

Follow us:     

“ Please **create an account** to participate in the Slashdot moderation system

Nickname:

Password: 6-1024 characters long


Public Terminal

[Forgot your password?](#)

[Close](#)



[Richard Stallman Challenges 'Misleading' Coverage of His Comments on Marvin Minsky](#)
([stallman.org](#)).

 Posted by EditorDavid on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:35PM from the MIT-emails dept.

Richard Stallman [posted a new update today on his personal site](#). "I want to respond to the misleading media coverage of

messages I posted about Marvin Minsky's association with Jeffrey Epstein." *The coverage totally mischaracterised my statements. Headlines say that I defended Epstein. Nothing could be further from the truth. I've called him a "serial rapist", and said he deserved to be imprisoned. But many people now believe I defended him -- and other inaccurate claims -- and feel a real hurt because of what they believe I said.*

I'm sorry for that hurt. I wish I could have prevented the misunderstanding.

On MIT's internal Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory (CSAIL) listerv, Stallman had seen the description of a protest of Marvin Minsky which said Minsky was "accused of assaulting" one of Epstein's victims. Stallman argued that "the most plausible scenario" is that "she presented herself to him as entirely willing" -- even if she was coerced by Epstein into doing so -- whereas the phrase "assaulting" implies the use of force or violence, faciliating what he calls "accusation inflation... Whatever conduct you want to criticize, you should describe it with a specific term that avoids moral vagueness about the nature of the criticism."

An angry MIT alumni who was forwarded the email then "started emailing reporters -- local and national, news sites, newspapers, radio stations" -- and then not receiving quick enough responses, [published it herself in a Medium essay](#) titled "Remove Richard Stallman. And everyone else horrible in tech." And then [leaked the whole thread to Vice](#).



news rms !sjw 

→

[Europe's Space Industry Is Working On Reusable Rockets With Environmentally-Friendly Fuel](#)
[Richard Stallman Resigns From MIT](#)

[GNU's Former Kernel Maintainer Shares 'A Reflection on the Departure of Richard Stallman'](#)

[Java EE 'Goes All In' on Open Source with Jakarta EE 8](#)

[Richard Stallman Challenges 'Misleading' Coverage of His Comments on Marvin Minsky. 272 More | Reply](#)
[Login](#)

[Richard Stallman Challenges 'Misleading' Coverage of His Comments on Marvin Minsky](#)

[Post](#) [Load All Comments](#)

[Full Story](#) [Abbreviated URL](#) [Create an Account](#)

Comments Filter:

- [All](#)
- [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.

>1

[Taking out the open source movement with the SJWs!](#)

(Score:5, Insightful)
 by The Narra (688488) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:42PM (#59194770)
 Password: 6-1024 characters long
 Great way to undermine a movement. This construe something someone said and then sic the outrage mob on them. It's a classic move. Bitcoin, Linux, and you win. No one should have control over their own software. It should all be in the cloud governed by faceless public corporations who can always blame any transgressions on careless subordinates and have their leadership replaced and changed at whim by their shadowy owners. Seriously, this whole COC movement seems tailor made to ruin people who could present any independent leadership of open source through fake allegations magnified by social media.

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)
[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

• [Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ](#)

(Score:5, Informative)
 by Anonymous Coward on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:19PM (#59194906)
 It appears that the author's full name (Selam Jie Gano) was left out of the summary and Medium article.
<https://selamgano.wordpress.co...> [wordpress.com]
 If you're going to say something then take full ownership. (AC posting irony noted)

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)
[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■ [Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ](#)

(Score:5, Insightful)

by Anonymous Coward on Sunday September 15, 2019

@05:43AM ([#59196066](#))

After looking over her attempt to summon a rage mob against RMS, reading RMS's response to her screed, and RMS's original statement that triggered her, as far as I'm concerned, she's unemployable. Nobody needs that kind of shit in their workplace.

Selam Jie Gano, enjoy your future in the food service industry.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[Re: \(Score:2, Insightful\)](#)**
by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#)
I'm one of RMS's biggest fans, but he screwed up here. If we can't say that without "undermining the movement" then we have a problem, because apparently the movement isn't bigger than just RMS and legitimate criticism isn't allowed.

-
- **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**
by [OldMugwump \(4760237 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @07:05PM ([#59195178](#)) [Homepage](#)
Read what RMS actually said, not what the press claimed he said.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[the original deposition says \(and doesn't say\)... \(Score:5, Informative\)](#)**
by [XXongo \(3986865 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @08:12PM ([#59195306](#)) [Homepage](#)
Read what RMS actually said, not what the press claimed he said.
And more importantly, read what [the deposition](#) [google.com] says. And what it doesn't say.
It says she was *instructed* to have sex with Minsky. It says she went to the private island *in order to* have sex with Minsky.
...but what it doesn't say is that she actually *had* sex with Minsky.
(It also says that she doesn't remember how old she was. She wrote down all the details about ten years or so after the events discussed... and then burned it.)
The deposition is here: <https://drive.google.com/file/...> [google.com]

(the part dealing with Minsky is on page 204, which (confusingly) is page 182 of the pdf)

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■ **[Re:the original deposition says \(and doesn't say\).](#)**

(Score:5, Insightful)

by [arglebargle_xiv](#) ([2212710](#)) on Sunday September 15, 2019 @01:15PM ([#59196836](#))

Is it just me or does that whole story sound completely bogus? Let's look at the facts, some random skank gets flown to the private island of a sleazy guy old enough to be her father with no suspicion at all that he may be interested in her body rather than her extensive knowledge of financial market regulations, has sex with a guy in his eighties who until now has no record of ever being interested in young women despite presumably being surrounded by them while he was a MIT, can't remember when it happened, how old she was, or indeed anything else except that an octogenarian had sex with her, oh, and she burned any evidence she claims she had.

Yeah, that's a really plausible story. I mean... Minsky? Sheesh, at least pick someone plausible like Clinton or Trump where there's a good chance they'd actually have done it.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■ **[Re:the original deposition says \(and doesn't say\).](#)**

(Score:4, Informative)

by [sabt-pestnu](#) ([967671](#)) on Monday September 16, 2019 @12:52PM ([#59199804](#))

There are good reasons that crimes like rape have statutes of limitations. To me, it's not so much that these accusations sound bogus as they sound like recollections from many, many years ago. Details are vastly important, when you are accusing someone of a crime, and time modifies memories, and can even create ones where they weren't before.

