

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00215.html>

- *From:* "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 7 Dec 2006 21:35:33 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

just plain lies.

Message-ID:

<1165382392.924931.265...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

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

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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

JimMcGinn: "When lions and hyena came into their habitat they had to

get high in trees to survive."

They?

A'pith only. This would be apparent if you included the context.

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?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Yes, the evidence is pretty indisputable on this point, AFAICT. It would be a problem for my hypothesis if the evidence did not indicate that Lucy was heavily preyed upon. Especially considering that predation is essential to the group selective mechanism of my hypothesis of early hominid evolution.

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.

So, you're suggesting we should just pretend they are tame? Why not let paleo-reconstruction of habitat based of fossil evidence dictate your conclusion. Accordingly we can only come to one conclusion: there were a lot of violent, vicious beasts in their habitat. Nothing you're saying here amounts to a dispute with this supposition. So, get over it.

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.

Come come, now. That's a ridiculous assertion. Why would they not want to eat A'pith. (And this directly contradicts the evidence that indicates feline predation on A'pith (Lucy).)

They were geared for giant slow moving creatures.

So you theorize a slow moving feline? How do you expect anybody to take this seriously?

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.

Obviously you're just making this up as you go along. As I explain in my hypothesis, they would have been especially vulnerable to predation in the dry season. As indicated there, these would often result in predatory massacres.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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?

True or false, Apith were preyed upon by feline predators?

(Let's see how this evasive twit tries to avoid answering this question.)

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.

Answer the question you evasive twit.

.