

Re: Software Protection system...Any tester there ?

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2004-04/0474.html>

From: Beth (*BethStone21_at_hotmail.NOSPICEDHAM.com*)

Date: 04/21/04

Date: Wed, 21 Apr 2004 05:43:39 +0100

wolfgang kern wrote:

> *Beth replied to:*

> *

> / > > *Everything can be analysed and modified.*

> / > *not "love". ; -)) :-))*

> *

> *I just remember an very old Z-80 BASIC example were a virtual*

> *psychologist (32Kb) responded with astonishing human-like questions*

> *to the dialog. Similar to the Teddy-Bear anyway.*

Yes, a version of a very famous AI program...which, funnily enough, was called "Eliza" (but is no relation to myself in any way...though, as I often waffle on about completely pointless things with an "alien brain" and produce text like a robot on a factory floor, then it might be tempting to think I'm just the modern "mark II" of the program...unfortunately, nothing so grand...I'm just a very weird person, is all ;)...

What the program basically did is parse over what you type and then extract things, turning them around into a question to keep you talking (and when it can't understand what was typed, out comes stock phrases like: "please, tell me more" and "interesting, but why do you feel you need to tell me this?" and so forth ;)...

For example, if you type "I am afraid of mice" then the program picks up "I am" and replaces it with "why are you" or "how long have you been" or other very clever "wordplay" tricks that turn a sentence into a question, to produce seemingly "intelligent" replies: "I am afraid of mice" -> "how long have you been afraid of mice?"...if it finds "I think" in a sentence, then it questions "why do you doubt...?"

At no point, of course, does it actually understand a single word of what you're saying...all the answers are "stock phrases" with perhaps a touch of "random numbers" thrown in to select various alternatives (so that it doesn't end up repeating itself too often, as that would be the big give-away)...

Arguably, "Eliza" could be considered to have half-passed the "Turing Test", _despite_ how actually crap and totally lacking in "intelligence" it was...this is because the author was a university professor who wrote it for fun, just to make a point about the difference between actual "intelligence" and _perceived_ "intelligence"...and, from the choice of subject, to probably also make a little subversive comment about what he thought about the profession of "psychotherapy"... "he", by the way, was Joseph Weizenbaum and this happened in the mid '60s...

And what made this program so famous was the unbelievable effect it had on people...he placed the program onto the MIT mainframe and students could access the program from many terminals dotted around the campus at all hours of the day and night...looking through his "access logs", Weizenbaum noticed that the program was being accessed _frequently_ and, more interestingly, always late at night...as if the students really were all believing that the program was a real "computer psychotherapist" and were actually seriously discussing their problems with the program...the accesses to the program were also, suspiciously, _very long_ which also suggested that they weren't merely just looking quickly at the program to be "amazed" at how such a simple program could seem so "intelligent"...but, yeah, were really exploiting the program for long, free "therapist" sessions...

What is even more interesting is that Weizenbaum's secretary _knew_ how the program worked (scanning for "keywords", turning your sentences around into questions, etc. ;)...and, yet, when Weizenbaum walked into the room, she'd become embarrassed and try to hide the "print outs" of the conversation...she _knew_ what it was doing but _still_, it seems, was having long conversations about her problems with the program...and when Weizenbaum – like any curious scientific mind – was so mystified by all these students accessing his program late at night for hours at a time, that he suggested to his secretary: "perhaps we could hook it up to a printer and see what they are actually doing for all this time"...she freaked out with complete horror: "You can't do that!"...treating him like he'd just suggested they set up video cameras in changing rooms or similar major "peeping Tom" activity...but, then again, if they really were seriously engaging the program with their secrets and problems, then she was actually very right to insist on their privacy being respected (Weizenbaum, to be fair, was just not seriously believing people were so easily fooled by some cheap and cheerful LISP program he'd only written for a joke)...

Hence, as I say, you could say this program "half-passed" the "Turing Test" in that people were _treating it_ like it was another human being on the other end of the line...interestingly, though, one presumes most knew or could work out after a bunch of replies that it wasn't really a human but _still_ they persisted to talk with it as if it was...

Though it would almost certainly fail with an input like: "So, do you think David Beckham is a good football player?" (it wouldn't understand the _semantics_ of the question – nor know who "David Beckham" is (like, perhaps, a lot of Americans out there don't know who he is...but the rest of the "soccer"–Loving world will know for sure ;) to talk about him in any way – that the reply would likely come out as being crap and too obviously "computer generated"...although, that said, with "keyword scanning", you could still come up with a very simple "David Beckham is a good football player. Why do you ask this question?" to quickly try to "change the subject" to avoid being "found out" ;)...one of the clever things with choosing a "psychotherapy" application is that you don't really "talk" in the same way...at least not "chat"...but kind of sit there just replying – quite embarrassed – as "minimally" as possible to the program...the actual _style_ of a "therapy" session lends itself particularly well for "bluffing" that you actually know what's going on when the program, in fact, was nothing but a "keyword parser" and a bunch of "if" statements, so to speak...

