

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)

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> wrote:

>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: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.
>

- >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.

Also unlike me, you don't mind altering the apparent thrust of an argument by deleting sections of it without saying so.

- >So I do the
- >reasonable thing and cut text. Any fool can go back up the
- >thread and see what the original said.

But only if they know that something has been deleted.

- > 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?

I take it you are referring to my statement in response to you that "In some cases they were and this has been demonstrated". What I wrote then is demonstrably correct (see the URL above) and you would know that if you had been following this matter for more than the length of this thread.

- >
- >> 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.

What do you think you have corrected me on? Do you think I am wrong when I say that sections of the book are demonstrably wrong?

- >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.

I have copies of 'prime documents' which prove my case. They are exactly the same as the ones Michael Zalar relied upon when he made his criticism and I have to say that they support his views.

> 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.

This is getting a long way off the topic. Its nothing to do with style. Its to do with matters of fact.

>
>> 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.

In that case I suggest you stay quiet until you actually know what you are talking about.

>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 minnesota in 1362.
>Anyone who believes so needs to have thier head examined.

... and this relevant to what we have been discussing because ...?

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

Probably.

>
>
>>And Steve's claim was a stupid bluff.
>
>Wasn't it you who was criticizing his rhetorical style.

I was criticising his honesty.

>

>>>> *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.*

You clearly are in no position to know. I suggest you do some background research on source material before you form an opinion.

Eric Stevens