

*>immaterial until Michael comes back with at least something of
>that level.*

Neither of those two sources makes either the book or (as Steve Marcus later claimed) the article peer reviewed. It is depressing how you pretend to require peer reviewed sources except when the source you want to rely on is not peer reviewed.

>

*> Until he does so you are JUST bad mouthing Steve and the
>Book. So the key phrase here is put up or shut up. I have
>followed each of Michaels sources backwards, the best that I
>could find is that 2 or 3 rely on or interpret from one single
>source of information, and that source is a guess.*

You are attempting to resolve the matter on the basis of an argument from authority. Both Michael and I can do better than that. In most cases we can go back to primary sources to establish the actual facts. The problem with the KRS is that from early in the 20th century it has become surrounded by a cloud of lies. The last great liar was Wahlgren but his lies are carried on in the literature, in some cases by people you would expect to know better.

Eric Stevens