

It's getting hard...

The Urth list — 20 messages, 12 voices, 05 Jan 2011

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5873>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 05 Jan 2011, 17:44

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

Dave Muir-Bacon — 05 Jan 2011, 17:47 · in reply to Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

I only just joined the list; I hope it's not always going to this fractious....

Dave M-B

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Dan'I Danehy-Oakes Sent: 05 January 2011 17:45 To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: (urth) It's getting hard...

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 05 Jan 2011, 17:50 · in reply to Dave Muir-Bacon

Dave --

There have been occasional periods of fractiousness in the past, but it isn't always like this.

On Wed, Jan 5, 2011 at 9:47 AM, Dave Muir-Bacon
<dave.muir-bacon at tracegroup.com> wrote:
I only just joined the list; I hope it's not always going to this
fractious....

Dave M-B

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net]
On Behalf Of Dan'I Danehy-Oakes
Sent: 05 January 2011 17:45
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: (urth) It's getting hard...

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Lane Haygood — 05 Jan 2011, 17:58 · in reply to Dave Muir-Bacon

No, these things happen about once every two months or so. It will be followed by a three week lull.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 5, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Dave Muir-Bacon" <dave.muir-bacon at tracegroup.com> wrote:
I only just joined the list; I hope it's not always going to this fractious....

Dave M-B

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net]

On Behalf Of Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Sent: 05 January 2011 17:45

To: The Urth Mailing List

Subject: (urth) It's getting hard...

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dave Muir-Bacon — 05 Jan 2011, 18:07 · in reply to Lane Haygood

Well I might post something about Cerberus soon as I finish reading it, only for the second time though, and I still find it the most frustratingly enjoyable book. At least I got the references to Kate Wilhelm, Virginia Woolf and the mis-shelved Vernor Vinge in the library this time, as all being close to Wolfe.

Dave M-B

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lane Haygood
Sent: 05 January 2011 17:58
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) It's getting hard...

No, these things happen about once every two months or so. It will be followed by a three week lull.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 5, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Dave Muir-Bacon"
<dave.muir-bacon at tracegroup.com> wrote:
I only just joined the list; I hope it's not always going to this
fractious....

Dave M-B

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net]
On Behalf Of Dan'l Danehy-Oakes
Sent: 05 January 2011 17:45
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: (urth) It's getting hard...

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to
win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to
nobody in particular), please shut up.

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>Disclaimer:

The contents of this E-mail plus any attachment is intended for the
use of the addressee only and is confidential, proprietary and may be
privileged. It will not be binding upon Trace Group or any group
company (Trace). Opinions, conclusions, contractual obligations and
other information in this message in so far as they relate to the
official business of Trace must be specifically confirmed in writing
by Trace. If you are not the intended recipient you must not copy this
message or attachment, use or disclose the contents to any other
person, but are requested to telephone or E-mail the sender and delete
the message and any attachment from your system. Trace takes all
reasonable precautions to ensure that no virus or defect is
transmitted via this e mail, however Trace accepts no responsibility for
any virus or defect that might arise from opening this E-mail or
attachments.

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Son of Witz — 05 Jan 2011, 18:56 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

+1

~witz

On Jan 5, 2011, at 9:44 AM, "Dan'l Danehy-Oakes" <danl do at gmail.com> wrote:
...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

António Pedro Marques — 05 Jan 2011, 19:13 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote (05-01-2011 17:44):

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Dan'l, Dan'l, Dan'!! What if some people are both looking for truth and trying to win?

(What kind of a name is Dan'l? Looks like Teal'c.)

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 05 Jan 2011, 19:21 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

2011/1/5 Ant?nio Pedro Marques <entonio at gmail.com>:

Dan'l, Dan'l, Dan'!! What if some people are both looking for truth and trying to win?

I suppose that the two aren't necessarily mutually exclusive; but the desire for one's theory to "win" tends to blind one to its flaws and thus makes the search for truth that much harder.

