

# Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-10/msg00020.html>

---

- *From:* Claudius Denk <[claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 2 Oct 2008 07:32:57 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Oct 2, 3:05 am, Paul Crowley <[crowl...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:crowl...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Claudius Denk wrote:

the absence of predators  
enabled huge changes in  
behaviour,

Speculative nonsense.

Take a look around you sometime, at birds and wild mammals. When a predator arrives on the scene the prey animals start to behave in a very different manner. Likewise for large primates. Lions, hyenas (and leopards at night) keep chimps in trees. Once they are completely absent, the chimps can move away from trees suitable for sleeping.

I don't dispute this.

Read your own post. What were you trying to dispute?

I don't know why you think I do. And since you keep snipping the context it seems you don't care to be clear.

You can always restore what you regard as "the context".

## Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

including sleeping on the ground and the ability to retain tools and weapons almost indefinitely.

Absurd assumption.

Try to be more articulate (and it is NOT an assumption it is a conclusion drawn from the evidence).

You don't get it. You have to construct a selective scenario. And in the scenario you have to explain to us why the variants of the population that (as with chimps) do not habitually (indefinitely) retain tools/weapons would have, generally, died childless while those that do habitually (indefinitely) retain tools/weapons would have, generally, survived and had offspring. (And, obviously, you will never be able to do this.)

I have done this often. And it's not hard. Try to imagine what would happen when one group (of proto-hominids) which had weapons had a fight with a group without weapons. Might some 'selection' appear to operate?

There's no reason for them to fight. Why wouldn't they just avoid it?

You don't have a hypothesis.

What happened in 19th century California, when local Indians (without guns) came up against whites (with guns)? Do you now see many native Indians in California?

Those brought about the need for larger groups,

Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

"Brought the need" for larger groups? How do you expect anybody to take statements like this seriously? This is a vague, worthless statement.

It is simply a continuation of the line of reasoning.

The only reason that matters in a selective scenario is who lives and who dies and why. You don't have any of that

When europeans moved to North America,

We're talking about a transition from apes to hominids, you retard.

they  
nearly always had larger numbers in any particular locality (with their more intensive farming, and ability to infect local Indians with their diseases).  
Did those larger numbers have an effect on the native population?

Chimp groups are remarkably small for a primate or a mammal -- relying on one alpha male to control both males and females. Once the taxon was out of the chimp niche, into a different habitat (of more wide-open spaces) it would have been very unlikely that it would have been able to maintain that unusual social structure.

Speculative nonsense.

This seems to be the limit of your capacity to 'argue'.

You don't have a hypothesis.

## Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

In a violent and dangerous species,  
groups with large numbers are always desirable, but  
limited resources will inhibit them.

Here you go with the vague rhetoric again. "Always desirable?" You  
don't get it. You have to tell us why those with large group traits  
survive while those without died. See my hypothesis for a perfect  
example of following this standard approach.

This does not need stating -- to anyone who has  
any knowledge of biology -- or of human history.  
Larger groups DO tend to dominate, and then wipe  
out, smaller ones. Ask most Europeans for their  
opinions of Germans.

We're talking about a transition from apes to hominids, you retard.

If there was truly a selective/situational  
factor that  
"brought the need" for larger groups you  
wouldn't have to state such.  
It would be apparent in your scenario.

It is apparent in my scenario.  
I only state it because you ask me to.

It's not apparent in your scenario or I wouldn't have had to ask.

Sorry, I had not realized how completely ignorant  
you were of all nature and all human history.

You have chimps who start carrying weapons  
on a regular basis for no  
apparent reason

Nope -- it's the same reason as peasants in Afghanistan  
and Somalia wear Kalashnikovs. It is dangerous to  
be seen without them.

## Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

Why, there are no predators. And there is no conflict over resources. why would they bother?

Do you really think that there are no disputes over resources in places like Afghanistan and Somalia?  
Or that such disputes as do occur have nothing to do with resources?

All animals dispute resources. Your thinking is worthless.

and you have them forming larger groups for  
no  
apparent reason.

I have explained the reasons numerous times.

Your reason have to involve biological selection.

My reasons are, of course, based entirely on selection.

But it happens only in your mind. Is it a secret?

And it all stems from your simplistic notion  
that  
being able to sleep on the ground,  
supposedly, enables/allows this  
behavior.

