

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

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00574.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 30 May 2005 15:56:25 +1200
- 

On Mon, 30 May 2005 02:27:24 GMT, Philip Deitiker  
<[Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)> says in  
>[news:cpqk919grm7rpgsshetsmghvqlan08ogu@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:cpqk919grm7rpgsshetsmghvqlan08ogu@xxxxxxxx):  
>  
>>>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.  
>  
>The Viking period ended at the end of the 10th century. The  
>greenlanders were christianized thereafter and would have been Norse.  
>The swedish state with recognized borders did not begin until 1323,  
>however a partial definition was in place by the 12th century. Prior  
>to that people would have been informally called Swedes if they were  
>from eastern trading portion of the viking world, prior to 1323 there  
>was a contested claim over finland, so at that time the Swedish state  
>would have been Swedo-finnic.

All of which is correct. They all come under the umbrella term  
'norse'. See <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Norse>

>  
>>>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.  
>  
>Me?

Is there anyone else in the room?

>  
>>>>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?

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

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

>>>>

>>>>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

>

>' and ' indicate a paraphrasing. The first time you've seen  
>paraphrasing marks.

I might have taken them as paraphrasing if you hadn't labeled it a  
'statement'.

>She was in essence implying that a person was  
>inadequate if they could not pay homage to her 'forthcoming' facts of  
>evidence. 'Pay homage to my people' means 'pay homage to me'.  
>Looks like we are back to the obfuscating Eric. Eric, you know damn  
>well what I mean, you have no need to play games, your offense at the  
>racism claim is a actually an attempt to defend her agenda from the  
>reality of her critics, true of false. Playing loosely with the facts  
>as you know she has been doing, might be explained by ignorance, but  
>she has so many times pulled out bovine excrement and wanted someone  
>else to do the homework, 95% of these so-called links between canada  
>and the NE US are utter brain farts. And the excuses.  
> Truth or not, do you believe all her excuses? How about 50%, 25%.  
>And if you don't believe them how can you not see deliberacy. The so  
>called fauna picking, again one error, fine, but she has brought up a  
>half dozen animals and claimed these connect old world and new world  
>via the Norse. You be the judge, how many of these connections is a  
>solid link. So, therefore, consider whether or not this is deliberate  
>or just an inability to learn from past mistakes. Shall we go through  
>all the flora and fauna. Kettles, Clams, Horses, . . . . . Let us  
>go through the Archaeology, the so called new studies, new native  
>american sites for Norse, all the reports that are supposed to be now  
>published or aired, where are they, how come none have appeared.  
>And let us not consider how many threads she started went in the  
>direction of false accusations, sex mail, viruses, claims about  
>supreme knowledge of the internet, etc. Certainly there is no  
>deliberacy there on diverting the discussion.

>

>

>> I stopped responding to that article right then.

>

>I see, but you continued responding to the follow-up.

I'm glad to see you can follow these things.

>I suggest you

>stop, I have predicted about 2/3rds of your last few replies, also  
>what you have avoided responding to. You are testing for a weakness

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

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

>in my argument and avoiding the general argument being made. Here is  
>the chessboard, you have only a few pieces left. I will allow you to  
>see those two moves.  
>  
>'Don't put off to malice that which can be explained by stupidity'  
>  
>So which is it malice (bigotry) or stupidity, if you say its simple  
>ignorance, I should note that racisms definition has no exemptions  
>for ignorance, ignorance is always presumed. Your argument would then  
>include and exclusion for the fact there is a pathology associated  
>with the excuses and that the reintroduction of failed arguments is  
>caused by some kind of dementia. I should also note that as we began  
>making web pages of the discussion of some 'lines' the quadriannual  
>repetition of some topics stopped, mnemonic device?  
>  
>Wouldn't you rather plonk me? :^).  
>  
Oh no, on your good days, when you have taken your pills, I read what  
you have written with interest. :-)

Eric Stevens

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)***  
◇ From: IEJ

• *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: Big Druid***

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

- Next by Date: ***Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press***
- 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***