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If you’re an economist in 1999, the major new thing is bits that cut costs and vastly more efficient market competition…
Britannica Unveils Ready Reference Encyclopedia; 12-Volume Set Retail at Bookstores for Under $500

Business Wire, June 1, 1998

CHICAGO—(BUSINESS WIRE)—June 1, 1998—

New Product Demonstrates Company's Commitment To Print

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. today announced that it will begin selling a popular-priced encyclopedia in bookstores across the country. Called Britannica Ready Reference(TM), the 12-volume set will be available in June at a suggested retail price of $499.

Affordable Britannica(R) Quality

"We are enhancing our print encyclopedia line to offer consumers more choices, especially parents who may have passed up Britannica due to price," said John Hallberg, senior vice president, worldwide marketing. "The Britannica Ready Reference gives families the legendary Britannica quality at a price they can afford."

The Ready Reference set consists of the first 12 volumes of the full 32-volume Encyclopaedia Britannica. Containing 64,000 articles organized from A to Z, the Ready Reference provides an unmatched breadth of information on a variety of topics. Contributors include many leading authorities and Nobel Prize winners, such as Albert Einstein, Sigmond Freud and Milton Friedman. The articles are enhanced by more than 16,000 illustrations, maps and photographs. Also included with the set is the Britannica Year Book(R) which features the important people, events, disasters, discoveries and achievements that changed our lives in the past year.

Room To Grow

The most frequently used part of the full Encyclopaedia Britannica, the Ready Reference is designed as a starter set for families who expect to expand their reference resources as their information needs grow over time. With the initial investment in the Ready Reference, parents can add other reference tools such as the remaining volumes of the print encyclopedia or Britannica's electronic products.
Encyclopedia Britannica 2007 Standard Full 2-CD for Win or Mac

Our Price: ONLY $29.95
Retail price: $49.95 Save $20.00 (40%)

Shipping: Only $5.00 FedEx Ground - Ships same or next working day!

Mfg. Part: LBBRIEN7SJ
Our SKU: EBSD07CD

Version: Retail 2-CD 2007 Win or Mac Version

Sales Support LIVECHAT online now
or...
call free to order
888 999 2611

Today's Deals
Nero 7.2 Essentials Suite 1 Full OEM CD/DVD Version for Windows
Our Price: $6.00
Retail Price $19.00

SAV 10.2 AntiVirus Corporate Edition Full Version (100-249) w/1-Year Basic Maintenance
Our Price: $32.36
Retail Price $41.60
Rorschach test

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

"Rorschach Test" redirects here. For the band, see Rorschach Test (band).

The Rorschach test (German pronunciation: [ʁoʁʃax]; also known as the Rorschach inkblot test or simply the Inkblot test) is a psychological test in which subjects' perceptions of inkblots are recorded and then analyzed using psychological interpretation, complex scientifically derived algorithms, or both. Some psychologists use this test to examine a person's personality characteristics and emotional functioning. It has been employed to detect an underlying thought disorder, especially in cases where patients are reluctant to describe their thinking processes openly. The test takes its name from that of its creator, Swiss psychologist Hermann Rorschach.

In a national survey in the U.S., the Rorschach was ranked eighth among psychological tests used in outpatient mental health facilities. It is the second most widely used test by members of the Society for Personality Assessment, and it is requested by psychiatrists in 25% of forensic assessment cases, usually in a battery of tests that often include the MMPI-2 and the MCMI-III. In surveys, the use of Rorschach ranges from a low of 20% by correctional psychologists to a high of 80% by clinical psychologists engaged in assessment services, and 80% of psychology graduate programs surveyed teach it.

