



**We wrote an unpublishable article (that you can still read):
This is not that article, but without that article, this one would not exist, or
A Story of Collaborative Writing: How Technology and Unchecked Arrogance Led
to an Unpublishable Debacle...**

 **Thaddeus Stoklasa**
2:49 AM Nov 19, 2013

If I highlight the redaction then you can see the writing, which defeats the purpose. Anyway: nice move on the name extension. Now they'll never suspect a thing.


██████████
and ██████████

In this article, Thaddeus Stoklasa and Scott Pyrz, or Scott Pyrz and Thaddeus Stoklasa (depending on who you like/respect more) ruminate on the ways in which the technological and partnership choices one makes when doing collaborative writing significantly impact the successes and failures of that collaborative work. Drawing on the experience of collaborating to create an unpublishable article, the two discuss the technological and rhetorical choices they made that led to both the successes and (far more often) the failures of their article.¹

 **Thaddeus Stoklasa**
2:53 AM Nov 19, 2013

If they're pulling this outta the printed text, does that mean they have to type this out themselves?
Hah.

Note: In order to have a (relatively) complete understanding of this article, we suggest readers look at (if not read) our previous attempt. It can be found at: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gXYfAdMvzUimFNEmTilutfyaCdfhuow-f70J-nj356A/edit>.

 **Scott Pyrz**
1:50 PM Nov 19, 2013

Yes. How else can we do that? I can link it on my personal page so it is easier to find, but I don't want people on my personal page.



¹A note about the fonts used in this document: in order to distinguish between authors and in hopes of revealing some behind-the-scenes workings of our writing, each writer will use a different font.



Scott Pyrz
8:58 PM Nov 18, 2013

I don't know if this is going to work for us. It adds yet another formal deviation from traditional discourse, but it does so in a way that may make it impossible to follow the logic/rules of our own document.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:10 AM Nov 19, 2013

Maybe if we spent more time at Denny's, none of this would've happened.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:11 AM Nov 19, 2013

The /good/ Denny's, I mean.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:12 AM Nov 19, 2013

Note: I am using slashes to resist the lack of italics in Google Doc comments.
/Sic semper tyrannisl/



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:14 AM Nov 19, 2013

Nevermind. I figured it out: put underscores around the words Same as in Google Hangouts.
How's that for some *antecedent knowledge*?



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:21 AM Nov 19, 2013

I want to rephrase this... but I don't know how.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:22 AM Nov 19, 2013

I mean I don't know what to change it to. Obviously I know how to type.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:24 AM Nov 19, 2013

Experiment with? Push/test the boundaries of?



Scott Pyrz
2:10 PM Nov 19, 2013

Is that better?



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:23 AM Nov 19, 2013

Oh, snap!
We could talk about disposition.



Scott Pyrz
2:10 PM Nov 19, 2013

I think we do (though not explicitly) in our section on partnership. If not, we can add to that, because there is stuff there that can come out.

An Introduction in Three Parts

In our previous attempt to write this article (well, not *this* article, but an article like it) we allowed the similarity of our personalities and our affinities for technological play to significantly influence the content of our article, and as such, we created something that was both unreadable and not appropriate for the medium of publication. What follows is our attempt to rectify those shortcomings in an equally interesting way.

“We should write an article about writing an article!” That’s what I said. Or something near to that, anyway. Metacognition is a big part of how I teach and think and generally go about wasting time in the world. But when you have *two* people who think this way, and multiply that by technology that enables them to push this impulse to the breaking point, you end up with editors who very politely inform you that your work cannot *physically exist*.

Collaborative writing is an integral part of literate practice (both in the humanities/sciences and in the private/academic realms). As such, exploring the ways in which collaboration informs/influences/affects/alters/etc. individual writing practices/experiences/conceptions is a valuable undertaking. We think that in order to understand how documents (read: genre artifacts) are created, thought of, implemented, etc. through collaboration there should be more transparent representation and discussion of how collaborative practices actually work. By focusing on the two main issues that plagued our original attempt to create a *Grassroots* article, we seek to articulate (and complicate) how collaborative practices offer opportunities for success/innovation/growth as well as opportunities for failure/miscommunication/etc. The most significant successes and failures of our previous article stemmed from our desire to play and experiment with technology, and our similar dispositions and personalities.

