Re: Trying to find some space for research paper.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006−08/msg00919.html

- *From*: "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 16 Aug 2006 13:32:02 GMT

"Felix of The North" <schmuckinitup@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:RfWdnTrWioMR83_ZnZ2dnUVZ_o−dnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
|
| > | Here's what I'd like to do folks, we're gonna write a paper
| collectively,
| > | public is invited, everyone welcome, anyone can get their name on this
| > | thing.
| > |
| > | We develop a paper, and in a couple weeks we'll send it in to the
APA −
| > | collectively
| > |
| > | I need a place to put it where anyone can edit the draft or doccument
| the
| > | research that they have done. I have already encountered the Wikipedia
| > | police, and so I'm thinking to put it on a public editable blog
instead.
| > |
| > | Any suggestions ?
| > |
| > | I'm trying to put something together that will be something like the
| GIMPS
| > | (Great Internet Mersenne Prime Search), except that this will be more
of
| a
| > | theoretical work.
| > |
| > | The central idea is already in place, just need some help making
things
| > | percise, and probably some research for prior work. The neat thing is
| that
| > | we can have as many contributors as we want, anyone cen get their name
| on
| > | it, and if there is no prior work like this then it would probably be
| > | accepted somewhere.
| > |
| > | Any takers ? Tips ?
| > |

| >
| > Yes. I have a newsgroup, hogwarts.physics, a highly exclusive newsgroup
| > that only I can edit. You can do the same, create a new newsgroup anyone
| > can read but only a select few can write and which you can moderate.
| > Go to Google Groups and follow instructions on how to set it up.
| > You HAVE to keep the trolls out, that's a simple fact of life.
| > Keep in mind that if anyone can edit it, you'll need to police it.
| > Potential contributors should APPLY for editing privileges which
| > only you can grant or revoke.
| >
| > Disagreement in inevitable.
| > I too ran foul of the Wackypedia police, the Wakypedia police
| > are as prejudiced as any other.
| > Chris Hillman and Ed Schaefer are not honest, they claim that special
| > relativity is based on only two premises whereas in fact the third
| > premise, essential to the paper, is Einstein's own definition
| > of time. That Einstein calls this a definition and not a postulate is
| > a semantic issue, but I was not able to overcome prejudice.
| >
| > A "couple of weeks" is highly optimistic unless the paper is trivial,
| > few Ph.D candidates will produce a thesis in that time frame and
| > what you suggest would take far longer as disagreements are resolved
| > or not as the case may be. A year is more realistic.
| >
| > It could be that you disagree with me already, and that is precisely the
| > kind of disagreement I'm talking about. If you want it to work, you'll
| > have to be the Managing Director/President and treat contributors as
| > employees. You can appoint Vice Presidents to assist, but the
| > inevitable thunder stealing will occur as one contributor rewrites
| > another contributor's words in a different style. So your first VP
| > should be a competent editor with overall responsibility for the final
| > version.
| >
| > It may seem that I'm pessimistic to you, but I'm trying to be optimistic
| > and offer encouragement. You'll be opening a can of worms, but if
| > you want to try it then good luck, you'll have your work cut out in
| > administration. Being a realist I predict it will fail, I've had seven
| years
| > experience with sci newsgroups and a career in industry. Success
| > depends not only on good employees but on good management as
| > well. I have to tell you that the reward offered −− having one's name
| > on a collective paper −− doesn't really interest me personally but it
may
| > be sufficient stimulus to others.
| >
| >
| > Androcles
|
|
| Yeah − I know. The idea does seem completely half baked, and even a bit
| stupid. But hey − I'm not a professional academic, so I dont really have

all
| that much to gain from getting published anyway, and it might be kind of
| fun. Besides − would'nt it be a kick in the ass to look back one day and
say
| "Once upon a time, when UseNet was still quite young, some loonie amateurs
| created a paper and actually got uit published" −
|
|
| gotta run − the wife
|

Go ahead, have fun.
Androcles

.