Re: Terra Amata poo poo

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2007−08/msg00047.html

- *From*: charles <charles.uzzell@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 02 Aug 2007 02:53:08 −0000

On Jul 31, 10:47 am, Lee Olsen <paleoc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On Jul 30, 9:19 pm, charles <charles.uzz...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > On Jul 27, 9:02 am, Lee Olsen <paleoc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > On Jul 26, 7:18 pm, charles <charles.uzz...@xxxxxxxxx>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > > On Jul 19, 9:40 pm, Lee Olsen
> > > > <paleoc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > On Jul 16, 5:27 pm, charles
> > > > > <charles.uzz...@xxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > On Jul 16,
> > > > > > 5:24 pm,
> > > > > > Lee Olsen
> > > > > > <paleoc...@xxxxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > > wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > On
> > > > > > > Jul
> > > > > > > 16,
> > > > > > > 1:44
> > > > > > > pm,
> > > > > > > Marc

Verhaegen
<m_verhae...@xxxxxxxxx>
wrote:
More
lip
sevice.

Comparative−imagination
evidence
is
nice.
One
can
imagine
Homo
ancestors
living
almost
anywhere,
bottom
of
the
Indian
Ocean,
Atlantis,
seaside,
who
can
prove
you
wrong?
Absence
of
evidence
then
becomes
proof.
One
can
imagine
early
Homo
eating
mountain
beaver
food,
swishing
for
algae

like
flamingos,
noodling
for
catfish.
Sir
Hardy
knew
what
he
was
doing
when
he
gave
up
AAT
for
spiritual
phenomenon,
because
isotopic
sigatures
refute
algae,
sedges
etc.
Smart
guy
that
Hardy.

Not that I
am going to
jump on
either
bandwagon,
but there is
some
evidence
that the
bonobo eats
some sort of
teeny, tiny
food out of
streams. Cf.
Bonobo:
The
Forgotten

> Ape, By
> FRANS DE
> WAAL,
> Photography
> by FRANS
> LANTING,
> University
> of
> California
> Press. He
> did not
> know what
> the bonobos
> were
> eating but
> they spent
> some time
> at the
> activity.

But I know what the
bonobos were eating even if
Frans does not.
The teeth of the bonobos
reflect C3 fruit and veggies,
isotopic−forest
food, just exactly as
expected for the habitat in
which they are
living. We know common
chimps eat a small amount
of monkey meat and
termites, but not enough to
dominate the major portion
of their diet
or the isotopic signature of
their teeth. If early Homo
ate tons of
algae and other riverside
food, the signature of their
teeth would be
the same as chimps/G, C3.
This is not the case, early
Homo is C4, just
exactly as one would expect
from the cut−marks on
antelope bones, thus
it is also the same as the
signature as the habitat in

which they were
living ie savanna. Early
Homo is always found with
ostriches, big
cats etc, which of course are
savanna or open woodland
type
creatures.

Lee.. thank you for your thoughtful and
detailed response, and I
apologize that it has been so long in my
reply... I just didn't see it
until tonight... have been busy being Judge
Judson in a theatre
production of Amistad.
Don't forget that the C3C4 research did not
include fish, and the
author of the study considered that a
weakness in the work.

Maybe for her purposes, but as far as changing early Homo from C4 back
to C3 (savanna back to "riverside" as Marc likes to dream about) fish
would not enter into the equation. I would have to look it up, but I
think only a lot of salt water fish in the diet (Marine reservoir effect) could change the numbers substantially and I don't think there
were any salt water fish at Swartkrans. Freshwater fish are in savanna
streams also, even if there were evidence for their consumption.

Just getting home from a long, wonderful weekend... so no time to reply in full tonight. I am not really interested in whether the fish confirms the diet that Marc touts; rather, I am concerned that the fish component of the c3/c4 studies was absent entirely.

But I still don't see why.

Fish or the things that fish ate would skew the results. I also think

that the researchers could have included more insects. I don't know if either of them are essentially C3 anyway, or afterall.

> Fish
> probably were a part of our diet very early on... we are a generalist species, adn it is a food that we hss folks continue to consume today... well.... most of us.
> I hate fish and only eat it when
> nothing else is available. Once caught some awesome tasting little smelts, though, in the lake country of Finland.. we roasted them on the fire and ate the whole thing. Gads. Not an activity I would think of enjoying, but they were good.