Although the Exner Scoring System (developed since the 1960s) claims to have addressed and often refuted many criticisms of the original testing system with an extensive body of research, some researchers have raised questions about the objectivity of psychologists administering the test; inter-rater reliability; the verifiability and general validity of the test; bias of the test's pathology scales towards greater numbers of responses; the limited number of psychological conditions which it accurately diagnoses; the inability to replicate the test's norms; its use in court-ordered evaluations; and the proliferation of the ten inkblot images, potentially invalidating the test for those who have been exposed to them.
Networked Information Economy

The most important inputs, into the core economic activities, of the most advanced economies, are widely distributed in the population

Material

- Computation and communications resources
- Sensing and capture

Human

- Creativity, intuition, experience, and motivation
- Social capabilities to manage processes
The most important inputs, into the core economic activities, of the most advanced economies, are widely distributed in the population.

Behaviors once on the periphery: social motivations, cooperation, friendship, decency, mobilization, hatred, move to the very core of economic life in the most technically and economically advanced societies.
## Four transactional frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market-based</th>
<th>Non-market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>Price-system</td>
<td>Families; friends localized efforts of social economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>Government; Non-profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Networked information economy destabilized the Second Industrial Divide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market-based</th>
<th>Non-market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price-system and edge entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Network-based social sharing &amp; exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger, highly capitalized firms</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newly effective non-profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centralized**

**Decentralized**
## A new solution space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market-based</th>
<th>Non-market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="skype.png" alt="Skype" /></td>
<td><img src="wiktionary.png" alt="Wiktionary" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="youtube.png" alt="YouTube" /></td>
<td><img src="mediawiki.png" alt="MediaWiki" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="yelp.png" alt="Yelp" /></td>
<td><img src="ushahidi.png" alt="Ushahidi" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="tripadvisor.png" alt="TripAdvisor" /></td>
<td><img src="couchsurfing.png" alt="CouchSurfing" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="google.png" alt="Google" /></td>
<td><img src="sunlightfoundation.png" alt="Sunlight Foundation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="ibm.png" alt="IBM" /></td>
<td><img src="bbc.png" alt="BBC" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decentralized

### Centralized

Citizens connect
--distributed inputs from on-the-ground participants
--using any kind of device
--mashing with usable data/mapping
--open source to harness developers => iterative use of decentralized, cooperative techniques
London rocked by terror attacks

At least two people have been killed and scores injured after three blasts on the Underground network and another on a double-decker bus in London.

UK Prime Minister Tony Blair said it was "reasonably clear" there had been a series of terrorist attacks.

He said it was "particularly barbaric" that it was timed to coincide with the G8 summit. He is returning to London.

An Islamist website has posted a statement from al-Qaeda - claiming it was behind the attacks.
Help us make the news

Do you have a comment or news story?

Have you taken a picture or filmed some video that tells a story? If so, BBC News wants to hear from you. Read below to find out how to get in touch with us.

YOUR VIEWS, YOUR STORIES

What issues do you want to comment on? Use the postform to send in your suggestions and you could set the agenda for a global conversation.

Let us know if you feel passionately about a particular issue, or if you think the BBC is not covering the stories that are important to you. This is your chance to tell us about it.

YOUR PICTURES

If you capture an unfolding event on camera or mobile phone, either as a photograph or video, then please send it to BBC News.

You can send pictures or video to yourpics@bbc.co.uk or via mms by dialling +44 (0)7725 100100.

Please do not endanger yourself or others, take any unnecessary risks or infringe any laws.

Name

Your E-mail address

Town & Country

Phone number (optional):

Comments

Send Clear

The BBC may edit your comments and not all emails will be published. Your comments may be published on any BBC media worldwide.

Terms & Conditions

TOP HAVE YOUR SAY STORIES

What impact will murder of
28 January 2011

**LIVE** Egypt unrest

---

2228: Hosni Mubarak: “I have requested the government to step down today, and I will designate a new government tomorrow.”

2225: Hosni Mubarak: “We will continue our political, economic and social reforms for a free and democratic Egyptian society.” This doesn’t sound like a resignation speech.

2222: The recent protests wouldn’t have been possible without the introduction in Egypt of civil and media liberties, says Mr Mubarak. While he takes the side of citizens’ freedom to express their views, he also wants to defend Egypt’s stability. “There is a fine line between freedom and chaos,” he says.

