

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg00751.html>

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <[smarcus_spamout @xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout@xxxxxxx)>
 - *Date:* Fri, 10 Jun 2005 06:43:38 -0400
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:og3ia19baen6ota6ebacoolaitq31ge8a0@xxxxxxxxxx
> On Fri, 10 Jun 2005 03:30:14 GMT, Philip Deitiker
> <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>>Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> says in
>>news:gsthal1vdodl0mqad9vgomt50fdjo6vllr@xxxxxxx:
>>
>>>>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 'regulated'
>>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.

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

Your definition of "proof" is pretty damned flexible. You cite Wolter's allegations re Templar markings on the KRS as possibly having a bearing on the authenticity KRS; clearly you regard those allegations as potential "proof" notwithstanding that the Templars had long been disbanded, and pretty much hunted down and murdered/imprisoned by 1362. Yet you claim that the fact that Arnold came from an area wherein there was a windmill having a structure similar to that of the Newport Tower, and referred to the Newport Tower structure as his stone-built mill, as not constituting "proof" of the structure's origins. Ancillary facts such as the failure of European visitors to the area prior to the advent of Arnold and his colonists to mention the NT, carbon dating of the mortar on the NT to Arnold's time, the absence of pre-Columbian Norse artifacts around the NT (notwithstanding a search for the same), etc., as not constituting "proof."

Yep. You are some objective scientist, all right.

>
>>Let us not forget 77 viking ships,
>
> Probaly wrong and disposed of by a scholar who used neither ridicule
> 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
> aproval 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 finda 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

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

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

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

We know what you're talking about. Any and every straw in the wind that might conceivably point to any and every "alternative history", from Atlantis to Norse colonists in Oklahoma. And at the end of the day, when there's an absence of evidence of any quality to support those propositions, well, "absence of evidence ...", and all that jazz. You are some friggin dishonest that you don't even question the implications of a "scientist" like Wolters promising to publish, failing to do so, and then showing up on TV with wild claims involving the latest "best selling" concepts, Code and Templars.

>
>
>
> Eric Stevens

Steve

—
The above posting is neither a legal opinion nor legal advice, because we do not have an attorney–client relationship, and should not be construed as either. This posting does not represent the opinion of my employer, but is merely my personal view. To reply, delete _spamout_ and replace with the numeral 3

• *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
- ◆ *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

- Prev by Date: *Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion*
- 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):

Re: Some of the Logic of KRS discussion

- ◆ Date
- ◆ Thread