
Subject: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 26 Sep 2021 19:51:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.

But both fora are plagued by over-quoting so anyone following a thread sees the same tedious repetition ad nauseam.

For me, if I open any article and all I can see is quoted material disappearing off the bottom of the page, then I skip over it.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:20:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Grant Taylor

On 9/26/21 1:51 PM, gareth evans wrote:
> Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Yes, netiquette still matters.

Netiquette is independent of online medium.

--
Grant. . . .
unix || die

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:44:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100
gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.

It is common politeness, when joining a group, to adopt the conventions of that group, it is a joy when those conventions are also

sensible and a minor burden when they are not.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith

Odds and Ends at <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 04:41:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:

- > On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100
- > gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
- >
- >> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
- >
- > It is common politeness, when joining a group, to adopt the
- > conventions of that group, it is a joy when those conventions are also
- > sensible and a minor burden when they are not.

Just so. I occasionally top-post when a previous post may be needed for reference but my own contribution is essentially stand-alone and not in the nature of conversation. This appears to be common in business email where I find it workable and correct -- at worst a "minor burden".

Most Usenet posts are more or less in the nature of conversation so top-posting is a stumbling block as is massive quoting -- failure to trim -- when responding to some small element of a previous post.

--

Mike Spencer

Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 05:54:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Grant Taylor

On 9/26/21 10:41 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:

- > I occasionally top-post when a previous post may be needed
- > for reference but my own contribution is essentially stand-alone
- > and not in the nature of conversation. This appears to be common

> in business email where I find it workable and correct -- at worst a
> "minor burden".

Why would you ever reply to a message / thread with something that's stand-alone as opposed to starting a new thread?

Your logic makes sense. But I don't understand why you would be in the situation you describe.

--

Grant. . . .
unix || die

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Quadibloc](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 07:01:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sunday, September 26, 2021 at 11:54:19 PM UTC-6, Grant Taylor wrote:

> On 9/26/21 10:41 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
>> I occasionally top-post when a previous post may be needed
>> for reference but my own contribution is essentially stand-alone
>> and not in the nature of conversation. This appears to be common
>> in business email where I find it workable and correct -- at worst a
>> "minor burden".
> Why would you ever reply to a message / thread with something that's
> stand-alone as opposed to starting a new thread?
>
> Your logic makes sense. But I don't understand why you would be in the
> situation you describe.

I agree with his logic. I could see the situation emerging where the quoted post is being used as reference material rather than one directly replying to it.

John Savard

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 08:58:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

Netiquette is not etiquette.

Perhaps those who take offence so easily over such a trivial matter were the prototype woke generation?

Wherever the new material is placed, whether at the top or the bottom (or both, in this case) you get to read it and assimilate its intelligence, so why have an emotional reaction in addition?

On 26/09/2021 21:20, Grant Taylor wrote:
> On 9/26/21 1:51 PM, gareth evans wrote:
>> Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
>
> Yes, netiquette still matters.
>
> Netiquette is independent of online medium.

Netiquette is not etiquette.

Perhaps those who take offence so easily over such a trivial matter were the prototype woke generation?

Wherever the new material is placed, whether at the top or the bottom (or both, in this case) you get to read it and assimilate its intelligence, so why have an emotional reaction in addition?

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:00:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

But are conventions determined by historical personages some of whom are long dead, or do the later contributors also have a say in what is a convention?

On 26/09/2021 21:44, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100
> gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>

- > It is common politeness, when joining a group, to adopt the
- > conventions of that group, it is a joy when those conventions are also
- > sensible and a minor burden when they are not.
- >

But are conventions determined by historical personages some of whom are long dead, or do the later contributors also have a say in what is a convention?

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 10:03:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 10:00:40 +0100
gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

- > On 26/09/2021 21:44, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
- >> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100
- >> gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
- >>
- >>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
- >>
- >> It is common politeness, when joining a group, to adopt the
- >> conventions of that group, it is a joy when those conventions are also
- >> sensible and a minor burden when they are not.
- >>
- >
- > But are conventions determined by historical
- > personages some of whom are long dead, or do
- > the later contributors also have a say in what is a convention?

The origins of conventions are generally obscured by time, even when everyone involved is present they can be difficult to pin down, whatever documentation may remain is usually only a thin remnant of the original discussions and thinking. Once established they tend to have enormous inertia by virtue of group acceptance and tend only to change if pretty much everyone finds them irksome.

--
Steve O'Hara-Smith
Odds and Ends at <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [D.J.](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 15:03:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:58:58 +0100, gareth evans
<headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
> Netiquette is not etiquette.
>

In a way, yes it is. But then again, I always felt Emily Post was a
bit off in her head.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Arne Luft](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 17:45:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2021-09-27 00:41, Mike Spencer wrote (in part):
> Most Usenet posts are more or less in the nature of conversation so
> top-posting is a stumbling block as is massive quoting -- failure to
> trim -- when responding to some small element of a previous post.

Indeed, trying to follow a conversation with top-posting inserted in
bottom-posting (not to mention responses that do not clearly delineate
previous posts) can give me headaches.

N.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [John Levine](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 19:57:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I always attributed it to having too much free time, e.g.:

<https://xkcd.com/386/>

According to gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com>:
> Netiquette is not etiquette.
>
> Perhaps those who take offence so easily over
> such a trivial matter were the prototype
> woke generation?

--

Regards,
John Levine, johnl@taugh.com, Primary Perpetrator of "The Internet for Dummies",
Please consider the environment before reading this e-mail. <https://jl.ly>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 20:34:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
Usenet wokes.

On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:

> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:
>>
>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>
> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
> everybody's killfile.

I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
Usenet wokes.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [D.J.](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 23:24:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:34:36 +0100, gareth evans
<headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
> Usenet wokes.

>
>

> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:

>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:
>>>
>>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>>
>> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
>> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
>> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
>> everybody's killfile.

>

> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
> Usenet wokes.

Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 23:25:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Grant Taylor <gtaylor@tnetconsulting.net> writes:

- > On 9/26/21 10:41 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
- >
- >> I occasionally top-post when a previous post may be needed
- >> for reference but my own contribution is essentially stand-alone
- >> and not in the nature of conversation. This appears to be common
- >> in business email where I find it workable and correct -- at worst a
- >> "minor burden".
- >
- > Why would you ever reply to a message / thread with something that's
- > stand-alone as opposed to starting a new thread?
- >
- > Your logic makes sense. But I don't understand why you would be in the
- > situation you describe.

Off the top of my head, without trying to get deep or analytical...

"That reminds me of a story..."

Connected, probably on-topic but not sequential.

--
Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 00:10:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:

- > On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 10:00:40 +0100
- > garth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
- >
- >> But are conventions determined by historical
- >> personages some of whom are long dead, or do
- >> the later contributors also have a say in what is a convention?
- >
- > The origins of conventions are generally obscured by time, even when
- > everyone involved is present they can be difficult to pin down, whatever
- > documentation may remain is usually only a thin remnant of the original
- > discussions and thinking. Once established they tend to have enormous
- > inertia by virtue of group acceptance and tend only to change if pretty much

> everyone finds them irksome.

