

Re: Way OT: Asia Earthquake

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-01/0428.html>

From: Andre Lieven (*dg411_at_FreeNet.Carleton.CA*)

Date: 01/04/05

Date: 4 Jan 2005 19:59:57 GMT

"Christopher M. Jones" (*christopher.m.jones@gmail.com*) writes:

> *Andre Lieven wrote:*

>> *"Christopher M. Jones" (christopher.m.jones@gmail.com) writes:*

>>>> *Oh, please: That being such a nit of no change of menaing,*

>>>> *that it only further makes my point.*

>>>

>>> *Accuracy is kind of important.*

>>

>> *So is intent and priorly accepted meaning.*

>

> *Intent is meaningless in communication without accuracy.*

In the words of Monty Python: " Yes, it is ! ".

Intent, in a converstaion, allows people to not have to be 100% literal robots. It speeds actual communication, unless one is the Casinni probe, and the other is the DSN.

> *If you intend to say "open the window" but instead say*

> *"froggle the bilzbit" then you have missed saying what*

> *you intended to say entirely.*

Straw man: " froggle the bilzbit " is meaningless and not-English.

" Gasoline " and " oil " ARE both English. Thus, your analogy fails.

>>> *You could have said the*

>>> *US imports whale oil for its automobiles and still have*

>>> *had the same general meaning yet you would still be*

>>> *wrong in the details.*

>>

>> *Again, wrong.*

>

> *Yup, thanks for being a man and admiting it.*

See above. Oh, BTW, froggle the bilzbit.

>>> *Oh, and by the way, before I forget, Canada imports
>>> almost exactly as much oil per capita as the US does
>>> (~12.9 barrels per person per year for Canada, ~13.5
>>> for the US). See above regarding issues of accuracy.
>>
>> Yet, you leave out that Canada *exports* over 1 million
>> bbl per day...
>
> I didn't leave that out, it's relevant but it doesn't
> bear on your point. Your point concerned imports only,*

No, my point was about *total* oil flows.

The US imports, but does NOT export oil. Canada does both, thus you tried to compare *dissimilar* situations.

So, " be a man ", and deal with your errors.

Thats *two*, now...

> *and Canada does, in fact, import some petroleum products.*

So ? Is Canada a NET importer or not ?

Exactly. Your claim, blown up.... again.

> *Whether or not it is energy independent is irrelevant to
> this point. Interestingly, the US exports petroleum
> as well.*

LOL ! In amounts meaningful to imports/consumption ?

Didn't think so.

>>>>> *Europeans pay no more for their imported oil than anyone
>>>>> else, including the US. European gasoline is so expensive
>>>>> at the pump because of massive taxation.
>>>>
>>>> Indeed. That allows infrastructure upkeep.
>>>
>>> Having been on several extended road trips longer than
>>> 100 miles in the last year I can't say I noticed the roads
>>> in any particularly undrivable condition.
>>
>> Not been to NYC/New Jersey, lately, eh ?*

I guess not...

>>> *Indeed, for the
>>> most part they were more than satisfactory. I'm curious
>>> though, have you ever done the research to find out where*

>>>all the money from European (or Canadian) gas taxes goes?
>>
>> A lot of it goes to general revenues, to be sure. But, in
>> Canada, more is scheduled to be given to cities, so that
>> they can use it for road and infrastructure work.
>
> So your claim that the high gas taxes in Europe are for
> infrastructure upkeep is, in fact, by your own admission
> false, then?

Straw Man #2: I never said that ALL such revenues went to such.

Please post PROOF that I wrote exactly that, or take your place with LaLiar...

>>>Considering that not all the gas tax in the US goes to
>>>infrastructure upkeep I highly doubt that all of it in
>>>Europe does.
>>
>> Never said that it did...
>
> Oh, you quite clearly implied that it did. You specified
> infrastructure upkeep for the reason European gas taxes
> are as high as they are (many times higher than in the US).

I spoke of *effect*, now you're trying to claim that I " meant " *intent*.

Really, get thee to an ESL class...

> Let me put a sharp point on it, what is the fraction of
> the portion gasoline taxes in Europe above the US tax level
> which is used for "infrastructure upkeep"? If this number
> is below half then clearly those higher tax rates are not
> due to "infrastructure upkeep" at all, but general revenue
> gathering.

If *you* want to know that, *you* can find it out.

