

Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1056.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 10/19/04

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 05:38:48 -0400

"Michael Zalar" <m_zalar@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a458909b.0410172203.3fff99b2@posting.google.com...
> "Steve Marcus" <smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net> wrote in message
news:<Gxx7d.3800\$gm.1044@okepread07>...
>> "Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
>> news:n22tl09is5hd3a4ftmnj0r5k0bb9trjnr9@4ax.com...
>>> On 1 Oct 2004 15:05:05 GMT, Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> In sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens created a message ID
>>>> news:p1upl0th703il87fctvhhdscm4v2gdj8su@4ax.com:
>>>>
>>>>> On Fri, 01 Oct 2004 01:28:33 GMT, Philip Deitiker
>>>>> <Donevenask@worlnet.att.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> says in
>>>>>> news:2i1pl0tiupu21gbjt813cim7ln6d9nbaev@4ax.com:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I would stay away from the exhaust of that fume cupboard,
>>>>>>> if I were you.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So you admit the KRS was rather large for not having any
>>>>>>> of the typical runic artistry on it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> lol.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Stick to the subject.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 'Spirit Pond', Philip, 'Spirit Pond'.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 'Another hoax', Eric 'Another hoax'
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>> Maybe. But the stones need more genuine study before that can be said
>>>> with confidence.
>>>>
>> They have been studied, and you ought to know it, since you claim to own

the

> > *book "Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga." Of course, the book is 400 pages,*
> > *exclusive of bibliography and index, and you claim to be unable to read a*
> > *Usenet post longer than 20 lines, so*
> >
> > *On the other hand, you are quite fond of dismissing peer reviewed and*
> > *referenced scholarship, such as set forth in the above book, while*
> > *simultaneously crediting the lies posted by Inger. So perhaps you have read*
> > *the above book, and simply choose to disregard it. In that case, what sort*
> > *of genuine study will you credit? Besides anything that Inger posts, that*
> > *is.*
> >
> > *Steve*
> > --
>
> *I dont believe that Vikings... was peer reviewed. Certainly there*
> *were numerous errors in the text regarding the KRS, which were later*
> *admitted (and in some few instances corrected.)*

Nonsense. The scholars listed in the book authored articles that they simply made stuff up, and the Smithsonian published it all without checking any of it through a peer review process.

You seem to think that peer review means "error free." I don't, and no one else does either.

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
>
> Michael
>
>
> > 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
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Eric Stevens
> > >