2219: Here’s Hosni Mubarak. He’s been monitoring the demonstrations and protesters’ demands, he says, and regrets the innocent casualties on both sides.

2216: Nile News also reports that Mr Mubarak himself will address the nation soon.
1. Can it be only online?

2. How can we systematize design of cooperative systems?
Becker: Penalty * probability of detection = deterrence
Tough on crime => community policing
Technical: walk, not car
Organizational: no-911; monthly community meetings; agenda setting
Institutional: more room for discretion?
Social: humanization; changing us/them boundaries; norms take central role; trust built over time...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market-based</th>
<th>Non-market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>Price-system</td>
<td>Families; friends localized efforts of social economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>Government; Non-profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I made a mistake in presuming that the self-interest of organizations, specifically banks and others, were such as that they were the best capable of protecting their own shareholders.
GM Fremont plant ==> NUMMI (Toyota Production System)

organizational: Taylorism => TPS
technical: Fordism; single task station => team stations
Work on stock options and incentive compensation suggests preverse effects;
Low, rather than high return to shareholders;
Relatively higher designation as tax "fraud" etc.
Osterloh & Frey; Bebchuk

Hiroshi Okuda scaled to estimated compensation levels 2005/2006
Hierarchy plus high-powered incentives vs. more collaborative; team production; trust-based supplier relations; lower power monetary incentives at top (Sabel 2006; Osterloh and Frey 2005)
Cooperative Human Systems

• An integrated approach
  • Technical, organizational, institutional, social
  • Mutually-reinforcing design characteristics or inconsistent
• Based on the best evidence we have
An intellectual arc

- **Evolutionary biology**: from group selection to selfish gene through kin altruism, and direct reciprocity, back to indirect reciprocity, multi-level selection, and culture/gene-culture co-evolution.

- **Economics**: strong assumptions of self-interest and guile; mechanism design and efficiency; shifting to experimental and modeling away from self-interest; developing neuroeconomics.

- **Political theory**: from Downs, Olson, Hardin, to Ostrom on commons.

- **Management science/ organizational sociology**: work on TPS, team production, networks since the 1980s; DiMaggio & Powell; Sabel; Adler; Heckescher; high-commitment, high performance organizations.
“Be warned that if you wish, as I do, to build a society in which individuals cooperate generously and unselfishly towards a common good, you can expect little help from biological nature. Let us try to teach generosity and altruism, because we are born selfish. Let us understand what our own selfish genes are up to, because we may then at least have the chance to upset their designs, something which no other species as ever aspired to do.”

“Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of evolution is its ability to generate cooperation in a competitive world. Thus, we might add “natural cooperation” as a third fundamental principle of evolution beside mutation and natural selection.”

Herbert Spencer, “survival of the fittest;” Social Darwinism
Singer et al

Empathy, actual pain simulation

Sanefy, Rilling et al: humans differentiate computer from human; respond differently to unfair offers in Ultimatum games

Kosfeld; Zak: Oxytocin and trust
Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology

Diversity of needs & goals; social dynamics; meaning

→

Material interests  
(Economics)

→

Emotional needs/ Affective responses

→

conformism

Moral Commitments  
Philosophy; law; Psychology  
Sometimes in economics  
-Fairness; -Right; Virtue

Social motivations/connections
-Functional social capital
-Social network effects
-Solidarity, “in-group bias,” relatedness;

Centrality of the situation; frame; system

The potential for “crowding out”, or misalignment
Including misalignment in design

Titmuss-Arrow debate 1970/71

Give blood

Do Not Give Blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/ signals

Emotional needs/ Affective responses
Including misalignment in design

Titmuss-Arrow debate 1970/71

Give blood

- Material Interests
- Moral Commitments
- Social Connections/signals
- Emotional needs/Affective responses

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johanssesson 2008
--baseline population voluntary donation system (Sweden)

