

# Re: KRS book: Geology

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-01/msg00086.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Tue, 3 Jan 2006 16:44:58 +0100
- 

Eric Stevens wrote

It should by now be clear that I can't understand the reasons for your insistence that Ojakangas should have shown more data points on his triangle diagram than he did. I'm quite happy to accept that he showed the coordinates for the composition of the KRS and those North American Greywackes of a composition closest to that of the KRS. I see no point in showing the composition of all those very many materials of a more widely different composition.

Then you have a problem.

Last try.

Let's go back, up this sub-thread, to your post dd Sat, 31 Dec 2005 23:29:02 +1300, which includes Michael Zalar's original post and Daryl Krupa's reaction. Start with rereading Daryl's comment, and then your own.

My problem is the assumption in your comment "Ojakangas plotted six different types of greywacke on his particular triangle diagram and almost certainly \*examined many more specimens he did not consider\* \*worth plotting\*."

To put it boldly: It is not for him to decide what is worth presenting or not. If he examined all types of grauwacke from every possible location of origin (and not only from the Animikie basin), then it is his duty as a scientist to present all his results, and not only those that point in a certain direction. He can conclude that the krs-grauwacke probably originated in the Animikie basin, but it must always be possible for others to form an independent opinion.

Re: KRS book: Geology

Bear in mind that I do not say that Ojakangas withheld information, only that you say he "almost certainly" did. If I trust you, I must distrust him.

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

.