

## Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-12/msg00759.html>

---

- *From:* "Paul Crowley" <[slkwuoiutiuytciuyik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:slkwuoiutiuytciuyik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 30 Dec 2005 17:44:14 -0000
- 

"Jim McGinn" <[jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1135626473.088346.5530@xx](mailto:news:1135626473.088346.5530@xx)

>>>> In my model the adoption of tools/weapons is organic.  
>>>> Your model is silly in comparison in that there is no underlying reason  
>>>> at all for them to begin employing clubs.  
>>>>  
>>>> Chimps do it now,  
>>>  
>>> They certainly do not!  
>>  
>> You quote Kortland below, setting out how they do.  
>  
> Kortland involves an observation of an incident involving a leopard.

So what? They used clubs (and made them on the spot from trees when they needed to). The level of 'conscious' behaviour was far in excess of what you allow to such animals, and is more than enough for my theory.

> My model for communal territorialism involves constant intracooperative  
> vigilance of a somewhat clearly defined communal territory

Two good basic rules (especially for you) would be (a) never use words of more than three syllables, and (b) allow no more than two three-syllable words in every twenty. You might then have some faint hope of making sense.

> (let's say a  
> city sized, town sized patch of forest that persists near a lake).

What constitutes its 'clear definition'? What are its boundaries?

> The vigilance would be continuous, day after day (but more intense in  
> the dry season). At any moment a herd of food competitors

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Such as . . . ? Wildebeeste? Zebra? Buffalo?  
Elephants? Hippos? Rhinos? Or are they  
entirely mythical entities in the McGinnian  
mind?

How about chimps? I'd accept that THEY  
would really be competitors. How do your  
(recently ex-chimps) compete with their  
ancestors?

> or a predator might be spotted and the call would go out to  
> make a show of force, weapons in hand.

No animal is impressed with a 'show of force'  
unless it sees the real thing in action fairly  
often.

> Such behaviors would have only been adaptive in the context of the very  
> unusual selective factors associated with monsoon forest habitat—most  
> notably, predatory massacre behavior.

Drivel.

>>>> All I assume here are periods of drought.  
>>>> No big deal. But even they are not  
>>>> essential.  
>>>>  
>>>> Without some kind of environmentally caused periodic scarcity  
>>>> there is even less reason for them to assume the territorialism in  
>>>> your model than you have already.  
>>>>  
>>>> This is crazy in any event. What species  
>>>> (of, say, mammal or primate) has natural  
>>>> populations which don't regularly encounter  
>>>> scarcity? Along with forgetting Darwin,  
>>>> you have (just like standard PA) forgotten  
>>>> Malthus.  
>>>>  
>>>> Read what I wrote:

You are like a Bible-thumper — only worse: you  
regard your own 'texts' as Biblical. You seem to  
think that anything you wrote is above criticism,  
and is necessarily and inherently true.

> Without some kind of ENVIRONMENTALLY CAUSED periodic  
> scarcity there is even less reason for them to assume the  
> territorialism in your model than you have already. If you are (now)  
> claiming that the motivation for them assuming weapons is the result of  
> the same kind of periodic malthusian scarcity that all species  
> experience then it brings us to wonder why there aren't a lot more

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

> species that employ weapons that do currently.

Because such species would (a) need good hands; (b) be fairly large (only heavy clubs do real damage, and small ones are a waste of time); and (c) not sleep in trees nor spend much other time in them. (Those that run around, and sleep in, trees can't hold on to weapons while they are up there.)

> Paul, you seem to not  
> want to confront that fact that the communal territorialism in my model  
> is categorically distinct both with respect to the specific behaviors  
> involved and—most importantly—with respect to the unit of selection  
> if these behaviors are successful or unsuccessful.

The 'communal territorialism' shown by chimps is plenty for my model -- as regards the origins of bipedalism in an isolated population. It would be developed much more strongly by mainland populations later on, and each population would, to a large extent, become a 'unit of selection'.

But it is quite unnecessary at the start (i.e. for about the first 200 Kyr) among a relatively small isolated population, undergoing rapid genetic change.

> In my model it's  
> literally a matter of survival for the community as a whole. You don't  
> have this in your model.

