not care less if you agree on the issues and concepts put forth by the pointed authors, or not.

You are delusional if you believe I am going to take the works of the authors --- what took them entire careers and books to accomplish --- and distill it down into a usenet bumpersticker version for some ludicrous "proofing," for only *\*your\** benefit.

> *And your point would be?*

Lift your veil of ignorance. Read the parable of Plato's Cave or something.

> *And your point would be?*

You are uneducated.

> > *The only thing you've written of import -- when you said it \*all\* --*

> > *was this:*

> >

> > *"If they do not, they are provably wrong, so not worth reading. If*

> > *they do, they are not worth reading as they would only confirm the*

> > *essentials I already know."*

> >

> > *Thus spake the omniscient blind man.*

>

> *What \*are\* you on about.*

You are a know-it-all. At least, you think you know it all.

> > > *Er.. get real, like I'm going to go and buy a book based on a one*

> > > *off NG debate.*

> >

> > *As if a book still being published widely since 1944 (and another in*

> > *1962) is a remotely in scale with a "one off NG debate." Some*

> > *education.*

>

> *Look, the bible has been going for a few 1000 years, and its,*

> *essentially, all crap.*

I am likely no more religious than you (that would be zero). However, I do suspect there is \_civil\_ (and in some cases historical recording) value to portions of that particular text. Moreover, I've been told that the Songs of Solomon can get pretty juicy, if you're into erotic readings.

But that is an aside. Once again, I will tell you that mine was a suggestion for reading a counter; it was not an attempt to either espouse views or to "prove" them.

> > > *It would seem that not only do you not know what your references*

> > > *views are, you don't know what mine are either.*

> >

> > *I know the references views to a point, and I welcomed you to judge*

> > *for yourself. You could have simply said "I don't feel like spending*

- > > *the money" and it would have been a done deal.*
- >
- > *I did. It was the bit about rejecting an "appeal to authority" as a*
- > *useless argument.*

You still can't get a grip on it, despite being told time and time again. You keep thinking this "appeal to authority" nonsense is remotely relevant. You always swallow that bait and the hook remains deeply stuck in your entrails as you thrash around in irrelevance.

I did not "appeal" because I was not "arguing." I told you I was not going to try to prove anything. The most I said was that some key folks disagree with you on one specific point. That was the magnitude of the claim for which I bluntly said I would not attempt to prove. I'm making suggestions, not pretending to be the schoolmaster of some usenet hack who is a self-described expert-of-life.

- > *As for your views --*
- > > *by and large -- I am not interested, and never have been.*
- >
- > *Apparently you are. You have made many posts trying to prove that my*
- > *claim was false. You failed.*

At this seemingly perpetual point I am left to believing you are either stupid or delusional. I did not attempt to "prove" your claim was false, therefore I cannot have possibly failed in doing so. I've suggested that you get yourself some education. I did indeed "claim" that some experts in the field would disagree with you on a specific point. I used a few clips, and a couple of independent reviews, to suggest that my claim of "expert disagreement" (and \*not\* that the experts were absolutely correct) \*could\* have validity, perhaps enough validity for a reasonable person to say: "yes, maybe someone does disagree with me... I wonder why?" I told you I have no intent of "proving my claim," since I believe it would involve something like rewriting the books already written. And why would I do that? For the benefit of some usenet know-it-all hack with bad manners? Sure, it crushes me when I fail at something I did not even consider. And you complain about me being illogical! LOL.

Decisions on "which reading material to read" go a bit like purchasing and then following a map. I don't bother proving every squiggly line on a map goes where it symbolically claims to go -- and indeed occasional errors are found on published maps. Instead, we in practice "play the probabilities out" rather than making the assumption of, nor being overly concerned with absolute correctness. We know we will get reasonably accurate maps by purchasing from reputable vendors. Reputation is established by successful historical use from map users ("experts in the field"). Thus by \*using\* the so-called hearsay of map users regarding "who makes good maps," we enhance the probability of purchasing good maps. We test the maps by using them. If the map guides us to Liverpool in good fashion, we make the reasonable presumption that it will guide us to Manchester too, without really questioning (proving) that it is so by actually driving to Manchester.

Maps have some mistakes. Engineering texts have some mistakes. Poli-econ texts have some mistakes. And on and on. We know that. We do not ask the "field expert" truck driver to \*prove\* his/her recommendation that the recommended map will direct us to Manchester. We don't ask the store clerk to \*prove\* the map will get us to Manchester. In everyday life we more often accept consensus rather than "absolute proof" because it lowers our workload (a rational motive), even at the risk it is on occasion incorrect. "Proof" of the claim that "some bright folks counter you on the specific point" will \*not\* be attempted because of the high cost and little or no return.

