


Stories Firehose > All Popular Polls Deals [Submit](#)


Search 

khayman80

Topics: [Devices](#) [Build](#) [Entertainment](#) [Technology](#) [Open Source](#) [Science](#) [YRO](#)

Follow us:     

“ Slashdot is powered by [your submissions](#), so send in your scoop



This discussion has been archived.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

[Do You Have a Right To Use Electrical Weapons?](#) [672 More Prefs](#)

[Do You Have a Right To Use Electrical Weapons?](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load 500 More Comments](#)

[26 Full](#) [0 Abbreviated](#) [0 Hidden](#)

Comments Filter:

Score:

[5 insightful](#)

[4 informative](#)

[3 interesting](#)

[2 funny](#)

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

0'es (Score:5, Insightful)

by [EmagGeek \(574360 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

[The Constitution](#) does not say "firearms." It says "arms."

"Arms" include firearms, electrical weapons, slingshots, bows and arrows, and any other sort of weapon.

Re: (Score:3)

by [Adriax \(746043 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

I wonder if concealed carry permits cover broadswords?

--

I don't suffer from insanity, I enjoy every minute of it!

Yes, in many states... (Score:3)

by [PortHaven \(242123 \)](#) [Foe of a Friend](#)

In many states the permits simply state the right to bear a concealed weapon. Hence often referenced as a concealed weapons permit.

It's one of my objections with the Pennsylvania permit, while it is one of the best states for personal firearms possession. The permit is worded specifically as a "License To Carry Firearms" (LTCF)

Re: (Score:2)

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

Washington did that too, about 15 years ago or so. It used to be a "concealed weapons permit", now it's a "concealed pistol permit". I don't like the change.

Considering the year the Constitution was ratified, a baseball bat is also a "thoroughly modern invention". I don't think that argument holds much water.

Re: (Score:-1)

by Anonymous Coward

2C target old idea, phys unsafe, see @KenCaldeira thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/0... "There is some noise around the idea that it useful to think about some amount of 'allowable CO2 emissions budget' that would keep the world under 2 C of global warming. ..."

[[Peter Shepherd, 2015-08-11](#)]

Then @KenCaldeira should commit suicide immediately. He emits 40,000 ppm CO2. Talk about unacceptable levels! @tan123 [[Lonny Eachus,](#)

[2015-08-11/](#)

No, Lonny. Your despicable statement was morally **and** scientifically wr

[Re: \(Score:1\)](#)

by [Falconhell \(1289630 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

I nominate this post for the APK award for best dijointed irrational rant of the week.

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

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

Also, if you think that post was something, you should see some of his others over the years.

I have given up telling him to seek help. I have engaged one attorney so far, and he has recommended another, who is more of a specialist in this sort of thing.

While Slashdot tries to pretend it is immune from objections to this sort of behavior, it does have certain obligations it has not seen fit to bother to enforce, and I strongly suspect that should a lawsuit arise, Slashdot will be listed as one of the r

[Re: \(Score:-1\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

Jane/Lonny Eachus aces his [hypocrisy final](#) for [bragging about](#) how he's [desperately trying](#) to [silence/censor/suppress/stifle](#) the [speech](#) of [others](#).

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

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

This comment is even more astounding than most of your others. Not all, but most.

THIS time, you have **not** just misrepresented my words, but turned them around 180Â°.

That's called **lying**, man. Just plain lying. Of course, I've caught you at it before, but it has seldom been quite so blatant.

[Re: \(Score:0\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

Or Jane/Lonny Eachus is the world's most blatant hypocrite. And since you're [shamelessly bragging](#) about being a good liar...

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

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

Or Jane/Lonny Eachus is the world's most blatant hypocrite. And since you're shamelessly bragging about being a good liar...

No, since you insist on bringing this up, let's revisit this. Because you will, just as hilariously as before, lose this one too.

You have often claimed I have been "pretending to be" a woman, mainly because I made a comment long ago that "most people who bothered to look" called me a gal. I let your snide comments slide for a long time, because I believe in giving people "enough rope".

