

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/0414.html>

From: Yuri Kuchinsky (*yuku_at_trends.ca*)

Date: 07/05/04

Date: 5 Jul 2004 16:38:17 -0700

benlizross <benlizro@ihug.co.nz> wrote in message news:<40E32F33.12C9@ihug.co.nz>...

> *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.*

Well, here was a chance for Dr. Clark to demonstrate his objectivity, and to offer us a few balanced comments about Heyerdahl and his work.

But, alas, this was not to be... and Dr. Clark declined to demonstrate his objectivity. Perhaps because he doesn't have any?

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

>> *specifics of late...*

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

Still short on specifics?

> > > 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.*

Yes, as I recall it, we'd established that, while the actual cloth that was made by the Canadian Indians and the Maoris was very similar, still and all the modern scholars have made up different names for it. So this was seen as highly significant...

> *We also dealt with the earth-oven here quite recently. It's
> very widespread, no evidence of anything special.*

The earth-oven was the same, but this cannot be used as proof.

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

Let's quibble about a word now!

Dr. Clark doesn't like the word "special".

> *This leaves us with a lot of artefacts that (in Thor's opinion) are
> "similar" or "very similar" or "identical".*

No, here you show your ignorance again (or perhaps your poor memory)... In lots of peoples' opinion. How about Claude Levi-Strauss, for example?

> *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.*

Yes, I know, the word "similar" has a very different meaning in Dr. Clark's private vocabulary.

And, knowing this, I, of course, have those long lists of S American plants that seem to have come to all sorts of places around the Pacific, including Polynesia, in ancient times! 36 of them, in fact!

Available from here,

Easter Island and Polynesia

<http://www.trends.ca/~yuku/tran/teaster.htm>

Even Dr. Clark cannot deny that they are not only similar, but... actually the same! :)

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

So let's see him squirm now.

- > *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*

What's the point?

I already know that the word "similar" has a very different meaning in Dr. Clark's private vocabulary. So he doesn't have to demonstrate it all over again...

OTOH if someone else is interested, we can talk about these things further.

Regards,

Yuri.

Yuri Kuchinsky --O-- <http://www.trends.ca/~yuku>

A great many people think they are thinking when they are merely rearranging their prejudices --O-- William James