People only have so much time to read and learn. With personal time being a scarce resource with alternative uses, we want to make rational decisions regarding our use of time (and time spent reading). We don't want to waste our time reading text A, if we can somehow pre-determine that text B is superior. This decision will be based on probabilities. With time being the scarce resource, we also have limited time to make the decision of which text to read. One typical way of performing that decision in rapid fashion is getting guidance from those already in the field of study and those who've already read various texts in the field. Thus it is a wholly rational choice, based on very real time constraints, to simply consider without proving, and thus following suggestions from experts in the field regarding what particular texts will not be a waste of time. This is "playing the probabilities." There are no guarantees. One man's bible is another's fire starter.

When not well versed in a given field, it would seem the rational choice is to initiate learning from those who've made a career of the matter, and formalized much of the material. Moreover, if some in the field have received awards and good reviews from peers in the field, then that is simply reinforcement regarding from whom it may be efficient to learn from when it comes to the probability of making a "good" choice. There is little wrong with appealing to authorities to teach the fundamentals of a given field. In fact, that is exactly what is done in virtually every field I know of. There are simply not that many Ramanujan's (self taught) walking around on the face of the planet. There is nothing to state that the "authorities" are always correct — it is caveat emptor as always. It is efficient and in one's self-interest to learn foundations from the experts, not usenet hacks, simply for the enhanced probability of receiving a better education.

How does the preceding apply? Hayek and Friedman are field recognized experts (and nobel prize winning), whether or not other field experts agree with them on all matters of substance. You, on the other hand, are a hack. They might be wrong. You might be right. I will not rewrite the books. There is more to their ideas than that which can be written on a napkin or usenet posting — that is why their ideas took entire books and careers to do so. Reductions (essays) on the authors and their topics will have out practical necessity unproved presumptions and claims; you must go to the source if you wish to argue. This is not a 2-transistor 5-resistor circuit. I will provide another suggestion that Hayek counters your idea:

~~~~~  
The Foundation of Our Civilization

Our civilization depends, not only for its origin but also for its preservation, on what can be precisely described only as the extended order of human cooperation, an order more commonly, if somewhat misleadingly, known as capitalism. To understand our civilization, one must appreciate that the extended order resulted not from human design or intention but spontaneously: it arose from unintentionally conforming to certain traditional and largely moral practices, many of which men tend to dislike, whose significance they usually fail to understand, whose validity they cannot prove, and which have nonetheless fairly rapidly spread by means of an evolutionary selection—the comparative increase in population and wealth—of those groups that happened to follow them. The unwitting, reluctant, even painful adoption of these practices kept these groups together, increased their access to valuable information of all sorts, and enabled them to be "fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28). This process is perhaps the least appreciated facet of human evolution.

...The main point of my argument is, then, that the conflict between, on one hand, advocates of the spontaneous extended human order created by a competitive market, and on the other hand by those who demand a deliberate arrangement of human interaction by central authority based on central command over available resources is due to a factual error by the latter about how knowledge is and can be

generated and utilised. As a question of fact, this conflict must be settled by scientific study. Such study shows that, by following the spontaneously generated moral traditions underlying the competitive market order (traditions which do not satisfy the canons or norms of rationality embraced by most socialists), we generate and garner greater knowledge and wealth than could ever be obtained or utilised in a centrally-directed economy whose adherents claim to process strictly in accordance with "reason." Thus socialist aims and programmes are factually impossible to achieve or execute; they also happen, into the bargain as it were, to be logically impossible.

--Hayek, *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*, 6-7.

~~~~~

Free web references abound that create a chorus of agreement with me: Hayek and Friedman counter you on the point. You are simply too lazy, prefer to argue than to learn, and wish someone to have someone hold your teeny tiny hand through the process. Yes, so many of us -- both critics and supporters -- could be wrong that Hayek does not actually say what we think he says. But I happen to have read the class material. You have not. Read it again: "Thus socialist aims and programmes are factually impossible to achieve or execute; they also happen, into the bargain as it were, to be logically impossible."

from <http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/publications/digest/003/cassidy.html>

"...Hayek published *The Road to Serfdom*, a damning indictment of socialism and state planning that once more, this time in plain English, laid out the fundamental advantage of the free market: by allowing millions of decision makers to respond individually to freely determined prices, it allocates resources—labor, capital, and human ingenuity—in a manner that can't be mimicked by a central plan, however brilliant the central planner."

"Its fans included Margaret Thatcher, who, during a visit to the Conservative Party's research department in the mid 1970s, slammed a copy of it on the table and declared, 'This is what we believe.'" [You are so uninformed you don't even know the ideological background of one of your country's former leaders.]

"By gradually learning to follow a few rules—honesty, how to exchange goods for money, respect for private property—he maintained, man had 'stumbled upon' an extremely effective, though unplanned, method of coordinating human activity. Socialism, Hayek explained, was a futile attempt to overturn the evolutionary process."

>From <http://www.hayekcenter.org/friedrichhayek/hayekquote.htm>

"... the most powerful critique of socialist planning and the socialist state which I read at this time [the late 1940's], and to which I have returned so often since [is] F. A. Hayek's *'The Road to Serfdom\_.'* (Margaret Thatcher, *The Path to Power*, New York: Harper Collins, 1995, p. 50)."

