

[Stories](#) [Firehose >](#) [All](#) [Popular](#) [Video new](#) [Jobs](#) [Deals](#) [Submit](#)Topics: [Devices](#) [Build](#) [Entertainment](#) [Technology](#) [Open Source](#) [Science](#) [YRO](#)Search [khayman80](#)Follow us:     

This discussion has been archived. No new comments can be posted.

[A Software Project Full of "Male Anatomy" Jokes Causes Controversy](#) [739 More Prefs](#)

[A Software Project Full of "Male Anatomy" Jokes Causes Controversy](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load 500 More Comments](#)[Full](#) [Abbreviated](#) [Hidden](#)

Comments Filter:

Score:

- 5 • [All](#)
- 4 • [Insightful](#)
- 3 • [Informative](#)
- 2 • [Interesting](#)
- 1 • [Funny](#)
- 0

The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

[739 More Prefs](#)[Normal women...](#) (Score:5, Funny)by [sribe \(304414\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Actually find the male anatomy to be hilarious...

-
-

[Re:](#) (Score:5, Insightful)by [MrBigInThePants \(624986\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Not if they are a true feminist / he4she / she4she / fuck it I cannot keep up anymore.

Basically what is happening here is that anything remotely male specific in the workplace is being banned because some hugely overly sensitive person with neurotic tendencies (and no, it does not have to be a woman) might potentially get offended - even silently or potentially. So even if no one has said anything or there is no obvious actual problem, then action MUST be taken at all costs.

So the answer is to corporat

-
-

[Re:](#) (Score:5, Insightful)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Some people need to get over the ridiculous notion that they have some kind of "right" to not be offended.

Which is actually Article II of the [Bill of No Rights](#).

-

■

[Re: \(Score:2, Insightful\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

No one is complaining that they should have the "right" not to be offended. People are complaining that this kind of "offensive" behaviour is part of a culture that is misogynistic and unwelcoming to women. And there is probably something to that.

Now, that said, let's keep it real for a second. Referencing male anatomy is being said here to be anti-woman. "'DICCS' is offensive and the kind of thing that keeps women out of tech", etc. But could the exact same case not be made if it had been named "CUNTT

■

■

[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

No one is complaining that they should have the "right" not to be offended.

Wrong. LOTS of people do it. I see that kind of crap from one person or another on social media almost every day. And I **have** gotten it at work, too. Not for a long time, but it did happen.

Nobody -- or almost nobody, anyway -- wants a harassing workplace, but some people are just plain thin-skinned and get all offended at the drop of a hat. Those people don't have the right to make everybody around them miserable just because they won't grow up.

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar \(Score:2\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

Apparently you feel that you have a right to be offended, but not I. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2010-12-06\]](#)

There is no "right to not be offended". The very notion is a mockery of American values. ... [\[Lonny Eachus, 2013-12-22\]](#)

Some folks got this weird idea they have a right to not be offended. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2013-12-28\]](#)

THERE IS NO "RIGHT" TO NOT BE OFFENDED. THERE IS AN OBLIGATION TO BE HUMBLE WHEN YOU OFFEND EGREGIOUSLY, THOUGHTLESSLY, OR GRATUITOUSLY. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-05-03\]](#)

I'

■

■

Re: (Score:1)by [operagost \(62405\)](#) [Foe of a Friend](#)

You know, you really should lay off. I looked at your recent posts, and of the first page, EVERY ONE was directed at JQP. It's disrupting the discussion, and I wish I had mod points.

--

[Gamingmuseum.com](#): Give your 3D accelerator a rest.

■

■

Re: (Score:1)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

You know, you really should lay off. I looked at your recent posts, and of the first page, EVERY ONE was directed at JQP. It's disrupting the discussion, and I wish I had mod points.

He's been pulling this crap for somewhere around 5 years now. It didn't start out that bad, but progressively grew worse, except for some brief interludes.

I have solid evidence that his tactics of, well, let's just say "bothering me" have included sock-puppetry here on Slashdot, and even attempted impersonation. Which didn't work but as they say it's the thought that counts.

I mean look: you want evidence that this guy is short of a full load? Some of those comments are from someone he thinks is me, an

■

■

>

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 17:08 ([#49324263](#)) [Homepage](#)
[Journal](#)

I mean look: you want evidence that this guy is short of a full load?

Charming. Jane, keep in mind that you're saying this right after [adamantly rejecting](#) the standard physics definition of the word "net", and pretending not to understand how a crayon mark representing cooler power doesn't pass through a boundary inside the cooler wall.

Looks like you were lying yet again, when you claimed that you'd be [happy](#) to declare to everyone that you were wrong about your Latour Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense. Or maybe you'd like to keep disputing basic physics definitions and the esoteric art of using crayons in a coloring book?