(What kind of a name is Dan'l? Looks like Teal'c.)

It's an American version of Daniel, used by both Dan'l Boone and Dan'l Webster.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Jeff Wilson — 06 Jan 2011, 01:19 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

On 1/5/2011 1:13 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote (05-01-2011 17:44):

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Dan'l, Dan'l, Dan'!! What if some people are both looking for truth and trying to win?

(What kind of a name is Dan'l? Looks like Teal'c.)

You dare to mock the First Prime of Abaia?!?! Serpent guards attack!

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

Computational Intelligence Laboratory - Texas A&M Texarkana
< <http://www.tamut.edu/CIL> >

António Pedro Marques — 06 Jan 2011, 12:38 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson wrote (06-01-2011 01:19):

On 1/5/2011 1:13 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote (05-01-2011 17:44):

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Dan'l, Dan'l, Dan'l! What if some people are both looking for truth and trying to win?

(What kind of a name is Dan'l? Looks like Teal'c.)

You dare to mock the First Prime of Abaia?!?! Serpent guards attack!

Shoon't that be Eel Guards in this case?

Now we know why stargates are round and there's one in Antarctica.

Mo Holkar — 06 Jan 2011, 12:51 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

At 19:21 05/01/2011, Dan'l wrote:

I suppose that the two aren't necessarily mutually exclusive; but the desire for one's theory to "win" tends to blind one to its flaws and thus makes the search for truth that much harder.

This is why one has to seek for truth AND penitence...

Mo

~ # ~

WolfeWiki -- a wiki about Gene Wolfe

<http://www.wolfewiki.com/pmwiki/>

Jerry Friedman — 06 Jan 2011, 21:30 · in reply to Mo Holkar

From: Mo Holkar <lists at ukg.co.uk>

At 19:21 05/01/2011, Dan'l wrote:

I suppose that the two aren't necessarily mutually exclusive; but the desire for one's theory to "win" tends to blind one to its flaws and thus makes the search for truth that much harder.

This is why one has to seek for truth AND penitence...

Thank you. List membership has its rewards.

Jerry Friedman

Jane Delawney — 06 Jan 2011, 23:43 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

On 05/01/11 17:44, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

...for me to tell who's looking for truth and who's just trying to win.

If you're just trying to win (and note that this is addressed to nobody in particular), please shut up.

Have had to shut up for a week or so for reasons unconnected to the list, but have to say Dan'l, I have some sympathy with your frustration. This isn't a competition ... is it? if it *is*, I think

potential listmembers need some kind of heads up before they join :) All I ever wanted to do here was to bounce ideas off other Sun-cycle mavens. Some of the 'tudes I've seen, whether in discussion I've participated in, or in catching-up time (of which I have a great deal to do most times given personal cirx) suggest some on here do actually regard this listserv as a competition. One or two even seem to think that there is some ultimate religious truth in question here.

How anyone can think they are 'right' when discussing the literary work of a writer who does not choose to participate himself in these discussions is completely beyond me. GW is over eighty and so successful as a writer that he doesn't need any of this stuff; he's definitely not going to tell us word for word what is what. Given that - and I don't think that's a stretch - what any of us think is as likely to be plausible / interesting as what any other thinks. And regarding the 'religion' aspect, it's plain to me that some have forgotten that what we are discussing here is a work, or works, of fiction; not a set of texts competing, as at the Council of Nicea, for canonical status.

jd

Jane Delawney — 07 Jan 2011, 00:18 · in reply to Mo Holkar

On 06/01/11 12:51, Mo Holkar wrote:

At 19:21 05/01/2011, Dan'I wrote:

I suppose that the two aren't necessarily mutually exclusive; but the desire for one's theory to "win" tends to blind one to its flaws and thus makes the search for truth that much harder.

This is why one has to seek for truth AND penitence...