Did this happen precisely as she has describe? Almost absolutely not. Did it happen roughly as she describes (assuming no intentional lies)? Could be. Can it be proven at this point? Nope.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■ **[Re: \(Score:3, Interesting\)](#)**

by [Actually, I do RTFA](#) ([1058596](#))

Whether Minsky had sex with her or turned her down seems important. The entire first third and last third of your paragraph that is victim blaming is unimportant, immaterial and serves only to cloud the issue.

You don't get to say "this child made bad choices" and therefore what happened to her is her fault. You don't get to say "this child had sex that was a bad idea it was her fault". You don't get to say that "this sexual assault victim decided not to speak up for years and therefore is a bit hazy about

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

by [sg_oneill \(159032 \)](#)

" random skank"

Well thats a rather uncharitable way to talk about a child.

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

by [arglebargle_xiv \(2212710 \)](#)

A trafficked sex slave who waited more than ten years to report it to the police, pretty much guaranteeing that not only will all evidence have vanished but the statute of limitations will probably have expired even if some evidence does miraculously turn up?

-
- **[Re:the original deposition says \(and doesn't say\).](#)**
(Score:4, Insightful)

by [Ol Olsoc \(1175323 \)](#) on Monday September 16, 2019 @09:07PM ([#59201380](#))

A trafficked sex slave who waited more than ten years to report it to the police, pretty much guaranteeing that not only will all evidence have vanished but the statute of limitations will probably have expired even if some evidence does miraculously turn up?

There is something about this long waiting period that is rather strange. My wife was assaulted by a co-worker, reported it to me immediately, then the business owner, who flew down immediately and took care of everything. the whole system worked, and it worked fast and well. She was not subjected to any of the things that women who have waited for years claim would have happened to them if they reported it immediately. And with all of the support, very little psychological damage.

The business of waiting until long after the statute of limitations just gives the whole thing a strange list of "why's".

Why would a young woman of intelligence accept such an invitation?

Why would she engage in sex with a creepy old guy after foolishly accepting such an invitation?

Why - if after all of this, would she not march straight to a police station upon returning home and report that she was raped?

Why would she wait so long to report it.

And the biggest why - why would anyone that doesn't agree that due process must be eliminated, or asks any questions about the process is just met with outrage - as if they as supporting the alleged rapist. We are now ordered to believe unquestionably, any statement made by any woman, at any time. #believeher .

I dunno. I don't believe that *men* are always truthful! But all men and all women are sometimes truthful, sometimes not.

Extending an unimpeachable veracity and inability to dissemble to all women seems a bit odd don't we think?

There are actual trials in actual courts of law where yes, women have been found to lie under oath. This using evidence and investigation, and due process.

Was she dissembling? Gaw - who knows? It's a complicated world. I'm willing to believe something might have happened. But the concept of whether it was consensual or not is another matter. It certainly would have lent a lot of credence to her version of events if she would have immediately reported it. I know people who have experience in this matter.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [arglebargle_xiv \(2212710 \)](#)

There's a pretty good reason why she waited so long, and specifically until after Minsky was dead and could no longer defend himself: It's because [nothing happened](#) [archive.is]. Note that even the crappy original NYT story never tries to claim that anything happened, and [Greg Benford](#) [wikipedia.org], who was there with Minsky, says specifically that nothing happened.

OTOH "Girl who may or may not have been underage only she can't remember propositions octogenerian who politely turned her down" doesn't make for nearly as good a headline

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [swillden \(191260 \)](#)

Read what RMS actually said, not what the press claimed he said.

And read it as a pedant, paying extreme attention to the precise definitions of the words used, and with little to no understanding of cultural context or subtext. Because RMS is such a pedant, with such limited understanding of context and subtext, and that's how he speaks. As soon as I saw the first criticism on Twitter, I knew it was going to be a case of RMS saying something precisely scoped, meaning no more

and no less than exactly what he said, and his critics analyzing it as they would "normal" lan

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [shanen \(462549\)](#)

I'm one of RMS's biggest fans, but he screwed up here. If we can't say that without "undermining the movement" then we have a problem, because apparently the movement isn't bigger than just RMS and legitimate criticism isn't allowed.

That's kind of where I started on this topic. Then I started thinking about a question that rms sent me in an email exchange some years ago. Turned out it was a much deeper and more insightful question than it seemed at first. I had to significantly modify the economic model that I was working on at the time, even though Stallman's main surface point was that he could not care less about such trivialities as money and economic models for "free" software. (My new economic model became much more symmetric, po

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [jcr \(53032\)](#)

Apparently, Epstein just enjoyed hanging out with leading scientists. Not everything in his life was about gaining money, power, and sex.

-jcr

■

○ **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ \(Score:5, Interesting\)](#)**

by [gbjbaanb \(229885\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @06:31PM ([#59195078](#))

Its the new way - from Sir Tim Hunt who was shamed for some remarks that one of the outrage mob arbitrarily decided deserved public attack.

I'm certain it is all to ensure free thought is crushed, like a boot stamping on a human face, forever.

(And don't even start with the MeToo movement, where one woman was driven to suicide by the mob because she was with Rose McGowan when the alleged Weinstein assault occurred, [and remembered events differently to those presented as fact](#) [spiked-online.com])

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

■

■

■

■ **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ \(Score:4, Interesting\)](#)**

by [Cedric \(9623 \)](#) on Sunday September 15, 2019

@11:01AM (#59196508) [Journal](#)

I think she misunderstood his contribution to the conversation and why it's a legitimate one that in no way denigrates the victims of sexual assault.

Indeed, if anything he's seeking to protect victims of assault by assuring that their suffering isn't perceived as lesser due to the watering down of the term.

That she's using this misunderstanding to push a misandrist policy of denigrating men makes her an imbecile that requires strong criticism for her sexism.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-

■ **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ](#)**
(Score:5, Insightful)

by [Cedric \(9623 \)](#) on Sunday September 15, 2019

@12:11PM (#59196678) [Journal](#)

If a woman walks up to you, grabs your crotch, smiles at you while maintaining eye contact and says, "Hi there Big Boy, your room or mine?"

Yep, you're guilty of sexual assault there, right? I mean, you just touched her with your penis.

So in fact you have it backwards.

