

Tuesday, October 31, 2006

### "Hi! I'm a United States Senator, And I Want To Be Your Friend!"

In another great use of our tax dollars, the US Government is trying to teach kids to recognize creeps online. In my day, this was a job left to our parents. Well, we didn't have an "online" then, but we were taught not to go with strangers, yadda yadda. In any event, the "game" features such come-ons as: "Accept or Deny: Wazzup? I think I know U send me your pic (in swimsuit, pls!)"

Which the "savvy" teen is supposed to "deny".

Lizard wants to know: Is the following in there as an "unsafe" buddy?  
Accept or Deny: Hi! I'm a United States Senator, and I want to be your friend!

Because, y'know, it should be.

I mean, even if the Foley scandal hadn't occurred, kids ought to learn the scariest words in the English language are "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help you." Or any variation thereof.

So, kiddies, whenever a Congressman or Senator or even a President says they want to "be your friend" or "help you" or "work for you", just deny, deny, deny the psychopathic egomaniac.

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 17:00

### The Beeb, the Principal, and the Imam

What do the following have in common?

- a)The BBC
- b)Way too many American High School principals
- c)Imam Hilaly of Australia

Answer: All of them believe that it is the responsibility of the free and sane to kow-tow to the unfree and insane.

Imam Hilaly recently generated a furor when he compared women to "raw meat" which attracts rapists, and that men cannot help but be incited if they happen to see a woman dressed in anything but a burka. He said judges who consigned rapists to the jail terms they deserve were "without mercy". Yes, folks, you read that right -- the good Imam is weeping for the poor, poor, rapists who are being (sniff) jailed because they lacked the most basic human self control. (Never mind that rape is not a crime of lust, but of violence and control -- anyone who is overly horny and who lacks for female companionship can just find themselves a prostitute or an internet terminal.)

In other words, if there is a group of people (in this case, sexually repressed Muslim males) who cannot live in a free and open society without committing crimes of violence, the Imam feels the problem is those who 'tempt' them to violence, not those who have never learned to be human. (Yes. Lizard is saying that if you can't control your impulses to violence, you are not fully human. We are social animals. Our nature is to live in packs. If you are so incapable of self control that you cannot abide the relatively few restraints placed on your behavior in a Western liberal society, you are not really a member of the human species and should remove yourself from contact with humanity -- before someone decides to do the world a favor and remove you from existence. Libertarianism and anarchy require self-control and discipline. Statist and collectivist philosophies hold that man is by nature sociopathic; individualist philosophies hold that man is capable of working cooperatively for mutual benefit without being compelled to do so.)

So what does this have to do with the Beeb, and with assorted American school principles?

They, too, follow the philosophy that it is a moral duty to avoid offending the easily offended, rather than a moral duty to teach the easily offended to get the smegging hell over themselves.

The BBC, for example, has stated that they would allow a comedian to symbolically 'trash' icons of Judaism or Christianity, but not Islam, for "fear of offending the British Muslim community". Why not care about offending anyone

else? Because other people, at least in the eyes of the BBC, are capable of accepting offense in a civilized manner. They may be upset; they may write letters; they may boycott advertisers (not a big deal in England, I suppose); they may complain to Parliament or whatever Brits do -- but they won't burn down the BBC's offices or knife BBC executives in the street. In other words, the mere fact they can be trusted to act responsibly means they can be insulted; to the BBC, it is their duty to not tweak the feelings of those who cannot learn to behave themselves, not the duty of the latter to learn to behave.

So we come to our last example, American principles. American school principals are, as a breed, known for their lack of principle. If there is a courageous path and a craven path, anyone standing on the latter will be tramped to death by hordes of balding, suit-wearing, career school board bureaucrats racing to take it.

Take, for example, this case, one of thousands of similar. Confederate flags, anti-gay shirts, pro-drug shirts -- anything which might cause "offense" is banned. Why? Because it has, somehow, in some sick and twisted parody of what a free society is all about, become more of a moral failing to offend than to react violently to offense.

No.

Here's the rule: He who escalates words to force is the loser.

