

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-01/msg01099.html>

- *From:* "benlizro@xxxxxxxxxx" <benlizro@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 25 Jan 2008 02:58:25 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 25, 8:11 pm, mb <azyth...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 24, 5:07 pm, "benli...@xxxxxxxxxx" <benli...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 25, 6:34 am, mb <azyth...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

...

And what exactly are you gonna do about that, and how?

When have you been appointed judge and censor of what is allowed and what not?
Since when has Google, or anyone, a right to censor anything?

The idea of defending this sporge-flooder on some sort of free speech grounds seems totally misguided.

It's not that anyone can defend what one spurger or worse one Maharaj does.

The spurger has no opinions or ideas to express. He is trying to prevent such expression.

It's just that it's impossible to defend censoring anything. It's not about free speech but the inviolability of speech. Now you invent a necessity for ideas. Someone else will invent a need for artistic content and in no time a fuckin Justice will reinvent a need for not disagreeing with him.

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

I didn't "invent a necessity of ideas". It's fundamental to the very concept of freedom of speech. You appear to have invented something called the "inviolability of speech", which says that even when so-called speech has no other content or purpose than to prevent others from speaking, although we cannot defend such behaviour we have no right to prevent it. That's what seems weird.

Go get a provider who you'll pay to screen out what you don't like and leave the rest of the people alone.

That sounds like a fine idea. And certainly many people in discussions like this talk as if they had some setup by means of which they did not have to view any of this. But for technically unsophisticated home users, it is not such a simple matter.

I have no idea what providers might exist within my area who would screen out such stuff, or how I would define "what I don't like" so that they could screen it. Some practical advice (without condescension or abuse if possible) would be welcome.

Fine. Do like me, I'm on Google groups. Don't open what you don't want to.

Looking on both Google Groups and Netscape, it appears to me as if the post to which I am replying, and its immediate followup, were the last legitimate sci.lang posts to appear.

That was more than six hours ago. Meanwhile 200 or so pseudo-threads have been posted, almost all sporge. Have those more fortunately positioned seen the same? At this rate, it is hardly worth anyone's time to pick through all the crap to find real discussions.

Spurge threads are almost immediately identified.

How? The spurger is now able to create nonsensical posts to originally legitimate threads using the names of legitimate posters.

Even to eliminate completely bogus threads, I need to at least read the subject lines. When I have to read 200 subject lines to find one or two that might contain genuine sci.lang content, this is nothing like "immediate".

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

Yet I do not like the idea of sci.lang or any other group being destroyed by this sociopath.

He's not the real problem. Look at the Hindoo-nazis and the overwhelming sci-fi-linguistics (to whom we all more or less respond).

He is the real problem. However obnoxious J-Doc may be, at his worst he does not produce one tenth of the volume that the spurger has displayed today and before. And he usually capitalizes his subject lines to make them easier to ignore. The cranks were here when I arrived, and I take them as part of the scene. I know Franz, I know Du! an, etc, and I can happily ignore their threads most of the time.

Ross Clark

.