

Re: Java 7 features

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-08/msg00377.html>

- *From:* nebulous99@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sat, 04 Aug 2007 06:53:07 -0000
-

On Aug 4, 2:24 am, Joe Attardi <jatta...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 4, 1:38 am, nebulou...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:> I'm not talking about people disagreeing with my views. I'm talking

about people calling me a name or otherwise impugning me, personally, the author of those views, rather than merely taking issue with the views themselves.

There's nothing that can stop people from doing that. [insult deleted]

Apparently, but I have every right to object when people behave in such a clearly objectionable manner towards me.

[insult deleted] Nobody is throwing down a gauntlet and challenging you; you are taking a post on the Internet as much, much more than it is.

Oh, so now I'm just imagining it, and his post was really all sweetness and light and did not at a single point suggest that I had done anything wrong or incorrect, or that I had anything wrong with me? Yeah, right. I believe you. Not.

I trust the evidence of my own eyes far more than I trust weasel words that come from a keyboard registered in the name of Joe Attardi. :P

You'll be better off when you just start ignoring it.

Except that then, the insulting things will stand unchallenged as part of the record. Someday someone will find that someone called me an idiot and I meekly accepted their judgment of me. And decide that either I'm an idiot as evidenced by my appearing to agree that I'm an idiot, an idiot for not having spoken up in my own defense, or a

Re: Java 7 features

floor mat. I'd rather not have that future person think of me as either an idiot or a floor mat, and I certainly don't want to give anyone here the power to make sure that happens by simply calling me an idiot; but my ignoring such a thing would give them precisely that power.

Which conveniently excuses you from coming up with a response to any of it.

What response can there possibly be to a bunch of nonsense? More nonsense? I'm not going to stoop to your level; sorry.

Or you could ignore the post in question and

have it stand unchallenged as the Official Truth about Twisted, as evidenced by Twisted himself not having corrected it given ample opportunity?

Er, no thanks.

What "victory"!!?? Again you make more out of an Internet argument than it ever will be.

It's my attackers that have made it a matter of win, lose, or draw. As evidenced by their insistence on having the last word, among other things.

Except that I am using Google Groups like you. The difference is I don't whine and complain when it gives me trouble.

Floormat.

Then why, in the past, have you publicly accused me of being a know-nothing who can't get anything right?

Unless you can provide me with a citation where I made such a broad assumption, you are full of shit.

Not in so many words, but every single time you've questioned my intelligence, denigrated my competence, or otherwise publicly behaved as if you think I'm something you found under a rock, you've implied

Re: Java 7 features

something of the sort; particularly it is implied by the cumulative volume of such incidents, if not always by a single one of them. Ditto for other attackers whose posts have repeatedly questioned by honesty, intelligence, or competence; the repetition itself implies the beliefs about me that they seek to publicly promote.

Well I may not be able to stop them publicly promoting such beliefs, but I can keep sabotaging them with counterweights that keep them tipping the scales in one direction, and I can keep publicly calling attention to their own hostile, bad-faith behavior and evident sleazy motives! I can hope to make their attacks less effective and to make their own reputations become mud by their very actions if they keep it up. And I can at minimum not go down without a fight.

It's stuff that suggests I'm an idiot, e.g. "Only a fool believes that!", that riles me up. Stick to debating the actual topic, not the debaters themselves. This is `comp.lang.java.programmer`, not `alt.twisted.iq.speculation.d`; I am not up for debate -- Java is.

If you don't like what's being discussed here, you can leave or stop fueling the fire.

Me, leave? Excuse me. If I objected to the newsgroup's charter topic, Java programming, being discussed, then it would be perfectly reasonable to suggest I find a different newsgroup. But what I'm objecting to is stuff that is OFF-TOPIC HERE ANYWAY!

Also, how exactly am I "fueling the fire"? Let's see. We have posts like this, which are self-defense; I certainly have to rebut each of your attacks lest your nasty opinion of me have more "for" than "against" posts in the record long-term, swaying peoples' opinions the wrong way. At the same time, things like my innocuous post trying to provide helpful information in good faith that that Hawtin guy attacked apparently "fuel the fire", to judge by the nasty response it drew. Yet I don't see how it can at all be reasonable to hold me to fault for an obvious good-faith posting; rather, blame Hawtin for responding with, if not outright flamage, at least flame-bait! If you ask me, it was he that was "fueling the fire" in that particular instance. Tell him to leave!

The difference is I don't care. You are the one that hypes it up like it's the ultimate goal or else your life is over. Me, I don't give a crap either way

Then prove it -- by shutting up. I dare ya.

Re: Java 7 features

Show me such a documented case.

STFW.

Because it's Usenet. If you've been around for as long as you suggest, you'd realize this.

You're mixing the alt.* hierarchy up with the whole thing. comp.*, rec.* etc. are supposed to be held to a higher standard of civility and on-topicness.

[insults deleted]

I will when you do.

You first.

[a bunch more insults deleted]

[nothing left]

.