No, I understand very clearly that it's extremely possible to be unaware that the person with whom you're interacting is being coerced.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [Cedric \(9623 \)](#)

No, because I just described what may be exactly the experience that Minsky may have had, and you've just run away screaming like a small child because you know you've lost the argument.

Run away little child, I won't chase.

-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#)

I was referring to your standard tactic of throwing out a ridiculous straw man in the hope that the other person goes on the defensive. The bog standard "never play defence" strategy.

-
-

[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ](#)**(Score:5, Interesting)**by [rednip \(186217\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019@06:38PM ([#59195094](#)) [Journal](#)

While an early advocate, RMS is not the open source movement; conflating the two is the work of 'useful idiots' with a variety of agendas.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-
- **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the SJ](#)**

(Score:5, Informative)by [Penroze \(3517299\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019@06:39PM ([#59195098](#))

Uhhhh you DO know that Stallman also defended pedophilia [thenextweb.com]...right?

No, he didn't. First of all he was trying to get things defined accurately, He was objecting to the word assault here. Agree or disagree with that definition, but I think people are still allowed to make arguments and aren't "defending pedophilia" when they want to distinguish between statutory rape, and assault. Two completely different things.

Secondly, pedophilia is defined as attracting to PRE-PUBESCENT CHILDREN. The girl in question was 17, not 12.

Here's the wikipedia entry if you don't believe me:

Pedophilia (alternatively spelt paedophilia) is a psychiatric disorder in which an adult or older adolescent experiences a primary or exclusive sexual attraction to prepubescent children.[1][2] Although girls typically begin the process of puberty at age 10 or 11, and boys at age 11 or 12,[3] criteria for pedophilia extend the cut-off point for prepubescence to age 13.[4]

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/...> [wikipedia.org]

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-
- **[Re: Taking out the open source movement with the S](#)**

(Score:5, Informative)by [reanjr \(588767\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019@06:51PM ([#59195136](#)) [Homepage](#)

Paedophilia has nothing to do with consent. It has to do with biological sexual maturity. Just because you don't

know what words mean doesn't mean you should take out your ignorant interpretations on other people.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■
 ■
 ■ **[I think you missed their point \(Score:5, Informative\)](#)**

by [BankRobberMBA](#) ([4918083](#)) on Sunday September 15, 2019 @10:11AM ([#59196382](#))

RMS, Penroze, and reanjr are arguing definitions and differentiating between actions and orientations.

Hairyfeet seems to think any kind of discussion or disagreement on the issue constitutes a defense of baby-f_ckers.

A guy who desires sex with children is a pedophile, even if he never acts on that desire. If he's never around children, never looks at child porn, whatever, he's still a pedophile. Nothing to do with consent, because there is no act to consent to.

A guy who gets drunk at a party and has sex with a 16 year old girl (or I think 13 in Florida) has committed statutory rape. Statutory rape is about consent because she is not legally competent to GIVE consent. Similar issues arise with intoxicated people and people with some disabilities.

A guy who has sex with a 10 year old is BOTH a pedophile and a rapist (as well as weapons-grade creepy). I think RMS was arguing about definitions (because that's kind of what he does, not the most socially clueful guy walking around).

Penroze was pointing out that arguing about definitions is not the same as defending pedophiles.

reanjr just pointed out that hairyfeet's arguments about consent had nothing to do with the definitions argument.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■
 ■ **[Not pedophilia \[Re:Taking out the open source'\] \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**

by [XXongo](#) ([3986865](#)) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @07:47PM ([#59195262](#)) [Homepage](#)

Uhhhh you DO know that Stallman also defended pedophilia...right?

No, he didn't. [...]

... pedophilia is defined as attracting to PRE-PUBESCENT CHILDREN. The girl in question was 17, not 12.

Oh good lord trying to defend pedophilia because it involves someone you like...you sir are seriously fucked up, do you know that?

No, you missed the point.

Having sex with a 17 year old is statutory rape, but is not pedophilia. Pedophilia would be having sex with a person younger than puberty-- conventionally defined as under 13. (see definition here: <https://www.psychologytoday.com...> [psychologytoday.com])

Sorry but if they are not adults THEY CANNOT CONSENT period the end.

Correct. Rape means having sex with some one without consent. So, if they're not capable of consent, it's rape. Pedophilia, however, means having sex with somebody under 13. (*)

No more argument, no more bullshit, you can't have "consensual pedophilia because THEY CAN'T CONSENT.

Correct. All pedophila is statutory rape, but not all statutory rape is pedophilia.

Here's the wikipedia entry if you don't believe me:

Pedophilia (alternatively spelt paedophilia) is a psychiatric disorder in which an adult or older adolescent experiences a primary or exclusive sexual attraction to prepubescent children.[1][2] Although girls typically begin the process of puberty at age 10 or 11, and boys at age 11 or 12,[3] criteria for pedophilia extend the cut-off point for prepubescence to age 13.[4]

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/...> [wikipedia.org]

A good link.

(* footnote: technically, pedophilia is the *desire* to have sex with children (defined as under the age of puberty). Here, however, I'm willing to go with the definition of pedophilia as *acting* on the desire to have sex with children.)

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [jrumney \(197329 \)](#)

Also 16 in the US Virgin Islands, where Epstein's private island was. So statutory rape is only relevant to armchair jurists who want to impose their own state's morality on the rest of the world.

-

■ **[Re:Not pedophilia \[Re:Taking out the open source'\] \(Score:4, Informative\)](#)**

by [jrumney \(197329 \)](#) on Sunday September 15, 2019 @03:28AM ([#59195886](#))

Correction, as someone else posted below, it is only 16 in US Virgin Islands if the other party is of similar age, otherwise 18. I shouldn't have just trusted the headline figure that Google threw back. So, yeah, statutory rape is a

possibility, though in many jurisdictions the minor misrepresenting themselves as older can be a valid defense where there is no allegation of an actual assault to answer.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-

■ **[Re: \(Score:2, Troll\)](#)**

by [angel'o'sphere \(80593 \)](#)

If the person is under the age of consent, whatever that is, it's rape.

In a fucked up country perhaps, where you get indoctrinated with that believe from child hood on. In most countries it is not. First of all it is simply "sex with a minour" and not rape. And the judge will figure if it was rape, pedophile etc. or not.

As far as I have researched, that term "statutory rape" basically only exists in the US.

