

Re: New Ethiopian Find – Oldest Biped At 3.8–4 mya

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005–03/0340.html>

From: Rick Wagler (*taxidea3_at_shaw.ca*)

Date: 03/18/05

Date: Fri, 18 Mar 2005 04:37:17 GMT

"Algis Kuliukas" <algis@RiverApes.com> wrote in message
news:77a70442.0503171518.4cb35014@posting.google.com...
> "JAE" <jae@ucdavis.edu> wrote in message
> news:<1111072673.958698.250470@l41g2000cwc.googlegroups.com>...
>> Algis Kuliukas wrote:
>
>> > *I stand by the point I made at the beginning and have repeated many
>> > times: Human bipedal efficiency only really works in certain flat,
>> > firm and relatively vegetation–free substrates. As the substrate
>> > becomes less perfect the efficiency gets worse. It's clearly due to
>> > our inverted pendulum gait and this can only be practiced in certain
>> > places.*
>>
>> *That you stand by a point based on anecdote, as you've got no
>> comparison, is perfectly in line with the rest of your quackery.*
>
> *As usual you avoid musing over the interesting subject in question,
> the science and the implications on human evolution and instead try to
> twist my arguments into something they're not and then go for the
> jugular with nasty personal attacks.*
>
>> > *As apes do not do the inverted pendulum gait I think it is reasonable
>> > to assume that they would be less effected, efficiency–wise, by
>> > walking in less–than–perfect substrates than we are.*
>>
>> *That you argue far more about what you believe is reasonable to assume,
>> that you position this above actual study, that you attempt in no way
>> to expand beyond anecdote to investigate the relevent comparison—–all
>> this serves to make you look like the antithesis of a scientist. You
>> are a propagandist with a cultish devotion to a notion that that you've
>> admitted no evidence can move you from. It appears that neither does
>> it take evidence to move you to this point.*
>
> *That your only response is, again, to attack me and not the message
> when you have repeatedly claimed that is what I do to you, merely*

> *shows your hypocrisy and double standards.*
>
> *My mistake was to share the results of an incomplete study with you*
> *that was in progress. Charles Oxnard warned me of this. In most*
> *scientific fields (in the good old days), he told me, you'd send your*
> *results to your adversaries before publication, so as to get them to*
> *critique the results first. People in those days were more interested*
> *in the science, than in reputations, apparently. Not in anthropology,*
> *though. I thought a scientist would appreciate such openness, instead*
> *you've used it as a vehicle to attack me. Congratulations.*
>
> *I admitted that no evidence could dissuade me from the notion that*
> *(shock, horror) water has influenced our evolution more than it has*
> *the evolution of our great apes, true – because, after all, humans*
> *swim better than apes. (It's illustrative how you didn't qualify that*
> *– but left it out so as to make my position look as dodgy as possible*
> *– a really scientific approach that.)*
>
>>> *"Efficient" is relative. You appear to be using it as absolute.*
>> *The*
>>> *statement that bipedalism is efficient in certain substrates is*
>>> *meaningless without external reference on those substrates.*
>>>
>>> *I know and I've given that relative data several times. Walking in*
>>> *tall grass is a lot more expansive than walking on concrete.*
>>>
>>> *Again assuming that your study was performed in such a way that it was*
>>> *worth a damn (and this is an assumption rather than anything I'd advise*
>>> *people to do) you have no comparison with which to view the relevance*
>>> *of this.*
>
> *Not yet, but I will have. Note that I am not slinging four-letter*
> *insults your way in response to the repeated, blatant slurs against my*
> *methods, although that is surely the deserved response.*
>
> *[... snipped yet more bitter vitriol ...]*
>
> *I wasted enough time trying to communicate with you. All you are*
> *interested in is reputation, not the subject, not the science, nor the*
> *implications. You come here, not to share knowledge, ideas and*
> *enlightenment but to strut around like some pompous old professor,*
> *determined to show how superior he is and how stupid and inferior*
> *anyone is who dares to challenge him. Specifically, as far as I'm*
> *concerned, you seem to come here to pick on me like some great*
> *lumbering pretentious academic bully. Well... up yours, Jason! (Sticks*
> *middle finger in general direction of the computer screen.)*
>
> *Algis Kuliukas*

In this latest go-round all Jason is trying to do is establish the point that if you want to make a comparative argument

you have to make a comparison between the types of locomotion at issue. Simple enough point I should have thought. Comparing humans in different substrates does not help you engage the issue that is your professed interest. All it does is prove that gravity is a real phenomenon and has measurable effects. Its good to establish the basics but don't get carried away with it.

Rick Wagler