

## Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-11/0144.html>

---

**From:** Philip Deitiker (*Nopdeitik\_at\_att.net.Spam*)

**Date:** 11/01/04

Date: 1 Nov 2004 22:30:34 GMT

In sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens created a message ID  
news:4b9do0d3kpcnjc9qlh8c096vvntvrsgfh@4ax.com:

> *I could give you my book list but what do facts matter.*

You could but you don't, and you and I, both, know why you won't.

> *I know that with respect to the KRS the Smithsonian  
> book was ill founded.*

Because you implied this you got your butt whooped-up on.  
You can make this statement 1000 times, but unless you  
come up with something better, this is all bad-mounthing.

> *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 want to rely on is not peer reviewed.*

Editors of books can be considered as peer reviewers if the  
articles that are submitted are not thier own. Invited review  
articles are infrequently rejected but frequently corrected.  
This suffices as pure review. Sure there is a 5% chance that the  
editor added the review without further changes, 95% that he  
didn't.

> *You are attempting to resolve the matter on the basis of  
> an argument from authority.*

Have you ever refereed an article. I was an assistent editor of  
both a review journal and a primary literature journal,  
therefore I am an authority. You nor Michael have done neither.  
Which makes you what? That's right bad mouth.  
I don't like reviews or books but that does not mean relatively

speaking that books and reviews are 'bad'. Books and reviews are opinionated and dated, the best sources of literature are primary peer-reviewed literature because the current collection is the most up-to-date and represents a variety of perspectives. Nonetheless I have refereed many very good review articles and book chapters given that context.

> *Both Michael and I can do better than that.*

Neither you or Michael, after 2 weeks have chosen to do that. People do what they can. I suspect that neither you or Michael can. The bottom line here is you have an opinion about various books, that opinion comes from your ignorance about science, as you have put forth here on many occasions and been shown to be faulty. Michael is more careful than you. However his opinion was that why does he need to show the peer review status if Stever Marcus did not. The problem with Zalar's opinion, with the exception of one college site, he gave no resource which can be said to be academic, and none of 5 which were peer-reviewed or even had the appearance that they might have been peer-reviewed. In addition it appears that 3 of his references borrowed from 1, and that none of them were anything more than a guess. Whether or not Steve's reference was wrong, Michaels references cannot be substantiated. The basic claim is that there are no Viking activities in the New World after 1300. While this is not a 'line in the sand', Michael countered that the book was wrong because there is 'good' evidence based on the King runes that they were after 1300. IOW he contested a generally accepted position, that position itself has some substantiation within the context of a book, and in fact he did not do so well because 2 of the sites place the date range commencing before 1300. Therefore Michael needs to quote a better or more up to date reference. As a matter of fact most of his references point to the oldest claims, and none are peer reviewed. Authority or not logic stands with Steve and against Michael up and until Michael gets back in here and substantiates the claims of the 5 links with primary literature information. Personally I think Michael said what he said in that manner because he is upset as you are, that his 'favored' sources of information do not have the academic prestige of the 'opposing' sources of information. More or less jealousy. Since he has not provided better sources I maintain this is the correct interpretation of that post.

This is not a one time issue of logic, you are immulating the behaviors of Inger and the late Larry when you engage in this kind of subtrifuge. Do you really think you can be taken seriously if you cannot provide references?

> *In most cases we can go back to primary sources to  
> establish the actual facts.*

Bud, talk is real cheap.

- > *The problem with the KRS is that from early in the 20th*
- > *century it has become surrounded by a cloud of lies.*

The politician is ones again talking. Because you believe differently is the truth, anything that disagrees with your belief is a lie. Truth lies at the insection of valid perspectives. To approach the truth one needs a multitude of perspectives, what you are calling lies are what I would call other perspectives.

- > *The last great liar was Wahlgren*
- > *but his lies are carried on in the literature,*

Oh dear, the big bad ole literature again. Let's take the flag of Max Plank and Christopher columbus and run it around the ball park again.

[http://home.thegrid.net/~lllove/net-loon\\_index.html](http://home.thegrid.net/~lllove/net-loon_index.html)

The Net-Loon Index for UseNet Science Newsgroups and Science Mailing Lists

"the new Net-Loon Index is oriented toward science posts in general, and should be applicable to any sci.\* newsgroup or mailing list."

- 4) Claims to be an expert or a "specialist" on the subject but will not give their credentials when asked. (+ 40 points).
- 6) Makes a statement that is widely known to be a misrepresentation of a researcher's published conclusion. (+ 30 points).
- 7) Makes a statement that is widely agreed on to be false. (+10 points per statement)\*
- 8) When asked, they subsequently cannot (or will not) provide a published reference that backs up their statement in #6 or #7. (+ 40 points).\*
- 12) Makes a statement that is clearly vacuous (i.e., without content). (+10 points per statement)\*
- 13) Statement that is logically inconsistent. (+10 points per statement)\*
- 15) Prefaces (or ends) their statement with a comment about how misguided/shortsighted/brainwashed/delusional the professional scientific community is. (+ 40 points).

17) Is not aware of the widely published evidence that contradicts his/her hypothesis. (+ 10 points).

> *in some cases by people you would expect to know better.*

The mdm started with this tactic back in January with Zolota. Look what it got her. You want to take the same approach? Lies are obvious, not of interpretation. You can disagree with the literature, but unless you bear creditials of a level comparable to the writers of that literature, you bear yourself out as a snake-oil salesman when you start down the path of calling them frauds and liars. As a matter of fact you paint yourself as a fraud and a liar, like the mdm clearly did to hereself. Is that what you want to do. Be smart like Michael, its one thing to press your discontent its another to cast dispersions at other people driven by diatribic discontent.

Go read the Net Loon Index, it was not based on anything dealing with the Norse problem, if you find your thinking falling under an excessive numbers of catagory, you can be assured that it is not science that is lying.

Up and until the time that it was confirmed that Piltdown man was a hoax there were a fair number of people convinced it was the missing link between apes and humans. Not because it fit evolution, but because if fit their preconcieved notion about the primacy of europe in human evolution. Since then science has learned a whole lot, for one it has learned to be skeptical of potential hoaxes.

<http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/piltdown.html>

--

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/>  
DNAPaleoAnth at Att dot net