Like I say, it probably _still worked_ in its "therapeutic" context from the perspective of just allowing people to talk a problem out loud...it just had to show some "interest" in what was being said to be slightly better than talking to a brick wall...but, thereafter, even if you know the program isn't really understanding you – as Weizenbaum's secretary did – you could simply use it as a way to "talk a problem out with yourself" but without the worry that this is the proverbial "first sign of madness" to be having conversations with yourself...no, you could claim to be "talking to the program"...the truth of the matter, though, is that the program simply "mirrored" back what you said into a question to keep you talking that, actually, you really _are_ talking to yourself because the machine's replies were _quite literally_ what you'd just said fed back at you in a different form...

The real funny thing is, of course, that there are real psychotherapists out there who basically do much the same thing...none of the "standard replies" actually look in any way out of place from what therapists _really do say_ (you know, "please, tell me more", "why do you feel you needed to tell me that?", "Do you think this affects your relationship with other people?" :)...the program was _programmed_ to throw out so-called "Barnum statements" but therapists seem to also do much the same...

A "Barnum statement" for those that don't know (and have probably fallen for them) is that statement which _sounds_ like it's "personal" but is, in fact, totally generic...the "Eliza" program, of course, is the perfect demonstration of these "Barnum statements" because it literally was a "on–the–fly Barnum statement generator" and nothing more than that...

Amazing, actually, that there's an awful lot of people who's careers are basically all about "Barnum statements" ...for instance, you go to the fortune teller and they say "yes, you've been having difficulties of late...someone in your close circle of friends is involved...but this is starting to clear up, isn't it? I can tell you that these problems will eventually sort themselves out in the future" ...hands up who finds such a statement to seem to have some "bearing" on their current situation...basically, 99% – if not 100% – of people will "relate" to such a total load of "generic" nonsense I've just spitted out there...it all works on what applies to anyone and everyone...everyone has problems so saying "you've been having difficulties" is always going to apply...the "cleverness" here is phrasing it in such a deliberately VAGUE manner that what I'm depending on is that you'll automatically think to yourself: "what difficulties? Ah, yes...that problem at work I've been having" ...it's YOU who's actually "filling in the gaps" without realising it...

If you like, I'm presenting you with a blank, vague "form" with "generic" things that apply to everyone: "name", "date of birth", "address", etc....then YOU are filling are actually filling out that form in how you reply: "Hmmm, I see in my crystal ball that you have a name...I see that it has a vowel in it [practically all words do that this assertion isn't taking any big risks of being wrong...and, anyway, when they clearly get it wrong, the fortune teller invents some "bad vibes have clouded my vision...these bad vibes seem to be coming from you...is there some problem you're not being honest about?" which turns it all back around into seeming like they, again, can really see into the future and can "read your soul" as you sit there]" / "Yes, yes...that's right...I have a name...it's Fred" / "Yes, Fred...didn't you go to school in the '70s? Somewhere near where you lived?" (basically, the "'70s" thing is the fortune teller taking a blind guess from looking at someone how old they are...but by turning it around as a guess on when they were at school "hides" that all we're talking about is a blind guess of someone's age...plus, the clever thing with choosing "school" as your target would be that a person can be in some kind of "school" from age 3 up until 20 something...hence, you can be "out" with your guess at their age with a decade or so of time in either direction...beginning to see how these people twist their questions and assertions to make it seem like they know you backwards and forwards but actually know absolutely nothing whatsoever about you...as for the "your school was local to you" ...well, who lives in New York but goes to school every day in the middle of Moscow? Exactly, no-one...it's just like same "locality of reference" thing that cache memory depends on... most memory access just so happens to be "local" to the last access and often "sequential"...sometimes it isn't...but if you put money on this "principle", then the majority of the time, you WILL win your "bet"...and, again, "near" is a subjective and vague term quite deliberately...some people go to school and it's in the same street as they live...some might go on a bus to the neighbouring town...all depending on how much you want "near" to apply, you can twist

things...it's a relative measure...for instance, even living in New York and going to school in Moscow could be considered "near", when compared to going to school on Mars or Jupiter...and that's where an even cleverer aspect of psychology comes into it: IF you have been doing a lot of long-distance travel just to go to school, then chances are that what you call "near" is a further distance than everyone else...catch how this works? Talk to someone who goes to school in the same street as their home, that going to the next town to go to school is "near" and they'd probably reply: "Near? That's not near! My school is in the same street as where I live!" ...but, to you, this is "near"...because this was the short bus ride you took every single morning for over a decade...this kind of distance – exactly because you travelled it all the time – is "nothing" to you...while someone who doesn't ever go anywhere, finds travelling to the next city is a "journey" and "adventure"...

