

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

Search 

[khayman80](#)

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

Follow us:     

“ Want to read Slashdot from your mobile device? Point it at m.slashdot.org and keep reading!

This discussion has been archived.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

[Ask Slashdot: Storing Family Videos and Pictures For Posterity? 160 More Prefs](#)

[Ask Slashdot: Storing Family Videos and Pictures For Posterity?](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load All Comments](#)

14 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

[Insightful](#)

[Informative](#)

[Interesting](#)

[Funny](#)

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

[Geographic redundancy](#) (Score:5, Insightful)

by [Rinisari](#) (521266) [Alter Relationship](#)

I have a NAS that I regularly upgrade with new hard drives when the old ones' warranties expire. I just recently went from 4x 1 TB + 4x 750 GB in two RAID5 arrays to 8x 2TB in RAID6. That NAS is backed up off-site to another, similar NAS at trusted, non-corporate location, but only the parts of it which are 100% irreplaceable: pictures, video, financial paperwork, schoolwork, etc. The drives in the second NAS are from different batch and are 4x 3TB in RAID5.

I've considered also paying for a service like Ama

--

[Colin Dean](#) Go a [year without DRM](#)

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

by [andrew71](#) (134546) [Alter Relationship](#)

Good thinking. I have a similar (but smaller) setup and make the same considerations about cloud storage.

I wonder if you have a strategy to fight bit rot.

--

13-4=54/6

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

by [mlts](#) (1038732) [Alter Relationship](#)

Bit rot needs to be fought on multiple levels. I have wound up (just because it is easier than using multiple programs) using WinRAR with its recovery record feature for long term storage. If there is bit rot, it can be detected and recovered, especially with the 128 bit CRCs that WinRAR 5.x uses.

Drive-wise, it would be nice if someone could come up with a special archive filesystem, preferably with WORM capabilities.

Take UDF. Expand it to the PB realm, not the existing 2TB. Add some ZFS features like d

>

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

by [Jane Q. Public](#) (1010737) [Friend of a Friend](#)[Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-05 23:43 ([#50465615](#))

But what about the bitwise media, as opposed to the hardware media? OP asked about that as well.

It seems obvious that lossless compression is preferable to no compression, and an open-source algorithm should be used. (Like lossless PNGs for stills, FLAC for audio. Video is still kind of up for grabs, and one might have to settle for lossy compression.)

For very long-term storage, you'd want to have the source code for your decompression/display software.

M.disc, as opposed to standard CD or DVD, is expressly intended for long-term storage and retrieval.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-06 0:36 ([#50465701](#))

How is this a "little" [conspiracy rant](#)?

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:2\)](#)**by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)[Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-10 21:13 ([#50500257](#))

How does this have anything to do with the topic under discussion?

If you have specific objections to anything that was written, bring them up! Oh, but wait... I already told you I won't discuss Twitter with you on Slashdot. So never mind.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:0\)](#)**by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-10 21:27 ([#50500289](#))

You also won't discuss Twitter with anyone on Twitter, remember? You just call it a "debate" and say Twitter isn't suitable. But Slashdot doesn't have Twitter's character limits. So don't all your excuses sound pathetic even to you?

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:2\)](#)**by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)[Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-10 22:39 ([#50500527](#))

You also won't discuss Twitter with anyone on Twitter, remember? You just call it a "debate" and say Twitter isn't suitable. But Slashdot doesn't have Twitter's character limits. So don't all your excuses sound pathetic even to you?

I discuss lots of things with lots of people on Twitter. I do not, however, discuss them with you. For reasons which should be obvious to anybody.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:0\)](#)**by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-10 23:26 ([#50500637](#))

It should be obvious even to you that you use Twitter to baselessly accuse NASA, the US NAS, etc. of being liars. But when someone criticizes your incoherent accusations, you claim that you don't "debate" on Twitter. You've done this to many, many people. Not just me. Again, this should be obvious even to you, which is why you're making it so difficult to believe that you're just confused when you accuse NASA of lying.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:2\)](#)**by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)[Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-10 21:28 ([#50500291](#))

However, I **will** reply to something else you stated here on Slashdot:

It's especially amusing that Jane/Lonny cites the exact paper which was already debunked in the links I've repeatedly given him. Since the code I just gave [slashdot.org] Jane/Lonny reproduces figure 2 in Rahmstorf and Vermeer 2011 [pik-potsdam.de], Lonny already had all the code and data he needed to see that Houston and Dean 2011 had been debunked for years.

