

Re: Request for Discussion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-12/msg02578.html>

- *From:* "Timothy Golden BandTechnology.com" <ttpppggg@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 21 Dec 2006 09:16:20 -0800
-

Edward Green wrote:

I've reserved some real estate on Google groups for one or more physics discussion groups. The format will be mildly moderated discussion with pre-screening of members. "Mild moderation" means that after an initial probation, members will only be silenced for flagrant abuse. I will undertake the moderation.

Any suggestions for content, interest in studying particular texts, topics, welcome. Reply here or email me directly at this address.

The beauty of sci.physics is that it is completely uncensored.
The proof of this is the poor grade postings present here.
That anyone can contribute without fear of censorship is valuable.
The people who shit here are sort of the da da artists of physics.

I believe that the proper form of censorship is a filtration of sci.physics.
In effect the base layer remains as is; an unfiltered viewer sees it all. You as a moderator would then have the ability to present a customized interface to the generic pool. It could even allow access to the censored material, but would allow a user who opts for your censorship to save his own filtration time by reusing yours. Now we could have the option of parallel filtration. Theoretically this would allow a user whose persuasion is aligned with particular other readers to adopt their filters in parallel.

This is potentially a consensus model where universally rejected messages have a high likelihood of being garbage. Numerous features are possible but the beauty of such a system is really the act of filtration rather than deletion. This model might actually cause the shitters to generate more sincere content.

It's scary how megalithic Google has become. It is tempting to ask them to implement this interface. Already they have a simple rating flag. The filtration implementation could be as simple as you replying to the content that you wish censored with a vote of for instance 'errant',

Re: Request for Discussion

'overemotional', or 'junkmessage'. The structure is already present. The implementation is an addition to the existing protocol and so is compatible with any existent interface. The new interface hides information without conceit. A group methodology allows for a master of the group who lets in or denies fellow consors thereby preventing censorship abuse for that particular group which is admittedly biased toward the master. This then alleviates the master's responsibility of reading every message thanks to teamwork.

This is quite a competition model. Somewhat like a stock market democracy. The negative model rather than an 'in' and 'out' model seems to make sense doesn't it? Just 'outing' information is actually a positive format since it tends toward diversity. We probably need a shrink to assess what human behavior will yield under these models.

I do not have enough USENET protocol knowledge to identify the pitfalls of this approach.

-Tim

.