

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-12/msg00136.html>

- *From:* "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 03 Dec 2005 22:17:42 GMT
-

"Paul Crowley" <slkwuoiutiytciuyik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote

<snip>

- >> I know evasiveness when I see it. I see enough of it. If you were
- >> being honest you would have at least acknowledged that your scenario
- >> DOES NOT claim a reduction in intraspecific conflict.
- >
- > It certainly does not. Why should it?

Look at the subject line of this thread.

<snip>

- >> You knew what I was getting at. Or you should have.
- >
- > It seems (as far as I can gather) that you think
- > a politically--correct scenario is a good thing,
- > AND that we all think (or should think) that it is
- > a good thing -- and therefore more scientifically
- > probable.

Strange comment since I'm the one saying hominids have been conducting war for 8 million years and not just 8 thousand and anthropologists would have us believe.

<snip>

- >> It makes it more likely to reflect human realities. When was the last
- >> time you had to wrestle one of your neighbors for a meal?
- >
- > You can bet that if there was no police force,
- > etc., etc., I and you and everyone else would
- > have to do it every day

I agree. And which of our respective scenarios better predicts the emergence of a species that has a police force?

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>
>>>> In my model the communalism brings about long periods of
>>>> relative peace at most locations, just like present day human
>>>> society.
>>>
>>> Been to Somalia recently?
>>>
>>> Been to Palm Springs lately?
>>>
> Do you really think early hominid society
> was closer to Palm Springs than to Somalia?
>>>
>>> Ever read any
>>> history? Ever read Thomas Hobbes? Did
>>> they have a working police force in Early-
>>> Hominid-Land? Laws? Courts? Legitimate
>>> Government? Democracy? Respect for Law
>>> and Order?
>>>
>>> Does your scenario predict any of this? Mine does.
>>>
> Then it is both wrong and crap. All we want
> from any evolutionary scenario is to get as
> far as, say, australian aborigines.

My model is intended to predict the origins of all hominids, including aborigines. The whole framework of your approach to these issues is archaic. It's reflective of nineteenth century mentality. Aborigines are *not* indicative of ancient hominids. They are very sophisticated in their ability to survive in sparse habitat, more like eskimoes in their lifestyle. The term aborigine is reflective of nineteenth century view that some people are indicative of early man. It's just bad science.

>
>>>> And it doesn't
>>>> involve islands that suddenly emerge. And I don't have to disregard
>>>> microwear data (this is inexcusable, btw).
>>>>
>>>> Microwear bullshit you mean. Those guys
>>>> see what they expect to see, and only publish
>>>> what their readership wants to read.

Intentional ignorance.

>
>>>> Sure
>>>> there's constant conflict against immigrating food competitors and
>>>> occasionally, maybe every ten years, there is the threat of predatory
>>>> siege/massacre. But for the most part they have periods of constant
>>>> civility.
>>>>

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>>> You are as bad (if not worse) than the Politically–
>>> Correct Margaret–Meads of Standard PA. You
>>> seem to believe in the fantasy land of a Golden
>>> Age before nasty Capitalism ruined it all.
>>
>> Where is Deitiker when you need him. Go to Google Groups and do a
>> seach on capital ape theory. My hypothesis explains the emergence of
>> the most primitive form of hominid capitalism. It explains how it
>> first became adaptive. Capitalism began when and because the first
>> hominids emerged.
>
> So how do you explain war?

You'd have to read my hypothesis and we all know how allergic you are to reading.

And the descent
> from your Golden Age of universal peace?

My scenario has no age of universal peace.

>
>>>> The warred with each other, 'cos it was in their
>>>> nature -- as it seems to be with modern chimps
>>>> and modern homo, and in many other species.
>>>> Those good at it had more offspring. Those
>>>> who were bad at it, died.
>>>>
>>>> Pure nonsense. Chimps aren't any more likely to be embattled
>>>> than any other species. It's pure nonsense to suggest they'd
>>>> just begin warring with each other.
>>>>
>>> And you STILL haven't read any of Jane Goodall's
>>> work!
>>
>> Hardly any difference between what Goodall observed and similar
>> observations of wolves, or many other species.
>
> There are some significant differences. Firstly,
> they are not carnivores (except occasionally)
> which means that they can have a fairly high
> density and small territories; secondly, the
> species is female–exogamous, meaning that the
> hostility can be habitual and uninterrupted.

Relevance?

>
>> Goodall's observations
>> are an invaluable source of preadaptive behaviors. Take Goodall's
>> observations and overlay them on the dry–season influenced, late

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>> miocene, habitat;

>

- > That would have made no difference. Climate
- > changes all the time (we can see it happening).
- > So vegetation changes and species re-locate.
- > End of story.

Your an idiot. There's a big difference between changes in weather and changes in climate.

>

>> include the migratory food competitors

>

> Never happened.

Take a look at the fossil evidence of the faunal assemblages of late miocene east africa and then compare them to those of middle miocene Africa. (Not that there's any chance you'll actually do any of this.)

>

>> and large social predators of the Ethiopian fauna

>

> Mythical.

>

>> and then you have a hypothesis of hominid evolution.

>

> It never got off the ground.

>

> OTOH, allow for something that we know

> happened: the isolation of populations on

> islands, and the rest is fairly predictable.

Evidence?

> [..]

>

>>> When a male chimp loses ONE canine, that's
>>> effectively the end of its life. It can no longer
>>> defend itself -- nor reproduce, and it will have
>>> much difficulty feeding.

>>>

>>> All the more reason to reject your scenario in that the continued
>>> intraspecific conflict would suggest they'd maintain these defensive
>>> weapons. Compare the cost of these canine teeth with the costs
>>> associated with the adaptations necessary to make hand held weapons a
>>> part of their everyday existence. You're not even in the ballpark.

>

> Right. Conservatism is enormously powerful,

> But it happened. Live with it. It has to be

> explained. You can't come close.

>

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

- > Bipedalism coincided with the disappearance
- > of large canines (and the arrival of hard teeth)
- > All had, essentially, the same cause -- the use
- > of weapons and tools. All your stuff is garbage.
- > It does not begin to tackle the problems.

Have you actually studied the tooth evidence? Obviously not.

Paul, most of your argument is based on deliberate ignorance.

Jim

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Paul Crowley

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* nickname
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Jim McGinn
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Paul Crowley
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Jim McGinn
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Paul Crowley
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Jim McGinn
- ◆ ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
◇ *From:* Paul Crowley

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***