

## FNORDS

Ai em a {{{{NURSE}}}}. Ai em not to have my judgement questioned. Ai aem not to have my authority flouted. Ai em to be obeyed Why is this ludicrous and filthy drivel tolerated for 10 seconds?

Some ignorant illiterate criminal animal trained in the scientific washing of bedpans thinks it's God Albloodymighty. Slummy mummy bobbed a curtsy to Doctor and Nurse, the only forms besides some religious goon of pseudo-educated life in whatever vile violent bookless wordless mindless hole the creature crawled out of, thought to be the source of all wisdom and knowledge.

So they crawl out of intellectual and moral if not physical slums, never met anyone who reads let alone reads and writes. They are {{{DOCTORS}}}, they are {{{NURSES}}} and now they can push other people around, everyone will look up to them and obey them and because they have received no moral or intellectual education whatever, because they are essentially criminal, they believe that the mores of their slums are universal, 'everyone' knows you obey religion, believe in God, believe whatever {{{HOLY BOOK}}} is the drug of choice is the {{{WORD OF GOD:}}} believe women obey, women are not to pretend to be men and go hiking or think or write, nursing that's suitable for a woman. If they are male they probably had slummy mummy sucking her little prince's cock and being a door-mat to {{{MY SON THE DOCTOR}}}

If something is {{{THE WORD OF GOD}}} it is therefore to the believer true. Others might think if this the word of God then God is a screaming nutter talking out of his arse of course, but if it is true, then anything contrary to it is a lie and lies are to be suppressed Lies are not to be permitted. And we must all obediently accept that anything perceived by the believer to be false is to be eliminated.

What? Oh, fnords:

**{FNORD!} {FNORD!} {FNORD!}**

*Oh, RTFM.*

*No, tards, not fjords, those are what Slartibartfast was so good at designing. Just remember he was very proud of Norway. You might learn something thereby if you were capable of learning, but of course you are not.*

*The word, says Wikipedia drily, lacks clear definition, but one such is that which shuts down rational processes, one such being undoubtedly the capacity to analyse new information.*

*A fnord is a propaganda word conditioned in the masses from a very young age to respond to, usually with fear, anxiety, or uneasiness, but unable to be seen by the general populace, says the Urban Dictionary.*

*However, I cannot discuss an invisible word, so let me stick with conditioned responses to particular words, or indeed explore the concept of fnord more closely Perhaps a fnord is rather a word that makes invisible the real word for something. Thus devout or doctor may replace the real word thug or psychopath.*

*Religion is a particularly good fnord. It Is Religion. No, this person is not a feral psycho animal.*

*He Is Religious. Ah, then, says anyone sane, his religion demands he be a feral psycho animal. Who gives a fuck about such a religion.*

*After all, 'fnord' is shorter than 'whited sepulchre'.*

*Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Matthew 23:27*

*See also: <http://www.dillsplace.com/glossary.html>*

To continue...

Such supposed education as they have receive has only the purpose of confirming and maintaining ignorance, psychosis and bestiality. Education is absolutely not to broaden their minds, expand their horizons, instruct them in the variety of the busy buzzing universe outside their holes. That would offend them. They have no intellectual curiosity. The world is fixed in the little rat brains. They have no intellectual capacity. A thing is good or true dependent on whether it meshes with the words in their head.

Perish the thought of course that the experience of leaving their holes in the ground and going to a supposed university in the wider world broadens their minds, expands their horizons, teaches them to think or anything else for that matter beyond their trades..

Having been rendered by their filthy anti-educators incapable of analysing their own beliefs, never mind anyone else's, they are of course totally unfit for university and at all cost must remain so. Their ignorance and psychosis must remain untouched. Thus the concept of safe space' people must not say the beliefs of others are nasty unverifiable garbage. Ideas are not to be examined, tested, developed, thrown out, ideas are to be suppressed. People are not to learn from each other, refine their thinking, change their views, demolish the views of others and have their own demolished. The universities must be rendered fit for boneheads.

