

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00212.html>

- *From:* "Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 7 Dec 2006 18:59:00 -0800
-

Jim McGinn wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

Jim McGinn wrote:

Let's keep it simple. Yes or no, IYO, did lion sized (or bigger) predators exist in the earliest (late miocene) years of hominid evolution?

Yes.

Why do you think Lee wishes beyond hope to not believe this?

"You're a chickenshit phoney, afraid to quote me directly."

"I see your arguments have disintegrated from simple misinformation to just plain lies.

Message-ID:

<1165382392.924931.265...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Lee: "Apiths were victims of bear-sized hyenas, why not? Saber-tooth cat bait also. But not lion, I don't think there is any evidence for those mixing with apiths, maybe late boisei at best."

What part of the simple statement "cat bait" are you too stupid to

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

understand? As for your imaginary late Miocene lions, cite fossil evidence for them."

IOW, show where lions, not saber-tooth cats or leopards, were eating apiths. Hard evidence exists that leopards were killing or scavenging apiths at Swartkrans for example. You need to be specific. It matters a great deal if lions were involved. Lions evolved relatively late, if there were no lions present at many of these sites, it would be hard for them to kill anything, let alone apiths.

The issue was whether or not A'pith would have been confined to treed habitat. As to whether or not the exact predators involved have the label of lion or some other label I don't give a flying fuck

No, you simply backed down from what you first said.

Message-ID: <1165297102.665010.205640@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

JimMcGinn: "When lions and hyena came into their habitat they had to get high in trees to survive."

They?

Jim McGinn: "Both" (Meaning Homo). Which is it and how many times are you going to change your position? My objection was to both. But I did agree about Lucy being—"cat bait" remember? But another problem was your statement that "Sabertoothed lion" (no such thing) were bigger and that was supposed to be a problem and you also proclaimed the lions speed was also a factor.

You are wrong on both counts. Saber-toothed cats were very specialized animals. They wouldn't have evolved giant canines just to stab a tiny apith. They were geared for giant slow moving creatures. They had bob-tails, further indication they were slow ambush hunters. The only way they would be a threat to a hominid is if hominids were wandering around in tall grass or thick bush, otherwise they could be seen a mile away and would never be able to catch Lucy. As long as she stayed out of the ambush zones (and stayed near trees), saber-tooths would have been no problem. Lions weren't around early, so no matter how fast they were, what early apith would care?

All the above demonstrates the lack of thought you have put into this. The same applies to your sci-fi hypothesis. You were told by qualified people (Greg Laden, Su Solomon etc.) in 1999 that you needed to go back to the library. You have made it very clear you didn't take their advice.

.