

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00225.html>

- *From:* "Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Dec 2006 07:10:32 -0800
-

Jim McGinn wrote:

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?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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
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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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?

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

Subject: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Date: 2 Dec 2006 14:32:48

Message-ID: <1165098768.578213.303960@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Jim McGinn: "The supposition that early man, including homo, regularly walked or ran over, across, or through treeless savanna habitat is not viable in that they were largely if not

completely defenseless against the predators thereof."

Do you know what the words "including Homo" actually means? You started this thread based on that claim. You can't even remember the statements you made in your own thread.

Then just to make sure You really were making such a stupid claim I asked:

Lee Olsen: "You realize he is talking about early Homo, not apiths?" (meaning Dennell)

Jim McGinn: "Absolutely I realize that. There is no good reason for homo to regularly travel through treeless habitat. They were completely incapable of hunting any of the animals that resided there and they had no defense against lions, dogs, and hyena.

Your quote: "Claudius Denk:

You're going to just continue believing that they hunted and scavenged out in treeless habitat.

Lee Olsen:

Are you talking about Homo, apiths, or both?

Claudius Denk:

Both.

Lee Olsen:

Are you sure you mean that?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Jim McGinn: "To answer your question, Yes, I do mean that."

Yesterday it was Homo ("This would be apparent if you included the context."), today it is "A'pith only.

You are so ignorant, you can't even remember what the premis of your own thread is about.

Jim McGinn: "The supposition that early man, including homo, regularly walked or ran over, across, or through treeless savanna habitat is not viable in that they were largely if not completely defenseless against the predators thereof."

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?

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.

Then why do you keep babbling about Homo not being able to function out on the treeless palin, when clearly they did?

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 the lying clown that claims he is familiar with the literature.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

I expect someone who claims to be familiar with the literature to know the simplest of basics, just as I would expect a person claiming to be a Christian to have heard about the Bible. Does your mother still have to tell you when to blow your nose, does she still have to wipe your ass? Does everything obvious have to be explained to you in detail? Get to the library you illiterate sot.

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).)

So, you think saber-tooth cats chased down their prey with the speed of a lion? Lions give up after on 50 to 100 yards, how far do you think a saber-tooth is good for?

They were geared for giant slow moving creatures.

So you theorize a slow moving feline?

Is your memory completely gone? You were the guy just forced to concede that saber-tooths weren't ancestral to lions (a demonstration of how little you know). I got that info from the same sources that forced you into a retraction, now you are going to try for two embarrassments in a row?

Homo can and does outrun any mammal alive given enough of a head start. Nobody said these animals can't catch you from ambush, so the safest place is still out in the open where you can see what's going on.

They had
bob-tails, further indication they were slow ambush hunters. The only

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

Cite from the literature, not from science fiction.

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?

Is that question for me, or do you still hear voices? I cited CK Brain. Since you know the literature so well, what did he say?

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

It's been answered before, at least three times, I think even you should get it by now.

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.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Answer the question you evasive twit.

It's already been answered you senile idiot.

.