Of course they don't care about my books, or for that matter anyone else's, books are evil, dangerous, disturbing, offensive.

Whereas once a university education trained the mind, the biological sciences have pioneered degrees for the mindless, degrees for those dead from the neck up and so tard ignorant cunt-for-brains deadhead doctors have no issues with tard deadhead ignorant cunt-for-brains Pol Pot arse-wipers making me do heavy manual work. It is of course a matter of history which particular tradition was hot on making liberal bourgeois intellectuals do heavy manual labour.

Do just let me remind you of the founding principles of UCL, which is emphatically not a clerical foundation, unlike that place in the Fens, 'that godless place in Gower Street', you will recall.

#### Some Interesting Facts

The first university in England to admit students of any race, class or religion, and the first to welcome women on equal terms with men.

Students from outside London, and from overseas, present from the start.

A teaching programme was established in which religious beliefs would not constrain the dissemination of knowledge and exploration of ideas.

Academic disciplines introduced as required by the emerging industrial and commercial society; the first English university to offer the systematic teaching of law, architecture and medicine. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/profile/175years.html>

**Censorship alert: this appears to have been removed from the UCL site.**

A lone blogging physical sciences student cites it but with no link and searching on 'dissemination' on the UCL site is not fruitful, nor Google.

Oh, this too

In passing a coherent and intellectually satisfying explanation will be required of how UCL comes to be linked to the worst university in the country.

[Overall LSBU ranks 116th out of 116.](#)

[Improved slightly in the Guardian league table, where it's 100th out of 119 \(UCL is 5th\)](#)

[LSBU also ranks 91 out of 92 in the biological sciences](#)

[89th out of 95 in the biosciences according to the Guardian](#)

[and 52 out of 67 in nursing](#)

[37th out of 78 according to the Guardian ranking of courses in 'nursing and paramedical studies', possibly suggesting the paramedical courses are an improvement on the nursing ones.](#)

[Nurse Boden is of course frightfully fond of the Guardian - so fond she borrows Polly Toynbee's work.](#)

Why do I doubt she asked nicely first?

LSBU is still 100 out of 102 for the biosciences

Pitiful, sickening, ludicrous, bestial psychotic hysterics. All these things. Probably think one book that counters their Book is the only other book in the world and to be expunged.

To paraphrase Victor Lazlo, for every one book they destroy there are thousands, millions more saying something different to the filthy nonsense in their sick animal brains

But without people to defend them, books are vulnerable little things and so they destroy the people and with this filth of politicians and fake academics fall over themselves to comply, while filth of clerics jabber the obscenity that that moral superiority lies in believing in God

There are two distinct issues of course. To believe the Bible or the Koran or as some treat it the Communist Manifesto is the unchallengeable work of a god is one thing.

To seek to impose your mental sickness on the billions who do not so believe is quite another to demand we all perjure ourselves and say arrant garbage is Truth.

Of course the fake Left has no problem with this and all the Left is fake, thus Sacranie and his band of psychiatric cases. And cunt for brains fascists generate cunt-for-brains analogies. Of course there are limits on freedom of speech. What about shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theatre?

Or for that matter "Shark!" on an Australian or even English beach. What, indeed?

What is wrong with lying is that it offers a fake reality, tells people something is the case that is not the case. You know, like the Bible, the Koran and the Communist Manifesto.

Logic somewhat dictates that where any bonehead propagates arrant garbage, anyone half-sane is entirely at liberty to yell, "Fire!" Or indeed "Shark!"

Of course you might believe there is a fire or a shark, have mistaken a dolphin or the glow of an usherette's (do they still exist?) torch which some drongo had designed as reddish-orange. What you are saying does not accord with the facts on further examination.

But you're only saying it to distress oo poor ickle propagators of arrant nonsense - who by their nature have not the remotest concept of fact. You are stating your own views, as they state theirs and if you genuinely believe there is a fire what are you expected to do, let everyone be incinerated?

Let us dig further. To shout "Fire!" is to cause alarm and panic, whether or not there is a fire. The source of this alarm and panic is imminent danger to life.

