

Re: A new early Holocene human skeleton from Brazil

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-03/0587.html>

From: Eric Stevens (eric.stevens_at_sum.co.nz)

Date: 03/25/05

Date: Sat, 26 Mar 2005 10:43:41 +1200

On Fri, 25 Mar 2005 08:17:35 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

<smarcus_spamout_@cox.net> wrote:

>
> "*Eric Stevens*" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
> news:8t6741hbn9ck2qslth1m82jn0nr76nichc@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 24 Mar 2005 19:18:39 -0500, "Steve Marcus"
>> <smarcus_spamout_@cox.net> wrote:

---- snip -----

>>>
>>> *or "Mr. Perez is, in fact, the last person entitled to speak about
>>> terrorism, being directly responsible for the death of one hundred and two
>>> children, women and elders killed at Cana by the Israeli shelling that
>>> tracked them to the UNIFIL tent they sought refuge in." from:*
>>>
>>> <http://www.lebanemb.org.au/Aboutus/Speech.html>
>>>
>>> *Yet another example of you not understanding your native tongue. Nota
>>> bene
>>> the international character of the websites linked; perhaps you would like
>>> to claim that the idiomatic phrase in question hasn't made it to New
>>> Zealand
>>> from Australia.*
>>
>> *I'm disappointed. You are now defending the failure of your native wit
>> to recognise that I was responding to the literal meaning of your
>> words. Now, when I point it out to you, you get all indignant. "I
>> didn't mean what I literally said!"*
>
> *Of course _you_ were responding to the literal meaning of the words. The
> problem is that ****no one**** could take what I had written as being other than
> the idiomatic useage of the phrase. Having no answer for that, you promptly
> generated squink. Typical.*

I challenged your statement with a bet that it would turn out to be wrong. Now you claim that you, a lawyer, did not go back and carefully read what it was that I was betting was wrong. Dear Me!
Had you not yet drunk your morning coffee?

>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>poster.
>>>>> Perhaps
>>>>>by claiming that I lied re the plug-in that was installed on my old
>>>>>16-bit
>>>>>sytem that enabled me to kill file Usenet posts. How would you prove
>>>>>your
>>>>>claim? And you claim to be someone who deals with evidence for a
>>>>>living.
>>>>
>>>> And I gave an explicit argument as to why I thought you were lying.
>>>> Anyone who wants to know more can use Google.
>>>>
>>>>Indeed. Which argument was wrong. Now you are arguing that one can
>>>>ignore
>>>>posts (which can't be heard, smelled, tasted or otherwise sensed) by
>>>>reading
>>>>them, every one. A classic Stevens squink generation.
>>>>
>>>> Where have I said that? There is no reason why I can't skim them to
>>>> see if you have said anything particularly reprehensible.
>>>>
>>>>You never said skim, you said "read." And of course, "skimming" is reading,
>>>>just more quickly. It is interesting to watch you get trapped in the very
>>>>cloud of squid ink that you generated; it's not difficult to imagine that
>>>>you typically "skim" all posts that you "read" because it's not unusual for
>>>>your response to a given post to be such as to indicate that you've either
>>>>totally ignored the poster's point, or totally missed the point.

I skim what I read to see if there is anything worth reading thoroughly. It only after the second screen of unproductive skimming that I give up on the other two thirds of your posts.

>
>> You are
>> trying to equate me ignoring most of what you have written with having
>> you in a kill-file. Well, it isn't the same thing as you should well
>> know.
>>
>>And you are trying to explain that you are ignoring what I've written by
>>first reading it.

The penny is slowly dropping.

>If you had any command of your native tongue, you might
>have originally written something like "I read (or skim) what you write, and
>choose to mostly ignore your posts rather than responding to them."

A loud clunk as the penny hits the floor!

I would have thought that you would have realised that that is what I
meant some years ago. After all, that is what I have been doing.

>Instead, you chose to write "you are on ignore", which is precisely the
>result that can be obtained when someone is placed in a kill file; that
>someone's posts are ignored by the filter and the newsreader never presents
>them for review.

Quibble. Mere quibble. If in meant to killfile you, why do think I
would not have used that term. Better still, why did I not merely say
<plonk>? Why do you think I used the quite different term of 'ignore'
in various forms?

>
>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Or didn't you quite mean what you wrote in that last sentence either?
>>>>>
>>>>>I meant every word. While we are at it, should be discuss your claim
>>>>>that
>>>>>I'm a patent attorney?? As it happens, the proof that I'm not is
>>>>>readily
>>>>>available on the Internet. Last time I offered to show your claim to be
>>>>>wrong, you shut up about it pretty damned quickly.
>>>>
>>>> You are getting twitchy. You have denied that you are a patent
>>>> attorney but have never offered any support for that claim.
>>>
>>>I expressly stated that if you required proof, I would be happy to supply
>>>it. See:
>>>
>>><http://tinyurl.com/4tdoy>
>>>
>>>Yet another Stevens lie. The above post must have been one of my posts
>>>that
>>>you "ignored" by reading it, and then, having seen that you were about to
>>>be
>>>outmaneuvered, you didn't take me up on my offer.
>>
>> That's offering to offer support. I never bothered to take you up on
>> it but, why don't you lead us to the evidence that you are not a
>> patent attorney?
>
>Sure. Just as soon as we see the evidence you have that I am a patent

>attorney.

