

sci.physics: Re: _ SHOULD _ Have No Back Reference.

Re: _ SHOULD _ Have No Back Reference.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/9806.html>

From: Jesse F. Hughes (jesse_at_phiwumbda.org)

Date: 07/30/04

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 2004 16:13:52 +0200

jmfahciv@aol.com writes:

> *In article <410a34eb\$0\$2826\$61fed72c@news.rcn.com>, <jmfahciv@aol.com> wrote:*
> *In article <87smb9zrz2.fsf@phiwumbda.org>, <jesse@phiwumbda.org> (Jesse F. Hughes) wrote:*
>> *Funny defense.*
>>>
>>> *RFC says you shouldn't do this.*
>>> *RFC doesn't say you mustn't do this.*
>>> *Conclusion: it's perfectly okay to do this.*
>>>
>>> *This is the reasoning of an asshole.*
>>
>> *No, no. Fucking asshole.*
>
> *Ptui. I screwed up. It's fucking idiot.*

Uh, it's obvious you have a subtler grasp of epithets than I have.

Still, I can't help but think "asshole" was better. "Idiot" sounds like he's ignorant and thus less culpable.

--

Jesse F. Hughes

"Radicals are interesting because they were considered 'radical' by the people who played with them who wrote a lot of math work that modern mathematics depends on." --Another JSH history lesson