

Holy Hallucinations 44

This is a continued response to PPSimmons' video, "DEBUNKED! 'Flores Man' EVOLUTIONARY FIND?"

Oh, hello Carl. I didn't notice you down there – I'd thought you'd gone off to stretch your legs. Hmm? What's that? They're still feeling a little wobbly, are they? Well, I can't say I'm too surprised, but I suppose that's for the best since it means we can finish off this extended lesson by ripping off the Elastoplast right in one go so you can get back to your own channel to let Pisspants and your other cronies lick your wounds for you.

With that said, though, I need to pause for a moment to correct a mistake of mine because, very much unlike you Carl, accuracy *is* important to me. You see, in the previous two videos of this series of arse-oriented educational episodes, I mistakenly referred to the title of your videographic catastrophe as "Best Critique of Evolution You Will Ever Hear." This came to pass because some time ago I'd started a script to address *that* particular digital clusterfuck but never got around to finishing it. So, when the extant abomination was first brought to my attention I chose to use parts of that earlier introduction for this one, and in doing so was careless enough to forget to update the title of your little artistic endeavor. This error escaped my notice until now, and while it makes absolutely no difference to any of the arguments I've inserted thus far, I wanted to correct it here for the record.

Now, with that out of the way, Carl, let's get back to putting you out of your misery. As you know, I noticed that during the course of your video you squeezed out an occasional Joycean nugget that was unrelated to your two main cadaveric theses, and I promised my viewers that I wouldn't let the comedic opportunity of sharing them pass. Thus, while you've been recovering, I've taken the time to gather them up in one place, and so while you're bracing yourself for the next lesson, I'll play the first clip.

"The problem was... is that these skeletons were only three-and-a-half feet tall, and they were very human-like... in many respects, and they also had characteristics of chimpanzees and apes in other respects."

Now that you've had a chance to hear yourself, Carl, did you spot what you did there? But wait... don't answer that because I don't want to have to bend over to pick up the coprolite, and instead let me do it for you. Aside from implying that chimpanzees aren't apes, which, against my better judgement I'll attribute to a slip of the tongue rather than a product of your boundless ignorance, you plainly admit that the Flores specimens displayed both ape-like and human-like morphological traits.

Needless to say, I was somewhat taken aback by this because there's a special phrase that scientists use to describe a specimen that displays a mosaic of primitive and derived characters, Carl – and you may have heard of it – it's called a transitional form. You know? *Exactly* the kind of form you and your fellow Yahweh-loving, science-denying, thought-allergic, fact-phobic, reality-averse bumpkins will deny at the drop of a choirboy's skivvies even when it's inserted forcibly into your most posterior of circular orifices.

The kinds of forms whose existence Charles Darwin presciently predicted in his theory of biological evolution which, funnily enough, *also* provides a beautifully elegant explanation of their existence while invoking only observable and verifiable physical phenomena within a perfectly cogent and internally consistent conceptual framework, and without even once needing to resort to invoking the trans-dimensional prestidigitation of a mysteriously elusive cosmic pixie.

So, what's *your* explanation for the existence of this mix of traits you've admitted to, Carl? Did the pixie undergo an existential crisis one day, unable to decide whether its *true* image was that of a chippendale or a chimpanzee? Or does *Homo floresiensis* represent one of its countless failed attempts to produce an intelligent creationist? Or is it a result of him reaching for that trusty mud puddle and mistakenly scooping up an elephant turd? You see? I could go on indefinitely like a creationist, pulling *ad hoc* explanations out of my arse, without even breaking a sweat. It's so easy for you odious reptiles, isn't it Carl? Actually, when I say 'you', I don't really mean *you*, because I realize that your hobbled perspicacity presents an insurmountable barrier that prevents *you* from dreaming up your own such rationalizations.

