

## Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1387.html>

---

**From:** Eric Stevens ([eric.stevens\\_at\\_sum.co.nz](mailto:eric.stevens_at_sum.co.nz))

**Date:** 10/23/04

Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 00:03:59 +1300

On Sat, 23 Oct 2004 03:07:06 GMT, Philip Deitiker  
<[Donevenask@worlnet.att.net](mailto:Donevenask@worlnet.att.net)> wrote:

>Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@sum.co.nz](mailto: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](mailto:Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam)> wrote:  
>>  
>>>In *sci.archaeology*, Eric Stevens created a message  
>>>ID <news:3vkg0l3r5mk2nrpap1i9i987orpki3htt@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.

It has already been demonstrated by Michael Zalar some time ago. See  
<http://tinyurl.com/3pdav>

>  
>>>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.  
>

sci.archaeology: Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

- >*Right, unlike you and your friend Inger, I don't like wasting*
- >*UseNet and Internet band width with post, and in particular I*