

Request For Discussion: sci.physics.fundamentals

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.research/2006-12/msg00118.html>

- *From:* dynamics@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Mon, 25 Dec 2006 17:16:42 +0000 (UTC)
-

[Moderator's note: This is a repeat posting with followups now properly set to news.groups. -P.H.]

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION (RFD)

sci.physics.fundamentals

This is an informal Request For Discussion (RFD) for the creation of the moderated Usenet newsgroup, sci.physics.fundamentals. After an initial informal discussion a formal RFD will be posted to news.announce.newgroups.

NEWSGROUPS LINE: sci.physics.fundamentals
discussions of fundamental and philosophical issues and of research in physics

MODERATORS: Charles Francis, Jay Yablon, Fred Diether.

RATIONALE:

A body of serious researchers have felt there is a case for a new moderated physics newsgroup to allow free discussion of more speculative research than is permitted by the moderation policy of sci.physics.research, to act as a sounding board for ideas, to assist in trapping errors prior to submission for publication, and also to allow more scope for discussion of philosophical and foundational matters. At the same time, moderation is required to keep out both the flames and the noise of patently non-physical theories which characterize the unmoderated groups, sci.physics and sci.physics.relativity.

Posts about philosophical and foundational issues and posts speculating on unresolved issues would be considered particularly appropriate. It is hoped that directing such posts to sci.physics.fundamentals will relieve the burden on the moderators of sci.physics.research, who have to make a

Request For Discussion: sci.physics.fundamentals

decision on whether such posts are "overly speculative" according to the charter of that group.

CHARTER:

Light moderation is intended, aimed not at restricting subject matter but at reducing noise. Under this guidance, the following sorts of material are deemed inappropriate for sci.physics.fundamentals:

Personal attacks (i.e. flames) and overly-scathing corrections;
Discussion that isn't about or related to physics (excepting that purely humorous posts may be permitted);
Multiple responses which all say the same things;
Advertisements;
Posts about theories which are, in the opinion of the moderator, patently inconsistent with established scientific knowledge;
Posts rejecting special relativity, for which there is already a newsgroup;

Posts enquiring about standard theory may not be prohibited, but would be encouraged to sci.physics.research. Similarly posts on string theory would be generally be considered more appropriate to sci.physics.strings.

It is not intended for the moderators to trap errors in posts about research, since that is part of the rationale for the group.

If a moderator has doubts about whether a post is "patently inconsistent with established scientific knowledge", the post should either be allowed or referred to the other moderators for a consensus view.

Posters will be expected to maintain high standards of manners. We should recognize that we all make mistakes, and that making and then correcting mistakes is fundamental to scientific methodology. This group is a resource for those pursuing serious scientific research. Crackpot physics starts not with making mistakes, but with a failure to recognize mistakes. Part of the function of the group should be to assist independent researchers in trapping and correcting mistakes. Corrections should therefore be phrased with due diplomacy.

DISTRIBUTION:

This document has been posted to the following newsgroups:

sci.physics.research
sci.physics

Request For Discussion: sci.physics.fundamentals

alt.sci.physics
sci.physics.particle
sci.physics.strings
news.groups

PROPONENT:

Charles Francis <N...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
(Sub Charles for Notl to email)

Co-Proponents:

Jay R. Yablon <jyablon@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
Fred Diether FrediFizzx@xxxxxxxx

Regards
Ken S. Tucker

.