To: [support@extreme-dm.com](mailto:support@extreme-dm.com)  

From:john chronos - chronos@apexmail.com  
Subject: counter miscounts   
Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1999 09:55:45 –0800

have several of you counters and I was just made aware of a problem that  
puts into doubt the unique visitor counts I have been getting. At this point  
I can not in good conscience even use the figures your counter is providing.  
  
I just set up new web page and I am the only one to have visited it. I got  
these results  
  
Last 20 Visitors Unique Visitors  
19 Apr, Mon, 22:15:40    proxy-381.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV  
    
19 Apr, Mon, 22:53:13    proxy-388.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV  
    
19 Apr, Mon, 23:19:47    proxy-384.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV  
    
19 Apr, Mon, 23:22:34    proxy-386.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV  
    
19 Apr, Mon, 23:22:52    proxy-381.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV  
    
19 Apr, Mon, 23:23:36    proxy-388.public.rwc.webtv.net    WebTV 1    WebTV   
  
Obvously I was one, not all 6 "unique visitors". In fact the counter could  
not even distinguish some duplicate proxy IPs made over a short time. So how  
does you counter identify a a "unique visitor"? Is a cookie used to ID a  
visitor over time regardless of what proxy IP they came from?   
  
Another problem, most of m referrers to my main HP come from mail and NG  
posts. But your counter can not identify these sources so it puts them down  
as "undefined". This may in part be due to WTV's use of it's own mail and  
newsgroup URLs. Any way to remedy this would be helpful or I will have to  
consider using counters that do not have these problems.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 1:05am From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

no\_ng

no\_ng\_deletion attempted to confuse you by posting: "If you think

your alt.discuss newsgroup is in danger of being deleted by Ultrax and

his gang of config controllers, click the website below to find out how

to stop their harassment of our community."

Gee, here I was thinking I was alone in proposing a NEW idea that would

protect BOTH the community AND individuals and all you can do is bring

up some idea that I am NOT in favor of. Hmmmmm..... All of a sudden both

Chantel and no-person RUSH to oppose these ideas. Can they be

threatening to the ProConfusion's hidden agenda?

I have to be suspicious of ANYONE'S motives when they deliberately try to

MISLEAD readers. Shame Chantroll!!!!

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 10:13am From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion poor Chantroll

poor Chantel\_4u spewed: "The question being, why are you going around

alt.discuss threatening to use the proposed newsgroup deletion system to

cancel newsgroups????"

I only did that in two, 2, TWO, 1+1, NGs... both were YES NGs created

ONLY because the YES THUGS got around the community safeguards and voted

them in, yet obviously these voters (if they exist) had no desire to

post there. Hence they are DOA.. and the ONLY way they would NOT be

deleted automatically by the bot, was if you and Ben put them on life

support. Which you a month ago stated in your post about the Counterfeit

Config.... that you'd make sure it was there forever and ever LOL

Obviously I do NOT think Nobody's first or revised NG deletion plan

would work.

I posted only to PROVOKE you and Ben into revealing your plans to

sabotage the new deletion process... and you both fell for it.

Thank you!!!!!!!!!!!

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 10:55am From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

road

Road-Devil wrote: "Might not a better solution be to simply support

efforts to close truly dead groups, rather than embroil the rest of the

hierarchy in a pointless fight over what constitutes a "misnamed"

group?"

Getting rid dead NGs would accomplish only one thing: getting rid of

dead NGs. The bigger issues are how to restore... or create a NG system

that

1: performs it's main function as an information utility and

2: maximizes the rights of both individuals and the community.

"There are, after all, nearly as many opinions on that topic as there

are posters."

You GROSSLY overstate the problem. If there's a NG called

a.d.rolling-stones and it's about the band, not physics, then it's a

a.d.music NG. Whether it's then put in a music.rock category, is another

question. At this point I'd be happy with top-level reform. Anyway, in

my proposal the regulars in the NG would have to deal with the renaming

and if Nobody makes it clear there are naming guidelines, the result

would have to be more order than exists now.