Collaborative writing (really any collaborative undertaking) is inherently complex. The complexity of collaboration is (partially) what makes it such a worthwhile and common occurrence, but this complexity also leads to a number of potential issues. Even an individual writer isn’t just one inert thing: people are full of contradictory impulses and complicated inner lives that nobody outside that individual will ever be fully aware of (and assuming that the individual

is fully aware of themselves is still pushing it). So to a certain extent, this article can be read as a discussion of managing (or failing to manage) the individual as much as managing (see: previous parentheses) a collaboration.

Collaborative Writing: The Activity

Most of this article (as well as its ancestor) was composed in different rooms of different buildings in different towns, via a shared document in Google Drive. In person, we sketched an outline of major touchstones (some of these would describe particular content areas, but quite a few were just reminders to include particular jokes or asides) that took the form of a brief bulleted list.

But if you want a chronological tale, it was something² like this: I said that thing, from up in my half of the introduction about writing an article about an article. It appealed to us both and seemed a good way of keeping ourselves engaged with the project³. I recall a meeting at Denny's (and not the good Denny's, unfortunately): we sat in a booth near the door, laptops on the table alongside the remains of breakfast-for-dinner (eating takes precedence over work; we are in grad school, after all⁴). This was the only time during the production of either article that we were both on our computers in the same place at the same time.

It's important to clarify that I have no specific recollection of what was hashed out post biscuits and gravy and pancakes and sausage and so forth. We had the first part of the title fairly early, and a lot of the structural plans (alternating colors, striking out [and eventually redacting] our names, footnotes and side comments galore), as well as an endnote explaining to our prospective editors that we wanted to incorporate their



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:29 AM Nov 19, 2013

NO, GOOGLE! I will not replace *themselves* with *himself*. Singular them/they goes back to Shakespeare and is completely legitimate and I will be damn'd before I let you force your gendered assumptions on my writing!



Scott Pyrz
8:47 PM Nov 18, 2013

I really want to name this Collaborative Writing: The Musical!



Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:43 AM Nov 19, 2013

Our metacommentary insists upon itself.



Scott Pyrz
2:12 PM Nov 19, 2013

I haven't had the time yet, but I will go through this and correct it with my (much more accurate) recollection.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
9:18 PM Jun 29

Were you going to change something here?
Or... did you already?



Scott Pyrz
9:34 AM Nov 19, 2013

Isn't it your third of the introduction?


²I reserve the right to obfuscate, approximate, or outright fabricate my own version of the truth in these matters. Because all writers do. And so do all people, for that matter. Whether they say so (to either themselves or others) or not.

³Whenever you have a choice, research/write what you're interested in. When you don't have a choice, find a way. If you really absolutely have no choice and are just crushingly uninterested, you have probably given up too soon. And anyway, what're you doing being so disinterested in things? Don't give me "gen. eds." as an excuse, either. "Oh, no! I'm being taken out of my pre-determined comfort zone!" Y'know what? I'm not talking to you anymore, hypothetical reader. You're getting on my nerves.

⁴Though the same applies for undergrads. Eat something similar to regular meals and invest in vitamins/hand sanitizer, lest you succumb to Dorm Death (or worse, pass it along to your instructors).


comments into the article in the next draft. As far as specifics go, we didn't do a lot early on.

Separate, percolate, collate. Most of the writing on the actual article took place in late September and early October, in separate houses and apartments respectively. Middle of the night (though how the pair of us define that is slightly different), hammering away at keyboards connected wirelessly to other servers in other places, connected across town by way of Google only knows where.




Scott Pyrz
9:24 PM Jun 29

I can't believe we have a whole page without any comments or footnotes on it.




Thaddeus Stoklasa
9:28 PM Jun 29

Where? I see comments on every page.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
9:35 PM Jun 29

Oh. Right.
...
Nevermind.




Scott Pyrz
10:13 PM Jun 29

*See footnotes 7 and 8


It might be a fair assessment to say that we knew (or at least suspected) early on that the article wouldn't physically work in the *Grassroots* journal. Sure, the colored text could be replaced with alternating fonts (as we've done with this article), but the comments? As central to what we wanted from our article as they were monstrously unwieldy (more and more so as they continued to pile up one on the other, stretching far beyond the boundaries of the individual pages they were meant to comment upon).

