

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-02/msg00080.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 3 Feb 2008 18:35:55 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 3, 3:54 pm, rmacfarl <rmacf...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 4, 3:52 am, claudiusd...[@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:claudiusd...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) wrote:

On Feb 2, 11:33 pm, rmacfarl <rmacf...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 3, 6:45 am, claudiusd...[@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:claudiusd...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) was

Why did you snip the context you evasive twit. Now people have to read upthread to see what a complete evavise twit you are.

Why do you continually accuse other of employing what are self-evidently your own debating tactics?

Look at the title of this thread.

Playing dumb, as usual.

Well may we ask:

Then why the constant whining?

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

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 australopithecine 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 made the claim. You support it. If you don't like this then maybe you need to find a new hobby.

No,

Yes. Read upthread.

, you made the claim that there was a "dramatic" morphological change. I simply asked you to support your claim.

Yes, I did. But this is not the claim being discussed here you doofus.

You need to support
your claim,

You don't disput it. Right? (If so then present your dispute.)

lest it be dismissed as content-free.

It's content free by design, you idiot. Its and interpretation of the evidence.

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

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Your inability to support your argument is not my concern.

Why do you continually accuse other of employing what are self-evidently your own debating tactics?

Really? Reference? (Put up or shut up.)

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

Are you saying it's not "dramatic?" (Answer the question you evasive twit.)

No,

Then why did you bring it up?

I'm not saying that it's not dramatic. I'm asking you what your measure of dramatic is.

You tell us. Go ahead. What is your, "measure of 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.

You're pretend ignorance of the evidence is not my concern. You're a big phoney.

Why do you continually accuse other of employing what are self-evidently your own debating tactics?

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.

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

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Nevertheless we don't see you protesting when Lee makes specific claims about HE living a hunting/scavenging existence in treeless habitat. You only protest because my solution collides with the paleoanthropological agenda to whitewash human social realities.

Wrong on both counts. I don't protest against Lee making such claims because he isn't making them. And I protest against your claims because they are vague, ill-defined, content-free and not based on scientific data.

Would you care to expand on what these human social realities are which your imaginary paleoanthropological agenda is supposedly intending to whitewash?

You are so brainwashed that you are unable to even acknowledge the existence of human social behaviors.

Humans are first and foremost social, communal (communicative), and communally territorial.

Which makes them different to chimpanzees, how?

Are you saying humans are the same as chimps?

The fact that you've been indoctrinated with the belief that this isn't the case doesn't add up to an excuse to ignore evidence and its implications. Science is about what is. It is not about what we wish to be.

Now answer my question, you evasive twit.

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

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Does anybody?

No.

A fact which invalidates your entire hypothesis, because you have no idea if australopiths or any prehomnids were capable of behaving in the ways that you postulate.

But you admit that you have no specific disputes with my scenario.
Right?

This is the core dispute with your hypothesis, Jim. You don't have one.

You appear desperate.

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.)

No, that is a straw man argument.

No, it's not a straw man argument. You stated that the evidence is too vague for my conclusions. But, through some magical process that you've yet to explain, the evidence, apparently, isn't too vague for Lee's outlandish claims that HE could outrun lions, horses, kudu etc.

Yes, it is a straw man argument. I repeat, Lee has not made the outlandish claims that you claim that he has. You are attacking an argument that he is not making – the very definition of a straw man

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

fallacy.

Yes he did. He's made these claims hundreds of times!

Lee has not, to my knowledge,
postulated this behaviour among early hominids such as
australopiths, nor would he have any basis for doing so.

You evasive twits are unable to incorporate A'piths into your
dimwitted premise so you employ the propaganda tactic of
pretending not to notice that the evidence of A'piths is
plainly contradictory to your premise about HE lifestyle. You
(yourself, Lee and all conventional nitwits) purposively keep
your thinking vague so that you can pretend to not have to
confront this issue. This proves that yourself and Lee are
not acting like scientists but like propagandists.

Sorry Jim, but you are getting carried away with the force of your own
arguments. You seem to be suggesting that "conventional nitwits" don't
acknowledge that morphological differences between Australopith and
early Homo imply differences in abilities and lifestyle.

Reference? (Refer to my words directly you straw-baiting nitwit.)

This is also
a straw man argument based on a false premise,

I wouldn't know since I never made such an argument. Keep in mind
that the rest of us don't have direct access to your imagination.

as clearly it is a
subject of lively debate in the paleoanthropological community.

Thank you for this useless information. Now let's get back to the
issue under discussion:

You evasive twits are unable to incorporate A'piths into your

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

dimwitted premise so you employ the propaganda tactic of pretending not to notice that the evidence of A'piths is plainly contradictory to your premise about HE lifestyle. You (yourself, Lee and all conventional nitwits) purposively keep your thinking vague so that you can pretend to not have to confront this issue. This proves that yourself and Lee are not acting like scientists but like propagandists.

This is likely to be one of those areas in which your efforts to portray yourself as a maverick or some kind of original thinker are doomed to disappointment.

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").

Phoney nonsense. Obviously this "evidence" is irrelevant to anything that happened millions of years ago.

It's not irrelevant, but I agree it's not definitive. Try to keep things in context, Jim.

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.

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

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

Keep in mind that we don't have access to your imagination.

Why do you continually accuse other of employing what are self-evidently your own debating tactics?

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 stockbroker's?

Re: Conventional Evasiveness

Answer the question, you evasive twit

Why do you continually accuse other of employing what are self-evidently your own debating tactics?

In the respect that you describe "early hominids (Apith)" as having a "lifestyle that was distinct from chimps", was their lifestyle more "distinct" from chimpanzees than a Bedouin goatherd's is from a Manhattan stockbroker's?

Ross Macfarlane

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