"That is only one purpose. There are also boards for conversation,

inspiration, silliness, and artistic self-expression. Because of that,

some slack must be allowed to those with divergent interests, if they

exist in significant numbers."

There are PLENTY of options available for these people. Nothing I'm

suggesting would interfere with this vital function of the NG system. I

mentioned NGs perform as an information utility, but i also stated that

another crucial NG function is that they allow people to easily MEET

those with similar interests... Whether those interests serious or not

is NOT important. NGs SHOULD be a reflection of ALL our interests... But

it does little good for newcomers not to be able to FIND communities

with similar interests. When this occurs, the system is becoming

dysfunctional. Reforming the existing naming mess in alt.discuss is

crucial for the system to meet everyone's needs.... except those who

seek to perpetuate confusion.

"The new 100-post margin requirement for new top-level NGs is certainly

a high enough barrier, I would say, to prevent groups from forming

without such serious interest,"

Nobody's proposal will help prevent future abuse but my proposal for NG

renaming deals with the existing NG mess.

"Hardly surprising, but better than the original nightmarish

alternative: 150 posters banding together to close down any group which

they opposed"

I am NOT in favor of this idea. That's why I started this thread.

"Three-day/no-post deletion... I cannot stress that enough. No longer

period of time would be sufficient to discourage widespread

dime-dropping."

The deletion of some NGs still does NOT deal with the problem of the

hideously misnamed NGs already in existence.

"So? Change isn't necessarily the enemy... although it certainly is to

those who favor order over progress."

You use the term "order" as if it has some common meaning to all. Some

seek order in clubs. I'm seeking order in allowing a NG system to

operate efficiently... where people can find the information they want

and meet the people they need to.

"Anything goes, as long as the trains run on time""? That seems to be

the philosophy here... am I wrong?"

Yup. NGs will never be perfect places.... but they do not have to be

grossly imperfect either. Allowing NG regulars in some misnamed NGs to

come into compliance with some minimal community guidelines hardly seems

an imposition or threat. They have plenty of options.

"Not everyone even agrees on what those are at this point; a simple set

of objective guidelines for all posters might achieve the ends you seek

more quickly and more effectively than subjectively weeding out those

NGs you personally find offensive."

Obviously many people who created misnamed NG either did not know about,

or care, that there are naming conventions. Hence the mess we have

today. But if Nobody is supporting higher standards for future NGs, why

not for existing ones? Today's reforms are in response to yesterday's

failures... I for one do not think we should be held hostage to those

failures.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 11:19am From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

road

Road-Devil wrote: "whatever one individual deems to be best for the

community is, in fact, what is best for the Community. My question to

you is, "Is it really?"

Who says any one person's ideas are the issue. Most arguing for some

reform in the system are simply reflecting pretty traditional Usenet

wisdom.

"How, then, does one go from supporting the removal of obviously

unoccupied areas of the community to ordering that place names be

changed once they have been accepted?"

NGs are more than individual creations. They are a utilization of a

community resource. I would like to think that anyone proposing a NG is

trying to fill a community need.... as well as a personal one. Whether

this was reflected in how NGs were proposed or voted on, who knows. In

most every case voters are NOT given better alternatives to vote for,

only an option to vote a NG proposal down. Soon, there are a myriad of

deficient NGs in the system. How are we to know whether voters who seem

to embrace these deficient NGs, would not want them to be improved?

Anyway, even if they resist a simple name change, the community has some

say in how resources are used. Individuals have now been given the Club

option and it's time the community concerns are addressed.

"I don't particularly care for hyphenated names. I think they are a

blight on conventional naming. Should I be able to require those with

such names to change them for the good of the Community?"

I don't think most people have problems with hyphenated names. They seem

pretty essential in naming. I think the issues here are first looking at

the broader issues of top-level reform.

"What if the people with those names have had them in their families for

a very long time?"

What are you saying... that vanity NGs should be allowed? There is a

club option now.... as well as the ability to form mailing lists,

private NGs, web sites, etc. Just because someone has been misusing a

public resource does not mean it must continue.

