

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-01/msg00000.html>

- *From:* "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 01 Jan 2006 01:34:30 GMT
-

"Paul Crowley" <slkwuoiutiuytciuyik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:2Uetf.3916\\$j7.88059@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:2Uetf.3916$j7.88059@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> 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?

Don't play dumb, Paul. Your model has NO PREDATORS.

> 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.

You're just determined to ignore the fact that there is really no reason for them to be fighting each other in your scenario.

>
>> 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-

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

- > 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?

Use your imagination. The boundaries are defined by the boundaries of the forested habitat.

- >
- >> The vigilance would be continuous, day after day (but more intense in
- >> the dry season). At any moment a herd of food competitors
- >
- > Such as . . . ? Wildebeeste? Zebra? Buffalo?
- > Elephants? Hippos? Rhinos?

Yes too all of the above.

- > Or are they
- > entirely mythical entities in the McGinnian
- > mind?

I don't know what your problem is, idiot. Express yourself more clearly.

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

They were the chimps, you idiot.

- >
- >> 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.

No. Avoidance of predators/conflict/flying rocks/sticks is instinctual.

- >
- >> 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.

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

What, you think islands are necessary. Nonsense.

>

>>>> 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

>>>> you 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

>> 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

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

Your model fails to explain why they would become communal.

- > -- 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

You tack it on.

- > -- 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.
- >>
- >> 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

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>>> 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.

No. I don't propose A.

>>>
>>> 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?

It's nighttime for the predators also.

>>>>
>>>> Collective shows of force in the dark
>>>> are (a) hard to manage; (b) don't make
>>>> much impression on the audience.

At nighttime they stayed in trees, just like chimps do presently.

>>>>

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

- > 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?

Like I said, constant vigilance, mob oriented attack strategies. As hominids became better and better at communally controlling larger pieces of territory the result would be high degrees of security, especially at the core.

- > 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.

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>
> How come? What is the connection?

Haven't I already answered this question.

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

Obviously hominids shifted to group structure that is generally larger and definitely more scalable.

>
>> > 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.

No. They are selected. Prove otherwise.

>
>> > > You completely failed to indicate a SELECTIVE benefit to larger
>> > > groups. (I have no trouble with this at all in my model.)
>> >

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

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

Your hypothesis, unlike mine, fails to provide selective factors that explains the expansion of hominid group size (and the fact that hominid groups are significantly more situated).

>
>>> 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?

See my hypothesis.

>
> 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

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>>> 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.

You're lost. Without a dry season you have no rationale for territorialism and without territorialism you have not rationale for large communal groups (and without large communal groups you have no basis for the emergence of intelligence, culture, and language).

>
>>>> 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.

Stupid request.

>
>>>>> 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

Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths

>>> 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.

Purdah is evident in my scenario but IMO purdah is not necessary.

Jim

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths*

◇ *From:* Paul Crowley

• Next by Date: *Re: Clark = Newton -- Yeah, right.*

• Next by thread: *Re: Absence of Canines in Apiths*

• Index(es):

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*