Circa 1972, I visited the celebrated Dauphinee Block Shop in Lunenburg, NS. Three-storey frame building with flat-belt-driven machinery that made the whole building vibrate.

In the cellar they had a blacksmith shop and that day the smith was making hooks for attachment to fairly large tackle blocks. He had several dozen half done and was making the eye by splitting the end of the iron stock, wrapping the split ends around a mandrel and forge-welding them shut.

I asked why he was doing it that way as I would have punched or slot-punched a hole and opened it to desired size, stronger and less error prone.

"It's stronger that way" was his answer. As I was a young novice smith and he was a middle-aged career smith, I didn't argue but I didn't get it.

It was years later, looking at a buoy bell clapper salvaged from Boston Harbor, that it dawned on me. When Dauphinee's was established, wrought iron was the article of trade used for anything "iron". Wrought iron has a grain resembling wood grain. Its structure is anisotropic. You never [1] make a wrought iron structural element with a hole under tension near the end of a bar for the same reason that you don't do that with a 1" pine or oak board; it stresses the area around the hole in its weakest direction.

Modern "iron" is more properly called "mild steel" and, unlike wrought iron, it is for practical purposes isotropic.

Dauphinee's had been making tackle since before Bessemer and open hearth replaced wrought iron with mild steel as the standard article of commerce. They'd settled, correctly, on the way to make a tension eye at the end of an iron rod circa 1850 and had been passing that wisdom on for 120 years.

[1] Never say never. The reason the buoy bell clapper [2] caught my eye was that it was so corroded that I could plainly see the grain of the wrought iron from which it was forged. The smith had in fact punched the eye near the end of the stock but had then forge welded a strip of iron across the end where it might tear out with the grain of the strip at right angles to that of the clapper and thus orthogonal to the direction of tension.

[2] Harold Edgerton collection, MIT.

--

Mike Spencer

Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 01:45:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 18:24:08 -0500, D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:34:36 +0100, gareth evans

> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded

>> Usenet wokes.

>>

>>

>> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:

>>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:

>>>>

>>>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.

>>>

>>> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to

>>> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like

>>> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about

>>> everybody's killfile.

>>

>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded

>> Usenet wokes.

>

> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

This is true, woke means that your buttocks have descended around your head.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 06:03:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Grant Taylor

On 9/27/21 5:25 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:

> Off the top of my head, without trying to get deep or analytical...

>

> "That reminds me of a story..."
>
> Connected, probably on-topic but not sequential.

As someone who makes extensive use of threading -- as in I will link and unlink threads -- I have always tried to keep threaded replies as part of the same conversation.

I've occasionally drafted new messages ~> new threads with very similar subjects and starting a new topic. E.g.

--8<--
Subject: format=flowed

On 9/27/21 5:25 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
> Connected, probably on-topic but not sequential.

Speaking of top or bottom posting, what do you think about format=flowed vs fixed width?
-->8--

I don't know if this speaks to Quadibloc's comment about "reference" or not. Reference seems like something specific and distinctly different than simply "speaking of <topic>, who's run into <problem> with <topic>?" type thing.

--
Grant. . . .
unix || die

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charles Richmond](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 06:04:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/27/2021 6:25 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
> Grant Taylor <gtaylor@tnetconsulting.net> writes:
>
>> On 9/26/21 10:41 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
>>
>>> I occasionally top-post when a previous post may be needed
>>> for reference but my own contribution is essentially stand-alone
>>> and not in the nature of conversation. This appears to be common
>>> in business email where I find it workable and correct -- at worst a
>>> "minor burden".
>>

>> Why would you ever reply to a message / thread with something that's
>> stand-alone as opposed to starting a new thread?
>>
>> Your logic makes sense. But I don't understand why you would be in the
>> situation you describe.
>
> Off the top of my head, without trying to get deep or analytical...
>
> "That reminds me of a story..."
>
> Connected, probably on-topic but not sequential.
>

The name of this group contains the word:

folklore

"That reminds me of a story..." seems an adequate reason for topic drift
in this group.

--

Charles Richmond

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charles Richmond](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 06:18:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> On 26/09/2021 21:44, Ahem A Rivet's Shot wrote:
>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100
>> gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>>
>> It is common politeness, when joining a group, to adopt the
>> conventions of that group, it is a joy when those conventions are also
>> sensible and a minor burden when they are not.
>>
>
> But are conventions determined by historical
> personages some of whom are long dead, or do
> the later contributors also have a say in what is a convention?
>

Historically (and probably now), the members of a group decide who should be allowed to post. Each person's newsreader software allowed a list of addresses to be maintained... and would automatically discard messages from that address. If the majority of members of a group had your address on their "discard" list, effectively you were kept out.

(There is a name for that "discard" list... but I can not remember it now...)

Some "official" groups (not "alt.*" groups) are moderated by an "admin", and you have to be officially admitted to the group by that admin.

--

Charles Richmond

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [usenet](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 13:09:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:58:58 +0100, gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
> Netiquette is not etiquette.

It certainly is. It is a branch of etiquette that deals specifically with online communications.

> Perhaps those who take offence so easily over
> such a trivial matter were the prototype
> woke generation?

I dispute your assertion; it is not trivial.

> Wherever the new material is placed, whether at the
> top or the bottom (or both, in this case) you get
> to read it and assimilate its intelligence, so
> why have an emotional reaction in addition?

Layout matters, viz:

<https://keepmeme.com/meme/you-matter-dont-give-up-or-you-dont-matter-give-up>

Every so often some pedant comes along and advances the argument that some part of established etiquette, for example, shop clerks asking "how are you" or wishing you a nice day -- to say nothing of "please" and "thank you" -- are superfluous and unnecessary because they convey no information and are just some outdated, arbitrary convention, and thus can be discarded. They ignore that, among other things, these phrases actually provide useful functions: they can reveal intentions, set expectations, and generally establish a framework for successful transactions between strangers. You might think of them as verbal lubricant, or liken them to a computer protocol that allows two heterogeneous computers to exchange data. Be it place settings, wedding invitations, or some other etiquette matter, the same tired arguments regarding their irrelevance are made periodically, and same valid refutations are made in return.

And so it is with netiquette, and most frequently, the top/bottom posting issue. That horse is long dead, beaten into a grease spot, and even the bones are turning to dust. The overwhelming consensus is that bottom posting and judicious trimming of long posts is the proper course. Exceptions are rare, and continued top posting marks one as a newbie or a self-declared iconoclast who thinks they are championing reason, freedom, or some other abstraction. But they are just ignorant, or being selfish and childish. They tilt at windmills in their mind.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [usenet](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 13:12:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:45:47 -0400, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 18:24:08 -0500, D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com>
> wrote:

>> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:

>>>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:

>>>>> >

>>>>> > In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.

