

Re: Do you have a Knowledge Officer?

## Re: Do you have a Knowledge Officer?

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2007-10/msg00442.html>

---

- *From:* [docdwarf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:docdwarf@xxxxxxxx) ()
  - *Date:* Thu, 11 Oct 2007 02:51:47 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <ucefg31jagm5fejoofq3rhgm86h9497j1o@xxxxxxx>, Robert <no@xxxxxx> wrote:

On Sat, 6 Oct 2007 08:43:39 +0000 (UTC), [docdwarf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:docdwarf@xxxxxxxx) () wrote:

In article <srmdg3192coq5ifp54vg1ei1978fcbilu8@xxxxxxx>, Robert <no@xxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 05 Oct 2007 23:22:45 GMT, "William M. Klein" <wmklein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Pete Dashwood"  
<[dashwood@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dashwood@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote in message  
[news:5mntnsFefolrU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:5mntnsFefolrU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

<[docdwarf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:docdwarf@xxxxxxxx)>  
wrote in message

[news:fe5uol\\$k5b\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fe5uol$k5b$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article  
<[BMuNi.3425\\$bM6.496@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:BMuNi.3425$bM6.496@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>, tlmfru

<[lacey@xxxxxxx](mailto:lacey@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

[snip]

One  
man's  
experience

Re: Do you have a Knowledge Officer?

is  
never  
adequate.

Oh, I  
\*cannot\*  
resist...

... seems  
like I've  
seen  
different  
attitudes  
manifested,  
say, by Mr  
Wagner.

Why pick on Robert? You  
yourself have manifested  
such an attitude,

as, indeed,

have I.

[snip]

Pete,  
It seems to me that you, DD, I, and MOST  
of us USUALLY qualify our

statements

with phrases such as " in my experience" or  
"from what I have seen".

This is in

stark opposition to how RW usually (not  
always) makes his statements.

[snip]

It is common for CLC postings to state a conclusion,  
unsupported by

Re: Do you have a Knowledge Officer?

## Re: Do you have a Knowledge Officer?

facts/premises and  
the canons of logic, much less citations.

Leaving aside any sort of analysis indicating how this attribute of 'common' was determined... this certainly looks like a Brooklyn Bridge defense. To paraphrase my Sainted Paternal Grandmother – may she sleep with the angels! – on such things, 'So... it's common for CLC posters to jump off the Brooklyn Bridge, you will, too?'

It's like pot .. kettle .. black. You didn't criticize your Sainted Grandmother for failure to qualify the percentage of people jumping off the Brooklyn Bridge nor their survival rate. I don't fault others for unqualified generalizations. It's a human trait. The ability to generalize with inductive logic was an evolutionary development that helped humans advance in a world of incomplete information. For example, 'Don't mess with bees, they sting.' overlooks stingless bees in the Meliponini tribe.

Trivia: Only female bees have a stinger, whose technical name is ovipositor. Its primary function is laying eggs, not defense.