

Re: WIKIPEDIA and "Proto-Ionians"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-04/msg00233.html>

- *From:* Cory Albrecht <coryalbrecht@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 14 Apr 2008 12:00:21 -0400
-

grapheus wrote, on 2008-04-14 07:52:

Up to know, there was an article on "Proto-Ionians" in WIKIPEDIA, what

And that article is still there. You'll note that contrary to your implied criticisms the article wasn't arbitrarily deleted. It was marked for discussion about deletion

seems a normal thing when one remarks that typing "Proto-Ionians" on Google or Yahoo, there are c. 1,000 references.

Actually, Google only gives 676 references, rather less than 1000, and of the first 30 in that list:

- 1 is an article by Faucounau
- 5 are copies Wikipedia articles at other sites
- 18 are threads where you have mention Faucounau's theory
- 1 is somebody mentioning "Proto-Ionians" with no connection to you (I'm being nice and assuming that you don't nymshift)
- 1 is a books.google.com result where I can't find the phrase
- 1 is a domaintools.com advert link on an unrelated page
- 2 are seemingly outdated links not possessing the phrase
- 1 article on a Greek yahoo list, and I don't read Greek

So if that trend continues through the remaining 646 returns (and quick scan of the net 5 pages of 10 shows a rather high number of Google Groups links, docendi.org and other webarchives of usenet), your so-called claim of 1000 references via search engines is nothing more than a record of your attempts to promote Faucounau's idea.

Happily, a "Wiki-administrator", named "Henrik", with NO KNOWLEDGE in Archaeology or Linguistics and that some suspect to be the natural son of late Dr Goebbels, was there. He has proposed the suppression of

Argumentum ad hominem, Grapheus. Shame on you. It doesn't matter whom this Henrik's parents are.

Re: WIKIPEDIA and "Proto-Ionians"

He has proposed the suppression of this article. His motive ? He dislike the word "Proto-Ionians".

Prove that Henrik dislikes the word. Can you make that claim more than mere assertion?

However, the reason for deletion being that it is mostly WP:OR by Faucounau has merit, as does the WP:NOTE criterion mentioned by Dab WRT the fringe-theory aspect. As such, I'd have to agree that Faucounau's theory only has the bare minimum of notability to merit mention in another article but not notable enough for it's own article.

So works WIKIPEDIA...

Seems like a decent system to me, and you're not exactly known for NPOV editing habits on Wikipedia. I am not competent in archaeology or Greek history to judge Faucounau's work, however the fact that he is described as an "amateur linguist" by what appears to be your edits on Wikipedia does raise a valid concern in my mind about Faucounau's credentials.

.