

## Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-12/msg00193.html>

---

- *From:* "JAE" <jae@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 5 Dec 2005 09:33:04 -0800
- 

Jim McGinn wrote:

> JAE wrote:

>

> <snip>

>

>>> So despite the fact that you are unable to dispute any aspect of my  
>>> hypothesis I'm supposed to take your word for it that somewhere in this  
>>> book there's information that will refute my hypothesis. Yeah, right.  
>>> Like I haven't heard that toothless assertion a hundred times on this  
>>> NG.

>>

>> Well, Jim, I think I realize your problem. You appear dead-set in  
>> repeating a lie. That lie is that I am unable to dispute your  
>> 'hypothesis.' Now normally, repeating a lie would make you a liar, but  
>> since you're not altogether there, since your brain doesn't work right,  
>> it's probably unfair to call you a liar. You're just nuts.

>

> Oh, I get it. I'm supposed to take your word for it that there is some  
> dispute of my hypothesis in some obscure book.

You do not have to take my word for it. You can get the book and see for yourself; it is not so 'obscure' as to be difficult to obtain. I have no faith that you will do this, but you could do so rather easily. Now why again is it that you don't seem to be familiar with any work actually relevant to your claims?

> And you are suggesting that \*I'm\* nuts?

Yes. I'm suggesting that you're nuts.

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

