

# Re: KRS book: Geology

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-01/msg00253.html>

---

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 7 Jan 2006 09:16:43 -0500
- 

"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:lf3vr1htoq340f07cuuti882prte02jkrp@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:lf3vr1htoq340f07cuuti882prte02jkrp@xxxxxxxx)  
> On Fri, 6 Jan 2006 18:05:25 -0500, "Steve Marcus"  
> <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>>  
>>"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>>[news:0cqtr198drquot46mojmqifl8o54rp304n@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:0cqtr198drquot46mojmqifl8o54rp304n@xxxxxxxx)  
>>> On Fri, 6 Jan 2006 07:12:30 -0500, "Steve Marcus"  
>>> <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>>>>[news:j7lrr19j5jtqb1umejc9hhd4jecfj5583s@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:j7lrr19j5jtqb1umejc9hhd4jecfj5583s@xxxxxxxx)  
>>>>> On Thu, 5 Jan 2006 16:58:32 -0500, "Steve Marcus"  
>>>>> <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>>>>>>[news:it4rr192984l46b52blhajdfllq491h53lf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:news:it4rr192984l46b52blhajdfllq491h53lf@xxxxxxxx)  
>>>>>>> On 4 Jan 2006 22:04:53 -0800, "Daryl Krupa" <[icycalmca@xxxxxxxx](mailto:icycalmca@xxxxxxxx)>  
>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>Eric Stevens wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> On Tue, 3 Jan 2006 16:44:58 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <[P.Alaca@xxxxxx](mailto:P.Alaca@xxxxxx)>  
>>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>><snip>  
>>>>>>>>>>> You are asking that the decision as to the best match of the KRS  
>>>>>>>>>>> to  
>>>>>>>>>>>> the local greywacke be done not by Ojakangas but by his readers.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> But Eric, he cannot convince his readers that he is correct if he  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>does not present the evidence supporting his argument.

Re: KRS book: Geology

>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> The point is that Ojakangas conveyed his opinion to Wolter in a  
>>>>>>> private communication. We are not privy to what was conveyed  
>>>>>>> verbally  
>>>>>>> and it is not surprising if his written summary of the results  
>>>>>>> did  
>>>>>>> not contain the detail of a formal report.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> That speaks pretty "well" for Ojakangas and Wolter. He knows Wolter  
>>>>>>> is  
>>>>>>> writing a book, does a study, and communicates his results to Wolter  
>>>>>>> privately. The study ends up in Wolter's book with only some of the  
>>>>>>> data  
>>>>>>> included. Fine science, all that. :(  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> See 'Vikings–The North American Saga', p379 bottom of 2nd and top of  
>>>>>>> 3rd column.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> The book cites a "Personal Conversation", and does not present the  
>>>>>>> subject  
>>>>>>> of the conversation because the author/publisher of the book does not  
>>>>>>> wish  
>>>>>>> to reveal the name of a person known to have committed forgeries;  
>>>>>>> obviously,  
>>>>>>> they don't want to have to defend a lawsuit even if they will win it.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> They especially don't want to defend it, if it has no substance  
>>>>>>> whatsoever.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Oh, I'm certain that ...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Certain? Not even 'on the preponderance of the evidence', not 'the  
>>>>>>> balance of probabilities' but 'certain'? My goodness you are easily  
>>>>>>> convinced when the argument leans in the direction you favour.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> ... the person who they have in mind knows that they  
>>>>>>> believe him to be the author of the Spirit Runestone.

Absolutely certain. Think about it.

> So the Smithsonian  
>> clearly does not wish to defend any lawsuit, and can maximize the chance  
>> that one will not be filed by not publishing the name. On the other hand,  
>> I  
>> doubt that the Smithsonian has to make up what they published; I think  
>> that  
>> they are doing pretty well for themselves without creating false issues.  
>> Can you, on the other hand, say that Wolter and Nielse are doing pretty  
>> well  
>> for themselves without creating false issues?  
>>  
>

Re: KRS book: Geology

> With you around, nobody is free from the risk of false issues. :-)

I'm not the one who raised the ridiculous analogy regarding the published data that was personally communicated by Ojakangas to Wolter and the personal communication cited in the Smithsonian's book. You are. You are the master of false issues and squink.