When **finally** I felt it was no longer funny watching you thrash about lost in your own inanity, I deigned to explain th

[Re: \(Score:-1\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

It's a fucking pseudonym, twerp. ... One of these days -- and there is even the possibility it will be in court -- I will tell you why I chose to use the pseudonym "Jane Q. Public". And when I do, there is a very good chance you will look pretty foolish. I am deliberately understating.

Let me guess: you wanted to [make all women look bad](#) by acting out the worst sexist stereotypes of women, and wanted a more credible way to [accuse women](#) of being able to "control your behavior" and "decide whether or not you ar

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

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

Let me guess: you wanted to make all women look bad by acting out the worst sexist stereotypes of women, and wanted a more credible way to accuse women of being able to "control your behavior" and "decide whether or not you are a criminal" unless we legalize up-skirt panty shots?

Your "guesses" have been no better than your outright lies. Wrong on all counts.

And endlessly quoting yourself about past fabrications is... well... weird. Not that your other behavior has been exactly normal. You really do seem to live

in your own little world. Which would be fine, if you just stayed there.

I think it's rather hilarious that you quote fantasies of your own that were previously shown to be wrong, to support your current fantasies. There's a name for that, too.

And thanks once again f

[Re: \(Score:-1\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

So you deny saying that women would be able to "[control your behavior](#)" and "decide whether or not you are a criminal" unless we legalize up-skirt panty shots?

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

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

Just so we're clear, here is a statement from an attorney about this habit of yours. You can find the same information in many places:

Putting a question mark at the end of a statement when it's meant to be a statement can still lead to liability.

Also, from a law school:

Defamatory statements can come in the form of questions as well, especially if the question implies certain facts about the person who is being questioned. For example:

A radio DJ, during an interview, asks his guest "when did you stop beating your wife?" This question carries the implication that the guest has been beating his wife. Thus, there is a defamatory implication to the question and the guest may have a viable cause of action against the radio DJ.

Your long history of making statements similar to the one you made above, some with question marks and some without, has made your intent very clear.

You don't get a pass just because you put a "?" at the end of a defamatory sentence.

[Re: \(Score:0\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

LOL. Remember that next time you Just-Ask-Questions that Just-So-Happen to smear **yet another** mainstream scientist.

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

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

As I have pointed out to you many times, there is a world of difference between making statements you have reason to believe are true, and your brand of dishonest character assassination attempts.

>

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:0\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-02 15:19 ([#50446423](#))

As I have pointed out to you many times, there **ISN'T** a world of difference between your statements, and dishonest character assassination attempts.

Outside of Jane's bizarre PSI Sky Dragon Slayer world, very few people are going to believe that Slayers are actually stupid/insane enough that they were simply making statements they have reason to believe are true.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)[Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-03 1:27 ([#50449283](#))

There you go again. You have just illustrated a very real difference, and made my point for me.

You have been told many times that I am not a "sky dragon slayer". Whether I might have been once, in your opinion, is another matter. But you talk about years ago as though it were today, in **precisely** the calculated way that would give someone else the wrong impression.

That's dishonest. Unlike an honest mistake, it's a form of deliberate lying.

I am not (and have not been) the liar here, you are. You might try to excuse yourself for that in many different ways, but it hasn't worked.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:-1\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-03 1:58 ([#50449363](#))

Jane, [remember that](#) you [spent years and hundreds](#) of [pages desperately regurgitating Latour's Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense](#).

Jane/Lonny Eachus hasn't retracted his endless Sky Dragon Slayer claims, and **continues** to spread Slayer misinformation. Years don't fix this problem, Lonny. Not unless you retract your Slayer claims and find it in your heart to stop spreading Slayer misinformation. But that's probably asking the impossible, because Jane/Lonny Eachus is so brainwashed that he went above and beyond the call of duty by joining Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan in [blaming his teenage victim](#), and [wrongly insisted](#) that none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (John O'Sullivan's Sky Dragon Slayer club) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing. If Jane/Lonny Eachus really isn't a Sky Dragon Slayer, **at the very least** he'd retract his mistaken claim that no Slayers have been convicted of sexual wrongdoing, and admit that Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan is an admitted pedophile.

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

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:-1\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-03 4:26 ([#50449705](#))

Jane, are you still confused about why you aced your hypocrisy final by [bragging](#) about how you've been desperately trying to silence/censor/suppress /stifle the speech of others?

