

Re: Engineers Pay, world wide

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-06/2196.html>

From: Kevin Aylward (kevin.aylwardEXTRACT_at_anasoft.co.uk)

Date: 06/15/04

Date: Tue, 15 Jun 2004 11:00:14 +0100

gwhite wrote:

More fantasy from mr white.

>
>
> *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 --*

Nonsense. Don't reply if this is the case.

> *that's why I keep snipping that junk out.*

Nonsense. You snip what you cant refute and therefore try to imply that my arguments were never made.

> *Your "views" and arguments*
> *probably range from the rantings of a madman to true but trivial.*

Ho hummm... Its plainly obvious that my arguments are well reasoned and clear.

> *course -- and again -- I don't know for sure, because I don't care.*

Then go away.

> *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.*

If they were so phoney you would have refuted them with an argument. You have said absolutely nothing.

- >
- >> *You have gave none to your arguments...*
- >
- > *I'm not making an "argument/claim" beyond "some respected folks*
- > *disagree with you on a point."*

Indeed you haven't. However, you have made claims, claims that are patently false.

- >*That's what you can't get pounded into*
- > *your thick wooden head. I'm not going to attempt to "prove" that*
- > *they "disagree,"*

Then dont make claims that you can not support.

- >*although I have before*

You have give no contrary proof whatsoever. Your a complete joke.

- and will now provide some
- > *suggestion that they do.*
- >
- > *The work is *your's* to do, if you are interested.*

Simply clueless.

- >
- > *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.*

It was you that introduced the "evidence". If you are unable to show that such "evidence" has any value, the onus is on you to do so. Period.

- >
- >> *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.*

Oh dear...

>>

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

>

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

Not at all. However, I have a very, very, good understanding of exactly what I do know and don't know.

>

>>>> *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.*

What do you think the point of the word "essentially" means in this context? Again, you show that you have little comprehension of the subtleties of the English. Sure, there may be one or two bits of non religious based history in the babble, but this has no relevance to the general religious message in it.

>

> *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.*

You claimed I made a false statement then attempted to make a pathetic "appeal to authority" argument in a vain attempt to support your view. Unfortunately for you, the NG posts are still here.

>

>>>> *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.*

No. You are simply too incompetent to understand the error of "appeals to authority".

*> You keep thinking this "appeal to authority" nonsense is
> remotely relevant.*

Of course it is. You are using to try and "prove" that I am incorrect. You have failed.

*> I did not "appeal" because I was not "arguing." I told you I was not
> going to try to prove anything.*

Then go away. Don't make vacuous claims which you cannot support.

*> The most I said was that some key
> folks disagree with you on one specific point.*

And you presented no evidence that such an assertion was true. Show me one quote where a "key" figure denies that:

"there is nothing intrinsically wrong with many aspects of socialism. It has many attributes that maximise the interests of individuals"

Your simply pissing in the wind.

*>> 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 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.*

My education is quite sufficient to deal with one as uneducated as you.

*> I did indeed "claim"
> that some experts in the field would disagree with you on a specific
> point.*

And presented no evidence for this assertion. That's what you simply don't understand. You are trying to give credence to *your* view by claiming, erroneously, that other authorities also have that view. This is an "appeal to authority" argument. It is worthless.

If you cannot supply the actual content, don't supply anything. You cannot gain credibility by hanging on to the coat tails of others.

- > *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:*

None of the clips contradicted my claims.

- > *"yes, maybe someone*
- > *does disagree with me... I wonder why?"*

Look, mate. I have made it abundantly clear of the basics of how things work. Capitalism and socialism are intertwined, you cant disentangle them. Its fundamental to why the nature verses nurture debate , i.e genes and memes on what is dominant is futile.

The only researchers in this field that could possible disagree with me are the unenlightened ones. That is they believe either 100% Capitalism or 100% Socialism is the only way to go. This is provably false, and I have done so. All practicle systems must use a combination of both. Its that simple.

(and now that I have read further, Hayek agrees with me)

- > *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*

You mean you are jealous of my clear superiority on this subject matter?

- > *with bad manners?*

You are the one who is laying out the personal insults.

- > *Sure, it crushes me when I fail at something I did not even consider.*
- > *And you complain about me being illogical! LOL.*

Yep. You cannot understand the 101 logic in simple English sentences. This is not debatable. You whole set of posts is, and still is, on this basic misunderstanding.

- >
- > *Decisions on "which reading material to read" go a bit like*

{snip drival}

- > *Maps have some mistakes. Engineering texts have some mistakes.*
- > *Poli-econ texts have some mistakes. And on and on. We know that.*

{snip more drival}

- > *"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.*

Your simply amazing. It is clear who is delusional. You prattle on continuously about so and so experts disagreeing with my claims, yet have **still** failed to show even the slightest bit of evidence that indicated that this is so. It isn't.

Nothing that you have presented by others contradicts my views in the slightest.

