
evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

Let's reduce your example and you tell me if I am correct: You assert that $X + Y = A + B$ based on C. Assume $Z + D = E$. Assume $Z - Y = G$. Ergo, $E + G = H$. This makes no sense. It says, in essence, that me with evidence but without an understanding of the evidence constitutes a logical fallacy. This is patently illogical. $E + G$ can only = H if $E + G = Y$. But, as clearly shown in your own assumption, $Z - Y = G$. Sue, pointing out that jimamy is backing himself into a corner in your mind. By the way, I noticed you failed to address the issue again. jimamy, pointing out that Sue is in over her head.

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

As I said, the burden of proof in this discussion is on you since you are the one who made the claim that the info was a valid counter argument. It's like arguing with a creationist! Learn a little before you run off at the key board. All you have to do is offer a simple retraction and admit that you don't know that the Mayans here in America didn't notice it, the Incas didn't notice it, the Aztecs didn't notice it, and strangest of all, the Egyptians, which were Right Next Door didn't even take note of it, or mention it anywhere. All this because you are not sure. You may be right but you lack the evidence to make such a claim.

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Mark Isaak - 2008/06/28 02:00

That is all I have been looking for, is evidence, not gut feelings. The only concrete responses I've heard so far deal with annual sediment deposits in certain lakes that have an annual track record going back 40,000 years and the lack of evidence for the movement of the Greenland Ice sheet in the last 100,000 years. Isn't that enough?

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Mark Isaak - 2008/06/28 02:00

No flood myths dating 2700 BCE. YOU are throwing in a mishmash of flood myths from who knows when. Anyone who attaches a date to a myth is a fool. Myths are built over time, by repeated retelling, with changes coming with each retelling. That's one reason why it is a bad idea to use myth as an indication of ancient history.

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

That is all I have been looking for, is evidence, not gut feelings. The only concrete responses I've heard so far deal with annual sediment deposits in certain lakes that have an annual track record going back 40,000 years and the lack of evidence for the movement of the Greenland Ice sheet in the last 100,000 years. Isn't that enough? Sure. But that is not the point of an academic argument. - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text -

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

My determination is not to remain stubbornly with my ideas but I'll leave them and go over to others as soon as I am shown a plausible reason which I can grasp. - Antony Leeuwenhoek

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Dave Oldridge - 2008/06/28 02:00

First, and most importantly, scientific protocol and logic prohibit *concluding* a negative from an absence of evidence. Logic permits concluding a negative from an absence of evidence if the positive requires evidence. There is an absence of evidence that an elephant occupies the room with me. It is logical to conclude that no elephant is here. A single global flood wouldn't be that much harder to detect. <snip I see. So, you are saying that since we have tried very hard to find evidence of earth-bound abiogenesis and have failed

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Paul Gate - 2008/06/28 02:00

snip Nope. I made the statement that there isn't any 2700 BCE flood Inca legend. Wrong Sue. You said: Of course, the Mayans here in America didn't notice it, the Incas didn't notice it, the Aztecs didn't notice it, and strangest of all, the Egyptians, which were Right Next Door didn't even take note of it, or mention it anywhere. And they left a very large volume of writings from much earlier than 2800 BCE. To say something did not occur is an affirmative proposition. The burden is on you to back it up. You failed to prove that the flood myths of the cultures demonstrate that they failed to notice the 2800 BCE flood. Absent evidence of when those flood myths occurred, you can never say they did not notice the floods or when they occurred. What bunk..A neutral position assumes that nothing specific happens unless we have a reason to think so Otherwise every piece of unevicenced claptrap that couldn't be utterly disproved would have equal standing to evidenced beliefs In that case mad conjecture like, champion the wonderhorse created the universe would have equal standing to commonly accepted notions, such as, the world is sperical Plainly this isn't the case..The burden is on you to show its even worth considering as a hypothesis

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Johnny Bravo - 2008/06/28 02:00

I see. So, you are saying that since we have tried very hard to find evidence of earth-bound abiogenesis and have failed

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by aelffin - 2008/06/28 02:00

