

## Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2004-09/0763.html>

---

**From:** Marc Verhaegen ([fa204466\\_at\\_skynet.be](mailto:fa204466_at_skynet.be))

**Date:** 09/13/04

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 19:15:35 +0200

"J Moore" <[anthrosciguy@yahoo.com](mailto:anthrosciguy@yahoo.com)> wrote in message  
news:4c00d.396323\$gE.286961@pd7tw3no...

> > *So, again, you're just wrong. Compared to apes we ARE naked and*  
> > *compared to all primates we're fat. How could that be, Jim? What's*  
> > *your ecological scenario for explaining that? Is it the*  
> >  
>  
> *slightly-less-wooded-than-chimp-habitats-but-slightly-more-wooded-than-might*  
> *-be-labelled-savannahs-because-that-was-a-straw-man-invented-by-Elaine-Mor*  
> *ga*  
> *n*  
> > *habitat? And if it is why did it have such a dramatic effect?*  
>  
> *Both features are quite obviously sexually selected, and in amount of fat*  
I  
> *agree with Pond that this is something one expects to see in an animal*  
> *which*  
> *hasn't had to deal with much predation (for quite some time now) just as*  
> *you*  
> *see with other animals. Again, if it were an aquatic trait, then you are*  
> *comparing us to seals, whales, and sirenia, plus you would see an*  
> *incredibly*  
> *different pattern of differences between the sexes and during the*  
> *lifespan.*  
>  
> > > *well, maybe you don't, but there you go -- are traits "shared" with*  
> > *seals,*  
> > > *whales, and sirenia. And of course those traits aren't really the*  
> > *same*  
> > *in*  
> > > *humans as in those other mammals, so that's another problem for the*  
> > *AAT/H*  
> > > *(and esp. it's claim of parsimony). And of course when we look at*  
> > > *bipedalism, aquatic anything isn't where it's at, but other primates*  
> > *are.*  
> >

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

- > > *Blaa blaa – still banging on about seals and whales. Jim, we've moved*
- > > *on.*
- >
- > *If you've moved on, why are you still using as evidence features found*  
*only*
- > *in seals, whales, and sirenia and claiming these features are similar to*  
> *humans?*
- >
- > > > *If hominids waded through water more than ape ancestors they would*  
*be*
- > > > *more likely to move bipedally. That's not vague.*
- > > >
- > > > *If hominids swam through water more than ape ancestors they would be*  
> > > *more likely to gain buoyancy through increased adiposity. That's not*  
> > > *vague.*
- > > >
- > > > *If hominids lived in hot tropical water-side habitats they would be*  
> > > *more likely to go for dips to keep cool than ape ancestors and*  
*evolve*
- > > > *sweat cooling mechanisms to supplement it. That's not vague.*
- > > >
- > > > *It's vague when it doesn't give any sort of time needed to affect*  
*these*
- > > > *changes – of course, since the features in question are those of*  
> *virtually*
- > > > *or completely aquatic mammals which have been aquatic for between*  
*25–50*
- > > > *million years, there's a really good reason to be vague on your part.*
- > >
- > > *Yes it does – time since the LCA of course. We don't actually know how*  
> > *long that was but if it was 5.5 Ma or 13Ma, increased selection from*  
> > *moving through water is going to have some effect isn't it?*
- > >
- > > *I mean your position is either saying:*
- > >
- > > *a) Our ancestors did not move through water more than the ancestors of*  
> > *chimps since the LCA. (Not backed up by the fossil record and not by*  
> > *comparative anatomy either)*
- > >
- > > *b) If they did move through water more, then no significant selection*  
> > *took place. (Illogical since an increased terrestriality has certainly*  
> > *had traits selected for.)*
- >
- > *Since you are using as evidence features found only in seals, whales, and*  
> *sirenia I don't think the idea seems very sensible, especially since the*  
> *features in humans are dramatically different in differences between the*  
> *sexes and during the lifespan, indicating that they are sexually selected*  
> *rather than due to convergence.*
- >
- > > [..]
- > > > *I want you to do that, Jim. I want you to cite references to the*