There is more. The presentation is intended to be consensus, not "proof," for consensus is adequate for the task at hand. That is, the task is simply to create reasonable doubt that Hayek indeed counters you, so you may be reasonably convinced to go to the source rather than to interpretations by others.

>From *Steven Pressman's 'Fifty Major Economists\_'*:

FRIEDRICH HAYEK (1899–1992)

Friedrich Hayek (pronounced HI–YACK)

achieved worldwide recognition as a champion of the free market and an opponent of government interference with the right of individuals to engage in free exchange through the market. His work makes a strong case that individual choice, rather than government decision-making, yields both economic benefits (greater efficiency) and non-economic benefits (greater liberty and freedom).

...

Hayek's main contribution as an economist has been his arguments about the benefits of free markets and the information provided by prices. These arguments lead to the conclusion that attempts to alter or control markets should be opposed because they inevitably limit individual freedom, reduce economic efficiency and lower living standards. Markets, for Hayek, were self-regulating devices that promote prosperity. Government policy and other attempts to hinder the workings of markets make us worse off economically and reduce individual liberty.

#### MILTON FRIEDMAN (1912-)

The two main themes in the work of Friedman are that money matters and that freedom matters. Money matters because only changes in the money supply can affect economic activity. Money also matters because inflation results from too much money in the economy. Freedom matters because economies run better when governments do not attempt to control prices, exchange rates or entry into professions. And freedom is also important as an end in itself.

...

Milton Friedman is the rare economist who has managed to span two very different worlds. On the one hand, he is regarded a giant within the economics profession, and is one of the two or three most referenced and revered economic figures in the twentieth century. This work has stressed the impor-

tance of money and the importance of markets to improve economic well-being. At the same time Friedman has written voluminously for the general public. This work has stressed the importance of individual decision-making and freedom, and has made Friedman one of the two or three best known and most recognized economists of the late twentieth century.

I would rather refer to the experts for my information than some nobody usenet poster, simply because of the enhanced probability that what they say is more refined via in-the-field critique than that obtained by likely pretenders.

People reference experts all the time. People cite experts all the time. If you knew the first thing about economics, you'd know that citing amounts to division of labor, an idea expounded upon by the pin factory in Adam Smith's 1776 manifesto *The Wealth of Nations*. There is not enough time to prove everything all the time -- not enough work would get done. Corners get cut. It is better to have something with a some errors than attempt perfection and produce nothing. The citations are there for the explicit purpose of knowing where the ideas/data came from, in the event it may need to be questioned. That is where you need to go should you choose to do so.

> > > *There is*  
> > *no reason to source from you. I simply gave you some tips, to which*  
> > *you responded with a hissy fit fat with irrelevency.*  
>  
> *I presented clear arguments to support my position. You provided*  
> *nothing. You still don't even get it. You continue to past nerdy links*  
> *to books in a vain attempt to suggest that such links support your*  
> *views.*

Review the thread. If you do, and you look at those few *\_tangential\_* points where *\_both\_* you and I reflect our *\*own\** views, it is seen that we generally have agreement on those few mutually considered points. For the rest of your junk, which I didn't care to consider or review, I didn't respond to it, and snipped it out. I have no idea who you are arguing against. It isn't me.

> *No. What shows a lack of judgement on your part is your inability to*  
> *accept the clear arguments that I have made to support my view. e.g, the*  
> *\*mathematical\* one on how mutal co-operation benefits the individual,*  
> *i.e. socialism benefits capitalism. Do you want one that shows how*  
> *capitalism benefits socialism as well? Hint: its trivial.*

Blah blah blah. If I snip it all again will you take the clue?

> *You can snip all the text you like, but it don't change the facts.*

The fact is, my computer is beige. That fact gets snipped because it is irrelevant, like much of your screed.

> >> *I have a very, very good handle of what life is all*  
> >> *about.*  
> >  
> > *You have some talents and skills, but stupid is as stupid does. I*  
> > *would have been more helpful if you'd changed your tone and dropped*  
> > *the glaring nonsense.*  
>  
> *And what nonsense would that have been? You have made \*no\* actual*  
> *arguments that refuted anything I have said.*

No shit. Briefly, "nonsense" is arguing about stuff that isn't even being considered by at least \*two\* parties. It would be like me saying: "You are wrong. You have provided no proof that my computer is charcoal and not beige." You didn't say squat about my computer's color, as I didn't say squat about much of the crap you are allegedly "arguing" about.

> >*It would have been in the interest of two*  
> > *individuals. Your genes and memes (or whatever it is you talk about)*  
> > *lost quite badly.*  
>  
> *It was you that lost, again...*

"He just spends his life, living in a rock 'n' roll fantasy" — the Kinks

Your comparison of Tom Robinson to Hayek was you \*proving\* you don't know what you're talking about. The Kinks have you dialed in. You are the sole participator in the winner–loser precept. Trade is supposed to be win–win, otherwise there is no reason to do it.