

# Re: The job of NASA

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-11/msg01092.html>

---

- *From:* [simberg.interglobal@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:simberg.interglobal@xxxxxxxxxx) (Rand Simberg)
  - *Date:* Sun, 25 Nov 2007 15:59:48 GMT
- 

On Sun, 25 Nov 2007 06:32:12 -0800 (PST), in a place far, far away, Ian Parker <[ianparker2@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ianparker2@xxxxxxxxxx)> made the phosphor on my monitor glow in such a way as to indicate that:

I cannot see anyone in their senses  
employing you in any capacity. If  
you slandered a colleague like that you could  
destroy any teamwork and  
goodwill there was in an organization.

I haven't slandered you.

Even though I think it's been explained once, I'll do it again, because you're apparently an idiot, and still don't get it (and probably still won't even after I explain it again).

You committed a logical fallacy called a Complex Question, in which a question is asked in such a form as to imply that another question had already been asked and answered. It's also known more popularly as a "trick question," or "loaded question."

Here are some web pages on it.

[http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/skepticism/blfaq\\_fall\\_complex.h...](http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/skepticism/blfaq_fall_complex.h...)

## Re: The job of NASA

If you read them all, slowly and carefully, and think about it, very hard, there's a slim possibility that you'll finally get the point.

The classic example is "When are you going to stop beating your wife?" This implies, with no evidence, that the questionee is a wife beater.

You asked the group such an (idiotic) and loaded question. To wit (or in your case, non-wit, or nitwit): "How is it that the Republican party can live in the gutter?"

Since it has not been established that "the Republican party can live in the gutter" (it's not even clear that it has attempted to do so, let alone that it \*can\*), then it's completely idiotic to ask us how it can do so. If you'd like to argue that "the Republican party can live in the gutter," then you should do that (though it's quite off topic here), but we're not going to allow you to steal a rhetorical base by just accepting your foolish assertion.

To make my point, I responded with a complex question of my own, though not in the form of a question—it was in the form of a response to your moronic question: "I'll explain that when you tell us why you continue to engage in pederasty."

You see, this is what is called a "rhetorical device" (something else

Re: The job of NASA

with which you seem to be unfamiliar, being such a literal and simple-minded bloke).

It doesn't mean that I literally believe that you do now, or have ever engaged in pederasty (though I have to admit some amusement at your guilty conscience in your response).

It also does not mean that I'm accusing you of that. I was simply making a point about your idiotic question, which anyone with an IQ above room temperature (leaving out, of course, you and Eric Chomko) could see. I \*didn't\* claim to have evidence of your propensity for young boys. In fact, the very point of a complex question is that it is making an implication with zero evidence.

But your response that, because I used such a rhetorical device, I must be a CIA agent, or am "hacking your personal life" is, to me, indicative of someone with paranoid delusions. As I said, if I were you, I would seek professional help.

Then again, if I were you, I'd be nuts, so maybe I wouldn't.

The amount of sheer lunacy here amazes me. In fact, I'd say the ratio of sense to nonsense is far less than unity.– Hide quoted text –

I think you are dead right. There are a number of facts about Rand – based purely on his postings. The first of these is that he made a completely unwarranted personal slur against myself. I cannot just let that go.

The second fact is that he makes an assertion in a posting. For

Re: The job of NASA

example in his last but one postings he repeated the slur. In his last posting he denied it. Where are you? You simply cannot have a discussion.

In other words, as I predicted, you didn't comprehend a thing that I wrote.

There are but 2 possibilities.

Ah, here comes more of the paranoid theorizing. And note the fallacy of the excluded middle—there can be only two possibilities—no more. He leaves out entirely the possibility that his comprehension of written English is abysmal, and that he's stark raving mad, which is not just probably, but at this point, almost certain.

1) He is a psychopath – on reflection I think this is the most probable.

<laughing>

2) He is in the CIA or some other intelligence organization. This is in fact unlikely because even the Central Stupidity Agency would not employ anyone quite so stupid. Let us take this slur. If it did come from my conversation with Bassam al Kuwaiti as I first supposed, Syrian Intelligence would be on to it like a shot. Nobody even in the CSA could do that. BTW – Bassam has had a full run down.

Do you have any idea whatsoever that paragraphs like this tell us about your mental state?

<rest of raving lunacy snipped>

.