
Subject: Rules for reading SF-Lovers.

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 25 Sep 1985 17:16:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: OC.TREI@CU20B.ARPA

Article-I.D.: topaz.3782

Posted: Wed Sep 25 13:16:29 1985

Date-Received: Sun, 29-Sep-85 07:01:32 EDT

Sender: daemon@topaz.RUTGERS.EDU

Organization: Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, N.J.

Lines: 71

From: Peter G. Trei

7 Rules of thumb for reading SF-Lovers:

I have been watching SF-Lovers for about 4 years now, and have also delved extensively into the archives. Certain patterns have emerged, and I thought the list might find them of interest.

Rule 1:

If quotations are nested to a depth greater than two, the topic has been mined out.

Comments on comments on comments are of very little interest to most people (including me). Some of the discussion of Quality in SF/Dhalgren is now preceded by '>>>>' and thus the submission consists of a counter-blast to a flame against a rebuttal to an alternate opinion to a comment on Dhalgren. Does anyone, save the individuals involved, really care? The horse they are beating is not merely dead, it's fossilized. (I suppose this submission goes to another level, and is a complaint about counter-blasts to flames against rebuttals to counter-opinions to comments on Dhalgren).

Rule 2:

If there is a movie/book you are interested in, some jerk will submit a spoiler without a warning. (Also known as the 'But I thought EVERYBODY had seen The Prisoner.' rule).

Rule 3:

If you have limited storage for mail, it will be on a weekend when you are away that Saul will clear the backlog, and mail out 10 issues.

This is not really a complaint, but a comment on our embarrassment

of riches; SFL this year is far more voluminous than last or any other year. Keep 'em coming Saul!

Rule 4:

Info in SFL, provided it does not fall to Rule 2, will be far more timely, and often more informative, than info from almost any other source. (Not all my rules are sarcastic).

Rule 5:

If a question/topic is not inextricably bound to a recently released work, SFL has probably tackled it before:- in depth. For example, SF Music was covered extensively a couple years ago, and Showscan was first mentioned around '81. The source of Sturgeon's Law appears definitively in volume 1. Inconsistencies in Niven's Known Space series were discussed soon after Ringworld Engineers came out. Going back into the archives is often a good idea.

This probably results from the average reader watching SFL only for a year or two before going on to other things. I suspect that the modal reader is a 3rd or 4th year undergrad who loses contact when he/she graduates.

Rule 6:

There is no Rule 6.

Rule 7:

Often, comments contain deeply obscure in-jokes (Also known as 'The Rule 6 Rule').

Anyone else, particularly long-time SFL'ers, have some favorite rules?

'about 30% of submissions will have a "cute" signoff'

Peter Trei
oc.trei@cu20b

Subject: Re: Rules for reading SF-Lovers.
Posted by [oyster](#) on Thu, 26 Sep 1985 20:04:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Article-I.D.: uwmac.1496
Posted: Thu Sep 26 16:04:31 1985

Date-Received: Tue, 1-Oct-85 09:59:44 EDT

References:

Reply-To: oyster@uwmacc.UUCP (Vicious Oyster)

Organization: UWisconsin-Madison Academic Comp Center

Lines: 5

Rule number 8:

The 7 rules for reading SF-Lovers are also the rules for reading every other newsgroup.

Subject: Re: Rules for reading SF-Lovers.

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 02 Oct 1985 00:45:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: ewan@uw-june (Ewan Tempero)

Article-I.D.: uw-june.300

Posted: Tue Oct 1 20:45:10 1985

Date-Received: Thu, 3-Oct-85 04:37:07 EDT

References:

Organization: U of Washington Computer Science

Lines: 15

Unless it's a discussion I'm particularly interested in, I "n" most Re: articles. This may result in my missing some interesting comments on some other topic but then the poster should have changed the header to reflect that..... The comment that Nothing is new in SFL (paraphrased) may be true (almost certainly) but some of us have only been around a year or so and like to partipate in "live" discussions rather than dig around archives (assuming they exist - some poor state run universities have barely enough space for current stuff :-). End of rambling....

--

Ewan

Ewan Tempero

"Oh no, not again"

UUCP: ...!uw-beaver!uw-june!ewan ARPA: ewan@washington.ARPA

Please check all nuclear arms at the door.