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 20:26 ([#49325055](#))

Charming. Jane

Why should I make any effort to be "charming" to YOU??? You have been anything BUT charming to me. It seems I see the old hypocrisy beginning to peek out just a little again.

And STOP taking my comments out of context and persistently misrepresenting them. That's dishonest!

I have explained to you many times that I was not disputing the definition of "net". So STOP LYING. Because that's what you are doing.

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 20:53 ([#49325145](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... I have explained to you many times that I was not disputing the definition of "net". So STOP LYING. Because that's what you are doing. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

[Once again](#), you disputed my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation, and simultaneously insisted that you don't dispute the standard physics definition.

Who do you think that's going to fool, Jane? I don't think it's likely to fool anyone who understands what a "definition" is. Not to mention the fact that you repeatedly pretended not to understand how a crayon mark representing cooler power doesn't pass through a boundary inside the cooler wall.

If you're actually this confused about basic physics, why are you lecturing physicists about physics?

If you're **not** actually confused, why has Jane/Lonny Eachus betrayed humanity?

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 21:09 ([#49325183](#))

Once again, you disputed my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation, and simultaneously insisted that you don't dispute the standard physics definition.

No. You do NOT get to take my words out of context, insert your own later comments around them, then try to argue that I said something **I explained to you in plain English that I did not mean in the context you are trying to portray them.**

That's called LYING, man. Or worse.

We already had this argument, and you lost. End of story. Go the fuck away, and leave me alone.

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) [g+](#)

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:0, Offtopic)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 21:24 ([#49325241](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

No. You do NOT get to take my words out of context, insert your own later comments around them, then try to argue that I said something **I explained to you in plain English that I did not mean in the context you are trying to portray them.** That's called LYING, man. Or worse. We already had this argument, and you lost. End of story. Go the fuck away, and leave me alone. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

Once again, all I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

If power in = power out (your own stipulation), and the only NET power INTO a defined spherical region is electrical, and the only NET power OUT of that region is radiative, then net radiative power out **at steady-state** must therefore be equal to the net electrical power consumed. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

Jane seems to be saying that at steady-state:

net electrical power consumed = net radiative power out

But net radiative power out of a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in", so the equation Jane just described also says:

net electrical power consumed = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in"

Once again, all I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

And once again, would it really be so hard to take a few seconds to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms? That's another way to see that you should consider using the standard physics definition of the word "net". If you ever learn how to use crayons in a coloring book, that is...

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:0, Offtopic)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 21:38 ([#49325273](#))

Once again, all I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

I neither agree or disagree. I'm not even reading your entire comments. I have no reason to.

I solved the problem we discussed using standard textbook radiative physics methods. I have ZERO reason to go back and try to do it the "Khayman80" way, which is not exactly what I would call "standard" methodology. The textbook way is fine by me and I'm sticking with it.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:0, Offtopic)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 21:50 ([#49325299](#))

[Homepage Journal](#)

I neither agree or disagree. I'm not even reading your entire comments. I have no reason to. I solved the problem we discussed using standard textbook radiative physics methods. I have ZERO reason to go back and try to do it the "Khayman80" way, which is not exactly what I would call "standard" methodology. The textbook way is fine by me and I'm sticking with it.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

One thing Jane said is true. Jane's never read my entire comments, or the comments by any other physicist.

But everything else Jane said is sadly wrong. Jane solved the problem using his own incompetent misunderstanding of his own textbooks. That's why inserting the standard physics definition of the word "net" into [Jane's equation](#) reproduces the energy conservation equation Jane's still adamantly rejecting.

Another independent way Jane could see that he misunderstood the "textbook way" would be to learn about how to apply conservation of energy. Here are some introductions: [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#).

If Jane would ever bother to read entire comments by physicists, or textbooks about basic physics, Jane would quickly learn that only power passing through a boundary is included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary.

It's just like crayons in a coloring book, Jane.

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:0)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-24 17:05 ([#49332211](#))

One thing Jane said is true. Jane's never read my entire comments, or the comments by any other physicist.

STOP LYING.

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-25 11:48 ([#49337857](#))

[Homepage Journal](#)

One thing Jane said is true. Jane's never read my entire comments, or the comments by any other physicist.

STOP LYING. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

Jane, that's the most charitable explanation for all your baseless accusations.

[Once again](#), leave you in peace so you can keep baselessly accusing scientists of fraud?

I haven't "baselessly" accused anyone of anything. I make sure I have very good bases when I make actual accusations. If anything, your comment was a "baseless accusation". ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

Again, your [accusations](#) were baseless, and you reasonably should have known that. Instead, you [doubled down](#) and [tripled down](#) on your baseless accusations of fraudulent bullshit lies. And now you're **quadrupling** down.

