

Re: MV is the most published author of SAP

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2004-12/0667.html>

From: Algis Kuliukas (algis_at_RiverApes.com)

Date: 12/23/04

Date: 22 Dec 2004 20:49:38 -0800

Jason Eshleman wrote:

> Algis Kuliukas <algis@RiverApes.com> wrote:

>>

>> Jason Eshleman wrote:

>>> In article <Xns95C75F885571Dprd@128.249.2.19>,

>>> Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam> wrote:

>>> >In sci.anthropology.paleo, Michael Clark created a

>>> >message ID news:GcCdnZ-Xh4nc-lTcRVnygw@skypoint.com:

>>>>

>>>>> I post questions and you post nothing.

>>>>> That's the way it is with you wet apes. Jason thinks he can

>>>>> reason with

>>>>> you. I know better.

>>>>>

>>>>> That, I agree with.

>>>>

>>>> I think I agree as well.

>>>>

>>>> Algis now says he admires Verhaegen greatly.

>>>>

>>>>> I do. He has shown single-minded determination to put forward the
view

>>>>> that water has influenced our evolution in the face of overwhelming

>>>>> hostility and some quite appalling personal attacks from people

here,

>>>>> people like you.

>>>>>

>>>>> His view that bipedal origins probably pre-dates the LCA of Pan-Homo
in

>>>>> wading-climbing environment, even before evidence like Orrorin and

>>>>> Sahelanthropus was available, will turn out, I'm now quite sure, to

>>>>> have been a brilliant piece of deduction.

>>>>>

>>>>> Admiring someone who for

>>>>> years has shown no ability to be civil is, in my opinion, a flaw.

>>>>>

>>>>> I think his tactics often let him down and have said so repeatedly.

But

> >repeatedly calling people idiots is nothing compared to what you,

Jason

> >Eshleman, called him yesterday, 22nd Dec 2004. You are now to my mind,

> >by head and shoulders, the worst abuser on this newsgroup. Calling

> >someone 'a sub-human piece of shit' drags this pathetic slanging match

> >down to new depths. I notice that giving an apology for doing so is the

> >last thing on your mind. More shame on you for not doing the civil

> >thing there either.

>

> A) Learn to read. I realize that you seem to idolize someone who is

> liberal in her modification of quotes, but correctly, I did not call

Marc

> a sub-human piece of shit as you seem to parrot time and time again.

I

> said he presents himself as such. I realize you were too busy

looking for

> another opportunity to compare me to a genocidal dictator, but do try

to

> get it right. He has spent years being abusive at no provocation.

YEARS.

> He has, to the best of my knowledge never apologized for such actions

to

> anyone. This is the marks of a sub standard human, or at the very

least

> sub-standard socialization.

More hypocrisy. You say that I should learn to read because I mistook your subtle use of saying he "presents himself as a sub-human piece of shit" as meaning he *is* a sub-human piece of shit. (Oh what a clever distinction!) And yet in the next sentence, ooops – the rules have changed, now me comparing what you said about Marc to what a Nazi would have said is comparing *you* to a *genocidal dictator*! Your ability to perform such acrobatics in the use of double standards is impressive, but damning, Jason.

Presumably, by "her", you meant Elaine Morgan there. So, she's "liberal in her modification of quotes", is she? Really? And the source of this smear comes from where? Jim Moore's 'scientific' critique, right? Let's examine that 'evidence' shall we?...

The *four* examples Moore gives on his web page

<http://www.aquaticape.org/quotes.html> simply do not stand up to close scrutiny. I thought you'd read his web site. Clearly you didn't bother to check any of his allegations out but just accepted them as fact.

Well done, Jason. What a thorough scientist you must be.

Here's the summary of that page, taken from my critique...

This page makes serious allegations against the AAH's chief proponent, Elaine Morgan and her writing practices. More than once, he implies that she deliberately misleads and misquotes as part of her normal reporting technique. The heading and introductory paragraphs seem to have been written in a way to lead the reader into a belief that the claims made in her books are little more than lies and deception. However, if one reads the detail of the page one finds that, actually, Moore has only four specific examples to back up these claims and none of them are anywhere near as bad as he portrays them to be.

1) The Darwin misquote. Moore lambasts Morgan by suggesting "Dropping 27 words from the middle of an 86 word quotation of Darwin and pretending it's whole is just not kosher, and certainly contradicts Morgan's self-righteous claim." The 22 words, Morgan omitted... "As Mr. Wallace remarks, the natives in all countries are glad to protect their naked backs and shoulders with some slight covering" did not affect the meaning or the context of her quotation in the slightest. The claim Moore alludes to, made on an internet newsgroup, that Morgan never omitted words without indicating she'd done so with a row of dots, was clearly proven as false, but how many of us have not made such claims and wished they hadn't? Moore does so himself on this very web page. He wrote 'You won't find these problems here', alluding to three types of deception, including leaving out "relevant material from the same source which contradicts the AAT position" when we do find such problems on at least one one occasion. (see the Denton misquote below).

