

## Re: Homo Erectus Traits in Hss

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-08/msg00559.html>

---

- *From:* Tom McDonald <[kiltmac@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kiltmac@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 19 Aug 2007 17:59:36 -0500
- 

J.LyonLayden wrote:

On Aug 18, 10:29 pm, Tom McDonald <[kilt...@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:kilt...@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Aug 18, 8:30 pm, "J.LyonLayden" <[JosephLay...@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:JosephLay...@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

This is debatable. The pre-scientific world was filled with shadows, and lots of 'common knowledge' that led to needless conflict and oppression. Science shone much light on the world, and dispelled much of the worst depredations of 'common knowledge' that turned out to be uncommonly wrong.

Yes that's true. But I'm also reacting to the general air of this community. For instance, believing that homo erectus only had hand-axes because we don't have any of their wooden implements is nonsensical to me. Wood disintegrates, and common sense dictates that they had them en masse.

To what community are you referring? No one on s.a., to my knowledge, has written that they believe He didn't have wooden implements.

And 'common sense' is not synonymous with 'common knowledge'.

Likewise, if every aussie I meet tells me the same thing about aboriginals, I tend to think it must have some basis in reality.

There are scads of urban legends that many folks will tell you are true. Does that mean every urban legend that many folks repeat as true *\*must\** have some basis in reality?

But what is not debatable is that this is a group in the sci. hierarchy, and the relevant science here is physical anthropology. If

## Re: Homo Erectus Traits in Hss

you want to make potentially racist assertions here, you need to back it up with something other than second-hand stories.

Why would it be potentially racist? A thick skull is an advantage not a disadvantage.

That's what I meant. Why do you think I am inferior to an Aboriginal?

And what's with the PC idea that racism stops with Hss?

I don't know. I don't hold that opinion.

I don't take it as a given that Hss is superior to neanderthal or erectus. If aborigines retain erectus genes and the rest of us do not, perhaps that even makes the aborigines superior.

Superior in evolutionary terms is not absolute, but rather related to the increased survival value of a specific trait or suite of traits.

To consider an entire group superior, when they are currently under fairly intense evolutionary pressure, is difficult for me to understand.

And if there is some truth to it, that truth will be discovered in comparative cranial anatomy.

When? I seem to remember that the origins of the aboriginals were questioned by scientists early in the last century, and the mere questioning brought about a mass protest by the PC police.

Do you remember Mungo Man? They called him a Hss because they thought he was so late. But then they found he was older, but they couldn't retract his classification. Soloensis, which is very similar, had finally been placed in the erectus category after much debate. But then his redating to 27,000 threw a new wrench in their tidy little timeline.

Now they are even classifying Flores as an Hss, even though it clearly isn't so. They just don't want anything called erectus to live past 50,000, so they name things to fit their agenda.

Who is this 'they' to which you refer? If you mean anthropologists, and if there is such an agenda, perhaps it is

## Re: Homo Erectus Traits in Hss

related to the fact that early anthropologists' views on racial matters were so often colored by pro-white bias that modern anthropologists have found it useful to avoid that which could lead to bias in their work.

I think you will find that real anthropologists are a lot like people; like scientific people who change their minds on the basis of new evidence and/or new interpretations.

>> It is also possible that the Aussies who told you those things are

racists, or people who are willing to accept stories that separate Abos from themselves.

Yep that's how you look down on other races– admit that they can kick your arse.

Or consider them so violent that just to keep a viable population they had to develop thick skulls to avoid dying out.

There are many skeletal anomalies among the billions of Hss who have lived on this earth. You have to show that the anomaly you posit is endemic to Aboriginals,

That's a pretty impossible task.

Why? I think it is a pretty easy proposition to test.

Let's just stay in the dark and not speculate or theorize on anything, because we have to be politically correct.

Oh, fuck P.C.

Remember that it was once politically correct to hunt Aboriginals like wild animals. It was once politically correct to think that black Africans were a separate species from white folks. It was once politically correct to imagine that the Sons of Ham were by nature and God's judgment fit only to be slaves.

And remember why we no longer think those things are correct, politically or otherwise. It is because of those in the dark, as you would have it, those scientists who formulated the questions, set up the tests, conducted the trials and found out the facts.

I'd think that, as a writer, you'd be intensely interested in finding things out by using, among other tools, the methods of science.

You might then ignore the findings for the purposes of your story, as many excellent writers do. But you would at least know when you were doing so, and not make egregious errors by inadvertence that your readers

Re: Homo Erectus Traits in Hss

would take as ignorance or carelessness on your part.

I write, too. I am very conscious of needing to know when I'm going beyond the facts, or ignoring them, for effect. I assume from your early postings here that you are the same. God send you are.

<snip>

.