

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008–05/msg00712.html>

- *From:* Peter Alaca <p.alaca@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 25 May 2008 01:04:14 +0200
-

Eric Stevens wrote, 25/05/2008 00:44:

On Sat, 24 May 2008 22:52:08 +0200, Peter Alaca
<p.alaca@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Jack Linthicum wrote, 24/05/2008 22:42:

On May 24, 4:37 pm, Peter Alaca
<p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Jack Linthicum wrote, 24/05/2008 22:18:

On May 24, 4:02 pm, Peter
Alaca
<p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

David
wrote,
24/05/2008
20:10:

On
May
24,
1:16
pm,
Peter
Alaca
<p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

David
wrote,

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

24/05/2008

18:35:

On
May
24,
11:44
am,
Peter
Alaca
<p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

David
wrote,
24/05/2008
17:34:><http://www.eurekalert.org/pu>

"Research
led
by
the
University
of
Leeds
has
discovered
genetic
evidence
that
overturns
existing
theories
about
human
migration
into
Island
Southeast
Asia
(covering
the
Philippines,
Indonesia
and
Malaysian
Borneo)
–
taking
the
timeline

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

back
by
nearly
10,000
years."
d.c.

That
is
what
Jack
said.

I
am
happy
you
take
your
valuable
time
to
track
every
move
I
make.

No
need
to
track
you
down.
Unlike
yoy
I
use
a
decent
newsreader.

I
have
a
Google
Group
account.

That's what
I said.

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

Why
did
you
repeat
Jack's
contribution?

Why
do
you
ask
such
questions
when
you
can
read
between
the
lines?
Clearly,
I
did
not
check
whether
ANYBODY,
let
alone
Jack,
had
got
there
earlier
with
the
same
link.
Why
would
you
expect
me
to
do
so?

You posted
it in the
same thread
in reply to

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

Jack's post

As a possible explanation, I have noticed at least two situations this past week where I have posted what I thought was an original thread only to find it part of another thread which involved the same original source. Either newsgroups or Google is getting tired of multiple threads or the Internet is starting to think for itself.

Only if exactly the same title is used that is possible.

It happened to me once with a thread which was out of sight for months.

But in any case The Carl did not read what was posted only 17 hours earlier.

--
p.a.

That sounds right. I usually use the title from the source.

Like everyone else does. That's why such titles (and the same content) are all over the net. :-)

Which is also why the two articles finished up in the same thread. It's interesting to see that David's article has no entry for 'References' so it is not in the thread as the result of being the answer to another article. I note also that both Jack Linthicum and David use Google Groups so it is likely that Google Groups is responsible for posting David's article as part of the thread started by Jack.

Not in every reader it is part of the same thread.

> I also note that Jack's article has followed a different path

Re: New research forces U–turn in population migration theory

into my news server from that followed by David and this may explain why David launched his without being aware that Jack had already started the same thread.

Jack's post was there for over 17 hours.

.