Oh yes, this is the art of the "Barnum statement", you see...who'd have thought there could be so much psychology and clever tricks inside just one single word like "near"? You'd be surprised...the military, in fact, have a technique called "information mining" which works on the reverse principle...you've not been given too much information? Well, you can "mine" the sentence itself to get more out of it...if you don't mind it being more about "probability" than precise facts, then you really can get a lot of information out...for example, the use of the word "near" to describe a school bus journey to the next city says, as I suggested, "this person makes lots of long distance journeys...they are, therefore, well-travelled...hence, they must actually enjoy travelling (or, otherwise, they'd rather just stay at home and not go anywhere...that is, they would NOT be well-travelled...because they are, travel must not be too great a problem for them ;)...so, when they choose their vacations, they don't blink at the idea of going a long distance...therefore, chances are, they like to 'see the world' (this also makes use of the fact that most people do, at least when they are young...you can always depend on bringing in "human condition" and "average person" facts to help along your guesswork)...must have picked up on 'different cultures' when they did so (something to throw back at them should you be a fortune teller or psychoanalyst ;)...nothing is ever plain sailing, though, in this life...so, likely, they did once or twice NOT go on a journey thinking it was perhaps 'too far' or when they got there, there was some 'difficulty' involved...everyone gets some kind of 'stage fright' too, so you can imagine that there was an opportunity to go somewhere when a kid – a school trip – where they got a little 'scared' and 'home-sick', not really sure if they wanted to go along with these particular people (again, guesswork but a show of hands will still garner a majority of people putting their hands in the air about such guesses ;)..."...blah-blah-blah...

Though a computer program would always be crippled in never really understanding the semantics of what's being said, it could do a

pretty job of just "automating" some of these kinds of tricks (as I say, "information mining" is a military technique...you would actually be taught how to do it in a very "automatic" and "robotic" fashion...well, that's the style the military basically does practically everything...whether you're feeling happy or sad, whether you like the general or not: "yes, sir!" *salute* is ALWAYS the rigid response you MUST do...it's entirely how the military operates: they first "break" you – "You squirmy little maggot!! Your Mommy ain't here to cuddle you no more!!! Get down on the floor and give me a hundred!!!" – which is simply "de-programming" your "civilian programming"...you ain't "free" no more, it ain't about no "feelings", you ain't going to go running to your family and friends...and they make damn sure you know about it and get that message loud and clear: You aren't a "citizen" in any way, shape or form anymore...anything you learnt as a "citizen" should be immediately forgotten...if we see any "individual" showing through, then we're going to shout it out of you, run it out of you, make you do press-ups until you can't remember anything else, etc., etc....once "de-programmed", you're then "re-programmed"...and the military-style here is simply to almost literally program you like a machine...you do this first, then you do that, then you must do this...no "deviation" is permitted and must stick to the "program" exactly like a robot would...heck, they even tell you how to stand...how to walk...how to salute properly...re-loading your gun? They literally call out the "steps": "one, two, three" and you follow the pre-designed movements for re-loading a gun...you're a robot...you do not "think" about it, you just DO IT! Thinking, soldier, will get you killed...hesitating in the line of fire will get you and your platoon killed...you do NOT think, maggot...you DO exactly what I say when I say it...you don't eat, shit, piss or even breathe unless I give you express permission to do so! And you will do it exactly as I say you will do it!

Yeah, once you "get" what's going on, it's surprising easy to become a convincing "drill sargent"...just SHOUT it...the purpose of the shouting? Well, can you think straight with some big evil-looking brute of a man shouting how much he hates you and will break you directly into your ear? And, exactly, they want to disrupt your usual thinking processes...those are "civilian" thinking processes about "feelings" and "what am I going to have for lunch?"...don't want any of those...they must be "de-programmed" out of you, by hook or by crook...you will not be permitted to even think for your induction, soldier...not until you only think the thoughts we tell you to think...oh, and you will be called only "soldier" or "private" until you've forgotten that you have a name...names are "civilian" things...don't need those...you are a soldier, you have a number and you have a rank...forget everything else, we won't be using them...the closest you will get to a "name" is your surname and that's only so we can tell people apart...and, yeah, it will NOT be "Mr.Smith"..."politeness" is a "civilian" thing...you are just "Smith"...indeed, we actually do Hope that you find this "impolite" and "disrespectful"...you are just a "maggot", after all...get used

to it and get used to it _fast_, soldier!

Also, of course, politicians are full of "Barnum statements" which are designed to make you _think_ they are actually doing something...they also like to employ Orwellian "euphamising" too, for anything that sounds bad in its Plain English form...repetition, just like with our "maggots" under their drill sargent, is the way to _control_ how people think...

So, remember, "those who Love freedom", we are against "the axis of evil" on a "Crusade" to "restore democracy" from the "foreign fighters" and "former regime remnants" – as well as any other "pockets of resistance" – with "Iraqi reconstruction"...

Note very carefully that the phrases are always in a particular order because this is the use of _repetition_ and _euphamism_..._always_ "axis of evil", NEVER "the evil axis", despite being a syntactical valid alternative..._always_ "former regime remnants", NEVER "those left over from the former regime", even though it means the same thing..._always_ "foreign fighters", NEVER "international insurgents" ...although, this _does_ have the required _alliteration_ and other poetical tricks that, if "foreign fighters" hadn't been chosen as the "official title", you never know, they might have said "international insurgents" instead...