Changing the rules, eh?

In fact you have been evasive in this news group about whether or not you are a patent attorney, and your exact professional status, since before 1998. See <http://tinyurl.com/66qxy>

>So far, you've opined that I have a quasi-legal disclaimer in my
>sig file, and I offer write at length on aspects of patent law. I pointed
>out that I also write at length on aspects of archaeology, and on matters
>involving cardiology, (and all posts have the same sig file), but I'm quite
>clearly neither an archaeologist or a cardiologist. It is nice of you to
>demonstrate to the newsgroup just how low your standard of proof of a
>proposition really is, how you view the flimsiest of evidence as a license
>to speculate, and to then post as though your speculation were true (you
>write that I ****am**** a patent attorney).

>

>>>

>>>> I would be

>>>> happy to follow it up if you offered it.

>>>

>>>>But I did. You've yet to ask for the proof.

>>

>> I have now.

>

>And you'll get it just as soon as you post all of the proof that you have
>that I am a patent attorney.

>

>>>

>>>> But you do dress many of your

>>>> posts with a quasi-legal disclaimer and anyone who browses

>>>> <http://tinyurl.com/4ncs4> will find that you write often and at length

>>>> on aspects of patent law.

>>>

>>>>I am also frequently a poster on sci.med.cardiology, but that doesn't make

>>>>me a cardiac surgeon, any more than my posts on sci.archaeology make me an

>>>>archaeologist. I have a deep interest in intellectual property matters,

>>>>not

>>>>something that is strange for an attorney.

>>>

>>>>I can tell you that patent attorneys are required to join a special bar

>>>>association before being permitted to practice patent law, and that the

>>>>roster of such attorneys is available on the Internet, as well as

>>>>information confirming the need for patent attorneys to be members of that

>>>>special bar association. Ask, and I'll even do the research for you,

>>>>since

>>>>you seem intent on proving yourself a liar with respect to what my

>>>>profession is.

>>

>> Wrong, perhaps, but a liar no. I have no reason to misstate your

>> *profession.*

>

>Except that you did misstate it, posting what my profession is as though it
>were true. I believe the exact words were "Steve Marcus ***is*** a patent
>attorney. (My emphasis.) If you had any reason at all to post what you
>thought my profession is, then you certainly had reason enough to misstate
>it intentionally.

>

>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> *You should read Lewis Carrol on the subject.*

>>>>>>

>>>>>>Why? I know what sarcasm is and don't need Carrol or dictionary to
>>>>>>explain

>>>>>>it to me. That you failed to understand that "somewhat unique" was
>>>>>>sarcastic (perhaps because I didn't originally put the phrase in quotes;
>>>>>>given that you appear to have difficulty reading for comprehension, that
>>>>>>certainly was my bad) doesn't mean that I, and others, share your
>>>>>>failure.

>>>>

>>>> No doubt you wrote the above when your computer was 'somewhat on'.

>>>

>>>Still don't understand the meaning of sarcasm, do you?

>>

>> Here we go back to the beginning. I will quote your original statement
>> and interpolate comments:

>>

>> And you claim to have me on "ignore", by which you claim to mean
>> that you only reply to posts that you think warrant a reply.

>>

>> [That's a reasonably accurate summation of what I have several
>> times said.]

>>

>> How you determine which posts those are without reading all of the
>> posts remains an "unsolved mystery",

>>

>> [Here is where you go off the rails. There is no reason why I have
>> to read ALL your posts to pick up something worthy of a comment.
>> Consider the rest of your above sentence]

>>

>> and evidently involves a somewhat unique definition of the
>> word "ignore."

>>

>> [At this point I picked you up on your usage of 'unique'. Something
>> either is unique or it is not. It can't be somewhat unique.
>> Hence my reference to'somewhat pregnant'and later, to your computer
>> being 'somewhat on'. You seem to be trying to ignore the point I
>> made and now are claiming that you wrote it in sarcasm. It still
>> looks much more like some sloppy vernacular to me.]

>

>Squink. If you meant you read only some of my posts, it was easy enough to

>have said so. The context of your original post stating that you have put
>me "on ignore" is that you only look for those posts that you deem to be
>worthy of a reply because what I state in such posts is outrageous enough
>that they "need" to be replied to.
>
>At the end of the day, it's clear that for all your pretensions about being
>this genius in forensic analysis, often called to court to testify and with
>clients for whom you generate (presumably in writing) reports on various
>matters, you actually can't write clearly enough to post something on Usenet
>that actually means what you intend it to mean. Coupled with your displays
>of illogic and your biases to anything that is not the generally accepted
>norm, I feel genuinely sorry for the Courts in which you appear and the
>clients that you represent.
>
>Post your evidence showing that I'm a patent attorney. Then I just might
>post evidence clearly proving the negative. I think, however, that I'll
>require you to promise to admit having lied about my profession, before I
>post the that evidence.

OK, so you are not a patent attorney. I doubt that you are even a practicing lawyer and that your frequent disclaimer is pretence.

I am going to ignore your response unless you can do more than add to argument and confusion. I hope that is sufficiently clear for you.

Eric Stevens