

_ SHOULD _ Have No Back Reference.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/9575.html>

From: Jeff Relf (*Jeff_Relf__at__NCPlus.NET.Invalid*)

Date: 07/29/04

Date: 29 Jul 2004 22:22:11 GMT

Hi Jesse F. Hughes,

Re: Your RFC 1036 citation,

I can't thank you enough Jesse,

I will now use this RFC to shut people up
whenever they complain about my title changes.

I will also use it to prove that
Google.COM is in violation of RFC 1036.

Note: in these RFCs the word SHOULD (when capitalized)
and the word MUST (also when capitalized)
have very specific meanings.

>From <http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1036.html> <<

2.1.4. Subject

The " Subject " line (formerly " Title ")
tells what the message is about.

It should be suggestive enough of
the contents of the message to enable a reader
to make a decision whether to read the message
based on the subject alone.

If the message is submitted in response to
another message (e.g., is a follow-up)
the default subject should begin with
the four characters "Re: ",
and the " References " line is required. >>

>From <http://www.usenet-fr.net/fr-chartes/son-of-rfc1036.2.html>

<< If the article is a followup,
the subject SHOULD begin with "Re: "
(a " back reference "). >>

So the term, " back reference " refers to
the " Re: " tag at the start of a title,
and Not to the References line.

sci.physics: _ SHOULD _ Have No Back Reference.

And the word used was SHOULD, not MUST.

So Google.COM is in violation of RFC 1036.

>From <http://www.usenet-fr.net/fr-chartes/son-of-rfc1036.2.html>

<< If the poster determines that
the topic of the followup differs significantly
from what is described in the subject,
a new, more descriptive, subject SHOULD be substituted
(With No Back Reference). >>
^^^^ ^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^^^^^^^^

_ SHOULD _ Have No Back Reference... Get it ?

That means no "Re: " tag at the start of a title.
(It does Not mean no References line)

So every last poster in this thread (with the exception of me)
violated this RFC by not providing an appropriate title.

>From that same link, << *If the article is not a followup,*
the subject MUST not begin with a back reference. >>

...

<< An article whose subject begins with a back reference
MUST have a References header referencing the precursor. >>

Right, _ MUST not _, I always comply with that.

I never start a title with "Re: "
without also providing a References line.