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > > > *claims you make. That's what you criticise Elaine Morgan for not doing*  
> > > > *but you rarely do it yourself..*  
> > >  
> > > *You read that page and you still can't tell where Hardy said what I*  
> > > *reported? Wow.*  
> >  
> > *You still don't get it, Jim. I can read your page and I have. But I*  
> > *want you to get into the habit of writing a claim and putting a*  
> > *reference next to it. The technique goes something like this...*  
> >  
> > *Hardy claimed that the aquatic phase occurred in the fossil gap that*  
> > *was apparent in 1960. He wrote "It is interesting to note that the*  
> > *Miocene fossil Proconsul, which may perhaps represent approximately the*  
> > *kind of ape giving rise to the human stock, has an arm and a hand of*  
> > *very unspecialised form: much more human than that of the modern ape.*  
> > *It is in the gap of some ten million years or more, between Proconsul*  
> > *and Australopithecus that I suppose Man to have been cradled by the*  
> > *sea." Hardy (1960:645)*  
> >  
> > *Hardy, Alister (1960). Was Man More Aquatic in the Past?. New*  
> > *Scientist Vol:7 Pages:642-645*  
> >  
> > *See? It's easy. Now you try...*  
>  
> *Check out his later statement then -- what did he say then? Did he mean*  
> *what he said then, or not? If so, you have a statement that it was 20*  
plus  
> *million years, far longer than hominids have existed; if not, you're stuck*  
> *now saying that he was so incompetent that he couldn't even remember or*  
read  
> *what he'd said previously. Either one is damning, yet on the basis of*  
that  
> *you think he should have been taken seriously.*  
>  
> > [..]  
> > > > *I know that New Scientist is not peer reviewed but it's a more*  
serious  
> > > > *and important journal than Zenith.*  
> > >  
> > > *How non-serious need one get before they're allowed to spout nonsense*  
> *and*  
> > > *have it accepted as accurate science? I say that any science writing,*  
> > > *especially that which purports to be trying to get a new idea*  
accepted,  
> > > *should be accurate, no matter where it's published -- you obviously*  
> > > *disagree, so again, just how non-serious does one have to get in*  
choice  
> *of*  
> > > *publishing venue before one's work gets accepted uncritically in*  
> *science?*

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> >

> > *Ideally every single statement one reads should be absolutely truthful*

> > *and fully referenced but, unlike you apparently, I'm not living in*

> > *fantasy land.*

>

> *How many untruthful things are you allowed to have uncritically accepted in*

> *science? Does it vary by venue, or age, or whether one has grandchildren,*

> *as many AAT/H proponents over the years have insisted in newsgroups? I'm*

> *getting on now, I have a grandchild -- can I now write up something in an*

> *appropriately unserious venue and have it uncritically accepted as*

> *scientific fact, as you suggest?*

>

> > *When you claimed that I'd said that Hardy and Morgan's work was*

> > *'absolute trash' I was appaled but, hey, it's only a newsgroup and I*

> > *expect you'd had a few -- so no probs. If you'd have written the same*

> > *thing in the local edition of the Cleveland Telegraph, I'd have been a*

> > *little more pissed off -- but journalism doesn't have such high*

> > *standards either. If it had been in New Scientist I'd have written a*

> > *letter of complaint. Of course such a silly statement would never have*

> > *got past the editor of such a journal and if it had arrived at a*

> > *scholarly journal like AJPA they wouldn't have even opened the*

> > *envelope.*

> >

> > *Elaine Morgan made errors but so does everyone, even you.*

>

> *I'm not insisting that scientists accept my radical new theory -- and I've*

> *got a grandkid! Where do I apply for "my I'm an old grandpa get into*

> *science free" card?*

>

> > [..]