Surely, you've all noticed? "forme_r_ _r_egime _r_ emnants"...it alliterates and rrrrolls nicely off the tongue...as does "_f_oreign _f_ighters"...to which anyone who's a bit of a "poet" immediately recognises the "tricks of the trade" when it comes to making language sound good...why stop here? There's "_F_riendly _f_ire"... "axis of evil" or "pockets of resistance" might not be immediately obvious to those who haven't studied _poetical rhythm_ but alliteration can happen in other places and not just at the start of a word...the _syllables_ can alliterate...the overall "rhythm" can be pleasing to the ear...the syllables "balanced" on either side of the "of" in the middle...

The choice of unusual words which most people don't know or use, so that they can be "re-programmed" to mean _anything_ that they want them to mean...who on Earth _naturally_ says "colateral"? "Yes, the bus crashed on the main road! It colaterally took out some other cars as it rolled across the road"...all words implicitly carry _semantics_...when you meet a brand new word, you're not aware of what those semantics are...hence, yes, choosing a word no-one much knows allows it to be "programmed" to be seen in a particular way...

"Surely this can't go that far, can it?", you might be thinking to yourself...words are words and they mean specific things...you can't twist the semantics of a word that much, surely? Nope, sorry...you _really can_ do that...as a slightly twisted but most excellent example, which some will find highly amusing and / or offensive,

consider _swear words_...how come you can say "sexual intercourse" in public and polite company without too much worry, yet should you use a particular four-letter synonym beginning with the letter "F" then you could cause great offence? One word is deemed "taboo" and "may never be spoken", the other words, though, are perfectly fine to be said pretty much anywhere at any time...they _are_, though, effectively referring to the same act...here's another interesting example of these quite inexplicable "taboo" words...you can happily refer to the male genitalia all you like by all manner of names considered "harmless": "you're a dick!", "you're making a cock of yourself!", "willy", etc....but you may do the same for female genitalia...so much so – as some of these words are the greatest "taboos" of the entire English language – it would be difficult to provide examples that would not cause certain "polite company" absolute total offence...to the point, in some cases, of "I shall never speak to a filthy-mouthed person like you ever again"...suffice to say, the "scientific" word "vagina" is the one that causes least offence BUT _still_ is deemed far worse a "taboo" than any of the male words like "penis", "dick", "cock" or whatever...at the other end of the scale is arguably the word that is the greatest "taboo" and most offensive word in the entire language...oh yes, even the four-letter "f word" has nothing on the four-letter "c word"...this word is such a "taboo" that even making such an indirect reference has a lady feeling very guilty for even going near it in any capacity...and this is in modern "liberal" times...I would have been burnt at the stake for even admitting I might know what such a word was in more oppressive times past...

Anyway, I'm NOT trying to talk dirty with anyone before that impression floats around...the point is that these words are part of the English language and we all know them...but they are "taboo" and should not be spoken in "polite company" at all...this is less so in our modern, more liberal times but the "taboo" on these words does still exist...certainly, for that most "taboo" of all "taboos" – the "c word" – were you to march up and down a main street happily shouting it, then we can quickly judge just how "liberal" people have become and what effect the "taboo words" still have...aah, not quite so "liberal", "casual" and "permissive" as we first thought, eh? Blurt out that particular word on live TV and you shall never be allowed in front of a camera ever again...the newspapers will probably run "hate campaigns" against you for the rest of your life...if Janet Jackson thinks she got it bad for showing a nipple at the Superbowl, then she should try casually dropping the "C word" into conversation on a live broadcast cast show a few times...best to immediately pack a bag to emigrate to, ooh, Mars...

But, note, the word refers to exactly the same thing that "vagina" does...bizarrely, though it's arguably _worse_ because it's _descriptive_, something like "front bottom" would actually be considered even more "harmless" again ...the "F word" refers to exactly the same thing that "sexual intercourse" is referring to...

Hence, to get to my actual point here, you can see that it is _very possible_ for an innocent word to be "bestowed" particular semantics...semantics that, in fact, _don't_ relate to the object or act in question exactly because there are other _synonyms_ – which mean _exactly the same thing_ – that _can_ be said...none of this makes much actual logical sense but that is how the language is, carrying a set of "taboo" words like this...to non-native English speakers, of course, these words probably have _absolutely no impact whatsoever_, as it's really all a "cultural" thing...the words themselves are, of course, just a particular order of letters like any other word...what they refer to can be termed "scientifically" and immediately rendered "non-taboo": "sexual intercourse", "vagina", "penis", etc....and what they are talking about is IDENTICAL...they are completely synonymous...but you can say one but it's "taboo! Taboo! tabo!" should you even contemplate mentioning the other...

