

Assunto: Re: Vandalism and Wikipedia - Julio Siqueira is Back...

De: Julio Siqueira <julioobsiqueira@terra.com.br>

Data: Mon, 07 Jan 2008 00:36:11 -0200

Para: Atoms and the Void <AVOID-L@HAWAII.EDU>

To all,

I took a long time reflecting upon these many lines below. I will try to be as brief as I can, and I will express below my present understanding of how I should proceed regarding this whole issue, including how I should proceed in regards to Wikipedia.

First I will comment on some extracts from Jefferys' recent posts. My comments will be preceded by ###

I was simply unaware of what the thread was about, what Siqueira was claiming Dawkins had said, etc; thus there's no way that I could be "endorsing" anything by this comment.

Jefferys, as I said in my pdf to the wikipedia administrators:

- 1- You joined that debate on your own free will.
- 2- You called me, then, a loon and what I say as lunacy (inducing people to despise whatever I say in general, and to despise what I was saying at that very topic specifically - i.e. my fight against racism at that moment).
- 3- You strongly advised people to block me and whatever I bring, immensely increasing the negative effects of number 2 above.
- 4- **Worst of All**: You were replying to Crowell then, and that means that you had before your very eyes the message where Crowell was replying to Bob plus the **full content** of Bob's message, and in it **all that was necessary** for you to realize that the issue at stake was a very very serious one indeed. Instead of doing what was to be done, and instead of doing what is expected from you, you decided to join Crowell's in his juvenile mocking of the situation.

Now, I have searched the archives for any article where I had used the word 'bullshitter'. There are none (and anyone is welcome to perform the same search that I did, using my author's address as bill@astro.as.utexas.edu and the string 'bullshitter'). So, evidently I did not ever claim that Radin was a bullshitter. Anyone who wants to find out what I actually said about Radin's work can search for the string 'Radin' in the archives. I did this, and found a number of articles in which I was critical of Radin's use of statistics, but did not notice any instances where I called Radin names.

Try using the string '*shiHhHhHhnonsense*' instead... (or maybe it is my "weak knowledge of the English language" that teaches me that those who lie are liars, those who murder are murderers, and those who say *shitnonsenses* - bullshit - are bullshitters...).

Now, as to 'troll'. This is not a synonym for 'imbecil' [sic] or 'vandal' or any combination of them, as Siqueira seems to think.

My mistake. This is indeed the typical mistake one is to expect from non-native speakers of a language. Nevertheless, you ended up providing the "imbecil" component afterwards ("loon"), and, at least to an introductory extent, you ended up pointing in the direction of the vandal component, when you said that I would shout in the void ("shouting into an empty room"). Yes, shouting is one of the things vandals do, though, argueably, not their main trait, I concede.

When pressed to provide documentation of his claims of racism on the part of Bob, Brent and myself, he came up with the pdf he posted today, which fails utterly to prove that any of us is a racist

Racism-endorsers, not racists. And racism-endorsers for the reasons fully explained.

or has made or supported racism in any way.

That is the very point, Jefferys. I have gone to great lengths to explain in minute detail why and how the actions from you guys turned out to have a racist impact on avoid-L and on society.

At best, it shows a lack of comprehension. Now, he's not a native speaker of English, so we can perhaps forgive him a bit for this,

No you cannot. Some instances of lack of comprehension are to be expected from non-native speakers of a given language (as exemplified in the "troll misunderstanding" above). But other instances of lack of comprehension are not to be expected. I believe you do not make this distinction because you yourself don't study languages. I do. I study the logic of languages, the interplay between the structure of language and the dynamics of society, and the semantic dynamics of discourses and debates. Further, I hold the Certificate of Proficiency in English from the University of Michigan (US), and also the even more prestigious Certificate of Proficiency in English from the University of Cambridge (UK). Does this mean that I know more English than Jefferys? Obviously not. What that means is that I fully master all the language, logics, and psychology (plus the sociology-politics...) involved in this issue that we are discussing. I am not to be "forgiven." And I have not misunderstood the points, less so misrepresented or mis-analyzed them.

Julio, please pay attention to what I'm saying here. I bear you no ill will. I withdraw my comments about you ("loon", "troll") because they have offended you, and I apologize for using those terms.

Nice that you do it. Sad that you only came to realize the need for this after my charges at Wikipedia...

But you don't have a case that Bob, Brent, or I are racists

Never said so.

or support racist comments.

Already fully explained. Summing up: the problem is that Dawkins claimed there was **no ethical mistake** in Watson (remember: "all testing shows blacks to be less intelligent + **blacks** are not to get promoted in jobs if they do not do well at the lower ranks"). Bob agreed with Dawkins, and so did Brent. I tried to show them that Dawkins was (arguably indirectly) holding a view that amounted to a racist influence on society (Dawkins is the master of saying the right things in the wrong way...). Bob and Brent never agreed with me on that (as far as I know). They still side with Dawkins.

Well, of course, I think that these things are unethical. I've always thought that they were unethical. I don't know how Siqueira could possibly conclude otherwise from anything I've written.

This above is the core of the issue, and I will comment on it at the end of this message.

Julio, I want to tell you a little bit about my history and my family history. (...) (...) As you can see, I have been aware of the oppression of black people all of my life. I have worked in my own way to eliminate it.

Your family history is moving, touching, and highly honorable. Your own life history too, to a great extent.

You've claimed that I supported certain racist ideas. I hope that this history will give you some idea of

how abhorrent I think those ideas are. I utterly reject those ideas.

I believe you.

I also hope that you can see that you have offended me greatly by your intemperate and ill-informed claims about me. For someone of my background to be unjustly accused of the vile things as you have charged me with, is really, really hurtful.