> > > *"It may be objected that children have to be taught to swim; but the*

> > > *same is true of young otters, and I should regard them as more*

> > > *aquatic*

> > > *than Man has been." Hardy (1960:643)*

> > > >

> > > > *"Nobody has suggested that they turned into mermen and mermaids.*

*They*

> > > > *would have been water-adapted apes in the same sense that an otter*

*is*

> > > > *a water-adapted mustelid. If we knew nothing of the otter except*

*what*

> > > > *we can deduce from its bare bones, it would take a clever scientist*

*to*

> > > > *detect that it was any more aquatic than its cousins the stoats and*

> > > > *the polecats." Morgan (1997:31)*

> > > >

> > > > *"In an environment which combined trees and water ( a flooded forest*

> > > > *or an offshore island dwindling as the sea level rose) the more*

> > > > *dominant males would have had first call on the diminished reserves*

*of*

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > > > *the traditional food source and would have continued to confine*  
> > > > *themselves to it. In any society, long-established dominance tends*  
to  
> > > > *lead to conservatism. The hungrier females could have been driven to*  
> > > > *seek for less familiar things to eat and would have found them in*  
> > > > *water." Morgan (1997:100)*  
> > >  
> > > *Yes, they can say that, but look at the features they say we got as a*  
> > > *result, and what other creatures have them, and you see that these*  
> > > *statements you've quoted are disingenuous.*  
> >  
> > *Well yes, let's look at those features and those creatures...*  
> >  
> > *Apes wade bipedally ... and we walk bipedally on land.*  
> > *Apes don't swim as well as we do ... and they're less buoyant.*  
> > *Shaving body hair reduces drag in water and helps sweat cooling... we*  
> > *are more naked than apes.*  
>  
> *If you wish to have the AAT/H simply be one of many entries in a long list*  
> *of things that hominids did when bipedal, you would have no argument and,*  
> *incidentally, no hypothesis -- just one item in a long list. But that's*  
not  
> *really the AAT/H, is it? And look at the hair reduction business -- a)*  
from  
> *the presumed ancestral condition, it seems from the evidence that we could*  
> *have done well to either become more hairy or completely non-hairy -- we*  
did  
> *neither. Swimmers use two methods when it comes to hair -- they remove*  
it,  
> *which shows that the condition we find ourselves in is not good for*  
swimming  
> *fast, and nowadays they often use bodysuits which mimic the boundary layer*  
> *effects seen in dolphin's dermal ridges or seals' hairy skin. The one*  
thing  
> *they don't do is to leave us as we are -- and don't even look at head hair*  
> *and swimming speed. (But then AAT/H proponents don't, do they?)*  
>  
> > [..]  
> > > > *In the New Scientist paper he cites 10 My. In the Zenith paper he*  
> > > > *cites twenty. This tells us something about a) the relative quality*  
of  
> > > > *the editors, b) how much Hardy had declined in another 17 years*  
after  
> > > > *his retirement and c) the determination of Jim Moore to give the*  
worst  
> > > > *possible slant on anything to do with this idea.*  
> > >  
> > > *Ah yes, it's the editors' fault, not Hardy's -- poor fellow. Just as*  
> *you*  
> > > *suggested that Morgan's problems with leaving words out of quotes*  
> *without*

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > > any indication of their absence is her editors' fault... which would  
> mean,  
> > > of course, that her editors also crept into her home or office and  
> altered  
> > > newsgroup posts before she sent them along. Wow -- these editors have  
a  
> lot  
> > > of power, and the poor author. Well, Algis, let me respectfully  
submit  
> that  
> > > that theory is bullshit.  
> >  
> > You missed out points b and c. Editors are supposed to check the copy  
> > before putting it in to print. I'd have thought that any decent  
> > scientist reading Hardy's 'twenty million year' reference in Zenith  
> > would have known better, wouldn't you? Hardy was 81 at the time, I  
> > think your miserliness of spirit is appalling.  
>  
> Again, where do I apply for my "my I'm an old grandpa get into science  
free"  
> card? I am not an ageist as you are, Algis, when you attempt to excuse  
> errors by Hardy and/or Morgan by referring to their age.  
>  
> > > > [..]  
> > > > > But is it uninformed and inaccurate? When he wrote that in 1960  
> 10Ma  
> > > > > could have seemed reasonable. Heck, it even seems reasonable  
today  
> if  
> > > > > you take the scepticism about the molecular clock calibration  
and  
> > > > > assume Pan-Homo split 10-13Ma.  
> > > > >  
> > > > > As usual, you're just scraping the barrel for any bit of dirt  
you  
> can  
> > > > > gather against this AAH but, as usual, when you examine it  
closely  
> the  
> > > > > only dirt is on Jim Moore himself.  
> > > > >  
> > > > > Again you substitute your "10 my" -- you are not being accurate  
> about  
> > > what  
> > > > > Hardy said -- you should have read more than the title.  
> > > >  
> > > > Look, I'll make it easy for you...  
> > > >  
> > > > Click this link <http://www.riverapes.com/AAH/Hardy/HardyPage4.htm>  
> > > >  
> > > > Scroll down the third column, last but one para, last sentence.

