EDITORIAL POLICIES
William Bricken
April 2005

MY WORK

In preparing this site, I collected most of my work that was in electronic form, sifted through it, and put those pieces that required only a little revision into the site. I intend to continue editing and cleaning up pieces until done. Er, and then I have the work that is not yet in electronic form.

The EDITORIAL POLICY was to include most of the materials, eliminating those pieces that were repetitious, disjointed, too spacey, clumsy, and dead wrong. This still left many pieces that were potentially of little interest. I have included these on the site solely because I am using the site as a repository of work. In the future, should some pieces prove dysfunctional or of no use, I intend to leave them on the site, but break the references to them, rendering them essentially invisible to a visitor.

For now, I'm still adding pieces. There has also been an editorial policy about what priority to assign to those pieces that need repair, revision, completion, or substantial cleaning up. Basically, I left the most difficult for last.

INCONSISTENCY

The site suffers somewhat from a lack of consistency across the papers and pieces it contains. This is primarily cause I've created and written from many different perspectives. A lot of early work was playful and semi-satiristic, even though the technical content was totally formal and serious.

I haven't published most of my work, again cause my ambitions did not support a purely academic career. Some stuff was confidential because the client needed it to be that way, some was confidential because I used trade secrecy to possibly increase the value of my code.

So I'm concerned that folks looking for sober formalities will dislike the lightness in presentation, and folks looking for entertainment will dislike the math. My personal strategy to allay these fears is to present my work without trying to sort it on the basis of what I may project to be the desires of the audience. The Web is a *broadcast* system, not a direct communication; as such, I have left it to the Web users to decide what pieces they wish to access.

WORK OF OTHERS

Materials on this site are predominantly mine. However there are several
circumstances in which I have included work by others. These include:

1. Email correspondence
       my contributions are clearly marked

2. Work with colleagues
       my contributions are indicated,
       although there are a few circumstances for which the work was joint and
inseparable. In these cases, I have attempted to indicate my contribution to
the project.

3. Publications by others
       In a few circumstances, I've included work done solely by other folks,
for which I have had substantive input or editorial guidance. Student theses
are an example.

4. Work of interest by others
       confined exclusively to the HUMOR subsection of the PLAY section. For
other circumstances, I've attempted to reference work by others through their
URL.

CONFIDENTIALITY

I made an executive decision to modify all documents to eliminate references
to names, companies, dates, and other specifics. When necessary, these are
indicated in the site introduction to a document, and not on the document
itself. Very often, company names and dates are obvious, although not
specifically referenced. Sometimes this policy leads to strange sounding
dialog, with roles in place of names.

A few people are mentioned specifically, with permission.

In general, I have not edited work (particularly email) for profanity and
other potentially offensive styles. I have, though, deleted flaming that
does not contribute or refer to content, such as attacks on a person.

Throughout a professional career, some correspondence is personal and locally
political. This stuff is usually interesting, and in the interests of
fullness I have included it, clearly marked.

Similarly, some joint project documents have been edited to include only the
work that I either wrote, or contributed directly to.

I have worked on confidential government and private projects. When necessary this work has been excluded, although exclusion is rare. In most cases, I have desensitized content by eliminating specifics that would violate confidentiality. In the case of trade secrecy that may impact patent positions, I have referenced but not included work.

Finally, there have been several judgment calls, for which materials should not be released at this time. In many cases, the materials are on the site, protected by password access.

CROSS-REFERENCING

Category schemes are imperfect. I've stored documents in categories that refer to the bulk of the content, and cross-referenced them when they have content that is appropriate for other categories. Still, some pieces are multi-disciplinary. in these case, their primary category is somewhat arbitrary.

Some documents use material that is repeated in other documents. I have attempted to note these cases.

CLEAN-UP

I've retroactively

     corrected spelling errors,
     expanded some acronyms and abbreviations,
     deleted some comments and references that would be oblique,
     changed a few obviously mistyped or wrong words,
     corrected syntactic mathematical errors (but not semantic errors)
     changed some names of theorems to be consistent
     tidied up page formatting, and
     standardized document title formatting.

Spelling errors happen, they happen especially frequently in email messages. Some folks use a spell-check, other type fast and never go back. I've corrected all obvious spelling *erorrs*, for the sake of clarity.

During development, some mathematical theorems have been called by several different names. Sometimes there is good reason, for instance the conventional name of a theorem and the Losp name of the equivalent boundary math theorem. In some cases, a name has been in dynamic evolution, and I've standardized these.

Many letters and essays trace the growth of understanding. Therefore, some are "wrong headed". I've included some of these, clearly marked. However,

should an idea be misrepresented by a syntactic error in a mathematical form, I have corrected the syntactics.

TONE

My work has been primarily in research. Research documents have an unusual quality that they project theory and prototype into future actuality. I have developed a declarative style, stating observations and conclusions directly, and omitting over-arching phrases such as

        "It is my opinion that.."
        "Should this trend continue..."
        "Extrapolating this meager data..."
        "Assuming that the analysis is correct..."
        "I certainly hope that..."
        "If research data actually correlates with reality..."
        "Should the prototype actually be fully implemented..."
        "Should the appropriate technology magically appear..."
        "Given that we know everything..."
        "Assuming that we avoid ecological holocaust..."
        "Given that human motivation is honest and kind..."
        "Etc...."