Anyone who cannot keep the battle of ideas within the arena of ideas is not fit to live in a free society. He is not deserving of pity, consideration, or compassion. He is, and should be, outcast, to live alone and ashamed. It really doesn't matter what you can't stand to see -- a woman in a skirt, a boy wearing a Confederate symbol, or a t-shirt implying Jesus toked up. If it moves you to uncontrollable violence, rather than argument, go get yourself a 10 by 10 cabin in the deep woods. You do not belong among civilized people, and civilized people should feel no guilt or shame over your weakness.

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 09:46

Monday, October 30, 2006

### **Why Not Teach Ether Theory? Or Geocentrism?**

You can tell it's an election year when the rhetoric from politicians passes "just typically moronic" and enters the realm of "If this had been published in 'The Onion', it would be seen as too far-fetched to be funny". All across this once-great nation of ours, those who would represent us declare themselves to be imbeciles of the first order (and thus, I suppose, eminently qualified to represent the vast majority of Americans, as Mencken noted a long time ago). To wit, Sarah Palin of Alaska, who seems to have been standing out in the snow too long. She wants to teach mythology as science, and hauls out the rotting chestnut of "teach the controversy".

Yoo hoo, Ms. Palin! There is no controversy. What other discredited, falsified, and useless theories such scarce tax dollars be wasted on? Shall we teach the "bad air" theory of disease alongside germ theory? How about giving heliocentric and geocentric theories of the structure of the solar system equal time?

If it were just one nutter in a state which is not even really connected to America, well, no big. But the ignorance has spread to several elections, including Iowa.

This would not be an issue if it did not resonate with the mindless masses. (And that's a redundancy) The sad, depressing, and wrist-slitting-worthy truth is that the majority of Americans do not understand science, and prefer to learn about the world by reading the made-up stories of a bunch of semi-literate desert nomads. Ayn Rand said that, ultimately, there is one choice -- to think or not to think. Most Americans have chosen not to think.

And they vote.

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 13:59

Tuesday, October 24, 2006

## Connecting To The Universe

On a list I'm on, someone mailed me this:

Is there not some social utility in having human beings who feel a direction connection to God/Yhwh/the universe/Whoever and to His/Her/its creations? Can we not expect it to deeply influence their behavior in a way more profound than an intellectual acceptance of a system of morality?

To which I replied:

Only if they've been conditioned, by society, to believe that morality is external to human beings.

Your argument is, basically, the 'con job for their own good' argument. "Well, sure, you and I know there's no such thing as God (wink, wink). But it's better for society if the masses THINK there is."

Is social utility a good reason to lie for people? If a moral code rests on an immoral act (telling people God exists), can it truly be moral?

I have a direct connection to the universe through science. Dude, \*I am made of the corpse of a star\*. So are you. You can't get more connected than that. Every atom in my being used to be something else. There's bits of me that were dinosaurs, plants, fish, worms, and rocks. I may contain pieces of Julius Ceasar or King Richard III or the Prophet Mohammad. That's pretty mind-bogglingly awesome, and you do not need to believe in anything 'spiritual' or 'religious'. (And if it turns out the current theories are wrong, well, so it goes. Whatever the truth is, it will most likely be just as cool, if not cooler.)

Posted by Lizard in Religion at 11:58

Friday, October 20, 2006

### **And By "Diversity", Of Course, We Mean "Agreeing With Us"**

Andrew Sullivan takes us back to college. Where every opinion is tolerated, provided it's basically leftist. Where diversity is the watchword -- provided you define diversity as "A black liberal, a gay liberal, a Jewish (but anti-Zionist and self-hating) liberal, a liberal in a wheelchair, and a white liberal if he's even more grovelly and self-hating than the Jew (Paging Robert Fisk!)". And where posters of mass murderers Mao and Lenin are cool, but Dave Barry is "patently offensive".

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 07:23

Wednesday, October 18, 2006

### **A Generation Of Vipers^h^h^h^h Weenies**

Now they're banning tag.

As a non-athletic person, I am all for the elimination of any mandatory physical activity, but banning children from engaging in spontaneous and voluntary games of tag, touch football, etc, is just the latest and most ludicrous manifestation of the Nanny State. Furthermore, it shows the ever-increasing desire for absolute, total, and constant control, from cradle to grave -- there must be no unstructured time, nothing which is voluntary or spontaneous or genuine. Every second of every day must be clocked, regulated, administered, and supervised. Deviation and nonconformity must be crushed (while, all the while, 'diversity' and 'tolerance' are lauded as virtues in theory, but never seen in practice).

