

Re: Questions

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-10/msg00421.html>

- *From:* "IE_J-son" <inger_e.johansson@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 26 Oct 2006 04:59:02 GMT
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:i920k2pd2dkd5d3215usc973te7j6uaurf@xxxxxxxx>

On 25 Oct 2006 16:25:52 -0700, "Tom McDonald" <kiltmac@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Peter Alaca wrote:

Tom McDonald wrote:
<news:1161745769.799172.244620@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Inger E.(Norah) wrote:

IEJ: For the record – There are numerous works, type we call 'arbetskopior' in other word not printed to be edited in public but to different meetings with specialists. As it happened in 1993 I had direct contact with SGI(Statens Geotekniska Insitute) in Linköping, not to mention that I in my direct surrounding at that time had three of the best specialists including one at that time working at the University, BUT I was told

Re: Questions

to use a lower grade in my
C-essay so it would be
possible for
anyone reading it to go
finding the referred work at
a University or
major Library elsewhere.
Had anyone of you gone
thru the other
geologic works or for that
matter the archaeological
works I have in
my ref.list you would have
had same information and
different
references for that
information given in the
ref.works!!!!
[...]

You know, it really doesn't matter how many
work products you may

have

sole access to, nor how many folks have
helped you out with your
papers. Ultimately, if it isn't published and
available to anyone who
wants to read it, it is effectively nonexistent.

Either give the exact reference(s) that
support your contention, or
fuck off.

Oh hell, just cut out the first part (which you
can't perform

anyhow).

Note that she calls publications inferior ("lower grade")
to working papers.

Jesus! Is that what she meant? I couldn't machete my way through that
jungle of verbiage well enough to understand what she meant. I thought
she couldn't possibly mean that a person's notes were inferior to peer
reviewed publications.

Re: Questions

Now certainly, it is vital to be able to see what the raw data are, and how one develops one's thinking on a research topic over time. But to claim that scientists' published work is generally less valuable than their notes is...well, it's fucking odd.

Now it is true that some published work could benefit from access to the raw data; and it is further true that sometimes the data are lost or withheld. But if that is common in the Madam's experience, then I shudder to think of the state of Swedish science.

Careful. Not being able to get access to the data is real as is even the claim to have 'lost' the data. In another field, In another field, no one has yet seen much of the data used by Mann when deriving his infamous hockeystick curve and I believe he now claims that he can neither find no reconstruct some of it.

Eric,

at present I am very very causus on who gets what.

That I am not presenting every proof Tom or Peter A calls for, doesn't say that I don't have them.

First of all neither of them ever been my friend.

Second, I have limited amount of hours to look for things, ref as well as full files and images, outside the field Terry, Dave and I am working with. Since they are working with other lines on same 'field' I am working with I support them with the work they ask me to do in order for them to get hold of sources they don't have access to.

Two others I am supporting and filling in gapes for are working with documents, and artifacts, related to the work I am doing myself at present. Apart from all that: NO ONE has any right what so ever to ask me to present quotes. As every serious scholar knows quotes taken out of context isn't worth anything what so ever if the person who get the quote aren't very familiar with the Prime or Primary source. Quotes taken out of context from a work doesn't say anything because no matter if the scholar behind it is known to be very trustworthy, he or she can make mistakes as well as be misunderstood if a quote is to be used.

For the folish comment re. the Official tourist site of Östergötlands kulturarv, I take that you aren't aware of who's behind that. That's scholars working at Östergötlands Länsstyrelse's Kultural Deparment who together with scholars employed in respective town or area pre-view the information. Since the level of Peter A's, Tom's and Jerry T's comments are lower than any student I ever met in 7th–9th grade when discussing Scandinavian History and Archaeology, I think that Popular–text written by scholars is appropriate. They aren't worth more!

Others who looked up the other references for full also had a chance, if they read them, to find almost all references I would have refered them to had they asked me directly.

Inger E

.