

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-03/msg00170.html>

- *From:* "Tom McDonald" <kiltmac@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Mar 2007 19:04:42 -0800
-

On Mar 8, 3:08 am, Eric Stevens <eric.stev...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<snip>

My subsequent comment stems from an experience I had some years ago when I asked persons qualified to read a particular script, to test a hypothesis that a number of petroglyphs employed a precursor subset of the particular script. [I'm being coy here because I do not want to reopen old arguments.]

....as you reopen an old argument. Coy, shmoy; let's talk frankly.

I COULD NOT GET THESE PEOPLE TO TEST THIS HYPOTHESIS for the simple reason that they could not bring themselves to even consider the possibility that it might just be correct. THEY WOULD NOT DO IT.

John Byrne did. You appear to think otherwise for your own reasons—in which I am not interested. If you want to explain why John is no true Scotsman, tell it to the wind.

But there are several groups of people for whom carrying out Larry's work would be exactly their cup of meat.

NONE OF THOSE PEOPLE, AFTER ALL THESE YEARS, HAVE STEPPED UP TO TEST THIS HYPOTHESIS for the reason...what was the reason, now? The argument that they couldn't bring themselves to even consider the possibility that Larry might have been right absolutely does not obtain. YET THEY WOULD NOT DO IT.

Money cannot be an issue. Those folks have found ways to pay for lots of more costly investigation. It cannot be due to lack of interest. In homage to St. Fell and his interest in 'American Ogham', and to McGlone et al., finishing Larry's work would seem to be right in NEARA's et al. wheelhouse.

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

It cannot be lack of capacity. Kelley, and many others, are certainly capable of looking up the straight lines and crunching the numbers. I am flummoxed to think of any reason why others have hot-potatoed this. Even Larry's abrasiveness would seem to be no bar to the final vindication of Fell's ideas.

Yet we, who have spent the blood of our children and the best years of our lives on this discussion, get dissed by you for not fulfilling your desires.

Huh.

Why do you not do it, Eric? You have the interest, the math skills, the open-mindedness, and a pretty fair file cabinet full of the discussion, and most if not all of the straight lines. You have some time, as you certainly read up on stuff, and have time to spend on-line. Go for it, Eric. Let's see how it's done.

John will be so impressed.

.