Have you tried to place yourself at my position? Foremost: take a look at these lines of yours right above. Read them? Now, look at what you did at that very moment when you decided to help Crowell's monkey business. How can someone with your family-history background (regarding this issue of racism and etc) and how can someone with your own life-history background make comments like those knowing that the issue at stake was racist influence on society? You had before your very eyes the lines from Bob Zannelli, that read like this:

"You need to read my remarks more carefully. I actually have no idea what point you are trying to make. That atheists are racists, that Dawkins is a racists, what exactly is your point? Tell you what, clearly state the assertion you are making and we can see if it holds water. If you think Dawkins is a racist make your case. Why do you think he is a racist? This endless inventing new meaning to what others have written isn't helpful to your cause. You are apparently making this assertion so I think you are the one who needs to defend it. I can't help you with that."

You had before your very eyes the issue of *atheists being racists or not*, the issue of *Dawkins being racist or not*, the issue of *points not being well made or not*, and, further on, the issue of *Julio being involved in this talk*, and you mean to say now that you did not realize the grave nature of what was being discussed?! How come? How can it possibly be?

It's false, and I ask you to retract your claims, remove the pointer to your pdf file from the W. Jefferys talk page, and apologize.

Unfortunately, what I have claimed and what I have said (and what I included at the William Jefferys entry on Wikipedia) was true. Unfortunately, I directed these very same accusations against these subjects (Meeker, Zannelli, Crowell, You) many many days before posting them elsewhere (my webpage or wikipedia); none of you complained or "corrected" me then. That is regarding the word "false" in your line above. As to the expression "remove the pointer," another "friendly wikipedia administrator" has already done it. I have nothing to object. (obviously, I must just point out that both you and the wiki administrators asked for the source of my claim; so it was there at your own request). As to apologizing, please see at the end.

I already have apologized to you for using the words "loon" and "troll" to refer to you.

Yes, you did. But I must say that, what that means, I do not know... Actually, troll was not that much of an offense (though the message that you sent me at that time was indeed just as offensive as I have always felt it to be - I re-read it today). You withdrew "loon." I wonder how can someone withdraw it at all... I mean, does it mean that you thought I was a loon and now you do not think I am a loon anymore? Or do you still think I am a loon but you think it was improper of you to tell the truth so openly? Also, all of it just because I charged you at Wikipedia. Had I not charged you there... Well, we all know, don't we?

You can likewise apologize to me for the much greater injustice that you have done to me by your comments about me here and on WikiPedia.

I wouldn't blush at kissing your ass if that is fair. Less so at apologizing.

&&& I never added you to the racist list.

Yes you did. From your own web page:

http://paginas.terra.com.br/educacao/criticandokardec/avoid_avoidl.htm

That is not the *racist* list, but the *racism endorsing* list.

"I must say that when I realized that people like Bob Zannelli, Brent Meeker, Lawrence Crowell, and Bill Jefferys (i.e. astronomer/statistician William H. Jefferys) were supporting racism, I decided it was high time I left."

So, it may very well be that this most weird Chimera of Our Modern Times (i.e. this "combined entity": Dawkins - Zannelli - Meeker - Crowell - Jefferys) is not indeed a racist being. But the fact is that they have highly endorsed unscientific/unethical racist remarks (and therefore they have endorsed racist influence on society).

Here you accuse not only me, Bob and Brent, but now also Larry Crowell of supporting racism.

I removed now this whole page (avoid avoid-L in my website).

As to the rest, including the apologizing, I will address it in the lines below:

First, you acknowledged the unethical nature of the statements that I asked you about. I just do not have a case against you anymore, neither at wikipedia nor at anywhere else. Even if I wanted to have, I would not be able to have it. Your acknowledgement dissolved the whole issue. As to apologizing, all I can say is that I will put things right at wikipedia (talkpage). There will be a correction tone, but I must say that there can be no apologizing. Unless you prove me wrong. If and when you do that, I will crawl like a worm from down under here up to the mounts of Vermont to kiss your ass if need be. But until then, I am not going to lie. Neither to me, nor to you.

You have your honorable and moving family history/own-life history. It so happens that I have some history too... I live in a country where racism is insidious. Some unwary foreigners won't see racism in Brazil. But we have it. We are learning to fight it. But we too, and me too, have our wounds from it. Though we are highly inter-mixed, I myself am considered white, actually kind of jew-looking. I married a black woman. My two marvelous kids (18 yo girl and 13 yo boy) would be considered black in the US. But in my own case, in my own history, the problem is not really so much the past, but the present and the future... I teach at an elementary public school to poor kids, coming from two slums in Rio de Janeiro. Lots of blacks. Lots of losers, as Crowell would label them. One of the strongest things that lures them into a criminal life (and each year we lose many of them to this...) seems to be this so unfair low self-esteem that they have, and much much of it comes from shame of being... black. I cannot remember how many times I have said, just this last year of 2007, to many of them, again and again that they are beautiful (and beautiful they are!), that they are intelligent, and that they can work their way... maybe not up to financial success, but surely up to existential success.

So these are the losers that I love so much. And who, if they manage to become good losers, will, at the very same time, become true winners (true winners like my ancestors were, my grandfather and uncles and some other relatives as well - all very poor, all very strong and happy). So when you ask for apology, I wonder who is in control: your life/family history, or your pride? Yes, because your life/family history seemed to be nowhere to be found when you advised everybody to killfile me...

But I do apologize for one thing. I apologize for having ever addressed you in the first place. And you can

rest assured that that will not happen again... Feel free, however, to address me if and whenever you wish. I do not have a killfile...

Best Wishes,
Julio Siqueira