Assuming you've read his posts, you do have a lot of evidence about Nykios' views. But unless you've read two obscure novels, you don't know what 'rithshathra' means. It might be the custom of cannibalizing your dead relatives, the custom of -not- cannibalizing your dead relatives, a sexual practice, a futuristic consumer electronic gadget. You have evidence, but you haven't a clue as to whether it applies or not. You, I submit, are up Fallacy Creek. i *knew* that .sig was a reference to puppeteers! Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/> Before you buy.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

snip Please excuse my mistatement in the other response to this post. Your conclusion was not a positive conclusion, rather it was a negative conclusion in the sense that you concluded there was no elephant in the room with you. However, your negative conclusion was based upon the evidence. i.e. you looked around and saw no elephant. This is eyewitness evidence (testimony) and is entirely logical. What you CANNOT do is conclude there is no elephant in the room with you based upon a lack of evidence. i.e. I have no evidence, therefore no elephant. Some who argue against the flood point to evidence (i.e. they look around for evidence that should be there that is not, such as sediment layers in certain lakes or movement of the Greenland Ice Sheet, or they look around for things that exist that should

have been wiped out, such as certain strata, etc.) and conclude no flood. This is entirely logical. Others, however (and I can go drag out the numerous posts if you want) first stipulate there is no evidence of the flood (wiped out by erosion, miracles took it away, etc.) yet conclude there was no flood. This is the extrapolation of a negative from a lack of evidence and it is illogical.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Louann Miller - 2008/06/28 02:00

Sigh. Let's take this in yet another direction. I say Big Foot doesn't exist. You say, yes he does, here's evidence he does exist. The evidence you post is very vague and may or may not apply to the existence of Big Foot. You can claim all you wish that *MY* argument is invalid because I don't know whether there is a Big Foot or not. The burden is not on me. I say the evidence doesn't exist. You have to prove it DOES!!!! Five quatlous he doesn't address this.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Louann Miller - 2008/06/28 02:00

What bunk..A neutral position assumes that nothing specific happens unless we have a reason to think so. Otherwise every piece of unevidenced claptrap that couldn't be utterly disproved would have equal standing to evidenced beliefs. In that case mad conjecture like, champion the wonderhorse created the universe would have equal standing to commonly accepted notions, such as, the world is spherical. Plainly this isn't the case..The burden is on you to show its even worth considering as a hypothesis. A further five quatlous he doesn't address this, either. BTW, can I play? The universe was created by Terry Pratchett as an indirect means of creating people who buy Terry Pratchett novels.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Louann Miller - 2008/06/28 02:00

That is all I have been looking for, is evidence, not gut feelings. The only concrete responses I've heard so far deal with annual sediment deposits in certain lakes that have an annual track record going back 40,000 years and the lack of evidence for the movement of the Greenland Ice sheet in the last 100,000 years. Isn't that enough? Sure. But that is not the point of an academic argument. Then I _am_ confused. I don't see any way you're going to get (1) tenure or (2) laid based on your current chain of reasoning. Louann, who knows a lot of academics.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by jimamy - 2008/06/28 02:00

Plainly this isn't the case..The burden is on you to show its even worth considering as a hypothesis. Only if I put it forward. I have not. I have asked those in the contrary to carry their burden, some have, some have not. As to a mistatement I did make, see my response in another post.

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Paul Neubauer - 2008/06/28 02:00

Courtship Ritual, author forgotten. </pointless_pedantry No, indeed. Pointless pedantry never ends around here. :-)
Paul

=====

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Louann Miller - 2008/06/28 02:00

Three. And I don't think Niven counts as obscure (unless my The Ringworld Engineers and The Ringworld Throne admittedly don't make a lot of sense without Ringworld. But I'm pretty sure that Ringworld does not contain (the word) 'rithshathra', even though the practice of it can be recognized (in hindsight) from the other two. So did you have a (different) third in mind? There is no novel called The Ringworld Engineers. Louann, who owns the movie Highlander (I hear they're finally making a sequel after all these years) and all five Star Trek movies (not sure why the numbering scheme went straight from 4 to 6).

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

Which is my point (based on logic). I never said they were 2700 BCE. Which makes them useless and irrelevant. No, it does not. Unless you can prove they were not contemporary, you have to retract your conclusion that they were not. You can speculate, but you have no basis in scientific fact or logic to conclude otherwise, as you tried to do. Sigh. I don't have to prove they are NOT contemporary. You have to prove they ARE! Jeeze, logic 101 time again. Sue Never trust anything that thinks for itself, if you can't see where it keeps its brain. J K Rowlings

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

Let's reduce your example and you tell me if I am correct: You assert that $X + Y = A + B$ based on C. Assume $Z + D = E$. Assume $Z - Y = G$. Ergo, $E + G = H$. This makes no sense. It says, in essence, that me with evidence but without an understanding of the evidence constitutes a logical fallacy. This is patently illogical. $E + G$ can only = H if $E + G = Y$. But, as clearly shown in your own assumption, $Z - Y = G$. Sue, pointing out that jimamy is backing himself into a corner in your mind. By the way, I noticed you failed to address the issue again. jimamy, pointing out that Sue is in over her head. Never trust anything that thinks for itself, if you can't see where it keeps its brain. J K Rowlings