I do -- but probably not until they became established on the mainland, and there was usually a substantial distance between hominid populations. Without that distance, interbreeding would prevent the development of distinct capacities or morphology.

>>>> Your island notion is contrived. Unnecessary.  
>>>>  
>>>> Isolation (over hundreds or thousands  
>>>> of generations) is essential. Freedom from  
>>>> predators likewise. Without an island,  
>>>> neither is possible.  
>>>>  
>>> Pure nonsense.  
>>  
>> Say how or why.  
>

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

> See my hypothesis.

The Holy Writ -- which can never be quoted  
except in total.

>> Let's say two scientists find a population of  
>> primates in Spain that has obviously got there  
>> from Africa. Scientist A says that there was  
>> some really bad weather in Africa in July of the  
>> previous year which drove some to make the  
>> journey and they succeeded. Scientist B says  
>> that any bad weather was irrelevant, and that  
>> the monkeys had been trying to swim across  
>> for thousands (or tens of thousands) of years,  
>> and eventually some had finally made it at  
>> some unknown time in the past.

>>

>> Which theory is more likely to be true?

>

> I suppose B. But what's this got to do with anything?

I propose Theory B. You propose A.  
Your theory is hopelessly unlikely.

>> Like other chimps, they'd be picking them up  
>> sometimes anyway. But, being on the ground  
>> all the time, means that they now hold on to  
>> them. And the clubs become 'serious'  
>> weapons.

>

> The problem you're going to be facing over and over again with this is  
> that if it is this simple then why don't apes currently employ clubs on  
> a constant basis.

Already answered dozens of times.  
See above.

>>> In my model whether or not they slept in trees is an open issue.

>>

>> An "open issue" ! What a dope you are.  
>> It changes everything. How did they cope  
>> with nocturnal predators? How did they  
>> ever start to cope with nocturnal predators?

>

> Collective show of force (see above).

Ever tried to put on a show in the pitch  
black night?

Collective shows of force in the dark  
are (a) hard to manage; (b) don't make

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

much impression on the audience.

You have picked up this form of 'thinking' from standard PA (which along with forgetting all of Darwin) has also forgotten that night exists. The 'scientists' are asleep during the night so, for them, it is a wholly irrelevant period of time.

>> Do a search on 'early hominid diet' in the  
>> 'scientific' journals. Not one paper you  
>> locate will mention roots as part of the diet.  
>  
> What does this tell you?

PA 'scientists' are dopes. But we knew that anyway.

>>> Shut up, imbecile, I haven't indicated one way or another.  
>>  
>> It's a basic part of human evolution.  
>> If you don't account for it [descent from the trees]  
>  
> A shift to communal territorialism, as described above, does account  
> for it.

How, when and why? As you say: "I haven't indicated one way or another." So you obviously haven't begun to think about it. You might as well pretend to "explain" the evolution of the whale taxon, but forget to account for why a land-living mammal went into the water.

>>> Well, retard, look around you. We are a communal species.  
>>> Certainly more so than chimps. If you can't explain this  
>>> you don't have a hypothesis.  
>>  
>> Sure I explain it. Once (substantial) monogamy  
>> came in  
>  
> This is to put the cart in front of the horse. Monogamy could not have  
> emerged without communal selection.

How come? What is the connection?

>> (as it did with descent from the trees  
>> and bipedalism) there was no limit to the size of

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

- >> the group.
- >
- > This is tacked on (at least you're consistent). In my model it's
- > intrinsic to the scenario itself. It is the communal selective factors
- > of my model (missing or tacked on in your model) that dictate the
- > emergence of large, size scalable, group structure.

That's silly and unnecessary. The size of the group in any species will depend on a range of factors. In many species it varies, almost by the week, as for example with starlings and many other birds, which come together when they can (presumably to keep predation down) and disperse when they have to . . . for food and breeding. I don't see hominids being much different. The mating systems of many primates dictate their group size, but that does not apply once monogamy is established.

- >> species manage large social groups, and
- >> hierarchy is essential — but even chimps show
- >> the beginnings of that. There is no need to say
- >> much more about early hominids; the need for
- >> language, and for lots of culture would have
- >> been pressing, but would have been relatively
- >> slow to evolve.
- >
- > You have no SELECTIVE FACTORS that dictate the emergence
- > of large group size.