For some reason Jane doesn't seem to grasp the irony of him lecturing scientists about what scientists think.

Perhaps an analogy could help. Jane, suppose someone who had never professionally programmed using Ruby on Rails asked you how most Ruby programmers would solve a problem. Because you're a professional Ruby programmer and you generously assume this person is asking in good faith out of genuine curiosity, you tell him how most Ruby programmers would solve that problem.

In response, that person (who's not a professional Ruby programmer) accuses you of incompetence, and insists that he knows how most Ruby programmers would solve the problem better than you do.

At this point, if you're feeling generous, you might provide a link to a poll showing that most professional Ruby programmers do in fact solve the problem that way. In response, he accuses the professional programmers who organized the poll of fraudulent bullshit lies.

Wouldn't that seem a **little** ridiculous?

Now remember your [baseless accusations](#) that scientists who point out the overwhelming scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change are guilty of fraudulent bullshit lies. Don't you think it's even a **little** ridiculous that you're lecturing scientists about what scientists think?

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-25 15:26 ([#49340031](#))

Jane, that's the most charitable explanation for all your baseless accusations.

You have not once demonstrated that any of my "accusations", as you call them, were in any way "baseless".

Saying my comments were baseless is a bald-faced lie. One which you know to be a lie.

That's something that is (at least in the moral sense) called libel. Knock it off.

I'm **not** accusing you of libel in any legal sense. At least not yet. If I do, I'm not the person you will hear about it from.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-25 15:38 ([#49340129](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

For some reason Jane doesn't seem to grasp the irony of him lecturing scientists about what scientists think.

Perhaps an analogy could help. Jane, suppose someone who had never professionally programmed using Ruby on Rails asked you how most Ruby programmers would solve a problem. Because you're a professional Ruby programmer and you generously assume this person is asking in good faith out of genuine curiosity, you tell him how most Ruby programmers would solve that problem.

In response, that person (who's not a professional Ruby programmer) accuses you of incompetence, and insists that he knows how most Ruby programmers would solve the problem better than you do.

At this point, if you're feeling generous, you might provide a link to a poll showing that most professional Ruby programmers do in fact solve the problem that way. In response, he accuses the professional programmers who organized the poll of fraudulent bullshit lies.

Wouldn't that seem a **little** ridiculous?

Now remember your [baseless accusations](#) that scientists who point out the overwhelming scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change are guilty of fraudulent bullshit lies. Don't you think it's even a **little** ridiculous that you're lecturing scientists about what

scientists think?

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar \(Score:1\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-26 15:30 ([#49350129](#))

For some reason Jane doesn't seem to grasp the irony of him lecturing scientists about what scientists think.

Since you consider yourself to be a scientist, maybe I can use you for an example of how scientists think?

You have VERY frequently demonstrated that you appear to think repeating the same false thing in public over and over again somehow makes it more true.

I assure you, it's not.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-26 17:30 ([#49350853](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

For some reason Jane doesn't seem to grasp the irony of him lecturing scientists about what scientists think.

Since you consider yourself to be a scientist, maybe I can use you for an example of how scientists think?

You have VERY frequently demonstrated that you appear to think repeating the same false thing in public over and over again somehow makes it more true. I assure you, it's not. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-26\]](#)

Good grief. When have I ever said false things? Since Jane claims this happens "VERY frequently" it should be easy to link to a single, solitary example.

Jane seems to be saying he isn't lecturing scientists about science. That's [absurd](#), Jane. You're lecturing me about what scientists think right here! In fact, you just [accused me](#) of knowingly lying because I've pointed out that your baseless accusations about what scientists think are... baseless accusations.

Jane seems to be stuck in a recursive loop where his baseless accusations of fraudulent bullshit lies spawn more baseless accusations of lying.

The ironic icing on this cake is the fact that Jane **still** hasn't [admitted he was wrong](#) when he repeated the same false Sky Dragon Slayer things in public over and over.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:3)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-26 17:37 ([#49350907](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Oops, I meant to write that "Jane seems to be saying he isn't lecturing scientists about what scientists think."

Lecturing scientists about science is Jane's other hobby.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Re:Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-27 23:04 ([#49359799](#))

Good grief. When have I ever said false things?

Your Slashdot comments are full of them, some of which I have thoughtfully saved for posterity.

I have argued with you about them at the time, but only later mentioned them in self-defense from your personal attacks. Unlike you, I am not trying to discredit you, **except for** defense of your personal attacks. Unlike you, I have only made comments on Slasdot that (should it ever become necessary) I can back up with documentation.

