

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

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005–03/0659.html>

From: Algis Kuliukas (*algis_at_RiverApes.com*)

Date: 03/28/05

Date: 27 Mar 2005 19:03:48 -0800

JAE wrote:

> *Algis Kuliukas wrote:*

> > *JAE wrote:*

>

> *[snip]*

>

> > *If this is not another example of your 'double standards' what is?*

>

> *This is not an example of a double standard.*

But you promote papers that support your argument even when they are severely lacking in data (e.g. Krüger et al, Rodman & McHenry) but criticise arguments you don't support (like anything I write) for not having enough data. – Double standards.

> *An example of a double*

> *standard is taking a study where you measure the efficiency of humans*

> *over a variety of terrains and say that they've no efficiency*

advantage

> *over some other form of unmeasured locomotion and claiming that these*

> *data are better than others. An example of a double standard is*

> *expecting a far–less–than–half–baked idea about a nebulous hypothesis*

> *that, by your own admission, hasn't even been defined by its*

proponents

> *for the better part of 40 years to get the same play in textbooks as*

> *material that has gone through rigors of peer review. These are*

> *examples of double standards, Algis. You should learn what the*

phrase

> *actually means.*

I was foolish to claim that my pilot studies' incomplete data was better than others.

That the AAH was not unequivocally defined was also an error in my opinion.

But whether these mistakes are examples of double standards or not does not help you in your defence of that claim I point at you. Do you recognise that argument? You use it against me often enough. But I know that you have a different set of standards for arguments you use against your opponents than the ones they are allowed to use against you.

> [snip]

>

> > *Oh, so I am to be admonished because I don't resort to calling you*

> > *names? Well I do apologise. If you were so honest why did you not*

> > *criticise the Kruger et al paper for not even measuring the amount*

of

> > *body hair shaved off and the size of the bodies it was removed*

from?

> > *Instead of touting it as some kind of rebuttal to the Sharp &*

Costil

> > *and Sharp et al papers?*

>

> *Actually, Algis, the point is that you DO resort to calling names,*

> *repeatedly. Your charge of "double standard" or to compare me to a*

> *journalist is your way of name-calling. You mean nothing favourable*

by

> *this but you've created your own vocabular of slurs and slander. I'm*

> *admonishing you for being a twit who pretends to be civil when you*

are

> *not.*

Oh, so you get to define what qualifies as 'name calling' too. I see.

If you get to invent the rules how can you lose?

These are just the desperate pleadings of a man who regularly lowers the tone of the newsgroup discussions to the gutter through instinctively escalating the antagonism to new heights.

I am civil to anyone who is civil to me and I try to avoid childish name calling even with those who are not. I challenge anyone to sift through our postings and compare notes. On the frequency and degree of insults, you are amongst the worst on this ng.

> *Algis, I did not tout Krueger et al as a rebuttal to Sharp and Costill.*

> *I had noted that you were long using evidence for complete shaving to*

> *show that *reduction* could occur from a need to swim faster. I had*

> *noted that you were extending out one phenomenon (removal) and using*

it

> *to address another (reduction). You seemed to claim that this was*

> *kosher. I had mentioned this before I'd located Krueger et al.*

> *[Though this was not a difficult task, it, like so many other papers*

> *that seem germane to your "studies" seem to come to your attention*

only

- > *when someone else points them out to you. Your ability to do your own*
- > *research beyond picking stuff up off the pop–science book rack doesn't*
- > *overly impress.]*

And I accepted the point and thanked you for pointing me in the direction of the Krüger paper. [Note that even here you have to sling in an insult – attacking the messenger, not the message, and then accuse me of doing that – not so much double standards, as doublespeak]

- > *I had mentioned that measuring the difference between*
- > *human hair and naked may not apply to the difference between ape like*
- > *hair covering and natural human like hair covering. The scope of their*
- > *paper was not at all to address this, but to look at a phenomenon that*
- > *had been widely noted and believed by athletes, namely that shaving*
- > *helps competitive swimmers swim faster. They covered this scope, but*
- > *in doing so, noted something curious that suggested that the amount of*
- > *hair removed was not an issue. This curious finding was never part of*
- > *their initial hypothesis.*

But although 'this curious finding' contradicts the Sharp et al conclusion that drag reduction was causing the effects it does not do so unequivocally as there was not enough data to show that.

- > *If Krueger et al had set out to address as the center of their paper*
- > *how different degrees of hair–reduction or hair loss affected swimming,*
- > *they should have collected more data. If they were to do a follow–up*
- > *study looking at *why* there was no difference, they'd have to collect*
- > *more data. I don't admonish people for finding a curious result in the*
- > *process of testing something else and reporting it.*

I agree. So why didn't you state this before? So are you prepared to agree that as the paper stands it really does nothing to contradict the Sharp et al papers – that swimming improvement was due to drag reduction?

[snipped – more of JE's usual hostility]

Algis Kuliukas