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Match Merge

The single-valued, ideal view requires us to make unfounded decisions that merge identities arbitrarily, without justification.

This replaces true ambiguity with false simplicity.
A conclusion-only database offers no basis for future evidence evaluation: no researcher can build on the work published by another.
The Challenge

How to represent evidence and conflicting conclusions in collaboration
Three Essential Views

1. Evidence: identity

2. Matching identities with possible conflicts: individual

Technology

- Links, intra-database or across the Net
- Dynamically assembled views
- Structured Text Records
- Tags
Tags

Family Relationships:
father  mother  child  spouse

Four Basic Events:
birth  marriage  death  event

Identity Link:
tie
Evidence Identities

3:239 identity Tom Jones birth 1903 Ohio marriage 1922

5:330 identity Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio death 1946
Evidence Identities

3:239 identity Tom Jones birth 1903 Ohio marriage 1922

5:330 identity Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio death 1946

Conclusion Individuals

6:101 individual Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio tie 3:239
   tie 5:330

7:333 individual tie 5:330

7:334 individual tie 3:239
Dynamically Extended Complete View For Evidence Evaluation

Before Expansion

6:101 individual Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio tie 3:239
tie 5:330

After Expansion

6:101 individual Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio tie 3:239
identity Tom Jones birth 1903 Ohio marriage 1922 tie
5:330 identity Thomas Jones birth 1901 Ohio death 1946
Collaboration
Building on the Work of Others

8:932 individual Mary Jones father 933

8:933 individual Thomas Jones death 06 JUN 1946 tie 6:101 child 932
Future

• Move to web transaction platform

• Open source development

• Field testing to learn from usage patterns