

Re: Homo & molluscs

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-09/msg00292.html>

- *From:* Rich Travsky <"traRvEsKy"@hotmMOVEail.com>
 - *Date:* Sat, 10 Sep 2005 23:53:19 -0600
-

Marc Verhaegen wrote:

>
> "Rich Travsky" <"traRvEsKy"@hotmMOVEail.com> claims that humans have a
> better sense of smell than chimps in message

Why do you have to lie? I said no such thing. I posted about a study finding our sense of smell is not so reduced after all. There is no mention of chimps in the excerpt. Quit being so dishonest.

> news:431BE662.3E89D76A@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> Marc Verhaegen wrote:
>>>
>>> Yes, Lee, yes, sure, my boy, human ancestors got a poor sense of smell
> to
>>> run over the savanna...
>>
>> http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2005/08/29_smell.shtml
>>
>> Study shows humans have ability to track odors, much like bloodhounds
>> 29 August 2005
>>
>> BERKELEY – Though humans may never match the tracking ability of dogs, we
>> apparently have the ability to sniff out and locate odors, according to a
>> new study by scientists from the University of California, Berkeley.
>>
>> Student volunteers presented with odors to one nostril or the other could
>> reliably discern where the odor was coming from, and functional magnetic
>> resonance images of their brains showed that the brain is set up to pay
>> attention to the difference between what the left and right nostrils
> sense,
>> much the way it can localize sounds by contrasting input from the ears.
>>
>> "It has been very controversial whether humans can do egocentric
>> localization, that is, keep their head motionless and say where the
> spatial
>> source of an odor is," said study coauthor Noam Sobel, associate
> professor
>> of psychology at UC Berkeley and a member of the campus's Helen Wills
>> Neuroscience Institute. "It seems that we have this ability and that,

Re: Homo & molluscs

> with
>> practice, you could become really good at it."
>> ...
>> Porter, Sobel and their colleagues reported the results in the August 18
>> issue of the journal Neuron.
>>
>> In a review appearing in the same issue of the journal, Jay A. Gottfried
> of
>> the Department of Neurology at Northwestern University's Feinberg School
> of
>> Medicine noted that the UC Berkeley findings open numerous avenues for
>> further research. "Finally, what are the implications for the Provençal
>> truffle hunt?" he wrote, only partly tongue-in-cheek. "In the traditional
>> world of the truffle forests, the dog (or pig) is king. The evidence
>> presented here suggests that humans are every bit as well equipped to
> carry
>> out the search."
>> ...
>>
>>> "Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>> news:1125420211.486529.34080@xx
>>>> Marc Verhaegen wrote:
>>>>> You keep missing the point:
>>>>> – AAT (shoreline adaptations sometime after the H/P split) is based
> on
>>>>> comparative data, eg,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Circumstantial musings are not evidence when there are many other
>>>>> possibilities that explain our evolution better (see Langdon 2005).
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> it's ridiculous to believe that olfactory reduction is
>>>>> for running over some plain,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Hunters like the long-legged-savanna Homo do not rely on olfactory
>>>>> senses like a short-legged jackals, because Homo can see farther than
>>>>> they can smell. Your savanna chimp argument is a nonstarter. There are
>>>>> no chimp fossils on the savanna 2 Mya, so naturally they haven't been
>>>>> hunting on the savanna as long as Homo, so I can't imagine why Homo
>>>>> wouldn't have lost more sensor area than they since Homos had far more
>>>>> time on the savanna to lose them.
>>>>
>>>>> AAT completely fails to falsify this.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> same for tens of other human features (AFAIK
>>>>>> the *only* human feature that is often seen in cursorial mammals is
> long

Re: Homo & molluscs

>>>> legs, but this is also often seen in wading birds).
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "However, there is simply no evidence that early hominins were
>>>> dependent on aquatic habitats or foods and the model is
>>>> unparsimonious." (Langdon 1997).
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> – So far, you completely fail to explain how archeol.data falsify
> this.
>>> What
>>>>> I see is a fast dispersal of Homo to Java & Algeria. Give 1 reason
> why
>>> not
>>>>> along the coasts.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Fast dispersal maybe, depending on who's dates one believes. You want
>>>>> fast? Then it is ridiculous to believe that a crooked ocean beach is
>>>>> the shortest distance between two points. The straight–line savanna
>>>>> trail, following the cheetahs of course, is the shortest, fastest
> route
>>>>> to China. Archaeologists have a trail of bones and tools to follow and
>>>>> you are left with nothing more than your imagination as a guide.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Sorry, Lee, no time for empty "discussions".
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Suit yourself, you haven't provided 1 little argument that refutes the
>>>>> savanna/hunting hypothesis.
>>>>
>>>>> <snipping what you failed to answer>
>>>>
.

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Homo & molluscs**
 ◇ From: Marc Verhaegen
- ◆ **Re: Homo & molluscs**
 ◇ From: Rich Travsky
- ◆ **Re: Homo & molluscs**
 ◇ From: Marc Verhaegen

- Prev by Date: **Re: Hominid Diet Examined**
- Next by Date: **Re: Homo & molluscs**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Homo & molluscs**

Re: Homo & molluscs

- Next by thread: ***Re: Homo & molluscs***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***