Give blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/s signals

Emotional needs/Affective responses

Do Not Give Blood
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johannsson 2008: **offer 50SEK**
-- only reaches significance in women (from 52% to 30%)
-- overall effect exists and trends in the “right” direction, but not significant (43% to 33%)

Give blood

Do Not Give Blood

Material Interests

Moral Commitments

Social Connections/signals

Emotional needs/Affective responses
Including misalignment in design

Mellstrom and Johannssesson 2008:
--permitting donors to donate their proceeds to a charity, as well as donating the blood, cancelled out the negative effect.
--overall giving levels no higher at end than at beginning (44%)

Give blood                                             Do Not Give Blood

Material Interests
Moral Commitments
Social Connections/
  signals
Emotional needs/
  Affective responses
Cooperative Human Systems

• Conceptual: From “rationality” modeled as universal self-interest translated into material concerns to diversity of motivations and a preponderance of prosocial humanity sensitive to conditions

• Design: Cooperative human systems design based on behaviorally realistic, evidence-based design; integrating multiple disciplines, susceptible of testing and implementation
Cooperative Human Systems

- Design: Cooperative human systems design based on behaviorally realistic, evidence-based design; integrating multiple disciplines, susceptible of testing and implementation

- Building blocks
  - Communication; framing the situation
  - Who matters? I, thou, we, them: empathy and solidarity
  - What is right, fair, and normal?
  - Calculation: material and social-relational
    - Subject to potential negative interactions between material punishment or even reward and social-relational motivation
  - Social dynamics: trust, transparency, reputation, social networks, leadership, asymmetric contribution
Discussion

This page is definitely improved and something really more can be done in order to make it a core article. And the fact that its one of the most important article in wiki. I have done my contributions on this i would expect others to do the same Kalivd 11:25, 21 April 2007 (UTC)

This is page is so poor an introduction to the subject area that to edit it would entail rewriting it completely. I recommend anyone approaching the topic to read "On Human Communication" by Colin Cherry.

Yeah, no kidding. I've been working on a new version offline, but it's coming slowly. I'll probably just post what I have and we can take it from there. --Stephen Gilbert 21:04, 25 Oct 2003 (UTC)

Hmmm... I've done some incremental stuff - want to send me something offline and collaborate? Richard Pitt Nov. 16

I'd love to collaborate, but let's let others in on it too! Collaboration is Wikipedia's middle name. Er... don't ask me what its last name is...

I've tried to work your current contributions into my sketchy notes. If anything got lost in the transition, be sure to pull it from the history and add it. --Stephen Gilbert 19:55, 22 Nov 2003 (UTC)

I've moved the outline here; it's more of a to-do list than article material. --Stephen Gilbert

Stephen it is much better but still too many links and chapters. If this page is to be a proper page I think a general introduction saying something like that communication happens whenever data transfers from one sentient being to another would help a lot. --BozMojtalk 13:31, 28 Jun 2004 (UTC)

My name is Kyle Mullaney. I majored in Organizational Communication with an emphasis in Intercultural Communication. I would be happy to add my help in cleaning up this article.

Would it first be possible to make this into a category? Of course this page would be something of a gateway to the rest of the communication articles. It would have links to the various disciplines in the study of communication. It could contain a brief definition of communication, maybe from different aspects or other disciplines. For example the opening definition is to technical. I feel it should be more basic. Wow as I read further into the article I realize this would not even qualify for any textbook we used. It is overly somewhat technical and jumbled. I will work on that now. The
Core Principles

These high-level principles have proven to help make social experiences work online.

Patterns in this Category

- Don't vent your frustrations, or Flickr is not a venue for you to rant about your complaint about your conduct.
- Don't be creepy. You know the guy. Don't be that guy.

Talk Like a Person
People reading impersonal text on a screen will remain disengaged.

Your Contacts
Labeling stuff with "Your" instead reinforces the conversational dialogue. It is how another human being might address you when talking about your stuff.