> Too many other predators are in competition for fish. Trying to get a fish away frrom a croc would consume
> more energy than it would be worth. If the people at Terra Amada did eat marine food, their descendents did not, at least to any major degree.

hmmmm... am still thinking about this one. I do recall that prey tends to outnumber predators by ten to one. So, one possible way to figure this part out would be the number of any predator animal to the predicted homo population. We would also have to know at which point "we" became the top of the food chain and not like rabbits to the coyote. It is in the news just this week, in my area, that humans are not the normal or prefered prey for sharks. Most shark attacks here are accidental on the part of the shark. True, also, of lions and many of the cats and crocs and etc. That is, while we are definitely attacked by many of these predator animals, we are not the preferred snack. I know that we have the one fossil with the holes in the skull that match the ancient jaguar. and tigers eat people.
my understanding of crocs is that they will eat anything they can catch, human or otherwise, but then they don't eat for some ten days or so.
I don't know if I agree that there are too many predators in competition for fish. Is that the same as saying that a huge whale eats huge amounts of plankton, so there is none left for others? Or are you saying that the little fish is eaten by the bigger one and then a bigger one and etc.? I guess the question is answered differently if one speaks of a watering hole, a river, the sea, etc.

> Otherwise, I agree about what the chimps were eating. And they hunt down those monkeys and chomp them up, which is a bit of a surprise. This does indicate that hunting precedes the LCA with Pan.

Probably, baboons hunt also, so this could be a trend that goes way back. Still, it is not something very common in those creatures, the difference is in us.

> Also, please note

> > The depth of the stream you cite is ankle deep, nothing that would invoke swimming or diving (else the common and bonobos wouldn't be trapped on opposite sides of the Congo). If they did swim and dive on a semi−aquatic basis, why are they not AAT also? Surely there is more water running through the Congo Basin than the savanna at Gona.

> > No, it doesn't. I agree. But it does prompt bipedal locomotion. Now how that would somehow lead to obligate bipedalism is another problem altogether.

Since oranges and sugar cane (Kano 1992) also prompts bipedal locomotion on dry ground, an extra step requiring water is

> not needed.
> Occam's Razor.
> Algis claimed he was going to check this out and he never came back
> with a reply. What could he say?

> > My recollection is that Algis did respond to this, in terms of "carrying" as a general reason to have gone obligate bipedal. Would be safer to check the archives on that, in that I don't remember what he said.

> I do because I was one of those debating him. It is exactly as I said.

okay

that De
Waal
devotes an
entire page
to
poo−pooing
the AAT.
Point is,
that if our
LCA also
ate some
sort of
teeny, tiny
food out of
streams
then the
evidence
would be
De Waal's
observation...
the bonobo
swishing for
algae... or
some such
stuff.

> I have no doubt that they do
> swish for something
> algae−like (same with
> gorillas who also wade in
> streams and eat swamp
> food), since their
> teeth isotopes reflect this.
> The teeth of early Homo
> does not (Julia
> Lee−Thorp 2001).

> This C4 signature is for early homo at about
> 3.2 mya. We still have
> to figure out what was going on between
> approx. 6 mya and 3.2 mya.

> Regardless of the names given to the species at that time, no
> matter
> what the size of the brains were at that time, only Homo has
> been
> *proven* (all else is circumstantial evidence) to understand
> the
> principles of conchoidal fracture. CF was in place at 2.6 mya.

> I agree entirely and yippee too... for my favorite thing is to find NA
> CF pieces... arrowheads. I found a 10,000 BC Hardaway DAlton, but it
> was not insitu so was of no use to the wise guys downtown.. they are
> only trying to keep ahead of the bulldozers here.

> Here they are getting ready to flood another important valley full of
> archaeological sites. It is illegal to hunt or dig artifacts. What the
> bottomline message is: don't touch anything so we can destroy it
> forever.

crazy, isn't it. Would love to know what is being flooded around the
world. By the way, slightly correcting my own previous paragraph....
in my area, the bow and arrow were not invented until approx. 2000 BC,
(4 kya) so most points are considered spearheads or some other tool.
In common vernacular, they are called arrowheads even if that is
inaccurate. Also, everything I have ever found has been a surface
find, which means that it could never be in situ. We have not yet,

AFAIK, found a Clovis point in North Carolina. The Hardaway series is the closest we have. I had hopes that the archeologists would at least look at the spot I found the thing... alas.. now it is a big ol' shopping center.

> What were "we"
> doing in the prior 4 my? wooden tools?

> I don't know, but by 2.6 mya "we" were 2.6 million years ahead of chimps in tecnological brainpower, because they haven't/can't catch up to CF. Most animals do a lot better trained in captivity, than they demonstrate in the wild, yet even in the lab, Toth can't teach Kanzi even the basics of CF. Kanzi understands sharp flakes cut, so his idea is to throw a rock on the floor and pick up the sharp flakes that randomly break off. Pretty amateurish compared to the 50 flakes Homo could drive off a single amorphous core 2.6 mya. I've been flintknapping for 15+ years and I'm impressed, so are Semaw and Roche.... read their debates.

Congrats on your flintknapping. I admire that skill and admire the skill of our forebearers... especially the Clovis culture. wow... what beatiful points.

> > What
> > this means, is the same mental gap that chimps have now, they had
> > then.