>>>>>

>>>>> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
>>>>> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
>>>>> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
>>>>> everybody's killfile.

>>>>

>>>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded

>>>> Usenet wokes.

>>>

>>> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

>>>

>>> This is true, woke means that your buttocks have descended around your

> head.

Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives, and there's not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals. That being said, what's wrong with treating people of different sexual orientations, or racial and cultural backgrounds, with the basic respect due any human being? What's wrong with addressing people in the manner they wish to be addressed? What's wrong with being upset at humor made at the expense of people in some minority, or that perpetuates negative stereotypes? What's wrong with condemning statements that belittle or denigrate others?

It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about "wokeness" are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Peter Flass](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 16:36:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:34:36 +0100, gareth evans
> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
>> Usenet wokes.
>>
>>
>> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:
>>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:
>>>>
>>>> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>>>>
>>> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
>>> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
>>> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
>>> everybody's killfile.
>>
>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
>> Usenet wokes.
>
> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.
>

Or more likely the opposite.

--
Pete

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 17:33:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 13:12:17 GMT

usenet@only.tnx (Questor) wrote:

- > Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives, and
- > there's not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals. That
- > being said, what's wrong with treating people of different sexual
- > orientations, or racial and cultural backgrounds, with the basic respect
- > due any human being? What's wrong with addressing people in the manner
- > they wish to be addressed? What's wrong with being upset at humor made
- > at the expense of people in some minority, or that perpetuates negative
- > stereotypes? What's wrong with condemning statements that belittle or
- > denigrate others?

Nothing is wrong with any of that IMHO - my father would have disagreed with me on several points.

- > It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about
- > "wokeness" are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.

I think it is the "holier than thou" attitude of many users of the term rather than the principles themselves. As a child of the sixties I do find it perplexing the extent to which youngsters today seem to think they invented tolerance but hey the old beatniks probably thought similar things about us.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith

Odds and Ends at <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [scott](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 18:16:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> writes:

> On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 13:12:17 GMT

> usenet@only.tnx (Questor) wrote:

- >
- >> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives, and
- >> there's not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals. That
- >> being said, what's wrong with treating people of different sexual
- >> orientations, or racial and cultural backgrounds, with the basic respect
- >> due any human being? What's wrong with addressing people in the manner
- >> they wish to be addressed? What's wrong with being upset at humor made

>> at the expense of people in some minority, or that perpetuates negative
>> stereotypes? What's wrong with condemning statements that belittle or
>> denigrate others?

>

> Nothing is wrong with any of that IMHO - my father would have
> disagreed with me on several points.

>

>> It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about
>> "wokeness" are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.

>

> I think it is the "holier than thou" attitude of many users of the
> term rather than the principles themselves. As a child of the sixties I do
> find it perplexing the extent to which youngsters today seem to think
> they invented tolerance but hey the old beatniks probably thought similar
> things about us.

The only people I've ever heard (or seen in print) using the
term 'woke' have been conservatives using it to denigrate liberals;

I've never seen it used by someone who is supposedly 'woke'.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 19:03:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2021-09-28, Questor <usenet@only.tnx> wrote:

> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:45:47 -0400, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com>
> wrote:

>

>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 18:24:08 -0500, D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com>
>> wrote:

>>

>>> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

>>

>> This is true, woke means that your buttocks have descended around your
>> head.

:~)

> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives,
> and there's not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals.

To me, a lot of it looks like a resurgence of the Political Correctness
nonsense of the late '80s. Call it PC 2.0. The basic idea is the same:
make yourself seem righteous by putting down others for some perceived
offence, which may or may not have basis in fact. Since the original PC

craze, the term "virtue signaling" has been invented to describe this.

- > That being said, what's wrong with treating people of different
- > sexual orientations, or racial and cultural backgrounds, with the
- > basic respect due any human being?

Nothing at all. At least as long as we can continue to distinguish between these characteristics and a political stance.

- > What's wrong with addressing people in the manner they wish to be
- > addressed?

Generally nothing, Your Majesty. But we shouldn't have to twist the language out of shape to do so.

- > What's wrong with being upset at humor made at the expense of people
- > in some minority, or that perpetuates negative stereotypes?

Generally nothing, but people are a little too thin-skinned these days.

- > What's wrong with condemning statements that belittle or denigrate
- > others?

Nothing unless they deserve it. I'm not going to start praising corrupt politicians because it might hurt their delicate feelings.

- > It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about
- > "wokeness" are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.

The rest are complaining about being attacked unduly harshly for saying things which were not intended to hurt or offend. A part of "wokeness" seems to include changing the standards too fast for anyone else to keep up with, and choosing the most malicious interpretation of anything others say.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_Snowflake

```
--  
/~\ Charlie Gibbs      | Life is perverse.  
\ / <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | It can be beautiful -  
 X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus  | but it won't.  
/\ if you read it the right way. | -- Lily Tomlin
```

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 19:20:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 18:16:18 GMT
scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) wrote:

> I've never seen it used by someone who is supposedly 'woke'.

I have, but not for quite some time.

--

Steve O'Hara-Smith
Odds and Ends at <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [D.J.](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 21:41:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 13:12:17 GMT, usenet@only.tnx (Questor) wrote:

> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:45:47 -0400, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com> wrote:

>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 18:24:08 -0500, D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

>>>> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:

>>>> > On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, gareth evans wrote:

>>>> >>

>>>> >> In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.

>>>> >

>>>> > Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to

>>>> > write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like

>>>> > here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about

>>>> > everybody's killfile.

>>>>

>>>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded

>>>> Usenet wokes.

>>>

>>> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

>>

>> This is true, woke means that your buttocks have descended around your

>> head.

>

> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives, and there's

> not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals. That being said, what's

> wrong with treating people of different sexual orientations, or racial and

> cultural backgrounds, with the basic respect due any human being? What's wrong

> with addressing people in the manner they wish to be addressed? What's wrong

> with being upset at humor made at the expense of people in some minority, or

> that perpetuates negative stereotypes? What's wrong with condemning statements

> that belittle or denigrate others?

>

> It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about "wokeness"
> are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.

I fully agree.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?

Posted by [D.J.](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 21:45:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 19:03:56 GMT, Charlie Gibbs

<cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> wrote:

> On 2021-09-28, Questor <usenet@only.tnx> wrote:

>

>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:45:47 -0400, J. Clarke <jclarke.873638@gmail.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 18:24:08 -0500, D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com>

>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.

>>>

>>> This is true, woke means that your buttocks have descended around your

>>> head.

>

> :-)

>

>> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives,

>> and there's not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals.

>

> To me, a lot of it looks like a resurgence of the Political Correctness

> nonsense of the late '80s. Call it PC 2.0. The basic idea is the same:

> make yourself seem righteous by putting down others for some perceived

> offence, which may or may not have basis in fact. Since the original PC

> craze, the term "virtue signaling" has been invented to describe this.

>

>> That being said, what's wrong with treating people of different

>> sexual orientations, or racial and cultural backgrounds, with the

>> basic respect due any human being?

>

> Nothing at all. At least as long as we can continue to distinguish

> between these characteristics and a political stance.

>

>> What's wrong with addressing people in the manner they wish to be

>> addressed?

>

> Generally nothing, Your Majesty. But we shouldn't have to twist

> the language out of shape to do so.

>
>> What's wrong with being upset at humor made at the expense of people
>> in some minority, or that perpetuates negative stereotypes?
>
> Generally nothing, but people are a little too thin-skinned these days.

Fascinating. I'm rather sure all of us have heard 'too thin skinned'
for decades, not just this century.

>> What's wrong with condemning statements that belittle or denigrate
>> others?
>
> Nothing unless they deserve it. I'm not going to start praising
> corrupt politicians because it might hurt their delicate feelings.
>
>> It seems to me that not all, but most of the people complaining about
>> "wokeness" are upset at being called out for acting like an asshole.
>
> The rest are complaining about being attacked unduly harshly for
> saying things which were not intended to hurt or offend. A part
> of "wokeness" seems to include changing the standards too fast
> for anyone else to keep up with, and choosing the most malicious
> interpretation of anything others say.
>
> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_Snowflake

Conservatives call people snowflakes when they get upset at being
called out for various things like racism and being a trump follower.
I've called people a racist, since I was a teenager, back in the
1960s, before hippiedom.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [D.J.](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 21:46:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 09:36:48 -0700, Peter Flass
<peter_flass@yahoo.com> wrote:
> [D.J. <chucktheouch@gmail.com>](mailto:chucktheouch@gmail.com) wrote:
>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 21:34:36 +0100, Gareth Evans
>> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
>>> Usenet wokes.
>>>
>>>
>>> On 27/09/2021 20:35, Andreas Kohlbach wrote:
>>>> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, Gareth Evans wrote:
>>>>> >

>>>> > In groups.io, a similar facility to usenet, top posting predominates.
>>>>
>>>> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
>>>> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
>>>> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
>>>> everybody's killfile.
>>>
>>> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
>>> Usenet wokes.
>>
>> Woke basically means your head isn't inserted into your buttocks.
>>
>
> Or more likely the opposite.

And I disagree with your claim.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Quadibloc](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 23:39:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 12:16:20 PM UTC-6, Scott Lurndal wrote:

> The only people I've ever heard (or seen in print) using the
> term 'woke' have been conservatives using it to denigrate liberals;

I've seen the term "woke" used by people on the liberal side.

What that term means to them when they use it is: someone who is genuinely conscious of the lived experiences of disadvantaged groups (particularly African-Americans) and of their perception of those experiences.

So, if you're "woke", then you "get it" - in rather longer-established slang.

Thus, one can be liberal without being "woke", and then one may be liable to be well-meaning but still make mistakes that can be seen as patronizing, or fail to grasp why certain issues are considered to be serious matters.

So there are black Americans who feel that the more white Americans become "woke", and the sooner it happens, the better.

John Savard

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Quadibloc](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2021 23:55:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 7:11:08 AM UTC-6, Questor wrote:

> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives,

True enough.

> and there's

> not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals.

I don't think that's the problem.

At least wherever I have seen that term used, it had a meaning that was clear and consistent enough that you could put it in a dictionary.

Someone is "woke" when his understanding of the situation of a disadvantaged group is genuine. When he sees what they're really living with, rather than seeing it through the distorting lens of his own experiences and assumptions. When he sees how they perceive their situation.

But that doesn't eliminate all ambiguity about who is "woke".

To illustrate why, let's take another term: "feminist". This one does potentially have multiple meanings, as it can also refer to forms of female supremacism. But its basic meaning is simply: a feminist is one who believes that women are fully human beings, fully equal to men in rights and dignity.

Now, a man could be a feminist by that definition, and yet also believe that abortion is homicide. There's no contradiction between believing that adult women are people, and that babies are people too, even when they're not born yet.

But such a man would hardly be **acknowledged** as a feminist by most of those we think of as feminists, would he?

Similarly, a man could indeed be knowledgeable as well as empathetic to the plight of black Americans, to the extent that he would qualify as "woke", and yet have doubts about Black Lives Matter due to other concerns: he could recognize the difficulties of the situations police officers often find themselves in.

Again, such a one might be woke without being likely to be **acknowledged** as woke.

John Savard

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 00:53:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: J. Clarke

On Tue, 28 Sep 2021 16:55:19 -0700 (PDT), Quadibloc
<jsavard@ecn.ab.ca> wrote:

> On Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 7:11:08 AM UTC-6, Questor wrote:

>

>> Unfortunately, the term "woke" is being smeared by conservatives,

>

> True enough.

>

>> and there's

>> not clear clear consensus on what it means to liberals.

>

> I don't think that's the problem.

>

> At least wherever I have seen that term used, it had a meaning that was

> clear and consistent enough that you could put it in a dictionary.

>

> Someone is "woke" when his understanding of the situation of a
> disadvantaged group is genuine. When he sees what they're really
> living with, rather than seeing it through the distorting lens of his
> own experiences and assumptions. When he sees how they
> percieve their situation.

>

> But that doesn't eliminate all ambiguity about who is "woke".

>

> To illustrate why, let's take another term: "feminist". This one does
> potentially have multiple meanings, as it can also refer to forms of
> female supremacism. But its basic meaning is simply: a feminist is
> one who believes that women are fully human beings, fully equal
> to men in rights and dignity.

>

> Now, a man could be a feminist by that definition, and yet also believe
> that abortion is homicide. There's no contradiction between believing
> that adult women are people, and that babies are people too, even when
> they're not born yet.

>

> But such a man would hardly be *acknowledged* as a feminist by
> most of those we think of as feminists, would he?

>

> Similarly, a man could indeed be knowledgeable as well as empathetic to
> the plight of black Americans, to the extent that he would qualify as
> "woke", and yet have doubts about Black Lives Matter due to other
> concerns: he could recognize the difficulties of the situations police officers
> often find themselves in.
>
> Again, such a one might be woke without being likely to be *acknowledged*
> as woke.

It's one of those words like "hip" that denote that someone is accepted as a member of an "in-group". This person is "woke" because he or she speaks a certain cant, that person isn't because they don't buy the cant.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 01:13:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

On 2021-09-27, gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Netiquette is not etiquette.
>
> Perhaps those who take offence so easily over
> such a trivial matter were the prototype
> woke generation?
>
> Wherever the new material is placed, whether at the
> top or the bottom (or both, in this case) you get
> to read it and assimilate its intelligence, so
> why have an emotional reaction in addition?
>

You are being ENLIGHTENED! I BOW to YOU!

--

7-77-777
Evil Sinner!