"At what point does the individual have real rights that demand to be

respected?"

You keep coming back to this point as if these concerns have not been

addressed. Individuals now have a club option. Even in what I have

proposed, there's plenty of respect for individuals. Next topic.

"As I've said before, this restrictive, coercive regime you advocate is

not necessary, not if we have operating liberty in these groups."

People have a right to post somewhere. That's not the same as saying

people have the right to post ANYwhere.

"A relatively high barrier to massive change (100 vote margin for top

level naming), smaller resistance to minor changes (50 vote margin for

other groups), private voluntary associations (club groups), and an

efficient sanitation system (TOS enforcement, three-day/no-post

auto-deletion) are all we need."

Again, you neglect to consider the pre-existing mess. So is it fair to

tomorrow's proposers to meet a higher standard when yesterday's

proposers got a free ride?

"Such a structure maximizes both individual autonomy and the Community

dynamic, rather than merely preserving one individual's view of How

Things Should Run."

Hardly, for again you have NO solution for the pre-existing mess...

hence you are NOT addressing the community's rights to have a functional

alt.discuss system.

Group: alt.discuss.config

Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 11:38am   
From: ulTRAX@webtv.net   
Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL(rwjazz)

RWJAZZ39 wrote: "WNI inaction" did not really create the mess -- the

voters did."

I realize Nobody has acted in the past to curb some abuses.... but I

wish there had been more actions taken a year, 8 months ago. What's

happening now is not just desirable but desperately needed.

"Personally, I think we're going to have to learn to live with it pretty

much as is."

All I'm saying is that THIS is the time to reform the system. I'd hate

to see the other reforms enacted and work, yet to see the NG deletion

remedy be DOA. I believe a different mechanism than the voting one

proposed can finally tame the mess...

"It's never going to be perfect. All we can hope for is that it does not

become the breeding ground for fatal, airborne, viral infections."

But it also need not be grossly imperfect and dysfunctional.

"We can perhaps pick up the big chunks off the floor that might create a

serious trip and fall hazard. It's unlikely we'll ever get into the

corners, or get the furnishings polished to a high sheen."

Colorful analogies but we're not talking about floors, but NGs. Either

we try to get this VITAL deletion (or renaming) reform to work NOW, or

we might as well just give up on ever making Alt.discuss work. Where are

we going to be in a year from now? We'll have maybe 100-150 more A.D

NGs.... And while those may reflect the current reforms, we'll still be

left with 4 to 6Xs the number of older NGs.

THIS is the time to reform the mess. Seize it!

(anyway, the true acid test: it must be a good proposal if Chantroll is

so opposed to it! ;-)

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 1:00pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG renaming (New Proposal)

As I have stated in numerous posts, NGs, if they are functioning well,

create synergy... allowing ideas to be proposed, discussed, modified,

rejected, whatever.

While I may have proposed some sweeping NG deletion reforms in my first

post I'm willing to streamline my proposals and downgrade my

expectations. Hence, the subject name change... from which I expect to

hear from tino.

Here's the summary:

Since there are numerous misnamed top-level NGs already in existence, I

propose there be an effort to reform these existing NG with simple

top-level name changes. This would be in keeping with Nobody's goal of

top-level reform for new proposals. This would also restore the utility

of the tools WebTV has given us: Search and Path.

There would have to be a community vote to determine which NG would be

on this list. This could require maybe 100-150 votes... who knows.

Whether there should be any NO votes is another question. This would

invite sabotage. And, this vote, after all, this would NOT be a vote for

a NG's deletion per se... only for it to be renamed.

Maybe as part of this initial vote some top-level options names would be

suggested... or that a single top-level name be mandated. The

possibility that a NG be renamed with a worse name has to be guarded

against.

Nobody would then post a notice in that NG saying the regulars there

would have to rename their NG. They would be given links to naming

guidelines and a timeline. Maybe a chance to add or modify a charter

could be possible. The regulars FROM THAT NG would be responsible for

renaming their NG... forming a club, moving elsewhere, or allowing the

NG to be deleted without being renamed. It's their choice.

