

## Re: Latest News

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2004-11/0447.html>

---

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

**Date:** 11/19/04

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 2004 14:58:49 -0700

R. Steve Walz wrote:

> *Mark Ferguson wrote:*

>

>>*R. Steve Walz wrote:*

>>>> *Yes, of course anyone can lie.*

>>

>> *And, you sidestepped my question. What concerns me here*

>>*is not your lying to me, but to yourself.*

> *And that's just your disingenuous posture.*

No Steve. Below you say:

>> *Everything is founded on lies, some better than others, that's all.*

Ergo you admit your idealized Socialism is founded on lies.

>> *And many lies are the Truth as well.*

Which is classic doublespeak.

>>>>*Pretending Rather is not credible because of a misstep he admitted*

>>>*is disingenuous.*

>>

>> *No, stating that he's not credible because he presented*

>>*faked documents he \_wanted\_ to believe to be true, and*

>>*wanted to convince his audience were true \_in the face of*

>>*counterevidence he suppressed\_, is reasonable.*

> *He told the Truth, he just didn't have proof of it. It's forgivable.*

Sigh. He knowingly lied about the validity of the documents.

The only relevant "proof" was that demonstrating that the events described in the documents did not occur as claimed. He had that proof in hand and suppressed it. This is not

truth of any kind, capitalized or otherwise.

But you're so blinded by your addiction to doublespeak, you appear to be claiming he was "serving a higher truth" or some such.

>> *He selectively presented information that supported his beliefs, and did not present information that contradicted them, and in fact said that any such information was "not credible" without stating his criteria for credibility. He also went out of his way to suppress information on the source of the faked documents.*

> *Nonsense, he was misled to believe the Truth. It was still True.*

Even granting that he did not originally know that the documents and their contents were fabrications, he still ought to have reported on their diminished credibility \_the instant\_ he suspected it.

He did not do that, which is lying by omission.

>> *After he was exposed he claimed to have "misstepped", yet did not remedy his failure to report the contradictory information, nor did he make any effort to report on the motives of the source of the faked documents. He lied to his audience and justified it by lying to himself.*

> *He isn't obligated to tell your falsehoods for you just because he couldn't prove the Truth.*

He isn't obligated to tell \_any\_ lies. He \_is\_ obligated to tell as much truth as he knows, which he didn't.

>>>> *Any credibility I \*DO\* have is based on \*WHAT\* I say,  
>>>>  
>>>> *But if you're lying...  
>>  
>>>You missed the point. Content determines credibility, not source.  
>>  
>> *There's the rub. Much of what you claim cannot be second-sourced.***

> *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. Your experience is not mine, and vice versa. Be extremely careful trying to refute that statement; you'll be reduced to using "spurious factoids".

- > *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".

- > *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".

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

Yep, since you can't out-argue anyone, stifle or kill them. Say, I was wrong; you're not a fan of Lenin at all. Actually, you're a fan of Stalin.

- >>> *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.

- >>>> *Nobody believes anyone else unless they agree with them.*
- >>>>
- >>>> *Only if they can't distinguish between "truth" and "fact".*
- >>
- >>> *No, what I said applies to everyone. People agree NOT based on*
- >>> *whether something is true, but whether they share the same belief.*
- >>
- >> *This contradicts what you said above. Agreement about*
- >> *"truths" is based on a common belief system which does not*
- >> *take note of, or deliberately rejects, objectively*
- >> *verifiable evidence.*

- > *There is no such thing outside a Majority-Respected Peer-Reviewed*
- > *milieu, because all falsehood can be misportrayed and all Truth*
- > *can be mischaracterized by you who seek to do Evil.*

Sure, once you define a "majority" of "peers" as those that believe the same bullshit doublespeak you do.

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.

- > *Our True statements are always dishonestly characterized by you*
- > *Evil-doers as being mutually contradictory using deceit.*

Oh, I get it; "logic"="deceit".

- > *The only cure for this is to torture or kill your kind.*

Same old same old.