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 01:17:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

On 2021-09-27, Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> wrote:

> On Sun, 26 Sep 2021 20:51:37 +0100, Gareth Evans wrote:
>>
>> In groups.io, a similar facility to Usenet, top posting predominates.
>
> Probably in comp.* or alt.*. If you top post in de.* (you also need to
> write in German for that) they roast you. Not just politely replying like
> here. If you don't comply by day 3 or 4 you'll end up in about
> everybody's killfile.

That is when you don't want critic and someone to DISCREDIT you :P

>

--

7-77-777
Evil Sinner!

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 01:18:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

On 2021-09-27, Gareth Evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
> Usenet wokes.
>
>
> I don't object to being in the killfiles of small-minded
> Usenet wokes.
>

I bow to ENLIGHTENED ones ALWAYS :P
(I am ANTITROLL, like ANTICHRIST :P)

--

7-77-777
Evil Sinner!

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 01:20:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

On 2021-09-28, Charles Richmond <codescott@aquaporin4.com> wrote:

>
> Some "official" groups (not "alt.*" groups) are moderated by an "admin",
> and you have to be officially admitted to the group by that admin.
>

Well, but moderation can be esilly bypassed by forging
approval header :P

>

--

7-77-777
Evil Sinner!

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charles Richmond](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 16:54:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/28/2021 8:09 AM, Questor wrote:

> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:58:58 +0100, garth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>> Netiquette is not etiquette.
>
> It certainly is. It is a branch of etiquette that deals specifically with
> online communications.
>

[... quoted material omitted ...]

> Layout matters, viz:
>
> <https://keepmeme.com/meme/you-matter-dont-give-up-or-you-dont-matter-give-up>
>
>
> Every so often some pedant comes along and advances the argument that some part
> of established etiquette, for example, shop clerks asking "how are you" or
> wishing you a nice day -- to say nothing of "please" and "thank you" -- are
> superfluous and unnecessary because they convey no information and are just some
> outdated, arbitrary convention, and thus can be discarded. They ignore that,
> among other things, these phrases actually provide useful functions: they can
> reveal intentions, set expectations, and generally establish a framework for

- > successful transactions between strangers. You might think of them as verbal
- > lubricant, or liken them to a computer protocol that allows two heterogeneous
- > computers to exchange data. Be it place settings, wedding invitations, or some
- > other etiquette matter, the same tired arguments regarding their irrelevance
- > are made periodically, and same valid refutations are made in return.
- >
- > And so it is with netiquette, and most frequently, the top/bottom posting issue.
- > That horse is long dead, beaten into a grease spot, and even the bones are
- > turning to dust. The overwhelming consensus is that bottom posting and
- > judicious trimming of long posts is the proper course. Exceptions are rare,
- > and continued top posting marks one as a newbie or a self-declared iconoclast
- > who thinks they are championing reason, freedom, or some other abstraction.
- > But they are just ignorant, or being selfish and childish. They tilt at
- > windmills in their mind.
- >

Is there an RFC somewhere that discusses all this???

--

Charles Richmond

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charles Richmond](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 17:03:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/28/2021 6:39 PM, Quadibloc wrote:

- > On Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 12:16:20 PM UTC-6, Scott Lurndal wrote:
- >
- >> The only people I've ever heard (or seen in print) using the
- >> term 'woke' have been conservatives using it to denigrate liberals;
- >
- > I've seen the term "woke" used by people on the liberal side.
- >
- > What that term means to them when they use it is: someone who
- > is genuinely conscious of the lived experiences of disadvantaged
- > groups (particularly African-Americans) and of their perception of
- > those experiences.
- >
- > So, if you're "woke", then you "get it" - in rather longer-established
- > slang.

- >
- > Thus, one can be liberal without being "woke", and then one may be
- > liable to be well-meaning but still make mistakes that can be seen
- > as patronizing, or fail to grasp why certain issues are considered to
- > be serious matters.
- >
- > So there are black Americans who feel that the more white
- > Americans become "woke", and the sooner it happens, the better.
- >

Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my computer screen! ;-)

Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

--

Charles Richmond

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 19:42:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

On 29/09/2021 17:54, Charles Richmond wrote:

> Is

A Request For Comment (RFC) is just that and not a ruling.

> there an RFC somewhere that discusses all this???

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Charlie Gibbs](#) on Wed, 29 Sep 2021 20:20:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 2021-09-29, Charles Richmond <codescott@aquaporin4.com> wrote:

> On 9/28/2021 8:09 AM, Questor wrote:
>
>> On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:58:58 +0100, gareth evans
>> <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Netiquette is not etiquette.
>>
>> It certainly is. It is a branch of etiquette that deals specifically
>> with online communications.
>>
>
> [... quoted material omitted ...]
>
>> Layout matters, viz:
>>
>> <https://keepmeme.com/meme/you-matter-dont-give-up-or-you-dont-matter-give-up>
>>
>> Every so often some pedant comes along and advances the argument
>> that some part of established etiquette, for example, shop clerks
>> asking "how are you" or wishing you a nice day -- to say nothing of
>> "please" and "thank you" -- are superfluous and unnecessary because
>> they convey no information and are just some outdated, arbitrary
>> convention, and thus can be discarded. They ignore that, among
>> other things, these phrases actually provide useful functions: they
>> can reveal intentions, set expectations, and generally establish a
>> framework for successful transactions between strangers. You might
>> think of them as verbal lubricant, or liken them to a computer
>> protocol that allows two heterogeneous computers to exchange data.
>> Be it place settings, wedding invitations, or some other etiquette
>> matter, the same tired arguments regarding their irrelevance are
>> made periodically, and some valid refutations are made in return.
>>
>> And so it is with netiquette, and most frequently, the top/bottom
>> posting issue. That horse is long dead, beaten into a grease spot,
>> and even the bones are turning to dust. The overwhelming consensus
>> is that bottom posting and judicious trimming of long posts is the
>> proper course. Exceptions are rare, and continued top posting marks
>> one as a newbie or a self-declared iconoclast who thinks they are
>> championing reason, freedom, or some other abstraction. But they
>> are just ignorant, or being selfish and childish. They tilt at
>> windmills in their mind.
>
> Is there an RFC somewhere that discusses all this???

RFC 1855 is a good start.

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc1855>

--
/~\ Charlie Gibbs | Life is perverse.
\/ <cgibbs@kltpzyxm.invalid> | It can be beautiful -
X I'm really at ac.dekanfrus | but it won't.
/\ if you read it the right way. | -- Lily Tomlin

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Joy Beeson](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 02:25:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Sep 2021 09:58:58 +0100, gareth evans
<headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Perhaps those who take offence so easily over
> such a trivial matter were the prototype
> woke generation?

Oh, I don't take offence. It's just that if you can't be bothered to write, I can't be bothered to read.

--
Joy Beeson
joy beeson at centurylink dot net
<http://wlweather.net/PAGEJOY/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 08:41:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: gareth evans

It never ceases to amaze me that in a forum for (presumably) computer experts, who must receive, read, accept, understand and reply to, emails where top posting is the norm, then have an emotional reaction against top-posting in this forum.