Thus, your other option would be to fall back onto one of two putrescent old creationist stalwarts. The first is the denial of the blindingly obvious, where half of you vacuous simpletons declare that any given form is clearly an example of an ancestral species while the other half announce the very same fossil is clearly a descendant, and *all* of you demonstrate how you have not the slightest inkling of a fucking clue.

The second would be to admit to the nature of the specimen as you did here, but then claim that all its discovery has done is create two new missing links that now need to be discovered to satisfy your eternally insatiable demands. Thus, when someone like *this* glabrous nematode opined, back in Holy Hallucinations 9, that for a whale evolutionary series to be convincing "to be honest with you, you'd need twenty", one can almost guarantee that. once the twentieth such fossil is finally inserted, the two-faced little fucknugget will clench his cheeks, turn around, and declare that that's not good enough and now he needs twenty-two.

It's this latter reprehensible and pitiful excuse for argumentation that I suspect would be your favored choice of dishonesty should you actually be confronted with your own stupidity, Carl, because elsewhere in your video, you also said this:

"And so, back in 2003, they declared it to be some kind of great evolutionary find – perhaps the missing link, and, er... you know... just *another* missing link."

Honestly, Carl, don't you ever pause for just a moment to divert your words past even the vague vicinity of your consciousness before you puke them out onto the internet? Because while the stream-of-consciousness thing might work well for some, it tends to be quite a little less than effective when you have the sentience of a potato.

So not only have you now acknowledged that *Homo floresiensis* is a transitional form, but also that other hominid/hominin transitions have also been discovered – all in a video in which you doggedly maintain your infantile assertion that Mankind is only 6000 years old and evolved in an instant from a fistful of Wonder Clay and an undercooked McRib under the guidance of mystical pan-cosmic entity which is somehow *both* incorporeal *and* a dead ringer for Charlton Heston.

This, I posit, places you into the "new links required" school of fucktardism by default, even though you're apparently too ignorant to realize that LB1 almost certainly doesn't represent a direct ancestor of our species but rather a cousin to that direct lineage, which nevertheless provides significant insights into the *actual* forms our ancestors took during the course of our evolution.

This all leaves us with the question of *why* you saw fit to make these admissions in your video, Carl? Was it because you don't really believe your anti-evolutionary rhetoric but continue spouting it because you give not one single shit about values such as honesty, decency, honor, truth or progress if they run

counter to the nauseatingly repugnant and backward agenda you're pushing like a crack dealer in a kindergarten? Or was it a Freudian slip, Carl – a desperate, stifled cry for help from your subconscious as it flails around frantically trying to extricate itself and escape from the steaming mire of ignorance, deceit and delusion that you've buried it in. Or was it because you're just *too* stupid to even contemplate the implications of the words you emit from your ignorant yap like the torrential spray from a fire hydrant that's been accidentally plumbed into a sewer line and then run over by a tank?

Who knows what's going on in that kaleidoscopic virtual reality inside your cranium? It could be any one of these possibilities, or *all* of them, or even one or more that couldn't even be conceived by someone not suffering from your *special* kind of dementia. But whatever it is, might I suggest that you would do well to pin it down and get it under control, because otherwise it'll continue to lead you to pwn *yourself* in your own videos *much* harder and *far* more hilariously than I ever could.

“And there's an artist's rendition [smug chuckle]. I mean, boy, that's pretty detailed, coming from some bone fragments and... and a partial skull.”

So, Smugly, just “some bone fragments and a partial skull,” is it? Well, when it comes to the skull, the images of it that were *in the article you used* in your dismal crap-fest of a video seem to suggest that a more accurate description would be “almost fucking complete!” To be fair, the authors of the original Nature paper that described the discovery actually used the phrase “fairly complete cranium and mandible,” but then they were writing for arguably the world's most prestigious science journal and not addressing a desiccated creationist dingleberry, and so they presumably didn't feel need to resort to the linguistic liberties that I need to take when making my videos, because they're not in the business of heaping fully deserved scorn and ridicule on delusional, unprincipled, deceitful piss-pots.

