

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00313.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 11 Dec 2006 08:03:32 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:

Lee Olsen
wrote:

Well, I think your comments only bolster my claim that my hypothesis is indisputable. You do admit, don't you, that you have not presented any

Science doesn't work that way, no hypothesis/theory is indisputable. They are always open to amendment. You have demonstrated an incompetence seldom seen outside creationist circles.

Answer my question you evasive twit: You do admit, don't you, that you have not presented any kind of dispute of my assertions.

kind of dispute of my assertions. Are you saying that stone tipped

Are you demanding hard evidence in return to refute hypothetical thinking, or are you demanding hypothetical theory to counter your hypothetical theory? If the former, cite any scientist in the world

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

that would let that get past peer review. Any example of such a case will do. Use your search engine if you can't remember any examples.

What are you blabbering about?

spears would not be useful to a community of Apiths that wished to keep immigrating herbivorous species from getting access to their garden habitat? Are you saying that a community of Apiths that wished to keep immigrating herbivorous species out of their garden habitat would not, as a result of maintaining their general health and well being through the depth of the dry season, be less likely to be a target for predators during the dry season? Are you saying that predators would

"Are you saying"? Where did you get the idea that I was saying any of that? Did you hear voices again? Do you see any quotes where I said that? I thought you said honesty was required in these discussions? "You're a chickenshit phoney, afraid to quote me directly."

Answer the questions you evasive twit.

Hypothetically your scenario wouldn't work. As soon as the predators found the herbivores, who feed at night in the gardens under the trees when Lucy is asleep, the resulting carnage from the chase and struggle would tear the garden apart, leaving Lucy's community to starve to death.

Let's not be ridiculous. Why would you assume this would happen typically?

What if the garden was infested by aphids, would the apiths be intelligent enough (as moden humans who do plant gardens), to invent bug spray? Or would they simply lose their garden to the bugs and starve to death? Hypothetically thinking they would obviously starve to death.

What's your point?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Your scenario has been completely falsified.

You're an idiot.

.