

## Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg00706.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 10 Jun 2005 14:38:39 +1200
- 

On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 01:23:28 GMT, Philip Deitiker  
<[Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)> says in  
>[news:p6kha1t9fmuk6bhsr536sttfoaf8kmmsv0@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:p6kha1t9fmuk6bhsr536sttfoaf8kmmsv0@xxxxxxxx):  
>  
>> On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 00:12:13 +0200, "Alaca" <[P.Alaca@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:P.Alaca@xxxxxxxxxx)>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>>Eric Stevens wrote: [6pcha1178dibosdibc17klkga5ein26aau@xxxxxxxx](mailto:6pcha1178dibosdibc17klkga5ein26aau@xxxxxxxx),  
>>>> Philip Deitiker wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Rather that argue around in circles with people who want to  
>>>>> debate trivia rather than what constitutes a good argument I  
>>>>> have decided to set this aside.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> It's been pretty obvious that this is all you have wanted to  
>>>>> do from the moment you first heard of the KRS.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>What, starting a clean thread?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Set the KRS aside.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> He's been agin it from the very first moment he heard of it. He  
>>>>> arrived in this newsgroup labelling anyone who didn't want to  
>>>>> reject it outright as 'KOOKS' or hyperdiffusionists.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>I was neutral to the KRS. I was calling people kooks because of the  
>>>>>style of their proofs for its authenticity. For example, proclaiming  
>>>>>that a deceased C.1362 organization carved the stone is a kooky idea.

That wasn't even suggested until probably a year later.

>  
>> Go back through the threads and you will find a consistent  
>> pattern of bias and arguing from ignorance. What he calls  
>> 'trivia' are the facts of the matter.  
>>  
>>>Give me a break, they are bullshit. You don't prove that the sun  
>>>exists by looking at the reflections of light off planets of distance

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

>suns.

I suppose you consider gravitational microlensing equally KOOKY.

>

>> You watch him now build a

>> fact-free argument against the KRS based on irrelevancies and

>> what people haven't said.

>

>You can't seem to answer basic question and yet you claim to have the

>firmest understanding of the facts.

Of course I can't answer some of the more basic questions. Nobody can.

All I claim about my knowledge of the facts is that it is firmer than

yours.

>

>1. Where did the stone core come from?

>2. Who and where was it carved?

>By who I mean what people.

>

>Start there.

Eric Stevens

.

---

• **Follow-Ups:**

◆ **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Philip Deitiker

• **References:**

◆ **Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Philip Deitiker

◆ **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Eric Stevens

◆ **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Alaca

◆ **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Eric Stevens

◆ **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

◇ From: Philip Deitiker

• Prev by Date: **Re: True history and myths told by naysayers**

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

• Previous by thread: **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

• Next by thread: **Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion**

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*