

# Re: A new early Holocene human skeleton from Brazil

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-03/2794.html>

---

**From:** Steve Marcus (*smarcus\_spamout\_\_at\_cox.net*)

**Date:** 03/25/05

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 2005 19:18:39 -0500

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message  
news:rdg6419rhrnvpougouipdiljm4omrf3joj6@4ax.com...

> On Thu, 24 Mar 2005 05:41:47 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

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

>

>>

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

>>news:dli441dl1q46p7fa7f1kka0517mc2kglni@4ax.com...

>>> On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 21:02:50 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

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

>>>

>>>>

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

>>>>news:8254411j6ghsb102k8bvn2aacm1ctm4t6@4ax.com...

>>>>> On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 18:43:35 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

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

>>>>>

>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>news:1gr341h0d8fvr1fjmb4u94mnfo6vc28s0v@4ax.com...

>>>>>>> On 23 Mar 2005 13:44:40 -0800, a.manansala@attbi.com wrote:

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Philip Deitiker wrote:

>>>>>>>>> In sci.anthropology.paleo, created a message ID

>>>>>>>>> news:1111596969.347053.66080@o13g2000cwo.googlegroups.com:

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> [I thought the guy was in my killfile]

>>>>>>>>>>> <plonk>

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>I've never been in your "killfile" and you know this very well.

sci.archaeology: Re: A new early Holocene human skeleton from Brazil

>>>>>>>You even join other groups to read my messages. <plonk>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Philip claims to have a kill file but it never seems to work.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Pot, kettle, black.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>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. How you determine  
>>>>>>>which  
>>>>>>>posts those are without reading all of the posts remains an "unsolved  
>>>>>>>mystery", and evidently involves a somewhat unique definition of the  
>>>>>>>word  
>>>>>>>"ignore."  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "somewhat unique" LOL  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Who would hire a lawyer who mangles logic so?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>? Perhaps you might have understood if I had written "somewhat unique."  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Since you evidently need it spelled out for you try this: Unless you  
>>>>>>>are  
>>>>>>>using a "somewhat unique" definition of the word "ignore", you \_aren't\_  
>>>>>>>ignoring a post by reading it. and you \_aren't\_ ignoring anything posted  
>>>>>>>by  
>>>>>>>me if you read everything I post in order to find the posts that you  
>>>>>>>think  
>>>>>>>"requires" a reply.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>> I have a 3-1/2 year old granddaughter playing in the room below. I'm  
>>>> aware of what she is doing but I continue to ignore it until she goes  
>>>> too far. I am sure you can follow the analogy.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Not even the best lawyer on the planet could extricate you from the  
>>>>>>>knots  
>>>>>>>you've tied yourself in trying to get yourself out of having been caught  
>>>>>>>in  
>>>>>>>a baldfaced lie. You claimed to have me "on ignore" (note the inclusion  
>>>>>>>of  
>>>>>>>the word on in the quotation marks; see: <http://tinyurl.com/3wr9x> ) and  
>>>>>>>that lasted about 1 post made the next day. You are the last person  
>>>>>>>entitled to call someone else on a claim of having kill filed another  
>>>>>>>poster.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> I bet I'm not. Do you want to bet?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Sure Eric. What shall we bet, and how would you prove your point?  
>>>>>>>  
>

> *Sorry Steve. It's not my point, it's yours. Remember "You are the last  
> person entitled to call someone else on a claim of having kill filed  
> another". My bet is that I am not the last person to be so entitled. I  
> am sure that if we wait for long enough someone else will be similarly  
> entitled. And then someone after that. Or didn't you realise that that  
> was the point I was making? Surely you understand the explicit meaning  
> of your own words?*

Absolutely. "The last person entitled" is idiomatic usage, quite common in English, and has nothing at all to do with the literal meaning of the words. For example, see ""It is known whose interests Kostov defended in the last few years. They certainly were not the national interests, but his own and his family's. He is the last person entitled to level accusations at us, claiming that we are defending special interests other than the national ones," Velchev said." from:

[http://www.sofiaecho.com/article/war-of-words-on-bonds/id\\_4112/catid\\_23](http://www.sofiaecho.com/article/war-of-words-on-bonds/id_4112/catid_23)

or "Prime Minister Ehud Barak said that the meeting in Vienna "is troubling from a moral point of view." MK Tzvi Hendel (National Union) retorted that the Prime Minister is the last person entitled to cast aspersions of this kind, "given his appointment of Yossi Ginossar as a political emissary, who has major economic interests in the Palestinian Authority." from

[http://www.hebroots.org/hebrootsarchive/0102/010218\\_a.html](http://www.hebroots.org/hebrootsarchive/0102/010218_a.html)

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.

>  
>  
>>>>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.

>>

>>>

>>> *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.

> *I would be*

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

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

> *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.

>>>

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

>>

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

>>*explain*

sci.archaeology: Re: A new early Holocene human skeleton from Brazil

>>*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?

>  
>  
>  
> *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