

Re: The inhabitants of Easter Island

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2006-10/msg00009.html>

- *From:* "Sylvia Knörr" <Sylvia.Knoerr_NoSpam_@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 26 Oct 2006 01:49:32 +0200
-

"Day Brown" <daybrown@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
[news:JLy%g.102\\$vJ.157767@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:JLy%g.102$vJ.157767@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Sylvia Knörr wrote:

Very unlikely. Once separated, species can't have fertile offspring with members of different species. Only very closely related species can crossbreed at all (like horses and donkeys), but mostly the offspring is infertile.

Evolution works in one direction and can't be inverted. Like two

branches of

a tree, once separated, can't unite again at their tops.

Whether the Easter Island population came from Asia or from South

America,

they share with us a common ancestor.

Not exactly. Turns out, there is no "moment" of conception. Turns out, it takes more than one sperm to fertilize an egg. Millions in fact, not that they get in, but each delivers a few molecules of a hormone that makes the ovum wall permeable.

The complexity arises when more than one sperm gets in. If both are XX or XY, nobody notices the diff. But if one is XX and the other XY, what you get is XXY, which is a hermaphrodite.

And from "Sperm Wars", we see that some are fast and mobile, while others last longer, and hang out in the tube waiting for an egg. And if more than one sperm gets in, they don't even have to be the same species.

Re: The inhabitants of Easter Island

Are you talking about artificial insemination? Outside that, it HAS to be the same species in most cases, or else they don't have any, or infertile offspring. The ability to have fertile offspring together, is the DEFINITION of the term 'species'.

the Chromosome count wont matter. DNA dont zip together like a new jacket, but an old one, with a zipper that'd reach all the way to the moon, with loops hung out unattached, that snippets of DNA from the Y chromosomes will latch onto, regardless of what the count is.

Thus it is that snippets of Neanderthal DNA for big noses, bushy beards, shorter forelimbs and digits as well as white skin, got spliced onto homo Sapiens African DNA.

The idea that we (Homo Sapiens) have some Neandertal genes in our genome, is an unproven hypothesis. The findings of Svante Pääbo tell us that we are NOT grandchildren of Homo Neandertalensis. But the examinations still go on. Let's wait until more information is available.

As for Easter Island, I dunno, but early man got around a lot further than has been generally realized. They found a skeleton in Britain with trace minerals that showed he grew up along the Mediterranean coast.

RG Wasson, "Persephone's Quest" delves into the shamanic use of Amanita Muscaria in pre-historic times, showing us the iconography of the shroom in SE European pre-historic cultures. But then, he also shows us the very same artwork on a cliff face along a river that empties into the arctic ocean 500 miles from the Bearing straits. Curious too, that the tundra in that area did not *have* Amanita Muscaria growing there 2000 years ago, nor now.

Our ancestors got around a lot. Nevertheless someone had to BE the first one at any place on earth. I don't claim to know who was the first human being (or the first GROUP of human beings) who reached the Easter Island. But I'm pretty sure they came from some other place instead of evolving from an Easter Island ape.