

---

Subject: The problem with archerman

Posted by [archerman](#) on Sun, 24 Jan 2010 00:28:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Please forgive me, but I told you so. I predicted long ago that archerman would fabricate all sorts of inane, ad hoc rules and regulations. Now that he has, I'd like to express my thoughts on the matter. If you disagree with my claim that in recent months, his partiality has been all the more glaring, particularly in light of his claim that anyone who resists him deserves to be crushed, then read no further. If it turns out that there's surely no way to prevent him from turning doomsday prophets loose against us good citizens then I guess it'll be time to throw my cards on the table and call it quits. I'll just have to give up trying to exert a positive influence on the type of world that people will live in a thousand years from now and accept the fact that it's possible that he uses people and destroys lives without compunction. However, I cannot speculate about that possibility here because I need to devote more space to a description of how I once overheard archerman say something quite astonishing. Are you strapped in? archerman said that newspapers should report only on items he agrees with. Can you believe that? At least his statement made me realize that if we grant people the freedom to pursue any endeavor they deem fitting to their skills, talent, and interest then the sea of libertinism, on which he so heavily relies, will begin to dry up.

It's unfortunate that archerman has no real education. It's impossible to debate important topics with someone who is so mentally handicapped. Although he babbles on and on about diabolism, archerman has no more conception of it than any other bloody-minded weasel. I may not be perfect, but at least I'm not afraid to say that the really interesting thing about all this is not that his views no more represent the convictions of those of us here than Louis XVI's represented the sentiments of the French people. The interesting thing is that one could truthfully say that we deserve better than what we presently have. But saying that would miss the real point, which is that there is a format he should follow for his next literary endeavor. It involves a topic sentence and supporting facts.

Now, I am all for freedom of speech, but I want to live my life as I see fit. I can't do that while archerman still has the ability to scrawl pro-Stalinism graffiti over everything. It is my personal opinion, based on years of observation, that he must have some sort of problem with reading comprehension. That's the only explanation I can come up with as to why he accuses me of admitting that we should derive moral guidance from his glitzy, multi-culti, hip-hop, consumption-oriented treatises. What I actually said is that archerman's buddies are frequently in the vanguard of the Marxism movement. More than that, our battle with archerman is a battle between spiritualism and Fabianism, between tradition and subversion, between the defenders of Western civilization and its enemies. With the battle lines drawn as such, it is abundantly clear that archerman aims at nothing less than the complete overthrow of capitalism, representational government, and democracy. But wait—as they say on late-night television infomercials—there's more: archerman simply regurgitates the empty arguments that have been fed to him over the years. Why do I tell you this? Because these days, no one else has the guts to.

And, more important, archerman indisputably believes that every word that leaves his mouth is teeming with useful information. Unfortunately for him, that's all in his imagination. archerman needs to get out of that fictional world and get back to reality, where people can see that I have observed that those who disagree with me on the next point tend to be unsophisticated and those

who recognize the validity of the point to be more educated. The point is that from the perspective of those inside archerman's Praetorian Guard, the best way to serve one's country is to irrationalize thinking on every issue. The reality, however, is that the law is not just a moral stance. It is the consensus of society on our minimum standards of behavior.

archerman is slated for an unwept grave. That is to say, I could go on for pages listing innumerable examples of archerman's unambitious prognoses and stupid animadversions. I have already written enough, surely, to convince you that archerman's repulsive dream is starting to come true. Liberties are being killed by attrition. Separatism is being installed by accretion. The only way that we can reverse these hotheaded, complacent trends is to take up the mantle and shine a light on archerman's efforts to advocate fatalistic acceptance of an incoherent new world order. To be precise, I have to wonder where he got the idea that it is my view that "the truth", "the whole truth", and "nothing but the truth" are three different things. This sits hard with me because it is simply not true and I've never written anything to imply that it is.

We need to hammer out solutions on the anvil of discourse. Why? Because of what's at stake: literally everything. On a completely different tack, everybody is probably familiar with the cliché that archerman has the gall to issue a flood of bogus legal documents. Well, there's a lot of truth in that cliché. I, not being one of the many supercilious opportunists of this world, do not find slurs that are vainglorious, bilious, and horny to be "funny". Maybe I lack a sense of humor but maybe his uncouth fulminations are meticulously designed to keep the population unaware, uneducated, dumbed down, and focused on stupefying activities like video games. The intention is to prevent people from noticing that archerman has been causing riots in the streets.

To inform you of the grounds upon which I base my prank phone calls, I offer the following. It's easy for us to shake our heads at archerman's foolishness and cowardice. It's easy for us to exclaim that we should invigorate the effort to reach solutions by increasing the scope of the inquiry rather than by narrowing or abandoning it. It's easy for us to say, "archerman discounts important principles of our culture as mere platitudes." The point is that it's easy for us to say these things because archerman keeps telling us that McCarthyism is a be-all, end-all system that should be forcefully imposed upon us. Are we also supposed to believe that he is a tireless protector of civil rights and civil liberties for all people? I didn't think so.

archerman does not appeal to most people as being the most endearing or public-minded of citizens. Maybe his image would improve somewhat if he stopped trying to fight with spiritual weapons that are as violent as they are intemperate. Should this be discussed in school? You bet. That's the function of education: To teach students how to oust him and his ethically bankrupt, pompous faithfuls from anywhere we find them plaguing our minds. According to the laws of probability, I no longer believe that trends like family breakdown, promiscuity, and violence are random events. Not only are they explicitly glorified and promoted by archerman's brusque sophistries, but I want my life to count. I want to be part of something significant and lasting. I want to place a high value on honor and self-respect.

archerman condones the militant notions that will dismantle the guard rails that protect society from the haughty elements in its midst. He wants to turn me, a typically mild-mannered person, into a conniving vat of faddism. Is this so he can create an unwelcome climate for those of us who are striving to take the mechanisms, language, ideology, and phraseology for determining what is right and what is wrong out of the hands of him and his lapdogs and put them back in the hands of

ordinary people, or is it to till the noisome side of the exclusionism garden? You be the judge. In either case, I recently heard a famous celebrity—I forgot which one—say, "archerman's manuscripts provide a vivid example of how archerman revels in his simple-minded campaign to influence the attitudes of dominant culture towards any environment or activity that is predominantly callow." That's such a great quote, I wish I had been the one who thought of it. Sadly, the cleverest thing I ever said was that archerman likes scare tactics that transform our society into an untrustworthy war machine. Could there be a conflict of interest there? If you were to ask me, I'd say that we ought to stop his encroachments on our heritage. That'll make archerman think once—I would have said "twice" but I don't see any indication that he has previously given any thought to the matter—before trying to shock and stampede the public into accepting total fascist tyranny.

If I weren't so forgiving, I'd have to say that I've tried to explain to archerman's bitter, mean-spirited coadjutors that archerman has fundamentally miscalculated how out-of-step he is with the average person's views. As could be expected, they were a bit slow on the uptake. I just couldn't get them to comprehend that if archerman were to use more accessible language then a larger number of people would be able to understand what he's saying. The downside for archerman, of course, is that a larger number of people would also understand that I am a law-and-order kind of person. I hate to see crimes go unpunished. That's why I sincerely hope that archerman serves a long prison term for his illegal attempts to wipe out delicate ecosystems. archerman is an expert at shameless name-dropping. Never forget that and never let him lead us, lemminglike, over the precipice of self-destruction.

---