+1

jd

Gerry Quinn — 07 Jan 2011, 16:54 · in reply to Jane Delawney

From: "Jane Delawney" <jane_delawney at sky.com>

Have had to shut up for a week or so for reasons unconnected to the list, but have to say Dan'I, I have some sympathy with your frustration. This isn't a competition ... is it? if it *is*, I think potential listmembers need some kind of heads up before they join :) All I ever wanted to do here was to bounce ideas off other Sun-cycle mavens. Some of the 'tudes I've seen, whether in discussion I've participated in, or in catching-up time (of which I have a great deal to do most times given personal cirx) suggest some on here do actually regard this listserv as a competition. One or two even seem to think that there is some ultimate religious truth in question here.

When you say 'bounce ideas' do you just mean post ideas, no matter how wacky, and that evidence against those ideas is unwelcome?

How anyone can think they are 'right' when discussing the literary work of a writer who does not choose to participate himself in these discussions is completely beyond me. GW is over eighty and so successful as a writer that he doesn't need any of this stuff; he's definitely not going to tell us word for word what is what. Given that - and I don't think that's a stretch - what any of us think is as likely to be plausible / interesting as what any other thinks. And regarding the 'religion' aspect, it's plain to me that some have forgotten that what we are discussing here is a work, or works, of fiction; not a set of texts competing, as at the Council of

Nicea, for canonical status.

Wolfe's books are not, of course, detective stories, or not only detective stories. And even detective stories may have lacunae unnoticed by the author, or in some cases may have been written in a spirit of perversity such that the number of valid solutions is either less than or greater than one.

Nevertheless, surely you agree that some readings must be better than others? For example readings of 5HoC or BotNS involving the Daleks as a major plot device are probably of less worth than readings for which it is easier to find support in the text.

It's not a question of religion. It's a question of trying to find the best reading, or perhaps readings. This won't be done without flagging problems with readings, and, as we all know, it's easier to spot problems with other people's readings than with our own. And it's easier for the originator of an idea to find ways around those problems. Even if this is motivated in part by competitive instincts, the same might be said of most human achievement. [If we are competitive, we should obey the rules of the game; which include not attempting to silence others by intimidation or other means, and not attempting to trap them, or hide arguments that would help their case.]

Sure, Wolfe doesn't usually explain (and even when he does I would say the words in the text are more authoritative than the words of the author). That doesn't mean that there are not good ideas, questionable ideas, and ideas that are totally out to lunch. Don't we care which are which?

- Gerry Quinn

Ryan Dunn — 07 Jan 2011, 17:32 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

I like to think that there are people on this list who are smarter than me and who have a deep knowledge of book text.

So if a passage about Agia hitting her head on the floor and it sounding like a hammer tapping stone, and I'd like to see if anyone she might be a robotic poppet, and if they may have any other insights one way or the other, then YES I guess I subscribed to bounce ideas whacky or substantial (ideally both).

...ryan

On Jan 7, 2011, at 8:54 AM, "Gerry Quinn" <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

When you say 'bounce ideas' do you just mean post ideas, no matter how wacky, and that evidence against those ideas is unwelcome?

Son of Witz — 07 Jan 2011, 17:48 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On Jan 7, 2011, at 8:54 AM, "Gerry Quinn" <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

Sure, Wolfe doesn't usually explain (and even when he does I would say the words in the text are more authoritative than the words of the author). That doesn't mean that there are not good ideas, questionable ideas, and ideas that are totally out to lunch. Don't we care which are which?

- Gerry Quinn

I certainly agree with that.

People can get so invested with their theories that they hold onto them well past their breaking points out of pride I guess. That's when things seem to veer off into the meta-critique of each

others' take on interpreting literature, which gets pretty boring, IMO.

We ALL know in our hearts that not every reading is valid. People glom onto one thing, start guessing, then forget that something might contradict. I come here because I want to find a certain consensus about the PLOT, and then to explore the crazy IDEAS in the plot. I LOVE Lee and Marc's gestalt ideas. Such far out stuff. I love Gerry and Roy's parsing abilities.

