

Re: turn off for learning assembler

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2004-07/0452.html>

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

Date: 07/11/04

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 2004 12:45:12 GMT

Dunny wrote:

> *Beth typed:*

> > *The problem is not that Mother Nature couldn't*

> > *"self-correct"...of course this happens or the planet would have*

> > *been bugged long since...the problem is that if we're*

> > *attacking on two fronts like this (multiple fronts, we're*

> > *unfortunately "tipping the balance" in all directions in all*

> > *manner of ways simultaneously), then She has the "Hitler*

> > *problem"...she can't fight on two different fronts at the same*

> > *time...and if she loses the battle, then so do we implicitly*

> > *because we're living on her planet...*

>

> *I think that the idea that the human race can "destroy/wipe out the planet" is*

> *pretty boastful. At best, we're capable of wiping out ourselves and a large*

> *chunk of life with us – but certainly not capable of destroying the planet.*

> *Given a few million years, things would be pretty much back to how they were*

> *before we stumbled along, and Mother Nature would hardly have registered a blip.*

Oh, indeed; I didn't mention it in this post but I think I did in the one in response to Annie that the "world" in "save the world" or "planet" in "save the planet" isn't literal...as I said there to try to sum it up, we're NOT talking about "the end of the world" but, rather, "the end of the world _AS WE KNOW IT_" ...

It's a similar use of "world" as something like a store called: "World of Sport" or "World of Carpets"...it's a metaphorical sense of "world" rather than a literal one...calling the store "World of Sport" is not meant to seriously imply that it's a true planet orbiting the Sun of its own devoted to sports...I mean, if that were true, then we wouldn't actually be able to

get to it to buy any sporting goods, lacking the convenience of having a spaceship parked in the back yard ;)...

Although, speaking of other worlds, there is our neighbours to consider...they actually make very interesting "case studies" ...

Both orbit within a "zone" – give or take – where temperatures for any satellites would be in a reasonable range for supporting life (well, our kind of DNA-based life...other types might be possible...we don't know, we've never met any other kind, but the stuff on Earth, as yet...at least, to a certain degree, anyway...the nature of the elements don't changes so there's not total "free reign" ...for instance, carbon is common because of the type of "bonds" it makes with other elements...a kind of "atomic glue", so to speak...silicon is similar – same "group" property-wise – but is somewhat weaker...perhaps "life" can also work with something "like DNA" but that isn't DNA...there may be "variations" available on the basic design...so, indeed, whenever scientists talk about "life supporting", there is a pinch of salt applied from the perspective that we don't fully know the extents of all possible forms of "life" that may be based on something slightly different to that we already know...and, even on this planet, there are examples of creatures that actually freeze solid (a lizard-y thing; Its cells are special that the freezing doesn't puncture them and it goes into a "hibernation" mode whilst frozen until it "wakes up" afterwards when the temperatures rise) or live inside volcanoes...there's also a small "ecosystem" of creatures that live at the bottom of the sea around hot volcanic vents in the ocean floor that are actually "cut off" from the rest of life on Earth, in the sense that their little "ecosystem" is based on these volcanic vents and, unlike every other creature on the planet, is not connected to the Sun's energy in any way...so, even on Earth, there are examples of "life" that really push the boundaries of the "possible" ...on the other hand, the "freezing lizard" can evolve to be that way eventually but the "origins of life" couldn't really happen inside a static solid...that is, "life" would still likely need to start in ordinary water or similar liquid (liquids are good from the perspective of random chemicals in it floating around and banging together and "mixing" to create new compounds and that kind of thing...solids are no good because things wouldn't "collide" and create these "random" new compounds (until, so the theory goes, the one in a trillion event happens that the compounds that collide form "amino acids" or the beginnings of "DNA" or something like that...with a totally "evolutionary" origin to life, the first single-celled thing that sparked it all off is just 100% "pure chance")...anyway, the point being that, yes, this "zone that supports life" thing is a concept with "fuzzy" edges...not a precise science...this is implied in discussing such things but best I state it explicitly ;)...

Anyway, both Venus and Mars orbit either side of us and are, roughly speaking, within a "zone" of "hospitable conditions for life"...that is, head towards Mercury, temperatures are far too high...head out past Mars and, well, it gets too cold...not to mention they all become "gas giants" for a while, which isn't particularly useful...oh, the "too hot" and "too cold" distinctions might seem a touch "how do you know?" but the basic idea makes sense when you realise some of the figures...basically, daytime temperatures on Mercury are typically 400 celsius (800 Farenheit)...hence, four times water's boiling point...and "too cold" that you drop below freezing point...