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > > >

> > > > *Now if I'd made an error like that, or Elaine or any AAH proponent, it*

> > > > *would find it's way on Jim Moore's 'Can AATer Research be Trusted?'*  
> > > > *page.*

> > > >

> > > > *See <http://www.aquaticape.org/quotes.html> for the original twists*

> > > >

> > > > *and <http://www.riverapes.com/AAH/Arguments/JimMoore/Quotes.htm> for the*

> > > > *expose.*

> >

> > *Nothing to say there, Jim?*

> >

> > *See that? He's very quick to pounce on the slightest error any AAH proponent makes but when you show that he's just as prone to making errors (or are they deceptions?) – oops, he just tries to slip away into the mist.*

>

> *I haven't looked at your site's critiques yet, Algis, and as I've said before, I don't want to assume they are all so facile and ridiculous as your*

> *complaints about my URL. On the contrary, I hope that some might be the*

> *sort of valid criticism that does me a favor, as the Carl Sagan quote on my*

> *opening page puts it. Of course, having seen you claim that I found only "4*

> *tiny errors" makes me wonder if I will be disappointed in your efforts --*

> *but I'll keep my hopes up; I'm an optimist by nature.*

>

> > [..]

> > > > *Now you're saying it isn't "boringly obvious"? -- that was a quote from*

> > > *you,*

> > > > *you know.*

> > > >

> > > > *Yes, Jim. When you quote someone you really should quote more than two*

> > > > *words. What was the context of it, do you remember?*

> > >

> > > *It was one of the many times you insisted that all should read only Hardy's*

> > > *1960 title and ignore all the words that followed, a technique I do not*

> > > *endorse. ("the question Hardy posed was merely 'was man more aquatic in*

> *the*

> > > *past?'* *It is people like you who refuse to consider it in the modest,*

> > > *boringly obvious, sense – because then you'd have to concede that there*

> *can*

> > > *be no serious objection to it at all.")*

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

>>  
>> *So are you conceding that I didn't actually claim that Hardy's paper*  
>> *per se was 'mild and boringly obvious' as you tried to twist?*  
>>  
>> *But see, here's another Moore twist. You know I think I'm going to*  
>> *start a page of 'Mooreish deceptions' myself.*  
>>  
>> *1. "And what, I wonder, given the above, did Elaine say when you said*  
>> *that her*  
>> *work, and Hardy's, was all just incompetent trash?" Moore*  
>> *(2004-Aug-30 sap 'What is the Aquatic Ape Theory?')*  
>>  
>> *2. "It was one of the many times you \*insisted\* [my emphasis] that all*  
>> *should read only Hardy's title and ignore all the words that*  
>> *followed..." Moore (2004-sep-10 sap 'What is the Aquatic Ape Theory?')*  
>>  
>> *3. "I disagree with your idea that one should stop reading after the*  
>> *title." Moore (2004-sep-03 sap 'What is the Aquatic Ape Theory?')*  
>>  
>> *Keep 'em coming, Jim.*  
>>  
>> [..]  
>>> *I'm saying that when you consider the AAH merely as meaning that*  
>>> *'Man*  
>>> *was more aquatic in the past' and by definition therefore more*  
>>> *aquatic*  
>>> *than ape ancestors, it becomes boringly obvious. That's why you have*  
>>> *to take words out of context and twist them into a claim that wasn't*  
>>> *made. This is all you do.*  
>>>  
>>> *Asking us all to ignore everything written by AAT/H proponents except*  
>>> *for*  
>>> *the title of Hardy's 1960 article isn't really sensible, yet if you do*  
>>> *read*  
>>> *more than that it rapidly becomes way less than "obvious" -- not*  
>>> *boring*  
>>> *either, at first, but that feeling creeps up on us after a few*  
>>> *exchanges*  
>>> *from AAT/H proponents denying facts and blaming all the idea's*  
>>> *problems*  
>>> *on*  
>>> *editors.*  
>>>  
>>> *Moore twists. I've quoted many times from the Hardy text. Here's some*  
>>> *more...*  
>>>  
>>> *"On March 5th [1960] I was asked to address a conference of the*  
>>> *British Sub-Aqua Club at Brighton and chose as my theme "Aquatic Man:*  
>>> *Past, Present and Future"... I ventured to suggest a new hypothesis of*  
>>> *Man's origins from more aquatic ape-like ancestors and then went on to*  
>>> *discuss possible developments of the future" (Hardy 1960:642)*

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> >

> > *"I have been toying with this concept of Man's evolution for many years, but until this moment, which suddenly appeared an appropriate one, I had hesitated because it had seemed perhaps too fantastic; yet the more I reflected upon it, the more I came to believe it to be possible, or even likely."* (Hardy 1960:642)

> >

> > *"... This history of the emancipation of animal life from the sea is very well known. I repeat it only because it forms the the background to another story, one that is not quite so familiar to those who are not trained as zoologists. .. We see . ... Again and again ... Over-population resulting in some members being forced back into the water to make a living because there was not enough food for them on the land."* Hardy (1960:642)

