

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

## Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-01/0836.html>

---

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

**Date:** 01/31/05

Date: 30 Jan 2005 17:43:07 -0800

jae@ucdavis.edu wrote:

> *Algis Kuliukas wrote:*

> > *jae@ucdavis.edu wrote:*

> > > *Algis Kuliukas wrote:*

>

> *[snip]*

>

> > > *Is this shape of nose consistent with any other aquatic creature?*

> >

> > *BZZZZT!!! Sorry, wrong question. Do I need to tell you why? Have you*

> > *not been listening to anything we've been arguing for the past eight*

> > *years? Honestly, with 'experts' like this, no wonder the field is so*

> > *ignorant about the AAH.*

>

> *When a proponent of a hypothesis starts dictating what questions can be*

> *asked of his hypothesis, he has ceased to do science. It was a*

> *question. You do not get to define the right and wrong questions. I*

> *realize that you still quite naively only like to look at humans and*

> *apes when the comparison with anything else doesn't fit your position,*

> *but you're not doing science in the process. You're engaging in pure*

> *propaganda defining the debate as you see it.*

As the AAH is not proposing that humans were ever 'aquatic' in the literal sense of the word, it's a false comparison.

> *I've been listening to what you've said, Algis, but much of what you've*

> *said is just bogus, irresponsible, and quite certainly not any way to*

> *go about a real scientific investigation.*

>

Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

- > *You're now trying once again to attack my credibility by implying that*
- > *A) I've said I'm an 'expert' and B) implying that I don't know*
- > *anything. I'm not aware that I've ever referred to myself as an*
- > *expert. Expertise is difficult to define. I don't think you're*
- > *interested in my qualifications in any event, so you're just acting*
- > *like a putz again. You're also pitting the "us against them" battle*
- > *again, or was that the royal "we" when you ask if I've been paying*
- > *attention to what "we" have been arguing. I've been paying attention*
- > *to what you've been posting and it's lousy.*

Get off your high horse, Jason. My point was exactly right. When people who are some kind of authority of anthropology (you are a professional in this area, are you not?) continue to misrepresent the AAH arguments (comparing our noses to those of seals, dolphins etc) even after they've been corrected time and time again for several years it does, quite clearly, explain the impasse that has resulted in the field.

Only when people like you actually manage to fully assimilate the idea that the AAH is merely arguing that human ancestors were *\*more\** (more than other apes) aquatic in the past (not aquatic, semi-aquatic or any other self-styled notion of imagined level of aquaticism you think it *\*ought\** to propose) can we hope to make any progress here.

The fact that you are so demonstrably determined *\*not\** to assimilate this point shows that you have no interest in making progress. You prefer to sneer against the prejudicial view of it you have created for yourself.

- > > > *Are*
- > > > *there other creatures who appear to have evolved an extended hood*
- > > > *redirecting their nostrils downward as a result of some selective*
- > > > *pressure of water?*
- > >
- > > *No, but then how many such creatures evolved from an ape stock ?*
- > >
- > > > *Aren't most aquatic creatures who have modified*
- > > > *nostrils capable of actually closing their nostrils?*
- > >
- > > *True, but an alternative way of voluntarily blocking off the*
- passage
- > *of*
- > > *water into the lungs is, of course, possible with a descended*
- larynx.
- >
- > *Making the nose irrelevant. But since you're arguing swimming shaped*
- > *the morphology of the nose, it's interesting that you don't want to*
- > *look at the noses that swimming appears to have shaped.*

It doesn't make the nose irrelevant at all. It shields the nostrils from the water and streamlines the face during swimming and diving and,

Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

whilst swimming face down, perhaps looking for shellfish in clear water, it provides an 'air bell'–like buffer. Compared to chimps/gorillas it's a clear move in the direction of adaptation for swimming.

> > > *What is the selective pressure differentiating our nose from that of*  
> *an*  
> > *ape while swimming?*  
> >  
> > *'Some'. More than 'none'. Enough for natural selection to make a*  
> *clear*  
> > *difference.*  
>  
> *This is not an answer to the question. You are asserting that it's a*  
> *selective difference, but providing no indication that it is such.*

I've done so many times.

- 1) Improved streamlining.
- 2) Shielding the nostrils from water whilst swimming/diving.

> > > *How does having an unshielded nostril decrease one's fitness?*  
> >  
> > *You are more likely to drown. When swimming at the surface, face*  
*down*  
> > *in clear water, perhaps looking for shellfish, having a beaky nose*  
> *like*  
> > *ours provides a 'diving bell' kind of air buffer which would be all*  
> *but*  
> > *absent if a chimp or gorilla attempted to do so.*  
>  
> *Is this true or is it conjecture? I don't believe you've actually*  
*got*  
> *any data to support your supposition. Your probability that one*  
*would*  
> *be "more likely to drown" is not empirical, is it? It's again the*  
> *product of your assertion. Since you seem to refuse to look at other*  
> *creatures other than humans and apes to see what kind of noses they*  
> *have, I'm not sure how your data can be anything other than your own*  
> *unsubstantiated assertion. This is, again, not science that you are*  
> *engaging in, despite your claims to the contrary.*

The scientific thing to do would be to conduct a proper investigation into it. Has anyone done that? Not to my knowledge. But then no-one had published any study AFAIK investigating the propensity for apes to move bipedally in water until my paper in 2002. Presumably, then, before 2002 you would hold that apes were no more likely to move bipedally in shallow water than they were on land, even though it was just obvious that they do. Heck, I bet you even hold that view today – even after the paper was published. Your anti-AAH arguments, as usual, can be seen as ad hoc and selective. Always, \*always\* based on the a priori

Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

sci.anthropology.paleo: Re: Is the AAH a legitimate hypothesis? Of course it is.

conviction that the AAH (in the form you have assigned personally to it) just must be wrong.

Algis Kuliukas