Also, in this regard, you also NEED an atmosphere and a touch of "Greenhouse Effect" here implicitly as well...for example, though Mercury is 400 C in the Sun, it's -180 C on its dark side...such wild temperature variations aren't something "life" is typically happy about...an atmosphere with a touch of "Greenhouse Effect" stabilises this a touch...you know, the heat from the Sun gets "trapped" inside the atmosphere and so the "dark side" doesn't drop so far in temperature when the Sun ain't pointing at it...as noted, "Greenhouse Effect" in itself is actually NEEDED...the problem is too little or too much of it...that the "balance" which keeps temperatures "just right" tips one way or the other too far...it's a "balance" problem rather than a "absence / presence" ("all or nothing") problem...we don't want to completely get rid of the "Greenhouse Effect" or we'd arugably be MORE bugged by that than the "minor" imbalance that's normally talked about (although, that's "minor" in universal terms...it's MAJOR in "life supporting" terms for the whole globe to rise or fall even by a few degrees from its "norm"...it triggers all manner of things just to even be a little bit "out"...for example, zero celsius is freezing point...raise the temperature by a degree or two from that and ice starts melting into water...all the sudden "extra water" can start triggering other things...rising seas...more "Greenhouse Effect" ...and so forth ;)...

Anyway, the point is our neighbours are actually very interesting to look at from this perspective...basically, with particular "special conditions" (which don't actually exist, unfortunately), both could theoretically have "life"...they probably don't and the reasons are actually very much educational from the perspective of our own environment...

Venus is an unholy mess, however "goddess of beauty" she seems from afar (appears her beauty really is only "skin deep" in this instance ;)...we have MAJOR "Greenhouse Effect" in operation with an atmosphere that's 97% carbon dioxide (the remaining 3% being mostly nitrogen but having traces of water vapour, sulphur and a only the merest touch of oxygen ;)...the effect can be

understood from it being 482 Celsius (900 Fahrenheit) on the surface...yes, hotter than Mercury's typical surface temperatures despite being further out that it's not being "baked" by the Sun's heat to the same degree, all down to this "Greenhouse Effect" (and because it's "Greenhouse Effect" then daytime and nighttime temperatures don't differ as sharply...it's basically permanently this hot all the time ;)...the atmosphere is also a big problem from the perspective of its pressure: a crushing 90 times more than Earth (1330 pounds per square inch)...there is a permanent incredibly violent thunderstorm raging on Venus everywhere...another consequence of that atmosphere...Venus was the Roman goddess of beauty...but, well, that beauty appears superficial only...get "under her skin" inside the atmosphere and on the surface and, well, I suppose the phrase has to be "hell hath no fury", as conditions there would, indeed, make even the boldest visions of hell in literature seem positively lame in comparison...

That's too much "Greenhouse Effect" for you...

Mars, on the other hand, has compelling evidence that it might, indeed, have once had running water and conditions suitable for life to perhaps have formed...if so, something went wrong with its atmosphere, which is quite thin...the NASA probes and such are rummaging around in the Hopes to perhaps find traces of ex-life from this earlier period or perhaps some microbes or something hiding somewhere...the atmosphere is also mostly carbon dioxide (a nice prospect "terraforming"-wise in that if you can get plant life to survive there – and with water looking possible and sunlight a certainty – the plants could perhaps convert the carbon dioxide to oxygen, like they do on Earth...that is, slowly build a "rainforest" – as opposed to chopping them down as we do here – that can start off a similar "balance" / "cycle" like Earth...a long ways off from happening and no doubt easier said than done but it's a nice idea that perhaps Mars could be "converted" to be reasonably Earth-like to act as a "second home" for humans in a distant future...although, not to spoil the "Star Trek" fantasies, the conditions will be different...any evolution will be separate...one thing that many fail to consider about ideas like this is that Martians and Terrans ("Earthlings" ;) would / could diverge culturally, linguistically (if there's more communication amongst themselves than regular "chats" back and forth between the planets ;) and, eventually, genetically...one has to consider the prospect of, well, humans going to Mars becoming "Martians"...that is, evolving off in their own "Martian" kind of way...the different gravity alone would probably actually be fairly QUICK in successive "Martian" generations tending to be taller...plants and animals introduced from Earth would also be effected pretty quickly by different gravity...as, on Earth, we easily forget that