In German law two 14 year olds can consent to each other to have sex. In USA they rape each other and

-

■ **[But... what actually did happen? \(Score:4, Informative\)](#)**

by [XXongo \(3986865 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @07:34PM ([#59195236](#)) [Homepage](#)

Uhhhh you DO know that Stallman also *defended pedophilia...right?*

Right? No, wrong. The article you linked is another of the ones that Stallman points out mis-interpreted what he said.

But, even more so, this is a tricky question, since we actually *don't* know what happened.

What we know is that Virginia Giuffre stated that Ghislaine Maxwell "instructed her" to have sex with Marvin Minsky, and that she went to Epstein's island in order to do so. What she *left out* of her deposition is what happened after that.

Then what? Did she proposition him? Did he agree? Did they have sex? Or not?

That part is left out of her deposition.

It's telling that her deposition doesn't actually say she had sex with Minsky-- it just says she was "instructed" to do so.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [angel'o'sphere \(80593 \)](#)

There is no single line in the cited text from Stallman in your linked article that supports your claim that he supports pedophilia in anyway. And why would he? And why would he so dumb, if he would, to post that public?

You have no common sense?

■

• **[Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:2, Insightful\)](#)**

by [DogDude \(805747 \)](#)

... can often get you into trouble. Many people are not interested in hearing your very specific, technically-correct bullshit. You should probably keep your "well, *technically....*" thoughts to yourself. Even if you're *technically* right, you can still come off as being an asshole, which isn't the best situation to be in if you're a public figure.

If you're a scientist, sure, absolutely, be very, very specific. If you're just spouting off your own opinion, you're probably best just shutting the hell up

○

○ **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**

by [Mr. Slippery \(47854 \)](#) <tms@inAAAfamous.net minus [threevowels](#)> on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:51PM (#59194800) [Homepage](#)

Many people are not interested in hearing your very specific, technically-correct bullshit.

Many people are not interested in hearing your "I'm not interested in whether statements are correct or not" bullshit. Even if you're technically right, you can still come off as being an asshole

RMS was not speaking for public consumption. He posted to an internal MIT mailing list -- to an audience which, one would hope, would be concerned with correctness. Looks like at least one member of that list was not, however, and misreported his comments.

RMS was not the asshole here.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

■ **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**

by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:39PM (#59194942) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

RMS was not speaking for public consumption. He posted to an internal MIT mailing list -- to an audience which, one would hope, would be concerned with correctness. Looks like at least one member of that list was not, however, and misreported his comments.

Actually if you look at the leaked emails other members of the list did pull him up on the correctness of his definition of sexual assault. That's the issue here, that he is trying to defend what Minsky did by arguing that he was ignorant of the situation. That's both extremely improbable and not an actual defence of what was still likely to have been a crime,

i.e. ignorance of the law or being "tricked" into breaking it isn't usually a viable defence.

I really hope RMS realizes this and corrects himself.

Minsky screwed up in a bad way, and painful as it is we just have to confront that.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**
by [loonycyborg \(1262242 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:45PM ([#59194958](#))
But if you hire a prostitute and only later find out that she was coerced into sleeping with you under threat of death will you consider yourself a rapist? Or just merely someone who hired a prostitute?

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:4, Informative\)](#)**
by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @06:02PM ([#59194996](#)) [Homepage Journal](#)
That's not what happened though. Minsky went with Epstein to his island and the girl had sex with him, and there was no monetary exchange between the two of them that we know of. Plus, the girl was only 17 at the time, possibly making it illegal in that jurisdiction (I don't know, what is the age of consent there?)
Maybe he thought Epstein paid her or something. Even then it can still be a crime. I think you would have to present a very, very convincing argument in court to get out of that one.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**
by [DRJlaw \(946416 \)](#)
possibly making it illegal in that jurisdiction (I don't know, what is the age of consent there?)
[18 in the alleged circumstances](#) [visuperiorcourt.org]. 16 if not involving an age difference of less than 5 years, and no aggravating factors.

-
- **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**
by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#)
So a 56 year age gap (73 and 17 at the time) would have made it illegal even if she had consented, or Minsky believed she had consented.

RMS argues that arbitrary age cut-offs for statutory rape are morally difficult to justify and that's certainly a discussion we could have, but it doesn't change the fact that legally it's still rape.

-
-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [sabri \(584428 \)](#)

biological maturity is the important border.

Except that biological maturity is hard to establish in court, and therefore a poor legal concept.

After her first menstruation she can have sex.

Physical readiness does not equal mental readiness. A 17 year old maybe perfectly capable of consenting to sleeping with an 18 year old. However, that same 17 year old may be driven by other reasons than her own wishes if a 73 year old courts her. If you don't understand that, you should see a psychologist.

-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [DRJlaw \(946416 \)](#)

After her first menstruation she can have sex. All moralists here have to admit this and shut up. Age gap does not mean anything, only if you want to have children which cannot be assumed with the population we already have (7.4 billion worldwide).

No, we don't have to admit that, and we don't have to shut up. Neither psychology nor the law agree with your menstruation-based fundamentalist viewpoint.

Age gap does not mean anything.

Pull the other one.

-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [ChrisMaple \(607946 \)](#)

After her first menstruation she can have sex.

Looks as if you failed your biology class.

-
-

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [ChrisMaple \(607946 \)](#)

Rape is sex without informed consent. Have sex with a partner who's drunk or comatose? That's rape because there's no informed consent. Have AIDS and don't tell your partner? That's also rape because there's no *informed* consent.

Forcible rape is one variety of rape, but not the only variety.

-

■ **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**

by [loonycyborg \(1262242 \)](#)

Mind you Stallman wasn't doubting that it's a crime. So what's your point? Did court of law already ruled that it's a rape? If not it's all guesswork either way. He just nitpicked

at which exact kind of crime it could be. And others were nitpicking at his nitpicking. What a waste of time!

■

■ **Re: (Score:2)**

by [rmdingler \(1955220 \)](#)

Virgin Islands (United States)

The age of consent is 18. There is however a close-in-age exemption that allows minors 16 and 17 years old to consent with someone no more than five years older than themselves and minors 13 to 15 years old to consent with one another, but not with anyone 16 or over.

■

■

■

■

■

■

■ **Re: (Score:3)**

by [swillden \(191260 \)](#)

Unfortunately I can't find a copy of the unsealed records online.

They're linked from the last of your links above (theverge).

I downloaded them and found the part about Minsky. She says she was sent to have sex with him. She doesn't say -- and isn't asked -- if she actually did have sex with him.

