

Re: Jupiter

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-02/msg00000.html>

- *From:* OM <om@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 31 Jan 2008 16:21:09 -0600
-

On Thu, 31 Jan 2008 02:57:44 -0800 (PST), Whippet
<naylor.nathan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

How reliable is Wiki as a source?

....Depends on the nature of the article content and whether or not the vandals, trolls and/or trolls with admin powers have discovered it. Here's some rules of thumb that I use to determine whether to use a Wikipedia article as a source:

* If it's a science-based article, and the science isn't undergoing mass-media scrutiny and/or involved in some major controversy – i.e., cloning, abortion, cervical cancer immunizations in teens, etc – then odds are **VERY** high that the article is reliable as a source.

* If it's a politically-based article, it's **always** suspect if any of the contributors are –not– native to the country relating to the content/topic in question. Ergo, if it's an article about Dubya, and the major contributors are not from the US, then it's suspect.

* If it's a genre-based article – i.e., one about a TV show, movie or other entertainment form – then it's totally suspect if you find a lot of bullshit arguments going on over on the article's talk page. Bullshit arguments are easy to spot, and usually involve two or more gender-challenged, basement dwelling British schoolboys pretending to be adults, who either have managed to acquire admin rights by faking support through sock puppet accounts and/or by sycophanting existing admins thru support of said admins abuse of other Wikians. This has been a major problem on the "Lost", "Battlestar Galactica (New series)" and "Jericho" pages for quite some time, and it's usually the same two limey twits – Matthew Fenton and Will "Sceptre" Noble – who are behind it all, and fully supported by their admin buddies for reasons stated above.

* If it's a sports-based article, trust it only if it's locked during and after the playoffs :-)

Re: Jupiter

* If an article has a lot of [citation requested] tags, take a look to see if they're all from the same person. If they are, ignore them, because 99.9% of the time they were added by some dipshit who hasn't a clue, and is just vandalizing.

....I'll give you an example: over on Memory Alpha – a Star Trek–based Wiki project – there was an article on Alpha Centauri that ***REALLY*** needed a major enema. I spent the better part of two days getting the article revised, and loaded with accurate facts about our nearest neighbor, as well as info about Proxima and Beta. Two days later, I checked the article and found that some twit had gone through and put {citation requested} tags on every single sentence – especially facts that were hyperlinked to JPL and JHU articles! When I removed the tags, the dipshit restored them, and then threatened to have me blocked from MA for vandalism. After chatting with an admin, it was found that this was some 12–year–old retard out on a trolling binge, and while the punk was punted, it still put me off of contributing to ***any*** Wiki.

* You can always look at an article's history to come up with an idea of whether or not it's suitable as a source. If it's had a ***LOT*** of major edits in a short period of time, and those edits caused edit wars and flame fests on the talk page, and an admin has stepped in to support one side that has a history of trimming articles and being anal about Wikinazi rules and guidelines, then you ignore those dipshits and go with the stuff that's been purged. There's a growing, retarded trend amongst the Wikinazis to "newspeak" articles and keep them ridiculously short, with only the barest minimum information as possible. This is ***NOT*** what a peer–editable reference work is all about, because you're ***NOT*** limited by page count. The more info, the better.

* If an article has an "Original Research" tag blatantly displayed, this does ***not*** mean the article is suspect. The problem is that, regardless of what Jimbo Wales has to say about the matter, ***ALL*** research is original, even if the data used is not. There's no such thing as research that is "not original", because any research comes to a conclusion that is the sole view of the researcher. With that in mind, every single article on Wikipedia is "Original Research", and should be wiped accordingly.

Bottom Line: Wikipedia is a great concept that's currently being destroyed from within simply because the asylum is being run by the inmates ***and*** those inmates have not only discovered how to undo their straightjackets, they've discovered that sexual favors are not limited to getting extra rations and privs from the wardens. There's quite a bit of sexual harassment going on these days, and at least once every 3–4 months some admin gets outed as a pedophile. But still, Wikipedia ***can*** be used as a reliable source. As with any source on the internet, one has to simply use both caution and logic. It's a shame that one has to use more grains of salt when considering a Wiki

Re: Jupiter

Re: Jupiter

article as a source, but until Jimbo Wales gets his head out of his ass and bars anyone under the age of 21 from doing anything but *read* a Wikipedia entry, it's only going to get worse as time goes on.

....Hope this helps :-)

OM

--

]=====

] OMBlog - http://www.io.com/~o_m/omworld [

] Let's face it: Sometimes you *need* [

] an obnoxious opinion in your day! [

]=====

.