There are more recent papers (in 2013 and more recently) that debunk the debunkers. We could do that kind of back-and-forth forever. You've proved nothing.

The issue isn't settled. And as for "debunked for years", that's pretty hard to do. 2011 was not that long ago, and if I am not mistaken the original Humlum paper wasn't even actually published until 2012. So if "years" means 3 years, okay. But again, there have been more recent papers as well.

No, I'm not going to "debate" this with you. I was just pointing out some of the sillier things you wrote.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) **[Re:Geographic redundancy \(Score:0\)](#)**by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-10 22:06 ([#50500421](#))

There are more recent papers (in 2013 and more recently) that debunk the debunkers. We could do that kind of back-and-forth forever. You've proved nothing. The issue isn't settled. ... again, there have been more recent papers as well. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Jane, don't you see the irony here? I [repeatedly](#) gave you links and even [gave you](#) ready-to-run source code with data included, all showing that Houston and Dean 2011 was a massive cherry-pick. In response, you actually cited Houston and Dean 2011! Why, if all these other more recent papers (which Jane doesn't even name) supposedly exist? Again, read the 2013 [IPCC AR5 SPM](#):

"Proxy and instrumental sea level data indicate a transition in the late 19th to the early 20th century from relatively low mean rates of rise over the previous two millennia to higher rates of rise (high confidence). It is likely that the rate of global mean sea level rise has continued to increase since the early 20th century."

If Jane is hiding blockbuster peer-reviewed papers that overturn that latest 2013 literature review, why would Jane keep them secret? **Unless they don't exist, and as usual Jane is just 100% bluster.**

... if I am not mistaken the original Humlum paper wasn't even actually published until 2012. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Good grief. Jane, you're slipping again. The Humlum paper [you and other Sky Dragon Slayers promoted](#) had **NOTHING** to do with sea level rise! Here's what the Humlum paper was about:

Paper: atmospheric CO2 *lags* sea-surface temperature change by 12 months or so. Since surface temperature increases occur before CO2 increases, [CO2 could NOT be the cause](#). [bit.ly/YTcYvI \[Lonny Eachus, 2013-02-25\]](#)

Lonny linked to [Humlum et al. 2013](#) which mistakenly claimed that *"Changes in ocean temperatures explain a substantial part of the observed changes in atmospheric CO2 since January 1980."*

A real skeptic would wonder why Humlum et al. analyzed the long-term increase in atmospheric CO2 by taking its time derivative. Differentiation is a [high-pass filter](#) because it amplifies high frequency variations and attenuates slow, long-term variations.

Here's why. If $A(w)$ is the amplitude at angular frequency " w ", its time dependence is $A(w) \cdot \exp(i \cdot w \cdot t)$. Its time derivative is $i \cdot w \cdot A(w) \cdot \exp(i \cdot w \cdot t)$. So taking the time derivative multiplies the amplitude by a large " w " for fast frequencies, and multiplies it by a small " w " for slow, long-term frequencies. This amplifies high frequency variations and attenuates slow, long-term variations.

Since our CO2 emissions increase atmospheric CO2 over the long term, Prof. Humlum's analysis [can't even detect](#) the rise he claims to be analyzing.

However, his method amplifies the faster annual carbon cycle. **Prof. Humlum "discovered" summer and winter.**

[Ferdinand and I](#) and many [others failed](#) to [communicate](#) that ["discovering"](#) the seasons isn't the [groundbreaking](#) discovery that many [contrarians](#) seem to think.

"Principia Scientific International" (which Anthony Watts [calls a "cult"](#) led by John O'Sullivan) is [responsible](#) for Humlum et al. 2013. Prof. Humlum [is a PSI member](#) with an [imaginative website](#). I agree with Lonny Eachus that he could use a [calculus refresher](#). Prof. Humlum might want to tag along.

Sadly, Jane/Lonny doesn't appear to have taken that calculus refresher. Even **after** Jane pretended I made a [good point](#), Lonny **still** kept [regurgitating](#) Humlum's Sky Dragon Slayer claims. And now Jane tries once again to bring up Humlum's Slayer nonsense even though it's not relevant. Why, Jane? How did the Sky Dragon Slayers brainwash you so thoroughly that you can't even retract obviously ridiculous Slayer claims?