■

■ **Re: (Score:3)**

by [DRJlaw \(946416 \)](#)

Whatever conduct you want to criticize, you should describe it with a specific term that avoids moral vagueness about the nature of the criticism."

RMS was not the asshole here.

The specific term is statutory rape. RMS was excusing it, which does indeed make him the asshole here.

■

■ **Re: (Score:2)**

by [karlandtanya \(601084 \)](#)

Bullshit. Any public figure knows you NEVER write anything down--especially in an electronic medium that is so easily propagated--that you don't want your worst enemy to read.

Hell, anybody working in an office knows that.

■

■ **Re: (Score:2)**

by [apoc.famine \(621563 \)](#)

Only the dumbasses think that.

There are lots of things that you put in writing to CYA.

Plausible deniability, shifting liability. And sure, there are lots of things you don't put in writing. The real slick people are good at figuring which are which.

■

○ **Re: (Score:3, Insightful)**

by Anonymous Coward

Yes, remain silent on helping people understand critical definitions. This way, we can soon call jaywalking "rape".

-
-

■ **[Re: Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [jwymann \(627857 \)](#)

Because we would not even be having this discussion without slippery slope in action. Look around you every freedom given twenty more are taken down the line.

-

○ **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Interesting\)](#)**

by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:52PM ([#59194808](#)) [Journal](#)

I don't think he was being pedantic in this case, he was trying to defend his friend (Minsky). After knowing the guy for 40+ years, he felt like Minsky wasn't the type to rape underage (or any age) women. He tried to offer an explanation of what happened.

As is normal for Stallman, he worded it in a way that made people upset. And maybe Stallman is actually wrong, I don't know.

If you're going around hating people, or drumming up hate, the problem is you.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-

■ **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**

by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:52PM ([#59194968](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I would like to believe that RMS just phrased it incorrectly, but in his response post he only says he was not defending Epstein. Either he doesn't understand the problem with what he said, or he is doubling down on it.

There just isn't a plausible way any reasonable person in that situation, a 73 year old man with a 17 year girl, on an island, being propositioned apparently because she was just in to sleeping with guys over 50 years her senior that she had only just met, would think it was not at least suspicious. At the very least Minsky should have known better.

I don't think RMS meant to try to argue the definition of sexual assault in general, only that his friend didn't intend to assault that girl. If that's the case he should say so clearly, but at the moment his response makes it appear he intended to actually argue the definition. As someone else on the mailing list responded, that's not a good idea to say the least.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **[Re: Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:2\)](#)**
by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#)
I see nothing in your post that inclines me to hate RMS.
-
- **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**
by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#)
It was not intended to make you hate him. I don't hate RMS either.
-
- **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**
by [sjames \(1099 \)](#)
I see nothing that he said that defends **Epstein**. He did defend Minsky in the sense that he doesn't BELIEVE Minsky would KNOWINGLY do such a thing. Nowhere did he say that KNOWINGLY doing that wouldn't be a crime.
-
- **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**
by [fafalone \(633739 \)](#)
There just isn't a plausible way any reasonable person in that situation, a 73 year old man with a 17 year girl, on an island, being propositioned apparently because she was just in to sleeping with guys over 50 years her senior that she had only just met, would think it was not at least suspicious. At the very least Minsky should have known better. See, but there are reasons to think that. Women do sometimes like to sleep with older men because they're rich and famous or extremely close to someone who is (as do younger men with older wealthy women). To directly or indirectly benefit from such access. Sure he almost certainly thought she was only interested because it meant money/long term type 'sugar baby' benefits, or modeling/career opportunities, but that's a far cry away from being threatened and coerced. Without evidence, you wouldn't assume the
-
-
- **[Re:Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:4, Interesting\)](#)**
by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:16PM ([#59194888](#)) [Journal](#)
He did, but he didn't do it in a crystal clear way that couldn't be misconstrued.
This is probably impossible.

My own solution is to not talk about these things, no matter my opinion (as you suggest), but some people are braver than I am.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re: (Score:2)**
by [bagofbeans \(567926 \)](#)
to phantomfive and DogDude... have to agree with both of you here, despite you two arguing the issue from different directions. However, RMS does have a rep. for speaking what he feels, and failing to avoid pomposity, so that should be taken into account on any analysis.

- **Re:Being a pedantic asshole (Score:5, Insightful)**
by [ilguido \(1704434 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:55PM ([#59194816](#))
So, in your opinion, (self) censorship is the solution?

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re: (Score:3, Insightful)**
by [ScooterBill \(599835 \)](#)
Social media is in effect censoring people because of the outrage mob mentality that comes with anything slightly triggering. The only people posting anything controversial will soon be the idiots since anyone with half a brain knows it's safer to keep quiet. Ironically, this is exactly what's happening in China these days only much, much worse because there the government is the mob and they're coming for you.

- **Re:Being a pedantic asshole (Score:5, Insightful)**
by [HiThere \(15173 \)](#) <[charleshixsn&earthlink.net](#)> on Saturday September 14, 2019 @04:58PM ([#59194822](#))
That's right. You should never defend anyone who's being subjected to a witch hunt.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re: Being a pedantic asshole (Score:4, Interesting)**
by [Edward Nardella \(1503565 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:10PM ([#59194864](#))
Using the phrase "witch hunt" in this situation is hilarious when you consider its origin.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re: (Score:2)**
by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#)

Using the phrase "witch hunt" in this situation is hilarious when you consider its origin.

What is its origin, The Code of Hammurabi?

■

■ **Re: (Score:3)**

by [HiThere \(15173 \)](#)

I don't think it's particularly hilarious, but it seems apt. Check your history for how such things were conducted. And note that one of the most famous victims, Jaques de Molay, was a man. And that the apparent actual purpose was to confiscate the fortunes of others. The basic rule was that when you were accused there was no way to prove yourself innocent.

■

■ **Re:Being a pedantic asshole (Score:5, Interesting)**

by [karlandtanya \(601084 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:54PM ([#59194972](#))

A live person who you believe is innocent? Absolutely, defend them. They have their reputation, fortune, freedom, and even life to lose. To defend the such an innocent person is a heroic act. Heroic in that it will likely fail and you will likely be destroyed and vilified in the process. This you do because it is the right thing to do.

RMS was not defending Marvin Minsky. Marvin Minsky is dead.

According to RMS' original email he was defending an intellectual ideal. According to his later clarification, he pissed off a lot of people who were to stupid to "get" what he was saying.

He does this a lot. One can only assume he enjoys the outrage and the knowledge that he's right and everyone else is wrong.

FWIW, I'm typing this on a GNU/Linux machine ;)

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

■ **Re: (Score:3)**

by [Cedric \(9623 \)](#)

According to RMS' original email he was defending an intellectual ideal. According to his later clarification, he pissed off a lot of people who were to stupid to "get" what he was saying.

He does this a lot.

Sadly the people who don't understand this appear to heavily overlap the set of perpetually outraged, making this cultural clash inevitable.

Whatever happened to "I disagree with you on this matter. This is my position, here is why I feel it is valid where yours is not and if that does not make you change your mind then we shall continue to disagree."

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#)

Minsky isn't the subject of a witch hunt. He's dead for a start.

We know he went to Epstein's island and have little reason to not believe the victim's account, given that much of what she had so far said checks out. Indeed RMS doesn't seek to even challenge her version of events, merely the interpretation of them.

Minsky would be facing serious charges if he were alive, and likely going to jail.

■

○ **[Re: Being a pedantic asshole \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**by [reanjr \(588767 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019@06:53PM ([#59195142](#)) [Homepage](#)

And you don't think we should fight for a world in which people can say what they mean and not be vilified by those with a low reading comprehension?

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

● **[Not one to talk \(Score:2, Informative\)](#)**

by Anonymous Coward

I was at MIT during the 1990s, in a lab across the hall from Richard Stallman's office. He was kind of creepy around women. Not sure I'd put much stake in his views on what constitutes an appropriate relationship.

○

○ **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**

by Anonymous Coward

Ah yes, the newest definition of rape: insufficient suavete.

■

○ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**by [SuricouRaven \(1897204 \)](#)

An anonymous comment describing memories from twenty years ago that suggest someone is 'creepy around women.'

No, I'm not going to put much stock in that. But here we see another problem: I can afford to say this openly because I am a nobody. A person of influence who dismissed this very unreliable accusation would risk being accused of trying to cover up abuse.

■

● **[Read the whole thread \(Score:5, Insightful\)](#)**by [Edward Nardella \(1503565 \)](#) on Saturday September14, 2019 @04:54PM ([#59194812](#))

Then form your opinion.

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

o

o [#MeTuna Re:Read the whole thread \(Score:2\)](#)by [shanen \(462549\)](#)

I'm mostly missing the point of your advice. Your reference for "whole thread" isn't even clear.

But mostly I want to know if your sig is true. If so, why?

On the actual story, it sounds to me like rms is being his usual excessively logical self. I'm reminded of Spock's closing dialog with T'Pring in "Amok Time". (Also, rms has been tenured for so long that his understanding of economics is minimal. (Kindest explanation I can offer.))

■

■ [Re: \(Score:2\)](#)by [DRJlaw \(946416\)](#)

I'm mostly missing the point of your advice. Your reference for "whole thread" isn't even clear.

You're missing the point of forming an opinion about a sexual assault? That utterly shocks me. The fact that you'll pull your usual "Public masturbation of" crap in reply to this response shocks me not at all, despite being entirely unwelcome.

■

o [Re: \(Score:3\)](#)by [AmiMoJo \(196126\)](#)

RMS's statement certainly does seem ridiculous on the face of it. Try arguing in court that a 73 year old man being propositioned by a 17 year old girl he had only recently met could reasonably have believed that she was a willing participant.

At best he was hopelessly naive and doesn't appear to have questioned the very odd situation he found himself in.

Legally speaking even if you are misled into committing a crime, it's still a crime.

I appreciate the argument that Stallman is trying to make, and would a

■

■ [Re:Read the whole thread \(Score:5, Informative\)](#)by [DRJlaw \(946416\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:54PM ([#59194976](#))

The issue is this statement by RMS:

"[I]t is morally absurd to define *rape*(TM) in a way that depends on minor details such as which country it was in or whether the victim was 18 years old or 17."

It's not morally absurd to say that adults should not be having sex with children. It's not morally absurd for laws to apply only within the country that they're enacted. And it's certainly not absurd to have an age threshold. "Whether the victim was n years old or $n-1$ " can be walked back all the way to birth, with the creepiness rising with each step. And there's nothing intrinsically immoral about setting $n=18$.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re:Read the whole thread (Score:5, Insightful)**
by [AmiMoJo \(196126 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @06:24PM ([#59195048](#)) [Homepage Journal](#)
No, this is the contentious bit:
The word "assaulting" presumes that he applied force or violence, in some unspecified way, but the article itself says no such thing.
Only that they had sex.
We can imagine many scenarios, but the most plausible scenario is that she presented herself to him as entirely willing. Assuming she was being coerced by Epstein, he would have had every reason to tell her to conceal that from most of his associates.
Most legal jurisdictions do not require force to be used for it to be assault. Any kind of coercion can make it assault. That is how most people understand it too I think, e.g. no-one is suggesting that Weinstein used force but he certainly used coercion, and his actions are therefore legally and morally considered to be sexual assault and/or rape.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re:Read the whole thread (Score:4, Insightful)**
by [angel'o'sphere \(80593 \)](#)
<angelo@schneider.oomentor@de> on Saturday September 14, 2019 @08:44PM ([#59195370](#)) [Journal](#)
Most legal jurisdictions do not require force to be used for it to be assault. Erm, no? Without physical violence or threat of it, it is not an assault.
Any kind of coercion can make it assault. By the one doing the coercion. *That is how most people understand it too I think* to the first point: nope.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
- **Re: (Score:2)**
by [ShieldWolf \(601553 \)](#)
It seems to me that what RMS was saying was "My dead friend allowed himself to be seduced by a 17 year old woman, and that was wrong, but it's not the same as

dragging a 17 year old woman into an alleyway and forcing yourself on her, and I think the distinction is important."

It's still fucking disgusting behavior, and I'm certain that he knows that. I'm pretty sure the people who turned this into "news" know that too. But, they enjoy being the center of attention, so they're picking on an old man who put

■

■ **Re: (Score:2)**

by [AmiMoJo \(196126\)](#)

It seems to me that what RMS was saying was "My dead friend allowed himself to be seduced by a 17 year old woman, and that was wrong, but it's not the same as dragging a 17 year old woman into an alleyway and forcing yourself on her, and I think the distinction is important."

