

Re: Savanna mammals

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-01/msg00782.html>

- *From:* Lee Olsen <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 21 Jan 2008 04:33:17 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 20, 10:59 pm, Marc Verhaegen <m_verhae...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I'm not interested in just-so opinions, I'm interested in serious arguments.

Aquatic Ape (non)Theory: Comments on a Recent Guest Lecture
by

Cameron M. Smith

PhD, Department of Archaeology

"If you were among the unfortunate crowd who spent a good amount of time listening to visiting lecturer Elaine Morgan recently, regarding the 'Aquatic Ape Theory', be advised of the following points.

1. Aquatic Ape Theory has been scientifically reviewed, and, despite what was presented at this lecture, it has been found to be severely wanting. AAT is not a 'credible alternative theory'; it is what is known as a post-hoc accommodative argument. Strictly speaking AAT does not really have a coherent body of theory, only a few disassociated (non)explanations for a few biological characteristics of the genus Homo. People should be aware that AAT is NOT 'mainstream' or 'a viable alternative' as claimed at the lecture.

2. AAT is poorly regarded because it is a poor explanatory device. It is poorly regarded because it has been examined and found to be invalid. It is not poorly regarded because of some scientific cover-up or paranoia. It is not poorly regarded because scientists cannot accept change. Scientific knowledge does change, all the time, and it has been pointed out that science is the worst place to try to hide anything because fraud will be exposed through experiment. AAT is simply a theory that has been evaluated (and ditched) by most serious anthropologists.

3. The presentation on 14 October is an embarrassment to Simon Fraser University, and the sponsoring hosts. How this pop/crypto/science 'theory' was given equal billing with real research efforts is beyond me. The fact that the 'theory' was included in a series of lecture