

Algis ranting about AAH

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2005-08/msg00607.html>

- *From:* "Marc Verhaegen" <fa204466@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 18 Aug 2005 13:38:03 +0200
-

>>Algis: Another posting about what the AAH and what the AAH isn't. My question is, again, when, why and by whom did this get decided? I thought the AAH was something rather different.

> Everyone gets to decide – about their *own* version of AAH. No one has the right to say that the AAH is X and nothing else. Well, Elaine perhaps. She is the nearest anyone has come to 'owning' the AAH, she can say whatever she likes :-). But I don't think she would.

>>(Sorry to keep ranting on about this but if no-one is bothered about this here, then where?)

> I think it's important enough to justify a little rant. But perhaps the time for the big rant is now past? The lengthy point-by-point discussions don't seem to be achieving a productive outcome, and are trying the patience of others in this group. Here's a suggestion: if Marc (or anyone else for that matter) posts that 'AAH/T is only about Homo [*]' (or whatever), simply post a one-line reply pointing out that this is only his version and there is no one definitive AAH/T. If I get there first, I intend to do the same. That's all that's necessary. [*] But he has quite a broad definition of Homo, doesn't he? Right back to the HPG LCA. I discussed this with Rob recently, and while it's not an impossible idea, it is – well, a bit unusual. — Pauline Ross

Thanks, Pauline. I wouldn't know why we would obscure discussions by introducing new terms like AA*H*. I never speak about AA*H* and I don't see any reason why I should: AAT is no hypothesis, it's a theory, as certain as say continental drift. If Algis wants to talk about AAH, fine, but not with me. Although everybody <http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~mvaneech/outthere.htm> agrees that the term "AAT = aquatic ape theory" is unfortunate & confusing (it's not about apes & not about having been some sort of dolphin), we can't drop it: it's short & everybody who is a bit sincere knows that we're talking about humans having been *more* aquatic than chimps. I've tried to make things a bit clearer by saying that AAT s.s. "amphibious ancestors theory" is about Homo, and AAT s.l. "aquarboresal apes theory" about ape evolution (arboreals becoming amphibious obviously go through an aquarboresal phase). Algis's problem is that for some reason (his "bipedality"?) he wants to have the apiths in & perhaps even his river hypothesis in. But that is not what AAT is about: AAT is about what makes humans Homo different

Algis ranting about AAH

from chimps Pan, and as Hardy argued 45 years ago: it's about our ancestors