

## Re: Polymorphism in genomics Re: subtract orangutan genome from chimpanzee genome to gain Throwing genes

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-07/1416.html>

---

**From:** Archimedes Plutonium ([a\\_plutonium\\_at\\_iw.net](mailto:a_plutonium_at_iw.net))

**Date:** 07/28/04

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 2004 13:35:22 -0500

27 Jul 2004 23:44:41 -0700 Ray Audette wrote:

> Archimedes Plutonium <[a\\_plutonium@iw.net](mailto:a_plutonium@iw.net)> wrote in message  
> > Well, you have to be able to distinguish in an environment, which is the >driving force for change in a  
> species. In this case it is simple to distinguish.  
> >  
> > On one side with have a new behaviour some 10 million years ago of Stone and Rock throwing.  
> > On the other side, Ray claims importance to brain shape and left and right  
> > hemisphere.  
>  
> A skull shape that began with Hominids 10 million years ago.  
>

Well, tell me Ray, what is the evidence of a longitudinally asymmetric skull for Oreopithecus? For Orrorin?  
Who was the ancestor of Oreopithecus and does it display a longitudinal  
asymmetry?

I am guessing that you are speculating that longitudinal asymmetry is to increased proficiency of stone and  
rock Throwing that stereoscopic vision is to increased proficiency in stone and  
rock throwing. Stereoscopic vision in the sense that one sees better, sees further and sees the location better  
than nonstereoscopic vision. Interesting also in that the Opposable Thumb is  
related to Stereoscopic Vision. So, then, Ray would contend that a Opposable Thumb is directly related to  
longitudinal asymmetry of the skull. But then I suspect some  
monkey species have longitudinal asymmetry but have no opposable thumb (correct me if I am wrong on  
that).

Interesting Ray. Interesting that you focus my attention on vision which I seem to have not focused before.

But chimpanzees and apes need excellent vision to judge when they swing through trees that they do not fall.  
So do chimps have the degree of stereoscopic vision that humans possess?

But to tell you the truth Ray, I think several species of monkeys such as baboons have longitudinal asymmetry  
so that would pose a problem to your claims.

ci.anthropology: Re: Polymorphism in genomics Re: subtract orangutan genome from chimpanzee genome to gain Throwing

And there is another large difficulty in your claim of longitudinal asymmetry in that bipedalism would benefit from this asymmetry in the extent that stereoscopic vision can better see the ground layout before walking and running, but if monkeys who are all quadruped yet possess longitudinal asymmetry. So if quadrupeds also have longitudinal asymmetry destroys your hypothesis.

>

> >

> > *I say easy, because, well, can brain shape force into existence Stone >throwing or drive throwing to various degrees of proficiency? No, of course >not.*

> > *But can Stone throwing create and drive brain geometry? And here the answer is*

> > *resoundingly yes.*

>

> *This is "which came first, the chicken or the egg" argument. Talk*

> *about silliness!*

>

Ray, are you calling Logic as a form of silliness? We all know humans are both biped and Throwing. We all know that human-species started to come into existence about 10 million years ago from an apelike stock. What we do not know for certain is whether Throwing came first and created bipedalism or the reverse. This is where we apply LOGIC which Ray seems to snicker over.

Logic Applied to Throwing and bipedalism: Given a choice of which came first—— an apelike creature that threw rocks and stones and eventually became biped or an apelike creature that walked biped and eventually took up the behaviour of throwing. The logical person can easily detect that the Throwing generated and created the need to become biped. Whereas the reverse of a biped needing to throw rocks and stones is untenable and silly.

The Logical person sees that the only Magnificent difference between humans and apes and humans and monkeys is Throwing and that throwing alone some 10 million years ago would craft out of a apelike line of creatures a biped humanity. Throwing generates and creates bipedalism. Throwing generates and creates humanity from a given stock of apelike or even monkeylike creatures.

IF we had the time and experimentation to do a 10 million year long experiment and given an ape species or a monkey species and with genetic engineering I would induce those two species to mutations such that they had a proclivity to Throw rocks and stones and then put those mutated individuals back into their population and then 10 million years later that monkey species would be a humanlike civilization of intelligent creatures as well as the ape mutated species.

Logic tells us, Ray, that Throwing alone is the engine and motor of change of apelike creatures into biped humans. Throwing can generate humans out of apes. But the reverse is not true, that biped can generate throwing. You first have to get to bipedalism. It is throwing that gets you to the bipedalism.

And as for the stereoscopic vision and the opposable thumb and to Rays claim of longitudinal asymmetry of the skull, well, those are all increments of change needed to make Throwing more proficient. It is all in the Throwing and everything else in Anthropology is secondary.

>

> > *So, once we get DNA or genomics evidence that shows human DNA is different >from chimpanzee and orangutan and gorilla DNA because human DNA is coded for >\*superior throwing behaviour\*.*

>

Re: Polymorphism in genomics Re: subtract orangutan genome from chimpanzee genome to gain Throwing

ci.anthropology: Re: Polymorphism in genomics Re: subtract orangutan genome from chimpanzee genome to gain Throwing

- > *And I suppose we'll get the DNA from pre-human Hominids from coal. The*
- > *DNA for a longitudinally asymmetric brain will produce \*superior aiming*
- > *behavior\*. We know they had that. Please read my references – many of*
- > *them pertain to fields of interest that you expound about on your*
- > *website ( I wish my computer was new enough to view your home-made*
- > *movies, I used to love making 8mm films when I was your age).*
- >

Don't be cynical Ray. Cynicism helps no one.

So tell me to what extent Oreopithecus had longitudinal asymmetry? Oreopithecus ancestors, did they have longitudinal asymmetry? Orrorin, and how does Orrorin compare with Oreopithecus? And can we in a straight line see a progression of longitudinal asymmetry from Oreopithecus to Orrorin to Homo erectus to Homosapiens? Is there an ever increasing longitudinal asymmetry?

Note: Neanderthal skull I suspect was less longitudinally asymmetric than CroMagnon which would then indicate that Neanderthal was less proficient at Throwing.

Archimedes Plutonium

[www.archimedesplutonium.com](http://www.archimedesplutonium.com)

[www.iw.net/~a\\_plutonium](http://www.iw.net/~a_plutonium)

whole entire Universe is just one big atom where dots  
of the electron-dot-cloud are galaxies

Re: Polymorphism in genomics Re: subtract orangutan genome from chimpanzee genome to gain Throwing