I made NO claims wrt =/-50%, either way.

>>>>>Oddly, Europe imports just as much oil per capita as the
>>>>>US (around 13.5 barrels per person per year).
>>>>
>>>>Sure. Now try this one: Which nation/continent is using
>>>>millions of fuel guzzling personal SUVs ?
>>>>
>>>Umm, let's see, many nations and every continent except
>>>Antarctica (and perhaps Australia). Sales of 4x4 SUVs
>>>in France were up 11% in 2004, and nearly a million SUVs
>>>are sold in Europe every year, they seem very popular

>>>everywhere.

>>

>> Surely even you understand that using different types of
>> stats (" 11% ", " a million ") is deceptive, not to
>> mention that you offer no **context** for those stats.

>>

>> If one sells 1000 widgets, one year, and 1110, the next,
>> thats an " 11% " increase, yet the **absolute numbers**
>> aren't up very much.

>

> They are not deceptive at all, they are direct refutations
> of your implications concerning America's SUV habits.

Oh, so if I deny something, I'm wrong, but when you do it,
you're right ?

LaDonna ?

> It was you who asked which nation/continent was using millions
> of SUVs. All of the major continents and many nations
> meet this criteria. As I said, SUVs are selling at nearly
> a million a year in Europe, and growing.

A, more robotlike literalities.

Pray, which nation started building, marketing and selling
them in million-plus lots, FIRST ?

>> Now, lets try that agaion: In which nation did **mass** sales
>> of SUVs start in ?

>

> Let's try this again.

No, NetCopWannaBe.

If I have to answer your questions, you have to answer mine.

Or else, enjoy KillFileHell...

> Can you possibly let your little pet
> hatred of America dim just a moment for you not to be blinded
> to the facts as they exist in reality?

<Projection>

Pointing out what nation's marketing is **responsible** for
something, is NOT " pet hatred " of **anything**, and only a
jingoistic " Ammurrica:Love It Or Leave It " Ugly American
would believe otherwise.

Sometimes, the USA and USians are " not loved " for reasons entirely rational, too...

>>>>>*I'm not sure whether you're being serious here or not,
>>>>>but at the very least you are wrong in the points you
>>>>>make.*
>>>>
>>>>*Nope. The point stands: Canada has enough fuel for itself,
>>>>and Europe uses it's fuel far more efficiently than does
>>>>the US.*
>>>>
>>>>*Oh, I see we've gone into Andre-fantasy-land now. Fair
>>>>enough, enjoy your stay.*
>>
>> <Projection>
>>
>>>>*Only the US needs to import so much for it's TOYS.*
>>>>
>>>>*Except that Europe and Canada need to import almost exactly
>>>>the same amount, and they have the same toys too!*
>>
>> *Well, as I've already said, Canada imports into it's east,
>> and *exports* from it's west.*
>
> *I guess in Andre-fantasy-land Europe doesn't exist except
> at your convenience.*

My point was about *Canadian* oil use. Europe is irrelevant to that, and yet another Jones-Straw-Man...

> *Note very carefully your statement that
> "only the US needs to import so much oil for it's TOYS." Note
> also that Europe imports as much oil per capita as the US and
> that Europe has millions of SUVs.*

What is the *per capita* ownership and use (miles/km per year driven) between European SUVs and USian SUVs ? What is the *market share* of European SUVs, in the European personal motor vehical market, V/ the *market share* of US bought SUVs, in it's personal motor vehicle market ?

Exactly !

> *Would you like to rephrase
> your anti-US screed now or would you prefer to just shut up
> before you dig a deeper hole of inaccuracies and falsities?*

<Projection>

>> *But, its not like a detail such as that will stop your
>> " everyone else does it, so we don't have to be *responsible**

>> *for anything " rant.*

>

> *I don't think you'll find that point in anything I said.*

<shrug> So you say, but you've already been caught cow-shitting, above, several times.

> *But*

> *don't let me get in the way of your "the US is uniquely bad*

> *because it does things others do to a similar degree!"*

> *temper tantrum.*

And, why should mere facts stop your " The US is great, and anyone who dare uses facts and free speech to question that, hates America ! "

Go put some more " USA rooles " stickers under the gun rack of your fuel guzzling behemoth...

" The USA: Not everyone bends to it's name ".

Andre

--

" I'm a man... But, I can change... If I have to... I guess. "
The Man Prayer, Red Green.