

## Re: Kling of KKKrap

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-09/0642.html>

---

*ekurtz99\_at\_WhoKnowsWhere.com*

**Date:** 09/09/04

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 2004 15:14:40 -0400

Bob LeChevalier wrote:

> *ekurtz99@WhoKnowsWhere.com* wrote:

>

>> *Gordon* wrote:

>>

>>> *If the word "race" is no longer politically correct, what word*

>>> *should be used in its place?*

>>

>> *The current euphemisms in genetics and genomics are "population",*

>> *"ethnic group" and "ancestry", eg:*

>>

>> *"In the initial phase of the Project, genetic data are being gathered*

>

>> *from four populations with African, Asian, and European ancestry."*

>

>> <http://www.hapmap.org/thehapmap.html>

>>

>> *Of course, these classifications are entirely congruent with races (by*

>> *"Asian" they mean Chinese and Japanese – ie Oriental or "Mongoloid").*

>

>

> *No they aren't. "Asian" would also include the Japanese Ainu, who*

> *look "white", and the Arabic peoples who look a lot like those of*

> *southern Europe, and Indian subcontinent peoples, who are generally*

> *classed as "white". Australian aborigines look a lot more like*

> *Africans than Polynesians, but are not closely related to Africans,*

> *genetically.*

Of course; "Asian" here is used because they don't want to say "Oriental" or "Mongoloid". The word is so vague it can mean anything. I only use it because they do. If they included other groups they would find a new euphemism.

> *The particular project cited is apparently NOT taking samples from a*  
> *highly diverse set of people, but merely from four groups. They have*  
> *several samples from Nigeria, but none from the rest of Africa. They*  
> *are not sampling African-Americans*

>>*If the races were genetically indistinguishable, or so close that  
>>differences do not matter, there would be no need to identify haplotypes  
>>based on race (or "population").*

>  
>

> *You are conflating by assumption "population" and "race". There is a  
> Japanese "population" – they are people who live in Japan.*

There people born in Japan to white parents. These are part of the Japanese "population", ie they are people who live in Japan. Should the Hapmap project include these in its "Japanese" sample?

> *You are making the assumption, as yet unsupported, that the Hapmap  
> population in Japan will show closer affinity to the population in  
> China (you've called them both "Asian")*

No, the Hapmap project calls them "Asian". I call them "Oriental" or "Mongoloid".

, than to the American and

> *African populations. You may be right. It also might turn out that  
> there are similarities that are not known*

There will inevitably be similarities and differences. There *must* be similarities between Chinese and Japanese and differences between Chinese and Japanese and the one hand and Africans on the other, since without genetic differences there could be no visual classification.

I don't rule out the possibility that the Chinese and Japanese genomes will turnout to to be profoundly different. It would be a great surprise, however.

>>*However, the people behind the Hapmap Project (an extension of the Human  
>>Genome Project) will deny the validity of race in their public  
>>statements, so that "\*" and those like him can fool themselves that they  
>>have science on their side. The reverse is true.*

>  
>

> *The Hapmap Project will not answer any question about "race".*

It may or may not; it has already answered the question about the status of the concept of race in science – it is alive and well and living under a new name.

> *To do  
> that, they would have to take all those populations classified as  
> "black", and all those populations classified as "Asian", and all  
> those populations classified as "white", and find that the whites all  
> share some trait(s) that the blacks and Asians don't have, and vice  
> versa.*

But they already do; they are reconizably "white" etc. They get that way via genetics rather than environment, so the differences in appearance must be genetic, so systematic genetic differences exist and will in the fullness of time be identified.

- > *If the racial classification does not match some genetic*
- > *reality 100%, it is subjective and hence not real according to*
- > *science.*
- >
- > *lojbab*