What kind of world are we producing? What sort of nation tries to raise children so that they never experience pain or discomfort, physical or emotional? The real world hurts folks, it hurts the body and it hurts the soul, and unless you develop tangible and spiritual scar tissue as a child, the pains of adulthood will kill you stone dead. What is going to happen when this generation of coddled, controlled, scheduled, and manipulated children become alleged adults? What happens when they're asked to make decisions on their own, or have to bear the consequences of poor planning or simply rotten luck? Some will go insane, freed for the first time from all strictures and having no concept of how to make adult choices about what indulgences to engage in. Others will simply curl up in despair and hopelessness. Few will adapt into sane, responsible, adults.

We are destroying our children in the name of protecting them.

Posted by Lizard at 09:02

### **The Know Nothing Party**

A recent news article reveals the shocking fact that Congresscritters, for the most part, can't tell a Sunni from a Shiite...despite the fact that understanding anything about the Mideast requires that you can.

This news item is pretty much "Dog Bites Man" or "Jack Thompson Loses" -- it's not news. As anyone who knows anything about anything knows, Congress knows nothing.

By this I mean -- pick a subject in which you have some decent knowledge. The Internet. Video Games. Biology. Automobile maintenance. The care and feeding of the rare southwestern striped rhinoceros.

Then look for Congressional comments on that subject, often made while debating, proposing, or blindly enacting laws on the topic.

Then, laugh if you are a bitter cynic, or cry if you are not. Hint: I laugh.

Now, it is not fair to expect Congresscritters to be renaissance men or women. Indeed, it's often not fair to expect them to be able to walk and breathe at the same time. We're talking about people who majored in 'Student Government' in High School and thought their participation in Model UN mattered.

However, it is not too much to ask that they bone up on any subject about which they are currently legislating. If you don't understand something well enough to write, say, a 1000 word essay on the topic, you don't have the capacity to make laws about it. Some would note that this would be impossible, given the sheer number of laws Congress passes each year. In that case, perhaps, we need a lot fewer laws, passed with a lot more wisdom.

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 08:01

Monday, October 16, 2006

### **Thompson Loses Again; Tensions Flare In Mideast; Hollywood Marriage On The Rocks**

You know, I need to add a new category to this blog: Schadenfreud.

At the very least, I need to write a filksong, to the tune of "Edelweiss".

But I digress.

In any event, Captain Loathsome, Jack Thompson, has lost again. After gloating about his 'victory' in badgering a poor judge in Florida to examine the upcoming game "Bully" to determine if it is a (get this) "public menace", the judge today announced it was not, and is refusing to block the sale of the game. Old Jackie is hopping mad, of course.

And I rather think this is proof Jack doesn't believe a word of the garbage he spews. If he did, surely, his constant string of failures would have driven him to depression and suicide. Yet, like Gary North, he sticks around, exploiting the gullible to line his own pockets. And he's so gracious in defeat, telling the judge he browbeat into submission that "you don't know what you saw". Well, that's a winning tactic, Jack. Insult the judge. That always works so well.

Lizard does the mocking jig.

Posted by Lizard in Technology at 11:18

Wednesday, October 11, 2006

### **We'll Try To Stay Serene And Calm...**

when Alabama gets the bomb! (Tom Lehrer, "Who's Next", 1965)

Well, it's not quite Alabama, though it's also filled with backwoods illiterates who shouldn't be trusted with a pocket knife, much less a nuke. And it's dubious if they really have a working bomb or not. They clearly want people to think they do, which is, frankly, stupid. They have no delivery mechanism, no capacity to mass produce them, and no allies who will pull a Kennedy and say "Any attacks on North Korea will be considered to be attacks on us". China might risk war with the US over Taiwan, but not over North Korea. Japan -- Japan -- a nation which is one of the most aggressively pacifist in the world is talking about re-armament, and it's unlikely the World War II victors will object to this very much. Kim is acting like a spoiled brat who didn't get what he wanted for Christmas ("I want the respect of the world...and a pony...") and he is heading for a thermonuclear spanking.

The worst thing to do would be nothing. That will just give him time to make a bomb that works and find a way to get it where it will do damage. The second worst thing to do will be to give him what he wants -- negotiating with terrorists never works. The third worst thing to do would be to invade or otherwise attack, since America is already in two wars (neither of which we're winning) and adding a third, especially against an enemy willing and able to shoot back, is folly.

