

Re: When did human races split from one another?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-12/msg00052.html>

- *From:* "chazwin" <chazwyman@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 29 Nov 2006 08:13:39 -0800
-

prd wrote:

In sci.archaeology message
news:1164741667.950050.99220@xx by "chazwin"
<chazwyman@xxxxxxxx> . . . :

Clearly the problem of species is that all taxonomy of life is based on morphology and certain assumptions have been made about the divisions between populations of similar animals.

As the most common definition for species, and the ONLY reliable one, is based on the notion of speciation (separated by the inability to produce viable offspring), we have a problem in that all living things have been categorised by phenotypical morphology

Including the misclassified neanderthals, which is extinct and offers no probability of contributing to the modern population.

Neanderthal may well have been the same species as HSS, as there is no genetic evidence it is not possible to confirm or deny such a possibility. There are individuals in our modern population which show certain morphological similarities to Neanderthals which were not present in the gracile human form which seemed to replace Neanderthals c-30,000BP.

Clearly HSN did show clear adaptations to colder environments and inhabited more northerly regions, but humans on the post 30kBP seemed to survive without many of these adaptations through the period of the last glacial maximum 18kBP. People are still arguing the toss.

, in which underlying divisions are the result of assumed genetic differences.

Re: When did human races split from one another?

Taxonomy is a science, science evolves.

The vast majority of living taxonomy was completed long before genetics was introduced into biological science.

The vast majority of assignments are being revised, bit by bit.

But few actually use genetic evidence as the complexity of the genome makes many of the genotype/phenotype assignments speculative.

The stupidity of saying HEY wait a minute – look at wolves and dogs, dolphins and whales they can breed this means that species CAN mate is quite frankly totally asinine.

One revision is as follows:

Canis lupus domesticus

Canis lupus lupus

Canis lupus dingo

Canis lupus latrans

Fine – nature gets on well without these divisions. The only division nature seems to care about is the species division. Where do you buy your anoraks?? (British joke)

What this actually means is that the taxonomy was wrong in the first place because Lamarck or Diderot decided on the taxonomy a long time ago purely on morphological grounds.

What it means is that science evolves, the same as humans evolve.

So your saying today's science is wrong tomorrow.

Re: When did human races split from one another?

Re: When did human races split from one another?

If race is not real then neither is Darwin's theory of evolution, because the theory was built out of his recognition of races that evolve and diverge over time.

This does not follow. Darwin does not rise or fall upon such tissue like grounds! THE theory of evolution did not fall because he understood nothing whatsoever about genetics! He can be wrong in part but right overall. For Darwin "race" was used very loosely to make very general distinctions.

Darwin was not talking about subspecies or species but a more abstract entity that transitioned from variants to formal 'races' species.

Indeed

The concept of color should be replaced. Mongloids are not identified by color, if they represented the intermediate between Whites and Negroid, then italians, greeks, iberians, middle easterners would be consider mongoloid, and indochinese, south asians, and austronesias would be considered negroid.

If one has to suggest that there is an intermediate between white and black , one could just as easily set the boundaries to say that the intermediate is the original progenitor and the white and black are subspecies that have darkened or lightened: all racial categories are arbitrary.

This may be true, color changes over time.

Traits, species and taxonomy are not immutable.

Re: When did human races split from one another?

It is no surprise that White is usually seen as a bench mark and degrees of whiteness measurable: this is ethnocentricity.

White is a benchmark because the latest and most global spread of individuals is seated in a region where people are coincidentally the fairest skin. Might makes right.

What you conveniently call "coincidence" many recognise as cultural imperialism and ethnocentricity. Science is not without its prejudice.

I should also add that in Asian culture fairer skinned women are preferred in the upper classes as it represents a woman who does not need to work in the field, the skin color is also a measure in parts of India that discriminates the untouchable from others.

Indeed yes. This is very likely how white skin evolved: through "domestic selection". This phenomenon was well known to ancient Greeks.

It's not

just a European thing. There is probably some discrimination here between people who wore clothes and worked in non-labor intensive jobs and people who were dark skinned and worked in agrarian or pastoral practices. With hierarchy also came structural changes in perspectives.

I can't prove it but I like to think that impractically huge breasts probably evolved through "domestic selection" also.

Chazwin

.