And what was it we wanted from our article? To show you (whoever you happen to be, person[s] reading this), what writing looks like. When you generally look at a piece of writing (here or in a newspaper or on the Internet [unless, of course, you're reading this on the Internet⁵, in which case that was redundant]), it has an enforced cohesion to it. It pretends to be one thing. But it isn't that. It is many things from many times influenced by many people. It was almost certainly not written in the order presented, nor is what's written the exact way the writer(s) imagined it.



Scott Pyrz
9:40 AM Nov 19, 2013

That's an assumptive little pronoun, you've got there



Thaddeus Stoklasa
12:49 PM Nov 19, 2013

That's why I'm phrasing it in an uncertain way.

There's a certain irony in that we actually *did* end up with a document that reflected what we wanted to do. Our plan was to write something that couldn't function as the thing it was supposed to be (though we didn't think of it that way at the time, or at least I don't *think* we did). There are, after all, reasons that most articles don't look like this temporally fractured, metadiegetically-littered, unpublishable wreck. The mind likes stable patterns, both visually and logically. People expect uniformity, text that's all one kind of text⁶ and is arranged in a predictable pattern down the page, sameness

⁵Which you might be if you're a) myself or my collaborator, b) one of the editors, or c) living in a future time where this has been archived in the ISU Writing Program webpage (which is assuming quite a lot, but I'm an optimist).

⁶Same font, size, color, voice, tone, etc.

so simple to read that the very act of reading, of decoding symbols into sounds and/or ideas, happens without a conscious effort. But our article breaks nearly all those structural conventions, looping back on itself in an infinite loop of self-reference. Whatever else can be said of our writing, reading it takes *effort*. Skimming is not an option.

Technological Play: Down the Rabbit Hole

One of the reasons our original article failed was our desire to utilize and play with (read: explore/push the boundaries of) technological means of collaboration/production. By attempting to push the boundaries of technological production and distribution⁷, our article exemplifies how collaborative practices function, but it also highlights the ways in which these technologies can be problematic.

Take, for instance, our use of footnotes, which are now much easier to include (something that was terribly irksome with previous technology, since there were issues of spacing and planning that I am grateful to never have to deal with [partially due to my inane inability to plan]). The removal of this barrier has (unfortunately) led to both of us wanting to play with presentation in a way that (often) negatively affects the reception⁸ of our work. While this is not close to the biggest issue that our original article faced, it does serve as an appropriate example of how we are unable to tell each other no. Instead of either of us attempting to limit our footnotes, we entered a metaphorical arms race. By attempting to outpace each other's metacommentary, we carpet-bombed our article with marginalia and footnotes, effectively rendering it a radioactive mess of unfollowable digressions and markings.

If you need more evidence of how working with somebody who not only appreciates your technological and representational eccentricities but openly encourages them can negatively affect your collaborative efforts, look no further than the unnecessary and unduly fragmented and difficult formatting of this article's (and the original article's) presentation, including (but not limited to) my excessive use of parenthetical phrases (that may or may not add relevant information) and parenthetical phrases inside of parenthetical phrases (that, again, may [or may not] add relevant information to the discussion). Or

⁷*Production* and *distribution* are used here in a sense heavily informed by CHAT (i.e. Cultural-Historical Activity Theory). Production refers to all the technology and actions involved directly in the production of a text. Distribution is used to describe how texts spread through the world and who they spread to.

⁸*Reception* is also used in the CHAT sense (see footnote 7). It refers to how the audience [receives/interacts with/takes up] the text, how they respond, and what actions (if any) they take with it.



Scott Pyrz

9:47 AM Nov 19, 2013

I don't know if I like referencing you like this, but *C'est la vie*

look at Thaddeus' tendency to use colloquial ramblings and lengthy digressions⁹ wherever they'll fit (or, if they won't fit, then wherever I decide to make room regardless of constraint because you aren't the boss of me¹⁰), as some hypocritical

attempt to represent myself on the page. Trying to synthesize a collective voice in a collaborative work will almost invariably (to my mind anyway [though it might just be paranoia talking]) be closer to one author than the other. So we went the other way, being the most overt and distractingly individual versions of ourselves that the available technology would allow.

