

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-02/msg00046.html>

- *From:* rmacfarl <rmacfarl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 2 Feb 2008 23:33:47 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 3, 6:45 am, claudiusd...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx was

Playing dumb, as usual.

Well may we ask:

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.

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

References?

Two clever obfuscations. You are the contributor who is being evasive, and you are the contributor who is unable to support his claims with references.

What is the empirical basis for your description of the morphological shift from great ape–hominid LCA as dramatic?

Either answer the direct question directly, or accept that this thread will henceforth provide concrete evidence that you have no empirical basis for your hypothesis.

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.

No, in my mind the answer is not clear enough for the sweeping conclusions you choose to draw from ill-defined premises.

Now answer my question, you evasive twit.

Do you know definitively what the LCA looked, and when and where it lived?

If this is the case why do we not see you protesting when 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.)

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

No, that is a straw man argument. Lee has not, to my knowledge, postulated this behaviour among early hominids such as australopiths, nor would he have any basis for doing so.

The long-running argument regarding "kudu runners" relates to Lee's highlighting the *fact* that Kalahari Khoi-San hunters can and do successfully hunt kudu and other large game, despite Marc Verhaegen's vain protestations that our "aquatic" adaptations make such behaviour impossible. Lee provided well-attested evidence for this behaviour (yes Jim, "references").

[Don't waste your breath Marc, I'll ignore you anyway. I'll also get in first with the ad hominem. Dumb-arse tooth-fairy believing aquatic ape enthusiast.]

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.

Nice try, but yet again it demonstrates that you still can't answer the question.

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?

Answer the question, you evasive twit.

Was the lifestyle of your eco-doormen more "distinct"* from chimpanzees than a Bedouin goatherd's is from a Manhattan

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

stockbroker's?

[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...]

I win.

And I'm still here, laughing at you...

Ross Macfarlane

.