- >
- > *People only have so much time to read and learn.*

Indeed.

- > *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 is the bit that you have failed miserably to do.

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.*

In principle, this may be a fair guide. However, you have no idea of how to use it. You need to be able to extract exactly what a claim is, and how such references refute such a claim. You have done neither. You failed to understand what my claims are, or what the references would say about such claims. What is even more incredible, is that even after you have been appraised in detail of what the claim means and how you have jumped the gun, you still insist that such hidden references back up such a claim that was never made.

- >
- > *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.*

You still dont get it. I will repeat:

You cannot gain respect by hanging onto the coat tails of others.

- >*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.*

Look...you are simply ignorant of the accepted facts here.

Competent researchers do not simple refer to an authorities name or description of work. They refer to the actual work itself. Whenever someone quotes a reference, it is the *data* in the reference that matters. The individual who wrote it is irrelevant. Sure, they may be a nod and a wink that if a noted expert wrote something then they may believe that the work has value, but this is completely besides the point. Indeed, when Hawking first proposed that black holes radiate away to nothing, it was met with complete disbelief.

Your way out of your depth here. You simply don't have the background.

- >
- > *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.*

But this is irrelevant. You have done nothing more than name drop. You haven't shown in the slightest that these dudes disagree with what I have claimed.

- >*You, on*
- > *the other hand, are a hack.*

Please show exactly what is "hacked" about <http://www.anasoft.co.uk/replicators/index.html>, upon which my argument on capitalism and socialism are based.

I have made precise, mathematical definitions, derivations, and arguments based on those derivations.

- > *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*

Indeed.

- > -- *that*
- > *is why their ideas took entire books and careers to do so.*

Means nothing. Indeed, I think it was Jacobi that spent 40 works on elliptic functions, which was made entirely redundant when (forgotten who) tackled the problem from their inverse elliptic integrals and derived all the results before tea time.

- > *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:*

Oh an argument...lets see...

- >
- > ~~~~~
- > *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.*

Yep, very misleading as "cooperation" is fundamentally a socialist term, that is good of the group. Although, the mutual co-operation is usually for the benefit of the specific individuals.

- > *To understand our*
- > *civilization, one must appreciate that the extended order resulted*
- > *not from human design or intention but spontaneously:*

Yes, Darwinian evolution.

- > *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.*

Not to me it isn't. hint: <http://www.anasoft.co.uk/replicators/index.html>

- >
- >
- > *.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*

Yep. This is daft one. A one way or the other. No suggestion of possibility of a merged system.

is due to

- > *a factual error by the latter about how knowledge is and can be*
- > *generated and utilised.*

There are many reasons. Fundamentally it is a misunderstanding of evolution in general.

- > *As a question of fact, this conflict must be*
- > *settled by scientific study.*

Not possible. There are two many interacting factors.

- > *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),*

Slyly badging all socialists as the same.

Secondly, there is not a chance in hell of doing a definitive experimental study. That keep *all* factors constant, and then vary only one to see its effect.

- > *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."*

Totally loaded argument. Definitions are used with subterfuge to disguise what is really going on.

A "centrally-directed economy" of a company is the norm, and as such, it's what makes them successful. We have CEO's, CFO, and some input by shareholders, having direct and control all the finances of the company, But of course, the company is a collection of individuals, whom all have

a certain measure of autonomy in that they do indeed make decisions not specifically directed by the company.

See the point here?

Notice the inherent mix of individual and group control.

> *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.*

Of course a pure socialist system is doomed to failure. This is a trivial prediction of Darwinian evolution. So, I certainly agree on the underlying structure of this claim. However, the statement says "...socialist aims and programmes are...", it does not claim *all* aims, only some. If the claim is that all (socialist) aims of socialists are impossible, then this would be an incorrect view. Individuals cannot build Boeing 747s. Its *requires* people to work in, now get this, social groups.

Of course, a pure capitalist system is also doomed to failure. This is also a trivial prediction of Darwinian evolution. Since it is not clear on *exactly* what Hayek is referring to when he refers to "capitalism", it is not possible to know whether or not, from this passage, whether or not he realises that all capitalism inherently contains socialist infrastructure.

A pure capitalist system would be one in which *every* man is a pure "selfish" individual doing only what is apparently in his own best interests. Such an individual would be driven, essentially, to extinction by individuals that decided to gang up, i.e. became social, as I have already mathematically proved in <http://www.anasoft.co.uk/replicators/altruism.html>

>
> --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.*

Nope. Again, to be quite frank, you are a liar. Nothing here contradicts my claims.

This is getting rather annoying. Look, dude, it is *you*, and *only* you that are disagreeing with my claims, not the references that you quote.

> *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.*

No, you are being deceitful in claiming other holds your view, when clearly, they do not.

- > *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.*

But not these posts, apparently.

- > *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."*

Just what is it with you? I already addressed this many posts ago. Purely non selfish individuals will be overrun by mutant selfish individuals, so sure, a pure socialist policy is doomed to failure, never claimed otherwise. Indeed, unlike economic researchers, I *derive* this result from simple assumptions.