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

it, the Incas didn't notice it, the Aztecs didn't notice it, and strangest of all, the Egyptians, which were Right Next Door didn't even take note of it, or mention it anywhere. And they left a very large volume of writings from much earlier than 2800 BCE. In fact, you have no idea whether the Mayans here in America noticed it. You have no idea whether the Incas noticed it. You have no idea whether the Aztecs noticed it. And you you have no idea whether the Egyptians noticed it. Yet, lacking the vital evidence, you make these conclusions. I wouldn't be so sure of this. If not, then pony up! As I said, the burden of proof in this discussion is on you since you are the one who made the claim that the info was a valid counter argument. It's like arguing with a creationist! Learn a little before you run off at the key board. All you have to do is offer a simple retraction and admit that you don't know that the Mayans here in America didn't notice it, the Incas didn't notice it, the Aztecs didn't notice it, and strangest of all, the Egyptians, which were Right Next Door didn't even take note of it, or mention it anywhere. All this because you are not sure. You may be right but you lack the evidence to make such a claim. You have given no evidence that they DID notice a flood. Which is your position. Support it. Sue Never trust anything that thinks for itself, if you can't see where it keeps its brain. J K Rowlings

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

snip Nope. I made the statement that there isn't any 2700 BCE flood Inca legend. Wrong Sue. You said: Of course, the Mayans here in America didn't notice it, the Incas didn't notice it, the Aztecs didn't notice it, and strangest of all, the Egyptians, which were Right Next Door didn't even take note of it, or mention it anywhere. And they left a very large volume of writings from much earlier than 2800 BCE. To say something did not occur is an affirmative proposition. The burden is on you to back it up. You failed to prove that the flood myths of the cultures demonstrate that they failed to notice the 2800 BCE flood. Absent evidence of when those flood myths occurred, you can never say they did not notice the floods or when they occurred. What bunk..A neutral position assumes that nothing specific happens unless we have a reason to think so Otherwise every piece of unevidenced claptrap that couldn't be utterly disproved would have equal standing to evidenced beliefs In that case mad conjecture like, champion the wonderhorse created the universe would have equal standing to commonly accepted notions, such as, the world is spherical Plainly this isn't the case..The burden is on you to show its even worth considering as a hypothesis Exactly. And he's becoming more and more ridiculous as he thrashes around, slaughtering logic every post he makes. Sue Never trust anything that thinks for itself, if you can't see where it keeps its brain. J K Rowlings

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by R Bishop - 2008/06/28 02:00

(the absence of evidence/evidence of absence problem) Sigh. Let's take this in yet another direction. I say Big Foot doesn't exist. You say, yes he does, here's evidence he does exist. The evidence you post is very vague and may or may not apply to the existence of Big Foot. You can claim all you wish that *MY* argument is invalid because I don't know whether there is a Big Foot or not. The burden is not on me. I say the evidence doesn't exist. You have to prove it DOES!!!! Five quatlous he doesn't address this. Either that, or he will try his best to argue that's not what I meant when I said Big Foot Doesn't Exist. Sue, with deep amusement at the maneuverings Never trust anything that thinks for itself, if you can't see where it keeps its brain. J K Rowlings

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Sam Lewis - 2008/06/28 02:00

than a day. Part of that *could* be explained by the relative elevation of the respective cultures. It might take 22 years for water to recede along pre-existing coast-lines or for folks on flat, low-lying interiors. Those who lived in the center of high continents (Rocky Mountains) might walk back down with the water after a day. But meanwhile the low-lying cultures are under water for 22 years, after which they develop the myth? Perhaps they had diving bells? What people are we talking about? In the Genesis flood everyone died but Noah and his family.

evidence for big foot Noahs Flood - yet more:

Posted by Paul Gate - 2008/06/28 02:00

there is no god and never was a flood. At the point, science has the burden and, IMHO, science has done an excellent job of disproving the Noah flood myth and a universal flood. In that case mad conjecture like, champion the wonderhorse created the universe would have equal standing to commonly accepted notions, such as, the world is spherical No, it would not. The proponent of such a theory has the burden of proof. Plainly this isn't the case..The burden is on you to show its even worth considering as a hypothesis Only if I put it forward. I have not. I have asked those in the contrary to carry their burden, some have, some have not. they don't have a burden..they are siding with likelihood (see above) Tell us why we should believe in the elephants when we can't see them