> I agree and well stated.

> > This mental gap could not have occured overnight because the
> > chimps and gorrilas have had millions of years since to catch up−−−−
> > and they haven't. This implies our ancestors were not doing chimp−like
> > things,

> I agree and well stated.
>
> > but savanna like things during that 6 to 2.6 era,
> >
> > not sure I agree with this part. For me, it is not necessarily Bolean logic to go from CF at 2.6 my to savanna CF at 6 mya.

True, I didn't state that so well:−)

The difference had to have happened sometime during that period though.

But during this interm, "we" IMO, wouldn't have had the time to separate from pan/G, evolve toward a semi−aquatic direction, and then end up fully adjusted out on the savanna with the ostriches by 2.6 mya. If this gap happened fast as opposed to slow, why haven't savanna chimps done the same, or at least headed in our direction?

> It is possbile
> that some sort of intervening lifestyle occured within that gap that caused "us" to grow bigger brains and begin using more tools that then lead to savanna CF. Of course, this requires the random mutation and the selection force to keep it. The missing component is the selection force, and seems to be what we argue about back and forth on sap.

They think common and bonobos (time frame differs from worker to worker somewhat) have been separated for roughly 1.5 My. Look how little differences there are between those two species in that amount of time. This is why I argue with Marc on this point, there just does not seem to be enough time involved for all this back and forth to have occured.

I wonder this same thing in terms of the LCA of HN and hss...
Neanderthals split only some 600 kya ago. If we share genes with HN, then I will fall in with the camp that gives current human populations red hair... <smile>

> otherwise
> there could be no CF tools at 2.6 mya. If the tools were being used on
> the savanna to butcher antelope and tortoise, then that gap from AATs
> perpective would have to be countered with the same type of hard
> evidence, not imagination. All AAT can claim is excuses as to why the
> data isn't in their camp.

I agree. The AAT camp has to work on producing some evidence.

Yes, and right now they are doing wonderful work finding artifacts in the North Sea and getting the geology there worked out. No excuses for not finding underwater sites any longer.

BTW, they have just found some Homo footprints a thousand miles inland (foothills of the Himalayas) dated to over 1 mya. Kind of off the littoral Indian Ocean path I would think.

> There is
> evidence
> that h.e.
> coprolytes
> from Terra
> Amata
> contained
> shell
> fragments.
> This kiddie
> book here in
> my hand,
> "Jurassic
> Poop" by
> Jacob
> Berkowitz,
> 2006, on
> page 28
> says that
> "The oldest
> human
> coprolites

found so far
are
300,000−year−old
coprolites
discovered
along the
southern
coast of
France, at
Terra
Amata."

Sorry charles, but if you
crap on a beach full of shell
fragments, a
small amount
of shell will certainly get
into some of the corprolites.
Terra Amada is not that old
compared to Gona, either
most or all of
human evolution had taken
place by then, so even *if*
shells were
involved, who cares?

While I am not willing to fight for the value
of the Terra Amata data,
I would put a lot more reliablitity on a
corprolite than I would on
cut marks.

I do not agree, because corprolites are rare and they only measure the
last meal or so, similar to tooth−wear data which only measures a
brief time. Isotope measures like tree rings, over
a large period of time during the tooth's formation.

I suspect that more of our ancestor's corprolites will be found as time goes by, and that will give us a complete picture of our ancient diet, and that is strong evidence, IMHO. ...

> My prediction is that an ostrich egg−shell will be found with a hole bored in it @ 1.7 My. They were doing something with awls, that's as good a use as any as I see it.

> > Hinds Cave in SW Texas was loaded with more than a thousand corprolites. Most of them contain a huge amount of fiber... some 15 times the amount of fiber in the US diet of today. Most of the fiber was from local desert plants such as the prickly pear cactus, agave and yucca. and bones from sixteen different animals including packrats, antelope, birds and fish. page 29 Jurassic Poop.

> Google Hidden Cave, Nevada. When you are starving, you eat what you gotta eat (I think they have some Corp. data from the Dirty Shame Rockshelter, Or. But I don't remember the results). See Lewis and Clark in the Bitterroots, not to mention their scavenged whale. The issue is, what are you eating most of for the longest period of time? <snip>

I DID google this, and read several papers related to it. INteresting stuff. Enjoyed especially this one

http://web.pdx.edu/~virginia/pdf%20files/ButlerSchroeder1998DigestiveTraces.pdf

Also, I note that the eating of the already digested seeds was not a hunger driven activity... dang.. they seemed to LIKE eating them. eek. The Eskimos love a small rotten bird. who knows what else we eat! but in terms of the poop eating seed seconds, it does make me wonder at which point we humans stopped eating poop, like the gorilla does. Certainly this must be related to our changing sense of smell and changes in our sexual habits and our child rearing?
regards
charles

.