So, did that image skip your notice as you scrolled through the Sun article salivating like a deranged loon at the prospect of finding something new to lie about, Carl? Or did the drool make its way through your keyboard and short out the Pentium Pro in your laptop before you got to it? Then again, perhaps Ken's biblical glasses prevented you from perceiving it because they did an exceptionally fine job of blocking out the reality glare? Of course, another possibility is that you saw the fucker perfectly clearly but still referred to it as “partial” because it suited your nefarious and despicable agenda and because you're a filthy, lying puddle of impotent jizz.

As for the remaining “bone fragments”, it's strange that you neglected to mention that these included a pair essentially intact legs, one intact and one partial arm, a partial pelvis and a partial hand, which *en face* would seem to provide just a little more detail than you're insinuating here, eh Carl?

It's also strange that while you referred the plural “skeletons” in the first clip you never bothered to mention that these consisted of partial remains of *thirteen other individuals*, albeit none anywhere as complete as LB1. Furthermore, just a year after the description of LB1 and in a second Nature paper reporting more of the remains the authors wrote that they could “...now reconstruct the body proportions of *H. floresiensis* with some certainty.” And do you know where you can find a citation of that paper, Carl? Why in the very same Wikipedia page you were slaving over in half of your video, and who's references you seemed to be so intent on harping on about but not actually reading.

I mean, what the fuck is wrong with you Carl? Even *your* factually vacuous, intellectually desolate dogma can be defended more competently than the way *you* do it. You don't research your subject in any

depth whatsoever to at least *try* and make your bullshit just a little less exhaustive. You don't provide *any* references in *any* of your videos to *any* of the material you're projectile defecating despite the alleged import you claim to place on source citation. You don't check your videos for errors prior to flushing them onto the web, and you don't even make a pretense of acting in a manner that's even passingly concordant with the teachings of the founder of the religion you claim that you follow.

It's almost as if you're deliberately going out to make yourself, and therefore by proxy all creationists, look like a collection of lazy, incompetent, lobotomized gibbons. I can only think of two possibilities here, Carl. Either you're really an undercover atheist who's been working diligently for decades to make the religious look like unhinged, mentally-castrated loons, or you're so firmly in the grasp of a case of biblically-fueled Dunning-Kruger Syndrome that even the violent insertion of a hard-back copy of the DSM-5 into your alimentary canal wouldn't snap you out of it.

And as for any sane Christians watching this, don't think that Pastor Carl's stupidity isn't rubbing itself at least partly onto you, because I can bet with near certainty that there are plenty of stupid atheists out there, let alone adherents of other faiths, who would be happy to paint *you* with exactly the same brush I've been using to "freshen up" Mister Gallups. And so, you'd be well advised to perhaps consider lifting a finger occasionally by climbing into the pigsty and putting the good pastor and his ilk in their place instead of leaving *all* the dirty work to me.

"Now, look at another artist's rendition. Oh my gosh! I mean, first of all, it's rather sexual. Second of all, it's... horrific looking. Thirdly, it is an artist's rendition. this came out of somebody's mind... they didn't find anything like this. They took the fragments and they *constructed* this artist's rendition to make us think, er, that... and, and look how humanoid it looks, way more human than ape-like. So, what are they trying to say? It's not a human, yet they draw a humanoid... erm... rendition of it. An X-rated humanoid rendition of it [smug chuckle]."

Man, you really drank the Kool-Aid here Carl, so let's take a closer look at what you subsequently threw up.

Firstly, regardless of the rendition, I fail to see what your puritanical distaste for hirsute wumba jumbas, nor your critique of the aesthetics of *Homo floresiensis'* appearance, has to do with the misinformation you've positively steeped your video in. Of course, if you really think that *this* constitutes X-rated material, then might I suggest you withdraw immediately from the internet and start running like all buggery in the opposite direction lest you shit your pants after clicking on that ad for bigbonersnboobies.com that keeps popping up whenever you're on the Answers In Genesis website.

