

## Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-12/msg00179.html>

---

- *From:* "JAE" <jae@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 4 Dec 2005 18:10:29 -0800
- 

Jim McGinn wrote:

> JAE wrote:

>> Jim McGinn wrote:

>>> JAE wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Since your 'hypothesis' isn't in any state such that it can be  
>>>> critically reviewed because you've steadfastly refused to organize  
>>>> whatever thoughts you have, what's left is to dispute some of the  
>>>> claims you've made. You've made the claim that a hunter-gatherer  
>>>> lifestyle is something new.

>>>>

>>>> Yes. Or, at best it is so vague as to be meaningless (untestable  
>>>> against the evidence).

>>>>

>>>> I dispute this because abundant  
>>>> archaeological evidence suggests otherwise.

>>>>

>>>> I would have thought it obvious to you by now that I'm not the kind of  
>>>> person to take anybody's word on something like this. If you are aware  
>>>> of such evidence then you should refer to it specifically.

>>>>

>>>> A curious request from someone who has, to the best of my knowledge,  
>>>> never cited a single source in support of his views. There's a wealth  
>>>> of data surrounding hunter-gatherer studies.

>>>>

>>>> For early hominids?

Why don't you try reading and find out. I realize that actually doing some research in the primary literature is against your general tendencies, but it might make you into less of a joke. For a world class evolutionary theorist, you're really something of a bumbling ignorant dunce.

>> I would suggest beginning

>>> with 'Hunter-gatherer foraging strategies: Ethnographic and  
>>> archeological analyses (Prehistoric archeology and ecology)' edited by  
>>> Winterhalder and Smith and the many references within.

>>>>

## Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

> Be specific.

Hmmm. You're never EVER specific yet you demand that I summarize a book that takes several hundred pages to summarize a field?! No, Jim. Why don't you actually read something. As it stands, you're nothing but a joke. Not a particularly funny one, but a joke nonetheless.

>>>> You've made the claim that  
>>>> agriculture is ocnsiderably older than what is more generally accepted.  
>>>  
>>> Yes, in a sense.  
>>  
>> And with no qualification at all, you've also not supported this claim  
>> with anything other than your assertion.  
>  
> And you're not disputing it with anything other than your assertion.

That, Jim, is false. There's a wealth of published research on domestication. It's not my assertion.

> Considering that there's no  
>> archaeological record of domesticates prior to about 10kybp at which  
>> point domesticated crops and animals do appear and are easily  
>> identifiable,, considering that the degree of molecular variation in  
>> domesticates similarly supports recent development, it's upon you, the  
>> guy making the abberant claim, to provide support for your abberation.  
>> You've yet to do so.  
>  
> Wouldn't your claim to the contrary also be considered abberant,  
> according to your definition, in that you just admitted it is based on  
> lack of evidence.

There's evidence for a sudden appearance in the archaeological record. There's a deep and rich archaeological record before that indicates very different subsistence patterns. There's molecular evidence in support of the archaeological interpretation. This isn't based on a lack of evidence, Jim, but abundant evidence that many humans lived for a long, long time without agriculture and domesticates. It's your claim that this is somehow not true that lacks evidence, Jim.

>>>> I dispute this because there's abundant evidence from archaeological  
>>>> and genetic evidence suggesting that your position is false.  
>>>  
>>> If you are aware of such evidence then you should refer to it  
>>> specifically.  
>>  
>> Again, you've blown up my irony-o-meter, you putz. You don't appear to  
>> ever reference evidence specifically, but "The Domestication and  
>> Exploitation of Plants and Animals" is again a good starting point,  
>> similarly with many references to primary studies on the subject. I  
>> suggest you familiarize yourself with such work rather than speaking

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

- > > out of your sphincter like you appear prone to doing.
- >
- > I'm willing to address any specific complaint you have regardless of
- > what orifice you employ to convey it.

The specific complaint is that you're denying evidence of recent domestication of plants and animals when there's solid evidence that it's recent. Since you don't appear to be familiar with the literature and don't actually appear to familiar with ANY literature in the field or related fields, I don't feel in any way compelled to be more specific. You haven't addressed any complaint specific or otherwise in the past. Why should I believe you're somehow different now? Did you start taking those pills the doc gave you?

[snip]

- > You can't get better at evolutionary theory unless you are willing to
- > address it's issues directly and honestly.

Fuckin' A, Jim. These irony-o-meters don't grow on trees. If you're going to continue to say such moronically stupid things, I really will have to send you the repair bill next time.

[snip]

- > It seems to me that all your arguments add up to one big excuse for
- > vagueness.

And since you're crazy and don't make any sense yourself, your opinion will be noted and disregarded as the babblings of an undermedicated nut who really ought to thank his lucky stars that deficient as it may be, there's a support mechanism that allows basketcases like himself who cannot function in the real world but instead find themselves in a delusional reality far apart from the one the rest of the world inhabits.

[snip]

- > Well, then, it does seem we are at an impasse then doesn't it.

Until you actually take those pills you had prescribed around the time you were deemed unable to work and support yourself, yes.

.

- 
- *Follow-Ups:*
    - ◆ *Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths*
    - ◇ *From: Jim McGinn*

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: rmacfarl
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: rmacfarl
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: rmacfarl
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: JAE
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: JAE
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: JAE
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: JAE
- ◆ **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**  
◇ From: Jim McGinn

- Prev by Date: **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**
- Next by Date: **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**
- Next by thread: **Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**