

Re: Savanna Versus Aquatic equals Junk Science

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-05/msg00480.html>

- *From:* "Paul Crowley" <slkwuoiutiuytciuyik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 26 May 2008 13:45:54 +0100
-

"Claudius Denk" <claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:e9027425-a6c2-45ee-abe7-ccf6aeab9511@xx

Real science involves careful consideration of *ALL* of the evidence.

Real science consists in REJECTING bad theories on the basis of the evidence, and then seeing what is left.

Uh huh. And so . . . ?

Your head is full of bad theories -- so obviously bad that any remotely competent scientist would disregard them. (Of course, that's also true of the Savanna and Aquatic theorists.)

Each of the Savanna, the Aquatic, and the Monsoon-Cities-in-the-Trees theories can be rejected on the most obvious of evidence.

Yeah, right.

What it comes down to, Paul, is that you have no evidence based dispute with my hypothesis.

Name two closely-related species that occupy different habitats.

Re: Savanna Versus Aquatic equals Junk Science

Not only do you have no evidence based dispute with the situational factors therein (onset of dry-season monsoon climate, isolation of treed localities, tremendous competition from food competitors, potential for collective predator siege/ massacres

Quite unknown in nature.

Current theory just assumes that cities emerged suddenly 8 thousand years ago.

Sure. Standard PA has not yet absorbed the notion of ice ages. For some very peculiar reason, they ALL assume that human ancestors lived on the tops of hills, preferably when they were covered in ice.

It considers cities (and agriculture) as things that were discovered at that time.

Of course, you are identical to the standard PA dopes. Where do you think all the cities were 13 kya?

What is left unexplained is the selective origins of the behaviors and abilities necessary. The communal selection of my hypothesis solves this riddle.

Nope. It doesn't. It also ignores every significant fact in hominid evolution, and in evolution generally

Paul.

.