Your vs. My

Communication

litigation vs mediation
Framing

- Ross et al, Wall Street/Community Game
  - Identical setup: finite PD
    - If “community game” 70% open & sustain coop
    - If “wall street game” 30% open & sustain coop
Empathy

• Singer et al

• Bohnet & Frey: anonymous partner; silent identification
  • Dictator Game
  • anon => 26% on average of endow; 28% gave 0
  • silent facial ID => 35% of endow; 11% gave 0
  • personal info shared => ~50% of endow; 0 gave 0.
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Empathy
Who matters: Solidarity/Group identity

- Organizational psych since early 1970s
  - Tajfel; Tajfel & Turner minimal group effects
  - Haslam: knowledge of group coupled with emotional significance of belonging
- Bowles & Gintis; Boyd & Richerson
  - Group selection in early human societies; support centrality of group identification
  - Fowler et al within political parties
  - Rand et al: plastic identities: from Obama/Clinton to Democratic, but only after DNC
### Top teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Recent average credit</th>
<th>Total credit</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SETI USA</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>655,110</td>
<td>420,080,314</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SETI Germany</td>
<td>10476</td>
<td>530,584</td>
<td>353,441,653</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L'Alliance Francophone</td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>309,169</td>
<td>189,003,711</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Knights Who Say NII</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>272,190</td>
<td>136,925,982</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BOINC Synergy</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>253,166</td>
<td>159,172,501</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overclockers.com</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>218,999</td>
<td>102,258,295</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SETI@Netherlands</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>209,130</td>
<td>149,148,788</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Czech National Team</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>200,240</td>
<td>158,349,699</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team China</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>191,908</td>
<td>61,100,900</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Team MacN</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>176,748</td>
<td>90,606,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BroadbandReports.com Team Starfire</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>173,769</td>
<td>175,875,661</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AUSTRIA - NATIONAL - TEAM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>169,068</td>
<td>39,325,598</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Team Art Bell</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>153,797</td>
<td>102,403,994</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Team 2ch</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>145,651</td>
<td>97,413,428</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Planetary Society</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>144,798</td>
<td>92,705,244</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Team Starfire World BOINC</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>138,406</td>
<td>58,460,991</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SETI@Taiwan</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>135,994</td>
<td>64,524,872</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Team AnandTech</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>132,265</td>
<td>63,550,333</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UK BOINC Team</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>117,465</td>
<td>44,132,479</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boone Community School District - Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114,964</td>
<td>19,867,181</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KWSN Orbiting Fortress

KWSN Distributed Computing Teams forum

- FAQ
- Search
- Memberlist
- Usergroups
- Register
- Profile
- Log in to check your private messages
- Log in

**News**

Also check out our multi-project BOINC stats.

The time now is Sun Nov 04, 2007 8:40 pm

### KWSN Orbiting Fortress Forum Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Last Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>News &amp; Info</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - **KWSN & BB related news, announcements, and information like BOARD RULES** | 25 | 40 | Wed Feb 14, 2007 3:47 pm Sir BaldyHead
| - **Team Stat Page Links** | 3 | 4 | Thu Aug 05, 2004 9:35 am Vayavo|
| **General** | | | |
| - **New and Departing Members** | 119 | 2425 | Wed Oct 31, 2007 12:00 pm belerus
| - **KWSN Round Table** | 496 | 5639 | Sat Nov 03, 2007 4:41 pm mohropriess
| - **KWSN S@H Team** | 57 | 600 | Tue Oct 30, 2007 8:04 pm Lloyd M.
| - **KWSN BOINC’ers** | 248 | 3034 | Sun Nov 04, 2007 3:09 pm Al Dante

http://www.kwsnforum.com/viewforum.php?f=36&sid=009d2a4c41e6504a35f4e4c837d1568
Solidarity/Group identity

Cooperation does not mean nice;
Design necessary to channel in-group bias, or solidarity,
to positive directions
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Economics: Sen 1977; Frey 1997
- Psychology, Campbell 1976; Greene 2008
- Most normal people, most of the time, will be tugged to doing what they think is the right thing to do under the circumstances
  - Disgust, taboo responses suggest a discontinuous function
Newsvine Code of Honor

