

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00343.html>

- *From:* Rich Travsky <traRvEsky@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 12 Dec 2006 08:06:04 -0700
-

Jim McGinn wrote:

Rich Travsky wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

[...]

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

Gona site. 2.6 mya. Stone tools in association with cut marked bones.

[...]

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence
that effect?

But do you have any evidence for gardens?

Much of the existing evidence is consistent wit