

---

### Final TTN Editorial

[Editor's note: Following the decision to merge *TeX* and *TUG News* (*TTN*) into *TUGboat*, a number of other items required publication, and so it is only as of this issue of *TUGboat* that the merger takes shape. A number of items originally destined for *TTN* now appear here, but only a few suffer from datedness. In his unpublished editorial regarding the merger, *TTN*'s editor, Peter Flynn, made a number of points which are best included in this return of *TTN*, now an integral component to *TUGboat*.

It is with a mixture of relief and delight that we include some of the material which was intended for publication in *TTN*, issues 4,3 and 4,4. ]

### *TeX* and *TUG News* and *TUGboat*

At the 1995 meeting in St. Petersburg Beach, it was decided that *TUGboat* and *TTN* should once again be published between the same covers.

The most overriding issue in the merger was that having two separate publications was diluting the effort and militating against members finding the information they want. Another factor was that it was considered less economically viable for TUG to maintain two publications, each with their own production budget.

Neither *TUGboat* nor *TTN* will change their own unique flavour, at least not immediately, and there is no question of either publication being forced to adopt any elements of style or editorial policy from the other (I have known Barbara Beeton and admired her work on *TUGboat* for too long to have any wish to impose on her). Barbara and I have also discussed the technical problems that will face us, and we feel sanguine that they can be overcome.

### Nam et ipsa scientia potestas est

One *canard* I wish to lay to rest before we go any further, however. Much concern has been expressed by some scientific and technical members of TUG — *TeX*'s original constituency — that *TTN* and the decision in Santa Barbara to unbundle *TUGboat* from the TUG membership fee meant that TUG and *TUGboat* are in some way being watered down.

To many members this will seem strange, as no-one who reads *TUGboat* or knows its reputation could for more than a second imagine that anyone associated with it would permit that to happen.

To other members, however, the *implication* that TUG should restrict *TUGboat* to technical discussions, and to mathematical or scientific work has

unsettled them. Many non-scientist, non-technical TUG members use *TeX* for purposes *other* than for typesetting mathematics, a fact which has long been recognised by TUG, in that *TUGboat* regularly publishes articles on linguistic and other areas of the humanities (albeit necessarily of a technical nature).

The *raison d'être* of *TTN* was that TUG should try to embrace these members (and the potential membership in their hinterland) by providing a publication which did not assume as high a level of technical expertise as that possessed by some readers of *TUGboat*.

In this, *TTN* has, I believe, been uniquely successful. It has been harshly criticised for dragging *TeX* down to a non-technical level — and I am delighted to have been a part of that. I believe that only by providing this kind of service can we help those members (who wish to expand their use of *TeX*) start the technical learning curve.

It is therefore significant that in reviewing the publications of TUG, *TTN* should be brought within the fold of *TUGboat*. An increasing sophistication on the part of the non-technical users may indicate that perhaps four years of separate publication has had the desired effect.

◇ Peter Flynn  
 Computer Center  
 University College  
 Cork, Ireland  
 pflynn@curia.ucc.ie