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

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \) Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-03 17:52 ([#50454361](#))

Jane, are you still confused about why you aced your hypocrisy final by bragging about how you've been desperately trying to silence/censor/suppress /stifle the speech of others?

Another of your outrageous distortions. Mentioning that I discussed your legal transgressions with an attorney has absolutely nothing to do either bragging or censorship.

But as the Supreme Court has said many times, your "freedom of speech" is limited. You legally get to say whatever you want, about whoever you want, under any circumstances, with gross disregard for the truth.

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

[Re:Yes, in many states... \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \) Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-03 18:08 ([#50454431](#))

Nothing I did was "desperate", nor was I "regurgitating" Latour. Why do you lie so much?

Jane/Lonny Eachus hasn't retracted his endless Sky Dragon Slayer claims, and continues to spread Slayer misinformation.

Bullshit. What "slayer misinformation" do you pretend I "continue" to spread? Just another lie. You seem to have no respect for the truth whatsoever.

But that's probably asking the impossible

What is asking for the impossible, is asking me to stop doing something I'm not doing.

But that's probably asking the impossible, because Jane/Lonny Eachus is so brainwashed that he went above and beyond the call of duty by joining Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan in blaming his teenage victim, and wrongly insisted that none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (John O'Sullivan's Sky Dragon Slayer club) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing. If Jane/Lonny Eachus really isn't a Sky Dragon Slayer, at the very least he'd retract his mistaken claim that no Slayers have been convicted of sexual wrongdoing, and admit that Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan is an admitted pedophile.

More blatant lies, with utter disregard to what you know to be the truth. Here were my actual words. The rest of your nonsense is links to other sources, or you quoting **yourself** again.

To the best of my knowledge, none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (which seems from the context is pretty obviously who he is referring to) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing of any kind. O'Sullivan was once accused of improper sexual conduct by a known troubled (and repeatedly IN trouble) teenager his family was trying to help. He was acquitted of all charges, as khayman80 already knows. If he knew about the charges, it is only reasonable to believe he knew about the acquittal as well.

Note the words "to the best of my knowledge". O'Sullivan had been **accused** of improper conduct, but was found **not guilty** by a jury of his peers. As for any other **non-criminal** conduct in his personal life, I have no knowledge or interest whatsoever.

Further, as I indicated to you, the only person **of whom I was aware**, who could possibly be the subject of your ranting was O'Sullivan. So imagine my surprise when you linked to a page about someone named Manuel who was completely unknown to me. Further yet, as I told you at the time, I had no idea who were "members" of the Sky Dragon Slayers, nor did I care, nor was I a member myself. So you knew all this, yet posted all this bullshit anyway.

So what is your point here? Some kind of attempt to show guilt by association? Some kind of attempt at sexual harassment? Because I have never so much as met any of these people, and I didn't even know of the existence of some of them until YOU pointed them out to me.

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

Re:Yes, in many states... (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a FriendFoe of a Friend on 2015-09-03 18:14 (#50454463)

My keyboard and spell-corrector have worked against me today.

The above should have read:

... nothing to do WITH either bragging or censorship.

and

You DO NOT legally get to say whatever you want...

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **Re:Yes, in many states... (Score:0)**

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-03 19:34 (#50454835)

Nothing I did was "desperate", nor was I "regurgitating" Latour. Why do you lie so much?

Jane, the **most charitable explanation** is that you were simply regurgitating Latour rather than repeating his civilization-paralyzing misinformation in full knowledge that it violated what you call "kindergarten-level physics". But very few people will believe that **most charitable explanation** unless you can find it in your heart to finally retract your Slayer claims.And nothing mainstream scientists have done is "desperate" but that doesn't stop Jane/Lonny Eachus from repeatedly projecting his own desperation onto them. Should we ask why Jane/Lonny Eachus lies so much, or just accept that "desperate" is a subjective judgment and that "[discussions](#)" about [semantics](#) are useless?

Jane/Lonny Eachus hasn't retracted his endless Sky Dragon Slayer claims, and continues to spread Slayer misinformation.

Bullshit. What "slayer misinformation" do you pretend I "continue" to spread? Just another lie. You seem to have no respect for the truth whatsoever. ...