Note there is no best thing. The best thing would be to have stopped this before it got this far, but with our international capital squandered, our forces spread thin and our 'allies' of dubious worth (Kim knows as well as anyone that the 'axis of weasel' won't commit to any serious military endeavour), we had no chance. So now we reap the consequences of fighting an unnecessary war -- we lack the diplomatic and military resources to fight a necessary one, and we missed the opportunity to prevent the war from becoming necessary in the first place.

Posted by Lizard at 10:44

Tuesday, October 10, 2006

## Organized Jewry

Someone on a conspiracy list was going on again about 'Organized Jewry'. I had to respond...

You know, the silliest thing about this is the concept of 'organized Jewry'. Do you know any Jews? As the saying goes, you put five Jews in a room, you get six opinions. It takes Jews 2 hours to decide what to eat for lunch, never mind trying to run the world.

I can just imagine the meetings...

"So, Moishe, how are you doing with the Russians?"

"The Russians? Who cares? They're a pain in my tuchas, they are!"

"You were supposed to be plotting to undermine them!"

"No, wait, we were going to SUPPORT them!"

"Who's meshugana idea was that?"

"Hymie was all for it!"

"Right, sure, listen to him. Shmuck! We need to destroy the Russians!"

"Why? I thought this whole 'fall of Communism' thing was just a plot to put the Americans off guard?"

"Schmedrick! That was all Goldberg's stupid idea!"

"Stupid? Who are you calling atupid? I faked the moon landings!"

"Not very well!"

"Waitaminute, you faked them? But I was supposed to be putting up the secret moon base!"

"Look, can we get back to the Russians for a minute here?"

"No! I want to know where all my moon base money has been going if we never landed on the moon!"

"We DID land on the moon! Goldberg faked one set of moon landings to cover up for Stein's REAL moon landings!"

"Oy vey, this is giving me such a migraine..."

"The Russians? Can we discuss the Russians?"

"Wait, we've got to order lunch."

"I want corn beef on rye, hold the mayo!"

"Corn beef gives me gas. Why not Chinese?"

"I'm allergic to MSG! You trying to kill me?"

"Didn't we invent MSG to support our mind control rays or something?"

"I forget. I think that Goldman was doing that."

"So where IS Goldman? You'd think he'd show up once in a while..."

"Something about his PTA meeting. I don't know."

"Don't we control the PTA?"

"That's on for next week. Don't you get the newsletter?"

"Apparently not. Someone's taken me off the mailing list and I think I know who, Goldberg!"

"Like I'd even know how. My son, he's a genius with these computers. Me? Nothing!"

And so it would go, as infinitum...

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 20:14

Monday, October 9, 2006

### **You Can't Spell "Untruth" without "Unruh"**

The latest spin in the abortion wars adds a wonderfully Orwellian twist. Per the Los Angeles Times, in addition to War Is Peace and Freedom Is Slavery, we must now add "Restricting Women's Choices Is Feminism". The author of this Big Brotheresque illogic is one Leslee Unruh, who clearly dropped a few 't's from her name at some point. (Props to Daily Kos for the link. It is always good to read all sides of the political spectrum. Firstly, knowing what your enemies are thinking allows you to prepare arguments against them. Secondly, having your opinions challenged will strengthen those which are correct and prune those which are not.)

So Ms. Unruh, feeding off of our tax dollars, has decided to shift the focus of abortion from the fetus to the mother. Apparently, women are just too weak and stupid to decide if they are physically, emotionally, or financially ready to bring a child to term, and so, the Benevolent State, From Whom All Blessings Flow, will decide for them, for their own good, poor little helpless dears. To Ms. Unruh, this is "feminism". To the fox, I suppose, a deep fryer and a package of bread crumbs is "Chicken Liberation".

If there is any doubt where Ms. Unruh belongs in terms of her commitment to feminism, merely consider this:

"If you don't do your job right as a mother," Unruh asked, "what good is everything else?"

Sort of says it all, doesn't it?

But it does point out the intellectual vacuity and growing desperation of the anti-choice movement. (One cannot properly call them 'pro life', as a meaningful human life requires freedom. At the most, they might be called 'pro existence'.) Having gotten nowhere in 30+ years by claiming an indistinct blob of cells is a rights-possessing human being, they are now trying to claim the mantle of being "pro woman". That this pathetic ploy has fooled anyone is disappointing; that the only people it's fooled so far are safely isolated in South Dakota is, I suppose, a small comfort.