The renamed NG need NOT be subject to a community vote since the NG had

already been created by a vote, and they already had their input in the

list of proposed top-level names.

The regulars would also have the option to add an appropriate 2ed level

name. So say if there's a NG called a.d.beatles they would probably be

mandated into a a.d.music category, but whether they were pick

a.d.music.rock or a.d.music.british or a.d.music.classic-bands... who

knows. Maybe just a.d.music.beatles would be sufficient, even if the

naming purists think otherwise. As I have said before, naming is as much

an art as it is a science.

I think the threat of having a misnamed NG be deleted in 30-60-whatever

days is essential to insure the cooperation of that NG's regulars.

I think this proposal is a well thought-out balance between the

community's right to finally have a functional NG system and the right's

of those who post in misnamed NGs. It may not solve all A.D's problems,

but would go a long way towards that goal.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 1:11pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

Freida

MalFre wrote: "Would it be possible to persuade Nobody to \_assign\_

prefixes, such as soc., edu., misc., sci., mus.,etc.? to each group and

organize the list according to them? The rest of the group name would

stay the same."

I think trying to rename existing NGs is a much less onerous proposition

than the Vote to Delete idea.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 1:19pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is (deletion)

(hoyt)

hoyt wrote: "Key point, Ultrax. News groups today are not attacked by

lone trolls posting insults. Instead they are besieged by organized

armies of trolls willing to go to any length to achieve their ends. That

has been and is the pattern in 4-webtv and here in config."

I have addressed this problem in the post called New Proposal where as

part of the initial community vote to rename a NG, some naming

guidelines would be offered... in some cases mandated.

"I say, let us move FIRST on the reforms suggested by nobody... without

diluting the discussion with hopes and dreams that require active

support from Bill Gates and WNI."

For the most part I support Nobody's changes. But if a crucial component

to reform, NG deletion, will be sabotaged, then I think this is the time

to reconsider that proposal from scratch before too much effort goes

into creating a mechanism that won't perform its intended task.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 3:15pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion poor

ChanTTTroll

<having fun><ChanTroll squirms>

Chantel\_4u muttered: "Thank you for admitting your trolling efforts once

proof of such was put before your face."

In the Trolling, being destructive, and TTTing Censorship departments,

I'm a mere victim in the Kingdom where you reign supreme.

"Please explain what "community safeguards" you are referring? The

community voted to include these newsgroups into the hierarchy."

The whole idea of VES Votes is to pass flawed NGs which would be

opposed. Not that all are, but many. But it's obvious that YES has

corrupted the safeguard that votes=viability. So as you and Ben continue

your Troll war here, NGs are being passed when it's pretty clear these

voters (if they exist) don't give a damn about these NGs. Hence they are

as I have called them: DOA NGs.

"If you weren't trolling these newsgroups, then MAYBE they could get

back ON TOPIC."

I tire of this bogus argument... Your Counterfeit Config is dead

because NO ONE, with a few Yes Thug exceptions and fellow travelers,

BELIEVES THE GROUP IS LEGITIMATE!!!! You can call my warning innocent

proposers whom you planned to manipulate and victimize "trolling" if you

want. But it's just sour grapes. I was performing a community service. I

also posted more useful info in Prep than you did.... All you could do

was TTT your own posts to death.

"Could you please explain to the alt.discuss community how you determine

what a "DOA" newsgroup is"

Already did.

"Since the idea for the newsgroup was my idea, and since the a.d.

community at large voted in favor of its creation,"

Ya, where are they? Where are all these folks who voted for Tortilla?

"I will try to salvage the newsgroup you are attempting to destroy by

off-topic posts and the proposed deletion process."

Feel free to knock yourself out. Please do! But, again, when that NG had

a few real visitors I posted more ON-TOPIC posts than you. At the time I

accused you of being a Troll in your own NG LOL!!!!.

"Nice backslide loser."

