

Re: When Burial Begins

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-11/msg00051.html>

- *From:* Chip Flintknapper <nobody@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 06 Nov 2006 10:30:42 GMT
-

Paul Crowley wrote:

"Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1162180698.802965.269700@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.

We all put forward theories (or, if you prefer,
'imaginary scenarios'). We have an obligation
to set out, as far as we can, how they would be
proved or disproved. Standard PA skips this
duty all the time. It does not even recognise
one. Its supporters have to duck all hard
questions.

One test of a theory is its coherence. Does
it have major gaps? No account is ever

Re: When Burial Begins

provided of crucial stages in the PA model — such as when, why and how early hominids began to sleep on the ground. The only explanation for most of the major steps in its model would be 'fairy dust spread by aliens'.

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.

What tests does standard PA propose for its theory? The finding of fossils is so haphazard and unpredictable that one can only say that (a) individual cases will support one theory rather than the other, and (b) the overall patterns emerging will support one rather than the other.

Little Lucy's 'rolled-up-into-a-ball' state certainly supports mine, and defeats yours. The 'First Family' supports mine and defeats yours. The identification of major pathologies in fossils, providing highly probable causes of death — such as the tooth infection of 15000 and the hypervitaminosis of 1808 — support mine and defeat yours,

The finding of numerous fossils on uplifted, formerly coastal, land supports mine. Their rarity and strange nature on inland sites defeats yours. The predominance of young males on inland sites defeats yours.

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.

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.

Re: When Burial Begins

The Asiatic Lion once roamed from Spain to middle India, as well as from Morocco through Arabia and up to Persia, where the fork was joined.

"Sport" hunting cut the range into pieces but there were isolated groups living from Bulgaria and Greece through Iran to middle India until the 1890's. The last lion kill in Persia was in 1942, and since then, the last of them live on a small preserve in western India. I believe there are about 300 of them extant.

There was a recent experiment (within the past 30 years) to cross the remaining Asiatic Lions on the Gir preserve in western India with African Lions, but the offspring are not viable in the wild; they are born handicapped and cannot hunt, and in fact have trouble standing.

Although both African and Asiatic Lions lived on the African continent, they apparently separated around 100,000 years ago, and did not interact because of the desert between them.

Please bear in mind that they were only exterminated within the past 200 years, so it's a good bet that both Neanderthals and modern humans had to fight them, occasionally.

<http://www.asiatic-lion.org/>

Going back ten years is pathetic. Presumably you never make mistakes, because everything you say is copied from a book. You don't possess a mind, and are incapable of having your own ideas.

Neither Lucy's (or later Homo e) habitat was not primarily close to the coast, but ubiquitous over nearly all of Africa.

Of course. Lucy was a successful species, and could compete with lions, hyenas, elephant, buffalo, zebra, hippo and so on. Erectus and its successors were tens, hundreds and thousands of times MORE successful. That's why around 1800 A.D. (200 years ago), Africa had a hominid population in the billions,

The population of the entire Earth did not reach the 1 billion mark until the year 1800. Where do you obtain your facts?

<http://earthtrends.wri.org/updates/node/61>

Re: When Burial Begins

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.

You are careful to NEVER confront the facts of the 1808 case.

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.

Yes, well they also eat bugs.

Many human tribes and cultures do not bury their dead. They are obliged to burn them, or leave them out for the vultures (e.g. Tibetans). The reasons are usually obvious -- such as the absence of suitable ground (and for Tibetans, the scarcity of wood). Sun-baked earth is hard to dig. The Maasai are cattle-herders and not much use as models for early humans. The Hazda live in semi-desert, and are just as bad. Humans did not evolve in semi-desert -- as is very obvious from our anatomy.

They simply abandon the terminally ill when they can no longer keep up with the group.

Re: When Burial Begins

This only applies to nomadic peoples, who are devoid of working animals.

'Terminally ill' is not the same as 'dead'.

They certainly don't leave corpses to rot in their camp sites.

Dead bodies attract scavengers and carnivores. The smell also becomes disturbing, even to the unwashed. If you have ever encountered a dead horse, bloated in a rotten, green creek, then you know the odor that I am referring to.

A similar fate obviously happened to 1808.

They had looked after her for weeks — feeding her soft liver. If they had just abandoned her, she'd have been consumed by scavengers (including vultures) within minutes, whether she was alive or dead. They obviously waited till she died, and then covered her body with rocks, or dug a shallow grave, or both.

A lot of cures have been tried and failed, but quite a good number have succeeded as well; which explains our presently overpopulated world.

Paul.