"evolution" does a lot to do with "environment"...Earth's environment hasn't altered too radically that it doesn't force any sudden, radical changes...suddenly dumping things from Earth onto Mars, though, will immediately cause effects and the beginnings of such "life" _diverging_ from its Terran counterpart...for example, different gravity – which "terraforming" couldn't really do anything about – meaning things more easily grow taller...bones and other supporting structures don't need to be so strong (astronauts in space have this worry that, with no gravity to constantly fight, bones and muscles get weaker...counteracting these effects will be important when sending people the long distance to Mars, one day (you can tell Bush knows he's screwed up...promising to put people on the Moon or on Mars is a cheap "feel good factor" vote-winner...regardless of his political motivations to suddenly announce this after NASA has been side-lined more and more over the years, though, shouldn't impact on the idea of such a mission itself...indeed, Bush knows he's screwed up, which is why the promises of "good stuff" start appearing...you're supposed to now think he's a "visionary"...except, of course, it ain't his "vision" at all...the idea of such missions have been on the cards and pre-planned in "wishful thinking mode" by NASA for ages but always told "no" because of budgets and funding ;)...by how much the different conditions effect things and the speed at which it might happen is, of course, all complete speculation...it's never happened and is still a long ways off...the idea is more "sci-fi" than anything else...

Anyway, actually looking at our neighbouring "worlds" shows us something I think is very important...Venus has serious "Greenhouse Effect" and it's a vision of hell because of it...Mars appears to have possibly "aborted" half-way through possibly going on to support life (it might even have done so for a very short time)...that it was headed down a path not too dissimilar to Earth but conditions were just too much one way or the other and it failed to actually materialise...

As much as these planets are different to Earth, they are also very much the same...if you like, they obey the same laws of physics and their positions – certainly with Mars – place them near or within the rough "zone" where life is potentially possible...if Earth had Venus' atmospheric conditions and such, then Earth would also be the vision of hell that Venus is...if Earth had also taken that "wrong path", then it could very well have ended up to a Martian-like fate...

Looking at these and then hearing the phrase "Nature has an infinite capacity for self-correction"...then, sorry, the reply has to be to say Jackson Pollocks to that idea...total Sandra Bullocks...the capacity is clearly very much _FINITE_...these

two neighbours _could_ have headed down paths not to different to Earth...yes, actually different...yes, perhaps no "life" on them...but they _ARE_, in a sense, obeying the same "laws"...

It can go wrong...because, arguably, with Venus and Mars, it _DID_ "go wrong"...more so with Mars, though...and that's kind of why the presence of water on Mars has such significance when they look for it there...it's not just that if it has water, this bodes well for manned missions to the red planet (but that is something to think about ;)...it's that, if it had water and it had a warmer atmosphere and so forth, then the idea of "life" there isn't completely perposterous...

Indeed, pointing at the hell on Venus begins to show how "global warming" doesn't just mean higher air-conditioning costs and a chance to wear that new bikini you bought...it throws conditions into permanent turmoil...and pointing at Mars, we can begin to say: "look, it _CAN_ go wrong" (if any "fossil" of life is found on Mars then it quite literally _DID_ go wrong...life was on its way but got snuffed out because conditions weren't "just right" with the atmosphere and such)...

Granted, it's more "illustrative" than any concrete case...but these two certainly should make Annie and anyone else completely reconsider that "infinite capacity to self-correct" notion...although, anyone with a mathematical / scientific mind probably also cringed at the word "infinite" being used so casually...oh, sorry..._if only_ it were true then we would have nothing to worry about...but "infinite" just doesn't happen..._EVERYTHING_ has its limitations...

NTFS "self-corrects"...but if I took a large axe and put it straight through my hard drive, then it would be miraculous to see it "self-correct" its way out of that one...and could, even in more "normal" conditions, NTFS "self-correct" when another process is deliberately ruining it at exactly the same time? As I say, there's no doubt about the "self-correction" but _IS_ it capable of handling being constantly attacked on multiple fronts? It's only had to cope with "natural variations" before humans came along...we _know_ it can handle "natural variations" because it's been doing so for billions of years...but, basically, are we damaging the system faster than it can "self-correct"...if we are, we may _EXCEED_ the unfortunately very _FINITE_ capacity of the "self-correcting" mechanism that we may _BREAK_ the "toy" beyond all means to fix it...

