

Re: Savanna nonsense

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-10/msg00343.html>

- *From:* "JAE" <jae@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 10 Oct 2005 14:19:22 -0700
-

Algis Kuliukas wrote:

> JAE wrote:

>

>> [snipped, the usual crazed, self righteous, pedantic ranting]

>

> Jason, it's no wonder creationism is on the increase in America if
> people like you represent the case for evolutionary science there. Such
> constant, tedious hostility is bound to put any would-be scientist off
> for life and send them running to the nearest comfort zone, even if it
> happened to be a church (in my case, however, it would be a pub.) I bet
> when students walk out of your class for the last time they thank God
> they'll never have to hand in a piece of work to you again. The irony
> is: You're probably taking this as a compliment. Putting people off
> science is what you *want* to do, isn't it? Only really clever people,
> like you, should be allowed to do that.

If people like you represent the British educational system, we're in big trouble because you've come through with a master's degree and you're as ignorant as a rock. Since I've met other Brits for whom this is not true, I'll not make that generalization. You represent yourself and your ideas and you don't do it well. It's also a good thing that you *don't* bet about how my students have reacted to me because the overwhelming majority (n>1000) give me very favorable reviews. What I want to do is make sure that if people do science, they don't engage in the stupid half-baked excuse for science that you typify. Is it only for clever people? That's irrelevant. What is relevant is the methodology that is practiced and presently, the methodology I infer from your postings says that you're not doing good science.

> You seem to have decided, on day one, that this thing, mislabelled the
> 'AAH', is wrong and that anyone who has the audacity to argue for it
> simply must be wrong too. So, you have set about on your crusade,
> trawling the newsgroups day after day, hour after hour, for anyone
> daring to "bastardize the scientific method" by giving it serious
> consideration. I accept that it's not *only* AAH proponents that incur
> your wrath. Anyone who you perceive as not being "in with strict
> orthodoxy" gets your goat just as much.

Re: Savanna nonsense

You seem to be particularly dense and seem to want to believe that I'm prejudiced against water. I suspect it's because facing the music and realizing that what you're presenting is a load of horseshit that underscores your own ineptness and the abysmal failure that your own education has produced is far, far more difficult to deal with. You HAVE presented a bastardization of the scientific method. You do so every time you substitute your inferences for observations. You do every time you present a 'research design' that is circular in nature and at heard doesn't address the questions you claim it does. You perceive this to be an attack on AAX because that's what you promote, but the reality is that it is your methods, your overall lack of care and clear thinking that brings about scorn and criticism. Until you accept this, you will continue to be a pseudoscientific hack and an abysmal failure blabbering about prejudices that don't exist stuck in some other reality where it's politically important to lay blame at a scientific establishment for 45 (or is it more than 100) years of not paying attention to what Algis thinks is important. You're so off the mark that it's not funny, and you get my scorn because in addition to simply presenting your own particular brand of bad science, you seem to have this need to blame others (sometimes me, sometimes physical anthropology in general) for your problems. Grow the fuck up, crybaby.

- > When you find someone like me, who has even gone back, far too old, to
- > academia to study it and is trying, naively probably, to actually *do*
- > some science, (because they have not found the answers satisfactory
- > from your sacred orthodoxy, to why this thing *is* wrong) you have to
- > intensify your efforts: Pick all the holes in any words and phrases you
- > can; Take literally any piece of conversation said in haste and, as if
- > you were the editor of some pretentious scientific journal reading a
- > carefully worded manuscript, attempt to tear it to shreds; And,
- > whenever the opportunity arises, twist any sentence that happens to use
- > the word "you" (even if used generally, as in "one") into lies,
- > accusations or pretend insults against your oh-so-precious reputation.

All you have are your words. I do not have to do any twisting of your words to make them seem ridiculous. You have done that all by yourself. You are not very careful with them; no more careful with them than you are with your own research design. I do not think you much of a thinker. Whether or not you have gone back to school doesn't reflect on whether or not you're doing science. You have gone back to school, but you are not doing science.

- > When you can't find any, at least question the correct use of some
- > words there – maybe that will cause a crack to appear in the reply and
- > then you can crow-bar your way in to extract the next fatal error or
- > pretend damning insult. In any case, and at every opportunity, you try
- > to up the ante. In true George Bush style, you've been determined to
- > have your war and damn the consequences.

And again: All you have here are your words. You are not the least bit

Re: Savanna nonsense

Re: Savanna nonsense

careful with them and as a result, you produce things that you cannot defend. If you mean one thing but write something else, you are the one at fault. When what you write is something ridiculous, blaming me for calling it ridiculous is not the correct thing to do. Do yourself a service and try not to compare me to Bush, for all it does is make you look like a real asshole, again trying to blame others for your own personal failings.

[I'll let the insulting Bush comment slide, though the urge to say that in true Tony Blair fashion, you're a brain-dead lacky sucking up to Elaine Morgan's moronic notions does come to mind. Of course, you couldn't have tossed out a Bush insult because you, Algis, are NEVER the one to up the ante.]

> Well, look. I'm even less impressed with this now than I was before.

What you're impressed with is clearly not terribly important because you've been impressed with some singularly stupid shit.

[snip Algis trying to blame me.]

> You say it's *me* that's

> at fault, not the message, but curiously, you didn't attack me about my

> similar speculations on the hybridisation idea, only the AAH.

It wasn't as stupid as what you've presented about AAX. Neither did you make the overarching circular claims in it that you do in AAX. You were more careful. I suspect it's because you aren't so wedded to the notion that it must be true and thus you must prove it to be so as you do with AAX, but that's just my suspicions.

[snip Algis's crying like a pathetic little baby about no one paying attention to his Sainted Sir Hardy—boo hoo hoo!]

> Call me a poor student, naive about the scientific method and

> inadequate at doing research if you will but I thought science was

> supposed to be about open-minded, fear-free enquiry into interesting

> ideas. I thought scientists were supposed to be people with an infinite

> capacity for curiosity about new ideas and how they might or might not

> fit into what we know already.

Whether or not I call you a poor student doesn't reflect on whether or not science is about fear-free inquiry into interesting ideas. You ARE a poor student if what you present here is any indication. You are not impressive in your ability to make distinction between observation and inference. You are not impressive with your ability even to find papers by a particular author or find literature relevant to what you're interested in. These latter points have nothing to do with curiosity. Curiosity is important, but if that's your end point, you're stopping far too soon and curiosity doesn't excuse bad methodology in

Re: Savanna nonsense

the investigations. Your methodology sucks donkey balls, Algis.

- > The brand of 'scientific' orthodoxy you espouse is nothing like that.
- > It's the sort of methodology that builds reputations of superiority but
- > hinders progress and enlightenment.

My mileage varies. You cannot achieve any progress with faulty methodology and your methodology is faulty. You seem to want to blame others for this problem. The fault is your own however. Your commentary about what I think about science misses the mark entirely.

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: rmacfarl
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: Algis Kuliukas
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: Rich Travsky
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: JAE
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: Algis Kuliukas
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: JAE
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: Algis Kuliukas
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: JAE
 - ◆ **Re: Savanna nonsense**
◇ From: Algis Kuliukas
- Prev by Date: **Re: Where did wading babies sleep?**
 - Next by Date: **Re: Where did wading babies sleep?**
 - Previous by thread: **Re: Savanna nonsense**
 - Next by thread: **Re: Savanna nonsense**
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**