

Re: Wild kettle and oxen

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1055.html>

From: Doug Weller (dweller_at_ramtops.removethisdemon.co.uk)

Date: 02/13/05

Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 11:34:06 +0000

On Sat, 12 Feb 2005 15:12:43 GMT, in sci.archaeology, 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...

>>>> 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

sci.archaeology: Re: Wild kettle and oxen

>>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?

I agree completely. I'd add that in doing this I've learned more not just about methodology but about archaeology in general.

>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".

:~)

Doug

--

Doug Weller -- exorcise the demon to reply

Doug & Helen's Dogs <http://www.douqandhelen.com>

A Director and Moderator of The Hall of Ma'at <http://www.hallofmaat.com>

Doug's Archaeology Site: <http://www.ramtops.co.uk>