

Re: Latest software here!!!!

## Re: Latest software here!!!!

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2007-09/msg02201.html>

---

- *From:* Peter Duniho <[NpOeStPeAdM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:NpOeStPeAdM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 18 Sep 2007 11:45:26 -0700
- 

Göran Andersson wrote:

Peter Duniho wrote:

I quoted the messages so that you could see for yourself.

And as I pointed out, you need not have done that, since I had already seen all of the messages in the thread, via Google Groups.

If you really saw all the messages, why do you keep saying that I did reply to spam?

Because in my opinion you did.

[...]

What is your opinion then? That I am not allowed to reply to messages in a thread that happened to start with a spam message, but you are?

No. First, my opinion does not in any way address what is "allowed". This is a freely open forum, and every person is "allowed" to post whatever they like.

Secondly, this isn't about replying to messages in the thread. It's about replying to `_spam_` in the thread.

I'm sorry that you don't see the need to avoid helping spammers sell their wares.

Now you are being ridiculous. Do you really think that I posted to help spammers?

Do I think that you intended to help spammers? No, nor did I ever write anything like that. Do I think that you DID help a spammer? Yes.

Re: Latest software here!!!!

Re: Latest software here!!!!

I'm not interested in a huge argument about the issue, and you seem more interested in inventing a disagreement about "the facts"

I'm only so concerned with the facts because you keep ignoring them.

Not true at all, and it's not productive to accuse me of doing so.

than in listening to the identical opinion stated here by two newsgroup regulars, and a third person by proxy.

How does your "regularity" have anything to do with the matter? Does it make your opinion worth more? If that's really how you see yourself, that is rather frightening.

I don't know why you see the need to be so snide. Not only do you seem to be taking the whole issue very personally, you seem to want to turn everything about it into an opportunity for a personal attack against me. Again, I don't think that's a very productive approach.

Now, as far as "regularity" goes, it was simply a comment meant to distinguish between those who replied in person (the "regulars") and the person who didn't reply per se, but who was referenced as having the same opinion. It's not at all about "how I see myself", and I don't see why you would jump to the conclusion that it was. It's just about acknowledging that even though I reference three people who appear to be in agreement, only two made an actual reply in this newsgroup.

But even if it was more than that, in what way is that "frightening"? I don't know about you, but I definitely hold the opinion of someone I've seen post on a regular basis in higher regard, especially when I generally tend to find that person's posts to be of high quality. I suppose you take a more egalitarian approach, treating everyone's opinion with equal disdain, as you're doing here? I guess that's fine, but I don't see why it should be so scary to you for someone to have an opinion different from yours.

I'm not clear on what you found so frightening about that prospect, even if it were true (and it wasn't in this case).

We all agree that you should not have quoted the spam but, since that's clearly a subjective issue, there are no "facts" that could be used to persuade you.

Why do you keep repeating that lie?

What lie?

I didn't quote anything from the spam message.

Re: Latest software here!!!!

Re: Latest software here!!!!

I disagree.

You obviously believe that you didn't, but Cor and I have observed that, at least in our opinion, the second message was every bit as much a spam message as the first. And there is no question that you replied to the second message.

The question of whether post to which you replied is spam or not is NOT a factual matter. You have no more basis to claim that it is factually not a spam message than I have to claim that it factually is a spam message. Further, if you do want to go down the road of whether you can make a factual claim regarding whether that post was spam, the post meets two very basic criteria for spam: it's advertising and it was posted to a wide variety of unrelated newsgroups.

Ergo, this is a disagreement of opinion, not of facts.

I have shown you the messages, but still you act as you never saw them?

I do not act as though I never saw them. I have several times explained that I have, and it is not productive for you to continue claiming that I haven't, or that I "act" as if I haven't.

The facts are the messages that was posted. You say that there is no disagreement on the facts, but that's not worth much as long as you keep ignoring the facts.

I do not ignore the facts. I have a different interpretation of them than you, based on opinion. As I said, it's clear that we don't disagree on the facts, only on the things that are a matter of opinion.

If you will not be persuaded by the concepts of being a good community neighbor, there is nothing left to do but just drop the thread.

If I'm going to be met by lies and slander whenever I try to act like a good community neighbour,

In what way were you trying to act like a good community neighbor? And what lies and slander were posted? All of the "lies and slander" you've accused me of so far are simply a matter of you misunderstanding and misinterpreting the interpretation of the facts at hand.

it will rather quickly stop me from trying. What is your purpose with treating me this way?

Treating you this way? Please go back and read the reply to which you got all hot and bothered. I feel it was quite polite and made my point quite clear. My purpose was simply to request that you (and others by implication) not reply to spam, and not quote spam when replying. It's a very simple request and I was not at all rude when I made it.

Re: Latest software here!!!!

Re: Latest software here!!!!

I still am not clear on where your hostility comes from, and especially at this point when all you really need to do is agree to disagree with respect to the opinion of whether the post to which you replied was spam. It's a fair disagreement, but you continue to take offense and to accuse me of all sorts of things that I have not done.

At the same time, you post inflammatory statements like "you have no idea what's happening" and accuse me of ignoring the facts. At the same time you take offense for imagined "lies and slander", you engage in the very behavior that you incorrectly infer on part of other people.

I am sorry that you so severely misconstrued the various posts in this thread. However, I don't believe that until you go back and review them and try to understand them from the perspective of the person writing them rather than your own defensive perspective, that any progress is likely to be made. So, I promise this is my last post on the topic as long as you continue to hold to the impression that I am somehow attacking you or otherwise deserving of your hostility.

Pete

.

Re: Latest software here!!!!