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

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) [Foe of a Friend](#) on 2015-09-10 22:32 ([#50500503](#))

And here are some other things I will reply to, since you started this game of replying to comments in other topics. Unlike you, I do not (and will not) make a habit of this, but I'm replying here because I didn't even see [this libelous comment](#) until just now, and replies are now locked.

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?

Because to the best of my knowledge (which YOU prompted me to look up, by the way), none of them have. That guy name Manuel you found (I have no idea how) is not a "member", he is listed as a consultant. There's that attempt to insinuate guilt by association again.

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.

I think Mr. O'Sullivan would be interested to know about your claim that he is a "psychopathic pedophile", and again, you already know that your assertion a "member" of that organization is a "convicted child raper" is false. Even if that Manuel guy had been a member, he isn't a "convicted child raper". And since you saw the charges against him (YOU showed them to me!), you already know that.

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?

I have nothing further to say to you about that which I have not already stated repeatedly, to you and to others, and I have no reason to repeat myself yet again. This assertion is completely baseless, and even if it were not, I don't owe you anything.

So once again you are proven to be lying. "Psychopathic pedophile" is not exactly a friendly phrase, and once again I have to wonder why you're using it, even for someone else, when I have no association with that group, and I personally do not know a single person, either in or out of that group, who has been shown to be a "psychotic pedophile" or "child raper".

So once again: what is your purpose for posting these proven lies, unless it is to try to defame me or imply guilt by association? You still haven't answered that question.

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

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-12 19:29 ([#50511491](#))

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?

... I have nothing further to say to you about that which I have not already stated repeatedly, to you and to others, and I have no reason to repeat myself yet again. This assertion is completely baseless, and even if it were not, I don't owe you anything. So once again you are proven to be lying. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Jane, you owe it to **yourself** to show that you have a shred of intellectual integrity by retracting your Slayer claims. And don't you think the accusations of lying you're [hurling at NASA, CU, the NAS, et al.](#) are undermined when you accuse someone of lying just for noting that you've [spent years](#) regurgitating Slayer claims? Aren't you worried that posterity will find out you were actually "repeating yourself" by continuing to double down on your Slayer nonsense even to the bitter end of [this comment thread](#) where you were repeatedly and politely asked to give your reply to that physics problem which you [insisted](#) you had?

... So once again: what is your purpose for posting these proven lies, unless it is to try to defame me or imply guilt by association? You still haven't answered that question. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

It's so cute how Jane pretends I haven't answered that question. [Once again](#): 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...

Even if Jane/Lonny Eachus thinks his own intellectual integrity is a lost cause, he should at least pretend to show empathy towards others. If only to blend in. He should remember that khalow [went Sky Dragon Slayer](#) because of Jane's argument. Since Jane/Lonny later [seemed to realize](#) this argument violates "[kindergarten-level physics](#)", doesn't Jane have a responsibility to let khalow know that he went Sky Dragon Slayer over a bogus argument that Jane calls "an insult to an adult discussion"?

Otherwise, how does Jane/Lonny justify promoting this [utter bullshit without consequences](#)?

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?

Because to the best of my knowledge (which YOU prompted me to look up, by the way), none of them have. That guy name Manuel you found (I have no idea how) ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Jane/Lonny pretends he has no idea how I found that "guy name Manuel". Has Jane/Lonny ever heard of a website called WattsUpWithThat? Has Jane/Lonny ever [heard](#) of a supposedly "[compelling](#)" book called "[Slaying the Sky Dragon](#)"? If so, how did Jane miss the [first article at WUWT](#) about "Slaying the Sky Dragon"? Just in case Jane [still](#) has no idea even after laboriously reading all the way to the third sentence in that WUWT article:

"... What makes for a sociopath? Largely, it's a self centered egotistical person who does not learn from their mistakes and does not [give a damn](#) about others as they have low / no empathy. They are also, often, very successful as they don't care who they crush or how as they climb to the top of organizations and can be very skilled [social manipulators](#). (There is a strong excess of [sociopaths](#) and sociopathic behaviour at the tops of businesses and especially governments.)" [chiefio.wordpress.com/2015/03/19/are... \[Lonny Eachus, 2015-03-19\]](#)

Lonny probably won't appreciate the irony of omanuel leaving three comments on that article Lonny linked and quoted about how the "leaders of the global warming movement" are sociopaths because omanuel says he was "addicted to the [delusion of power](#) until 1996."