The impact of technology on the representational aspect of these texts (our original article and this article) cannot be overlaid. Without the combination of multicolored text, different font styles, cloud storage, sidebar comments, and various other little bits and bobs, these articles would have had the "polished" appearance readers are conditioned to expect of collaborative writing efforts or, (more likely, they might never have come to exist in the first place). This is not to say this crazed, meta, mash-up style is necessarily new or unique. Rather, these elements tend to stay on the other side of publication. The technology at hand (in this case, Google™Docs) allows the text to formally represent the kind of back-and-forth inherent in any kind of collaborative undertaking. This representation of the back-and-forth is, without question, necessary to add transparency to our discussion of collaboration, since it explained the almost constant exchange of concerns/ideas/additions/subtractions that usually occurs behind-the-scenes, but it was also so profuse that both the core text and the marginalia could not appear on the same page, essentially marking our inability to control our impulses and to fully understand the physical constraints of the genre in which we were/are working. Our inability to fully understand/acknowledge the genre constraints we had to deal with **drove us into a content overflow**. Our pop culture riddled-asides, digressions, and marginalia, created an article of self-referencing, self-perpetuating, and (possibly) never-ending conversations that (while working in parallel) never coalesced into any traditionally understood meaning.

Partnership: Where Two is Not Better Than One

Another issue that plagued our original article is the ways in which our personalities worked together, in that we are so aligned in our goals/

⁹My 495 word footnote (a.k.a. footnote 15) in the unpublished article was probably my proudest achievement in this sort of jackassery. But sadly, I must curb that impulse here.

¹⁰Yes, even the Editors. You may be the boss of the text that is allowed to appear in the *Grassroots Journal*, but I remain an independent entity. My consciousness, such as it is, is yet my own!

dispositions/approaches that we were unable to successfully limit practices that effectively detracted from the article. Generally, we think that having collaborative partners who think similarly and who have similar goals would be a benefit, but this is not always the case; too much alignment can (and for us did) lead to unchecked use of difficult and questionable rhetorical practices as well as problematic textual relationships between the two of us.

We enabled one another to an unhealthy degree. But there's an important point of clarification needed here. There was nothing inherently wrong with the article as we planned to write it. There are plenty of ways to resist the traditional structures of a publication and still manage to be published. No, the problem is rooted in the enabling. Without a certain amount of boundary-drawing, any project can fall apart. Anybody who has lost hours browsing randomly on Wikipedia knows that any one particular topic can lead you in any number of other directions, across innumerable disciplines and places and times. Except instead of reading, you're making the article instead of just reading it. Also, there are two of you, and you're different people (except for all the aspects you share), and neither one knows how to work the brakes.

Suffice it to say, that there was a (probably) excessive amount of gloating when I realized that I had been singled out and quoted in the editorial response to our previous article (and thus validated and privileged) in the response to the proposal. This exemplifies how the reception¹¹ of a text is problematized when it is explicitly collaborative, because this kind of reception (how a reader privileges specific portions of the text) creates an inherent competition between the creators of the text. This is partly why instead of limiting our formal and linguistic departures from traditionally accepted modes we overly pursued complex/confusing methods. Our desires to not be the forgotten writer meant that we approached each sentence with more awareness of our stylistic choices for clarity, originality, and audience than if only a single voice/ideas were present in the text, since we were/are acutely aware that including any ideas/phrases that are unclear or insignificant in some way risks one of us becoming the forgotten author—the one who toils in self-



Scott Pyrz
8:11 PM Jun 29

Good point, buddy. I was making it seem as though our methods were the problem, which really is not the case. The problem was that we couldn't stop ourselves or the other from taking the conversation in any direction or form they wanted.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
5:12 AM Nov 19, 2013

Is there a specific word for that?



Scott Pyrz
2:13 PM Nov 19, 2013

I don't think so? Wikiflaneur?



Thaddeus Stoklasa
5:39 AM Nov 19, 2013

I'd say this is a mixed metaphor, but there's not actually a *mix*. It has an ending and no beginning.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
5:08 AM Nov 19, 2013

Are... are you Frankenwriting with your past-self?



Scott Pyrz
10:02 AM Nov 19, 2013

Yes, I am. Though, so are you.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
12:52 PM Nov 19, 2013

Yeah... pretty much all of it is. But don't tell *them* that.



Scott Pyrz
2:02 PM Nov 19, 2013

I'm actually kind of glad you responded like that. This again is an example of us going to far. I get it. You learned how to put **bold** or *italicized* words in the comments. Now stop it.



