

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00229.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 8 Dec 2006 12:04:41 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

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."

Homo was probably considerably better at surviving in treeless habitat (especially after the discovery of fire). But even so the general PA supposition that homo's stone tools would have been effective against the large predators found in treeless savanna habitat is inconsistent with reality as we know it, IMO. And this means that the general notion that homo was a dedicated hunter, scavenger is nonsense.

This means that the stone tools found in association with homo serve agricultural ends—keeping food-competitor species out of their gardens—and not the hunting/scavenging lifestyle that has become popularized. And the stone tool cut marks found on bones associate with Homo fossils are the result of ambush hunting in the context of their garden-like communal territory.

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.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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

You've already demonstrated a propensity to interpret (misinterpret IMO) the evidence of homo based on the current climate. You have to make more of an effort to rule out the possibility that the current climate at these locations was not wetter and more heavily wooded when these fossils were laid down than it is currently.

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. 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.

Nothing about the evidence is obvious. It has to be interpreted. Sorry to burst your bubble.

So, you think saber-tooth cats chased down their prey with the speed of a lion?

Of course. Only an idiot would assume otherwise.

Lions give up after on 50 to 100 yards, how far do you think a saber-tooth is good for?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

This seems like a desperately stupid argument.

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?

If you don't theorize a slow moving feline then what's your point?

Homo can and does outrun any mammal alive given enough of a head start.

The same is true for tortoises.

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.

Now your stupidity seems blatant, intentional.

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

Cite from the literature, not from science fiction.

Are you aware of any literature that disputes the assumptions that underly my hypothesis?

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.

Answer the question you evasive twit.

It's already been answered you senile idiot.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

In this discipline if you are not honest with yourself about the evidence you've already failed.

.