2) The Elsner & Gooden Misquote. Here Moore correctly calls Morgan to task for misquoting a reference to bradycardia as evidence in support of better breathing control. Morgan was clearly in error but as the evidence Elsner & Gooden were citing was still of the nature which AAH proponents would use to argue in favour of the diving reflex, if not for greater breathing control.

3) The Negus quote. Here, Moore is clearly scraping the barrel as he abandons Morgan's early published books and, instead, resorts to postings made on internet newsgroups. Even here, it is not clear that Morgan's omissions made any substantial difference to the argument she was making.

4) The Denton Quote. Moore rightly points out that Morgan misquoted Denton. She used the word 'selective' instead of 'selection'. He also correctly points out that she omitted a word ('appetite') without informing the reader of it. Nor did she accurately show that her quote was only a part of a sentence. However, Moore's allegation, that Morgan's placing of Denton's quote in a savanna context was a "complete fabrication" is a little less certain. Not only did Denton clearly allude to 'Kalahari Bushmen' in the first paragraph of this section but Moore chose to omit that sentence from his own quotation which was meant to justify his allegation.

Even if we accept all of Moore's points, Morgan's changes (or errors) do not really change the substance of the quotation and the savannah context she may have misplaced his quote into could be argued to have been the general paradigm seen for hominid evolution by Denton himself. Impartial readers of this might go a little further and conclude that

if anyone is guilty of attempting to twist the words of an author to make cheap points, it is clearly Jim Moore, and not Elaine Morgan who is doing so.

It is argued here that, sloppy as some of these examples may be, they are almost certainly the result of genuine human error and not any sordid intent to mislead. The fact that Moore could only find only four, very poor examples, supporting relatively minor points about the AAH from a book that Morgan published in 1990. In her five books Morgan makes hundreds of points, most backed up by referenced quotations. Her last book, especially, is relatively accurate in all of this. It is mischievous in the extreme to imply, on the basis of this evidence, that this is a general symptom of all her work.

(See <http://www.riverapes.com/AAH/Arguments/JimMoore/Quotes.htm> for a fuller analysis.)

So out of all of Elaine Morgan's works there is one serious error as far as I can tell. BFD. It certainly didn't change the general substance of her argument that humans appear to have adaptations which appear to provide some kind of diving reflex. As for the others, the Darwin misquote is a ridiculously inconsequential offering. She missed out a few words from Darwin's quote because they were boring. She omitted the elipsis from that quote to indicate that some words had been omitted. Big Deal. It could have been a type-setters error for all we know. The Negus quote was taken from a bloody newsgroup for heaven's sake. Talk about scraping the barrel. And on the Denton 'misquote' Moore was more guilty than she was of omitting selected phrases from the passage quoted to 'prove' his point. That's it. It's just crap, Jason, but I'm glad that have you so clearly endorsed Jim Moore's research methods. I *know* that you'd have been full of damning condemnation if I, Marc or anyone open to the idea that water might have influenced our phenotype more than the apes had been so sloppy. You've just demonstrated your bias clearer than I ever could because you have repeated, and in fact exaggerated, Moore's smears by suggesting that she was "liberal in her modification of quotes." Thanks.

You're also wrong to say Marc had no provocation. Stone walling every pro-AAH argument in the way you have done for YEARS is incredibly frustrating. As you know only too well yourself, one's patience has a tendency to snap eventually. Marc's snapped a long time ago. I sympathise with that but still don't condone his readiness to call people idiots. But even there, people have called Marc far worse than 'idiots' and 'fools' for YEARS too. You just pretend that fact away though in your attempt to vilify and de-humanise someone who's only crime is to understand that human evolution was clearly greatly influenced by water and get very frustrated that so-called experts have argued themselves into such a corner on this that they would rather argue that black is white than admit they had made a monumental and fundamental mistake.

- > *B) You idolize an asshole who hasn't shown a hint of standard courtesy for*
- > *a number of years. You idolize someone who has what goes far beyond habit*
- > *of attacking a range of posters. Is his modal abuse as nasty as I got?*
- > *No, but the prick spent years earning his due.*
- >
- > *Do note what kind of company you keep with Marc. You pick your idols*

- > *poorly.*

Now if I'd have written that you'd have lectured me about not having the presumption to decide what you think. I do not 'idolise' him, nor do I suggest that he is a sub-human piece of shit. Some of us are able to hold more moderate positions.

I'm really only replying to this to remind everyone that Jason is clearly in absolutely no mood for an apology on calling a fellow newsgroup poster the lowest kind of insult possible.

I'm going to end this by getting back on thread. MV might be the most published author on SAP, and I suspect he has called others idiots or fools far more often than anyone else but Jason Eshleman must be the number one candidate for the most abusive poster on this newsgroup.

And with that, I have nothing more to say about name calling. Can we please get back to debating human evolution?

Algis Kuliukas