Scott Pyrz
8:13 PM Jun 29

Now that I think about it, this is of our biggest undoings. We were young postmodernist, trying to prove how clever we could be.

¹¹See footnote 8.

denigrating and depressing obscurity. Though, this also raises ethical issues about who is able to claim what in a collaborative piece: are we both allowed to claim anything presented in our collective work as our own? An answer is that the reader doesn't know whose words/ideas they are privileging are, so it doesn't matter who gets to claim the praise or criticism, but this answer falls apart when we consider the multiple spaces in which collaborative writing functions. In a professional setting (i.e. a collaborative presentation) it seems wrong (or at least inappropriate) to claim praise or blame for ideas/words that were not your own, but in other settings (for instance, this article) it seems more appropriate for me to accept praise and blame for words/ideas that I didn't write.



Scott Pyrz

2:28 PM Nov 19, 2013

It also falls apart here since we are so interested in showing who wrote what

These uncomfortable feelings about observation (and inherently judgment) greatly affected our production of both articles, by increasing the potential for competition and by limiting our willingness to engage in some of the richest practices of our writing and thought (since if I know I'm being watched I may start to doubt myself¹² when I let my cursor hover over a single word for minutes while I dig through the OED for a sufficiently better replacement [What if my observer thinks I'm not working or that I have a pathetically, and laughably, inadequate vocabulary?]) and I think we were both unwilling to edit and rewrite as much as we normally would since we wanted to keep everything we wrote in the document, making it messy and uneditable). The pressures of being observed and working collaboratively led to an increased and hidden tension in both texts.



Scott Pyrz

10:41 PM Nov 18, 2013

Do you think you can do something with this?



Thaddeus Stoklasa

5:06 AM Nov 19, 2013

I'm not really sure. I mean, I can't even tell if our competition is real or not.

The (In)Visible Hand of the Editor(s)

A week or so past when we submitted our article (the previous one, not the one you're reading now), we received three letters in response: one from The Editorial Team as a collective, one from an unknown party calling themselves Editor One, and a third from the similarly *nom de plumed*¹³ Editor Two.

I can't speak for my collaborator (though I intermittently do regardless), but I found these comments a touch disheartening. Especially the one that suggested "cutting back on the meta-commentary," which was presented

¹²Hey! This is what my giant footnote in the other article was about. Except with *Star Wars* references and therefore inherently better.

¹³And yes, I know that isn't correct French. What do you want? I took French in High School. I've been several entirely different people since then.

in that united voice of The Team. Both of us seemed to agree that we hated (at least portions, of not the entirety of) our article but also thought it was amazing. This fed into a response something akin to, “Hey, nobody can rip on our work but us^{14!}”

Much of their commentary was focused on trying to carve something legible out of our textual behemoth. The Collective of Editors wrote that the “article as it stands now needs some reshaping and revision in order for it to better fit the scope and aims for the journal,” with Editor One saying it was “challenging” while pointing out that the dense and branching structure “may detract from the main points” and Editor Two describing the mix of structural elements as “fascinating and confusing at the same time.” These points are not without merit. While it was our intent to create a dense/challenging article presented in a formally complex/fascinating way, we failed precisely because our presentation detracted “from the main points.” This is a valuable lesson when thinking about any genre: the form and content are inextricably linked. Which is not to say that content cannot appear in different forms, but that the form and content affect each other.


There’s also a certain comedic value in the fact that both Editors One & Two discussed the potential for making editors a part of the discussion within the article.¹⁵ Granted, we had said this ourselves and always planned on doing it, but there’s still something funny about seeing them say it. But this text is nothing if not an attempt to make the invisible visible, in regard to collaboration. And if you’re getting published, even as an individual, you’re collaborating with editors.

In all seriousness, the article you’re currently reading does reflect specific points of commentary from our editors. Editor One closed their letter saying “I hope the writers will save this original draft for possible submission to other publications.” And Editor Two remarked that we could

¹⁴Not that any of the editors were rude or combative, but people often have weird and intense relationships to things they created. And, despite (or, if we’re being honest, because of) the fractured meta-bizarritude, *it was something we both developed some manner of attachment to*. Can you be in an unhealthy relationship with a piece of writing? I submit that you can.