An open mind for the rest of the World but a closed narrow mind in this forum? How very strange!

On 29/09/2021 23:10, Dave Garland wrote:

> On 9/28/2021 1:18 AM, Charles Richmond wrote:
>

>> Historically (and probably now), the members of a group decide who

>> should be allowed to post. Each person's newsreader software allowed a
>> list of addresses to be maintained... and would automatically discard
>> messages from that address. If the majority of members of a group had
>> your address on their "discard" list, effectively you were kept out.
>
> On a.f.c. it seems equally to have been a matter of social pressure
> involving attempted correction, giving way to (or sometimes replaced by)
> rude replies. Most transgressors mend their way, or go away. A few
> combative ones remain and get blocked. In spades, as one sometimes said.
>
>>
>> (There is a name for that "discard" list... but I can not remember it
>> now...)
>
> Kill file
>>
>> Some "official" groups (not "alt.*" groups) are moderated by an
>> "admin", and you have to be officially admitted to the group by that
>> admin.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Ahem A Rivet's Shot](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 09:22:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 09:41:33 +0100
gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> It never ceases to amaze me that in a forum for (presumably)

It never ceases to amaze me that there are some people who for no
good reason lack the common courtesy to follow the conventions of the group.

--
Steve O'Hara-Smith
Odds and Ends at <http://www.sohara.org/>

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Harry Vaderchi](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 09:42:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 10:22:44 +0100
Ahem A Rivet's Shot <steveo@eircom.net> wrote:

> On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 09:41:33 +0100
> gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>> It never ceases to amaze me that in a forum for (presumably)
>
> It never ceases to amaze me that there are some people who
> for no good reason lack the common courtesy to follow the conventions
> of the group.

>
He's trolling for a flame-war, best to let it go.
Unless you really want to; in which case please go play over in alt.flame, alt.usenet.kooks or uk.legal or uk.radio-amateur where they love that kind of thing.

--
Bah, and indeed Humbug.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [scott](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 14:31:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> writes:
> It never ceases to amaze me that in a forum for (presumably)
> computer experts, who must receive, read, accept, understand and
> reply to, emails where top posting is the norm

Facts not in evidence. One doesn't need to top post even when using that horrible application called Outlook.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [D.J.](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2021 15:07:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 09:41:33 +0100, gareth evans <headstone255@yahoo.com> wrote:

> It never ceases to amaze me that in a forum for (presumably)
> computer experts, who must receive, read, accept, understand and
> reply to, emails where top posting is the norm, then have an
> emotional reaction against top-posting in this forum.
>
> An open mind for the rest of the World but a closed narrow
> mind in this forum? How very strange!

if you had an open mind, you wouldn't top post.

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2021 01:58:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: David Lesher

scott@slp53.sl.home (Scott Lurndal) writes:

> Facts not in evidence. One doesn't need to top post even
> when using that horrible application called Outlook.

I think you have it wrong, it's "Look Out" as you'd best look
out if you see it coming....

--

A host is a host from coast to coast.....wb8foz@nrk.com
& no one will talk to a host that's close.....
Unless the host (that isn't close).....pob 1433
is busy, hung or dead.....20915-1433

Subject: Re: Top or bottom posting; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2021 04:11:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: 711 Spooky Mart

On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:

> Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this
> thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my
> computer screen! ;-)
>
> Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good
> too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to
> alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

What does political nonsense have to do with this hierarchy? And why do
otherwise intelligent people seem to have an off switch on their brain
when it comes to grinding political axes? Everyone today is delusional.
Left, right, center, it doesn't matter--they're all slinging woo.

Political and religious ideologies are the ideas of your OPPRESSORS.
Elections and their ancillary politics are a sh!t show designed by the
ruling class to make you think you had a choice in who taxes and robs
you and your neighbors. Religion is a racket to scare you into obedience
to your oppressors, with a healthy profit to the prophets for keeping

the sheep in line for the slaughterhouse.

Liberalism, wokeism, cultural marxism, neo-conservatism, libertarianism, evangelical dominionism, charismatic christianism, catholicism, racism, anti-racism, islamism, judaism, buddhism, communism, nazism, yada, yada, etcetera and ad nauseum are ideologies carefully manufactured over the ages in Babylonian, Egyptian, Spartan, Macedonian, Assyrian, British, Roman, Kremlin, Berliner, and DOD spook think tanks to divide and conquer populations while looting them and tightening the invisible empire's grip.

None of these ideas are new and the same divide-and-conquer political ruses have been used by the mystery Babylon elite for millennia. If you study ancient propaganda you will quickly learn this. There's the master race bogey man and the oppressed minorities sh!t show in every imperial culture in world history. The roles are reversed, the tables turn, but the same group that turns the tables stays in power while the rest of us fight each other.

The world rulers have always ruled by deception, agitation, and division. They divide up their spoils by staging wars to cull the population and cash in and consolidate. They are desperate for another world war to cull the population, and the current political climate is designed to bring the population to despair and anger prior to starting a war and enacting new forms of authoritarianism to suppress real dissent while encouraging useless dissent, corruption and sabotage.

While the proles all battle each other over pet ideology or pet religious sect the entrenched bureaucracy is quietly installing the system that will ensure our grandchildren are sport f!ck toys for the elite for another hundred years.

--

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2021 04:17:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: 711 Spooky Mart

On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:

> Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this
> thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my
> computer screen! ;-)
>
> Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good
> too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to
> alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

Amen. I would like this hierarchy to move away from oppressive political bullsh!t. You guys seem to mostly have some nice and nostalgic discussions here that are a nice escape from the circus. But wherever people are, as soon as politics or religion enter the discussion, we can expect the combatants to circle the wagons with their camp and ready a romper.

If you want to argue politics and mangle the dictionary, please try talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh. On these political hierarchies you can:

1. Go vax yourself.
2. Drink your fluoride
3. Fellate your fuhrer.
4. Grope brown people to prove you aren't racist.
5. Claim Jesus identifies as a republican.
6. Prophecy about the second coming of Orange Man.
7. Fellate the cops.
8. Fellate the troops.
9. Defund the fellatio.

.... or whatever.

--

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [usenet](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2021 18:57:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 23:17:53 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:

> On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:

>> Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this

>> thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my

>> computer screen! ;-)

>>

>> Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good

>> too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to

>> alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

>

> Amen. I would like this hierarchy to move away from oppressive

> political bullsh!t. You guys seem to mostly have some nice and nostalgic

> discussions here that are a nice escape from the circus. But wherever

> people are, as soon as politics or religion enter the discussion, we can

> expect the combatants to circle the wagons with their camp and ready a

> romper.

>

> If you want to argue politics and mangle the dictionary, please try

> talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh. On these political

> hierarchies you can:

I find it curious that you, who just started participating in this forum
literally just days ago, are going to tell the regulars, who have been here for

years, how to conduct themselves.

