

Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1402.html>

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

Date: 10/23/04

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 21:09:45 GMT

Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> says in
news:ridkn0httd3isb1ii7uj07k2s15fjsuu7b@4ax.com:

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

Evasive, answer the question/

>>*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.*

You have a reader that can thread post, if not get one. I am not
responsible for the behavior of UseNet challenged individuals.

> *But only if they know that something has been deleted.*

You don't remember what you wrote. Pitty.

>>*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 repsonse 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.*

I followed the thread and I disagree, Zalar made a minor
correction, as is expected in these types of things. While he
and you may think the errors were major, they still place a date
off by 3 decades.

- > *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?*

What you said was that believe the authors were villainous in their intent could easily be confused. Any book, paper, even peer-reviewed primary literature has errors in it, minor errors do not equal some conspiracy to deprive the world of the facts. This is what you implied, not it appears you are denying it.

- > *I have copies of 'prime documents' which prove my case.*

Where?

- > *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.*

He made a minor adjustment of the dates.

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

And you do? But somehow you can't quote from the book or the refutations these supposedly 'villainous' omissions in the book.

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

That is not an answer, it is more Steven's evasion.

- > *I was criticising his honesty.*

As I am criticizing yours.

--

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/>