

## Re: Questions

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-10/msg00427.html>

---

- *From:* "Tom McDonald" <[kiltmac@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kiltmac@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 26 Oct 2006 06:40:45 -0700
- 

IE\_J-son wrote:

<snip>

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.

I don't remember ever asking for quotations, although I might have wrt some particular claim.

I ask for \*references\*. You know, things that anyone can look up and read for themselves. Things that support a contention or claim or argument or counter-argument. Things that suggest one has not pulled some idea out of their ass, but that at least one other person, ideally one who has some reason to be considered knowledgeable and reliable in a relevant field has pulled out of...their research.

You misunderstand what is requested, and therefore go maundering on trying to pretend that educated, intelligent and potentially interested adults need, more than anything else, condescending lessons, badly taught, in egg-sucking. Which, Madam, we all learned at the feet of our grandmas, and do not need you for.

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.

## Re: Questions

This sort of thing might be useful as an introduction to an issue. In fact, because the purpose of such sites is to present interesting and important stuff about an area quickly and powerfully in writing and images, such sites can be as good a start as, say, Wikipedia.

But to stop there, or to suggest that what you mean to convey is not directly given on the site, but must be dug out of some undefined rummaging through the web site's lumber room is not only insulting (which can be forgiven) but also timewasting and unscholarly.

If you wish to understand why some people are frustrated with you, perhaps looking closer to home might be a useful exercise.

BTW, when I began posting on s.a., I was quite friendly to you. I have offered to help you polish your English when you want to present something in English that you want to be clearly understood by English speakers; I have offered to help you set up a web site where you could put materials you find useful and interesting, and where you could put the materials and arguments you say you have presented over and over and will not any more because you have presented them over and over; I offered to set you up with a service like Picasa or Photobucket where you could upload images; and I have told you (over and over :-)) a number of things you could do to get less resistance and more useful conversation out of Usenet.

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.

But what about the many times you have presented materials by non–scholars, and even by anti–scholars? It's not the useful but simple I protest from you; it's the useless and unscientific.

They aren't worth more!

Why not try treating us as though we were for, say, two weeks. What have you to lose, except the opportunity to insult us one more time?

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 referred them to had they asked me directly.

....and which would have been easy for you to direct them to if you put

## Re: Questions

them up on a web site, as I offered to do. Or even asked someone else to do for you, such as myself. Which I am still willing to do for you.

It begins to look as though you may be here for the abuse, Inger, and not for the argument.

(NB: this is a reference to a Monty Python skit, and is not abuse directed at Inger. Though I wonder whether she will care.)

.