Jane's also [already been told](#) about Manuel's [comments](#) on other articles that Jane/Lonny has linked and quoted, so he probably won't appreciate the irony of "[that Manuel guy](#)" regularly [commenting](#) at [PSI Slayer websites](#) which Jane [told me to go to](#).

Has Jane ever [heard](#) of Prof. Curry's website? That guy Manuel has left [nearly a thousand comments](#) at her website. Just in case Jane/Lonny [still](#) has no idea:

Climate change "dragon slayers" ([wottsupwiththat.com/2010/12/03/new...](#)) John O'Sullivan ([desmogblog.com/affidavits-mic...](#)) & Oliver Manuel

([http://www.mshp.dps.mo.gov/CJ38/OffenderD...](#)) [\[Michael E. Mann\]](#)

So you're saying their social lives should weigh on their scientific arguments? That's called "Ad-Hominem" argument. SHAME!!! [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-09-12\]](#)

Nonsense. Jane has [already been corrected](#) on that incorrect use of "ad hominem". The Slayers are wrong because their "scientific arguments" violate "[kindergarten-level physics](#)". Sadly, some people don't yet understand those physics, so they're easily brainwashed into spending years regurgitating nonsense which violates kindergarten-level physics. Some witnesses would just let the brainwashed victim keep humiliating himself. Others might feel compassion for the victim, and try to help him see clearly by repeatedly [explaining the physics](#) in exhausting detail. Then if that [still](#) doesn't work, their last resort might be trying to help the victim see clearly by pointing out that he's been brainwashed by a cult led by a psychopathic pedophile.

Jane has tended to get angriest when I tell him I'm simply trying to [help him see clearly](#). Why?

... That guy name Manuel you found (I have no idea how) is not a "member", he is listed as a consultant. There's that attempt to insinuate guilt by association again. ... you already know that your assertion a "member" of that organization is a "convicted child raper" is false. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Jane, are you accusing me of lying because of [this asterisk](#) next to his name? The asterisk which, at the very bottom, is said to mean "Consultant/ Friend of PSI"? If so, why did you leave out that context? Has anyone told you that quoting out of context is a bad habit?

So "that Manuel guy" is a "Consultant/ Friend of PSI" along with that dowsing guy Morner who impressed Lonny so much that he violated his own rule about not citing a creationist so he could [repeat Morner's baseless accusations](#) that scientists (at NASA, US NAS, etc.) are lying.

These "Friends of PSI" have been manipulating you for years, Jane/Lonny.

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

Re:Geographic redundancy (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-09-12 19:35 (#50511509)

... Even if that Manuel guy had been a member, he isn't a "convicted child raper". And since you saw the charges against him (YOU showed them to me!), you already know that. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

As usual, the most charitable explanation is that Jane/Lonny keeps defending Oliver K. Manuel because he hasn't actually clicked on the links I've showed him. So before you continue, [click here](#) and tell everyone what crime Manuel was convicted of, and how old the victim was.

Then read the first two paragraphs [here](#) and tell everyone how many of his children said he abused them, and at what ages.

Then read this [courageous testimony](#) and tell everyone **why** Manuel's children finally decided enough was enough. It had to do with a little girl, right? Tell everyone how old she was.

Again, hopefully Jane just hadn't actually clicked on any of those links before continuing to defend Manuel. Can Jane/Lonny prove that he knows the facts by answering those simple questions? If so, could Jane/Lonny **really** look all those victims in the eyes and keep defending Manuel?

I think Mr. O'Sullivan would be interested to know about your claim that he is a "psychopathic pedophile" ... "Psychopathic pedophile" is not exactly a friendly phrase, and once again I have to wonder why you're using it, even for someone else, when I have no association with that group, and I personally do not know a single person, either in or out of that group, who has been shown to be a "psychotic pedophile" or "child rapist". ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-09-10\]](#)

Jane, you've [already been shown](#) that John O'Sullivan wrote (and illustrated!) a book shamelessly bragging about his erotic obsession with an underage schoolgirl. And yet you **still** refuse to apologize for helping O'Sullivan blame his victim.

