

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00243.html>

- *From:* "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Dec 2006 22:29:26 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

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.

"Nonsense" is nothing more than a troll's frustrated response proving his total ignorance of the literature.

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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.

The reason you can't cite anything is because you don't know anything.

Semaw: "The recent cut-mark data from Bouri indicates that early hominids c. 2.5 Ma began incorporating some amount of meat in their diet.....

This is perfectly consistent with what I stated.

It is not clear whether or not the first stone artifacts were used for the processing of plant foods. There are certain indications from microwear studies on artifacts from Koobi Fora (Keeley & Toth, 1981) and from Gona (Beyries, 1993), but strong cases have yet to be made based on the archaeological record to demonstrate the use of flaked stones for processing plant food items"

I never asserted they used stone tools for plant processing. They used their teeth for plant processing. I asserted stone weapons for pest control, specifically as a deterrent to large, mammalian herbivorous pests. Pest control was part of their strategy to survive the dry season and its predatory implications.

Yes, you are right, I simply don't do well reading science fiction, I tend to rush through it giving it the little time it deserves.

Well, I think your comments only bolster my claim that my hypothesis is indisputable. You do admit, don't you, that you have not presented any kind of dispute of my assertions. Are you saying that stone tipped spears would not be useful to a community of Apiths that wished to keep immigrating herbivorous species from getting access to their garden habitat? Are you saying that a community of Apiths that wished to keep immigrating herbivorous species out of their garden habitat would not, as a result of maintaining their general health and well being through

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

the depth of the dry season, be less likely to be a target for predators during the dry season? Are you saying that predators would not instinctively key in on communities (of Apith and other species) that are the most starving, desperate and, therefore vulnerable? Are you saying anything at all?

Modern
hunter gatherers use stone tools for plant–food processing.

Relevance?

I expect
data consistent with the evidence. In this case, you have failed to supply any evidence.

In this discipline we all use the same evidence.

Moreover, there is no direct evidence that any of
the apiths were tool users.

Relevance. You seem to not be following the gist of the thread.

If you read the paper I cited there is a
discussion on who might have made the first tools, but there is no proof of who made the tools.

Relevance?

If it turns out apiths were not tool
users,

Well, according to my hypothesis they employed rocks and sticks to head off or drive out these large, mammalian pests. So if what you're saying is true it effectively refutes my whole hypothesis.

then they also couldn't have been using stone tools to drive all those mean preadators out of their garden.

Are you saying that A'pith could not have used rocks and sticks? Are

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

you saying that even if they could they would not have been (or could not have been) effective preventing the immigration of large mammalian pests and thereby preserving territorial resources? Are you saying that even if it did preserve territorial resources in the manner I indicate that it would make no difference because A'pith were typically not confined to patches of treed habitat in the manner I specified and therefore they would just meander over and across treeless habitat to ? Are you saying anything? Or are you, again, saying that you are saying something but really you aren't saying anything or, at least, not anything relevant to the issue at hand?

<snip>

Cite your literature that says they were fast.

Cite your literature that says they were slow.

Fat chance, since you have decided that under no circumstances are you going to cite anything. You expect others to cite, but you have no intention of citing anything. IOW, you are just a pompous ass.

It is only ever necessary to site something if it is disputed. You have dismissed much of my thinking. But you haven't disputed any of it.

So you don't dispute my hypothetical thinking you dispute the hypothesizer, myself. Right?

Anyone can hypothesize/imagine anything, proving it is something quite different. As I explained to Paul, who doesn't understand anymore about science than you do, imagination only gets you started. The burden is on the hypothesizer to gather the evidence, not the other way around.

No. It's the burden of those critical of a hypothesis to dispute it. When they fail, as you have done here, this is the best indicator of scientific validity. (Once again, retard, we all use the same evidence.)

Your evidence for gardens is?

Is there any evidence that they did not have gardens, or something to

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

that effect?

"Did not have"? That is classic negative argument. The burden is on you to show some sort of evidence. Even weak evidence might work if you have several independent lines of it. So other than you said so, what is your evidence?

Obviously this is a wash, retard. So you only look even more stupid (and desperate) to even bring it up. Obviously I have no direct evidence of these gardens. And obviously you have no direct evidence that disputes their existence.

There isn't any, it is a negative argument. Are you aware of any literature that disputes the assumption that Lucy was making elaborate sand paintings, playing with string cradles, or playing Hopscotch?

No.

Well then, we can just sit here and ponder gardens and hopscotch.

I'll leave that to you.

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

Is that why all those people back in 1999 gave you an F?

?

Your hypothetical thinking was not very well received.

They appear to be a bit threatened, don't they.

How about your own hypothesis, Lee. Is it threatened by any of this?

Do you have a hypothesis of early hominid evolution? Yes? No? Maybe?

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Not yet? I haven't thought about it yet? Anything?