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

- > *Any such forum that permits the dogshit you pretend is a POV is*
- > *doomed. At some point it must be admitted that no codification*
- > *can ever prevent the infinitely creative nature of Evil, and that*
- > *such Evil must simply be strangled to death by the Majority Will.*

That's right; even the most rabid European Leninists reject doublespeak these days. When will you catch up?

- > *At some point your deceit, lies, and cheekiness should simply be*
- > *frightened back into hiding like a child who is intentionally*
- > *disruptive and should not be coddled under pretense of reasoning*
- > *with your sort.*

Waah.

- >> *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.

>> *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.

>>>>>*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.

>>*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.

Try again.

>>>>>*below awareness, beyond our control.*

>>>>

>>>> *True for those that will not even attempt to understand  
>>>>how their minds work.*

>>

>>>*Nonsense. You cannot lift yourself into the air, and you cannot  
>>>encompass 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.

>>>>> *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.

> *That pretty much sums up your failure to grasp here.*

Sure Steve. Your naivete is showing.

>> *Did you fail to actually read the points on both sites and note the similarity, or did you just prefer to not see it because it contradicted one of your articles of faith?*

> *Nonsensical toss-off slur.*

Failure to respond.

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?

>> *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?

>>>>>> *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.

>> *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.

>> *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?

> *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.

>> *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?

>>>> *Or find better ways to make things that don't involve  
>>>>more hand labor.*

>>

>>>*Absolutely. Don't tell me that you have some delusion that I want  
>>>everyone to "plant a garden" or "make things by hand"!?? By labor  
>>>I mean the maintenance and use of state of the art manufacturing by  
>>>manufacturing technician workers.*

>>

>> *Yeah, I got that. But that means that an hour's labor one  
>>day (before an innovation is installed) will produce less  
>>than an hour's labor the next day after upgrading. Also, an  
>>hour's labor in one factory will produce less than a factory  
>>elsewhere with more efficient technology.*

> *It does in fact cost more labor to do whatever without any certain  
> technological amplification. If we did it yesterday without the  
> tools it took more manpower, and that cannot be denied, and those  
> workers must be paid. That is ALREADY true in ALL systems.*

>> *OTOH are you suggesting that every workplace everywhere  
>>be upgraded simultaneously? Sure, that'll work.*

> *No, just that that's irrelevant.*

No, it means that workers in plants at different upgrade levels will be producing different amounts per worker-hour. Unfair! Torture to death the bastard that thought this up!

>>>>>>*How about making us ALL the current equivalent of filthy rich?  
>>>>>>You know damn well we're capable of it right now.*

>>

>>>>>*You know no such thing, we don't have self-replicating industrial  
>>>>>robots yet. This means we are limited in what we can have and  
>>>>>maintain by how much we can work and to what degree our industrial  
>>>>>base amplifies our production.*

>>

>> *So? That doesn't mean that a more efficient distribution  
>>of the output of the present means of production cannot make  
>>everyone the equivalent of filthy rich in terms of not going  
>>without necessities or even luxuries (depending who's  
>>defining "luxury"). What's stopping it from happening is the  
>>popular addiction to bookkeeping in the form of  
>>artificially-defined credit.*

<irrelevant repetitious screed snipped>

>>>> *"Production amplification" is exactly the reason your  
>>>>"work to live" scheme is pointless. People used to have to  
>>>>work down to dusk just to eat. That's no longer the case.*

>>>> *It's down to, what, four hours a day (excluding "tax hours")?*  
>>  
>>> *We need to share the profit of production entirely equally, and*  
>>> *then we'll see the average buying power triple, when we prevent*  
>>> *the rich from stealing it all.*  
>>  
>> *Exactly; there won't \_be\_ any "rich" by the old*  
>> *definitions of accumulated wealth and buying power.*

> *Yup, the formerly rich will be required to produce consumer items*  
> *using factory equipment. They will receive the same wage per hour*  
> *as everyone else. Their accumulated wealth on paper will cease to*  
> *exist when the banks are destroyed, and they will forfeit any more*  
> *than an average fair-sized residence to the rest of us.*

No, the entire concept of wages will be irrelevant.

