

# Diverting attention from the real issues of hominid evolution

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-04/msg00252.html>

---

- *From:* [claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Fri, 11 Apr 2008 09:44:29 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 10, 10:08 pm, Day Brown <daybr...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 7, 3:32 pm, Lee Olsen <paleoc...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 7, 12:35 pm, Marc Verhaegen <m\_verhae...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Everything we know suggests our ancestors always lived  
near lots of water >> Idiot, near it isn't in it.

<http://www.mnh.si.edu/anthro/humanorigins/aop/olorg2004/dispatch/star...>

"The idea of sleeping on the higher ground rather than next to water seemed an attractive idea. Lakes, ponds, and stream channels in the African bush are good natural sources of water and plant food during the day. But at night they turn into really great places if you want to be hunted down as prey! The water margins attract the big and small predators that like to hunt in the dark of night. Even today at Ologesailie, we often go to sleep hearing hyenas, jackals, and sometimes lions growling and whooping off in the distance during their nighttime prowls. Anyway, early humans could get food in the lowlands – that's where they left the chipped stone tools and other evidence of their activities. And, unlike earlier hominins, they could have avoided the favored hunting areas of other predators if they got to higher ground at night."

got part of their foods from the water:

Oh, you found some early Homo crayfish middens? Great, why are you hiding this important evidence, we all would like to see it.

## Diverting attention from the real issues of hominid evolution

I dont see that sarcasm or ad hominum strengthens your case.

This would assume that Marc has a case. Marc does nothing but make some rather obvious observations that hominids would be located close to sources of fresh water. I mean like, DUH. Meanwhile none of the real issues of hominid evolution are addressed. With Apith we still have an animal that, like its chimpanzee-like ancestors, resided in treed habitat and still has a hunting gathering lifestyle. And thus with Marc's particular brand of biological vagueness we are still left with an explanation that fails to explain why hominids have evolved into the highly social, cultural, and communally territorialistic species that is us modern humans.

The only thing that distinguishes AAT from Conventional theory is that AAT diverts attention from the real issues by vaguely referring to water in the vicinity while conventional theory diverts attention away from the real issues by vaguely referring to treeless habitat in the vicinity. These arguments are equally stupid and equally absurd.

Hominid adaptations are clearly dry season related adaptations that involves communal territorialism as the means to survive the dry season and its predatory implications. You have to about be mentally retarded to think they would spend much time in or very close to predator infested waters or in predator infested treeless habitat. A'pith were primarily frugivorous. And although the communal territorialism would begin to set the stage for hominids gradually evolving the ability to survive in or near water or out in treeless habitat it would be a long time for these abilities—which themselves were afforded by our intellect—to evolve.

I dont

see where he claims that hominids lived in water, only that they could take advantage of it. Inasmuch as they still do, it begs the question of when these aquatic adaptations began.

It also begs the question why you/we should refer to it as aquatic when clearly it is not. Almost all species drink water. Does this mean all species are aquatic?

I dont claim to know. We see

hominids also adapted and lived in arid regions, but I dont see the data to show when that began either.

Evolutionarily, it makes sense that both ecosystems would have been useful at one time or other, and that the lines which could propagate

Diverting attention from the real issues of hominid evolution

in both would be more common.

Obviously.

Now tell us your theory on why humans are the most social and  
communally territorialistic species known to exist.

.