It's common knowledge you and Ben can easily be coaxed into revealing

your true destructive agendas. LOL

"However, considering Ben and I do not have the technical skills in

which to hack into munitions utility, we are all waiting for YOU to get

your crack at the new voting pages..."

The new site is quite impressive but needs some work to make it more

secure.

"The only plan so far is educating the a.d. community about how a

self-proclaimed "hacker" is attempting to delete topical newsgroups in

alt.discuss under the guise of "reworking the hierarchy" for structure."

If you will notice my last proposal called for RENAMING NGs, not

deleting them Duh Chantroll. I also think it's comic the way you think

labeling me a "hacker" works to your advantage. That I ever used my

skills or knowledge in a destructive was has been discredited in Prep.

maybe I have to crosspost all my responses to your personal attacks

here. Maybe I should find the Net4TV profile. In the mean time think

there's an opening in the Third Riech's Propaganda Department for you

LOL.

</Chantroll squirms></havig fun>

UlTTTrax Posts:

Thank you!!!!!!!!!!!

Chantel Responds:

No, UlTTTrax, thank YOU:-)

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 12:07pm (EST-3) From:

nobody-munition@webtv.net (Nobody @Munitions) Re: NG Deletion is

ESSENTIAL Aylana

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///):

The third area, and the one that I fear we're losing site of, is

reforming the pre-existing mess. That's what Nobody was also trying to

deal with in offering a NG deletion

mechanism, but I fear his proposal would not work before, and certainly

won't work now.

While I share your concerns about the effectiveness of the

proposal-based newsgroup deletion scheme, I'm more concerned about the

potential for depriving smaller groups with minority views of their

newsgroups. It would be nice to have clean, well-organized hierarchy,

but not at the cost of driving out minority viewpoints.

I think THIS is the time to find a way to >FINALLY reform the mess

created in the past

two years. Either we come up with some

workable alternatives to Nobody's proposal NOW, or settle on the

hierarchy ALWAYS

being a mess.

I welcome alternative suggestions. Let me give you some criteria that

any suggestion has to meet in order for me to consider it:

1) it has to be automated - it can't rely on either WebTV staff or

munitions volunteers to make decisions.

2) it can't impose excessive burdens on WebTV or munitions computer

systems. (Newsgroups and article storage are relatively inexpensive.

Database lookups to determine which a box a particular account comes

from are expensive.)

3) it has to be "fair", which means democratic in this context.

As an example, it would probably be possible to create an alt.discuss2

hierarchy with different rules than in the alt.discuss hierarchy. In the

alt.discuss2 hierarchy, readers could elect a Central Committee which

would decide which newsgroups to create, which to delete, which to

rename. Each committee member could be elected for a six-month term,

maximum of two consecutive terms.

(That was an example, not a suggestion.)

I think this can be done with a "guidelines" approach rather than merely

with votes which can be abused.

How would guidelines be enforced? By whom? Not by me and certainly not

by WNI.

nobody@vote.munitions.com

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 4:29pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

road

Road-Devil wrote: " Unless you've found some way to force these changes

without one person being the linchpin to such changes, then these name

changes would indeed be one person's responsibility."

Make up your mind. You started off implying one person was trying to

impose their will on the system, then when I refuted that by saying it's

merely conventional UseNet thought, you move the target to some

imaginary "linchpin". If by that you mean Nobody finally decides.... ya,

but Nobody is setting up a system to prevent abuse, we would be making

decisions.

"Likewise with the deletion of "duplicate" groups; =someone= will have

to decide when duplicate groups are OK, and when they are redundant,

under the system you advocate."

I have advocate there be a vote. I also have backed off from seeking

sweeping reform to just top-level reform. Either way there was no

"someone".

"I don't know that anyone should have the right to impose such a system,

or that any one person has the wisdom to do so fairly,"

As I stated earlier... there is a balance between community and

individual rights. Since the individual has plenty of options there is

hardly any cause for concern except for those seeking to obstruct

reform. And what wisdom is really required by renaming a NG within a new

Top-level? How is this "unfair"? The NG can remain intact. Sounds like a

no-brainer yet you raise all these dire objections. Why?.

