

Re: Heyerdahl (Re: Rat genes solve mystery of great Pacific odyssey)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/0046.html>

From: benlizross (*benlizro_at_ihug.co.nz*)

Date: 06/30/04

Date: Thu, 01 Jul 2004 09:22:59 +1200

Yuri Kuchinsky wrote:

>

> *benlizross* wrote:

> >

[snip]

> > > *I was going to ask you for a reference, but then I noticed that this is*

> > > *just a selection from the list in Heyerdahl 1952, pp. 92ff. Ho hum.*

> > > >

> > > *Ross Clark*

> > >

> > > *I see... So it seems like, according to Dr. Clark's system*

> > > *of values,*

> > >

> > > *1. Anything that Heyerdahl has ever said is automatically*

> > > *wrong.*

> >

> > *No, this is not entirely correct.*

>

> *Well, now we would expect Dr. Clark to specify which of*

> *Heyerdahl's contributions to Polynesian history may be*

> *important.*

You don't seem to be reading at all carefully these days.

I simply rejected your ridiculous suggestion that everything H ever said was "automatically" wrong.

> *But, I'm afraid, Dr. Clark has been remarkably short on*

> *specifics of late...*

Still haven't learned how to work Google Groups yet?

> > > *2. Any subject upon which Heyerdahl had ever touched is*

> > > *automatically tainted, and is no longer worth talking about.*

> >

> > *No, this is completely wrong.*

>>
>>>
>>> *No doubt these assumptions do simplify Dr. Clark's Universe*
>>> *considerably...*
>>
>> *No doubt you have not misunderstood what I said quite as completely as*
>> *you pretend to. I mentioned the list from H because you posted it here*
>> *already some 4 years ago, and, judging by today's posts, I am sure you*
>> *have nothing further to add to it.*
>>
>> *Ross Clark*
>
> *Have you yet dealt with what had already been posted some 4*
> *years ago?*
>
> *I guess not... So let me help you here a bit. Here's the*
> *goods,*
>
> *[quote what had already been posted some 4 years ago]*
>
> *The following info is all brought together in Heyerdahl's*
> *AMERICAN INDIANS IN THE PACIFIC, pages 92ff.*
>
> *– special similarities between NWC and NZ, noted by Capt.*
> *Cook*
> *– similar double canoe*
> *– same type of rudimentary sail used both on NWC and in NZ*
> *– the sewing of wood*
> *– same canoes, and same techniques of canoe-making*
> *– same canoe-decorations*
> *– the special neolithic elbow adze: identical on NWC and in*
> *Polynesia.*
> *– the rectangular plank-house*
> *– similar house facade decorations, and house-posts*
> *– mortuary and ancestral poles*
> *– very similar petroglyph designs*
> *– identical pounders and pestles*
> *– identical hand-clubs (patu clubs)*
> *– various fishing implements, especially the halibut hook*
> *– the earth oven*
> *– bark-cloth manufacture*
>
> *[unquote]*

Well, I notice you've still got "bark-cloth" in there, even though it was made clear to you at the time that the NW coast peoples did not make bark-cloth. We also dealt with the earth-oven here quite recently. It's very widespread, no evidence of anything special.

And you can take out the word "special", which is a kind of pixie-dust that Thor likes to sprinkle on various descriptions.

This leaves us with a lot of artefacts that (in Thor's opinion) are

"similar" or "very similar" or "identical". And here I fear we are likely to get into the same impasse as we did with the "totem poles" a while ago. You will look at them and say they are so similar they must be related, whereas others will look at them and not see such a similarity, beyond what one might expect from functional constraints, chance resemblance, and common inheritance from an Asian past. But if you can expand on one or two items and add something to what's on the bare list, we might be able to have a discussion. What's special about the halibut hook, for example? Since the Polynesians didn't catch halibut, what would be the corresponding Polynesian hook?

Ross Clark