>> *But as I've tried to explain to you many times, those you*  
>> *despise as "wealthy crooks" don't count their wealth as*  
>> *accumulated buying power, but as accumulated ability to*  
>> *influence and control the lives of those they perceive as*  
>> *lesser beings. You propose to cure this misperception*  
>> *through slow death by torture, which completely misses the*  
>> *point.*

> *I think employing those of the formerly rich who accept employment,*  
> *and having them work for a living, after they relinquish their*  
> *wealth, is sufficient. The rest we can shoot.*

Kill, kill, kill. Same old same old.

>>>>> *So, why do Dems lie?*  
>>  
>>>> *They don't, except obviously where appropriate and moral to do so.*  
>>>>  
>>>> *Interesting; you forgive doublespeak when your side does*  
>>>> *it. I don't forgive it at all.*  
>>  
>>> *Republican lying to steal versus Democratic lying to steal back,*  
>>> *of course!! Stealing is not forgivable, stealing back for the*  
>>> *victim is a virtue!*  
>>  
>> *Bullshit. Exposing lies does not require lying. Getting*  
>> *in the habit of lying \_for any excuse\_ merely makes further*  
>> *lying easier. This is the doublespeak trap that forced what*  
>> *\_might\_ have been Lenin's Socialism in the USSR to become*  
>> *Stalin's Oligarchy. The leaders first lied to themselves,*  
>> *then each other (with a wink here and there), then everyone,*  
>> *because they'd gotten in the habit of not telling harsh truths.*

- > *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.

- >> *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.*

That's me telling you a truth you simply don't want to hear.

- > *Everything is founded on lies, some better than others, that's all.*
- > *And many lies are the Truth as well.*

Ah, you do understand it. You just want to pretend your lies are better than anyone else's. Doublespeak.

- >>>> *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.

<arrogant bullshit snipped>

- >>>>> *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.

>> *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.

> *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.

>>>> *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.

>>>>> *Yeah, right. Which coast do you "live" on?*

>>

>>>>> *The Left Coast*

>>>>  
>>>> *Why am I not surprised?*  
>>  
>>> *Why do you posture irrelevantly?*  
>>  
>> *Not irrelevant posturing. 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.

> *Two: California exports more food and tax money to the rest*  
> *of the USA than all but two other states. It's the 7th wealthiest*  
> *nation on earth in its own right.*

I said, "try living on the resources within your borders".

>>>>> *where we have the most productive farms on earth.*  
>>>>  
>>>> *Using water stolen from other states.*  
>>  
>>> *Who can't use it when they're frozen or parched 7 months of the year.*  
>>  
>> *I live in AZ, one of those places parched seven months of*  
>> *the year which is exactly when that water is most needed.*  
  
> *Your latitude and solar flux and desertification means that your*  
> *land would simply wick it all into clouds.*

Your ignorance is astounding. BTW the exact same conditions apply to the Imperial Valley...

>> *Oh, wait; the People's Republic of Kalifornia has greater*  
>> *need because You Say So, right? Try living on your own*  
>> *rainfall. We can, and have. But the Imperial Valley will dry*  
>> *back up to the desert it was before it was irrigated with*  
>> *Colorado River water stolen from other states.*  
  
> *That thing you CALL the "Colorado River" starts HERE from OUR*  
> *mountain rainfall!*

Your ignorance of geography is staggering.

<collectivist horseshit snipped>

<historical ignorance snipped>

>>>> *not a bunch of long-haired Co-op ex-hippies.*  
>>

>>> *Which is also irrelevant and unrelated posturing crap.*

>>

>> *Really? Communes are not "family dynasties"; they're*

>> *closer to a corporate setup with all members making*

>> *decisions, eliminating the takeover steps. Why couldn't they*

>> *outproduce their own needs and sell the excess?*

> *Try because most of them neither had nor wanted land, maybe??*

Then that kind of commune had no hope of continuing.

>>> *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. Ferguson