

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

## Re: \_ SHOULD \_ Have No Back Reference.

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/9757.html>

---

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

*Date:* 07/30/04

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 2004 12:53:21 +0200

Funny defense.

RFC says you shouldn't do this.

RFC doesn't say you mustn't do this.

Conclusion: it's perfectly okay to do this.

This is the reasoning of an asshole.

Relf, even if the RFC supported you (it doesn't), the fact is that you're simply an annoying inconvenience.

--

But in our enthusiasm, we could not resist a radical overhaul of the system, in which all of its major weaknesses have been exposed, analyzed, and replaced with new weaknesses.

-- Bruce Leverett (presumably with apologies to Ambrose Bierce)