Jane, read **O'Sullivan's own words** and then ask yourself if you **really** want to keep defending this psychopathic pedophile:

... on my own particular indiscretion my friend still had a further question for me.

"Didn't you say you had some theory that a man can't really be a kiddie fiddler if the object of his affections was a female with the fully-ripened body of a woman?"

Now he was broaching on a facet of this matter I felt peculiarly pertinent to the positing of paedophilia.

"I did indeed. It's all in the hip-to-waist formula! I have my facts to aid my theoretical arguments, too!"

I put my case to him thus: a girl becomes a woman from the time the distribution her body fat attains that Darwinian perfection of a waist to hip ratio of 0.7. That is what makes the fertile female human form so unique. He looked somewhat askance at the implausibility of my opening gambit but I continued with my theory.

"By looking at the female waist to hip ratio, you know when a female is of the right age for reproduction. At that time, and if the mind is mature enough you can argue that you are dealing with a woman and not a child. If nature says she a woman then she is a woman-it's not arbitrary like the age of consent laws that vary so wildly throughout the world from country to country, jurisdiction to jurisdiction."

The frank soft shape of her small breasts was brought out ... Perhaps I should send my wife away on some time consuming trivial errand then ravage my sweet over the dining table? ... Have the chugger's prime view up the little darling's school skirt as she totters and sways as I carelessly hold the ladder, her head hooked into the dark recess while I examine to my fullest contents the divine detail of the folds of her warm panties, just to imagine the tang, oh, to taste! Aerial verb clench. Then sniffing the moist, odorous folds between thigh and pubis. ... those juicy jiggling jugs ... To her closet I plunged where I found a heap of discarded, crumpled items of clothing. I dived down for my treasures and rescued some pink and turquoise skimpy and a bra. There was a wondrous faintly acrid odour in the seam. Pure heaven. ... I waited for my daily fix and for her scent to intoxicate me. She would wear an extra dose just for me, I am sure. I would leer and she would know it then have to give me a peek. I studied the milky silkiness of her breasts appearing to jostle and wanting to break free. And then there was the tightening of that grey skirt on her luscious thighs-it so rises up high. Here I am once more salivating copiously over nubile concepts. Together we both were finding a whole new appreciation of algebra (not her best topic in Mathematics). In more abstract terms I believed whole-heartedly in studying structure, perusing quantity and contemplating relations. Thereafter shall be the chicken choking when the cock comes home to roost. ... I wanted her input as an expert in the one-to-one side of things whether it was wise to engage in such relations with a young girl such as this. ... Rebecca was slouched forward sat on the floor with her silk blouse loosened and opened immodestly. Her left breast was showing a dark nipple. Oh boy! Drunk. ... I imagined my tongue, my nostrils and eyes full of her stocking tops and the casual parting of her upper legs to better savour the soft, damp folds of her womanhood and musky heaven. ... The air was getting thicker with her musk ...

There was never anything remotely sexual going on between her and me!

I admitted that I had set up an Internet account called 'sexihunk' for the purpose of proving that Rebecca van Hiller was a prostitute. I then admitted to sending anonymous text messages via the Internet to her mobile phone suggesting sexual acts with her for ten or twenty pounds. ... You admitted to Officer Godbolt you were the creator of the Sexihunk screen name and thereafter that you sent texts to Miss van Hiller to arrange meeting with her for paid sex. Isn't that true?" Bloom: "Semantics, sir. All semantics. I was arrested for assault and was being scrutinised, questioned just about the details of that alleged assault. My mind was only on those facts and not on precise words about when or whether my stepdaughter or I sent this or that particular text. In fact, the officer never questioned me on when or what particular texts I sent at all!"