So, yes, words _can_ be given "additional semantics" well beyond what the words themselves specifically refer to...note that the only thing "special" about swear words is that this element is at an extreme and the words cross a "socially acceptable" line into the realms of "taboo" that they may NOT be said at all...EVERY word actually carries these "additional semantics"...they come from how a word gets used naturally in general...synonyms are the way to begin to see these "additional semantics" (or, alternatively, it's also easier to see "additional semantics" in languages other than your own native one...exactly like the swear words earlier would not cause any offence nor tweak the ear or anything of someone who didn't speak English...even if they learn English, the "taboo" thing is cultural that the words themselves won't mean anything in particular to them...it would just be a case of repeating "must remember not to say f**k, must remember not to say f**k"...this is only to "fit in" and not accidentally cause offence to anyone, as they personally don't actually care one way or the other about the word...thanks to lots of Hollywood movies using the "F word" everywhere then even this "taboo" word is actually losing its "taboo"...I could have, indeed, typed it out here, right, and, in fact, no-one would have cared...but, well, no sense risking upsetting anyone when there's no need to do so...after all, when you say "F word" and "C word", everyone knows what those words are...which is another bizarre thing because I have just spoken those words, in a manner of speaking, in the sense that what I just said is now the full, unadulterated "taboo" word inside your mind...BUT I cannot be blamed for that...hey, I never actually said it aloud so if you're thinking it then that's your own dirty mind...nothing to do with me, guv'nor ;)...

Hence, look at any "unnatural" word like "colateral" with a lot of suspicion...if you can find a word that people don't know much then it comes to them "semantically blank"...in exactly the same way that English swear words are first learnt by non-native English speakers with exactly the same "semantically blank" nature...it just doesn't mean anything at all...indeed, they might happily and completely

innocently ask their English teacher: "so, what does f**k mean?"...it's at this point that the English teacher explains about the actual very unusual presence of "taboo words"...yeah, this is actually rather a strange thing to have in a language, as most don't have much in the way of "curse words" and rarely "taboo words" that are deemed to never, ever be spoken whatsoever...it's a strange juxtaposition indeed, in fact, for English to have such "relics" of cultural taboo in it when English and English-speaking countries tend to actually pride themselves on being all "modern" and "liberal" and so forth...you know, that English is one of the richest languages when it comes to "technical terms" that people often use English just for the "convenience" of having the widest, most known vocabulary, even when in a country that has another native language and they are discussing things amongst themselves that it goes nowhere and doesn't need to be in English for any "translation" purposes at all...I was, in fact, somewhat "disappointed" to see, when I was in Germany, that it's very usual to say "computer" exactly like English, even though there is a perfectly good German equivalent in "rechner"...well, you know, I wanted to learn all "new" and "exciting" words and "culture" and everything but, oh, they just want to use the most handy words...and, from an English-speaking perspective (as English has never been one to turn down a "borrowed word" from another language...the language itself is almost basically one long string of "borrowing" from other languages ;), there's "nothing wrong with this" – though those special "societies" in France and in other places about "keep English out of our language!" would disagree (which is actually a quite reasonable thing because English can kind of "bulldozer" itself into other languages and push out the local words and culture...that if you want to hold onto that stuff and "tradition" and what-not then English would actually become a bit of an unintentional "enemy") – but here we wander into "cultural differences" again...the attitude of the English language is that it doesn't really consider itself "precious" in any way...so, fine, let some German or Japanese words muscle their way into English...English (personified) just doesn't care! The more, the merrier! A reasonable enough attitude...but then so is "we have our own language and culture and we don't want English coming in and wiping it all out!"...I mean, that's also a reasonable enough thing...you like your own language and want to hold onto it and keep it...that's fine...and, really, English isn't trying to muscle in and wipe out other languages...it's not intending to "invade" or "conquer"...it's all just a consequence of America, Britain and Australia (plus others) all speaking it, making it kind of "what the West mostly speaks"...and English "invades" unintentionally because of other coincidental things...that is, America makes all the big Hollywood movies and tons and tons of TV shows (well, big country, lots of TV channels...needs an awful lot of TV shows to fill in all those "gaps" in the schedules ;)...and it's those that "invade" simply because they tend to have all the big budgets and all the best film-makers and stuff...because, for example, if I wanted to become a "big film director" or something then, to "make it big", I immediately get on a flight to L.A. (and join all the

others being waitresses in cafes or pumping gas at the gas station while they "wait to be discovered!"...odds are, of course, firmly against you...the place is crawling with "people who have dreams"...the old "more applicants than vacancies" and, dare we say, often a touch of "more dreams than talent" amongst those "applicants"...but, regardless, if you want to be doing the BIG films with the BIG budgets and all the BEST special effects, then NOWHERE throws their money around at this kind of thing than Hollywood, L.A....hence, note, it isn't necessarily any "only Americans know how to make films" or anything...it's just that, wherever you come from, that is the "Mecca" towards where people go...after all, Nicole Kidman is an Aussie Sheila...Sir Ian McKellen (Gandalf, Magneto ;) – as the "sir" gives away – is a "limey Brit"...John Candy is Canadian...blah–blah–blah...therefore, it's just a consequence that people who want to make films and act go to Hollywood because that's the world's "capital city of film" and because all the "big talent" goes to this one place, which happens to be in America which is English–speaking, then all the films made there are almost always English–speaking films...they also tend to be the biggest and most popular films for the entire world (because all the money and talent "gravitates" to Hollywood ;)...so, unintentionally, English – by way of films – goes and floods other countries...