To say a religion is vicious crap does not entail the disposal of its propagators, unless of course they respond by trying to dispose of you. To say the eating of meat is vicious crap does not cause every carnivore to quiver in terror. The propagators of vicious crap must not be made aware they are not liked or wanted. Why not? The problem is not crap, but vicious crap. If they ceased to try to silence others, if they would just get on with their lives and contribute without trying to shut others up, they'd just be another minority of the weird, of which there are plenty enough and irreligious at that. Having a Mohican haircut and studs all over your face doesn't in itself invalidate your views on TFL or Brexit

We have among many two current garbage propositions. Believers must not be confronted with the fact that others do not share their views. In the case of Islam it is Islamophobic and racist to do that.

Many people are profoundly Marxophobic. This is because those countries that claim or claimed to be ruled by Marxism are shit-holes, as are those countries ruled by Islam. When the behaviour and standards of Muslims in the West is that of the shit-hoes - sexist, racist, homophobic, psychopathic, fascist - being hostile is an entirely sensible thing to be.

They want the West to be like back home. The problem is not that they are here. The problem is the number of indigenous persons falling over themselves to accommodate this desire.

Indigenous religious people in the West had to learn not to kill and imprison those who challenged or derided their beliefs. The real racism is that the same may not be asked of Muslims.

Do I not after all have a personal take on a bunch of fucktards brandishing a single book?

<http://www.dillsplace.com/comsymp-shariasymp-plus-ca-change.html>

*ComSymp, SovSymp, there were members of my family who would not have fared well under McCarthy, but this is England. When I hurl the word 'traitor' around with apparent right to gush over a hostile foreign power.*

*To not like someone's point of view is distinct from demanding he or she be silenced and only your point of view be heard. To campaign against views one believes erroneous or pernicious is distinct from demanding they be forbidden. One accepts the right of others to hold their own views and seeks to instruct them in the error of their ways. The other doesn't.*

*Without liberty, no-one would be permitted either to practise a religion other than that of the Church of England or to have no religion. Muslims need freedom of conscience to be upheld. They do not gain fans by seeking to deny it to others. To seek to change the foundation of society from one where everyone has a right to his or her own views and so you have a right to your minority view to one where only you have a right to your views would not seem very bright for there may surely be an awkward hiatus when those in power under the original system may shrug and say OK, you don't think anyone else has a right to his or her views so why should you have that right, and pull the rug out from under you.*

*Some Islamists think to impose the new order by force. The Party I am sure would have loved to have a revolution but you do need at least five people for that. Like classical Marxism, Islamism entails a change to the foundation of society. Both of course point enthusiastically at what everyone else calls a shit-hole and demands that here be more like that. If you are taking your cue from Saudi, Iran or Pakistan, it is no different to taking your cue from the Kremlin. The fog of garbage concerning the supposedly sacred nature of faith conceals this simple fact. Hey man, it's cool. No-one has to take any notice of people taking their cues from hostile foreign powers. The problem comes from insistence that we do. Pause to imagine some 30s Party member lecturing the British government of the day on Marxophobia. Well, you know, I am a devout Marxist-Leninist and surely there can be no right to abuse the sincere beliefs of millions of people. Marxists consider Comrade Lenin a towering figure, a giant among men leading the proletariat from darkness into*

light. The rhetoric is appropriately similar: we want real democracy not sad corrupt old bourgeois democracy. We want proper Islamic human rights not sad corrupt old Western human rights. There are minor comments to be made, such as that in a world with vastly diminished communications, early generations of British Sovsymps had no great grasp of 'there' but Shariasymp are clear what 'there' is like. Whether either really wanted or want to surrender what they have here is moot.

Do you have a problem with inviting those who thought things were vastly better ordered in the Soviet Union to fuck off and live there? I don't, or only a personal one: chunks of my family might have been born in the USSR and family get-togethers would have been a bit difficult. To suggest people fuck off is distinct from insisting they fuck off and deporting them. Really, it would have been frightfully unBritish to deport Uncle Richard or Cousin Rodney. You didn't get hanged/sent down for 30 years/deported to Mother Russia for being an open SovSymp but for being paid by the KGB to pretend you weren't.

