

This is a ridiculous post to write because of the subject matter and my preference for a quiet life. I'm only bothering because I'm drowning in a sea of competing sources and clawing my way to the truth has a very real link to my wellbeing. My usual diligence (filtering out the top third of hysteria, the bottom third of ignorance, then refining based on obvious vested interests and ability to cross reference) isn't working right now. That's why I felt moved to try and write it out. I write or speak to think, always have done. The title probably puts it in the tightest possible nutshell for me: Have we withdrawn permission to disagree?

Nearly three years of mind-blowing global muppetry and five recent things conspired to prompt this:

## 1. Turing incompleteness

Thomas Dullen a.k.a @halverflake venting his incredibly experienced malware-reversing and all round InfoSec viking spleen about [misuse of the term "Turing Completeness"](#) (my capitalisation so I can abbreviate to TC). No doubt encouraged by the intellectual tone leant by the Turing association and certainty related feels created by 'completeness', folk have been finding creative ways to slot it into stuff they write. As far as I can fathom (given it very much isn't my specialism) TC is being wrongly interpreted as a condition that always enables exploitation. In his post Thomas gives us situations where you might have TC, but not necessarily a compromisable state.

While I have nothing but respect for his obvious creds, I fear trying to walk that back to precise usage is not going to be a rewarding task. Too many incredibly skilled and experienced folk have died on hills defending proper use of terms <cough> AI <cough>. A reminder that words can be made to mean whatever you want them to, first for a malleable faction, then for the wider world. With the right sponsors, effort, and exposure even the best and most authoritative sources can't really unring that bell (Anti-facist? Socialist? Liberal? Fake? Alternative right? Nazi? Feminist? Social justice warrior? Toxic? Leaver? Remainer? Expert? Winning? Great? Enemy? Truth?).

## 2. Academic own goal?

James Lindsay (@ConceptualJames), Helen Pluckrose (@HPluckrose), and Peter Boghossian (@peterboghossian) trying to prove that academia will celebrate any left-wing new clothes the Emperor may or may not be wearing if folk pay hard enough lip service to academic rigor. They try to out the alleged self-fulfilling bias through performance protest: getting 'ridiculous' but well researched hypotheses (e.g. [doggy sexpoits in parks](#) as indicator for local rape culture) into recognised journals.

Their declared mission is to tear down the so called 'grievance studies' faction that has grown around fields studying gender, race, and more general diversity research. But I'm unclear whether they think their proud self-identification as liberal academics, and their service to the purer principles of academic rigor, negates the harm that will be perpetrated with the narrative they just gifted to the right wing.

It will likely force more diligent content filtering in some circles and help keep conflict for conflict's sake out of some curricula (who is the arbiter of 'sanity' in academia), but folk creating a counter-narrative to oppose oppression in the best traditions of the traditional civil

rights movement badly need punchy and accessible facts. Peer researched journal content will carry on trailing months behind social discourse and fail to compete with rampant and more or less psychometrically-targeted memes. Clicking our heels together three times and wishing for a return to long-form civil debate and discourse ain't gonna bring it home. Someone has to reign in the kangaroo court characterised by the knee-jerk social media pile-on, but my guts said this isn't that. Currently a short write up, short YouTube video, with full length documentary in progress.

### **3. CERN meltdown**

Where [Alessandro Strumia](#) (link to twitter thread from the CERN employee who broke the story), a Dr of Physics, using a speakers slot at a gender focused CERN event to pivot and tell those present that there is no gender discrimination in physics...which went down as you might expect. They also got to hear how the feminist narrative is masking the reality: women are just less smart. Artificially inflating numbers is destroying the careers of incredibly valuable experts (he offered himself as an example and named the woman who got 'his' job. In conclusion women present were told how they are damaging the credibility and quality of the scientific community as a whole.

