Subject: Should we split this group? (was Re: Lift the "ban" :-))
Posted by zawodny on Thu, 14 Mar 1996 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <4i76uh$o7g@fu-berlin.de> Sergey Senin <ss@ee.port.ac.uk> writes:
> todd@rainbow.rmii.com (Todd Bradley) wrote:
>
>> The problem is that one man's technical issue is another man's
>> marketing hype or slander.
>
> Can't we sort of restrict participation of the employees of companies A and B
> :-) to a certain area, say employees of company A or B can only answer
> questions about products A or B respectively if this questions are from the
> range "How do I do this or that?".

>> Historically, employees of company A
>> felt that just about every article posted by employees of company
>> B were attempts at marketing or selling company B's product.
>
> This is called paranoia, isn't it? :-)) ;-)) :-))
>

I think that we are all missing the obvious solution here, namely that we split the group into comp.lang.rsi-idl (I think comp.lang.idl is taken) and comp.lang.pvwave. The two have diverged sufficiently in the last few years that I think there is little reason to logically associate them with the same group. In this way Company A can still snoop on Company B's group, but they cannot claim that Company B is advertising to a captive audience of Company A users. Let's face it, this group is 95% IDL related right now. So, let's kick the PV-WAVE users out on their own. I'm sure they'll stick around after the split, since this (IDL) group has the knowledge base and can solve a large number of PV-WAVE problems/questions.

So what do you think?

--

Dr. Joseph M. Zawodny KO4LW NASA Langley Research Center
E-mail: J.M.Zawodny@LaRC.NASA.gov MS-475, Hampton VA, 23681-0001

Subject: Re: Should we split this group? (was Re: Lift the "ban" :-))
Posted by Sergei Senin on Thu, 14 Mar 1996 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

zawodny@arbd0.larc.nasa.gov (Joseph M Zawodny) wrote:
> I think that we are all missing the obvious solution here, namely that we
> split the group into comp.lang.rsi-idl (I think comp.lang.idl is taken)
> and comp.lang.pvwave. The two have diverged sufficiently in the last few
> years that I think there is little reason to logically associate them with

> the same group. In this way Company A can still snoop on Company B's
> group, but they cannot claim that Company B is advertising to a captive
> audience of Company A users. Let's face it, this group is 95% IDL related
> right now. So, let's kick the PV-WAVE users out on their own. I'm sure
> they'll stick around after the split, since this (IDL) group has the
> knowledge base and can solve a large number of PV-WAVE problems/questions.
>
> So what do you think?
> --
> Dr. Joseph M. Zawodny KO4LW NASA Langley Research Center
> E-mail: J.M.Zawodny@LaRC.NASA.gov MS-475, Hampton VA, 23681-0001

That's a very good solution IMHO. And we don't loose anything - It wouldn't be
difficult to monitor both groups, since traffic here is low :-(

--
Sergei
ss@ee.port.ac.uk, http://www.ee.port.ac.uk:80/~ss-www/WAVE/

Subject: Re: Should we split this group? (was Re: Lift the "ban" :-))
Posted by peter on Thu, 14 Mar 1996 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Joseph M Zawodny (zawodny@arbd0.larc.nasa.gov) wrote:

: there is little reason to logically associate them with the same group.

: this (IDL) group has the
: knowledge base and can solve a large number of PV-WAVE problems/questions.

Which is it; they are not logically associated, or, the IDL group can
solve large numbers of PV-Wave problems?

As a former IDL, now PV-Wave, maybe future IDL user, I'd say it's a
ridiculous idea. About 95% of the questions are common to the two
languages, widgets being the only obvious exception.

: So what do you think?

Just say no.

Peter

Peter Webb, HP Labs Medical Dept
E-Mail: peter_webb@hpl.hp.com
Phone: (415) 813-3756

Subject: Re: Should we split this group? (was Re: Lift the "ban" :-))
Posted by Sergei Senin on Mon, 18 Mar 1996 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mgs@www1.utech.net (Mike Schienle) wrote:
> In article <Do9M2K.42p@hpl.hp.com>, peter@hpl.hp.com (Peter Webb) wrote:
>
>> Joseph M Zawodny (zawodny@arbd0.larc.nasa.gov) wrote:
>>
>> : this (IDL) group has the
>> : knowledge base and can solve a large number of PV-WAVE problems/questions.
>>
>> As a former IDL, now PV-Wave, maybe future IDL user, I'd say it's a
>> ridiculous idea. About 95% of the questions are common to the two
>> languages, widgets being the only obvious exception.
>
> I have to vote with Peter on this one, also. As a daily user of both IDL
> and PV-WAVE, I think they are still common enough to make a single
> newsgroup meaningful. Also, with the low number of posts here (5-10 per
> day?), it's not an issue of having to wade through 100's of IDL posts to
> find something relevant to PV-WAVE, and vice versa.
>
> --
> Mike Schienle
> Custom Data Visualizations
> mgs@www1.utech.net

After some reflections on the subject I tend to agree with Joseph and Mike and since
my initial proposal to lift the ban hasn't gained support, I think that we can as
well bury this subject for the time being.

Cheers

--
Sergei Senin
University of Portsmouth
Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
Microwave, Telecommunications and Signal Processing Research Group
Anglesea Building, Anglesea Road,
Portsmouth,P01 3DJ,England.
ss@ee.port.ac.uk, http://www.ee.port.ac.uk:80/~ss-www/WAVE