And something similar happens with computers because America (and Britain when it comes to some of the "pioneers" of the "theory"...Turing, Babbage, etc. ;) goes and builds most of those...the big companies that make OSes and programming languages first were English–speaking...again, those who get their "first" and do it "biggest" unintentionally carry along their language with what they do...telephones and TV were also invented by English–speaking Scotsmen...you get the picture...they come up with something new and they need "terms" for things so these all turn up in English first...once you've got a term to use – though you can, of course, completely come up with one of your own that's "native" – it's just too tempting if you happen to know English, anyway, to stick with speaking English and the original terms...again, unintentionally, it has "invaded" another country...

Mind you, it would be remiss not to mention that, though often "unintentional", that English–speaking people aren't a touch "happy" about this...that is, simply, we don't want to be "left out of the conversation" just as much as the next person, so we may not intend the "cultural invasion" BUT it would be lying to say that – seeing as it has happened – this doesn't suit English–speaking Westerners just fine...note: very important...it's NOT meant in a "nasty" way, I stress...just a case of, like I say, NO–ONE enjoys being the one "left out of the conversation", whatever the language, that when people speak your language, it's a very useful thing indeed...one of those things that "works both ways" too...after all, it also means that technologies and ideas can be given as well as received...

Indeed, it is an incredibly delicate balance...it's arguable that many problems facing the West have been helped along – if not caused directly – by the very, very understandable feeling that no-one wants to be "invaded" nor "occupied" (Iraqis demonstrate this physically but the same is true metaphorically too when it comes to some kinds of "cultural invasion")...and related problems like "yes, we want your technological ideas but we don't want your Judeo-Christian morals and beliefs thrust upon us!"...but, well, see it from a Westerner's perspective...we aren't necessarily doing that intentionally...you know, like I talk about a belief in Liberty, it's because that happens to be my beliefs and, to a degree, that IS me...so, I can't really "switch it off" or easily "detach" it from the things I say...I mean, it's not that I intend to ram it down anyone's throats...because doing that would, of course, be hypocritical...how can you talk about "Liberty" and then offer someone else no choice to be free to believe what they want to believe? That would be oppression...yes, even though what you're "oppressing" them with is the idea of, ummm, not oppressing people...

Indeed, one great problem with the West is this kind of hypocrisy showing up all the time...often unintentionally, just because someone was not really thinking straight at all, getting themselves all confused in what they think they are doing...you know: "freedom is great! I Love freedom! I so wish other people could enjoy freedom too! I know, I can go and help them get freedom! Oh dear, they say they are happy as they are...but that's not freedom...they should have freedom, like me, because it's so great! If only they could taste freedom then they would want it too, I'm sure of it! So, I know, I'll force them to be 'free' so they can see how great it is, like I do! Oh dear, they are resisting my attempts to make them 'free'...well, I'll just have to force it harder...still don't want it? Right, then, you ungrateful people, I'll make sure you have 'freedom', whether you bloody well like it or not! Take that! And take this! Ha-ha! See? You don't stand a chance against my 'overwhelming military force'! Bastards! They're firing back and have killed my soldiers trying to make them 'free'! Right, that's it...no more Mr.Nice Guy...send in the tanks! Send in the gunships! Blow up their cities!"...then, ummm, the soldier stands on a wasteland of dead people and fallen buildings that once was a city..."so, what was our mission again, sir?" / "To make these people 'free', soldier" / "Yes, sir...looks like we did a pretty good job there, didn't we?" / "Are you being sarcastic there, maggot?" / "No, sir" / "Well, soldier of freedom, just remember that you have no freedom...when I tell you to make people 'free' then you will make them 'free' without question and without answering back...do you hear me, maggot?" / "Yes, sir" / "We are here to stop oppression and give freedom...DO YOU HEAR ME, MAGOTT?" / "Yes, sir" / "Speak up, soldier! I can't hear you! What are we here to do?" / "Stop oppression, sir" / "Yes, that's what I told you so that's what you're going to do without question...I am your superior officer and that means you don't think, you don't eat, sleep, shit, piss or even breathe unless a higher ranking officer tells you that you can do it...so when I say

'stop oppression' and 'give people freedom', you are going to _do exactly as I say_...your own feelings in the matter are immaterial...isn't that right, maggot?" / "Yes, sir!"...

