

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-02/msg00513.html>

- *From:* rmacfarl <rmacfarl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 15 Feb 2008 15:22:33 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 15, 10:22 pm, "Paul Crowley"
<slkwuoiutiuytcu...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"rmacfarl" <rmacf...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:ec90fb7c-c97c-4cee-838a-675ec7107d19@xx

"Plains zebras can not
survive very long without
water
and must be at least 25-30
kilometers from a water
source."

Hominid groups did, of course, always
establish territories, and those territories
always had good water sources. BUT
that requirement meant that they could
not occupy the huge tracts of land in
which zebras prospered. They are very
different taxa, and occupy very different
habitats.

The ability to encompass 6 or 8 separate assumptions into
a single sweeping generalisation, without a skerrick of
evidence offered in support of any of them, is the
unmistakeable mark of the netloon. The above paragraph
exemplifies this.

The generality and vagueness of this
response is strong evidence of an
inability to deal with the issues.

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

Give the fact that you don't attempt to define which species of "Hominid groups" you are speculating about, or how it is that you have gained this a priori knowledge about how or where they formed territories – given, in fact that you encompass 6 to 8 separate assumptions for which subtle differences in extant species produce quite different evolutionary outcomes, and yet you obviously believe you have some kind of exceptional insight into the lives and loves of several thousand millenia of pre-human hominids, an insight which has never been conspicuously evident in your many years of drinking and posting here on SAP, – then yes, Paulie, I would and do find it hard to deal with your "issues". Which is fine with me. I wouldn't want your issues.

The ability to encompass 6 or 8 separate assumptions into a single sweeping generalisation

Try to name those assumptions -- or, at least, some of them.

See above. You don't nominate which hominids you are speaking about. You are non-specific about the lifestyle assumptions you make about them. You apparently know all about their territories – except where they are. You don't reveal what evidence you rely on to draw your inferences on lifestyle. And yet you profess a remarkable level of confidence on why you know more about the subject than anyone else. Moreover, you profess to know more about what I think than I do.

Do you know the hominid taxa lived in groups? Do you know they all had territories? Where? Do you know what their social structure was? Which hominid taxa are we talking about? When? Have you considered the fact that there are mammals (e.g. plains zebras) are territorial but also migrate seasonally following food or water? Any reason why a hominid could not have become adapted to do the same? What about your assumption (unsupported) that baboons drink less than humans because they don't sweat as much? But what if the early hominids had a full covering of hair like a baboon, rather than being hairless like a modern human? Wouldn't this change the assumptions?

without a skerrick of evidence offered in support of any of them,
If you could state the 'assumptions', you could ask for their supporting evidence.

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

Re: Michael Clark, would you like to make a retraction?

is the unmistakable mark of the netloon. The above paragraph exemplifies this.

The non-answer answer is universally characteristic of the fraud — someone who claims to know, but hasn't a clue.

On the contrary Paulie. The non-question question, as employed by you, and revealed by me, is a classic manoeuvre of the politician or rhetorician who wants to disguise the fact that he has naught to say.

I do note that you quietly snipped out my direct and substantive question in your reply. So let me ask you again:

Exactly how much water do baboons need, Paulie? I take it from the categorical way in which you state the above opinion you are an expert in this field. What is the daily requirement of a 20KG female and a 40KG male?

[..]

When did you last see a savanna theorist present an argument in support of his belief?

Not answered, for the good reason that it does not happen. Superstitions are not based on fact or reason.

Factually in error. I did answer. I said I don't know, but if I ever meet a "savanna theorist" I will ask them. (The latter statement was of course a device for rhetorical effect: I won't waste the insights of any scientific theorist on Paulie...)

Ross Macfarlane

.