

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

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005–03/0687.html>

From: JAE (jae_at_ucdavis.edu)

Date: 03/28/05

Date: 28 Mar 2005 08:14:08 -0800

Algis Kuliukas wrote:

> *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.*

You use the word "promote" in a curious, mostly propagandistic manner, Algis. Please be aware of this. In neither case have I claimed that these papers have definitively answered questions, though both contain something potentially useful. The trick is figuring out what it is that is of use and using it appropriately. You seem to be confused, rather hopelessly so, and seem to rather ignorantly call this a "double standard" though you show no signs that you understand what this term means and are instead using it merely as an insult.

The Krueger et al paper indicated that there is *considerable* doubt that reduction from ape–like to human–like hair would resemble the *elimination of human hair as it relates to swimming. This *seriously* calls into question any relevance you drew, repeatedly so, from Sharp and Costill. There *may* be other explanations that may explain their findings. You chose initially though to question the veracity of their findings and their declaration of their subjects and then you seemed to try to explain it away with data that wasn't presented somehow sorting such that they'd get exactly the same results. Sure, body size might

have factored. If it were your counter explanation, one that smacked of desperation, rather than something unique happening with hair *removal* (again, this is what both studies addressed primarily—neither set out to address hair reduction) required a rather remarkable balanced relationship between size and body–hair covering in the test groups for it to s