The essential problem is that the West is implicitly schizophrenic...it's not intended to be ironic or hypocritical, you see...it's just that our beliefs aren't always ensured to be fully consistent with our actions..."going in harder" actually makes the hypocrisy _increase_, not diminish...Western integrity vanishes even further...people are less likely to listen to the West as the integrity disintegrates...relations get worse, the job of trying to _help_ gets harder to do...when Western politicians are found outrightly lying then, oh dear, the "we come in peace" is completely shattered...you're a known liar...how the hell can we believe a single word you say anymore? Oh dear, relations have almost completely vanished...what shall we do? "Go in even harder again"? Well, back around the cycle we go once more until the integrity has not only vanished, things are starting to _go negative_...the "liar" says "we come in peace" and, yup, people take this to mean the complete opposite: "Resist! Resist! The liar said 'peace'...but he always lies and attacks us harder and harder every time he says 'peace', so this must mean 'all-out war'...resist the liar's war at all costs!"...and again and again we go around and around the big cycle, making things worse and worse and worse...

Hence, we've _got to start being consistent_...if we say "rule of law" then NO exceptions shall exist in Guantanamo to the rule of law...if we say "democracy" then, under democracy, you _reason_ with people to gain their support, not "capture or kill" anyone who disagrees (imagine it applied back home...John Kerry says "I don't think this war was a particularly smart move"...traitor! Said something against the President's decisions! He must be killed in a "targetted killing" immediately "for the sake of democracy"...Hopefully, Western hypocrisy has not degenerated enough not to be able to spot that _killing_ political opposition is one of the first indicators that you've got yourself a "mad dictator" in charge...literally killing off those who are "political opposition" is what all the best evil dictators do so that their "diktats" have no opposition and are _forcefully imposed_ on people, whether they like it or not)...

Mr.Bush, in fact, clearly DOES NOT "believe in freedom"...because if you _believe_ in the "rule of law" then you will not be afraid to use it in Guantanamo, as you _believe_ it is the right way and it will not fail you...if you _believe_ in democracy, then you _believe_ that issues are settled by _reasoning_ and _gaining the support_ of the majority...if you do anything different then you can say what you like, you're a NON-BELIEVER..."belief" does not mean "I like to say the words a lot but then do something completely different in practice", belief means that you solidly _trust_ that way of doing things..."political opposition"? Then you _fight them at the ballot box_...you _reason_ with Iraqis...you _show_ them that your way is the

best way...you lead by good example...if you "believe in freedom" and that Iraqis want freedom and will work for their freedom, then – it might, indeed, prove to be very difficult at times – but your belief is that this system WORKS...if we're seeing this system being "by-passed" then, clearly, these are NOT people who "believe in freedom" at all...it is yet another "nice sounding" LIE...

I believe in freedom...that when someone is offered "freedom" or "oppression", then they will choose freedom...and things will, surely, never be 100% "plain sailing" ...there will be times when that freedom gets into trouble...there will be times when you doubt...but if you BELIEVE then you have FAITH that, no matter what, freedom WILL succeed because, in the end, ONLY freedom works and succeeds...Mr.Bush regularly "panics" that freedom won't work or isn't enough and "by-passes" it...sidelines it...uses other means...he's one of the biggest NON-BELIEVERS in "freedom" I've ever seen, in fact...indeed, if you look real closely when Bush says "I believe in freedom", his lie almost jumps out of the page at you...

Study Barnum, understand Orwell...get a bit of "poetry" under your belt...then take another look at what they say to you...it's all "pre-designed" to make you think in a particular way...the one nice thing about this is that they leave the proof in plain sight...what the alliterative "friendly fire" actually means is "incompetent killing of an ally"...what "colateral damage" actually means is "murdering innocent people" and, note carefully, it is often used in the context of "we accept that there will be colateral damage in making this strike"...that is, "we are deliberately choosing to murder innocent people"...

What's real interesting is that they are too cowardly to call things by their real name? Why are the words "killing", "murder", "death" absent from the terminology? Simple, psychological candy so they don't feel too bad in doing it and that other people don't completely realise what it is they've really done...note that what is even more worrying is that, yes, we're actually NOT talking about "conspiracy" in that sense...what is highly, highly dangerous is that the military commander IS saying "colateral damage" with total innocence...a really, really dangerous element here is that the people doing these things are often NOT "evil" ...they themselves have been "duped" by these "friendly sounding" euphamisms...and this is incredibly dangerous when a military commander is ordering a strike but because "colateral damage" lets him throw off the true nature of what he's doing – when he can refer to it all as "acceptable losses" – what it truly means is not only lost to everyone else, it is lost to him too...indeed, it's like handing a machine gun to someone and then saying "this is a projectile emitter" / "Can it kill anyone?" / "Well, it generates statistics...its damage is colateral" / "Ummm, what are you talking about? Is it safe to point it at people and squeeze the trigger?" / "That action would 'generate a statistic'" / "Oh, so it just generates statistics...kind of like some measuring device, eh? I

point it at someone and press the trigger and then it gives me a statistic...is that right?" / "In a manner of speaking" / "Cool...I wonder how tall that man over there is...right, point the gun...and press the trigger" *hail of bullets cuts man in half* "Crap! CRAP! CRAP! What the f**k happened there? Shit, shit, shit!" / "You've generated your first colateral statistic...well done"...