Secondly, obviously "they didn't find anything like this" you numbnut. Do you really think that your audience is quite *so* paralytically stupid that you needed to explain that? No, wait... on second thought, perhaps you have a point there. In any case, despite your facepalmingly inane self-contradiction that this reconstruction was simply the product of "somebody's mind" which was simultaneously produced with the aid of skeletal fragments, the fact is that this rendition didn't exactly spring forth from the fertile imagination of an artist in the same way that a creationist's claim materializes out of nothing and springs forth from their arsehole. No, you see Carl, there's a whole field called forensic facial reconstruction that specializes in rendering facial features from craniomandibular remains and that is used with remarkable success to identify long-dead murder victims.

However, such reconstructions seldom consist of a sculptor taking a glance at skull and then letting their imagination roam as freely as Kent Hovind's does when he's pondering his tax return. Instead, they consider any remaining soft tissue that might be attached to the skeleton and utilize extensive empirical datasets of muscle sizes and thicknesses. In fact, if you'd done any *actual* research for your piece whatsoever, you would have found the website of the *actual* artist that produced the model in question and found that she didn't just start slapping together some clay in the hope of coming up with something that looked just a step or two more evolved than the average creationist. Instead, she used – guess what? – the exact same methods employed in forensic medicine. Hopefully even you can understand what that sudden short, sharp ano-centric sensation was Carl, but just in case you don't – it was me placing your claim that this image simply “came out of somebody's mind” back from whence you'd fished it.

My third point addresses a possible objection you might have should you, by some miracle, think of it Carl. You see, it's obviously true that there were no soft tissue remains associated with the Liang Bua remains to aid with reconstruction, and also that current datasets on facial musculature are based on modern *Homo sapiens* since we have, by definition, no such data on other hominins. So should you want to go there, Carl, be aware that, contrary to what you may think, these reconstructions are not in any way scientific evidence and that attacking them would be as effective as calling a Muslim an atheist because he doesn't eat kosher or talk to a ceiling every Sunday. That's because the sole intent of these kinds of models is to sate the very human instinct of curiosity that drives us to want to know what these creatures might have looked like. It is the very same curiosity that first led our ancestors out of the forests and onto the savannahs, that led to the discovery of fire and the invention of agriculture, that led Copernicus to propose that the Earth orbits the Sun, that led Darwin to put forward the Origin of the Species and that led Einstein to turn physics on its head. It is also the very same curiosity that creationists mercilessly stifle in themselves and their children for fear that it might one day lead *them*, kicking and screaming, to the edge of reality and beyond. Thus, the *actual* accuracy of such reconstructions bears no relation to the veracity of the scientific data and biological interpretations that underpin them, and while it's hoped that the care taken in their production has resulted in at least an approximate likeness, only most monumentally ignorant of boobs would place any more significance on them than being the mere curios that they are.

Finally, let's finish with your incredulity that the reconstruction is a humanoid form. The question here, of course Carl, is what the fuck, exactly, you thought it should look like? A fucking pineapple? Of course, I'm joking because you did qualify yourself for a change by indicating that you expected it to be more ape-like. Why you thought *this* remains somewhat of a mystery, not least because it's quite clear from all the literature that the scientists working on these discoveries consider it to be a hominin and not a hominid. I'm joking again, of course, because your ignorance isn't a mystery at all, as it's equally clear you did nothing more to research this subject than to give Wikipedia the most perfunctory of perusals while steadfastly maintaining your ignorance in all other respects. However, what truly does remain a mystery is why, despite this self-imposed perpetual ignorance of yours you weren't clued-in by the genus name they gave it: *Homo*. Are you really that dumb Carl, or are the rusty cogs of that dilapidated jalopy of a brain of yours only jolted into action by a twat across the head with a copy of the King James?

So, to answer your question, Carl, what they're trying to say, or more accurately what they did say but you were far, *far* too dense to pick up on, is that *Homo floresiensis* is more closely related to us than we are to the great apes, you irredeemable cretin.