But, indeed, the planet won't blow up or anything because of this stuff...it's not "save the planet" in quite so literal a sense...it's "save _our_ world"...indeed, look over to Mars and there he is, floating around space just like us...he also has a form of "Nature" (would it be "Father Nature" on Mars, as it's

usual to feminise everything regarding Venus – all the geographical figures are named after women on Venus (except for a mountain, named after the pioneer of radar...this one slipped through, presumably, before it was fully agreed to make the planet "female only" ;) – and emasculate everything regarding Mars...in fact, the male and female signs are directly taken from Mars and Venus...originally, astrological but astronomy "borrows" much of the useful astrological symbols...well, they "re-invented" the "mumbo jumbo" into a true science but no need to completely "re-invent" the wheel that all the symbols and names that are still useful to have are maintained...for example, the stars in the "constellations" have absolutely no physical relationship but that they appear – from Earth – to be in the same part of the sky...nevertheless, they still have names like "Alpha Centauri" (first – that is, brightest – star of the constellation Centaurus ;), just because this is still a convenient thing for locating stars ;)...because Mars has its "summer winds" and other various things that make up its own particular "laws of Nature"...

So, yes, the literal, physical "world" – the actual planet Earth – would continue around...but our metaphorical "world" upon it – our to-ing and fro-ing – wouldn't...in a sense, when "save the planet" is said like this, it's kind of like saying "save Canada" and meaning "save the PEOPLE of Canda", not the literal landmass..."save the planet" as in: "save the occupants of the planet (not only humans but plants and animals and such ;)"...

It's a linguistical thing: When you say "America", you could mean the literal land itself ("(North) America is to the South of Canada" ;), the American people who live on that land ("We, America, want a peaceful world" / "America didn't actually vote for Bush and Cheney in the 2000 elections by the popular vote but they still succeeded, due to the electoral college system" ;) or even just the handful of people in governance or military who's actions "represent" America ("Haven't you heard? America's invaded Iraq!")...

English is that kind of language with the odd "built-in ambiguity" or two...there's also another often amusing one of the "multiple adjectives", which always legitimately have two potential meanings...for example, "the blind snail eater" could be "(blind snail) eater" (someone who eats blind snails) or "blind (snail eater)" (someone who eats snails and who is also blind)...whenever adjectives are "stacked" like this in English, there is actually no grammatical way to tell the difference...it's a "built-in ambiguity" to the language itself...and that's before things get "metaphorical" and "idiomatic" and what-not, where you say things you don't literally mean...this has to be taken into account: "Save the

planet" isn't trying to imply that the Earth will suddenly explode into a million pieces because of what humankind is doing...it's us..._we_ – and all its other plant and animal occupants – who are "the planet" in this particular context..."the planet" just shorthand for "(life on) the planet"...

Actually, this song quote captures it all quite poetically, I think:

"Her Love rains down on me
Easy as the breeze
I listen to Her breathing
It sounds like the waves on the sea

I was thinking all about Her,
Burning with rage and desire
We were spinning into darkness
The Earth was on fire

She could take it back
She might take it back...some day...

So I spy on Her, I lie to Her
I make promises I cannot keep
Then I hear Her laughter rising
Rising from the deep

And I make Her prove Her Love for me
I take all that I can take
And I push Her to the limit
To see if She will break

She might take it back
She could take it back...some day...

Now I have seen the warnings
SCREAMING from all sides
It's easy to ignore them
And God knows I've tried

All of this temptation
It turned my Faith to lies
Until I couldn't see the danger
Or hear the rising tide

She _CAN_ take it back
She _WILL_ take it back, some day...

She _CAN_ take it back
She _WILL_ take it back, some day...

She CAN take it back
She WILL take it back...

Some day..."

["Take It Back", Pink Floyd, "Division Bell"]

Lots of nice wordplay in this to note: The title "Take It Back" can be read in the imperative tone (as a command to take what we've done back) or as an abbreviation of "She will take it back" ...I've capitalised "The Earth was on fire" here (and a touch "metaphorical") but it could also be "The earth was on fire" (see my earlier capitalisation notes, if you don't quite get it :) and quite literal...

