

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg00750.html>

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <[smarcus_spamout @xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout@xxxxxxx)>
 - *Date:* Fri, 10 Jun 2005 06:35:08 -0400
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:jg4ia1141lakp7rm8r1f1cb770p4dp3has@xxxxxxxx
> On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 03:15:25 GMT, Philip Deitiker
> <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>> Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx> says in
>> news:oaqha1h4drfch4rd9fg7sk5rmmsvuvemt5@xxxxxxx:
>>
>>> On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 00:57:27 GMT, Philip Deitiker
>>> <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx> says in
>>>> news:6pcha1178dibosdibc17klkga5ein26aau@xxxxxxx:
>>>>
>>>>> On Thu, 09 Jun 2005 13:41:22 GMT, Philip Deitiker
>>>>> <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> 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.
>>>>>
>>>>>> No, I don't want to argue your squink with you, since you seem
>>>>>> unable to do anything but derail the argument into squink I need
>>>>>> to reset it at its fundamentals, IOW that which you don't want
>>>>>> to discuss because it is to important to the argument.
>>>>>
>>>>>> You call giving you the facts 'squink'?
>>>>>
>>>>>> Not facts, trivia. Gotlandic Templar c. 1362 doesn't even constitute
>>>>>> as trivia, its fiction. Your issue with the stone is also squink,
>>>>>> because its provenance begs questions given the fact that two
>>>>>> amateurs pulled it from the earth without regard to what damage they
>>>>>> might do, and the professionals from the area weren't much better.
>>>>>