"or that there can even be a single notion of "fairness" that all would

find acceptable."

Pretty soon I think you're going to ask how many angels can dance on the

head of a pin. Posters will ALWAYS have the right to post somewhere. But

that does NOT mean they have the right to post ANYwhere. It's time for

reforming the old NGs that never would pass today.

"When has a Usenet NG ever been canceled for failing to fall into line

with the generally accepted nomenclature guidelines? I agree with the

goal... but the method is all wrong."

I was referring to naming. Obviously WNI MUST carry A.D. NGs. Usenet

administrators can refuse to carry NGs if they choose. So what method do

YOU prefer? Or are you merely here to shoot down ANY talk of reform?

"We have the vote totals to reflect this. When the threshold for creation

was reached, in times past, this was generally a sign of significant

interest on the part of the community in creating the topic."

Even before YES votes, NGs were being rammed though by friends of

friends. But YES has certainly tried to sabotage the safeguard of

community voting. They are hollow votes... representing nothing.

"Every individual has the power to propose an alternative; that they

fail to do so is no reason to blame the successful proposers."

Unlike real elections where there IS a side by side comparison, that is

unlikely to ever happen in NG voting... that is even if an alternative

exists. The two Delaware proposals was the closest I've seen... ever.

Most voting goes on without any serious questions being asked of the

proposer... or any attempts made to improve the proposal. This is one

reason I'd like to see all proposers be subjected to Review and Comment.

"And we all know how those who made the trains run on time dealt with

those they considered "deficient", don't we?"

Trains, planes, and subways run on time without resorting to murderous

dictatorships. Hmmmmm....

are you beginning to betray your true intent as an obstructionist or are

you trying to improve some ideas though discussion.

"But the voting results are what they are, and they should be upheld as

valid in the absence of demonstrable fraud."

UH? But it was you who proposed " I would say, to prevent groups from

forming without such serious interest, while a three-day/no-post

deletion rule would quickly dispose of any useless groups that -might-

be so formed." So make up your mind. As I have said today's reforms are

necessary because of yesterday's abuses. It makes no sense to seek to

deal only with future proposals while leaving the existing mess intact.

Why should the greater community, perhaps millions of users, continue to

suffer from a legacy of bad proposals that just happened to get passed

by a mere 50 votes? This is Libertarian Lunacy at its most destructive

worst.

"If they passed, they passed. Rigging the vote in favor of "order" is

still rigging the vote."

"Rigging the vote" usually implies vote fraud. Explain why you are using

such a provocative phrase when no one's proposing vote fraud. And why if

you are favor of not tampering with existing NG why did YOU propose: "

to prevent groups from forming without such serious interest, while a

three-day/no-post deletion rule would quickly dispose of any useless

groups that -might- be so formed."

"What about the voters who did not believe this was a "misuse"? In every

case of post-w NG creation, a fifty-vote margin of victory has een

required to open a group. This means that the Community did not appear

to view the proposal as a "misuse".

Addressed above. And I again refer you to YOUR deletion proposal.

A sop. A =useful= sop, but still a sop.

Uh?

"As long as they agree with you."

Again, you're returning to the bogus argument that I, or any one else,

has some dictatorial power. Again I refer you to YOUR NG deletion

proposal. Why are your proposals to delete existing NGs acceptable why

my efforts to strengthen them not?

"They have a right to expect their votes to be upheld, in the absence of

any offense against the TOS."

But remember it was Nobody who proposed the NG deletion process. Shall I

go there and see if you posted in that thread? As the TOS changes to

reflect WNI's needs.... so should the rules which govern the NGs. Again

read your OWN proposal to delete NGs. So please make up your mind!

Glaring inconsistencies such as what you are revealing generally

reflect sloppy thinking or a hidden agenda.

Which is it?

"Most of the "pre-existing mess" would be eliminated by tossing

out unused top-level groups; the few left would exist as historical

oddities, to be both preserved and cherished, if only for their novelty

and perseverance."

