

# Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00329.html>

---

- *From:* "Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 11 Dec 2006 14:26:19 -0800
- 

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxx  
wrote:

Lee  
Olsen  
wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxx  
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.

## Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

Negative–evidence arguments can't be refuted, particularly those coming from an illiterate loon.

There is no such thing as negative evidence retard.

Having an especially bad day aren't you? Did you wake up this morning? If you did, your posts certainly don't reflect it

<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~hist12/writing.html>

3. Begin to frame your thesis. Consider why you have phrased your thesis the way you have. Think carefully about the evidence that will support your thesis. What about negative evidence? Do not simply ignore material that contradicts your thesis. Think about why you were not convinced by negative arguments or evidence. How can you discount them? Do you need to modify your argument to account for some of the negative evidence? (Be careful though, you do not want a wishy–washy argument.)

BTW, you base your assumption that Homo Erectus regularly occupied treeless habitat on zero evidence. Like I said previously, there is no evidence that the stone tools associated with HE were laid down in treeless habitat. None. Zero. Zilch. You might as well get used to it. Nothing your gonna say will change this.

Says the retard who just claimed "There is no such thing as negative evidence..."

Well, how much could you know with only the equivalent of a 4th–grade education?

Niccolo Caldararo: "It is embarrassing to you (or should be) for you to continually make

## Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

statements which most of us know are unsupported by the data. You need to read the literature and find which ideas you have which are just plain wrong and which are worthy of development."

So, not only do you refuse to answer my question but now you've taken a turn to become a full fledged propagandist.

Caldarao is such a polished gentleman. What a guy to actually imply you had something "worthy of development." In fact, Su called your rag a "manifesto" which I also thought was more than kind.

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 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?

Your arguments are irrational garbage, plain enough?

IOW, as I suspected, you don't have a point.

Funny how you always go brain dead and can't understand anything when

## Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

confronted with a situation that you can't handle.

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.

I'll make this so simple even you will be able to understand. I am not  
"saying" anything where you can't quote directly. Your reading comp  
skills are simply not good enough to be doing any paraphrasing or  
thinking on your own.

## Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

IOW, you refuse to answer my questions. Right?

So, still insist on lying about my position eh? Not suprising, honesty simply isn't in your nature.

Hypothetically your scenario wouldn't work.  
As soon as the predators  
found the herbivors, 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?

You mean let's not be as ridiculous as you. Where is the evidence for  
your typical gardens? The evidence would be impossible to miss at  
archaeological sites if they occurred at all.

Would it? This is the first interesting comment you've made in this  
whole subthread. Why do you say this? Please make an effort to be  
specific and explicit.

I think you need to take a course in archaeology 101. For a  
hypothetical theorist, you don't seem to be very well grounded in the  
basics. Your garden idea is very testable. Instead of demanding  
everyone else do your homework for you, like the lazy oaf you are,  
start searching for any evidence of a garden, like seeds, pollen, nuts,  
anything that would demonstrate an abnormal concentration not typical  
in the normal background scatter of the area in general. Check back if  
you find anything.

## Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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?

Your garden hypothesis is dead. I don't expect you to understand why, it is pretty complicated.

This is a stupid premise. If aphids were a constant and everpresent occurrence in these earliest of gardens then that would invalidate my premise. Do you have anything other than your imagination that indicates this to be the case. If not then why did you bring it up?

I didn't say there was any evidence for aphids dimwit, it was merely hypothetical thinking. Do you have any evidence that there wasn't any apiths or bug spray in these gardens?

Your scenario has been completely falsified.

Youre an idiot.

Not much you can do about counter-hypothetical thinking is there? Well, you just keep up the ad hominem attack, it's the only argument you have.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence