

Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2005-12/msg00045.html>

- *From:* "Sylvia Knörr" <Sylvia.Knoerr_NoSpam_@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 22 Dec 2005 02:23:31 +0100
-

"Aardvark J. Bandersnatch, MP, BLT, DOA" <someonelse@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> schrieb im Newsbeitrag [news:pKuof.650200\\$xm3.565268@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:pKuof.650200$xm3.565268@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)
> "Sylvia Knörr" <Sylvia.Knoerr_NoSpam_@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> [news:dnfva8\\$R3d\\$03\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dnfva8$R3d$03$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>> Hm, since war didn't exactly come as a surprise (given all the ultimatums
>> preceding it), it's hard to believe that Saddam was unprepared.

> Odd as it sounds, that's just about right. He *was* prepared for an
> invasion, but he was not prepared for the kind of force and tactics that
> would be employed against him. He had also deployed his forces in a way
> that
> can only be called backwards: the reserve troops (ill trained, ill
> equipped,
> ill fed, ill housed, and so on) were put on the front lines, the main
> forces
> were deployed in defensive positions around the Sunni Triangle. There were
> several other oddities that I cannot recall, but Saddam simply was not a
> military man, and he knew nothing about strategy or tactics. Prepared,
> yes;
> well prepared, no.

Though I still have a hard time swallowing it, this is the most plausible explanation I've ever heard about this issue.

>> All that, however, is rather moot, since we are all aware that
>>> Saddam & Sons had used chemical weapons repeatedly against his
>>> neighboring
>>> countries as well as his own people (and I say "his own people" in the
>>> loosest possible manner).

>> I thought the facilities to produce chemical weapons had largely been
>> destroyed in Gulf War I.

> Some of the facilities had been destroyed. However, it doesn't take that
> long to rebuild facilities, and he had about ten years to get it done.

Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)

In spite of all the UN inspectors checking the facilities? Hmm...

>>> Usually it takes hundreds of years for a new idea to take root. Modern
>>> American dissonance over evolution is small potatoes compared to the
>> tumult
>>> over the concept of zero, the heliocentric system, and Newton's gravity
>>> (Action at a distance? Impossible!).

>> Ah, I had forgotten about these quarrels. Thanks for reminding me! But to
be
>> honest, all these things are hard to swallow when they come as something
>> new, because they revolute the model of the world.

> Very true. Humans are loathe to change and will resist rapid change with
> violence.

Then again it is amazing that the Evolution theory is well accepted in
Europe, and I didn't hear about any kind of protest against it to be a
normal part of the textbooks in Germany. The concept of Intelligent Design
never got popular in Germany, and anyone who promotes it here is considered
as a weirdo or as VERY naive at best case.

>>>> Thanks, but I can still manage to read a bit of German. I'm rusty,
but
>>>> still useable.

>>>> Cool! :-)

>>> Oh c'mon, I have to read Husserl and Heidegger on a regular basis.

>> In German?? Wow, that's hard stuff. You must be pretty fluent then.

>>> Actual
>>> conversation, however, would be a horror show of epic proportions!

>> LOL, I wish I could be a witness. :-)
>> You probably exaggerate.

> Oh, I do not exaggerate. I have not spoken a word of German in over twenty
> years. Even my reading knowledge is rusting away. If put in a situation
> where German is being spoken, I would rather remain silent. I was never
> anywhere near fluent, anyhow.

I bet your German is just in a dormant mode, you could probably revive it in
no time if only you had a necessity to do it – which you have actually NOT.
I think German is too complicated for a world language anyway. With a
language like this, how could the nazis ever DREAM about being top of the
world? LOL

>>>> At least the outcome is evidence for the fact that our ancestors

Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)

Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)

turned

> >>> to stand up on the rear legs. :-)

> >> At some point they did. Establishing when that point was is another
> > question

> >> and the mechanism of and for that standing is the most intriguing of
all.

> > Alas, it seems that Prof. Niemitz remained vague about WHEN and WHERE it
> > happened. But he is quite detailed about the mechanism.

> Some genetic research will eventually help us determine WHEN the mutation
> occurred. That will help us establish likely species.

Now that I checked Niemitz's book again I eventually found some hints for the "where and when": he suspects the time between 8 and 6 million years before now, and the Red Sea as the location. There are geological hints that near the Afar triangle there was a bigger island in the Red Sea (which had been part of the Mediterranean Sea before, but later it opened to the Indian Ocean). This so-called "Danakil Island" had about 2 third the size of Sri Lanka – big enough to be a habitat for a bigger group of hominids, and it must have been a rich tropical environment with several types of edible plants and animals, and – more important – it was isolated long enough to permit a group of hominids to have their own rapid evolution – with biped semi-aquatic social beings as a result. When the Danakil Island got connected with the mainland again, the hominids could no longer interbreed with their "relatives" in Africa – the human species was born.

> >>> Indeed, it must have happened quickly, and it must have happened to a
> >>> relative small isolated group of hominids (or animals? I think this
could

> >>> also have been the turning point for when we started to be human.)

> >> Hmmmm. That is the quandary... did this happen BEFORE the turn to
> > hominidae
> >> or AFTER?

> > It could be the very same moment in time.

> Exactly. It could be any of those three. That's part of the reason why it
is
> important to determine the date, even with a fair margin of error. Once we
> have an approximate date, we can begin the work that will narrow things
> down. When we've done that we can move forward to establish what kind(s)
of
> environment we grew up in (or into).

We have good reasons to assume a riverine environment with tropical forests, coastlines and rivers to supply the fresh water. And lots of seafood proteins to foster big, energy-guzzling brains.

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: Aardvark J. Bandersnatch
- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: orders

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: Sylvia Knörr
- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: Aardvark J. Bandersnatch, MP, BLT, DOA
- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: Sylvia Knörr
- ◆ **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
 - ◇ From: Aardvark J. Bandersnatch, MP, BLT, DOA

- Prev by Date: **Re: The Revelation By Jesus Christ**
- Next by Date: **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
- Next by thread: **Re: Evolutionary ethics (Re: What does an evolutionist actually believe?)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**