You're under the mistake impression these NGs will be actually be

deleted. I think in a year from now we'll see about 4 NG actually

deleted.... if we're lucky.

So is it fair to tomorrow's proposers to meet a higher standard when

yesterday's proposers got a free ride?

Current groups met the requirements under the "law" at that time. That

shouldn't be held against them now that the "laws" have changed.

But you also proposed they could be deleted under the new rules which

did not exist then.

"In America, such ex post facto actions are so reviled, they were

enshrined in the Constitution as something to forever be rejected."

Then deal with your own contradictions.

"There should be room for something aside from pure function and

mechanistic behavior. People have eccentric, creative sides that deserve

and demand to be recognized. The voting system, especially the new higher

standards for creating top-level groups, affords protection from abuse

of free naming while allowing for these eccentricities that make the

Community an interesting place in which to live."

People would still be free to post as they always have in renamed NGs.

That you can object so strongly to such a modest proposal is most

suspicious.

"we don't need to wear Mao jackets or Brown shirts to be a Community."

So, consistent with your philosophy, I can assume you're down at the

local library denouncing the oppression of the cataloging system and

demanding dictionaries go free style?

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 4:38pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is (deletion)

(nobody)

nobody-munition wrote: "It is quite difficult to rename a newsgroup IF

you want to preserve the articles in the group when it is renamed."

Thanks for taking the time to respond and provide some technical info.

What if there was a one month transition... all posts posted the old NG

would be automatically cross-posted to the new NG... as Alt.Discuss Posts

are cross-posted to config. Only the New NG would not be accessible until

the old NG was deleted. In this way all the posts/threads would be

intact and nothing would be lost. A Meta refresh could whisk people to

the New NG for the new few months..

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 4:56pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

Nobody

nobody-munition wrote: "While I share your concerns about the

effectiveness of the proposal-based newsgroup deletion scheme, I'm more

concerned about the potential for depriving smaller groups with minority

views of their newsgroups."

If the attempt to reform NG was merely name-based rather than

deletion-by-vote, this might not be a problem. In fact no NGs need be

deleted.... and the name change could make these lost NGs more easy to

find.

"It would be nice to have clean, well-organized hierarchy, but not at

the cost of driving out minority viewpoints."

No one has suggested this happen, but the fear-mongers will play it up.

If NGs were deleted based on low usage, the

news:alt.discuss.webtv.privacy NG I created would be a prime target. Yet

a side of me almost wishes I had NOT narrowed its scope to webtv. It

probably should have been alt.discuss,.privacy.

"I welcome alternative suggestions. Let me give you some criteria that

any suggestion has to meet in order for me to consider it:

I'll ponder them. Thanks!

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 5:18pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion [Nobody]

Nobody wrote:

"1) it has to be automated - it can't rely on either WebTV staff or

munitions volunteers to make decisions."

First, imagine NO NGs are to be deleted... only renamed.

What if the renaming process went something like this:

There's a community vote to identify a misnamed NG. As part of that vote

there's a way to add what the top level name should be.

Since misnamed NGs are misnamed regardless of what the ProConfusion

people say, there need not be any NO votes, but there'd have to be a

very high threshold all agreeing on the same top-level name. Maybe 200

votes? Those opposed could just vote to keep the same name. This gets

away from that NG's regulars having a big say.... but then aside from a

minor name change they are not being affected in the least. Some may

welcome the chance to have their NG be more accessible/visible

Can this process be sabotaged? It depends whether the top-level choices

are limited to logical names.

Once the Vote is passed it sets in motion an automated process. The new

NG is created.... but not accessible. Posts to the old NG are

automatically cross-posted to the NG for a 30 day period. When that time

is up the new NG should have ALL the old posts/threads and be ready for

business. Visitors to the old NG are transferred to the new NG.

Whether there needs to be a timeline in this vote.... I don't know.

2) it can't impose excessive burdens on WebTV or munitions computer

systems. (Newsgroups and article storage are relatively inexpensive.

