

Re: Questions about human aquatic past

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2009-07/msg00041.html>

- *From:* VtSkier <vtskier@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 02 Jul 2009 20:55:55 -0400
-

caldervangogh@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Jun 27, 1:38 am, VtSkier <vtsk...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Algis Kuliukas wrote:

On Jun 26, 8:04 am, VtSkier <vtsk...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

So I posted, in reply to another thread, what I understand about the possible semi-aquatic past period in human development. I got zero, zip, nada, in response. Are you guys going to continue to fight with each other or would you like to try to educate me?

Sorry. You deserved a better response. If I'd have seen the posting I'd have responded anyway. Better late than never...

snip Algis post for space reasons...>

Algis Kuliukas

Thank you for your reasonable reply. I have previously thanked and responded to Pat Crowley and Robert McFarland for their responses also. In my reply to Pat Crowley I noted that my personal interest was in discussing and learning about what happened to (mainly) modern humans AFTER they became what we are now and BEFORE we started down the road to civilization.

Vermont Skier... I am interested in these subjects, too. And, you will find much info about your subject(s) here... if you can suss it out. So, not sure if you have already left for the wilds of

Re: Questions about human aquatic past

Vermont....

We have been physically the same creature since about 200 kya (200,000 years before present). This is only logical, because we are genetically the same all over the world and came from the same stock of people somewhere in East Africa at about that time. We also experienced a population "bottleneck" about 70 kya, which may be the result of the Toba volcano explosion about 74 kya. Sometime after 70 kya, we expanded again into the entire Old World. That group of people that entered Europe is also called "Cro-Magnon" man, and they may or may not have killed off the Neanderthals. The last known Neanderthal fossil was from 29 kya. So, we have been the only "human" species on the planet for about 30,000 years. (Well, except for Flores men and women... the so called hobbits.. they seem to have been a very isolated group and may have descended from homo erectus.... all cool stuff to read about.)

All of the above is hotly debated and subject to change as new fossils are discovered. It is kinda' an outline, and I think you picked up most of the same info in the "Journey of Mankind" video, that I love.

So, we have our physical beginnings 200 kya. I "believe" that our features, and the early inklings of our culture, were present at that time. I have argued (unsuccessfully, but with a proposal for proof) that we were already tending plants at that time, and that we had what I call a "relationship" with the soil. This is sort of a b.s. term, but I can't think of another way to explain it. At any rate, this propensity in our early ancestors allowed an easy transition into domestication and agriculture in the 10 kya range... which... in my opinion... was just an increase in population, and not an abrupt change in habits.

We did undergo a rapid change in culture in the 50 kya range. It is at this time that we start to find art and many of the features that we ascribe to ourselves exclusively. (It is not known the degree to which Neanderthals, homo erectus, flores, etc. possessed language and cognitive skills on a par with ours. Neanderthals did apparently have some music abilities.)

Writing developed between 10,000 and 7,000 BC (about 9kya) from counting systems in use to keep track of agricultural products. (Cf. Denise Bernard-Schmidt). Writing did NOT require any physical evolution. It just co-opted existing language systems and a bit of the motor neurons that were already in place. It is a learned activity.

I would argue that any learned behaviour is not a "physical evolution" part of our existence. Now, this does bring up a lot of questions. For example, humans today "learn" to walk! I argued this point in a thread here on sap called "cultural bipedalism."

Re: Questions about human aquatic past

Concerning the AAT. Some of the "best" reading here on sap was in the days when Jason and Algis were debating various points. It was very frustrating for both men, but as a spectator... wow... good. IMHO, we don't have enough evidence (ie, fossils) to support the AAT. But we do have a lot of circumstantial evidence that is interesting. for example, we do like to "vacation" at the beach, and rarely on the "savanna" (not the straw man version). We can swim (as do all mammals), but, we also can give birth in water & it may be one of the better methods for birthing. ("Squatting" being the other best bet.) I also know that children are totally attracted to & love water.

Current thinking is not a "savanna" by the way. It is a "mosaic."

regards

calder (aka charles a long time ago) (not the charles that wrote that weird book)

ps. here is a little blurb for the AAt folks, an article in the popular press here in the USA from one of our MENSA folks:
<http://www.parade.com/askmarilyn/archive/Sundays-Column-06-28-09.html>

In other words, I am looking for Anthropological studies rather than Zoological studies. I think the discussion of what was the 'first cause' of the physical adaptations which we now carry fall into the latter and that discussions of culture, and other responses to the world about us falls into the former. I also asked if this was the place for such discussions. Robert kindly gave me the names of a couple of listserves which might suit my purposes better than here, but I prefer the easiness and informality of newsgroups as long as the noise to signal ratio isn't too high.- Hide quoted text -

- Show quoted text -

You bring up some good stuff. Some that I've read (Oppenheimer's Journey) and some that I haven't. I'm saving your post and reply at length soon.

.