

Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

## Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-06/msg00338.html>

---

- *From:* [richardparker01@xxxxxxxx](mailto:richardparker01@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 19 Jun 2006 09:04:19 -0700
- 

rmacfarl wrote:

Jois wrote:

<[richardparker01@xxxxxxxx](mailto:richardparker01@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1150680362.555287.191770@xx](mailto:news:1150680362.555287.191770@xx)

Jois wrote:

<[richardparker01@xxxxxxxx](mailto:richardparker01@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in  
message  
[news:1150674896.946343.133690@xx](mailto:news:1150674896.946343.133690@xx)

Contributions to the  
discussions conducted in  
this forum by Macfarlane  
and McLark can be seen at:

And we hope to see your further  
contributions at some forum but not

here.

We can only hope.

Jois

Jois – you can be a real 'moderator' of a discussion forum, or  
you can  
take sides.

I have only quoted what those two contributors said entirely  
by  
themselves.

Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

Are you a 'moderator' or partial?

This is maybe the first time that I've deliberately been confrontational. I'm a bit fed up with being attacked by people who haven't, really, anything much more to say than personal insults.

[snip]

If I display a lack of respect for a couple of old wallies that have been hovering around this "entirely open and free discussion group" for some years, then I can only ask that they engage their minds before they hit the keyboard.

regards

Richard

It isn't so much a lack of respect but that I'm 78% sure you are one of the ATT group who decided to post here to stir something up and said so in that forum months ago. Heck, it might have been a year ago. IF that's your goal then you should be ready for what you do stir up.

You can float whatever ideas you want but why would you want to do so before such a disinterested and unappreciative crowd?

Jois

My issue with Dickie-boy isn't so much his ideas as his personality,  
which as demonstrated to date is that of a dishonest weasel.

That (dishonest weasel) is a very nice turn of phrase – must have taken a deal of thought. Do you have weasels in Oz? even dishonest ones?

It's better to quote something you know about than total rubbish.

By the way, rus-siba – near enough to Rossie-boy, but not quite, in my local Surigaonon language, means 'anus of an old pig' – it's the bit

Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

of a roast pig that 's refused by the cooks or the party-goers, but given to the dogs.

And more:

I like Algis, I really do, in spite of everything. Despite all the

extremely terse exchanges we've had, I find his Usenet persona to be one of sincerity, even if far too earnest for his own good (or my liking, depending on your point of view).

Well, that's nice. He really has some very good and original ideas. I haven't noticed anything remotely like that from you.

But Dickie-boy? Mr "I am trying to compose a troll on sci.anthro.paleo"

Sleazebag Parker?

Bah! A nasty taste is left in one's mouth by engagement with him. Yukkie yukkie! Ick! Ick! Ick!

Are you pregnant, Ross, or are you just going through the 'Late Old Man' syndrome?

If a second-hand message from another group produces these over-wrought symptoms, I would suggest you might contact your doctor. A psychiatrist would cost too much, and the treatment (and fees) would go on for much too long to deal with such an intractable problem.

Face it Dickie-boy. I've never agreed with Algis, because his ideas are crap, but he's still a nice bloke. There are other people who post on the PA groups who I may line up with in the AAT debates, but whom I have a personal dislike of & therefore don't correspond with. And then there are those who I don't like, & don't agree with.

Marc I don't

like, & really don't agree with. You I really don't like, & don't agree with.

Re: Forum for rational scientific debate?

Do you see the difference?

Not really.

I'm still trying to work out your 'subtle' message. Perhaps I'm trying to read too much into it, and it's so very crassly simple that I've lost the point of what you thought you were trying to say.

But, Ross, you're doing a really good job of nurturing the study and discussion of the science of palaeoanthropology in the anti-Podes

Keep up the good work, old chap!

regards

Richard

.