

Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1363.html>

From: Philip Deitiker (*Donevenask_at_worlnet.att.net*)

Date: 10/23/04

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 03:07:06 GMT

Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> says in
news:ni6jn0h4q5ubqvhctts0uitgagvqrgigip@4ax.com:

> *On 22 Oct 2004 18:02:07 GMT, Philip Deitiker*
> *<Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam> wrote:*
>
>> *In sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens created a message*
>> *ID news:3vkgn0l3r5mk2nrpap1i9i987orpki3htt@4ax.com:*
>>
>>> *What's that got to do with my criticism of what **you***
>> *wrote?*
>>
>> *Everything, you implied that the authors of the book could*
>> *be confused as wantedly misrepresentative.*
>
> *In some cases they were and this has been demonstrated.*

Is that a trivial piece of information, or is it an opinion you
want reiterated for some greater [rhetorical] reason.

>> *See this is what I*
>> *don't like when you are directly confronted on what you say*
>> *you become evasive, as if people don't remember. Your*
>> *specific critique of that book is what _will_ catch the eye*
>> *of anyone who read it, no matter how cleverly you try to*
>> *disguise your accusation, we know what you meant.*
>
> *You can make that accusation because you have snipped what*
> *I actually said. You make a habit of doing that without*
> *even noting the fact.*

Right, unlike you and your friend Inger, I don't like wasting
UseNet and Internet band width with post, and in particular I
get a message when quoted text is excessive. So I do the
reasonable thing and cut text. Any fool can go back up the
thread and see what the original said. If you say something
stupid I am doing you a favor by pointing it out to you, if you
don't want to go back and read what stupidity you have written,

fine by me.

- > *When I ask you to support your claims*
- > *by a quote you never do because they almost always are*
- > *wrong.*

In the first paragraph of this thread you reiterated what you said, and now you are saying I have to go back in requote. Do you like arguing with the wind, also?

- > *The truth is that in this case was point out that*
- > *Steve's claim that the book was peer reviewed was false.*
- > *Now you want to inflate that into an attack by me on the*
- > *book.*

Frankly I couldn't give a crap about the book. I was making a statement of your propoganda motif because you do this all of the freaking time, and I am frequently have to correct you on this. Unless you have a SPECIFIC peer reviewed article that refutes what another widely accepted source book or other peer reviewed article says, or you have a collective of really good information that any reasonable person would interpret just as you do, don't cast trivial dispersions against work to undermine it in favor of that which you, with your best set of data, cannot prove.

You don't seem to understand this, when you sling monkey poo, its not going to fly by unnoticed. So stop throwing the Monkey poo. Micheal seems to get by with alot more of the support than you or Inger do, you consider the style has something to do with why you get a hostile response.

- > *BUt Steve was trying to claim that *his* source was better*
- > *anchored than Michaels. Well it wasn't a*

I have yet to see the meat in Zalar's. The date on Kensington is 1362, Zalar is saying there is a _potential_ reference to Helluland which _might_ be as late as 1333. 1333 is potentially reasonable, however I would have some question about the communication between the New World and Old World in 1333. However to imply that some potential new world contact was proof of KRS's authenticity is a very far stretch of the imagination. In 50 years the world changed, the climate changed dramatically, what could be done in the early part of the 14th century, became troublesome at the end of the 14th century.

1333 contact with potential lands across the labrador straits does not equal a large scale expedition into minnisota in 1362. Anyone who believes so needs to have thier head examined.

Is there something specific about what Micheal said that suddenly makes a connection between Helluland and KRS that I missed?

>And Steve's claim was a stupid bluff.

Wasn't it you who was criticizing his rhetorical style.

>>> *End of this. You've been caught out and nailed. I need*

>>> *say*

>>*no more.*

>>

>>*The ultimate diversion here.*

>>

>>> *Take him down :-(*

>>

>>*This is supposed to have some meaning?*

>

> *Yes. It's what the judge in some British courts says to the*

> *warders after finding the prisoner guilty.*

No one appointed you Judge, and if we are asking for the providers of false and misleading information, you stand with the accused.

--

Philip

- - - - -
Mol. Anth. Group <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/DNAanthro/>
Mol. Evol. Hominids <http://home.att.net/~DNAPaleoAnth/>
Evol. of Xchrom.
<http://home.att.net/~DNAPaleoAnth/xlinked.htm>
Pal. Anth. Group <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Paleoanthro/>
Sci. Arch. Aux
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/sciarchauxilliary/>