1. Above all else, respect others. Address issues and arguments and refrain from making personal attacks. If you see something disrespectful or inappropriate, report it - rather than further inflaming the situation. More +

2. Newsvine's primary purpose is to provide a place for people to share and discuss topics relating to the news. Self-promotion, seeding links to your own site(s), and advertising are not allowed. More +

3. Headlines should be supported by the information presented in the articles/ed, rather than used primarily as a means to draw attention. Chosen news types and tags should be accurate and informative - not used to provoke or make a statement. More +

4. As the host of your column, you are expected to foster healthy, open discussions by setting a good example. Be responsible for the content you submit and exercise impartiality when deleting comments and reporting abuse. More +

5. Acts that run contrary to the spirit and purpose of Newsvine, including attempts to circumvent the Code of Honor & User Agreement, are not allowed. More +

So that's the Code!

Make sure to check out the additional recommended guidelines to make you a better Viner as well.
Right, Fair, and Normal

Wikipedia: Neutral point of view

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
(Redirected from NPOV)

This page documents an official English Wikipedia policy, a widely accepted standard that should normally be followed by all editors. Any edit to it should reflect consensus. Consider discussing potential changes on the talk page first.

This page in a nutshell: Each Wikipedia article and other content must be written from a neutral point of view, by representing all significant views on each topic fairly, proportionately, and without bias.

Neutral point of view is a fundamental Wikipedia principle and a cornerstone of Wikipedia. All Wikipedia articles and other encyclopedic content must be written from a neutral point of view, representing fairly, and as far as possible without bias, all significant views that have been published by reliable sources. This is non-negotiable and expected of all articles, and of all article editors. For guidance on how to make an article conform to the neutral point of view, see the NPOV tutorial; for examples and explanations that illustrate key aspects of this policy, see Wikipedia:Neutral point of view/FAQ.

"Neutral point of view" is one of Wikipedia's three core content policies. The other two are "Verifiability" and "No original research". Jointly, these policies determine the type and quality of material that is acceptable in Wikipedia articles. Because the policies are complementary, they should not be interpreted in isolation from one another, and editors should familiarize themselves with all three. The principles upon which these policies are based cannot be superseded by other policies or guidelines, or by editors' consensus. Core content policy pages may only be edited to improve the application and explanation of the principles.
Debating “creationism” on Wikipedia talk pages

Yes, you may choose to view the question as a two-sided debate. Others, however, have been shown to view the question on other terms. Some see the split three ways: special creation only, secular evolution only, and God-guided evolution. Your point seems to be focused on what people teach in a science class - which is only one small part of this question. Many “creationists” are very willing to leave science to science. Rlsheehan (talk) 22:28, 22 April 2008 (UTC)

No! I do not “choose to view the question as a two-sided debate” -- I describe what many prominent participants see as a two-sided debate. There is no “third way” unattached to either side. Your “God-guided evolution” is made up of those who side with what you describe as “secular evolution” and consider ID to be pseudoscience and IDers who side with the YECs and consider TE to be intellectually dishonest. This whole controversy is about “what people teach in a science class” -- it has been from Scopes through to Dover. Your entire argument is nothing but WP:POR, and you have presented no WP:RS supporting the existence of a coherent and cohesive “middle ground” (i.e., one that does not itself rely on the more extreme wings on either side), or what specific views this mythic creature might possess. Lacking such sources, this has no relevance to the article, and no place on this talk page.

Please be careful of WP:NOTOPINION and WP:SOAP. If your interest is primarily in creation then focus on that. This article has a POV problem and needs revision. Please do not get in the way of improvements. Rlsheehan (talk) 01:57, 25 April 2008 (UTC)

Thank you for that violation of WP:PAGE, making spurious accusations of my motivations for simply stating the positions that the participants in the controversy hold.

