

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00332.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 11 Dec 2006 22:00:02 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

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.)

Lee, you should have read this before you posted it. Your connotation of the phrase, negative evidence, is different than the connotation in

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

your sample here. Read it again.

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..."

There isn't. The phrase you're looking for is "absence of evidence," not "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 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 developement." If fact, Su called your rag a "manifesto" which I also thought was more than kind.

Why not quote the whole conversations between myself and these two idiots. I've got nothing to hide. How about you?

kind of
dispute of
my

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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
confronted with a situation that you can't handle.

I'm just wondering why you continue pontificating about things that
you, obviously, could not possibly know.

spears
would not
be useful to
a
community
of Apiths
that wished
to keep
immigrating
herbivorous
species

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

Like you have a clue. This wouldn't work.

What if the garden was infested by aphids, would the apiths be intellegent 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?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Uh, no.

Your scenario has been
completely falsified.

You're 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.