But, yes, the line: "Then I hear Her laughter rising" captures the part I think you wanted to capture...we can test Her all we like, She WILL always win...as She WILL take it back, some day...the question is do we "take it back" (imperative tone, as in "retract our actions") and hand it back to Her, to work with Her, sharing it...or do we continue to arrogantly think we could "tame" Her, in which case She'll "take it back" from us, like it or not...just snatch it all straight out of our hands, leaving us with nothing, as punishment for our greed and stupidity?

The first option really isn't at all "painful" or "problematic" when you consider the ramifications of sitting around for the second option to happen...the first option is simply to be sustainable and to maintain the balance...just that...to strive to work out a way to do what we do that's "in balance" ...note that you CAN have your "fast cars" and your "loud music" and your internet or whatever else you want, so to speak, as long as it's a sustainable way...it's backing the second horse – the "do nothing" horse – that ignores it and then ends up LOSING it all...because "sustainable" also means that you can keep on doing for as long as you like...because it's all "in balance" so you're now no longer doing any damage (or, at least, "sustainable" implies this "balance" ...so if you do knock down a tree then another one is put in its place, so to speak :)...

It's insane, really...because, in the end, what we're talking about is only "line of least resistance"...good options to begin already exist...everyone knows there's a problem with just doing nothing...but "do nothing" is easy...it's lazy...it's sit back on the sofa and let it be someone else's problem...

There was an experiment once where they put kids in a room with a plate of sweets in front of them...and then the instructions were simple: "I'll be back in five minutes...however many sweets

are still on your plate when I come back, I'll double"...so, say, there are 12 sweets on the plate...you can eat all twelve now but you get nothing when the researcher comes back five minutes later...or, just by waiting five minutes without touching the sweets, the researcher comes back and you get 24 sweets...eat 6 now, only get 6 (total 12) when the researcher comes back into the room...

Basically, if you can resist the sweets for five minutes, then you get loads more sweets to gobble up...then they left the room, so the kids could do whatever they liked...and the _majority_ immediately started eating the sweets...repeatedly, instinct – grab the sweets!! – won out over intellect to simply have five minutes' worth of discipline...

And the thing is that when people become adults, they might be able to work out a simple problem like that and resist the sweets (but how many – even as adults – would fail the test?)...but even adults effectively fail this test...because something similar is being presented and the head just dives into the sand...

Mind you, I suppose environmentalists are often half the problem...because it's all "doom and gloom" scenarios from the environmentalists...dwelling on the negative, failing to mention the positive things that could be done...which rather than "shocking" people into action to do something (as is intended), it ends up depressing everyone and we get the _opposite_ of what was intended: "Oh, all that doom and gloom...end of the world's nigh, eh? Ah, well...if it's so big and inevitable, there can't be much anyone can do about it...so, no sense in me trying to do anything"...but this isn't correct from the perspective that if _everybody_ made positive steps at the same time then those miracles can happen...a bit like how Kennedy just said "right, we're going to the Moon" and once everyone was focussed on that objective, it happened...

Note that the "doom and gloom" is more about the inaction than the situation...if people started taking up Solar panels where they can, then they create a "demand" in that market...with a good known "demand" for the things, then economies of scale will conspire to drop the prices (though, they have come down very sharply and really are sitting on the edge, even now...that in some special conditions, it's _already_ the cost effective solution)...also, the profits from selling all this stuff can be ploughed back into R&D to better improve their efficiencies...soon, something like solar then becomes _the_ option for many reasons, not only the environment...with prices down and efficiencies higher, it starts to become _THE_ option for a whole lot more reasons than only the environment, as it simply adds up as the _cheapest_ method for the majority

case...when it puts the power into your hands (they are your panels: once bought, whatever energy they produce is free of charge...the Sun isn't in it for the money and doesn't send any quarterly bills ;)...this also puts the power and control in the hands of individuals, not large companies (this is why I also talk little about wind farms while all the big companies talk a lot about it...they AREN'T that good, you know...oh, true enough, it's renewable so I won't knock the actual technology...but the REAL reason behind why they'll push wind farms but say nothing about the others has more to do with the fact that wind farms are BIG things...they are out of your hands...only big companies can build such monsters...and then they can CHARGE you for the privilege of using its energy...the push towards this when they do consider renewables has a lot to do with staying in business as a big company that charges people over and over for what is now a necessity, not a luxury...oh, I don't blame them, in the sense that if I was in their business looking for methods to still make lots of money, this would be what I'd probably decide to do in the interests of profits too)...

If there was even simple "baby steps" from everyone in this direction and they kept going in this direction, then that might be all that's needed...it's really a case of changing attitudes and habits, then the "doom and gloom" really can evaporate away rather quickly...there's no need to "save the world" overnight...just buy one solar panel...just as a "toy"...hook it up to take the burden off something...just as an "experiment"...see what you can do with it...a number of people do this and you get a "trickle"...the trickle becomes a stream...the stream becomes a river...the river becomes an ocean...with a "market", real "economies of scale" can kick in driving the prices down, the qualities up and feeding a steady stream of profit into the R&D department who can get bigger and have more resources at their disposal...and so on and so forth...then with tons of these things everywhere, the "burden" is drastically eased...we buy more time for something lasting at the very least...that is, presuming that this doesn't go on to do a mighty spectacular job of things (as the potential is certainly there...there is many times more energy "hanging in the air", so to speak, than we currently use...but it sits there mostly untapped...with panels on roofs and walls everywhere – they can be made to look much like ordinary roofing tiles now, the shiny "CD" look isn't the only option – and a good efficiency from the panels, it's actually remarkable how good they already could be...we had the figures here before – someone else calculated them so it wasn't biased from me – that even in hardly-known-for-its-sunshine Britain with panels on every roof, the magic efficiency figure seemed to be around 20%...and, remember, Britain usually has crap weather and this percentage reflects completely covering all the domestic use...it's the

"problem solved" figure...the "tall order" there...even if the efficiency isn't high enough, not everyone has the panels and so on, then let's say it only manages to cover half...this still, loosely speaking, slows things down that where an estimate says "30 years" now, it becomes "60 years" or whatever, as the "demand" gets cut in half...it buys more time to do an even better job...as we've not factored in here that there's nothing "mutually exclusive" about running this alongside hydro power (already contributing a large amount) or those wind farms...or, even, yes, alongside fossil fuels...we add this on in addition to "phase out" the fossil fuels...we want them to go eventually but it doesn't have to happen overnight necessarily...or, at least, it's better to "phase" it from one to the other and at least move in the right direction rather than just sit around doing nothing...or, more accurately, it's not realistic to see everyone change overnight...so, better reduced use that's only reducing more and more all the time than some "all or nothing" approach that fossil fuels just keep getting eaten through like there's no tomorrow (pardon the pun ;), while everyone's waiting for the "someone else" to drop a miracle in our laps...

And all this "I don't mind if we're all wiped out" stuff...well, that be as it may...but the little point that's being missed is that we NEEDN'T actually be wiped out at all...the fossil fuels running out is the "inevitable" bit, not being wiped out (in fact, humans managed already one Ice Age way back...again, it's NOT "end of the world" but "end of the world as we know it" ;)...if, indeed, we're no longer dependent on them but are using "sustainable" means instead that aren't causing problems (at least, not on the massive, massive scales we are now) then they give Nature some time to weave that "self-correcting" spell...forests re-grow, if they are only given a chance to do so...those forests convert the CO2 into oxygen, if given some time to do so...many materials just thrown away can actually be reclaimed and re-used...as we do more of that, we get better at it that we can re-use a lot more...just the change in attitude and direction gives a chance for the "self-correcting" to kick in and, indeed, things head towards re-balancing rather than away from it...

It's like someone standing in the middle of the road saying "oh, well...if I'm killed then I can accept that"...but, like, hello!?! Just get out of the road, as there's no actual reason for you to be standing there and there's no particular reason why you need to be killed...however "prepared to meet thy Maker" you may or may not be...indeed, when thou meets thy Maker, He's going to ask: "Ummm, why exactly were you committing suicide in the middle of the road when there was no reason at all to do so?"...coming up with an answer that doesn't sound completely dumb would be a sight to see...let's leave the pointless martyrdom that achieves absolutely nothing useful at all to

alt.lang.asm: Re: turn off for learning assembler

Osama and Arafat, shall we? As "woe needn't be me" in this particular case and such self-absorbed moaning isn't all that attractive...

Beth ;)