

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

Thats a statement of fact
Lee.

What would you know about facts?

For one, facts are most often challenged in a disrespectful way.

There's no real attempt at discourse, only the effort to prove superiority in order to feed an ego. Epictetus:"When I man showed me I was wrong, I was grateful to no longer be thinking wrongly. But when I performed the same service for another, he always went away angry."

I've worked with the retarded, and when you show them they are wrong, they are not angry at me, but dismayed. Anger is often expressed as asininity, and is a symptom of neurosis, not stupidity.

The facts in this thread are few; all the remains of the early hominids at issue would fit in a foot locker. We have no way of knowing whether they are really representative of most hominids alive at the time, and the fact is, we really dont know how many there were in ecosystems that did not favor the preservation of fossils.

The recent skull found in Chad was in what had been a seasonal delta like the Okavango. We have no way of knowing if the bone found was deposited there by floodwaters or whether the individual died in situ. We know that animals, including hominids, when sick, even if normally living on savannah, will seek water, and more often die near it. The proximity of the waterway proves very little.

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

We really dont have many facts, and what we do have does
not warrant
the passion I've seen expressed.

Would you please stop with the hand-wringing already?

You first.

Read Marco's posts.

Done.

Then come back and say that there's
just too much passion in this debate.

There is too much pasion in this debate. You have no viable
alternative.

No response.

The recent Carbon/
Oxygen isotope exchange should be enough of an example.

Why?

No response.

Marco will spend days calling "Savanna Fantasts" STUPID,
STUPID, STUPID ---even when shown to have missed the
point by a country mile.

What point you vague nitwit?

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

Then he'll shut up for 3 or 4 months

You never shut up.

only to come back with the same flawed assertions.

Yes, but in light of the fact you have no hypothesis at all . . . so what.

Assertion for which you admit you have no alternative. Right? Put up or shut up jackass.

No response

How long has he been going on about sedges and C4?

How long has Lee been going on and on about his endurant running nonsense. Years?

No response.

Years?
How do you make sense of the assertion that hominid microwear shows similarities with Capybara and thus clearly indicates a semi-aquatic lifestyle?

Why not just present your alternative and let the chips fall where they may.

No response.

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

Re: we're not going to see much sensible.

Oh, that's right. You don't have an alternative. Mikey, it appears you are down the river without a paddle.

How long do you
suppose you'll have to pour that in my ear before I want
to shoot you?

Maybe you should find a hobby that doesn't involve thought.

Marco and Pauly and Dimmy et al richly
deserve every ass-kickin' they get--and so do you.

It's unfortunate that you don't have confidence in your own thinking to let it stand on its own merits. Of course that would assume that you had any thinking in the first place, which obviously is not the case.

Is it not obvious that even a bad hypothesis, like Marc's, is better than no hypothesis at all?– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –