

Re: Polynesian canoes (Re: Rat genes)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/2484.html>

From: George (gblack_at_hnpl.net)

Date: 07/28/04

Date: 28 Jul 2004 13:02:25 -0700

benlizross <benlizro@ihug.co.nz> wrote in message news:<41077A1D.5970@ihug.co.nz>...

> *Yuri Kuchinsky wrote:*

>>

>> *benlizross wrote:*

>>>

>>> *Yuri Kuchinsky wrote:*

>>>>

>>>> *benlizross wrote*

>>>> *in article <41041CA5.283B@ihug.co.nz>:*

>>>>>

>>>>> *Yuri Kuchinsky wrote:*

>>>>>>

>>>>>> *benlizross <benlizro@ihug.co.nz> wrote in message news:<4100441E.11F6@ihug.co.nz>...*

>>>>>>> *Yuri Kuchinsky wrote:*

>

>>>>>>> *I was only asking you to back up some of your claims, but*

>>>>>>> *perhaps this was asking too much...*

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> *Your demand for "specifics" was a demand to replay several years of*

>>>>>>>> *discussion on this group, since you like to pretend that no such*

>>>>>>>> *examination of particular points of Heyerdahl's theory has taken place.*

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> *Yes, some examination did take place.*

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> *The question is about the results of this examination.*

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> *Well, for most people the results could be summed up as: Heyerdahl was*

>>>>>>>>>>> *wrong. But I don't see any point in pursuing a discussion on that level*

>>>>>>>>>>> *of generality.*

>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *Nobody else is interested in going over all that stuff again. If you*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *&*