

# Re: KRS book: Geology

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-01/msg00076.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Tue, 3 Jan 2006 00:57:03 +0100
- 

Eric Stevens wrote: 82ajr1t4m3t7s9hplnplttthj49ee2fsgb@xxxxxxx,

On Mon, 2 Jan 2006 21:04:13 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>  
wrote:

Eric Stevens wrote: lttir1l884jg3qq3q008a80vl0dda14jef@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

Re: KRS book: Geology

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?

I think it is the one he used to plot  
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  
losing. See  
<http://www.d.umn.edu/geology/people/fsbios/ojakangas>

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

--- snip----

Eric, you are hopeless

Re: KRS book: Geology

I'm never without hope.

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

Please reread my previous post on this subject.

I still can't make sense of it.

Not even if you read my previous post\_s\_ on this subject?

--  
\*\*\*\*\* < Peter Alaca > \*\*\*\*\*