She wasn't just a girl. She was a devious, calculating and street-smart psychopath. Evil carnal breech. I was the real victim. ... "Emotions for psychopaths are abstractions, much as they are for Data or Mr. Spock on 'Star Trek'," she said. It struck a chord with me. I had known that detachment myself with Rebecca. Carla had several times said she seemed distant and cold. It also echoed something of my memories of my father - the unfeeling way he would talk at me and not engage with me in conversation. ... Rather than spend my evenings online chatting in cyber space trying to find my next female fancy I started to spend more time doing some meaningful research. I needed it really more than I needed the superficial delights of anonymous women. I was studying myself as much as I was studying Rebecca or my father. I needed to know what it was that made us behave the way we did. I found it easy to find plenty of stuff on psychopaths. Whether it's a "defect" or not, it appeared that the psychopathic personality is an inherited trait (although this would certainly be controversial among psychologists, many of whom would argue that it can be a result of traumatic childhood experiences or brain injuries.) I found other expert's views on this. Kent Bailey (1995) argues that psychopaths should be called "warrior hawks," and that a healthy contingent of them would be necessary for the survival of any primitive band, faced with the need to survive in violent competition with neighbouring tribes. "Warrior Hawks" he concedes, is perhaps a kinder, less judgmental euphemism for the phenomenon. But on the other hand, it might be unfair to those who might favour warfare in some specific set of external circumstances. I was amazed that there appeared to be such a high number of these people out there. "All warrior hawks are psychopaths?" ... "Doctor, do you think Becky may be a psychopath?" ... the so-called three indicators that show the possible presence of psychopathic tendencies in teenagers. The three indicators were bedwetting, cruelty to animals and fire starting. When I read that I could have choked on my doughnut. I seem to remember Rebecca had been a bed wetter and was never really trusted around animals. ... I stumbled upon little gems like the studies on child psychopaths by the Canadian psychologist, Robert Hare. He advised that psychopathic 'precursors' often appear immune to punishment; nothing seems to modify their undesirable behaviour. Consequently parents usually give up, and the behaviour worsens. Carla speculated, "This would explain why Rebecca's father was the way he was. The poor guy got to the end of his rope like we are now." I showed Cookie one particular excerpt I had

