

Re: "People first lived in Britain about 700,000 years ago" ?

Re: "People first lived in Britain about 700,000 years ago" ?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-03/msg00296.html>

- *From:* Matt Giwer <jull43@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 15 Mar 2008 22:59:33 -0400
-

bent wrote:

Let me comment out of order.

> my 1st visit to s.a

Wrong newsgroup. Archaeology is literally, in its broadest sense, construction, not bones. Some like to claim tools are archaeology although reall arkies do not. In any event there is likely another sci.something group that is more appropriate because it has participants who are much more familiar with the subject. Without looking, sci.anthropology?

This statement is wrong isn't it? I mean it got my attention. I can remember seeing maps showing the progression of "people" out of Africa which began at the very latest something like 100,000 years ago, and showing how over time the (entire) earth became populated. If it were updated the latest entry may be showing 15,000 years ago, "people" came into North America, instead of 10,000 or even 500 years ago.

What do you mean people? Neanderthal or Sapiens? I have only read some passing mention of this. Problem is while folks can draw grand swatches of glaciers in this imagined maps of ancient times no one can deal with the local micro-climates. All the sea coasts were micro climates and the coasts were where the sea level was during the ice ages. How far people moved inland at least in summer is mostly hope and a prayer based upon very few actual finds.

But NO "people" have even been known to be anywhere anytime outside Africa before 100,000 years ago have we?

Neanderthal was out of Africa some 300,000 years ago and appears to have been in western Europe before eastern Europe although most put that down to simply a matter of what has so far been found. But is remains the most reasonable conclusion from what has been found. They are an unexplainable as the Barbary Apes. Feel free to speculate.

Having never [completely] read "On The Origin of Species[or Races]" I am no expert on this topic and I can only vaguely perceive any simple rules governing lineages of "people" such as

Re: "People first lived in Britain about 700,000 years ago" ?

Re: "People first lived in Britain about 700,000 years ago" ?

the DRAHESapiens. I am not even sure this hasn't changed.

It is species, not races. Species either cannot or do not interbreed. Races are as in Two Wongs don't make a White. They are "I know it when I see it" differences but no speciation has occurred.

However "people" and 100,000 years ago in the North Sea do not go together, and certainly "People first lived in Britain about 700,000 years ago" is *&^^5%%?

Not 700,000 ago by any definition. That could only be Homo Erectus and there is no way we can declare them our kind of human. It would also have been too cold as they show no sign of a clothing technology.

There are other forms of whatdya call 'em, I don't even know if I can use the term Hominids, that are like us "people" but are not us "people" and it could be them whomever is talking about. I need a refresher on who we "people" are: and possibly the rules of lineage, something like "for every ___ there is only one ____" This would simply explain scientifically why the subject statement is impossible, and I am confused why I can be reading it all over from reputable sources.

You really need to find an anthropology newsgroup.

I was surprised to see this statement not only in this ng, but also linked from a presumably reputable site. I mean I want to be able to keep up to date on what "people" are doing, but either I don't know what "people" are or other people don't. What's up?

In time of war people believe lies so transparent they would not accept them from children to ease their conscience. Think of "Iraq was involved in 9/11."

--- The Iron Webmaster, 3852

<http://www.giwersworld.org> a1

.