I think it's a bit more nuanced than that, but essentially yes.

Can you really say it's worse to use violence than to use coercion though? You might even argue that coercion is worse, especially given the way Epstein did it that resulted in multiple assaults over a prolonged period of time and which allowed him to keep doing it repeatedly for years.

In any case, whatever the distinction is I don't think it's anywhere near enough to excuse Minsky's actions, which is what RMS appears to be trying to do.

I apprec

■

■ **Re:Read the whole thread (Score:5, Interesting)**

by [angel'o'sphere \(80593\)](#)

<angelo@schneider.oomentor@de> on Saturday

September 14, 2019 @08:49PM ([#59195378](#)) [Journal](#)

Can you really say it's worse to use violence than to use coercion though?

You are missing the point. RMS supposes that Minsky **knew nothing about that** and that Epstein did the coercion.

So no: Minsky did nothing wrong! Is that so hard to grasp for you? Having sex with a woman of legal age is legal.

Especially when he has the impression she offers it to him.

And why the fuck would she not have sex with a 70 year old? Just because you can not imagine yourself wanting sex with a 70 year old?

If you remove the rounding errors and make her 20 and him 70 its a 50 year old age difference. In plenty of cultures that is a normal thing, while not very common, obviously. In asia the mantra is: age is just a number.

No idea why you are so strangely obsessed with it.

IF she was coerced into sex, then her age is completely irrelevant!!

If Minsky did not know she is coerced into having sex with him: he is not guilty, everything else is: irrelevant!!

Can't be so hard to grasp. I'm lucky you are not a judge ... or in a jury.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

• **[Literally true, but that kind of misses the point](#)**

(Score:5, Insightful)

by [WrathOfb0b \(302444\)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:20PM ([#59194908](#))

Stallman argued that "the most plausible scenario" is that "she presented herself to him as entirely willing"

I agree, that's the most plausible scenario. Now I want to ask a followup question, is it plausible that brain-the-size-of-a-planet Minsky ever suspected anything was amiss, or did he believe that she was entirely willing?

RMS is claiming (implicitly, by the way, he doesn't actually spell this out, which is not a good start for a person that we all know is more than *capable* of laying out his dependencies explicitly) that if she presented as willing then that settles the matter. Perhaps that's the case, perhaps not, but his restating of this literal truth does nothing to actually answer it.

In full disclosure, I really don't think it does. In my judgment, Minsky knew or should have known or should have figured out whether her consent was given freely and without coercion. If does. not seem like it could have escaped a man of that intellect except through explicitly choosing not to think about it. I don't think it makes him a horrible rapist and we should shred his books and burn him in effigy, but it's a moral failing to see a young girl in a situation that has all kinds of warning signs and to just be content that, well, she didn't **say** she was being trafficked so it's OK.

In the end, I don't think anyone has to agree with me on that conclusion, but I do strongly claim that this is the central question and not, as RMS framed it, whether she **presented** as willing.

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

○

○ **[Re: \(Score:2, Interesting\)](#)**

by [lkcl \(517947\)](#)

she didn't say she was being trafficked so it's OK.

Epstein was specifically engaging in the practice of blackmailing high profile individuals for the purposes of extortion.

He had **specific** training by Intelligence Services on **precisely** how to threaten women to get them to do what he wanted, and would also have received similar training on psychological profiling, as well as ACTIVE

SURVEILLANCE dossiers in order to "use" those women as weapons against the selectively targetted influential individuals.

Unfortunately, if you leave out that context, it is ea

■

■ **[Re: Literally true, but that kind of misses the po](#)** **(Score:2)**

by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#)

I am not sure if you are correct or not, but I would like to see more investigation into Epstein. That is surely a conspiracy that goes deep.

■

• **[Best not to comment. \(Score:5, Interesting\)](#)**

by [Gravis Zero \(934156 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:37PM (#59194936)

In criminal and especially controversial situations where you are not involved, it's best not to comment or invent hypotheticals. Doing so is like playing Russian Roulette along: you're only hurting yourself and there is nothing to be gained.

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

○

• **[RMS has chosen the wrong side in this debate \(Score:2\)](#)**

by [karlandtanya \(601084 \)](#)

RMS is a idealist and an ideologue, but he is not stupid. Willfully blinding oneself to what is because it's not what (you believe) should be is *willful* blindness. RMS "knew or should have known" that his comments would have been taken as defense of Epstein and his ilk.

He chose to make the comments and he is being held accountable for the predictable public outcry.

This public discussion takes place in a black-and-white world. At this stage of the conversation, we have only righteous outrage. The time

○

• **[Greg Benford says the accusation is bunk \(Score:5, Interesting\)](#)**

by [Nova Express \(100383 \)](#) <[lawrenceperson AT gmail DOT com](#)> on Saturday September 14, 2019 @05:57PM (#59194980) [Homepage Journal](#)

[Gregory Benford](#) [pjmedia.com], who was on the island as part of a technical conference at the time (which Epstein threw, whether for noble or nefarious reasons is unclear), said that it never happened.

"I know; I was there. Minsky turned her down. Told me about it. She saw us talking and didn't approach me."

Stallman is a nutter about many things, but here he appears to have been dragged by SJWs for his take on crimes that never occurred.

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

o

o **Re: (Score:2)**

by [oddtodd \(125924 \)](#)

+1 Interesting

This will prolly not get any notice from the SJW crowd.

■

■

■ **Re: (Score:2)**

by [oddtodd \(125924 \)](#)

Minsky is unable to defend himself and I never said he was innocent.

It is interesting to hear from someone who was there and witnessed the event around which is so much speculation is being flung, kinda like your second sentence.

■

o **Not even a defense. (Score:4, Interesting)**

by [kamapuaa \(555446 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019

@05:58PM ([#59194986](#)) [Homepage](#)

RMS didn't even defend himself. It was a total non-apology. Very disingenuous.

Nobody was saying RMS is pro-Epstein, just that RMS's comments that "sexual assault" shouldn't apply to a underage prostitute who was a victim of sex trafficking, as a means of defending a friend, is wildly offensive.

That is true. Minsky was an 80 year old man who knew Epstein, know his reputation, knew that MIT had blocked working with him and he had to keep their relations secret. There is a 0.000% chance that Minsky didn't realize he was having sex with a prostitute who was a victim of sex trafficking (additionally, Minsky likely surmised it was an underage prostitute). RMS is playing word games that don't apply because he has nothing more to stand upon, and in doing so in discounting the severity of the crime.