In the meantime, you have been given "plenty of rope to hang yourself", as the saying goes. And to continue the metaphor: you have made an awful lot of effort to put that rope to the use for which it was intended.

If you think I am at all bothered by your lengthy exercises in self-abuse here, you are very much mistaken. The more you do, the more goes into the notebook for later.

I am very patient.

Hey... speaking of which: what happened to that fatal condition you claimed here on Slashdot to have? The one you strongly implied would claim your life in a very short time?

It seems you have outlasted the dreaded (claimed) prognostications you quoted to me. Congratulations! By lying about that too, you have probably broken a record for the unethical ways one may tell lies on Slashdot.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-27 23:18 ([#49359819](#))

[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

As expected, Jane provides absolutely no links to back up any of his accusations. And still no evidence that Jane grasps the irony of his lecturing scientists about what scientists think.

And Jane **still** hasn't [admitted he was wrong](#) when he repeated the same false Sky Dragon Slayer things in public over and over.

... Are you aware that the KKK has historically been tied to the Democratic Party of the U.S.? Look it up.

[\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-16\]](#)

... KKK was a Democrat organization. Look it up.

[\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-01-09\]](#)

... Left-wingers who don't know that the KKK has historically been closely tied to the Democrat party? (Even just Wikipedia will tell you that much.) [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-22\]](#)

And we should never forget that the KKK was primarily a Democrat organization. Many people don't remember that. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-03-08\]](#)

... How easily people forget. Forget, for example, that Southern segregationists ([and even the KKK](#)) were overwhelmingly Democrat over the last century. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-21\]](#)

Pardon the FUCK out of me, but unjustifiably being compared to the KKK would piss A LOT of people off. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2013-05-31\]](#)

Is that why you repeatedly bring up the KKK? Because it's a good way to piss a lot of people off?

Truth: Lincoln also suspended Habeus Corpus. And he

wanted to ban slavery SO HE COULD SHIP ALL THE NEGROES BACK TO AFRICA. ... Lincoln was not much of a "hero". He was a [racist asshole](#). [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-01-18\]](#)

... Abraham Lincoln was a hero of the black people for abolishing slavery, yes? [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-04-26\]](#)

Abe Lincoln: the ultimate "white supremacist". He wanted to end slavery IN ORDER TO send them all back to Africa. #RealHistoryNotSchool [\[Lonny Eachus, 2013-12-17\]](#)

Abe Lincoln was the most openly racist President in history. Obama visiting Lincolns' memorial is a tribute to ignorance. Lincoln wanted to end slavery because HE WANTED TO [SHIP ALL THE BLACKS BACK TO AFRICA](#). It's history. Read it. Get educated. And by the way, yes Lincoln actually TRIED to ship some former slaves away, but it ended in disaster. [Look it the f* up](#). [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-05-26\]](#)

... Lincoln was a racist among racists. Lincoln wanted to end slavery BECAUSE he wanted to [send all the blacks back to Africa](#). He even tried to implement the plan. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-07-07\]](#)

Lincoln did not like negroes. His stated reason for wanting to free them was so that he could ship them back to Africa. He actually sent one ship full of them to the Caribbean as a trial run. Most of those on board died from smallpox. He was preparing a second expedition when the Civil War broke out. ... [\[Jane O. Public, 2015-03-21\]](#)

Gosh, how could anyone admire a man who was assassinated [three days](#) after [proposing](#) that some black people deserved the right to vote? Must be a tribute to ignorance, that's the only answer.

Only one person can save the day. Jane/Lonny Eachus, we need you to leap into action and keep lecturing "the black people" on how ignorant their choices of heroes are. Maybe after enough mansplaining by old white guys, we'll finally be able to heal as a nation.

[Parent](#)
[Share](#)
[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) [g+](#)

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)

by [khayman80](#) (824400) on 2015-03-28 14:34 ([#49362401](#))

[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Lonny [leaps into action](#).

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

[Jane is Lonny Eachus is a pathological liar](#) (Score:1)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-28 21:42 ([#49363651](#))[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)Lonny [leaps into action](#) once again.[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

- [Get 739 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

interlard - vt., to intersperse; diversify -- Webster's New World Dictionary Of The American Language

- [FAQ](#)
- [Story Archive](#)
- [Hall of Fame](#)
- [Advertising](#)
- [Jobs](#)
- [Terms](#)
- [Privacy](#)
- [Cookies/Opt Out](#)
- [About](#)
- [Feedback](#)
-

Switch View to: [Mobile](#) [Mobile View](#)

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2015 Dice. All Rights Reserved.
Slashdot is a [Dice Holdings, Inc.](#) service.

[Close](#)[Slashdot](#)