

## Re: X-No-archive considered harmful

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/1151.html>

---

**From:** Jesse F. Hughes ([jesse\\_at\\_phiwumbda.org](mailto:jesse_at_phiwumbda.org))

**Date:** 03/03/05

Date: Thu, 03 Mar 2005 15:36:13 +0100

ned@arthur.valhalla.oz (Ned Latham) writes:

> "CBFalconer" wrote in <4225162B.73F5F8AE@yahoo.com>:  
>> TGOS wrote:  
>> > john\_ramsden@sagitta-ps.com wrote in comp.programming:  
>> >  
>> > > I'm curious to know why you used no-archive, as it's an interesting  
>> > > problem (considered in abstract – as a practical matter it's fairly  
>> > > pointless and impossible given all your constraints), but anyway ..  
>> >  
>> > Because I usually post to groups that appreciate it and that dislike  
>> > Google. And I don't want to reconfigure my client all the time.  
>>  
>> Well, that is a good way to ensure that, if noticed, I and many  
>> others will make a point of not giving any assistance. We consider  
>> that usage to be anti-social and a horrible example of the gimme  
>> syndrome.  
>>  
>> I am going to try to persuade the authors of Mozilla, Thunderbird,  
>> and Kmeleon to add an indicator that shows the presence of that  
>> header. That will help us avoid accidentally helping such people.  
>>  
>> Incidentally there is no reason for Google (or anyone else) to heed  
>> it. They simply chose to do so.  
>  
> OTOH, there's good reason for them to ignore it. An archive with holes  
> in it is defective. Take the use of X-No-Archive to the extreme and you  
> have an empty archive: completely useless.

If Google didn't heed that header or have some other opt-out mechanism, then they surely would have faced legal issues. In posting to Usenet, I surely waive some of my rights granted by copyright, since otherwise posts could not be distributed. But I don't see any reason to believe that I've granted the right for Google to present a permanent public archive of my post.

I don't see that they have that right even with an opt-out header implemented. Their archive includes posts that predate Deja, after

sci.math: Re: X-No-archive considered harmful

all: did those folks implicitly grant the archive rights to Google?  
The fact that an archive with holes in it is useless doesn't seem relevant. The first question is whether Google has the right to publish the archive to begin with.

Personally, I'm extremely annoyed at Google's recent decision to edit posts to obfuscate possible email headers. I sure as hell didn't give them the right to edit my material in their public archive, whether it's my From: line or a message-id in the body of a post. I am considering using an X-no-archive header to protest this move, but I'm reluctant to do so because I \*like\* Google's archive and the service it provides (even though I don't see how it's consistent with copyright law). But I don't like the recent changes.

--

"All that 'shock and awe' stuff we've just dumped onto the Asian part of this earth - could we have fractured something? Perhaps the earth was just reacting to something that man has done to injure it. The earth is organic, you know. It can be hurt." -- A chatroom explanation of the Dec. 2004 tsunami.