

Re: The Anti Science Art Of Evasion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-06/msg00589.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 27 Jun 2005 22:40:32 -0400 (EDT)
-

>> JE:-
>> "Extensively?" All you commented was that yourself and O'Hara had made
>> some secret agreement between yourselves as to what O'Hara really meant.
>> You never stated what that agreement was to hapless sbe readers, i.e. it
>> was just more of the same: evasion.
>> I find it amazing that this is all you can find to actually comment on
>> within the entire post...

> JM:-
> Kind of unfair, isn't it John? You can say all kinds of eccentric, confused, and even paranoid ("secret agreement") things and people just ignore you. But insert just one blatant lie ("refused to comment")
> and they jump all over you.

JE:-
You only provided a bunch of syntax that added up to a negative net contribution. I do not consider a negative net quantity to be more than zero.

Until both yourself and O'Hara stop blatantly evading the obvious catastrophic consequences of O'Hara's answer to Hamilton's Rule and EITHER: provide to sbe readers an explicit retraction of what O'Hara had actually answered OR the supposed agreement between yourself and O'Hara as to what O'Hara's answer actually meant, I will continue to quite properly argue that O'Hara's answer to my question has been evaded by both yourself and O'Hara.

>snip rhetorical garbage<

Regards,

John Edser

Independent Researcher

PO Box 266
Church Pt
NSW 2105
Australia
edser@xxxxxxxxxx

-
- Prev by Date: *Re: specialization momentum*
 - Next by Date: *Re: Miller on Submarine Vents*
 - Previous by thread: *Re: The Anti Science Art Of Evasion*
 - Next by thread: *Re: The Anti Science Art Of Evasion*
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*