RMS's apology should have been something along the lines of "I am an old man out of touch with everything outside of certain computer-related issues. I'm sorry for publicly announcing my half-considered stupid viewpoint in defense of a friend. I realize that as a public figure representing a famous institution I should have just shut the fuck up."

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

o

o **Re: Not even a defense. (Score:2)**

by [phantomfive \(622387 \)](#)

Do a search for "Stillman defends Epstein." People actually have been saying that.

■

○ **[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)**by [Moridineas \(213502 \)](#)

I feel like I have to add a disclaimer that I'm not at ALL defending Epstein, but there are some useful facts.

The girl who allegedly had sex with Minsky was allegedly with Epstein around roughly 1999-2002. I don't know her exact age, and I don't care enough to research it, but in that timeframe should have been 17-20ish.

In the deposition she says she doesn't remember where, when, or how old she was when she had sex with Minsky, just that she claims she did.

There are no other public statements that

■

● **[\[W\]\[O\]\[R\]\[D\]\[G\]\[A\]\[M\]\[E\]\[S\] \(Score:2\)](#)**by [Malays Boweman \(5369355 \)](#)

Really, the media needs to stop. These cheap appeals to emotion and other forms of trying to manipulate rather than inform the public makes me not trust the source.

○

● **[Yep. End things now. \(Score:3\)](#)**by [Impy the Impiuos Imp \(442658 \)](#) on Sunday September 15, 2019 @11:51AM ([#59196634](#)) [Journal](#)

The coverage totally mischaracterised my statements.

Headlines say that I defended Epstein. Nothing could be further from the truth. I've called him a "serial rapist", and said he deserved to be imprisoned. But many people now believe I defended him -- and other inaccurate claims -- and **[I] feel a real hurt because of what they believe I said. I'm sorry for that [other] hurt [they felt].** I wish I could have prevented the misunderstanding.

New Amazon book: *I Feel Hurt. You Feel Hurt: A Guide To Transactional Political Lemming-Like Social Ostracism War*

[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

○

●

○ **[Re:Stallman is ok with pedophilia \(Score:4, Informative\)](#)**by [arcctgx \(607542 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019 @06:38PM ([#59195090](#))

Looks like he recently changed his mind about that:

<https://stallman.org/archives/...> [stallman.org]

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

■

○ **[Re:Stallman is ok with pedophilia \(Score:4, Insightful\)](#)**

by [Penroze \(3517299 \)](#) on Saturday September 14, 2019
@06:45PM ([#59195116](#))

Stallman's own statements make it clear he is ok with pedophilia as long as it's "voluntary" or with "consent".

As I said in another thread, pedophilia is defined as sexual attraction to PRE-PUBSECENT children. So that's under 12 or 13 or so. The girl in question was 17. No no, there's no pedophilia here.

Here's the wikipedia entry for you:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/...> [wikipedia.org]

Secondly, he wasn't saying it was OK, he was trying to use the right words describing what happened. You know... words... those things that have meaning? People seemed to have forgotten that getting things defined right, and using words accurately is something that's important in discussion. Otherwise you can say anything and lie indiscriminately. Just like you just did!

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

-
-
- **[Re: Stallman is ok with pedophilia \(Score:4, Insightful\)](#)**

by [SuricouRaven \(1897204 \)](#) on Sunday September 15, 2019 @04:15AM ([#59195936](#))

If you're going to make a claim that serious, you need to cite a source. I'm not saying you are wrong, and I'm not saying you are right: I'm just saying that the accusation is severe enough that it should not be made without something to back it up.

[Reply to This](#) [Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

- -
 - **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**
- by [SuricouRaven \(1897204 \)](#)
- The burden of evidence falls upon the one making the accusation. Otherwise I could just as easily accuse you of supporting pedophilia. I'm not going to cite any evidence on that - but can you prove that I am making a false accusation? If I say that there is a comment, somewhere out there on the internet, which shows that you do? You can never prove that such a comment doesn't exist. Proving innocence is a lot harder than proving guilt - that's why the presumption of innocence is a core legal principle.

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [Cedric \(9623 \)](#)

If an adult and a real 15-year-old agree to meet in a cafe, and if they later have sex, that doesn't mean anyone did anything wrong.

Yes, they did. The adult broke the law, and committed a serious sexual assault.

The 15 year old may have believed they were a willing participant but the law does not recognise their ability to consent. Sentencing may however treat it as a mitigating factor.

Fortunately it's really easy to avoid breaking this law. Don't fuck children.

■

■

■

■ **[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)**

by [fafalone \(633739 \)](#)

Yes but being the law doesn't make it right or wrong. And there's a big difference between the common meaning of 'statutory rape' and 'sexual assault'. I am indeed making the case that, when it comes to teenagers, the age of consent is absolutely arbitrary because many Western, first-world countries will have any given teenage age as acceptable (except 13 you'd have to go to South Korea). So because it's entirely arbitrary, actual freely given consent is what's morally important, because the technical legal

■

•

[Related Links](#) Top of the: [day](#), [week](#), [month](#).

- 929 comments [Wikileaks Co-founder Julian Assange Arrested in London](#)
 - 810 comments [California Has a New Law: No More All-Male Boards](#)
 - 808 comments [Theresa May, Undone by Brexit, To Resign as UK Prime Minister](#)
 - 794 comments [Mueller Report 'Summary' Delivered to US Congress](#)
 - 763 comments [Americans Shouldn't Have To Drive, But the Law Insists on It](#)
- [next](#)



[Java EE 'Goes All In' on Open Source with Jakarta EE 8](#)

53 comments

[previous](#)



[Europe's Space Industry Is Working On Reusable Rockets
With Environmentally-Friendly Fuel](#)

72 comments

[Slashdot](#)

Post

[Get 272 More Comments](#)

100 of 372 loaded

[Submit Story](#)

Nothing is easier than to denounce the evildoer; nothing is more difficult than to understand him. - Fyodor Dostoevski

[FAQ](#)

[Story Archive](#)

[Hall of Fame](#)

[Advertising](#)

[Terms](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Privacy Choices](#)

[Opt-out Choices](#)

[About](#)

[Feedback](#)

[Mobile View](#)

[Blog](#)

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2019 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved.

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)

Working...