

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg00719.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 10 Jun 2005 16:28:30 +1200
-

On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 03:30:14 GMT, Philip Deitiker
<Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> says in
>news:gsthal1vdodl0mqad9vgomt50fdjo6vllr@xxxxxxxx:
>
>>>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.
>
>Alright, some of the silly issues being proposed when I 'regulared'
>in this group were 'Red Indians/White Indians'.

And that really got you going, didn't it?

Whether or not was a proof is one thing. That it was a topic of
discussion was another, and that last is what you objected to.

You were unable to dispose of the topic with scholarship so resorted
to ridicule and name calling, a precedent you have followed ever
since.

---- snip ----

>OK. We have been through these:
>
>Next we went into
>
>Newport Tower, foolishness, obviously built by colonist.

A colonist which no one can name for certain, and please don't throw
in Benedict Arnold as there is no proof for him having built it.

>Let us not forget 77 viking ships,

Probably wrong and disposed of by a scholar who used neither ridicule

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

nor name calling for the deed.

>Nicholas of Lynn the north pole

I'll leave that as I'm currently following a non-KOOK lead which may throw some more light on it.

> and little green screaming pygmies,

I think you introduced them.

>king authors men,

A very old legend which surely does not need your permission or approval before we can discuss it.

>otherwise

> known as santa claus and his merry elves.

Ridicule as a scholastic method again.

>Incredible use of myth

> and foolishness, Nth hand accounts and bar tales.

>You offered up a picture of vancouver as it fits the vinland map,

Some one else introduced that topic. I merely told people where they can find a link to someone who seriously discussed it.

> circumnavigating the north polar ice cap.

Are you referring to the suggestion of John N. Harris that the vikings made a trip around the north siberian coast or his suggestion for which there is much more evidence that they made it round the northwest passage and through the Behring Strait.

>Somehow we are to believe

> that these vikings were heading to vinland on the pacific, as if

> they knew d'hell where they were going?

They probably did after the first time.

> If they knew where they

> were going, Louis and clark could clearly explain to them, Don't go

> that way, and La Salle could teach them don't go south either, And

> the spanish could tell them what awaits them taking a northward

> route.

That's another thing you are ignorant of – climate change over the centuries.

>

>We have enough fantasies in this group offered up as proof that the

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

>vikings were in minnesota in 1362 to write several volumens of good
>fiction, a few screen plays and at least one miniserries.

>

>>>> 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 suns.

>>>>

>>>> I suppose you consider gravitational microlensing equally KOOKY.

>>>>

>>>>You look at the fricken sun to prove the sun exists, not at the yeast
>>>>growing under your toenails.

That's a scholastic argument?

>

>>>>You can't seem to answer basic quetion 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.

>>>>

>>>>But they are completely fricking useless. If Wolters is your 'facts'
>>>>stop while your ahead.

>>>>

I don't have your advantage of being willing to argue from ignorance.
I want to find out what I'm talking about.

Eric Stevens

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

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

◇ *From:* Steve Marcus

• *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*

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

◇ *From:* Eric Stevens

◆ ***Re: 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:* Philip Deitiker

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***