

OT Culture

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-05/msg00521.html>

- *From:* Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 27 May 2005 17:17:43 GMT
-

This is not about archaeology but about culture.

I have been on this UseNet since 1989, but with a pronounced presence since 1994. I have observed many fights, wars, participated in some wars, started others, and still ended others.

What you want a group to be really depends on the collective culture. In unmoderated groups there is no control of how the culture of the group evolves, but despite the lack of control, group culture none the less evolves.

Changing groups culture often depends more on evidentiary results than in planning, IMHO, the only time a group culture shifts if someone comes into a group, does something, and it has a result that somehow they feel empowered by, others in the groups reinforce that result.

I have noticed in this group that crossposting is fully tolerated, whereas in other groups it is ubiquitously annoying and untolerated. The reason it is tolerated IMHO, is because the subject material is not overtly off-topic, even if 90% of the time it is nonsense. For the culture of the group to change the level of tolerance for the 'nonsense' component when tied to crossposting to other groups needs to evoke a different response in posters, that response needs to be the the removal of newsgroups from replies or killfiling. If this is the desired response by the culture of the group, then the result will reinforce the response, and if it is not it will not hold in the long term.

I can tell you that individuals who have their posts followed up religiously to one other groups tend to discontinue posting to that group because it results in the undesirable response. Getting people to ubiquitously killfile a pest is also a method. both can work in concert with each other. For s.a.p. the management of the EC A'J'S problem took about 8 years, not only getting our people to avoid followups but also convincing the folks in t.o. that getting our group members angry was not in t.o. best interest. There is an informal agreement in place with the moderator that as long as he keeps the lid on crossposting 'loons' to s.a.p. that we won't charge over and create havoc in his group. Tom knows how

OT Culture

all of that went down couple of years back, not proud of the war but it did accomplish its objective.

But in s.a.p. it was different, we had a culture that was undermined by the wanted activities of 2 individuals 'outsiders'. Tom and others disagreed with this assessment, then, in June 03, but as one looks at s.a.p. now one clearly sees who the regular posters are and who are interlopers, and how they desparately try to disrupt group activities by crossposting to completely unrelated groups (rec.ponds for instance). One of the call signs of this type of individual is morphing. I noticed that in talk.origins they thought it was amusing that this was going on with crossposts into s.a.p. that is the t.o. culture, up until I morphed 30 times in one evening, and turned t.o. upside down. It is clear that individuals morph to avoid being ignored and killfiled, it is a very effective UseNet technique and there should be consequences to morphing within the group culture, obviously not, though here.

In this group the people doing the undermining have become core members of the group, and are not interloping outsiders. As a matter of fact, the war instigators in the group are regular posters and have interpersonal relationships with other group members. The problem here is much more complex, because there is a solution to the problem of extremely biased topicality in the group, but I would say 80% of the regulars here do not want to do anything about it, although I have seen some change in heart over the last year, it is still quite common to see someone say 'Pet troll"our village idiot'. The other problem is that many here are attracted to discussion of Norse culture, even if the thread seed is complete nonsense or misinformation, it opens the discussion of norse up.

What I am trying to say is this, if you want change to the group, we can discuss it, bring the charter of the group into play, make revisions to the charter and post them quarterly, or use them in discussions where the charter is being violated. This is a huge group, one persons action will not alter the behavior of the culture at all, if that culture is not inclined to respond to that persons actions. I have taken some kicking from JerryT; however, I was the one who was rebuffed with the pet troll and other excuses. I have come to enjoy the culture of the group like everyone, given the fact I can't change it, and I see how to manipulate meaningful (to me) discussions out of this culture. This does not mean that it would be better off without change.

I bet you I could not extract 2 posters here who know where the charter for the group is or who have ever read it. Doug knows the charter, probably there is another person lurking about, it tells something about the informality of the culture. I will be frank about this group, and its patronage. This groups is a place of teasing, leg yanking, joking, misinformation, . . . in which by strange coincidence

archaeology is sometimes discussed. It is what it is, you can't have someone denying the spelling or meaning of words who is unable to fess up for notable ilks and mistatements of facts, at great propensity, and not have people making fun of it. See the Net loon index.

The first thing we have to admit here is that there are multiple standards at play, when &JM posts here no-one responds, for the most part the phasiotic disk discussion gets little response. We are doing this because we see that behind those individuals is an ulterior if not group destructive motivation for posting here. So that unless you are going to change the standards of what is 'complete outright off topic religious wacko' and what is on-topic enough to deserve a response in this group, the culture of the group will not change. I don't think that the mdm is destructive to the group, just destracting and unrelenting in her desire to dominate the discussion. Thus she resides in the grey zone of what is appropriate in a science group, and I think people are willing to entertaine her because of this, while another person they would completely ignore if the OT motivation was completely apparent (a.k.a religion or racism). My opinion is that if the individual is presenting OT material that is based on a different potentially valid perspective, we should respect that individual, despite some errors or something we don't like, but if a unscientific motivation becomes clear then other measures, as a culture, needs to take place, that is what works in these newsgroups. In my opinion and I have stated this on many occasion I don't think she is working with a full deck, and on top of that she has unresolved issues concerning ethnocentric behaviors

I have previosly stated my reason for joining this group, I am interested in seed and food culture, particularly the evolution of food culture in asia and the new world, this includes the storage archaeology and stone and metal impliments. While it does not seem like it when I have posted information on these I generally provide references at the time of the informations posting. While it would be nice for others to do the same when they post their interesting topics, it generally does not happen. If the charter were brought into the discussion I would like to see this added to the charter. I am not holding my breath.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ ***Re: OT Culture***

◇ *From:* Jim McGinn

◆ ***Re: OT Culture***

◇ *From:* firstjois

OT Culture

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Oops, Back to the You Know What***
- Next by Date: ***Re: A critique of the BBC aquatic ape programme and the transcript.***
- Previous by thread: ***linear build***
- Next by thread: ***Re: OT Culture***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***