Can't we all just get along, suck it up and accept that THEORIES ARE MEANT TO BE PRODDED? They only become really valid when you can't prove them wrong.

(I'm pretty sure my friend's theory that the characters of LOST were all actually delivered into Hell at the end, despite the fact that everyone thinks they went to Heaven hasn't been knocked down yet, though people sure try. This theory is the only way that show is redeemed in my eyes.)

Lee Berman — 07 Jan 2011, 18:49 · follows Son of Witz

When you say 'bounce ideas' do you just mean post ideas, no matter how wacky

Ryan Dunn: So if a passage about Agia hitting her head on the floor and it sounding like a hammer tapping stone...

Hah! Excellent riff on the "bounce" metaphor Ryan!

Gerry Quinn: That doesn't mean that there are not good ideas, questionable ideas, and ideas that are totally out to lunch. Don't we care which are which?

Son O' Witz: I certainly agree with that.

Not me. Gerry used the example of an apparently insane theory which involved Daleks to make his point. The thing is, nobody here (currently) does anything like that. As an example, Ryan's observation regarding Agia's head comes straight from the text. Robots are found in the text. Ryan connects them in a way that makes sense to him. If it doesn't make sense to you, what does that prove? That Ryan is stupid or insane? That we need to take a vote?

As Jane says, this is fiction! It is not possible for there to be a "right" answer. There is no objective reality to measure. Ideas are not found in dots on a page or screen. Ideas are not floating around in the aether either. They ONLY to be found as neural patterns in each human being's brain. And as long as one intelligent, sane person has a certain idea, that idea has validity.

It could be argued that Gerry's dismissal of a theory is itself a theory. And that his theory has validity. And it does! But, by Gerry's own philosophy, all theories need to be challenged. Judge not, lest ye be judged?

The truth is we waste time challenging only the theories that bother us. Neglected is the self-analysis- "why does this bother me?" Some interesting truths will emerge if we answer this question honestly (answer only to ourselves, please-

we don't need any Dr. Phil confessional crap in here ;-))

Gerry Quinn — 07 Jan 2011, 18:59 · in reply to Son of Witz

From: "Son of Witz" <Sonofwitz at butcherbaker.org>

Can't we all just get along, suck it up and accept that THEORIES ARE MEANT TO BE PRODDERED? They only become really valid when you can't prove them wrong.

(I'm pretty sure my friend's theory that the characters of LOST were all actually delivered into Hell at the end, despite the fact that everyone thinks they went to Heaven hasn't been knocked down yet, though people sure try. This theory is the only way that show is redeemed in my eyes.)

An ironic form of redemption! (But now you've got me thinking about Eastenders...)

Son of Witz — 07 Jan 2011, 19:29 · in reply to Lee Berman

On Jan 7, 2011, at 10:49 AM, Lee Berman <severiansola at hotmail.com> wrote:

When you say 'bounce ideas' do you just mean post ideas, no matter how wacky

Ryan Dunn: So if a passage about Agia hitting her head on the floor and it sounding like a hammer tapping stone...

Hah! Excellent riff on the "bounce" metaphor Ryan!

Gerry Quinn: That doesn't mean that there are not good ideas, questionable ideas, and ideas that are totally out to lunch. Don't we care which are which?

Son O' Witz: I certainly agree with that.

Not me. Gerry used the example of an apparently insane theory which involved Daleks to make his point. The thing is,

nobody here (currently) does anything like that. As an example, Ryan's observation regarding Agia's head comes straight

from the text. Robots are found in the text. Ryan connects them in a way that makes sense to him. If it doesn't make

sense to you, what does that prove? That Ryan is stupid or insane? That we need to take a vote?

Look, I understand there is no objective truth in fiction, and I like far out ideas.

I agree the Dalek example goes past what people do here. I don't think Ryan's question is too wacky. No one really gets Agia.

BUT, if you're going to say Green is Lune, you are just wrong, the idea has been shown to hold no water.