>>

>>>

>>> On the one hand you criticise the lack of information contained in  
>>> Ojakangas's personal communication, both the substance and content of  
>>> which can be confirmed, but in the past you have been happy to rely on  
>>> a report of an unconfirmed conversation with an unidentified person  
>>> who made generally unspecified and unconfirmable allegations about yet  
>>> another unidentified person. Aren't you letting your cloak slip a  
>>> little and expose your double standards?

>>

>>No, not in the slightest. The difference is that:

>>

>>1. Ojankanga's \*oral\* personal communication is not what you've reported

>>to

>>be reproduced in the Wolter/Nielsen book. Ojankanga's \*data\* is what

>>you've

>>reported to have been reproduced in the book. If Ojankanga's data is not

>>all of the data, then either Ojankanga did not give Wolter/Nielsen all of

>>the data, or he did and they didn't reproduce it all. Either way, someone

>>has done what should never be done, which is to present less than all of

>>the

>>data that was adduced so that the conclusion arrived at by a third party

>>is

>>not based on all the data, but upon a selected version of the data.

>

> The key data in this case is Ojakangas's opinion as to the most likely

> origin of the greywacke for the KRS.

>>

>>2. The oral communication you referenced in the Smithsonian's "Vikings:

>>The North Atlantic Saga" is all that is reproduced in the book; no

>>selective

>>presentation of data adduced by the communicator as a result of testing

>>has

>>been withheld.

>

> Hell! It's all been withheld, except for a completely unconfirmable

> opinion.

Which \*is\* the difference. No one of any scientific bent will draw a conclusion from the hearsay evidence in the Smithsonian's book, save only that there is no logical reason for the author/editors to even mention it if they didn't think that it had some merit. On the other hand, you have a scientist conducting tests on N samples, and then selecting data and reporting the data for N-Q samples. You see nothing wrong with the latter?

You are a \*fine\* scientist, Eric. Simply \*fine\*.

>>

>>>>

>>>>So what? "Personal Conversations" are cited all of the time.

>>>>Ojakangas'

>>>>situation involves much more than a "Personal Conversation" citation, it

>>>>involves a table of data which incompletely reports all of the data.

>>>>Did

>>>>his "Personal Communication" also incompletely report all of the data to

>>>>Wolter. Or was using less than all of the data Wolter's own bright

>>>>idea.

>>>>

>>>><snip balance of post that demonstrates Stevens' lack of understanding

>>>>as

>>>>to

>>>>why \*all\* evidence should be reported in a scientific paper/book>

>>>>

>>> But Ojakangas was writing neither a scientific paper nor a book. But

>>> I'm sure you know that.

>>>

>>>He was conducting a test, purportedly a scientific test. One reports all

>>>data and lets the data speak. One doesn't report less than all of the

>>>data

>>>and then allege that all reported data points to a given conclusion. For

>>>example, have you considered the possibility that some of the unreported

>>>data (which you think probably yielded the worst possible match(es) to the

>>>KRS) might indicate such poor match(es) that the testing procedure itself

>>>might be called into question?

>>>

>>> You don't know what Ojakangas was doing. You don't know what he was

>>> asked by Wolter. You can't possibly know whether his answer was

>>> adequate or not.

Oh? Ojakangas conducted tests and reported data, but he wasn't conducting a "scientific test." Wolter didn't ask him to conduct the tests that were conducted; Ojakangas simply happened to be testing some greywacke samples just as Wolter, a former student and someone whom Wolter had consulted re the KRS issue that Wolter was involved in needed some data? And I certainly know that it is totally inadequate to report less than all of the test data.

>>

>>>Regardless, you are arguing the inarguable. Scientists who gather test

>>>data

>>>are bound to report it all. The idea is that others have to be given an

>>>even playing field with respect to (1) reproducing the results and (2)

>>>drawing conclusions from the results. It is clear that you know this to

>>>be

>>>the case, because you failed to reply to Daryl Krupa's reply to your

>>>railway

>>station analogy.

>

What? No flippant answer? No answer at all? Do you or do you not agree with the immediately preceding paragraph? And if you do, then what are you arguing about re my position (and Daryl's position) about Ojakangas' data?

>

> 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

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Peter Alaca
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Peter Alaca
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Daryl Krupa
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**  
◇ *From:* Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: KRS book: Geology**

Re: KRS book: Geology

◇ *From:* Eric Stevens

- Prev by Date: ***Re: The language of the KRS***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Origin of the Etruscan people?***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: KRS book: Geology***
- Next by thread: ***Re: KRS book: Geology***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***