

# Humans vs Hominids, the major differences.

By Theodore A. Holden

The Neanderthal and presumably other related hominid groups were land predators, well adapted to conditions on this planet some tens of thousands of years ago. The thick fur coats were adapted to ice age conditions and the huge eyes were adaptations to the perpetual twilight of the Purple Dawn age which scholars like Dwardu Cardona and Troy McLachlan describe.

<http://saturndeathcult.com/the-sturn-death-cult-part-1/a-timeless-age-in-a-purple-haze/>

The Neanderthal was not diurnal and would have had difficulty dealing with direct sunlight. He simply never saw anything which we would call daylight.

Likewise early human needles are common while nobody has ever found the first Neanderthal needle. A creature with a 6" thick fur coat simply does not require needles.

Humans are totally different from all of that, and are basically aquatic mammals.

<https://tinyurl.com/y3w2qvm5>

Elaine Morgan listed a hundred or so traits which we share with other aquatic mammals but there are a few which stand out:

- Voluntary control of breathing which is an adaptation for swimming and diving. We take that for granted but monkeys and apes do not have it. That is the only reason they cannot teach chimps and gorillas to speak English (they can be taught to communicate using deaf signs perfectly well).
- Face to face sex. Marine mammals do that, land animals generally don't.
- Shoulders adapted for swim strokes. The motion to swim is the same as to throw something like a javelin or use an atlatl. Humans have that, primates and hominids never did. That is why Neanderthals were limited to thrusting spears while early humans had atlatls and javelins.
- Lack of a decent sense of smell. All land prey animals have vastly better senses of smell than humans do and would go extinct very quickly if they did not. A sense of smell is not terribly important to an aquatic mammal.

Again, Elaine Morgan lists something like a hundred such aquatic traits. Elaine Morgan's aquatic ape theory can be viewed two ways. Viewed as a new version of evolutionism, it is just another flavor of BS. Viewed as a theory of human adaptation, it is the best theory that has ever come down the road, but it has never gotten any traction in academia and there are two reasons for that:

- There is no fossil evidence of any sort of an aquatic ape ever having lived on this planet, and
- There has never been a body of water on this planet which would be safe for humans to live in.

An original human home world would need three things:

1. It would have to be bright (the relatively tiny human eyes).
2. It would have to be wet (the aquatic adaptations) and
3. It would have to be safe, both from sea monsters and from cosmic radiation.

Some tens of thousands of years ago, there was in fact one body in our solar system which had all of that, but it was not Earth. Ganymede is Jupiter's largest moon, just slightly smaller than Mars. Today it is a frozen icy wasteland. Sixty thousands years ago, it was a fresh-water ocean world with anchored islands and coagulated floating masses of pumice and luxuriant vegetation.

<http://www.bearfabrique.org/Misc/hggenesis.pdf>

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/514483018695199/>

Humans living on that original human world, of course, were aquatic humans and not aquatic apes. The Ganymede Hypothesis is not any sort of a magic wand capable of salvaging the theory of evolution.