### **4. May, Boris, and Hunt on Brexit**

Her almost cornered by Marr into saying it this was never a great idea. Blond boy trying to oust her while bouncing from £350m bus bullshit to Boris's special Brexit. A killer plan for a plan built on [ancient repealed legislation](#) and EU imported sand. Hunt jumping in for a bit part [comparing the EU to communist Russia](#). The rest of us variously souping round 'It's done! Suck it up and move on!', 'Please tell me we're not REALLY doing this', 'Hard Brexit is your fault you remoaner scum!', 'Hang on, didn't someone confirm that [SCL interfered with this?](#)' and 'What the hell do we do? There's no-one sane and honest left to vote for'. In the meantime, the Chequers deal got dusted off again. Painted as failing only because the EU are being petulant and Irish folk are failing to grasp how a digital, blockchain-powered border would plaster over cracks in the Good Friday Agreement. The ones our Arlene is leaning on a crowbar to open.

### **5. Trump on Ford**

Rough summary of the narrative: Kavanaugh's seat is his birth right, which will in turn secure Trump's. 'They' lie (the women, the media, libtard cucks, immigrants, Clintons, anyone else inconvenient). We have to protect our sons from false sexual assault allegations. Allegations destroy lives. The extreme left, sponsored by vested socialist interests will mobilise fake news to make a fair hearing impossible, and libel laws make it tough to push back against the Soros sponsored whores.

### **Key themes underlying all of this:**

(All of these bullet points can be tuned to defend any faction in the listed bunfights).

- Terms will be wrongly repurposed and you mostly can't reverse that.
- Bias is universal and constant, it's just a matter of visibility and degrees.

- People are innocent until proven guilty, but the media (msm or social) will muddy that.
- When your 'way of life' is threatened you must make a stand
- Facts are important, but pitching it right for the audience trumps that

Some are variably relevant, but the sense of confusion and desire for more fact-based clarity is a universal result of this kind of powerful drive to divide us...unless, that is, you are 100% certain of your current position, 100% certain everyone else is wrong, and 100% certain your mind won't change any time soon...unless your chosen religious or political authority figures tell it to.

If that's you, then I don't think we're going to benefit much from each other's company, so why not skip straight to comments and leave some rabid abuse. For the rest of the folk reading, always worth asking who's purpose it serves to keep people guessing or push out a conspiracy theory or two to boost fervour and hone polarisation, all aimed at distracting folk from inconvenient truths.

## Messages directed at me:

All of the best campaigning, commercially, politically, and socially, will try to personalise messages (see social media, politicians, and the adtech industry for details). Personalisation works in many ways; it can help us grasp complex concepts within our own sphere of reference, it can help us understand best next steps, it can help us see (or preferably 'feel') likely effects. I am a self-declared left-leaning centrist with a bunch of more polarised issue-specific opinions tacked on. I'm happy to acknowledge the less benign and downright manipulative social and political stuff goes on right across the political spectrum. Whoever it advantages most will pay, and the people who pay will get to play.

That might be campaigning for office, pitching for a new social policy, leaving a multi-state economic agreement that has been instrumental in ensuring decades of relative prosperity and peace, or it might be artificially intensifying fear of immigrants so related control proposals get the necessary social or bipartisan support, while at the same time ensuring opponents lose credibility and traction.

So just as a mental exercise, lets circle back to the top. With the exception of Turing Completeness how personalised are those issues? What does current messaging say to me?

**I am part of the prejudice problem** - I support taking some sensible action to improve gender and other diversity in InfoSec and STEM, so the alleged 'dumbing down' and discrimination against male, white, cis, able-bodied colleagues is partly down to me. To one faction I am 100% wrong. I am supporting and, in some cases, facilitating the destruction of our way of life by undermining the value of traditional masculinity and Caucasian, heterosexual, Christian culture. Yep, all that before breakfast, every day. As opposed to wanting my daughters and their less fortunate peers to be able to fulfil their potential under their own steam. To achieve things based on hard work and capability rather than their income, gender, skin-colour, or religion, and wanting them to be safe in the world while they live and love however and wherever they choose. All while recognising that we can't have everything. We have to recognise the difference between an unfair or pointless barrier we can

push against, move, or break down, and a temporarily immovable one we have to work around.

