Subject: Re: about moderation and comp.lang.idl*
Posted by bowler on Wed, 06 May 1998 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <6iqbdsbql1@canopus.cc.umanitoba.ca>, roberson@ibd.nrc.ca (Walter Roberson)
writes:
> In article <Pine.OSF.3.95.980506183704.6207A-100000@poseidon.ifctr.mi.cnr.it>,
> Sebastiano Barbieri <nospam@ifctr.mi.cnr.it> wrote:
>
> :If you close it, could one rename the ever-confusing comp.lang.idl-pvwave to
> :comp.lang.idl ? I believe the majority of (RSI) IDL users, which are more
> :than 100, would find that easy.
>
> That would leave out the Visual Numerics PVWAVE users unless a new
> newsgroup such as comp.lang.pvwave were also created. It does not seem
> to me that volume of PVWAVE messages distinct from IDL messages would
> be high enough to warrant a split. As newsgroup votes are always held
> independantly, this could easily lead to a situation where
> comp.lang.idl-pvwave was renamed to comp.lang.idl but comp.lang.pvwave
> was rejected, which would leave the PVWAVE users with no newsgroup.

On the one hand, if they don't have enough use to warrant their own news group,
they shouldn't have their own news group. On the other hand, if the volume is
so low, does it really get in the way of IDL users? On the third hand (I grew
up near three mile island :-), if we rename it to comp.lang.idl and have the
charter "allow" pvwave questions, it will make it more "logical" for those of
us who use IDL but not pvwave without totally disenfranchizing the pvwave
users.

On balance, as an IDL user who can barely spell pvwave, I'd vote to change the
name, but let them stay.

Bruce