
Subject: To those who DEMAND proof on a program
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 04 Nov 2003 21:44:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

f100d3dWARRANTO:

"Programming ability? None. I'm a philosopher, not a computer programmer. In fact I've never even attempted to program. But as majikent pointed out I fail to see how that would apply to my knowledge of what is regarded as truth. No matter if you agree with what the truth is or not. Don't like it, don't complain to me about stating it. Go and change it. When it's been changed, I'll start stating that as the truth. "

A philosopher? Isn't everyone a philosopher? Or is that just my philosophy? lol The point that I'm making is that you don't have any clue what open source is truly about or any technical information in your brain that would allow you to make an informed decision regarding the technical background and planning for this project.

"And since when was the "machine" represented by the truth? All you stated was that my reference to Microsoft, the military, and any other non-open source company was a poor one in relation to the RenGuard program.

I don't know if you realized it, but your wording screwed up your whole point.

"That right there proved you missed my point.

Let me explain it again in terms you can probably (I hope) understand.

Military Program, etc. = secret and not willing to be given out to just anybody.

OK ... agreed. Has nothing to do with a utility for a game that is not supported by its developers anymore. Continue.

"Closed source coding (the Microsoft reference) = secret and not willing to be given out to just anybody.

Proprietary information is what you're looking for. OK, a sense of confidentiality is understood. Continue.

"RenGuard = secret and not willing to be given out to just anybody.

Whoopsie! There's where you messed up. It should look like this:
RenGuard = secret and not willing to be given out because the people who created it would rather play with the fate of the community, rather than ask them for their unity and help.

"See the reference applicablility now? I hope I don't have to spell out why the RenGuard team is unwilling to provide the code (Hint: refer to the references I supplied)

No, I really do not.

So your a philosopher huh? Then please tell me your thoughts on Descartes meditaions of first philosophy. I'd also be interested to see what you think of Locke's presentation of personal identity, Hume's idea of cause and effect and how it deals with the 7 different philisophical ideas relating to said cause and effect. And let's not forget about Niezche and his feeling of morality (Just to name a few, though I guess I could also ask about Freud).

You don't need to know anything about programming to understand that ope source programming is an attempt to circumvent (not a bad thing) the mega businesses by allowing the "common folk" to produce similar if not better products by being able to view the programs coding.

Nope, mt wording didn't screw up my point. It states it right there in white, and well, black or green. Try taking another crack at it again. All I had been stated in my previous posts was the truth of the situation. You in turn made it out to be I was working, or part of "the machine". So I ask you again, since when is speaking the truth being part of "the machine".

RenGuard is playing with the fate of the community by not allowing the source code out? Odd. If thats the case, the military is playing with the security of a nation by not letting their secrets out and by not allowing the public to help, and being united under it. You could also say that about microsoft as well. But then again, this will go right over your head, and you'll miss the point completely.

Finally I'm not surprized that you don't get my statement about the teams reluctancy to release the code. Oh well, I've tried explaining it to you a number of times, and I highly doubt your limited ability to comprehend will understand yet another explanation.