<http://www.anasoft.co.uk/replicators/replicatortheory.html>
The Basic Axioms of General Replicator Theory

The starting point of any good theory are the postulates or axioms of the theory, and the fewer, the better. These postulates can be experimentally tested as justification for the results they predict. The postulates of General Replicator theory are as follows:

- 1 Traits of Replicators are randomly generated.
- 2 Traits of Replicators are inherited by "children" from "parents".
- 3 Traits of Replicators are selected by the environment.

- >
- > *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."*

Oh dear...to quote from your reference:

"Hayek got some things wrong (he was tardy about acknowledging the need for government action to reduce unemployment during the 1930s, for example) and neglected others (such as inequality and pollution"

Err.. hummmm

"there is nothing intrinsically wrong with many aspects of socialism. It has many attributes that maximise the interests of individuals"

And

"Hayek wasn't the most brilliant economist of his era (that was probably John von Neumann, the Hungarian mathematical genius who invented game theory)

I was going to point out "game theory". I highlight the fundamentals in my paper with references to "The prisoners dilemma". Look it up. It shows the importance of mutual co-operation.

And, oh dear,

"In retrospect, it is clear that Hayek seriously exaggerated the threat to liberty presented by social democracy of the sort practiced in Western Europe. For example, his attacks on compulsory health insurance, state-financed education, and regional development programs—all of which were intended to help people fulfill their individual potential—were often overheated."

>

> *"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.]*

Ho humm...

>

> *"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."*

Not exactly, pure Socialism is over emphasising the effect of memes (copied to all, even non genetically related) over Capitalism (genes). Pure Socialism takes some of the "good" points of mutual co-operation and then attempts to apply those ideas unilaterally and indiscriminably. Pure capitalism has the same issue, for example, if we indiscriminately allow supply and demand, then monopolies do indeed benefit only a few at the expense of misery for the majority. Government (social) intervention is often required to prevent such abuses

Indeed

"He simply reestablished the Victorian presumption that, unless there are strong and specific arguments to the contrary, the market is usually

the most efficient method of providing goods and services. Where the market failed, though, the government should step in, providing defense, public infrastructure, and even a guaranteed minimum income for all citizens. It is quite possible to be a Hayekian and still believe in active government. "All I am arguing about is that, where you can create a competitive condition, you ought to rely upon competition," he insisted during a 1945 radio discussion"

So, rather that contradict, my views, in main substance, Hayek is in agreement with my views.

You don't seem to understand that economics is just a subset of Replicator (Darwinian) theory.

>
>
> 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.

Oh please not more.

You just don't seem to get it. You have fantasized that:

"there is nothing intrinsically wrong with many aspects of socialism. It has many attributes that maximise the interests of individuals"

means "aint communism wonderful".

You are simply trying to argue against a point that was never made.

>*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,*

No he fcuking doesn't. Go away you dipshit troll. I have had enough. You are obviously debating with another Kevin Aylward. None of what Hayek, your God, disagrees with my claims.

{snip more irrelevant quotes }

>
> *People reference experts all the time. People cite experts all the
> time.*

No they don't. They cite references to *data* that just happen to have a name attached to them by default. There has to be some name, but the name is irrelevant from a scientific method point of view.

This is so unreal dude that you don't understand this principle. Google it, e.g.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/appeal-to-authority.html>

I got 10,000 references to the notion.

The above was the first link I got, which coincidentally has:

"There are many fields in which there is a significant amount of legitimate dispute. Economics is a good example of such a disputed field"

*>f 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.*

Ho hum... no one is disagreeing with this.

*>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.*

This is not at issue.

*>>>> There is
>>> no reason to source from you. I simply gave you some tips, to which
>>> you responded with a hissy fit fat with irrelevancy.
>>
>> I presented clear arguments to support my position. You provided
>> nothing. You still don't even get it. You continue to post 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.*

You are certainly not arguing with me. None of what you say is about *my* claims.

>>>> *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.*

Indeed. Why don't you take note of such a simple fact.

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.*

Incredible. You stand here accusing me of the fault that you are engaged in. I made a basic claim

"there is nothing intrinsically wrong with many aspects of socialism. It has many attributes that maximise the interests of individuals"

You immediately declare that this is wrong and so and so backs you up. What little evidence you do produce clearly show that it I am correct and you are out to lunch. This is obviously a case of:

<http://www.apa.org/journals/psp/psp7761121.html> on your part.

>
>>> *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.*

You are obviously illiterate. There was no comparison of Tom Robinson to Hayek whatsoever. I was simply pointing out that being "free" is not all positive.

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

Kevin Aylward

salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk

<http://www.ansoft.co.uk>

SuperSpice, a very affordable Mixed-Mode
Windows Simulator with Schematic Capture,
Waveform Display, FFT's and Filter Design.