

Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1392.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 10/23/04

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 10:56:59 -0400

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
news:ghijn01ib52jodqrk56ek783ahc3hoanfo@4ax.com...

> On 22 Oct 2004 22:38:25 GMT, Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam>

> wrote:

>

>>In sci.archaeology, Steve Marcus created a message ID

>>news:Tueed.16847\$jd.13574@lakeread04:

>>

>>

>>>> You don't give up do you?

>>>

>>> Because the real issue is the accuracy of the fact,

>>

>>Facts are open to debate, they could be in error.

>>

>>> Eric, not the quibble about whether peer reviewed

>>> facts in an essay written by an expert (which

>>> essay may or may not have been peer reviewed;

>>

>>This is the basic problem. Eric was trying to create

>>the appearance that the book was a sham by making

>>'appearances' like statement.

>

>

> Good God – you are dense.

>

> I was not making the point that the book was a sham. I was making the

> point that Steve Marcus's claim that the book was "peer reviewed" was

> a sham. Steve Marcus and Michael Zalar were debating the age of the

> Kingigtorsuaq stone. Michael Zalar had several references giving

> different ages, with all of which Marcus disagreed. He tried to give

> priority to his data over Michael Zalar's data by claiming that his

> (Marcus's) data was obtained from a book which was peer reviewed.

An outright lie and missequencing of events, as already admitted to by Stevens. As has already been posted, the sequence was this:

1. Michael Zalar posted something about the King. runestone, linking it to the expedition that he believes might have created the Kensington runestone. That post contained an alleged date for the King. runestone.

2. I replied, and in the reply, noted that the alleged date was in error, giving the most current accepted date, and asking, most politely, for references in support of what he had originally posted. I did in fact ask for "peer reviewed" references; although unstated, my request for "peer reviewed" material was so that I could easily compare dates and learn whether Mr. Zalar's references pre-dated or post-dated my reference. I did not state that my reference was peer reviewed.

3. Mr. Zalar replied with a list of six references, and noted that I had not, at that point, presented my own reference. He apparently regarded it to be either rude, or somewhat insulting, to be asked for references by someone who had not presented any reference(s) of his own. Mr. Zalar rather testily accused me of asking him to do my work for me (I guess he meant that my failure to cite a reference in my post meant that I had none, and now I was asking him to provide a reference backing my post). I can understand him be put off by my post, because my post pointed out that there was nothing to support various points of presumption and speculation in his post.

4. I then replied, giving my source, and noting that it was peer reviewed. Again, there is no comment in my post regarding the status of Michael Zalar's sources as being peer reviewed, or not.

Here are the posts in sequence corresponding to the above sequence:

1. <http://tinyurl.com/6rm6l>

2. <http://tinyurl.com/4xx95>

3. <http://tinyurl.com/4phqa>

4. <http://tinyurl.com/6xg5n>

>

> *This is not now an argument about the age of the Kingigtorsuaq stone.*

> *It is not now an argument over which of the various references is best.*

> *It is an argument over whether Steve Marcus is prepared to risk a lie*

> *to strengthen his own argument. The answer is yes, Steve Marcus is*

> *prepared to lie.*

Actually, my last post is somewhat ambiguous, and can be read either as stating that the book, "Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga" is a peer reviewed source, or that Gullov's essay, which is specifically what I cited (here's the quote from post #4 above:

"'Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga', Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000, pages 320, 321, article by Hans Christian Gullov (Danish National Museum,

Copenhagen) entitled 'Natives and Norse in Greenland'

is a peer reviewed source.

My belief was that because the Gullov essay relies upon peer reviewed material, it in fact was peer reviewed, and because the same would be true for all essays within the book that rely upon peer reviewed material, that the book would be regarded as being peer reviewed. The logic is that if I cite a given volume and number for, let's say, "Scientific American", and state that "Scientific American, vol. X no. Y" is peer reviewed, it's because the articles contained in "Scientific American, vol. X no. Y" are "peer reviewed." It's a peer reviewed publication. This may well be sloppy on my part, mea maxima culpa, but then again, you will note the time stamp on my post.

In short, two things are clear:

Stevens' characterization of the sequence of events given above is erroneous, _and he knew that when he wrote his post_ because it's been proven elsewhere in this thread, and Stevens actually agreed that it was erroneous.

My characterization in post #4 above hardly qualifies as a lie; and the fact is that Stevens not only doesn't know whether the cited Gullov article is a peer reviewed article, or whether any or every article in the book is a peer reviewed article, he doesn't care. He is simply casting as much squint about as he can, for the simple reason that he likes Michael Zalar (whose position on the KRS is one which Stevens supports) and dislikes me (whose position on the KRS is one that Stevens can't stand; note that it isn't simply that he dislikes my position, it's that he can't stand the spotlight of evidence and the scientific method being shined into his dirty corner of fantasy, speculation, presumption and mythology).

>

> *You may consider this acceptable but then you have to explain why one
> should trust data from anyone who is prepared to offer false data with
> a straight face. Why should you trust someone who tries to justify
> offering false data on the grounds that several unattributed and
> unverifiable layers of quote down there may indeed be some verifiable
> facts?*

The above paragraph wins this year's award for ironic Usenet post of the year, and may also have clinched the award for the entire decade. You, who championed the late Mr. Athy's erroneous claptrap, you who champion Inger's unsupported and false to the point of actually being invented claptrap, you, who cites any and every URL giving unsubstantiated nonsense, you, who are embroiled in a thread discussing Norse in Vancouver and Alaska and who has admitted that there is no cogent evidence supporting the concept, have the brass cojones to ask how one can trust someone who offers false data?

sci.archaeology: Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Eric, the King. runestone is datable to the end of the 13th century. That data appears in the article in the book cited above. It is true, and it is peer reviewed (see the bibliography). That's what matters. That's why you can trust the data. Get over it. And that's why no data from Inger is trustworthy, why no data from the late Mr. Athy is trustworthy, and why not all data from people's private websites is trustworthy. Get over that too.

>
> --- *long trail of irrelevancies snipped unread* ----
>
>
>
>
> *Eric Stevens*
>

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