**I am stupid and don't see that I'm being manipulated** - Related to the last point, I just can't see that Soros funded factions are ripping society apart by making me feel like a victim of various social blights. I'm not a victim. I'm not disadvantaged. The people telling me I am are the abusers who strip me of my power. I should stand up, buy a weapon, and defend myself (unless it's from my husband, a demand to see proof of my citizenship, or mental/physical consequences of an unwanted pregnancy). BE the change (unless it's to the 2nd amendment, or the result of Brexit). Walkaway from the people trying to rip apart the fabric of Christian god-fearing society and people who want to hand the pieces to Islamist aggressors. My desire to understand and offer equality to minorities and people less able than myself will be fatal. Empathy is an Antifa invention to make me open the door for brown folk, folk who think there's a gender spectrum, cripples who muddy the gene pool, and black lives that only matter if white lives matter more. Rapists, criminals, shithole country dwellers, who all want to take our jobs, our homes, our children, and the culture we, with no help from anyone else, conjured from the bare earth. Plus, a whole shedload of other words for 'How I feel when I think about there being more of them than me, because if I'd been treated the way we're treating them, I'd be taking names and buying bullets'.

**I can't report rape or assault because I'm not worth it** - Unless I immediately go to the cops with incontrovertible physical evidence, a recording of my lack of consent, proof I was completely sober, and witnesses who will back all that up (a tough one because they didn't see or hear anything. They were downstairs when I was shoved into the bedroom and I was quiet because he put his hand over my mouth).

Or, if I wait, I must not wait too long (unacceptable length to be based upon a more or less fair statute of limitations, then upon the attacker's career status). I must also document, in scrupulous detail, events preceding, during, and after the attack (or at least in more detail than him), and I must not have done any 'slutty' things or have any past evidence of 'distasteful' political views that raise the risk I might be destroying my reputation for partisan reasons. I must also tread a fine line between being attractive enough to make an attack believable vs demure enough to avoid being labelled a tease, being emotional enough to evidence the horrific trauma vs so upset I seem unhinged, being definite about facts vs filling in blanks where my memory has lapsed. To paraphrase: If he's in a position of authority and it comes down to 'he said, she said' I'm better off chalking it up to experience.

**I can't trust my eyes and ears** - The fakeness of information pervades every layer of every primary, secondary and tertiary source from social media, to mainstream media, to educators, to books, to academic research. AI can target disinformation with laser precision and at baffling scale. New tech wizardry can mock up video and audio content that's almost indiscernible from original digital content. I can't trust anyone except my closest contacts...unless they've also been swayed by the entirely untrustworthy fake news.

This is a useful narrative. It narrows my focus to a small feed of narrator-approved sources. It's not correct, but there has been a genuine increase in the effort it takes to verify sources because of concerted effort to muddy waters. Think bots, manual account spoofing, troll farms, spoofing genuine news sites, planted stories, explicit falsehoods presented as facts, preferred soundbites spread fast and furiously via the former mechanisms and via variably biased news feed algorithms. Then there's the alleged lies and bias. You don't have to break

stuff to confuse people, you just have to have enough people tell them it's broken - both sides are up to all of that, but the super-rich, who predominantly lean to the right because regulation and better enforced taxation can't fail to cramp their style, are best equipped and organised to win the information war and the tech organisations that enable much of this have plenty of their own super-rich folk with skin in the game.

The gulf (pun intended) between rich and poor was last this distinct in the regulation and social welfare lite 1900s, then the 1930s...and we all know, within a decade or so, what came next.

**I must only trust the narrator, their approved mouthpieces, and their fiercest followers** (that population of people we're told to trust changes because 'traitor' is frequently redefined. Paranoia will constantly plague those at the top as they strongarm more and more factions to support their increasingly authoritarian rule - first they came for the [insert others here], but I did nothing because I am not [other] - you know how the rest of that goes.).

We must be ready to fight for the cause...when we're told what that is (Is it Jews this time? No? They're our friends now because of Palestine? But Soros and Jared? Still Soros, but Jared and other Jews are ok...got it. Just the Muslims then...and the media, except Fox, and liberals, and Ted Cruz. Oh? Not Ted?).