The element of concealment is I think critical. If demanding the overthrow of the State were the key issue, 95% of 60s students now fully paid-up members of the human race would have gone down (the other 5%, hmm). I think the exact criterion would be working towards the overthrow of the State and its replacement with a system of government with different foundations and pretending you want something compatible with the existing order. Not surprisingly, the following in *The Morning Star* a couple of years ago caught my attention. I think Mr Howarth should have spoken to a few Marxists before opening his mouth. *Leading Tory Gerald Howarth unleashed a poisonous torrent of hatred against millions of British people yesterday. He declared that Muslims opposed to 'the British way of life' must leave the country, even if they are British citizens. The Tory shadow defence minister said that people who saw the Iraq war as a conflict against Islam should be considered as treacherous as Soviet sympathizers during the cold war. "If they don't like our way of life, there is a simple remedy – go to another country, get out," said Mr Howarth, echoing the fascist-type rallying cry of extreme right-wing leaders from the 1920s onwards.*

*Asked about people who were born in Britain, he replied: "Tough. If you don't give allegiance to this country, then leave." Mr Howarth, who is the Conservative MP for Aldershot, even compared those who despised the British way of life with traitors who spied for the USSR.... Labour Representation Committee chair John McDonnell MP called upon Tory leader Michael Howard to condemn Mr Howarth's 'outrageous xenophobic statement'. Mr McDonnell added: "There is no room within a democratic political party in this country for people with this kind of view." Labour MP Jeremy Corbyn, who represents the ethnically diverse London constituency of Islington North, said that Mr Howarth is completely out of touch with varied multi-ethnic nature of modern British society. His dangerous 'Colonel Blimp' outburst would 'foment discord between communities at a time when we need the maximum solidarity of all ethnic and religious groups," Mr Corbyn added. Muslim Association of Britain spokesman Anas Altikriti branded Mr Howarth's remarks as 'absurd' and contrary to the principles of free speech. Mr Altikriti said: "We have laws to deal with criminals and those who incite violence or hate. "To suggest that those people who hold opposing views to ours should leave the country, that this would be some kind of a solution, is absurd." Front page of the Morning Star, Thursday 4th August*

*If we consider, for instance, 'if you don't like our way of life, fuck off to the USSR', addressed to a British working-man during the Thirties, we see, I think, the matter rests chiefly on what is not liked, whether most other people don't like it, either and whether it is a failure to comply with the foundations of the existing order. Neglect of the poor and hungry was not compatible with the teachings of Jesus and a lot of people said so. The name Keir Hardie springs to mind. 'Our way of life' in the context of the 30s must surely be a capitalist economy subject to market forces as a consequence of which the workers may have a very hard time*

*Intellectually the matter rests on that quotation from Lenin I am exploring, a somewhat succinct statement of the question:*

*The workers may secure a greater or lesser degree of political liberty to fight for their economic emancipation, but no amount of liberty will rid them of poverty, unemployment, and oppression until the power of capital is overthrown*

*VI Lenin,*

### *Socialism and Religion*

*What is required? Should it be obtained? Can it be obtained without some fundamental change taking place first? Or: can enough of it be obtained? 'Our way of life' in the context of belief-systems may be summed up neatly as the freedom to be a member of the Kremlin-backed Communist Party and get on with one's little life. I have said I do not know if Richard and Rodney had cosy little chats with the security services, but I do know that they were not otherwise harassed for their beliefs. I also know from this obituary*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2002/jun/10/guardianobituaries.humanities>