> >

> > *"The suggestion I am about to make may at first seem far-fetched, yet I think it may best explain the striking physical differences that separate Man's immediate ancestors (the Hominoidea) from the more ape-like forms (Pongidae) which have each diverged from a common stock of more primitive ape-like creatures which had clearly developed for a time as tree-living forms.*

> > *My thesis is that a branch of this primitive ape-stock was forced by competition from life in the trees to feed on the sea-shores and to hunt for food, shell fish, sea-urchins etc., in the shallow waters off the coast.*

> > *I suppose that they were forced into the water just as we have seen happen in so many other groups of terrestrial animals. I am imagining this happening in the warmer parts of the world, in the tropical seas where Man could stand being in the water for relatively long periods, that is, several hours at a stretch. I imagine him wading, at first perhaps still crouching almost on all fours groping about in the water, digging for shell fish, but becoming gradually more adept at swimming. Then, in time, I see him becoming more and more of an aquatic animal going farther out from the shore: I see him diving for shell fish, prising out worms, burrowing crabs and bivalves from the sands at the bottom of shallow seas, and breaking open sea-urchins, and then, with increasing skill, capturing fish with his hands."* Hardy (1960:642)

> >

> >

> > *"Let us now consider a number of points which such a conception might explain. First and foremost, perhaps, is the exceptional ability of Man to swim, to swim like a frog, and his great endurance at it. The fact that some men can swim the English Channel (albeit with training), indeed that they race across it, indicates to my mind that there must have been a long period of natural selection improving man's qualities for such feats. Many animals can swim at the surface but few terrestrial mammals can rival Man in swimming below the surface and gracefully turning this way and that in search of what he may be looking for."* Hardy 1960:643)

> >

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > *"It may be objected that children have to be taught to swim; but the same is true of young otters, and I should regard them as more aquatic than Man has been." Hardy (1960:642)*

> >

> > *"Whilst not invariably so, the loss of hair is a characteristic of a number of aquatic mammals; for example, the whales, the sirenians and the hippopotamus. Aquatic mammals which come out of water in cold and temperate climates have retained their fur for warmth on land, as have the seals, otters, beavers etc. Man has lost his hair all except on the head, that part of him sticking out of the water as he swims: such hair is possibly retained as a guard against the rays of the tropical sun. Hair, under water, naturally loses its original function...*

> > *[keeping body warm by trapping air close to skin] ... The unborn chimpanzee has hair on its head like man, but little on its body. @ Hardy (1960:643)*

> >

> > *"The idea of an aquatic past might also help to solve another puzzle which Professor Wood Jones stressed so forcibly, that of understanding how Man obtained his erect posture, and also kept his hands in the primitive, unspecialised, vertebrate condition. . . . Wading about, at first paddling... He would naturally have to return to the beach to sleep and to get water to drink; actually I imagine him to have spent at least half of his time on the land." Hardy (1960:644)*

> >

> > *"Man's hand has all the characteristics of a sensitive, exploring device, continually feeling with its tentacle-like fingers over the sea bed; using them to clutch hold of crabs and other crustaceans, to prize out bivalves from the sand and to break them open, to turn over stones to find the worms and other creatures sheltering underneath." Hardy (1960:645)*

> >

> > *"Man, no doubt first saw the possibilities of using stones, lying ready at hand on the beach, to crack open the enshelled "packages" of food which were otherwise tantalizingly out of reach; so in far off days he smashed the shells of the sea urchins and crushed lobsters' claws to get out the delicacies that we so enjoy today. From the use of such natural stones it was but a step to split flints to make fires, perhaps with dried seaweed, on the sea-shore." Hardy (1960:645)*

> >

> > *"Man, now erect and a fast runner, was equipped for the conquest of the continents, the vast open spaces with the herds of grazing game. Whilst he became a great hunter, we know from the shell middens of mesolithic Man that shell fish for long remained a favourite food." Hardy (1960:645)*

> >

> > *"In such a brief treatment I cannot deal with all the aspects of the subject: I shall do so at greater length and in more detail in a full-scale study of the problem. I will just here mention one more point. The students of the fossil record have for so long been perturbed by the apparent sudden appearance of Man. Where are the fossils that linked the Hominoidae with their more ape-like ancestors?"*

