

Re: Kling of KKKrap

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-09/0666.html>

From: P.Comm (tjsrno_at_spampost.com)

Date: 09/10/04

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 09:01:16 GMT

"Bob LeChevalier" <lojbab@lojban.org> wrote in message
news:m4p1k0l6ogv6q54lllgvn6cvin2u9ahe9c@4ax.com...

> ekurtz99@WhoKnowsWhere.com wrote:

> >>> *"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 such animal. Remember that the Huns, many of whom ended up in*

> *Europe, were Mongol in origin. Other Mongol tribes ended in Northern*

> *India and the Middle East.*

HOLD on there. Please read this and grasp the BIG misunderstandings that
arise due to one (at the time) insignificant tribe with the name Mongol.

Those people were TURKS, Bob. Absolutely.

See http://www.geocities.com/go_darkness/god-turanians.html

There are some people who believe that

> *Finnish and Japanese are linguistically related, which suggests that*

> *their peoples may have some distant genetic linkage.*

Yeah, Ural-Altaic! Some deny that there is such a thing as "ural altaic"

now (a recent denial) – so then there is Uralic and Altaic – but still,

those two are linked moreso than anything Indo European or etc etc anything
else.

>

> *Tani can no doubt comment more.*

Hmm, same page... :) See the article.

>

> >> *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.*
>
> *Yep, which is one reason why race is meaningless. You can't define
> them usefully.*
>
> >>>*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?*
>
> *I'm not running the project, so I wouldn't guess what they "should"
> do.*
>
> >> *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".*
>
> *Wrong.*
>
> >*In the initial phase of the Project, genetic data are being gathered
> > from four populations with African, Asian, and European ancestry.*
>
> *is a reference to the hypothetical geography of the ancestry and not
> to race.*
>
> >*I call them "Oriental" or "Mongoloid".*
>
> *But that isn't meaningful.*

SOCIALLY it is. SOCIALLY no one refers to Denish Desouza as "Asian."

>
> >, *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.*

>
> *Nonsense. Australian aborigines and Africans are not known to have*
> *similarities to match their visual similarity.*
>
> *And it is only to westerners that Chinese and Japanese look the same.*
>
> *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.*
>
> *No human being genome is "profoundly different" from that of any other*
> *human being.*
>
> *But even Chinese themselves constitute multiple genetic groupings:*
> <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=33897>
>
>> *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.*
>
> *Nope.*
>
>>> *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.*
>
> *Only to racists like you.*

Oh come on, that was a jello throw.

>
> *lojbab*
> --
> *lojbab lojbab@lojban.org*
> *Bob LeChevalier, Founder, The Logical Language Group*
> *(Opinions are my own; I do not speak for the organization.)*
> *Artificial language Loglan/Lojban: <http://www.lojban.org>*