Nor do any of the numerous species which gather in large (and often massive) groups.

- >>> You completely failed to indicate a SELECTIVE benefit to larger
- >>> groups. (I have no trouble with this at all in my model.)
- >>
- >> I don't know how you fail to see that in my
- >> scenario. As I told you, larger groups would
- >> usually do better than smaller ones, for all
- >> manner of reasons.
- >
- > Vague nonsense. If it was this simple then all species would only
- > maintain very large groups.

Many species do form large groups — herds of bovids, flocks of birds, shoals of fish — mostly to reduce predation. But most can't do that, and have to disperse. It's little more than a matter of practicalities. Chimps and most primates can't do it. Their density is too low. Nothing special there. Hominids usually

## Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

(or often) prefer to be in large groups, especially when under threat.

> > Under your theory, the hour-to-hour and  
> > day-to-day behaviour of your early hominids  
> > would be identical to those of chimps. (In  
> > fact, they'd have the same morphology --  
> > but, for some unknown reason, you can't  
> > see that.)  
>  
> No. I can't see that.

So -- tell us -- in what ways would the hour-to-hour and day-to-day behaviour of your early hominids DIFFER from that of chimps?

Presumably, they spend the 12 hours of dark (and an hour or two at midday) doing exactly the same as chimps -- sleeping in tree nests?

> > > This is the way evolutionary scenario are supposed to be, you idiot.  
> > > Otherwise there is no reason for evolutionary change.  
> >  
> > Where did you get such a crazy idea?  
> > The first birds took to the air because they  
> > were forced off the ground? (I suppose it  
> > was a change of climate. Did it make the  
> > ground icy, or what?) The first amphibians  
> > were driven from the water to come on land?  
> > Was that a change of climate too? The first  
> > seals took to the sea because they were  
> > driven from the land? Did the expansion  
> > of a desert make them take to the water?  
>  
> Without a dry season you don't have a compelling rationale for the  
> adoption of communal territorialism because without it you don't have  
> communal selection.

Not so. There is no need for a dry season at all -- although there almost certainly was one at the time.

> > > > We do not live in forests, nor go into them  
> > > > to collect this 'food'. Your answer is false.  
> > >  
> > > Maybe you don't, but normal humans do eat these things.  
> >  
> > List "these things". How can I search for  
> > them on Google? Or are they reserved solely  
> > for your imagination

You ducked this request. What a surprise.

>>>> As another example, a requirement to change  
>>>> the method of locomotion would be a huge  
>>>> obstacle -- inconceivably large in nearly all  
>>>> instances. In effect, the species becomes  
>>>> disabled while it goes through the change.  
>>>> In some ways, it would have to go into a  
>>>> kind of 'purdah' (or a state of chrysalis) while  
>>>> it made the switch. Just like standard PA,  
>>>> you don't see this -- having the species  
>>>> endure its transient state for no good reason  
>>>> while also supposedly coping with predators  
>>>> and competitors and all the usual problems.  
>>>>  
>>>> I think the fact that chimps do, so often, assume a bipedal stance make your  
>>>> comments above regarding 'purdah' look really stupid.  
>>>>  
>>>> Humans often go on their hands and knees  
>>>> (especially in infancy). Does that mean  
>>>> that they are well on the way to becoming  
>>>> quadrupeds? If (for some strange reason)  
>>>> one population of humans really had to  
>>>> revert to quadrupedalism, how long would  
>>>> it take? And would the new species be  
>>>> fast at running, good at climbing and  
>>>> effective at fighting, while it was going  
>>>> through the process?  
>>>>  
>>>> What's your point here?

A species that changes its method of locomotion will need a period of highly protected 'purdah' while it goes through the switch-over. Your scenario (like all those of standard PA) fails to grant that to early hominids. Just a complete failure of imagination, I suppose.

Paul.

.

---

• *References:*

◆ *Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths*

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
- ◆ **[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
- ◆ **[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
- ◆ **[Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths](#)**
  - ◇ *From:* Jim McGinn
- ◆ **[Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths](#)**
  - ◇ *From:* Paul Crowley

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Why Algis isn't coming back](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Why Algis isn't coming back](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**