

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00293.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 10 Dec 2006 15:02:55 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen
wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:

Lee
Olsen
wrote:

Jim
McGinn
wrote:

Lee
Olsen
wrote:

Jim
McGinn
wrote:

Lee
Olsen
wrote:

claudiusden
wrote:

Lee
Olse
wrot

Tell me
what you
think it fails
to explain.

Negative question. You
have not explained
anything, so how can
anyone
explain where it failed?

IOW, you can think of no human adaptations
that my hypothesis fails to
explain the selective origins of.

Be specific retard.

You made the claim. You support it.

No, you made the outlandish claims. Your hypothetical delusions are
claims. You do not understand the scientific method or logic at all.
Making up just so stories about how you wish hominid development
occured is simply science fiction.
Suppose your neighbor wonders why you are psychotic. He reasons that it
is because you must be a child molestor. It explains everything
perfectly, great explanatory power, but still quite wrong and this
reasoning would not work in a court of law or in science.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Evolutionary theory is a difficult subject. Unfortunately you can't get better at it unless you approach it in a dispassionate, intellectually honest manner. There are relatively few people that possess the requisite objectivity to progress in this discipline.

No, I've said it all along, you are a loon.

You really don't understand any of this stuff, do you?

So, Gerrit, Su, Jason, Laden, me, et al----- we all don't understand, but you do?

Science is as science does.

I know how difficult it must be for a sci-fi writer to conform to actual scientific methods, because it tears hell out of your lunacy, so you simply don't recognise it. I understand.

Go ahead. Tell us about your understanding of scientific methods. I'm sure it will be very similar to the nonsense Gerrit submitted the other day.

So, Gerrit, Su, Jason, Laden, et al----- just don't understand, but you do? You can't support the simplest of claims, you make retractions a rate seldom seen even on sap. Your arguments are nothing more than an endless barrage of name-calling, lies, and misinformation (hence the retractions). You are pathetic.

You never stood a chance, Lee. Everybody on this NG knew that except you.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Stop
asking
negative
questions
you
evasive
twit.

There's no
such thing
as a
negative
question,
retard.

Jim: "Tell me what you
think it fails to explain."

Negative question. You
have not explained
anything, so how can
anyone
explain where it failed?

So this is where you pretend to claim that
you have no knowledge of my
hypothesis.

I do have knowledge of it. You just claimed gardens were a
part of it.

Your point?

Nobody cares about just so stories. Your hypothetical meanderings mean
nothing other than proof you haven't read the literature.

What literature did I, supposedly, not read. And how would it help me.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Be specific.

This usually means your desperation has run its full course and you will no longer be posting on this NG. (Or, at least, not on any topic that I might address.)

The truth is, Lee, you never had a chance in this discussion right from the start. (Tell him Mikey.) Your first mistake was to engage me in a conversation in the first place. And it was inevitable after that. You never had a chance.

Says the loon who has such a poor understanding of the literature that he had to retract his made up "saber-toothed lions" and Homo not on the savannas until the "advent of jeeps and guns" If you made that up, you made it all up. Stupidity like this does not get a second chance. Your delusional imagination will be pointed out as long as as you keep posting it.

It's always the same thing with you anthro-wackos. You're sure your right. You don't know what you're right about and you don't know why you are right about it. But you are sure you are right and anybody that disagrees with you is wrong.

Here is a statement from your first post in this thread:

McGinn: "If human ancestors were not regularly venturing across treeless habitat chasing down prey and defending themselves against predators then what purpose do the stone weapons (spears, bow and arrow) serve that show up in the fossil record starting about 2.5 mya?"

If this is the kind of evidence that you are claiming as support for

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

your sci-fi hypothesis, then where are all these weapons?

Learn to use a search engine.

It's obvious that to you PA is a religion and its beliefs are sacred. Beyond dispute. And, therefore, it's appropriate to employ creative reinterpretation of scientific methods to preserve the illusion that it is beyond dispute. This is what you are demonstrating to the world in this thread.

I'm not a PA and never said I was. But it is quite true qualified people looked at your hypothesis and did not accept it.

That's not my recollection. My recollection is that qualified people looked at my hypothesis and could not dispute it. Maybe you should actually read it.

That saves me the trouble of reading a paper that hasn't passed peer review.

So you admit that you prefer to avoid hypothetical thinking that is different than your own? Right?

I could dismiss it anyway on the grounds that you are not familiar enough with the literature to be making grand hypothetical theories on human evolution in the first place.

It's comical that you're going to try to pretend to have scientific reasons to dismiss hypothetical thinking. It don't work that way, jackass.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

My thinking is consistent with all the evidence. And you confirmed this by way of your inability to dispute it. This is how science works. Get used to it.

Your thinking is consistent with your lack of knowledge of the literature.

Uh?

If you knew the literature you could cite from it. Give us a citation that:

McGinn: "stone weapons (spears, bow and arrow) serve that show up in the fossil record starting about 2.5 mya?"

What weapons showed up at 2.5 MYA? Be specific.

Do you dispute it. No. Then why should I bother?

Your
evidence
for
Miocene
gardens
is?

Show me
where I
created

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

evidence,
dimwit.

Miocene gardens is a total
fabrication, dimwit.

Its not evidence, retard. It's a hypothetical
proposition. And you
can't dispute it.

Hypothetical proposition is pure science fiction in your case
becuse
you have proven you are not even remotely familiar with the
literature.

So, we're all supposed to take your word for it. Fat chance that.

"all"? You are hearing voices again, you seem to be very much alone in
your hypothesis as far as peer acceptance.

We're supposed to take your word on that also?

Science has rules. Follow them.

Hypothetical rules, no rules are better (makes it a lot easier to
publish junk that way).

You say you are, but you are lying, or else you could back up
your
claims like "saber-toothed cats" with a citation. It is clear
you tried
to lie your way out of this before succumbing to the truth.

The very fact that you can't get your work published in a
peer-reviewed
journal is proof you don't even believe it yourself.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

So, for you its a matter of belief? For me it's a matter of evidence.

Keep a list, you will be making more retractions before this is over.