

## Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-01/msg01133.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <[grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 25 Jan 2008 20:53:48 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Jan 25, 8:16 pm, richard01 <[richardparke...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:richardparke...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On 26 Jan, 08:58, "Peter T. Daniels" <[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jan 25, 7:52 pm, richard01 <[richardparke...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:richardparke...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On 26 Jan, 02:28, "Peter T. Daniels"  
<[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jan 25, 8:39 am, Franz Gnaedinger  
<[f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jan 25, 2:21 pm, Richard  
Herring  
<[junk@\[127.0.0.1\]](mailto:junk@[127.0.0.1])> wrote:

That's  
because it's  
unfalsifiable.  
What does  
that tell you  
about your  
"approach",  
considered  
as a  
scientific

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

theory?

I always engage in  
discussions, I even tell  
people how  
to do it: choose the worst I  
say and nail me on it.

They always do.

I never weasel away,

You always do.

I always stand my man. And  
until now I won the  
discussions.

You never did.

I proposed numerous  
reconstructions, daring ones.  
Nobody can point them  
out as wrong.

Of course not. They have no basis in reality,  
there is nothing to  
evaluate them against.

As long as you can't do that,  
with all  
your titles and all your  
universities and libraries and

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

connections in your  
background, as long I feel  
entitled  
to go on with my  
experiment.

You do not know the meaning of the English  
word "experiment."

Has  
anybody  
suggested  
otherwise?

They suggest that you stop plaguing us with  
the results, but "publish"  
them in newsgroups where they enjoy  
discussing such things, such as  
conlang newsgroups.

Of course, all the time, they  
try to send me away,  
to conlang or so.

That's because what you are doing is  
\_constructing\_ a language.

What is a  
"Google  
account",  
and how do  
you "fill" it?

If you look up my profile  
you see a lot of messages  
that have not been written  
and posted by me but by

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

that  
criminal who abuses my  
name and Google identity,  
appearing in groups I would  
never visit. Or look up  
"messages by this author":  
the same crap sent by  
the criminal who abuses my  
name, my own messages  
buried under them. Neither  
does Google remove that  
crap from my account, nor  
can I remove it, and when  
I report abuse I get ever the  
same robot answer.  
They have a serious security  
problem.

Once again: What is a "Google account"?

Usenet in  
general uses  
protocols  
that have no  
security.  
How is that  
specifically  
Google's  
problem?

If Google runs an account of  
my messages,

Ah. It appears that you don't know the  
meaning of the English word  
"account."

then  
they should not allow  
criminals who abuse my  
name

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

and Google identity to fill  
my account with his crap.  
Their robot can always tell  
me they do their best  
in order to improve the  
groups – when I see my  
account filled with crap by a  
criminal, archived by  
Google under my name, I  
say Google has a problem  
and is a part of the present  
mess, probably owing  
to their too fast  
implementation of ever new  
features.  
They should consolidate  
what they achieved so far  
before adding ever new  
features.– Hide quoted text  
–

– Show quoted text –

Google Groups (I didn't know this before being informed on  
this forum)  
is only a portal to various Usenet groups.

Please excuse me if I am apparently teaching you (or others)  
to suck  
eggs, but you don't seem to know much about Google  
Groups.

If you had bothered to look at the subthread you were responding to,  
you would have seen that it is Franz who does not understand google  
groups.– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

This is the relevant excerpt from that post that I was replying to

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

Daniels >>> What is a "Google account", and how do you "fill" it?

Franz G >> If you look up my profile you see a lot of messages

that have not been written and posted by me but by that criminal who abuses my name and Google identity, appearing in groups I would never visit. Or look up "messages by this author": the same crap sent by the criminal who abuses my name, my own messages buried under them. Neither does Google remove that crap from my account, nor can I remove it, and when I report abuse I get ever the same robot answer. They have a serious security problem.

Once again: What is a "Google account"?

Usenet in general uses protocols that have no security. How is that specifically Google's problem?

If Google runs an account of my messages,

Ah. It appears that you don't know the meaning of the English word "account."

then  
they should not allow criminals who abuse my name and Google identity to fill my account with his crap. Their robot can always tell me they do their best in order to improve the groups – when I see my account filled with crap by a criminal, archived by Google under my name, I say Google has a problem and is a part of the present mess, probably owing to their too fast implementation of ever new features. They should consolidate what they achieved so far before adding ever new features.– Hide quoted text –

Re: Idiot spam attack on sci.lang

Perhaps you might read my response again, specifically in the light of this.

You have a tin eye. It is perfectly obvious that I was not asking for a definition of "google account" from Franz. I was repeating Richard Herring's question to Franz that Franz, typically, distorted.

I can read or ignore Franz's messages if I wish. I certainly don't feel an obligation to respond immediately with a sneer or a snipe.

It would be better if you didn't respond to things that are too subtle for you.

I cannot ignore the ubiquitous presence of smammers and sporgers—

Why not? All the rest of us have managed to.

.