found: 'For most of us the idea of a psychopath conjures up images from movies like 'Silence of The Lambs' and characters with names like 'Hannibal Lector.' Fortunately characters like Hannibal don't really exist. Serial killers and people involved in ritual torture are rare, but psychopathic behaviour is more common than we might think.' Mister Hare enlightened the reader that he had known several psychopaths in his life. One was an older teen with no sense of guilt. He knew the rules, but he had no sense of conscience. The only thing that saved him was a mother who loved him, took him to counselling for years and spent a great deal of time patiently teaching him right from wrong. Hare related a conversation where the errant boy confessed, "People know when something is wrong because it feels wrong. I have to remember or be reminded that stealing from someone is wrong. I don't feel bad if I take something." Hare revealed that meeting that boy changed his opinion of a psychopathic personality. Why? Because children with this condition are "emotionally blind." Without help, potentially psychopathic children become adults who never remain attached to anyone or anything for long. They may end up living a "predatory" lifestyle, feeling little or no regret, and having little or no remorse - except when they are caught or about to be locked up. A psychopath is always prone to have problems with society, rules, expectations and relationships. Was my vanilla bean a psychopath? Was she just toying with us for her excitement and entertainment? I certainly felt she was using me to build her self-esteem. I overheard her one afternoon from the window as she waved goodbye to her cronies or the 'randoms' as she put, brought up to the house to gaze at her plush domain and wallow in the glory of my wife and her possessions. Over time it was conspicuous how she seemed to acquaint herself briefly with those lower school misfits. Carlton confided to us that she was 'poncing ciggies' and had heard she gave head to a random for a pound a blow behind the bushes at the old church cemetery. Just wishful thinking on his part, I thought. But he was right about something. Our vanilla certainly had the knack of getting a guy to dip his hand in his pocket and splash out on her. But like Hare says, our little 'precursor' may well involve and get other people into trouble quickly and will have no regret for her actions. I tried to find some box ticking user-friendly guide to test our Becky but found nothing. It appears that to date there is no checklist of behaviour and symptoms that will tell you with certainty whether or not a person is a psychopath. ... Apart from the bedwetting, cruelty to animals and fire setting there was compulsive lying where the deceptions extend well beyond any kid's normal impulse to not be punished. These lies are employed so commonly and so well by the psychopathic mind that it is becomes impossible to know what is lie and what is truth. Lies are not at all necessarily linked to clear objectives. Some of the unwelcome acts that will be present would include truancy theft, aggression to peers and a defiance of authority. Cookie turned to me and said, "Carlton was telling Harriet that Becky has skipped school a lot and had got him to cover up for her." ... I realised what that diary entry really was - a red herring and a clever ruse of psychopathic trickery. I was meant to see that excerpt. I was set up by a cunning schemer and baited and hooked by a con artist's prop. ... BLOOM: Fuck..fuck with my wife..fuck with my daughter..fuck with me...fuck with your family..and I know everything. I know stuff that you don't even think I know..I've got power of you..you don't know what you are dealing with, Rebecca. I'm cleverer than you. I've got money. I've got influence. One thing you are never going to do is contact your sister..I know what you are..Shall I tell you what you are? VAN HILLER: Go on! 02:36 BLOOM: You are a psychopath and I know you are a psychopath..I know you better than anybody..knowing what you have been like for the last three months..come here ... BLOOM: I've asked you to be calm..I need to sit down with you, for an hour, one hour, please do that. Will you do that for me? One hour? And don't walk away from me..you are a fucking nut case..a psychopath and you won't admit it...fuck the way they fuck..sit down. I'll be back in two minutes. Please wait there. Will you do that? Sound of footsteps ... I'm trying to help you. I've done nothing to you...Really fucked your life up. Do you know what? You should not be allowed near children. My professional judgement tells me you should be well away from children...you are a fucking psychopath..I spoke with your fucking sister..and your mother for three hours. ... VAN HILLER: Don't say fucking sister. She ain't a fucking sister, she's a sister. 14:11 BLOOM: ..she hates you and I know that now ... BLOOM: Do you know why? Because you're a fucking psychopath and you won't take treatment. There's something I didn't tell you about psychopaths. They don't know they have got a problem. ... BLOOM: No? Why are you the biggest whore in town? When are you called the biggest whore in town? Lita's shagged more than you..did you know that Lita wanted to fuck me? Did you know that? Did you know she came onto me? She's a fucking whore..she's cleverer than you. You're the dumb one-you're the fucking dumb one. ... BLOOM: ..do you know what? Truth doesn't matter. It's not about truth..people believed to be true. You could be a virgin but if people think you are the biggest whore in town then you are the biggest whore in town. That is what you are Rebecca whether you like it or not. That is the picture people paint of you. Who did it? You did it. I didn't do it. I did everything I could for you. You know, my wife and my fucking daughter have done more for you than anybody and you spit in their faces..that's real fucking back stabbing. ... Her control of the situation surprised me. ... She was the conductor, the ringmaster. It was her tape, her performance and her script we played out. She waited for her moment. ... psychopaths. They thrive by predatory instinct, too. Criminal but cunning to avoid prison with chameleon charm with the abilities to cut a swathe through society with a scythe of evil leaving a wake of ruined lives. Hare said it 'emotion for the psychopath is like a second language,' one she struggles to speak and never masters - deep down. ... The psychopath. It all fitted her purpose. Glib when it suited or friendly and easy-going, then in an instant switched back to her stock in trade performance as the hapless victim. She was truly devoid of the petty anxieties that trouble most of us. No conscience. Her wooden tops had all been danced around to the merry tune of a masterful puppeteer. ... I told myself it was the psychopathic tendency that possessed her. She was always out to sway that particular whomsoever she had chosen. ... I acted in partnership with my family to bring her reign of terror to an end. She is a psychopath and capable of real evil. I had to stop her! ... Another hour then comes and goes. Still more questions. No one offers me a glass of water. Ushers don't give graces to accused men only 'victims.' My head thumped with pain and my sore throat was parched so as my voice failed me more and more. I husked and coughed my answers. ... [\[John O'Sullivan, 2008\]](#)

Note how O'Sullivan deludes himself into claiming that he "was the real victim" of a "psychopath" and also admits sending sexual texts to that teenage girl "psychopath". It's VERY hard to believe O'Sullivan even believes himself when he claims "There was never anything remotely sexual going on between her and me!"

And yet O'Sullivan brazenly keeps lying and [projecting](#) his [faults](#) onto [scientists](#), apparently in an attempt to show that he's **incapable** of feeling shame. Even more surprisingly, **Jane Q. Public keeps defending this psychopathic pedophile**. Why, Jane? How did the Sky Dragon Slayers brainwash you so thoroughly?

[You have been manipulated](#). Wise up. [Reserve your anger](#) for the people who did that, not everybody else.

[Parent](#)
[Share](#)
[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Slashdot](#)
[Archived Discussion](#)
[Get 160 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](#)