

## Re: Bipedal Orrorin?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2004-09/1129.html>

---

**From:** Algis Kuliukas (*algis\_at\_RiverApes.com*)

**Date:** 09/22/04

Date: 22 Sep 2004 09:24:06 -0700

jae@ucdavis.edu (Jason Eshleman) wrote in message  
news:<b7af43cb.0409211532.770434e3@posting.google.com>...  
> *algis@RiverApes.com* (Algis Kuliukas) wrote in message  
news:<77a70442.0409210436.2c8ee792@posting.google.com>...

[.]

> *Jim presents in this paragraph a single point, why, despite his lack  
> of formal credentials his site shouldn't be disregarded entirely. He  
> backs this with two points:*  
>  
> *1) He say he makes an attempt to provide references where he can. He  
> makes it clear in statement that at present it's incomplete--he is  
> explicit about this and as such a website devoted to showing that he  
> didn't do this everywhere is both petty and pointless.*

This would be fine if one of his major arguments against Morgan was not doing exactly the same thing. Morgan's worst book is better referenced than many of Moore's web pages. (e.g. AAT Claims and facts – not a single reference.)

> *2) He says that he won't alter quotes. Following that statement he  
> makes the statement "Pro-AAT accounts \*ALSO\* [my emphasis] commonly  
> use quotes which are altered to "say" something the quoted person  
> didn't actually say; they leave out relevant material from the same  
> source which contradicts the AAT position; or they simply claim the  
> source says the opposite of what that source actually does say." Note  
> the word also. This is a separate idea. It is to this second point  
> that he refers when he says "[y]ou won't find those problems here."  
> While perhaps these should have been dealt with in separate  
> paragraphs, it's still rather clear to which statement he was  
> referring when he said "[y]ou won't find those problems here" as he  
> has already admitted, explicitly, that his process of providing  
> references everywhere is incomplete.*

Ok. I concede that you're right there and I was mistaken. I do think he could have made it clearer but, fine, I can see that I've interpreted it incorrectly.

Re: Bipedal Orrorin?

But this only substitutes one Moore False Fact for another. He says "at present this is still complete and will be rectified during my updates" but at least five/six years and at least three updates on – he clearly hasn't fixed them.

I know you think these are petty, Jason, and I agree that they are.

My only point in raising them is that they equate to exactly the same level of petty error that Moore hypes up and carefully insinuates as being close to fraudulent.

> > *So, Jim, you made the statement "you won't find those problems here"*  
> > *[meaning at your web site] but we \*DO\* find those problems there –*  
> > *lot's of them. So, your statement is simply completely false and is*  
> > *not out of context.*  
>  
> *No where did Jim claim that his website was problem-free. The*  
> *"meaning at your web site" interjection is your assertion, Algis. Not*  
> *Jim's.*  
>  
> > *Was it a lie or just sloppyness?*  
>  
> *"Sloppiness." And it was sloppiness, on the part of you, Algis.*  
> *Jim's clear in what he said he was trying to do and what he did.*  
> *You've misread and misrepresented him. I suspect that the inevitable*  
> *point though was merely a way to try to call Jim a liar without*  
> *stooping to Verhaegenesque directness.*

The point was to show that Jim Moore makes as many mistakes as the people he attacks on his web site.

I notice you have absolutely no comment to make, whatever, about the other misquotes and misrepresentations Jim made of me. Like for instance claiming that I'd "said" Hardy and Morgan's work was incompetent trash. Nor, for that matter, any of the points I make against Moore's web site.

> *[snip]*  
>  
> > > > *7) "the statement [my statement 'extant ape behaviour in water is*  
> > > > *almost totally bipedal'] is simply completely false". Jim Moore last*  
> > > > *posting. Well is it \*completely\* false, Jim? I mean if it were*  
> > > > *completely false then what? Wouldn't that mean that apes are \*never\**  
> > > > *bipedal in water. I put it to you that they are much more bipedal in*  
> > > > *water (any depth of water) than they are on land or in trees. On what*  
> > > > *basis do you say that it is \*completely\* false? I have written a*  
> > > > *masters thesis with a large section showing that it is far from that.*  
> > >  
> > > *Your statement was not "apes are sometimes bipedal in water" or "ape*  
> > > *behavior in water is sometimes bipedal" or anything like that. It was a*  
> > > *flat statement that is simply wrong.*

> >  
> > *No it isn't. Apes are more bipedal in any depth of water than they are*  
> > *on land. In waist deep water they are pretty much 100% bipedal, in*  
> > *thigh-deep water it's theoretical possible (but highly unlikely) that*  
> > *they might knuckle-walk, In knee-deep water, it's more likely and in*  
> > *very, very shallow (a few centimetres) then, if they're foraging for*  
> > *food in stream beds, then yes, they're likely to move quadrupedally.*  
> > *But even then, Jane Goodall in 1968 wrote this:*  
> >  
> > *"Chimpanzees frequently stand upright in order to look over long grass*  
> > *or other vegetation. Sometimes a branch or tree trunk is held with one*  
> > *hand, but often both arms hang down at the animal's sides. These apes*  
> > *frequently walk bipedally for short distances: (i) whilst moving*  
> > *through long grass when looking for an unusual object of searching for*  
> > *a companion, (ii) when it is raining hard and the ground is wet and*  
> > *(iii) when carrying food in one or both hands." Lawick-Goodall*  
> > *(1968:177)*  
> >  
> > *See that? Her number TWO reason for bipedality in chimps was moving on*  
> > *WET GROUND.*  
> >  
> > *Van Lawick-Goodall, J (1968). The Behaviour of Free-living Chimpanzees*  
> > *in the Gombe Stream Reserve. Animal Behaviour Monographs Vol:1(3)*  
> > *Pages:161-311*  
> >  
> > *So again – was it a lie or just sloppyness?*  
>  
> *Sloppiness, on your part, Algis. You seem to have trouble with the*  
> *words "almost totally." You've not presented a case that apes are*  
> *"almost totally bipedal" in water. Jim called you on that.*  
>  
> *You posted this sentence on Sept 15, 2004:*  
>  
> *The evidence is located in primatology (extant ape behaviour in water*  
> *is almost totally bipedal); paleoecology/paleogeography (almost all*  
> *early hominid sites could have been wetland habitats);*  
> *paleoanthropology (postcranial anatomy of early bipeds is certainly*  
> *for upright (hence bipedal) locomotion, but almost certainly not the*  
> *kind of bipedalism we practice today); comparative anatomy (humans as*  
> *compared to chimpanzees have a number of traits which are most*  
> *parsimoniously explained by adaptation to increased exposure to moving*  
> *through water) and that's just off the top of my head.*  
>  
> *That, save your name was the entirety of your post.*  
>  
> *There is no context snipped. You did not qualify the statement that*  
> *the "almost totally bipedal" statement meant only in water of any*  
> *specific depth. He was fair to call you on it. It is a slip that you*  
> *make routinely.*

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: Bipedal Orrorin?

But now you're just doing what Jim Moore does best. (Leave that genre to him, Jason, please). Congratulations, you found a paragraph of mine posted on the web where I hadn't qualified "in water" properly. Anyone can do that. You can trawl through the Bible to prove anything. My point against Jim (and now against you) is that most of the time I have clearly qualified that kind of statement with something about the depth of water and, on occasion, I miss out a few words for brevity. Like Jim Moore, it seems, you have an agenda to portray any pro-AAH argument in the worst possible light every time.

Algis Kuliukas