What's perhaps _even more worrying_ than the use of these kinds of terms to "dupe" us all is the prospect of those _MAKING DECISIONS_ being just as clueless about what "generating a statistic" actually means themselves..."Sir, the missile is in place...it should be able to 'silently' 'generate colateral statistics' for the entire city...shall we launch?"...

Now, refer back to the examples of "swear words" ...when we say "sexual intercourse" then it's just fine to say and do...when we say "f**k" then it's a terrible "taboo"..._ALL_ words carry semantics and effect how we see and interpret them...

So, let's look at the same question with the "euphamisms" removed and wonder if the simple change of words could make someone seriously think twice about their answer: "Sir, the nuclear bomb is ready to be flown over to the city and dropped...it _will_ mercilessly slaughter every innocent person in the entire city...shall we drop it on their heads?"...

Not so easy a question to answer anymore, is it? And for questions like these with people's lives hanging in the balance, then they _SHOULD_ be the most difficult questions possible...the questions that requires a lot of deep thought...we want to be _SURE_ that our decision maker is making the decision _CORRECTLY_...is fully aware in all capacities about what they are doing? After all, it's NOT just the lives of those they will kill...such "strikes" are almost certainly going to generate "reprisals"...if they have a nuclear arsenal too, then your answer could mean the extinction of all life on Earth should an "all-out exchange" be triggered by this action (also remembering that many countries take "opportunity" from others starting conflict, even if not directly involved...you know, "no-one'll notice this small missile strike on my enemy, while there's World War Three going on over there"...Saddam fired a missile over at Israel when attacked in the first Gulf War...a case of "oh, well...if I'm going to be attacked anyway, what's to stop me getting one last strike in at those enemies I've always wanted to attack?"...when you corner a wolf, the wolf very inevitably will strike back _regardless of what it is facing_...after all, it now has nothing to lose...if it did nothing, it would be dead...if it does something, then it might get killed but it would get killed, anyway, so what's to be lost from trying? It may be a very slim chance but maybe the wolf might "catch them by surprise" enough to take an opportunity to escape...probably not...actually, no, it just won't happen, the wolf is bugged...but, again, you've _nothing_ to lose_ from at least trying...really weird things sometimes

happen...so, "sensing his end" – which it should have been and then none of this current nonsense and tragedy would be happening – he no longer has the "restriction" he once had...you know, Saddam thinks "I always wanted to throw a missile at Israel but knowing that America and others would attack to defend them, there was a 'deterrent' from considering doing it...America and others are attacking, anyway...no more reason not to do it...here, Israel, have one of my missiles!"...yet another reason to consider really, really carefully before "going in hard" to "pound into submission"...a bear is "dangerous" but, leave it alone, don't spook it and it'll Hopefully just walk away...but walk up to a bear and pester it and try punching it a few times and, simply, _you're dead_...it'll rip you limb from limb...it's no longer "dangerous", it's now "deadly"...actually, a human versus a pissed off bear? Might as well go "whole hog", it's beyond not only "dangerous" and "deadly", your chances are so slim in unarmed combat with a bear, might as well jump to the conclusion and just call it _fatal_...things are so stacked against you, it really would be a "foregone conclusion"...you'd only live if the bear was feeling particularly "merciful" that day...note "merciful" means something like having your innards hanging out that you need _immediate_ medical attention and then probably still wouldn't make it but there's a slim chance...but, hey, the bear walked away before you were fully dead...a weird kind of "merciful" but it would be your only chance in a situation like that)...

Hence, indeed, there's a very interesting set of lessons in looking at something like "Eliza"...as the wise men say: "Many a true word spoken in jest"...the program _is_, even if not openly admitted, a "social comment" on the "usefulness of psychoanalysis"...just taking the mickey out of them royally for a funny joke...

But, indeed, Weizenbaum was stunned at the reaction..."Eliza" was demonstrating things well beyond a simple joke or a demonstration of how you can "fake" intelligence quite convincingly, even with a completely unintelligent program...that is, not by "good AI programming" but, instead, by exploiting "stupid human thinking"...people were having "sessions" with it for hours! Did they work out that it wasn't actually intelligent in any way and wasn't really listening but just didn't care because it was "kinda fun"...or did we actually have one or two students really _believing_ it was some fantastic new "computer brain"? I can imagine – knowing what people, especially students, are like – that a bunch of computer science students, who knew all about it being a simple program, would convince some other students about "Try this new AI! It's amazing! It can totally understand you and you can talk with it!" and then sit back and giggle to themselves as the other student has a go and is actually "falling" for the "scam"...you know, "let's see how long it takes for her to realise that it's not really intelligent at all?"...typical student prank (actually, a rather "lame" one because students would tend to do something a lot more cruel than this...but they'd still have a laugh doing it that I reckon one or two of those

alt.lang.asm: Re: Software Protection system...Any tester there ?

accesses was all about "let's see how long it takes for them to work
out the joke" ;)...

Beth :)