

Re: Meaning of Zero and All, Application to archaeology

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-01/1984.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 01/27/05

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2005 05:51:35 -0500

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
news:0odgv0ho43apsaq7jipj68mvur5marqmq5@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 26 Jan 2005 18:22:23 -0500, "Steve Marcus"
> <smarcus_spamout__at_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__at_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'm neither hurt nor indignant. I know full well what your modus operandi is: you take logically absurd positions supported by the flimsiest of evidence, one or more other posters easily demolish your position, you then generate a week or two of squink trying to dodge the matter, and then you move on. Occasionally, you skip the squink and dodge the matter by being totally nonresponsive to the posts that demolish your position.

I'm simply in awe of someone who gets publicly accused of intellectual dishonesty, and then proceeds to confirm the accusation in his very next response to the accuser. "Ignore" indeed.

>>

>>>

>>>> *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?*

As noted previously, you with Tedd Jacobs comment ""do UFO's exist? we dont have any evidence for it, and we dont have any evidence against it either.", calling it correct by responding "Quite right.: I disagreed with your statement, responding "Actually not." You then asked "Which part of Tedd's statement do you think I am wrong to agree with?" and I posted an answer. You then went into a dance, complaining that you had asked an "open-ended question" (of course your last question isn't open-ended at all), and complaining about the length of my answer. My answer in fact was all of 27 lines as composed on my newsreader, but you have yet to respond to it despite it being re-posted several times.

This isn't a boxing match, Eric. I don't need you to stay on topic ("stand still") to compose a post. Nor do you need to "get hit" in further discussion of the topic for anyone to see that your position is unsupportable and that I demolished it. The obvious conclusion to be reached by your "refusal to stand still" is that if you did stand still, you would come out on the short end.

>>
>>*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.*

So, Eric, I thought that you believe that absence of evidence (that neither you nor I could discover in Google) is not evidence of absence. Didn't work out to well for you in this instance, did it? Of course, as I recall the thing being a beta, for all I know it circulated to maybe ten people. So what?

>>
>>*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?*

Since I couldn't see any posts by you, (that's what I killfile does), it is hardly surprising that I responded by e-mail. In fact, your own post states that you sent the post to me by e-mail, to wit, "Just to make sure that he does not have to rely on an unknown fifth person to draw this article to his attention, I am forwarding him a copy by email." But logic never was your strong point, was it Eric?

>>

>> *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.*

Merely saying that doesn't make it so. As previously noted, you are apparently unable to distinguish between an argument based upon facts recited in the argument (like those I make) and arguments based upon gossamer wisps of faith and hope (such as those you make). But the best way to prove that last sentence wrong was for you to respond to the argument and show that it was based on irrelevancies, (or inaccuracies, or was illogical, etc.) Since you didn't do any of that, the logical conclusion is that you couldn't do it, just as Inger's failure to cite or name supporting sources compels the logical conclusion that she has none.

But that's your way, isn't it? Clouds of

> *entangling impenetrable argument. Commonly known as 'squink'.*

Let's see. I posted an argument in response to your invitation to do so. In response:

1. you've composed posts that claims you didn't ask a question that you in fact asked;
2. you've composed posts in which you refuse to address the answer that you asked for but instead have simply dismissed it out of hand;
3. you have twisted the conversation into the issue of whether you are actually ignoring my posts when you immediately responded to a post of mine after claiming you were ignoring me;
4. you have dredged up the matter of whether I had killfiled you several years ago; and in discussing that

5. you have produced illogically argument to support your allegation as evidence in the very post you cite on the matter; and
6. you inconclude in your arguemnt the very position regarding the absence of evidence (on Google) that is contra to the position you took in the main discussion.

I think that you had better rethink who is generating the squink, Eric. As Dylan said, "it ain't me, Babe."

>
> ----- snip -----
>
> *Until the next time, you are back onto ignore.*

As the Cos said, "Riiiiiggghhhhtttt"

>
>
>
> *Eric Stevens*
>
Steve

--
The above posting is neither a legal opinion nor legal advice,
because we do not have an attorney-client relationship, and
should not be construed as either. This posting does not
represent the opinion of my employer, but is merely my personal
view. To reply, delete _spamout_ and replace with the numeral 3