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 12:54

Wednesday, October 4, 2006

### **Transcendental Cluelessness**

From Hard To Do Any Worse comes this bit of wonderfully hilarious, 'laugh or you'll cry' news -- some numbnuts is trying to ban Fahrenheit 451.

Money quote:

"It's just all kinds of filth," said Alton Verm, adding that he had not read "Fahrenheit 451." "The words don't need to be brought out in class. I want to get the book taken out of the class."

"Ah ain't read it, but Ah knows it's chock full o' filth!"

This person has been allowed to breed.

(And I daresay if anyone has reached the age of 15 without being exposed to the language in F451, they have been so severely sheltered and controlled that it borders on child abuse.)

Posted by Lizard at 11:15

Tuesday, October 3, 2006

### **Warning: You May Be Too Stupid To Use This Bed**

Eugene Volokh is reporting that a nearly \$180,000.00 award given to a man who -- get this -- claimed he didn't realize there was a danger of falling out of a loft bed has been, thankfully, reversed. A trio of judges had to labor long and hard to fill up 20 pages when a single sentence -- "Claimant is too stupid to live" -- would have been more than sufficient.

How much did this insanity cost the citizens of New Jersey? How many serious criminals were able to cut plea bargains or walk because money to hold real trials was tied up in the prosecution of this insanity? And why are both the lawyer and the claimant still walking around free? The filing of baseless lawsuits is not just a waste of time and a subject for jokes, it is directly harmful to society, much more harmful than such alleged 'crimes' as drug use, prostitution, or gambling.

Anyone who is too stupid to realize that they might fall from a bed should not be allowed to live unsupervised -- they are clearly mentally defective and a 'danger to themselves and others'. If such a person claims he is capable of living as a free adult, then, the only explanation for the filing of the lawsuit is simple and outright malice, and the only lawyer who would accept it is one which seeks to extort money.

(We might also wish to place the jurors into some kind of protective custody as well, on the grounds that anyone stupid enough to buy this cock-and-bull story is also not fit to live as an independant citizen.)

There is a legal theory called "Broken window policing", which holds that going after minor crimes helps prevent major ones. I propose a similaire model for dealing with people who file lawsuits of this nature -- they are clearly not fit for life in the real world, and while they may not have harmed anyone yet, it seems likely that they someday will, and so, for their own good and the good of others, they should be put in a nice, safe, home. The cost of doing this would surely be less than the cost of these moronic lawsuits. (Think of how much money has already been wasted dealing with people who claim they didn't know eating at McDonalds would make them fat.)

This is, of course, an inevitable and natural consequence of the nanny state. Raised in the belief that no harm can be permitted to come to them, that the government exists to shield and protect them from all dangers, even those of their own making, we have a generation of utter and complete imbeciles who lack all common sense. Decades of coddling -- replacing nice, sharp, metal Tonka trucks with soft plastic ones, replacing knee-skinning playground asphalt with bouncy foam -- has produced an entire generation which has failed to learn, on an intuitive level, that the world is full of things which can hurt them, and which has no capacity to judge risks and act accordingly.

We have become a nation of sissies.

Posted by Lizard at 08:22

### **Frag Llamas For Allah**

The NSA today reported intercepting the following internet conversation between suspected terrorists. They have been unable to translate it.

Ham1d\_die4A11ah:U r Spawn campr! UR Lam3r!

Abdul911r00lz: STFU n00b! L2P!

Ham1d\_die4A11ah: hehe Pwn3d j00, n00b!

Posted by Lizard at 08:20

Sunday, October 1, 2006

### **How Do Congressmen Use Bookmarks?**

They don't. They just bend over the pages! Ha ha! I slay me!

Except I first heard that joke back in the early 80s. Nothing seems to change.

(Sadly, upon doing more research, I found out Foley is a fairly decent guy, for a Republican, as he supports stem cell research, voted against the anti-gay marriage amendment, and supported the rights of gays to adopt in Washington, DC. That takes something of the edge off the schadenfreud. Bummer. It's a lot more fun when it's a Jesse Helms or the like who gets caught in this sort of scandal.)

Posted by Lizard in Politics at 08:43