

Re: Scott and George's Teaching Thread

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-08/msg00459.html>

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 21 Aug 2007 19:40:45 -0700
-

On Aug 21, 6:51 pm, herbzet <herb...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

MoeBlee wrote:

On Aug 21, 5:45 am, george <gree...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 20, 7:21 pm, G. Frege <nomail@invalid> wrote:

On Mon, 20 Aug 2007 20:08:11 -0000,
Scott <ToaTe...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Okay, let's start with the
basics. What kind of
notation [...]?

I'd prefer the following (rather typical)
conventions:

Cancel this message.
Can't you read the title of the thread?

Can't you read the first post in this thread in which is said:

"You're welcome to contribute if you feel like it."

Anyway, title, first post, nor directive from the Department of
Homeland Security can or SHOULD dictate that people should not enjoy

Re: Scott and George's Teaching Thread

the full prerogative to put, as often as they like, their two cents into any thread that is open for posting.

No, but perhaps good taste and consideration for others should dictate certain behavior. In a public commons setting, such as a public park, do you really think it's cool to behave in any old way, so long as it isn't actually illegal?

First, in a public park, people do, and should, have a great amount of freedom.

Second, I am NOT saying that I approve of ANY way of behaving. Look, the poster G. Frege came in with his own suggestions on the subject of this thread and it is THAT that George took as a basis for directing G. Frege to desist from such posting.

Third, the analogy is in general poor anyway for reasons too tedious to bother with.

Would you be offended if people continually butted in to your conversations, with the justification that you're in public, so your conversation is public?

That's an absurd analogy. A thread is not such a conversation as is two people talking to one another over a cup of coffee.

How about on a bus? In a restaurant? On the street?

A news group thread is quite unlike those other situations. First, in such situations, no matter how much one might will to concentrate on certain voices, one cannot overcome that sound waves from drown out others so that certain interruptions make certain conversations physically impossible. Second, the very nature of a news group thread is to allow sequential posting (G. Frege's post does not drown out other posts) and from diverse people who are not in a situation of private conversation. Third, even though one might argue that there is a virtual drowning out, I disagree. It is George's option – he has complete freedom to choose which posts he wishes to read – and it is the thread starter's option to choose which posts to read, and the thread starter has full choice not to read G. Frege's posts, and the thread starter even made explicit that others ARE welcome to post aside from George (and even though that others have every prerogative to post without such permission or invitation from the thread starter). George has no standing to claim direction of who may or may

Re: Scott and George's Teaching Thread

not post what in this thread.

If you require communicating with someone on an exclusive basis, then it's not reasonable nor realistic in an open thread to expect that all others who wish to put in two cents must defer to you in that plan.

The thread starter was explicit in saying that there is not such a requirement. And the thread starter has no standing to demand such a requirement anyway. Unmoderated news group threads are to allow participation of various people. Neither the thread starter nor George have a basis to claim moderation of a thread in an unmoderated group. And it is important to keep that point out front. If George wishes an exclusive conversation, then he needs to find an appropriate means for that, and if he requires a moderated thread, then let him arrange for one. It is **PERNICIOUS** to allow someone to verbally bully so as to dictate who may post what where in open news group threads. And obviously I mean that such prerogative is within some reason so that things like spam are not included. G. Frege's post was **WELL** within reason in that regard.

Moreover, you have even taken the prerogative to post in this thread at your own will.

It's not reasonable to expect that from unreasonable people. It is realistic or unrealistic to the degree that people in general can be persuaded to act in a reasonable and considerate manner.

In open news group threads, the very idea is that people may put their two cents in at will. That is the beauty of it. When someone writes a post, then it is **NOT** reasonable to demand that others curtail the exercise of their prerogative to express their own thoughts, concerns, opinions, or wisecracks in response to the post and included in the thread in which the post was made so that the response is available to be read (or not read, as George or anyone else has full freedom) in sequential relation with the original post. That prerogative is, at least by me, to be **CHERISHED**, even as a matter of principle, and thus I **VERY** strongly resent and do not honor George to have any standing whatsoever to curtail that prerogative.

MoeBlee

.