

# Re: When Burial Begins

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-10/msg00324.html>

---

- *From:* "Lee Olsen" <[paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 29 Oct 2006 19:58:18 -0800
- 

Paul Crowley wrote:

"Lee Olsen" <[paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1162132466.364334.145670@xx](mailto:news:1162132466.364334.145670@xx)

Several things germane to discussions here. Because human graveyards are found in close proximity to home bases, more than one skeleton can be expected to be found in the same area as has happened at Krems. This is not so with Pliocene or early Pleistocene, with the First Family being a rare exception and was more parsimonious with a flooding event. This is strong evidence against any idea that early hominids utilized home bases or buried their dead.

Not so. Try to get the basic facts right about the theory you are seeking to undermine.

There are no facts to undermine because you don't have any. You also don't have a theory. What you have is imagination. You have a negative argument until you devise a test or cite others who have done tests in support of your imaginary scenario. Once again, imagination is only the first part of the scientific method. You have provided no tests, no data or any other person's data to support your imaginary hypothesis that Lucy buried her dead. You have only provided faulty logic in support of your claims.

If hominid home bases were readily found, and if hominids had been burying their dead for a few million years, then hominid graves would exist by the million. They don't -- since their habitat was close to the coast, and constant rise and fall in sea-levels wipe out such sites.

Re: When Burial Begins

You are making a false statement, just as you did in 1996 when you claimed Neandertals didn't hunt because there were no lions in Europe. Neither Lucy's (or later Homo e) habitat was not primarily close to the coast, but ubiquitous over nearly all of Africa.

Most of the fossils that have been found are those of individuals from small groups wandering around the uplands; they were strangers on alien ground. We have good

Most were found all over Africa except the rain forests. The only thing alien here is your UFO based argument. You have absolutely no evidence on how large their groups were.

evidence for that with KNM-ER 1808 who died from eating many meals of carnivore liver, much like Mawson's party in the Antarctic.

Your fundamentally flawed argument fails to take into consideration that the Hadza and the Maasai do not bury their dead. They simply abandon the terminally ill when they can no longer keep up with the group. A similar fate obviously happened to 1808.

the First Family being a rare exception

The location is one of the few where the ground has been rising for the last few million years, and some of its 'graveyards' escaped the usual fate.

There is no evidence of a graveyard, you made that up just as you made up the evidence that Neandertals didn't hunt because there were no lions in Europe.

Message-ID: <32592402.6F55@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Mon, Oct 7 1996 12:00 am

The point is, Paul, that you present both the absence of lions in Europe and the presence of lions in Europe as \*prima facie\* evidence

Re: When Burial Begins

Re: When Burial Begins

that Neanderthals didn't hunt. You must see the gross inconsistency in this argument, because I believe that you are a logical, reasoning human

being. You \*have\* to admit, to retain any credibility at all, that either one or both of your arguments are incorrect.

<snip>

by Stephen Barnard

---

and was more parsimonious with a flooding event.

There is nothing parsimonious in such a scenario.

Says the person who thinks flint axes turn to dust on a beach in a matter of months.

Nearly all hominid fossils at such locations are not found in their original position. They would usually be buried in soft sand in a river course, and be moved by the river within a relatively short time (e.g. 5 to 50 kyr -- when the great bulk would be destroyed). In any case, when they are found, the fossils often emerge from eroding rocks (as in the case of the First Family) scattered over a hillside, and little idea of their original location is obtainable.

"Nearly all--great bulk"? Cite your source for those statements. I suggest it was the same source that claimed Neandertals didn't hunt.

If PA are unreliable sources for conclusions according to you, why do accept their data for all you know about the locations where these fossils are found, i.e., "in soft sand of a river course" ?

Paul.