

Google.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-09/2208.html>

From: Jeff Relf (*Usenet_at_JeffRelf.Cotse.NET*)

Date: 09/05/04

Date: 5 Sep 2004 14:23:18 GMT

Hi Mitch Perkins,

You wrote: <<

Your method of " ranking of people ",
complete with error(s)... >>

Note that I labeled it _ a _ ranking, not _ the _ ranking.

It's just a method, take it or leave it.

I like it because it ranks people by direct replies.

As for errors... What errors ?

I divided the whole thing into two groups,
which I should've labeled more clearly as:

Those with two or more titles that don't start with "Re:"
and those with one or no such titles.

Why did I divide people into two groups like that ?

Because I feel that people who don't follow RFC 1036
should be ranked lower than those who do.

When all-uppercase, RFC documents employ exact definitions of
the following words: SHOULD and MUST.

Because the title of a message SHOULD describe the message,
RFC 1036 says that when the topic changes:

- A. One SHOULD Not use "Re: " at the start of a title.
- B. One SHOULD Not delete the References line.

>From <http://www.usenet-fr.net/fr-chartes/son-of-rfc1036.2.html>
<< If the poster determines that

sci.physics: Google.

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). >>
^^^^ ^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^^^^^^^^

The term, " back reference " here is defined as
the " Re: " tag at the start of a title,
(Not the References: line in the headers).

Google violates RFC 1036 by mandating something more like this:

Because the title of a message MUST define the thread,
One MUST use "Re: " at the start of a title...
Otherwise we MUST delete the References line.

And that's your unspoken complaint isn't it Mitch ?

Your stuck using a broken newsreader: Google.