What is asking for the impossible, is asking me to stop doing something I'm not doing.

I'll debunk all the Slayer misinformation you continue to spread. But you'll have to be patient (just like [when you demanded](#) that I debunk Latour's nonsense in the first place) because I'm still working on about a dozen debunkings of all the other libelous accusations you've hurled at mainstream scientists. Would you like me to debunk your Slayer misinformation **before** or **after** I debunk all the times you've accused mainstream scientists of fraud because they told you what scientists think?

So what is your point here? Some kind of attempt to show guilt by association? Some kind of attempt at sexual harassment? Because I have never so much as met any of these people, and I didn't even know of the existence of some of them until YOU pointed them out to me.

Wow! Jane, you **still** don't see the irony of your "[sexual harassment](#)" [rants](#)?Jane, you spent years regurgitating Latour's nonsense and loudly insisting he was correct. Don't you remember [repeatedly claiming](#) to be happy to admit your mistakes? Once again, I gave you another opportunity to show that you have a shred of intellectual integrity by retracting your Slayer claims. And once again, you've declined...Note the words "to the best of my knowledge". O'Sullivan had been **accused** of improper conduct, but was found **not guilty** by a jury of his peers. As for any other **non-criminal** conduct in his personal life, I have no knowledge or interest whatsoever. Further, as I indicated to you, the only person **of whom I was aware**, who could possibly be the subject of your ranting was O'Sullivan. So imagine my surprise when you linked to a page about someone named Manuel who was completely unknown to me. Further yet, as I told you at the time, I had no idea who were "members" of the Sky Dragon Slayers, nor did I care, nor was I a member myself. So you knew all this, yet posted all this bullshit anyway.Jane, that's ridiculous. Maybe Jane/Lonny really **didn't** know that O'Sullivan later [admitted](#) his "fact-based crime story of a teacher's struggle to control his erotic obsession with a schoolgirl."If Jane/Lonny really **didn't** know that, then he would apologize for helping a psychopathic pedophile blame his victim. Jane still hasn't apologized, but if he does posterity might find it easier to believe that he was just innocently manipulated by John O'Sullivan the same way O'Sullivan manipulated that teenage girl who had the misfortune to be the target of O'Sullivan's erotic obsession.If Jane/Lonny Eachus really didn't know that he was wrong to claim that no Slayers have been convicted of sexual wrongdoing, then he could easily show that by retracting his claim. But he **still** hasn't done that, even though he's had months to find the necessary few seconds. Why not, Jane?And if Jane/Lonny really **didn't** know that Latour is a vice chairman of O'Sullivan's "PSI" Slayer group, then that would help explain why he was so easily fooled. Maybe Jane/Lonny just wrongly thought Latour was some kind of independent expert and didn't realize that (best case scenario) Latour had been brainwashed by the cult led by that psychopathic pedophile with the convicted child rapist member.

But again, it's VERY hard to believe that Jane/Lonny Eachus was just honestly fooled by that cult as long as he refuses to retract his Slayer claims. Don't you want to show that you have a shred of intellectual integrity by retracting your Slayer claims?

Parent

Share

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **Re:Yes, in many states... (Score:0)**

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-03 19:52 (#50454931)

LOL! Jane, for **years** you've been hurling libelous and baseless accusations against mainstream scientists. You're just figuring out **now** that people aren't supposed to exhibit such a gross disregard for truth? And furthermore, you don't even seem to realize this applies to **Jane/Lonny too?** (Yes, this is still true even though Jane's such a **special Mensa snowflake**.) And you also don't even seem to realize that you **were** bragging about trying to get attorneys to help you censor speech that you mistakenly thought exhibited a gross disregard for truth? Sadly, that hypocrisy [isn't surprising](#) coming from

Jane/Lonny Eachus.

Parent

Share

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

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

[Get 672 More Comments](#)

[Submit Story](#)

Man is an animal that makes bargains: no other animal does this-- no dog exchanges bones with another. -- Adam Smith

[FAQ](#)

[Story Archive](#)

[Hall of Fame](#)

[Advertising](#)

[Terms](#)

[Privacy](#)

[Opt Out Choices](#)

[About](#)

[Feedback](#)

[Mobile View](#)

[Blog](#)

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2016 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved.

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)