There is no reason to get complicated. All agree that the hominid taxon started to sleep on the ground at some point. But you (just like standard PA) prefer to think it was an insignificant event undertaken at no particular time for no particular reason, involving no change in habitat, nor in morphology nor in any other behaviour.

## Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

IMO, it occurred after they became ecologically dominant in treed habitat (HE).

As I said, you think it was an insignificant event undertaken at no particular time for no particular reason, involving no change in habitat, nor in morphology nor in any other behaviour.

There is every reason to believe that they'd do exactly the opposite from what you're stating because there is no selective penalty from breaking off.

I don't get this. The penalty (for one or a few individuals) would, of course, be huge. Death would be rapid for any isolated person or a small group.

This is clear to you and you only. You need to make the details of this clear to your audience. Where are the details. Why wouldn't individuals just hide in the trees?

Absurd. Don't you think that the local population (which had driven them out) would see them?

No, not necessarily.

If those trees had fruit, or other edible matter, the locals would come looking for it.

How would a bunch of chimps get organized in the manner you suggest. Your thinking is absurd. All you have is vague notions that are applicable to any and all species. You have nothing that explains the transition from ape to hominid. You don't even seem to be capable of grasping what this means.

What follows was cut and pasted from previous posts of mine. Pay particular attention to the phrase, "losers or insipient losers."

Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

I have no idea why you think any of it is relevant.  
And it's "incipient".

I suggest you study up on group selection. My scenario is a group selective scenario in which the incipient losers cannot just walk away or they will have an even greater chance of dieing. You don't have this.

\*\*\*\*\*

I've discussed this subject more extensively in other posts.

The nature of the selective process that this amounts to is auto-catalytic (self-propelled). In other words the evolution of the resulting homonid species that would have been the result of this unique selective process would have caused them to, eventually, break free from the niche that normally holds in check the continued evolution of a species.

What is an "auto-catalytic (self-propelled) selective process. I'll repeat a quote by Richard Alexander that explains it: "At some point in their evolution humans obviously began to cooperate to compete, specifically against like groups of conspecifics, this intergroup competition becoming increasingly elaborate, direct, and continuous until it achieved the ubiquity with which it has been exhibited in modern humans throughout recorded history across the entire face of the earth (Alexander, 1990)."  
And, ". . . the necessity of dealing continually with our fellow humans in social circumstances that became ever more complex and unpredictable as the human line evolved (Alexander, 1990)."

Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do

Human evolution is the result of an intraspecies, socially oriented, auto-catalytic, selective process. He was mistaken, however, in his assumption that only if our ancestors first had achieved ecological dominance could they have actualized this autocatalytic selective process.

He was also mistaken not to make a more comprehensive analysis of the environmental factors (paleoclimatic factors) that were in effect during the earliest years of hominid evolution. If he had he may have eventually figured out how our earliest chimpanzee-like ancestors actualized an autocatalytic selective process despite the fact they were unable to achieve ecological dominance.

It's also important to understand why Alexander assumed that only through ecological dominance could our ancestors have achieved an autocatalytic selective process. The thinking that underlies this assumption is not without its merits. Alexander correctly surmised that in order for an autocatalytic process to be actualized there had to have been some means by which the "losers or insipient losers" of any such socially oriented selective scenario couldn't just walk away without losing even bigger. In other words, Alexander realized that a necessary component of any such socially oriented, autocatalytic, selective process had to have involved the participants having little choice but to participate, with the only alternative being sure and certain death. But Alexander was mistaken to assume that only through ecological dominance could this prerequisite be realized.

\*\*\*\*\*

[..]

What are you talking about? All significant resources available to the hominids would be exploited by the

Re: Born To Run: What Humans Really Evolved To Do  
established (and constantly warring) groups

Perfectly absurd. This could never happen with a starting population of chimps (and no predators).

What, on earth, are you talking about? Chimps, like ALL other species, generally MAXIMIZE their numbers in any particular location. There will not usually be anything to spare.

You are assuming human behaviors/characteristics. A selective scenario is supposed to explain the selective origins of human behaviors/characteristics starting with apes that lack these behaviors/characteristics.

Your hypothesis is worthless—sorry to be so blunt.

— the food,  
the shelter, the water, etc. Groups would sometimes be forced to leave — as the result of conflict, drought, etc. But they would nearly always soon die.

Why?

They would find little ...

You're such a phoney. You know what the correct answer to this question is.

You need to stop pretending and be honest with yourself. You do not have a hypothesis. Don't kid yourself.

.