*that Rodney was an officer in the British Army in WWII. For four years, such as between the autumn of 1941 and the end of the war; the Nazi-Soviet Pact collapsed in June 1941 and I'm wondering if they allowed Rodney into the Army while it was still intact but certainly I have found nothing about his being interned between 1939 and 1941. The decision to move to a different country rests on the belief it will be better for you and your family than where you are right now. If you don't like it when you get here, no-one is forcing you to stay. The great principle of the free movement of peoples, which I uphold, is distinct from any specious requirement the country you have chosen to honour with your presence roll out the red carpet, bow you in and hasten to change itself fundamentally in accordance with your views. However, where you come from may be Leeds. Your parents and your grand-parents have bedded down nicely and got on with their lives but you have decided Islam is insufficiently triumphant and you're going to change all that. Fine, you're British. Why then should the rest of Britain treat you any differently to any other holder of a minority view, or in short ignore you.*

*A refusal to accept people may mock and criticize Mohammed is not compatible with the existing order in which the indigenous religion was mocked and criticized, in which the frame of reference it gave to the whole of humanity was demolished by Darwin. In which the entire system of government is founded on rejection of those who claim to know God's will as overlords who impose it on a docile populace. What is required is a society in which there is no criticism or derision of Islam. Should it be obtained? No. Can it be obtained without fundamental change taking place first? No.*

*But that's OK because the politicians and clergy fall over themselves to create the fundamental change.*

### ComSymp, ShariaSymp (2)

*Indeed there are many similarities. Here are some more. My father was 11 in 1917, old enough to remember that they really believed (no, don't laugh at the simple faith of ordinary people, know you not the simple faith of total loons is to be revered) the revolution would spread to cover the earth. Marx said. Well, at least he said stuff about determinism and the progression of society, the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and so on. Since he died in 1883, he naturally couldn't have said anything of the kind.*

*Ah, 'Londonistan'. Marx wrote Das Kapital in London, where he remained until the end of his life, not in Paris, Berlin, Frankfurt or Bruges. The reason for this is that he had been kicked out of France, Belgium and Germany. If your society is freer than other people's, every dissident and every loon ends up there.*

*In 1989 a British author of Russian ancestry published a novel perceived as being 'disrespectful' of Stalin (I understand there was also a charge of revisionism) and a decree went out from the Kremlin that it was incumbent upon every true Marxist to kill said capitalist scum and many marches and demonstrations were organized demanding his death. Naturally the leaders of the British Left ever-vigilant for an opportunity to destroy liberty were vocal in their support. Arthur Scargill, prominent member of the Stalin Society, worked ceaselessly to have the man at the very least prosecuted though he thought death only perhaps too good for him, in consequence of which the Labour Party had him knighted. I'm sure you remember all this well.*

*'Opium of the people' it works on two levels, does it not. One is turning the mind of the True Believer into stewed ape-shit, and this is so whether the faith is religious or atheist. The other is what the word 'religion' does to politicians who clearly have minds of stewed ape-shit to start with, being convinced in the face of the evidence provided by 3000 years of so of human history that religion is necessarily good and further convinced that a bunch of capering junkies rendered through their dope apparently incapable of grasping the existence of large numbers of persons who do not share their addiction represent a valuable contribution to society to be supported and upheld.*

*Sigh. I can't quite imagine my dear old aunts, were they still alive, attending the AGM of the Stalin Society but I do know that they were hooked to the ends of their lives. They belonged to one of those ghastly Anglo-Soviet friendship societies and regularly visited l'espoir des travailleurs du monde, of which, as late as when I returned half-starved from Moscow in the 80s, they would hear no evil.*

Meanwhile a bunch of anonymous rat-braned gauleiters called Communications informs us of the necessity of preserving the reputations of UCH staff. Well, I mean if Communications says, that;s Authority innit

That creatures such as Whelan and Saunders should be sectioned of course passes Communications by.

That there is a public duty to expose those who conspire to pervert the course of justice, overthrow democracy, give aid and comfort to the Queen's enemies, are the Queen's enemies, cause actual bodily harm and attempt murder also of course passes them by.

Some tips, I think. If everyone with one scrap of power at UCH were made fully aware that he or she is publicly accountable, if UCH ceases to employ the insolently criminal and psychotic and treasonous, then UCH wouldn't have a problem with transparency, would it.