

## Re: Meaning of Zero and All, Application to archaeology

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-01/1940.html>

---

**From:** Eric Stevens (*eric.stevens\_at\_sum.co.nz*)

**Date:** 01/27/05

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2005 13:41:02 +1300

On Wed, 26 Jan 2005 18:22:23 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

<smarcus\_spamout\_@cox.net> wrote:

>

> "Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message

> news:ebufv0936aakh4v6n5e31hrcnjtpv30pfo@4ax.com...

>> On Wed, 26 Jan 2005 12:50:30 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

>> <smarcus\_spamout\_@cox.net> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> "Philip Deitiker" <Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam> wrote in message

>>> news:Xns95EA6DF736Fprd@128.249.2.19...

>>>> In sci.archaeology, Steve Marcus created a message ID

>>>> news:F1OJd.95569\$Jk5.89534@lakeread01:

>>>>

>>>>> BTW, Eric, got any evidence that I'm a "patent attorney"?

>>>>> For whatever

>>>>> stakes you care to name (most valuable to me would be for

>>>>> you to simply quit

>>>>> posting your crap), I now have the evidence to prove you

>>>>> wrong (yet again).

>>>>>

>>>>> Calm down Steve, being ignored by loons and kooks is a good

>>>>> thing.

>>>>

>>>> Agreed. But I don't think Stevens actually does put folks like you and me

>>>> in a kill file (I used to keep files of posts he made to so-called kill

>>>> filed posters almost immediately after he announced his intention to kill

>>>> file the poster).

>>>>

>>>> That's about as honest as your claim that you had kill filed me when

>>>> you were using a browser that didn't support kill files.

>>>>

>>>> In fact, if I had intended to kill file you I would not have said I

>>>> was putting you on ignore. The fact that I am ignoring you does not

>>>> mean that I will allow you to spread lies and half truths.

>

>*Fantastic. Two admissions by Eric himself that he's dishonest.*

>

>*Admission One: Eric, if you're "ignoring" me, but somehow you're reading  
>what I wrote. That's a great trick. But, by the definition of the word  
>ignore, you aren't doing it if you read that which you claim to have "put on  
>ignore."*

There is no need for you to act all hurt and indignant. You know very well I've been treating you this way for years.

>

>>

>>> *I believe that he quite often merely alleges that he is  
>>>kill filing someone as a convenient dodge when his absurdities have been  
>>>shown to be absurdities, and he can no longer defend them in the  
>>>particular  
>>>thread he was participating in.*

>>>

>>> *What hacks me off about Stevens is that he dishonestly posts that the  
>>>person  
>>>he was discussing something with did something "wrong" in the discussion,  
>>>when the truth is otherwise. Amazingly, he does that in the face of  
>>>archives such as Google, where the truth of the matter is easily seen.*

>>

>> *Google's a great thing. See <http://tinyurl.com/4requ>*

>

>*You're right, it sure is. Of course it just demonstrated your intellectual  
>dishonesty, and how, because you didn't like the answer to a specific  
>question that you asked me, you've been dancing around the answer generating  
>volumes of squink.*

Upset because I won't stand still long enough for you to direct one of your ponderous blows at me?

>

>*Admission Two: However, there is no corresponding archive for e-mails. You  
>were informed via e-mail, (in reply to the e-mail that you sent me as stated  
>in the post you linked above), that I had gotten hold of a third party  
>plug-in that permitted Netscape's (16 bit Netscape) to killfile usenet  
>posts. It simply extended the capability of killfiling e-mails. IIRC, the  
>plug-in was quite possibly a beta, but I do recall that it belonged to  
>someone else, and after it was installed, the disk was returned to that  
>person. By the time I sent you the e-mail telling you this, I couldn't even  
>remember the name of the plug-in.*

No. Nor could you find any reference to it in Google and, for that matter, neither could I.

>

>*Now, maybe you have the e-mail, maybe you don't. I've since changed my PC  
>and my ISP and no longer have any but the most important e-mail from 16-bit  
>days. Sorry, but correspondence with you didn't qualify as important to any  
>extent, let alone "most" important.*

Its a great pity you felt obliged to defend yourself by email. Thust think, if you had done it in the news group (in public) your answer would be there for all to see. I wonder why that never occurred to you?

>

*>BTW, care to comment on why the facts I presented explaining why the absence  
>of evidence for the existence of ET UFO's in fact constitutes evidence (that  
>is, an material tending to indicate) that they in fact do not and have not  
>existed? Nah, of course you don't. Seems as though you prefer appearing  
>dishonest to having someone show you that you are simply wrong.*

You produced arguments. You didn't produce facts which were evidence of anything relevant. But that's your way, isn't it? Clouds of entangling impenetrable argument. Commonly known as 'squink'.

----- snip -----

Until the next time, you are back onto ignore.

Eric Stevens