

Re: Wild kettle and oxen

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1045.html>

From: Tom McDonald (tmcdonald2672_at_nohormelcharter.net)

Date: 02/13/05

Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 00:19:37 -0600

Sawfish wrote:

> 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](mailto: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

sci.archaeology: Re: Wild kettle and oxen

>>>*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?*

Yes, that is the rationalization I was groping for. :-)

>

> *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".*

>

What a lovely, if long-winded, way of saying 'bullshit is manure'!

--

Tom McDonald

<http://ahwhatdoiknow.blogspot.com/>