You seem to be ignoring the valid citations which prove that a large number of people have a “centrist” position of accepting both Science and Creation, is WP:IDIDNTHEAR THAT not acceptable. Please let other editors have access to this article. Rlsheehan (talk) 14:25, 25 April 2008 (UTC)

Let’s take this one step at a time. What is this article about? Is it limited to the about what is to be taught in schools? Is it over what’s been demonstrated or is demonstrable by science? Is it about what people personally believe or subscribe to? Or is it about the alleged “consequences” or “fallouts” different sides in the controversy accuse the “other side” of (ie controversy over the redefinition of science, say, or moral decay in society etc). Professor marginalia (talk) 15:53, 25 April 2008 (UTC)
Yes, you may choose to view the question as a two-sided debate. Others, however, have been shown to view the question on other terms. Some see the split three ways: special Creation only, secular evolution only, and God-guided evolution. Your point seems to be focused on what people teach in a science class - which is only one small part of this question. Many "creationists" are very willing to leave science to science. Rlsheehan (talk) 22:28, 22 April 2008 (UTC)

No! I do not "choose to view the question as a two-sided debate" -- I describe what many prominent participants see as a two-sided debate. There is no "third way" unattached to either side. Your "God-guided evolution" is made up of TEs who side with what you describe as "secular evolution" and consider ID to be pseudoscience and IDers who side with the YECs and consider TE to be intellectually dishonest. This whole controversy is about "what people teach in a science class" -- it has been from Scopes through to Dover. Your entire argument is nothing but WP:OLR, and you have presented no WP:RS supporting the existence of a coherent and cohesive 'middle ground' (i.e. one that does not ally itself with the more extreme wings on either side), or what specific views this mythic creature might possess. Lacking such sources, this has no relevance to the article, and no place on this talk page. 11:23, 23 April 2008 (UTC)

Please be careful of WP:NOTOPINION and WP:SOAP. If your interest is primarily in creation, then focus on that. This article has a POV problem and needs revision. Please do not get in the way of improvements. Rlsheehan (talk) 01:57, 25 April 2008 (UTC)

Thank you for that violation of WP:AGF, making spurious accusations of my motivations for simply stating the positions that the participants in the controversy hold.

You seem to be ignoring the valid citations which prove that a large number of people have a "centrist" position of accepting both Science and Creation. is WP:IDIDNTHEARTHAT not acceptable. Please let other editors have access to this article. Rlsheehan (talk) 14:25, 25 April 2008 (UTC)

Let's take this one step at a time. What is this article about? Is it limited to the
Right, Fair, and Normal

• Outcomes
• Intentions
• Processes
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Culturally contingent; diverse
- Susceptible to framing
  - Luck and desert shift baseline
  - Market-integration correlated with baseline equal division preference
Right, Fair, and Normal

- No single theory of justice

Figure 1. Study 1: interaction between pay dispersion and individual incentives in predicting accident frequency ratio

Figure 2. Study 1: interaction between pay dispersion and individual incentives in predicting out-of-service percentage

Shaw, Gupta, & Delery (2002), Strategic Mgmt J. 23(6) 491-512
Right, Fair, and Normal

• Conformism and imitation
  • Anthropology: culturally-reinforced norms (Boyd & Richerson; Boyd and Henrich)
  • Social network effects (e.g. Obesity, Fowler & Kristakis)
  • As an imitation/learning effect (Hanaki et al 2007)
  • Minnesota and Australian tax experiments
Right, Fair, and Normal

- Conformism and imitation
- Habit plus self-justification = virtue?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Than Average</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Generous</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Love You</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The retreat of scientific selfishness

• “Scientific policy making” pushes back on widespread cultural norms of sharing
• Actual practices in the networked environment, and increasingly in businesses, revive “sharing nicely,” the broad pro-social educational bent with which we infuse our child rearing practices
The retreat of scientific selfishness

• Diverse business and social production models begin to challenge efficiency, efficacy, and growth-oriented effects of “scientific” selfishness

• Science begins to push back with theoretical, experimental, and observational work

• A new field? Cooperative human systems design

• A renewed view of our shared humanity