

Re: Recommendations for effective online scientific discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg02423.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 Jul 2008 06:17:55 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 24, 8:14 am, "Juan R." González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote on Thu, 24 Jul 2008 05:24:58 -0700:

(newsgroups
sci.physics.relativity,sci.physics,sci.bio.misc,sci.chem,sci.math
)

On Jul 23, 9:43 am, "Juan R." González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote on Tue, 22 Jul 2008 12:53:36 -0700:

On Jul 22, 4:22 am, "Juan R."
González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

This set of
recommendations was first
prepared after noticing some
nasty behaviors on the
USENET. Initially, I
embraced the usual
recommendation to ignore
trolls, crackpots, liars,
flamers, and
other nasty posters.

Re: Recommendations for effective online scientific discussion

It depends on how you measure efficacy of online scientific discussion. What is it you hope gets accomplished on a newsgroup?

I think it is more effective to notice lies, ad honimen, and nonsenses but without participating in further discussion, maintaining noise to acceptable 'minimum'.

That doesn't answer what I asked you.

It did. It gives a meaning to I mean by more effective discussion.

You just gave me some examples of tactics you use to deal with examples of what you consider to be bad behavior.

I gave below some examples of what I consider to be bad behavior for the sake of illustration.

Of course, I am aware that I consider bad content the continued nonsenses, the straw man the lies, the falsification of archives or ratings for promoting ad hominem.

Others are much more worried about some minor technological topics such as a 441 error in the followup-to header.

One folk (I don't remember who) worried a lot of about changing the subject title. It seems to me a good idea. Actually your personal non-scientific discussion with Tom Potter is labeled in a separated thread which I can easily filter by title and further ignore your mutual accusations.

I find that rather effective when reading entire threads.

Again, if you disagree, just follows your own rules or that you want.

I asked you what you think would be a measurable indicator of *effective* online scientific discussion? If *effective* online

Re: Recommendations for effective online scientific discussion
scientific discussion is occurring, what gets accomplished?

Can you please answer the above question, since this is the one I'm interested in getting your read on?

This may be qualitatively understood as follow.

The thread about massive and massless photons started fine with several people posting interesting stuff. E.g. Igor did the more important post to help to understand why Hamiltonian (2) would be just (1).

But the whole thread got full of noise, once Eric, Dono and others nasty posters participated here with their usual ad hominem lies and nonsenses.

In the past, if Eric had wrote the nonsense

"No. The special relativistic Hamiltonian is $H = L = -mc^2 \cdot [1 - v^2/c^2]$."

I had simply ignored because I recommended to ignore nonsense. But I don't see now reason for which I may ignore nonsense as that of above without warning to novices, non-physicists, and the like.

Today I would still notice how wrong Eric was, but I had not participated in subsequent discussion and the whole thread had been rather free of noise and nasty content, also from mine :-(

Re: Recommendations for effective online scientific discussion

Another reason is

<http://www.canonicalscience.org/en/miscellaneouszone/guidelines.html>

"Forget that nasty people. When you correct some of their mistakes, they often reply by making more mistakes, which you also feel obligated to correct. Avoid this trap also! It fills the network with useless noise in some exponential way as has been proven recently."

After several postings for justifying his mistake about relativity Eric wrote another nonsense

"But since you are pitching a shitfit over it, here: $v = p/m$
 $\rightarrow H = -$
 $mc^2 [1 - p^2 / (mc)^2]^{1/2}$ "

which contains new mistakes to be added to the large list of mistakes Eric was doing before.

If then I had the guidelines ready and operative like now, that mistake from Eric had never been posted, because once noticed his initial nonsense I had not continued to correct him.

I consider to maintain noise to a minimum and enclosed being more effective that leaving noise and mistakes to spread freely from threads.

Re: Recommendations for effective online scientific discussion

That was my MISTAKE when I recommended to completely ignore lies, ad hominem, and nonsense. They had the feeling they could post anything they want because I would never reply.

If you don't like guidelines don't use. If you prefer previous version, use previous version. If you think may be improved say me how. If you don't care then...

[#] To say one poster who I have also corrected in the past.

--
Center for CANONICAL |SCIENCE)
<http://canonicscience.org>

--<http://www.canonicscience.org/en/miscellaneouszone/guidelines.html>