Database lookups to determine which a box a particular account comes

from are expensive.)

3) it has to be "fair", which means democratic in this context.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Fri, Nov 26, 1999, 6:08pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

elf

elfking wrote: "I agree with you totally on this! its something that

needed to be said here for a long time now."

Since no one I know has been proposing the deletion of minority

viewpoint NGs, I think your comments are a pretty cheap shot.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Sat, Nov 27, 1999, 10:49am From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is ESSENTIAL

goodluck

j-goodluck wrote: " I oppose any and all proposals for newsgroup

deletion under any circumstances."

The reason Nobody proposed a deletion mechanism is because a.d. Land is

full of misnamed NGs and many others that were passed with such a narrow

focus they were never viable. Some narrow focus NGs sap strength from

parent NGs causing both to struggle. Then there's matter of voting abuse

etc.

"The fact that a NG may be \*temporarily\* "vacant" is no reason to delete

it.

For example, news:alt.discuss.knitting and

news:alt.discuss.history.civil-war.us were BOTH once empty or nearly

empty (for a month or more) but now they are BOTH extremely thriving

newsgroups."

You make it sound that those who post there now would NEVER had a

possibility to post if the vacant NGs did not exist. This is simply NOT

true. As for the knitting NG I seem to recall they vacated for a while

(summer of 98?) because of trolling. I bumped into them in another

vacant NG... I think it was Tweaker1... a vanity NG rammed though in

spring 98 and something the creator got bored with and abandoned in a

few weeks. Anyway, even if these NGs had been deleted, there was always

the option to create NGs with a broader appeal... and more likely to be

viable from the start. The deletion of some unused NGs is also essential

to directing readers back to higher level NGs which, if they become

popular and splinter, can do so along lines that insures viability for

both the parent AND splinter NGs.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Sat, Nov 27, 1999, 2:03pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is (mental)

MentalWard wrote: "Groups that were made that do not fit the index but

are viable and healthy should not have to worry about a change taking

place unless they wanted it to be changed."

The name change is not for their benefit, but for the benefit of those

in the greater community who are trying to FIND existing NGs that suit

their interests. Give the degradation of SEARCH and PATH... the ONLY

tools we had to find NGs, something has to be done.

In this light I believe the rights of those to FIND NGs that suit their

interests supercedes those in a NG who, under my renaming proposal,

would NOT be inconvenienced in ANY way. In fact I stated I'd be willing

to let the misnamed NG keep its name if it was placed in the proper

top-level hierarchy. Hence a.d.family.mygrandchildren. At least then

someone could use SEARCH & PATH to get to this NG.

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Sat, Nov 27, 1999, 4:48pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is (webber)

webwebber wrote: "Nobody has done a terrific service to the Community by

setting up this page. Do you have a problem with this additional

resource."

Yup, it's a great list. Kudos to Nobody on this and other restructuring

efforts. But having a list of misnamed NGs is NOT much assistance when

they should be in a top-level which describes their focus. The list does

not permit Search and Path features... well technically it does, but

Path has been rendered useless.

What is your plan? To hope for the creation of NEW tools to make up for

the ones that have been degraded and made useless though the passage of

possibly hundreds of misnamed NG?

Group: alt.discuss.config Date: Sat, Nov 27, 1999, 4:57pm From:

ulTRAX@webtv.net (///\ ulTRÅX \///) Re: NG Deletion is (elf)

elfking wrote:; "a.d.family.talk and a.d.mygrandchild were

grandfathered into alt.discuss when the old W groups were deleted. they

are alive and well newsgroups with a steady following. they should not

be bothered."

While you may focus on those in these existing NGs, my focus is on the

REST of the WebTV users, now and in the future, who may not be able to

FIND the NGs that interest them. I believe that if this SIMPLE goal can

not be met, the system as a whole is pretty dysfunctional.

"best you think more about dead and unused newsgroups. who are you

anyway?"

What's this? Some snotty attempt to claim seniority rather than to

debate the entire range of issues which affect ALL the users? Who the

hell are you to ask?