

Re: U of South Carolina Releases Topper Radiocarbon Dates

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-12/0079.html>

From: Lee Olsen (*paleocity_at_hotmail.com*)

Date: 12/02/04

Date: 2 Dec 2004 09:37:39 -0800

icycalmca@yahoo.com (Daryl Krupa) wrote in message
news:<c70365ef.0411301727.1ee90ad5@posting.google.com>...
> paleocity@hotmail.com (Lee Olsen) wrote in message
news:<40a73547.0411300739.5768f52f@posting.google.com>...
>> icycalmca@yahoo.com (Daryl Krupa) wrote in message
news:<c70365ef.0411262320.52358a2c@posting.google.com>...
>>> paleocity@hotmail.com (Lee Olsen) wrote in message
news:<40a73547.0411241031.52c0085a@posting.google.com>...

>>> <snip>

>>>> *The excavations have uncovered an enormous amount of ground and not
>>>> just a tiny fireplace pit. Where's the beef (oops, I mean humus) and
>>>> better yet, why should there be any in the first place 50 thousand
>>>> years ago? Humus soil does not necessarily form in dunes, but it
>>>> doesn't seem possible that some wouldn't have formed somewhere in that
>>>> amount of time. I have never been to the Topper area, but I can assure
>>>> you out here on the Pacific Coast vegetation takes hold in the dunes
>>>> and on the over-bank flood-plains rather rapidly. For example, the
>>>> Kennewick Man site has 14C dates on humus (this area gets only 7
>>>> inches of rain a year and no oak, pine etc. grows there) and the
>>>> Columbia River has a history of more violent flooding than anything
>>>> seen on the Savannah River. The *no humus* seems like a legitimate
>>>> puzzle.*

>>> <snip>

>>>

>>> *I forgot to mention the most obvious (and most problematic) explanation
>>> for the lack of humic paleosols at depth: consumption by fire.*

>>

>> *I don't think you will have much luck selling this idea.*

>>

>>