OK, we're almost done, but you'll be glad to know I've definitely saved the best for last. I must say that you really are full of surprises, Carl, because every time you make me think you've achieved sublime perfection – that you've crested the zenith of the infinite possibilities of human stupidity – you find a way out-do yourself. In this case the epic moment came when you reached up for the stars and shattered the fucktard ceiling by saying this:

“But, by the way, the guy that invented the word ‘Hobbit’ is now, um, considering some legal action against them for stealing his word from his books and, er, movies.”

His name, Carl, was John Ronald Reuel Tolkien and he's be dead since nineteen-seventy-fucking-three. Thus, if he really is considering legal action it's a bigger miracle than William Lane Craig coming out of a debate looking like a legitimate academic philosopher rather than an intellectually bankrupt assclown.

On top of that, it wasn't even the Tolkien estate that was threatening suit, but rather the company to which it had sold the rights to his work, and on top of *that* they weren't suing the scientists in question but rather a low-budget movie studio for their use of the word in the title of their exploitative release, “Age of the Hobbits.” In a different incident a scientist, who was stupid enough to ask for it, was denied permission to use the word in a talk he was giving on *Homo floresiensis* by the same organization, but this neither involved a law suit nor the scientists associated with the discovery or its documentation.

I asked it earlier, but now I feel the need to ask it again. What the fuck is wrong with you, Carl? You were wrong on *every conceivable point* here despite all of this information being in the Wikipedia article you claimed you were reading. It's very difficult to imagine a scenario here where you were deliberately lying because of the immensity of the down-side of how it makes you look.

So what on Earth could have moved you to expectorate this particularly laughable collection of miserably erroneous and muddled words and syllables? Are you really this stupid? *Really?!* Or have you just been telling lies for so long that you've convinced yourself that everything that comes out must be *de facto* true, and so have long since given up on checking *any* of your cranial flatulence for congruence with reality before you release its rancid noxiousness into public?

Whatever the answer, Carl, I would ask any of your subscribers who are watching this, no matter what their stance on any of the other points I've had issue with in your video, to at least pause for a moment and ask themselves this question: if you could be *so* wrong and *so* ignorant on something *so* straightforward and simple, then could you, *just perhaps*, also be wrong on the turd mountain of anti-science propoganda you've been peddling to them over the years?

And again, for any sane Christians out there, I'd suggest *you* ask yourselves how you think this unmitigated, feckless oaf reflects on *your* beliefs, and whether this might warrant you doing something more than just standing by and letting him smear his filthy excrement over *your* religion and *your* God while he's doing the same to modern science.

References

Brown, P. et al. (2004). A new small-bodied hominin from the Late Pleistocene of Flores, Indonesia. *Nature* **431**: 1055-1061.

Morwood, M.J. et al. (2005). Further evidence for small-bodied hominins from the Late Pleistocene of Flores, Indonesia. *Nature* **437**: 1012-1017.

Larson, S.G. et al. (2009). Descriptions of the upper limb skeleton of *Homo floresiensis*. *J. Human Evol.* **57**: 555-570.

Atelier Daynes. Accessed, July 13, 2017. <http://www.daynes.com/en/hominids-reconstructions/homo-floresiensis-lb1-flores-21.html>

Forensic Facial Reconstruction. Accessed, July 13, 2017. http://anthropology.si.edu/writteninbone/facial_reconstruction.html

Hobbit banned as title of lecture on prehistoric 'hobbit'. Accessed, July 15.. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/oct/30/hobbit-banned-prehistoric-hobbit>

'The Hobbit' Producers Sue 'Age of the Hobbits' Studio for Trademark Infringement Accessed, July 15, 2017. <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr-esq/hobbit-movie-producers-sue-age-387585>

Why Kristi Winters' PhD was encased by quotation marks:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QS5LleQVju0>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vYB_lxJPYw4

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=264nVj_E8yY&t=118s