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> > ... The gap... Is it possible that the gap is due to the period when  
> > Man struggled and died in the sea?" Hardy (1960:645)  
> >  
> > "It is interesting to note that the Miocene fossil Proconsul, which  
> > may perhaps represent approximately the kind of ape giving rise to the  
> > human stock, has an arm and a hand of very unspecialised form: much  
> > more human than that of the modern ape. It is in the gap of some ten  
> > million years or more, between Proconsul and Australopithecus that I  
> > suppose Man to have been cradled by the sea." Hardy (1960:645) – note,  
> > Jim, TEN million years.  
> >  
> > "My thesis is, of course, only a speculation – an hypothesis to be  
> > discussed and tested against further lines of evidence. Such ideas are  
> > useful only if they stimulate fresh inquiries which may bring us  
> > nearer the truth." Hardy (1960:645) – note the modesty of the man.  
> > He's requesting that scientists take an interest in the idea, that's  
> > all. That nobody did is a shocking indictment on the intellectual  
> > independence of a whole generation of paleoanthropologists. It was  
> > left to Elaine Morgan to try expose the stupidity of such ignorance  
> > but even today Jim Moore still can't see it.  
>  
> Here the assumption is that scientists didn't take a look at it; the ones  
I  
> knew in the field did, and they didn't find it to be sensible -- you can  
> take a look at all sorts of claims and not feel they're worth the time to  
> painstakingly dissect them in print -- it's far easier to spout  
speculations  
> backed up by "false facts" than it is to take them apart.  
>  
> > [..]  
> > > Yes, poor souls indeed. Jim expects you to read his whole gigantic,  
> > > one-sided, masquerading web site to find these extra (extra to the  
ONE  
> > > he reports on his 'Can AATer research be trusted' page) errors  
because  
> > > he's just not tellin'.  
> > >  
> > > I had to create a web site to list them all, I can't see cutting and  
> > > pasting  
> > > the whole thing in a newsgroup -- it's far better to offer the link.  
I  
> know  
> > > it's not the way you're used to seeing things done by, say, Marc, but  
> > > then  
> > > that's how he got the nickname "macroman". I think that sort of thing  
> > > is  
> > > bad newsgroup manners.  
> > >  
> > > But you don't give references to the 'errors' except on four occasions  
> > > and even those are just pathetic. If you say there are more... let's  
> > > have them – WITH FULL CITATIONS! Can you do that?

Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> >  
> > [..]  
> > > *By all means. There have long been a great many uncritically pro-AAT*  
> > *web*  
> > > *sites -- literally dozens by now, I think, and having one that takes a*  
> > *more*  
> > > *critical view (required in science, after all) never seemed so bad to*  
> > *me.*  
> > > *You disagree, of course, but hey, no one said you have to like*  
> > *science.*  
> >  
> > *I thought two wrongs don't make a right, but then that was Jason's*  
> > *argument, not yours. It's intersting how people like JE are so silent*  
> > *about the qualities or otherwise of your web site. Can't quite bring*  
> > *himself to comment on that, I note. It would put him in a very*  
> > *difficult position.*  
> >  
> > [..]  
> > > > *While you're there, check how many of his claims have references so*  
> > > > *you can check them out.*  
> > >  
> > > *I forgot to mention the business about Algis claiming Morgan deserves*  
> > *praise*  
> > > *because she tried so hard for so long, even though her tries were*  
> > *blunders*  
> > > *filled with falsehoods and distortions. In the States we'd call that*  
> > *grade*  
> > > *an "E for effort", and it isn't a compliment.*  
> >  
> > *Morgan's works were "blunders filled with falsehoods and distortions"*  
> > *- Jim Moore (2004-sep-10 sap 'What is the Aquatic Ape Theory')*  
> >  
> > *... that's one opinion.*  
> >  
> > *"I see Elaine Morgan, through her series of superbly written books,*  
> > *presenting a challenge to the scientists to take an interest in this*  
> > *thing, to look at the evidence dispassionately. Not to avert your gaze*  
> > *as though it were something you that you hadn't ought to hear about or*  
> > *hadn't ought to see. And those that are honest with themselves are*  
> > *going to dispassionately examine the evidence. We've got to if we are*  
> > *going to be true to our calling as scientists. Phillip Tobias 1998*  
> > *("BBC Documentary 'The Aquatic Ape Hypothesis')."*  
> >  
> > *... there's another. Take your pick.*  
> >  
> > *Algis Kuliukas*  
>  
>  
> *Then why do you and Marc and Elaine complain so when someone does take a*  
> *look at the evidence?*  
> --

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: What is the Aquatic theory?

> *JMoore*

> —

> *For a scientific critique of the aquatic ape theory, go to*

> *[www.aquaticape.org](http://www.aquaticape.org)*

>

>