

Re: KRS book: Geology

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-01/msg00072.html>

- *From:* "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 2 Jan 2006 21:04:13 +0100
-

Eric Stevens wrote: lttir11884jg3qq3q008a80vl0dda14jef@xxxxxxx,

On Mon, 2 Jan 2006 12:26:07 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
wrote:

Eric Stevens wrote: 2t8hr1hbq7bub7l1t4pg6itrlagj8qefk2@xxxxxxx,

On Mon, 2 Jan 2006 01:26:02 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
wrote:

--- snip ----

No, I think it is the published scattergram,
and if he did what you say he did, then he
presented only 'positive' results.

He presented the
results closest to
that of the KRS.

That is what I'm saying: only
the positive results.

Do you really want the diagrams for **all** the materials which the
KRS clearly isn't?

Re: KRS book: Geology

I think it is the one he used to plot the alternative
closest to the that of the KRS.

And you
believe
him
without
seeing
the
all
the
results?

Why not? He's got nothing to gain and everything to lose by lying.
See <http://www.d.umn.edu/geology/people/fsbios/ojakanqas.html>

I expected scattergrams. Dissapointing.
But looking at his 'palmares', are you sure
he did what you say he did?

--- snip----

Eric, you are hopeless

I'm never without hope.

But what is it that you think he should have done?

Please reread my previous post on this subject.

--
p.a.

.