We must not trust 'their' propaganda. We owe it to our families to defend our way of life to the death, even if it's our kids that do the dying. Anyone who tells us any different is trying to undermine our faith in that single righteous cause (the fella on our narrator-approved news show told us so, as did my husband, a man I trust with my life, because if I disrespect him I'm genuinely scared he might kill me, and I only get health insurance for the pre-existing arthritis - caused by the beatings - while married, and he won't let me get a job).

Anyone in any doubt about where I stand now? Nope? You are probably sure you either wholly agree or hate me, because, let's face it, those are frequently the only options you get. If you're not with me you're against me, and a bunch of our real or bot-like compadres will pile on to underline it. But I've only outed a tiny fraction of the opinions I've formed after reading hundreds of thousands of words and having thousands of conversations over more than a quarter century. I also have many outstanding questions that I can't now satisfactorily answer with the competing information available.

That means I stand on an incredible quantity of shared ground with the vast majority of folk on all sides. Folk just trying to find some straightforward sense to help them work out what to do next (or what's least bad. <cough> Brexit).

If you give me a minute to pin on my feminazi, libcuck, and remoaner badges (to save some of you time), I'd like to have a chat. My thoughts are evolving. Every time someone tells me I'm wrong JUST because I'm on the other side of a lobbyist sponsored and social media reinforced fence, it makes me go off and look for nuance, for evidence, for folk I've known a long time who have access to facts...because I'm as lost in the mediaverse as you are, and who the hell has time to double check EVERYTHING they read (I say this as someone historically called a research demon and a clear thinker...though rarely feeling that these days).

And even when I secure some certainty through direct experience, first-hand evidence, scientific research, or robust corroboration via trusted sources I'm told I'm lying, my sources are lying, or my points are called lies just because of WHO I am. All backed up by a counter narrative delivered with the kind of carefully tailored tone that revs up those most likely to agree. A narrative almost entirely built on prejudice-based fears and falsehoods. Like a well-practiced comedian, words and phrases are planted and circled back to for punchlines (pun again intended) that almost, but not quite, say 'Go out and hurt those who disagree before they hurt you. Tell them they are unwelcome, tell them leave, tell them they are animals, rapists, paedophiles, terrorists. Fundamentally worth less than you and white, cis, male, Christian, wealthy, and genetically superior me.

A narrative that drowns out every one of my carefully researched, reasoned, and respectfully delivered points.

And bingo: I am an enemy of the state.

The only antidote I can conceive of is getting to know you, all of you, cos no-one wins while we're throw bombs over jerry-rigged barricades shouting no surrender while telling ourselves there's nothing we can concede (you can thank the other half who was born in Londonderry for that one).

Or you can find a way to undermine my credibility. Try, through sheer weight of cruel attrition, to make the cost of starting a conversation way too high. Ignore the fact that organised trolls lay bait to provoke that. Cheerleading effort to peck holes in folk who once listened. Avoid asking a single meaningful question that might introduce a useful shade of grey. Pile on when I resort to sneering, fear, and anger. Reactions the result of abuse throughout the day.

Then I mute, block and/or report you and another possibility of eventual compromise sails away. You're carried off victorious on their digital shoulders. That's 10 people outed as fragile, cuck snowflakes today.

So, here's to nuance, and detail, and research. Here's to sensible questions, and sane heads. Here's to walking a mile in others' shoes and reading beyond the by-line. Here's to thinking twice and checking if there's a middle way. Here's to not hating just because we're told to, not piling on because one person took offence. Here's to drawing breath, then drawing another. Here's to constructively lurking on a digital fence. Don't be lulled into believing that behaving like an attack dog is a doing a service to the cause. The true service is believing that very few are truly broken or evil and finding middle ground needs that pause.

Deciphering wood from trees. Remembering who my parents raised me to be. The kind of person who invites you to disagree. Strong, tolerant, sceptical, fair, and (at least for now) free.