

Here's the detailed social contract for commenting at my blog, or blogs in the case of future additions.

1. You're not my conscience. I'm not concerned with being called one or another epithet and don't need anyone to "clean" my points. Factual correction is fine and welcomed, although see the Gish Gallop below. Statement of a contrasting position is also fine and welcomed, when presented as a fellow person rather than a higher-order corrective.
2. You don't possess telepathy. The degree of my self-reflection or your allegation that I presume my views are the bottom line are not topics you or any other person can speak to. That's my own concern.
3. "It's interesting that ..." is an off-limits phrase. It's code for "I spot prejudice." I don't do codes. If you think what I said is prejudiced, then say it openly. In which case, I'll take a look at what I said with different eyes.
4. No objectified terms are allowed. No one is *a* Gentile, *a* Black, *a* Jew, *a* Bisexual, or whatever term you can think of. Adjectival forms are fine, if and only if they do not imply intrinsic qualities; I'll also relax the grammar for "man" and "woman" as long as the same principle is observed. They're all important at the blog because assigned and self-assigned categories have impacted each person's experience, in thousands of ways. But no one gets to be handed or to self-assign special status, high or low, on that basis, and the grammatical trick gets us a little way toward observing that.
5. No Gish Gallop. Evolutionary biologists like me know all about it, and I'm not going to run off to refute every little claim no matter how intriguingly false it is, or to refine every little point that can be misconstrued, or to get drawn into a debate which is off-topic. Scientists and scholars are easily suckered into going further and further away from the point at hand, because to them (us, me) such statements are like a bouncing ball to a golden retriever. They have to be trained to recognize that the Galloper's goal is to keep them dancing in response-mode, and to use up valuable time. I could keep jumpin' to the round dozen dubious or off-topic points you've already made, but I know better.
6. Twin-trap. This is punishing whatever is said, removing options for discussing something. For example, one might object to referring to someone's stated ethnic background, and it's bad not to "realize" or to "be aware" of it too. The implication is that no one can talk about "it" without malign intent or content, and the effect is to lay down a cone of silence. If #4 is observed honestly, then this trap becomes especially obvious and can be called out.

All right, you've read it. These are all grounds for non-negotiable junking of comments, although I'll start with a feeler first to see whether you're really going where it looks like and therefore a way to say "no blood no foul" and return to real dialogue.