

Re: Wild kettle and oxen

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1042.html>

From: Sawfish (*mtn_at_q7.com*)

Date: 02/12/05

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:12:43 GMT

Doug Weller <dweller@ramtops.removethisdemon.co.uk> writes:

>On Sat, 12 Feb 2005 01:07:56 +0100, in sci.archaeology, Michael Kuettner
>wrote:

>>

>>"Alaca" <P.Alaca@is.invalid> schrieb im Newsbeitrag

>>news:420bfa30\$0\$35790\$a344fe98@news.wanadoo.nl...

>>> Michael Kuettner wrote in: 3723jpF57dqb9U3@individual.net,

>>>

>><snip>

>>> > I kick IEJ; asking something without a brain doesn't accomplish

>>> > anything.

>>> > No need for apologies, btw. It's just that shm gets spammed

>>> > by the asshole Hines (_massive_ crosspostings); and Ingwer

>>> > added is just too much.

>>> > Just check the headers, please.

>>>

>>>

>>> Oke Michael, but I think it is a bit strange that you criticize scia,

>>Why ?

>>I've been here longer than most; I've seen the great Kookinsky-

>>Diffusion wars; I've seen good posters leave while the "pond-scum"

>>accumulates.

>>Apart from Philip and Tom (and maybe you) no people with a love

>>for archaeology have become posters here.

>Philip? I don't see him as having a love for archaeology in the sense I

>think you mean it.

>>Competent people like Horace or tk don't bother to bring in some

>>substance; they're merely amusing themselves here.

>They certainly have.

>As have I, but my main interest is of course the debunking side, and I

>confine myself more or less to that now here, other interests grab my

>time.

>[SNIP]

>Doug

Interesting.

I would heartily agree that s.a has become a target-rich zone for debunking. It has been that way for *years*. What it is good for is not for obtaining information, but to hone one's logical analysis skills—to really get a handle on epistemology. I mean that seriously: that's what this group is good for. Who *cares* if a bunch of Scandinavians reached the interior of Minnesota in the 14th C? What's important is: how can we know that, for sure? By what methodology can we satisfactorily determine this? What level of fastidiously studied evidence is sufficient, and how do we qualify its quality?

It seems like this group has attracted posters whose one redeeming social value is that they are willing to tirelessly generate demonstrably specious arguments for the rest of the world to dissect. This is quite a public service! Their bravery and determination in the face of adversity is quite admirable, and brings a certain poignancy to the term "quixotic".

--

~~~~~  
"If we use Occam's Razor, whose razor will \*he\* use?" --Sawfish  
~~~~~