

Re: Stonethrowing theory has a competitor/rival theory of Running by Lieberman & Bramble

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-11/0362.html>

From: Archimedes Plutonium (*a_plutonium_at_iw.net*)

Date: 11/20/04

Date: Sat, 20 Nov 2004 01:15:34 -0600

Thu, 18 Nov 2004 00:27:24 -0600 Archimedes Plutonium wrote:

> --- quoting Reuters in full because I need to debate line for line ---
> *Humans Were Born to Run, Scientists Say*
>
> *Wed Nov 17, 4:05 PM ET*
>
> *Science - Reuters*
>
>

(huge snip)

>
>
> *"Running has substantially shaped human*
> *evolution. Running made us human -- at least*
> *in the anatomical sense," Bramble added.*

I think as good scientists when facing a choice of two rival competing theories that the good scientists take the theory that is more powerful. The theory that explains more and the theory that is the more logical complete theory.

A choice between Stonethrowing as the creator of humans out of apes or the choice of Running as the creator factor.

I say more powerful and logically complete is Stonethrowing because this behaviour by itself can create bipedalism in a primate where before there was only quadraped. And when we ask whether the Running theory had any role in creating bipedalism is a obtuse question to begin with because you obviously need to be a biped to ever become a runner. So in this sense the wise scientist can easily spot that the 2 rival theories of Stonethrowing versus Running as shaping and creating humans out of prehumans that the Stonethrowing theory is the more powerful and logically complete theory. Stonethrowing subsumes both bipedalism and its later enhancement of

running. So Running is merely an enhancement of bipedalism whereas Stonethrowing behaviour created bipedalism and once created then running not only enhances Throwing but enhances bipedalism.

Another aspect is that both Lieberman & Bramble discuss various parts of the anatomy that have changed and adapted to the needs of Running. But are those anatomical features enhancements only for Running or are they enhancements more for Throwing better? For instance they talk about the buttock and the shortened forearms, longer legs and larger disks. But are those areas of anatomical change the areas needed for change in order to Throw with precision?

If the Lieberman and Bramble theory of Running had any credence would ask whether there were any other anatomical changes of bones and muscles that were needed for Throwing that had a more dramatic and accelerated change. Are there parts of the bones and muscles needed to make throwing but not needed to make running? I believe so and those changes would disprove the Lieberman and Bramble theory. Changes such as opposable thumb of Rotator Cuff of loss of browridges and stereoscopic vision.

What I am saying is that the features of bone change that Lieberman and Bramble have assembled are needed both for Running but also for Throwing and they are needed more for Throwing. Because the additional bone changes such as opposable thumb and Rotator Cuff are needed not for Running but for Throwing.

So if you have a primate that is quadraped and living in trees and you want to make that primate a throwing and biped and running. Then to make it throwing you need to change the Rotator Cuff, thumb and finger region, arm and leg and backbone, eventually buttock. All of these changes create bipedalism. And once bipedalism is created you can start changing the bones for running. But the bones for running are a minor subset of the bones needed for Throwing.

Question: looking at early primates, how much of a anatomy change is needed to make Throwing with skill and how much is needed to make Running? Is it not easier to make changes in buttock and shortened forearm than it is to remove browridges and to make Rotator Cuff and Opposable thumb?

So the bones to do Throwing with skill takes a longer period of time to change than to change the bones of a biped to be able for the biped to run proficiently.

Archimedes Plutonium
www.iw.net/~a_plutonium
whole entire Universe is just one big atom where dots
of the electron-dot-cloud are galaxies