

## Re: Invitation to the new "Flores Man" Yahoo group

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-11/0143.html>

---

*From:* Doug Weller ([dweller\\_at\\_ramtops.demon.co.uk](mailto:dweller_at_ramtops.demon.co.uk))

*Date:* 11/01/04

Date: Mon, 01 Nov 2004 22:35:12 +0000

On Tue, 02 Nov 2004 10:15:33 +1300, in sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens wrote:

>On Mon, 01 Nov 2004 06:35:35 GMT, "I.E. Johansson"  
><[inger\\_nospam\\_e.johanssonx@telia.com](mailto:inger_nospam_e.johanssonx@telia.com)> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>><[joerevskelton@bellsouth.net](mailto:joerevskelton@bellsouth.net)> skrev i meddelandet  
>>[news:VDhhd.8578\\$Om6.4005@bignews5.bellsouth.net...](mailto:news:VDhhd.8578$Om6.4005@bignews5.bellsouth.net...)  
>>>  
>>> "I.E. Johansson" <[inger\\_nospam\\_e.johanssonx@telia.com](mailto:inger_nospam_e.johanssonx@telia.com)> wrote in message  
>>> [news:xX%gd.120634\\$dP1.408284@newsc.telia.net...](mailto:news:xX%gd.120634$dP1.408284@newsc.telia.net...)  
>>>>  
>>>> "Doug Weller" <[dweller@ramtops.thisremove.co.uk](mailto:dweller@ramtops.thisremove.co.uk)> skrev i meddelandet  
>>>> [news:1e756b4x7gfen\\$.79xim0jm3k6.dlg@40tude.net...](mailto:news:1e756b4x7gfen$.79xim0jm3k6.dlg@40tude.net...)  
>>>>> On 29 Oct 2004 13:22:33 -0700, Dan Gannon wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Having been enchanted by the spectacular discovery of Flores Man  
>>>>>>(Homo  
>>>>>> Floresiensis, "Ebu Gogo," "Hobbits," etc..) I have started a new  
>>>>>> Yahoo  
>>>>>> group for discussion of Flores Man.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Here is the link to the new group:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> [http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Flores\\_Man/](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Flores_Man/)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> In addition to messages, you may share files, photos and links with  
>>>>>> the group. Please credit all sources, whenever possible.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Dan Gannon  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Is this the Dan Gannon whose views are similar to those of Matt  
>>>>>> Giwer's  
>>>>>> (although I know this Gannon is a Libertarian party member, and I  
>>>>>> don't

sci.archaeology: Re: Invitation to the new "Flores Man" Yahoo group

>>> > *think Giwer is).*

>>> >

>>> > *Doug*

>>> >

>>> > *Doug,*

>>> > *what on Earth is it to you if Gannon is or isn't?*

>>> > *My point is that a person has to be able vote one way or an other*

>>without

>>> > *being believed to have an hidden agenda if he or she doesn't vote they*

>>way

>>> > *you do.*

>>> >

>>> > *Inger E*

>>> >

>>> >

>>>

>>> *Gwier's agenda isn't hidden.*

>>

>>*No, but D seem to believe that Gannon's is. My point is that we have to*

>>*leave the voting for a party out of the scholarly debate until we at least*

>>*have established such a hidden agenda with our own eyes.*

>

>*My point too.*

>>

>>*We aren't supposed to use our personal opinion for or against a party to*

>>*judge if a voter for an other party than our own is capable of being*

>>*objective in his scholarly work including administrating a forum for*

>>*discussion! If we let our own political belief guide us to who is to be*

>>*believed and who isn't then we are making worse mistake than the mistake the*

>>*other is accused of!*

>

>*Agreed.*

>

And the funny thing is, that I my mention of party was only an aside pointing out a difference between Gannon (not sure if he's the Gannon in this thread yet though) and Giwer. Only Eric and Inger brought the issue of political parties, beliefs, scholarship, etc. into this discussion.

Doug

--

Doug Weller -- exorcise the demon to reply

Doug & Helen's Dogs <http://www.douganandhelen.com>

Doug's Archaeology Site: <http://www.ramtops.co.uk>