

# Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00568.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 30 May 2005 13:37:47 +1200
- 

On Mon, 30 May 2005 00:43:38 GMT, Philip Deitiker <[Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)> says in  
>[news:2slk91lc0tctsi0d4pcc6grc795n7c8ido@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:2slk91lc0tctsi0d4pcc6grc795n7c8ido@xxxxxxxx):

>  
>> Don't you remember you recent arrival in this news group? You  
>> arrived pronouncing possible Norse presence in NA (beyond LAM)  
>> as lies, rubbish, a racist theory debated only by Kooks? Don't  
>> you remember how you promulgated your list of factors which make  
>> up Kookery so you could use it label people whose ideas you did  
>> not like? I would be careful before you start preaching about  
>> the dangers of leading with a hypothesis.

>  
>What I say then and now, I entered the discussion because of the Red  
>Indians White Indians issue and because I saw no peer-reviewed  
>literature. I still see no peer-reviewed literature. You very well  
>forget, the KRS discussion flowed over into s.a.p. on occasion, I was  
>well aware of the type of 'alternative' archaeology that was going  
>on.

>

True to a point. I went Googling looking for the overflow and, apart from finding very few KRS related articles, I found<Message ID <[zVzSa.767\\$zu1.8863@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:zVzSa.767$zu1.8863@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> See <http://tinyurl.com/cud8p>

Now that's a slightly different spin from the one you are using now. It seems that even then you were less interested in the facts than the wrapper they came in.

>>>And when that  
>>>faith involves a people you aspire to have a greater past  
>>>because of your relationship to that people, and you want  
>>>everyone to bow to your faith, that is racism.

>>>

>>>>>I don't see the Norse mentioned above in her paragraph.  
>>>>>She is talking about Norwegians and Swedes past the Viking age  
>>>>>and North American History.

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

>>>>

>>>> Norse is simpler to write than Norwegians and Swedes

>>>

>>>That is what she wrote. She did not write greenlanders,  
>>>icelanders, gotlanders, danish, she wrote Norwegians and Swedes.

>>>By 1456 the two entities had already separated, and were rejoin  
>>>under queen Margerate. You could have referred to them as  
>>>Danish, but I think everyone would agree that greenland was  
>>>under inuit control in 1456, and whatever claim the danish had,  
>>>was null and void, abandoned.

>>

>> Hmm. You are leading the argument into the trackless swamps.

>

>There are people and there are times. She is arguing Norwegian and  
>Swede after 1350, not Norse during the 11th century.

You seem to be equating Norse with Viking. They are not the same thing.

>

>

>>>> Inger's style of presenting her arguments earns her a fair  
>>>> proportion of what she gets. However, IMHO labelling her a  
>>>> 'racist' for her historical beliefs is going too far,  
>>>> especially when your own objections smack of racism.

>>>

>>>Wrong, it is the way she confronted Peter that showed her hand,  
>>>once again as Peter reminds us about past incidences. You still  
>>>don't get it. Let me clarify this for you so that you can  
>>>understand. Inger has confused buffulo and wild ox for kettle,  
>>>squirrels, clams, . . . . . what does also this confusion  
>>>mean?

>>

>> It has nothing to do with claims she is a racist. Stop trying to  
>> confuse the issue.

>

>See below.

>

>>> One does not look at a single event, but deliberacy in  
>>> actions, she  
>>>is trolling everything she can find to try to bring support for  
>>>her belief or her faith. If one is not lead by a belief, a  
>>>faith, or whatever you want to call it, there is no reason to  
>>>dredge highly questionable ties into the argument. Her reason  
>>>for dragging these can be directly tied to her desire to get  
>>>people to follow her forgone conclusion [conclusion may be a  
>>>nice word for it alternative you could call it a 5 letter word  
>>>that starts with F].

>

>Note he responded to a premise and not the conclusion.

>

>>>Is the sweat of a Jomon cool the brow differently from that of a

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

>>>Swede? Is a premature death any different an outcome for either?  
>>>And yet this continent was full of Native peoples, and yet  
>>>somehow this group is obsessed with the 18 mention on a  
>>>potentially fraudulent stone or the 'putative' escape of  
>>>greenlanders in 1456.  
>>  
>> Do you really regard this as a proper argument by means of which  
>> you can show Inger to be wrong?  
>  
>I certainly do. This groups is polluted with off-topic  
>alternative archaeology because of the belief of one or two people.

Either you have your tongue in your cheek or you are misguided.

>  
>>>I see so that is the license to play loosely with the facts.  
>>  
>> So,you consider that she plays looseley with the facts is  
>> grounds to call her a racist?  
>  
>Playing loosely with facts can be an indication of many things, in  
>this case her statement of 'play homage to me' ...

"play homage to me"? Inger never said that. I've searched both my own archive and then Google. I've also checked in case you meant "pay homage to me" and there is nothing by Inger in any group as far as I can see. As far as I can tell, the only person who has ever said "play homage to me" is Philip Deitiker in the article to which I am responding.

> ... indicates she is a  
>racist. Actaully in many different ways she is making the statment  
>The accusation of chauvanism is appropriate to some and racism is  
>appropriate to others. If you like I can just capsulize them and call  
>it bigotry, would that make you happy.  
>  
>> At this point I can see you have been taking lessons from Steve  
>> Marcus. I'm not going to go on responding to an ever expanding  
>> tail of allegations. I'm stopping right here.  
>  
>Apparently looking at the other replies you did not.

I stopped responding to that article right then.

Eric Stevens

.

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

- **Follow-Ups:**
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
  
- **References:**
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Eric Stevens
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Eric Stevens
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Eric Stevens
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Eric Stevens
  - ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
    - ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
  
- Prev by Date: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Next by Date: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Next by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**