¹⁵**Editor One:** “I encourage the authors to think through how best to acknowledge the role that editing by outside editors plays in shaping a published piece.”

¹⁵**Editor Two:** “They could also bring the editors into the article and show us as secondary collaborators.”




Scott Pysz
2:32 PM Nov 19, 2013

I don't recall saying that




Thaddeus Stoklasa
2:32 PM Nov 19, 2013

Power of imagination.




Thaddeus Stoklasa
2:34 PM Nov 19, 2013

But yeah, maybe it was just me. I shouldn't even have to say this, but feel free to contradict.




Scott Pysz
2:34 PM Nov 19, 2013

No no it's fine. You are welcome to speak for me




Scott Pysz
2:38 PM Nov 19, 2013

I demand you remove this ampersan. Now




Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:23 PM Nov 19, 2013

But then this comment will be gone and we'll lose this moment in time forever.




Scott Pysz
2:39 PM Nov 19, 2013

And other writers/academics /theorists/web designers/etc.



Thaddeus Stoklasa
2:18 PM Nov 19, 2013

Yeah, yeah... speaking for both again.



Scott Pysz
3:15 PM Nov 19, 2013

But this time it is true. I really loved that article, but I also really hated it too.

perhaps “follow [our] step-by-step process of writing together and explain how [we] navigated the problems that arose.” It’s not the entirety of what this article is, but it does reflect a direction we took with this piece.

A Conclusion in Three Parts

I don’t know that we succeeded in creating an article that is coherent or singularly focused (though that was never our goal), but I do think that the process of creating an unmitigated disaster of an article has allowed us to refine the ways in which we formally approach complex ideas. Just because we have the ability and technology to represent our ideas in certain formats, does not mean that those formats will enrich our (or our readers’) understanding of the text itself or the ideas contained therein.

No matter who one collaborates with, there are going to be issues. Perhaps the lesson here is the importance of being aware of yourself as a collaborator: weaknesses, flaws, that sort of thing. People tend to want to work with people they share some commonality with, but that’s not going to bring about success on its own. There is such a thing as getting along too well. If we as individuals had been as self-aware as our article(s), there might not have been a second draft here.



Scott Pysz
2:48 PM Nov 19, 2013

Sweet, found a place to use it.



Scott Pysz
2:59 PM Nov 19, 2013

So since you talked about partnering am I supposed to be talking about our technological issues?




Thaddeus Stoklasa
3:01 PM Nov 19, 2013

Could be a nice point to end on. And it would seem to justify the split structure as something more than an empty flourish.




Scott Pysz
3:14 PM Nov 19, 2013

Sounds good to me.



Scott Pysz
2:43 PM Nov 19, 2013

Look at that. I got it back in there



Thaddeus Stoklasa
2:44 PM Nov 19, 2013

Did you catch the *textual behemoth* up above?
I was considering *textual tyrannosaurus*, but I thought that might be too on-the-nose.

This article, while not the article we originally wanted to write, is (we hope) an example of how the collaborative process actually functions. Without our previous attempt at this article, we would not have had the gentle, guiding hand of our “Editor Team”¹⁶ to reign in our textual deviancy, which was (quite clearly) something we could not do as a collaborative unit. The collective achievement of these articles (if there is any, which I admit may be a stretch) is that they provide ample evidence of: how complex/problematic collaboration is; how inextricably connected content and form are; and how difficult it can be to present (and think about) practices that tend to remain invisible/hidden/forgotten/marginalized/etc.

¹⁶And we do mean that. Any appearance of distaste for Editors is purely ironical. Probably.



[Thaddeus Stoklasa or Scott Pyrz] is* a PhD student who really (only kinda-sorta) isn't a fan of rules and who has so many interests (academic and otherwise) that reducing them (and his "self") to a list or (even worse) a "blurb" is an insurmountable task that he (at least at the time he was asked to write this) simply refused to do.

*I suppose this depends on what your definition of is is.



[Scott Pyrz or Thaddeus Stoklasa] was a first-year PhD student at Illinois State University when he co-wrote this article (as well as the other unreadable one referenced in the title[s]). Some time before that, he picked up Master's and Bachelor's degrees from Missouri State University (though probably not in that order). Where he is now and/or what he might be doing is impossible for me to say, as I have no idea when you happen to be reading this. I'm just ink on a page, after all. Or pixels on a screen.

