

Conventional Evasiveness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-02/msg00035.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sat, 2 Feb 2008 11:45:56 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 1, 4:59 pm, rmacfarl <rmacfarl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 2, 2:29 am, claudiusd...[@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:claudiusd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) wrote:

On Feb 1, 12:24 am, rmacfarl <rmacfarl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

...

Ross, I began this thread with a content oriented question. I predicted that none of you whackos would even begin to address it. Why don't you prove me wrong? What are you so afraid of?

You what? You "began this thread with a content oriented question"?

Yes, and you phoney's couldn't muster an answer.

No, you did not begin this thread with a content oriented question. On that point I have already proved you wrong.

...

Put up or shut up jackass. Go ahead. What are you waiting for? Is it a secret?

Conventional Evasiveness

...

Put up or shut up jackass. Go ahead. What are you waiting for? Is it a secret?

The irony in your ad hominem is extraordinary, as ever.

...

This is the bit you carried over from another thread:

Answer the question you
evasive twit:
Is it not obvious that early
hominids (Apth) must have
had a lifestyle that was
distinct from chimps? If not
then why the dramatic shift
in morphology?

...

Mike's reply:

In answer to your question, sure something
is obvious,
chimps are quads and hominids are bipeds.

I was asking about lifestyle, you mental retard.

So what?

Playing dumb, as usual.

Conventional Evasiveness

Neither I nor Mike could, in principle, give a great, screaming, pink-and-blue rat's arse what you were talking about.

Then why the constant whining?

You asked 2 questions, to be quite specific, but in fact you disguised (from yourself, no doubt) a couple of other premises within those 2 questions.

Such as . . . ?

One premise being the "dramatic shift in morphology". Do we agree that this is a valid premise? Yes, we know Australopithecines are morphologically distinct from great apes, but is the change "dramatic"? (Mikey asked you that, but you – typically – did not understand his question, and therefore deflected it.) Can the word "dramatic" be defined in a scientific sense?

Evasive twit.

Is there an empirical measure which could show that the degree of morphological change from pre-hominid ape to australopith is more "dramatic" than – for example – brown bear to polar bear? These are the kinds of questions scientists ask, but you never do.

References?

To take that point further: your question preassumes that we know what the chimp / australopith last common ancestor looked like – and that we know how many morphological changes took place in the line from that LCA to chimps & bonoboes. This is a false premise, as anyone with a modicum of paleoanthropological knowledge would know. Is it Ardipithecus? Kenyapithecus? Orrorin? Sahelanthropus? Something else that we have or haven't found yet? Can you see why the answers to these questions would be important to answering your question?

So, in your mind the evidence isn't clear enough for any premise at all. If this is the case why do we not see you protesting when

Conventional Evasiveness

conventional theorist, Lee for example, propose hominids hunting extremely fast mammals in open habitat with spears and outrunning lions? (Answer the question you evasive twit.)

A second premise that Mike took issue with was the reference to a "distinct" lifestyle. He asks an entirely relevant question – and you did not – could not – answer it.

Provide a reference you evasive twit. Keep in mind that we don't have access to your imagination.

Firstly, we don't know what the lifestyle was like, owing to the absence of physical evidence, so we are unable to say how distinct the lifestyle was – but I'm going to assume that that ugly little fact won't do anything to reign in your imaginative enthusiasm. So answer me this... Was the lifestyle of your eco–doormen more "distinct" from chimpanzees than a Bedouin goatherd's is from a Manhattan stockbroker's?

In what respect?

[MClark: sidebet – I'll lay you 10 shares in a Bear Sterns "financial instrument" that Jimmy's answer doesn't stretch to 2 lines of Google text...]

... There's a long list of people that were driven off this newsgroup because they couldn't hack the scrutiny they got from me. Science ain't for sissies.

Yourself included Mac.

Like you would recognise science if it bit you on the bum. And I'm still here, laughing at you.

Evasive jackass.

Conventional Evasiveness

None of this qualifies as content. Most of it is nothing more than ad hominem abuse (ooh, look – more o' them ol' logical fallacies!)

I didn't present *this* as content you straw-baiting nitwit.

Which goes to prove (again) my previous point, that you did not start this thread with content. You simply recycled some of your bollocks from somewhere else...

This is your dispute? One can only wonder why you responded at all.

Ross Macfarlane

For the record:

Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) –
dra-mat-ic

Pronunciation[druh-mat-ik] Pronunciation Key – Show IPA adjective

1. of or pertaining to the drama.
2. employing the form or manner of the drama.
3. characteristic of or appropriate to the drama, esp. in involving conflict or contrast; vivid; moving; dramatic colors; a dramatic speech.
4. highly effective; striking: The silence following his impassioned speech was dramatic.

[Origin: 1580 90; < LL dr maticus < Gk dr matikós, equiv. to dr mat- (s. of drâma) drama + -ikos -ic]

Related forms

dra-mat-i-cal-ly, adverb

Synonyms 1. theatrical. 4. startling, sensational.