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2021 07:11:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: 711 Spooky Mart

On 10/1/21 1:57 PM, Questor wrote:

> On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 23:17:53 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:

>> On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:

>>> Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this

>>> thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my

>>> computer screen! ;-)

>>>

>>> Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good

>>> too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to

>>> alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

>>

>> Amen. I would like this hierarchy to move away from oppressive

>> political bullsh!t. You guys seem to mostly have some nice and nostalgic

>> discussions here that are a nice escape from the circus. But wherever

>> people are, as soon as politics or religion enter the discussion, we can

>> expect the combatants to circle the wagons with their camp and ready a

>> romper.

>>

>> If you want to argue politics and mangle the dictionary, please try

>> talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh. On these political

>> hierarchies you can:

>

> I find it curious that you, who just started participating in this forum

> literally just days ago, are going to tell the regulars, who have been here for

> years, how to conduct themselves.

The same is done with the natives of countries even to this day and hardly anyone bats an eyelash. Why not advance conquest on Usenet? The Ubernummer can colonize and seize some trollingsraum. No need to be fragile over digital turf. We can always make more so Ubernummer can take more.

I find it curious that quite literally, political discussion is about telling others how to conduct themselves. And my objection to that is seen as telling others how to conduct themselves. Voicing any opinion at all can be seen as telling others how to conduct themselves.

How long you incorrectly think I have been participating is of no relevance to the discussion, nor is it a accurate gauge of the relevance

of my opinion on such a universal matter.

If you don't like my opinion feel free to object. Don't expect me to be moved by it. I will generally ignore political points except to say that whatever political camp you belong to, you're all crazy.

--

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2021 17:22:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:

> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object.

Don't care about your opinion but I'd be much more likely to read what you post if you were to lose the long blocks of 0x81 0xe2 0x96 0x88

in your sig.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 05:31:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: 711 Spooky Mart

On 10/6/21 12:22 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:

> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:

>

>> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object.

>

> Don't care about your opinion but I'd be much more likely to read what

> you post if you were to lose the long blocks of 0x81 0xe2 0x96 0x88

>

>

> in your sig.

It sounds as if your locale settings may need updated either in your reader or system-wide.

Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:

"Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs 21.3 and below. You can prefer it just below your preferred coding system by specifying utf-8 with 'M-x prefer-coding-system' and then repeating the command to replace your most preferred coding system at the front of the priority list ('coding-category-list')."

More at: <https://www.emacswiki.org/emacs/UnicodeEncoding>

Maybe you are using a legacy reader that doesn't understand UTF-8 text. UTF-8 has been standard for many years now. Most modern mail and news readers and even terminal emulators now support it out of the box. Many programmers now use UTF-8 symbols in their source code with no problems. Even Python now supports `"*~ encoding UTF-8"` directives in source files.

Maybe check your locale settings, too. If your system locale is set to other than `"en_US.UTF-8"` or something similar containing `"UTF-8"`, this can cause display of escape sequences rather than characters. In a bash shell try this:

```
$ echo $LANG
```

You might also try:

or

```
grep -v "#" /etc/locale.gen
```


search for for a line similar to "en_US.UTF-8 UTF-8" and see if it is commented out, or if an older ISO encoding is enabled in that file. If this is the case then:

```
$ man locale-gen
```

should instruct you how to update the system locale to display UTF-8 characters properly.

Some hardcore and slim distros may not do these settings automatically, so applications that don't set their own locale settings will revert to whatever is in the system settings. For instance take XED text editor. You can open a file and specify the locale encoding.

You may ignore the string of escape sequences below this line.

--

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 17:33:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:

> On 10/6/21 12:22 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
>
>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>
>>> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object.
>>
>> Don't care about your opinion but I'd be much more likely to read what
>> you post if you were to lose the long blocks of 0x81 0xe2 0x96 0x88
>>

>>
>> in your sig.
>
> It sounds as if your locale settings may need updated either in your
> reader or system-wide.
>
> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
>
> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
> 21.3 and below.

Emacs 20.7. Just so.

> [snip]
> Maybe you are using a legacy reader that doesn't understand UTF-8 text.
> UTF-8 has been standard for many years now.

This is Usenet. a.f.c is an English language newsgroup. I'm an ASCII
guy, especially in English on Usenet. There are work-arounds for for
the occasionally wanted typographic items missing from ASCII. I
certainly don't need all the 2^32 or whatever symbols/chars/glyphs.

Thank you for your tutorial on enabling UTF-8. Saved in case Hell
should, in fact, freeze over in my lifetime.

> You may ignore the string of escape sequences below this line.

"Ignore" is the key word there. "below" is variable.

--

Mike Spencer Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 17:49:13 GMT

Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>
>> On 10/6/21 12:22 PM, Mike Spencer wrote:
>>
>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>>
>>>> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object.
>>>
>>> Don't care about your opinion but I'd be much more likely to read what
>>> you post if you were to lose the long blocks of 0x81 0xe2 0x96 0x88
>>>
>>>> â-^â-^....
>>>
>>> in your sig.
>>
>> It sounds as if your locale settings may need updated either in your
>> reader or system-wide.
>>
>> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
>>
>> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>> 21.3 and below.
>
> Emacs 20.7. Just so.

Where did you did that up and why should we consider that relevant?

GNU Emacs 27.1

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Mike Spencer](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 19:52:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:

> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
>
>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>
>>> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:

```
>>>
>>> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>>> 21.3 and below.
>>
>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.
>
> Where did you did that up...
>
> GNU Emacs 27.1
```

Off-and-on Unix user from '89, tried to install slackware from floppies in mid 90s, got lost in the mess. Fail.

In 1999 I bought a Great Fat Book with two Linux CDs in it: Caldera and RedHat. Installed Caldera. It came up with XEmacs default. Gak! Hastily downloaded and compiled then-current GNU Emacs -- 20.7.

With a working Linux up, as soon as I figured out how to do it, switched to Slackware 8.0.

Since then, with each new update of Slackware, there's a new Emacs version. I install it, spend several hours trying to make annoying features go away or revert to previous behavior. Get fed up and replace it with the 20.7 binary compiled in 1999. Rinse & repeat each time a new Emacs comes along.

I can't recall all the annoyances off the top of my head. The ones that come to mind:

- + Changed behavior of the prompt in shell-mode
- + Emacs wants to convert 30 years' accumulation of BABYL email & news files to mbox format.
- + Colorization/standout mode. Colors chosen by Emacs conflict with X colors I choose for Emacs windows, making (for example) the minibuffer unreadable.
- + Numerous others I forget.

Well, you asked.

> ... and why should we consider that relevant?

Not relevant to Spooky's bloated binary .sig itself. Relevant response to Spooky's quoted line, confessing that h{is,er} surmise about what {s}he regards as my antediluvian technology is correct.

--

Mike Spencer

Nova Scotia, Canada

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 20:13:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

On 2021-10-07, Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> wrote:

>

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:

>

>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

>>

>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:

>>>

>>>> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:

>>>>

>>>> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs

>>>> 21.3 and below.

>>>

>>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.

>>

>> Where did you did that up...

>>

>> GNU Emacs 27.1

>

> Off-and-on Unix user from '89, tried to install slackware from floppies in

> mid 90s, got lost in the mess. Fail.

>

Slackware was easy, it had bunch of HOWTO's, and I worked on AT&T Unix and SCO before :P

Also Stratus's VOS :P

--

7-77-777

Evil Sinner!

with software, you repeat same experiment, expecting different results...

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 22:54:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:

> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
>>
>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>>
>>>> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
>>>>
>>>> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>>>> 21.3 and below.
>>>
>>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.
>>
>> Where did you did that up...
>>
>> GNU Emacs 27.1
>
> Off-and-on Unix user from '89, tried to install slackware from
> floppies in mid 90s, got lost in the mess. Fail.
>
> In 1999 I bought a Great Fat Book with two Linux CDs in it: Caldera
> and RedHat. Installed Caldera. It came up with XEmacs default. Gak!
> Hastily downloaded and compiled then-current GNU Emacs -- 20.7.
>
> With a working Linux up, as soon as I figured out how to do it,
> switched to Slackware 8.0.
>
> Since then, with each new update of Slackware, there's a new Emacs
> version. I install it, spend several hours trying to make annoying
> features go away or revert to previous behavior. Get fed up and
> replace it with the 20.7 binary compiled in 1999. Rinse & repeat each
> time a new Emacs comes along.
>
> I can't recall all the annoyances off the top of my head. The ones
> that come to mind:
>
> + Changed behavior of the prompt in shell-mode
>
> + Emacs wants to convert 30 years' accumulation of BABYL email &
> news files to mbox format.

I used to be an MH-E bigot, but I've long been convinced of the merits of IMAP. Leave that stuff on your server. Well, I do sometimes save

stuff in nrmh format.

- > + Colorization/standout mode. Colors chosen by Emacs conflict
- > with X colors I choose for Emacs windows, making (for example) the
- > minibuffer unreadable.

Looks like I set the color of the minibuffer text using custom.
Simply get into the customize stuff and find and set it.

There are hundreds of themes, but I've been setting my own colors for too long. I can't recall that stuff ever being disturbed by a new release.

- > + Numerous others I forget.
- >
- > Well, you asked.

For each new version of Emacs, the News file indicates the changes and when relevant, how to revert them.

- >> ... and why should we consider that relevant?
- >
- > Not relevant to Spooky's bloated binary .sig itself. Relevant
- > response to Spooky's quoted line, confessing that h{is,er}
- > surmise about what {s}he regards as my antediluvian technology is
- > correct.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2021 23:50:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Branimir Maksimovic

- On 2021-10-07, Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> wrote:
- > Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
 - >
 - >> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
 - >>
 - >>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
 - >>>
 - >>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
 - >>>>
 - >>>> > Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
 - >>>> >

>>>> > "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>>>> > 21.3 and below.
>>>>
>>>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.
>>>
>>> Where did you did that up...
>>>
>>> GNU Emacs 27.1
>>
>> Off-and-on Unix user from '89, tried to install slackware from floppies in
>> mid 90s, got lost in the mess. Fail.
>>
>> In 1999 I bought a Great Fat Book with two Linux CDs in it: Caldera and
>> RedHat. Installed Caldera. It came up with XEmacs default. Gak! Hastily
>> downloaded and compiled then-current GNU Emacs -- 20.7.
>>
>> With a working Linux up, as soon as I figured out how to do it, switched to
>> Slackware 8.0.
>>
>> Since then, with each new update of Slackware, there's a new Emacs version.
>> I install it, spend several hours trying to make annoying features go away
>> or revert to previous behavior. Get fed up and replace it with the 20.7
>> binary compiled in 1999. Rinse & repeat each time a new Emacs comes along.
>>
>> I can't recall all the annoyances off the top of my head. The ones that
>> come to mind:
>>
>> + Changed behavior of the prompt in shell-mode
>>
>> + Emacs wants to convert 30 years' accumulation of BABYL email & news
>> files to mbox format.
>
> I used to be an MH-E bigot, but I've long been convinced of the merits of
> IMAP. Leave that stuff on your server. Well, I do sometimes save stuff in
> nnmh format.
>
>> + Colorization/standout mode. Colors chosen by Emacs conflict with X
>> colors I choose for Emacs windows, making (for example) the minibuffer
>> unreadable.
>
> Looks like I set the color of the minibuffer text using custom. Simply get
> into the customize stuff and find and set it.
>
> There are hundreds of themes, but I've been setting my own colors for too
> long. I can't recall that stuff ever being disturbed by a new release.
>
>> + Numerous others I forget.
>>

>> Well, you asked.
>
> For each new version of Emacs, the News file indicates the changes and when
> relevant, how to revert them.
>
Emacs is cleverly written, I might notice :P
iT figures out if you are on desktop or connected via
ssh :P

>

--

7-77-777
Evil Sinner!
with software, you repeat same experiment, expecting different results...

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Andreas Kohlbach](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2021 00:12:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 07 Oct 2021 16:52:33 -0300, Mike Spencer wrote:

>
> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
>
>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
>>
>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>>
>>>> Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
>>>>
>>>> "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>>>> 21.3 and below.

You can probably set something like

```
(setq mm-coding-system-priorities '(iso-8859-1 iso-8859-15 utf-8))
```

in the .gnus (or .emacs). I have it, although I doubt it's needed anymore
with my version

(GNU Emacs 27.1 (build 1, i686-pc-linux-gnu) of 2021-03-27, modified by Debian).

>>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.
>>
>> Where did you did that up...

>>
>> GNU Emacs 27.1

Then it automatically should deal with charäkerß outside the ASCII range, no?

> Off-and-on Unix user from '89, tried to install slackware from
> floppies in mid 90s, got lost in the mess. Fail.
>
> In 1999 I bought a Great Fat Book with two Linux CDs in it: Caldera
> and RedHat. Installed Caldera. It came up with XEmacs default. Gak!
> Hastily downloaded and compiled then-current GNU Emacs -- 20.7.

Installed my first Linux 1998, but took until 2000 that I used Gnus for usenet postings.

--
Andreas

PGP fingerprint 952B0A9F12C2FD6C9F7E68DAA9C2EA89D1A370E0

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Dan Espen](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2021 00:24:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Andreas Kohlbach <ank@spamfence.net> writes:

> On 07 Oct 2021 16:52:33 -0300, Mike Spencer wrote:
>>
>> Dan Espen <dan1espen@gmail.com> writes:
>>
>>> Mike Spencer <mds@bogus.nodomain.nowhere> writes:
>>>
>>>> 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> writes:
>>>>
>>>> > Are you using Gnus/Emacs? If so the Emacs wiki says:
>>>> >
>>>> > "Auto-detection of UTF-8 is effectively disabled by default in GNU Emacs
>>>> > 21.3 and below.
>
> You can probably set something like
>
> (setq mm-coding-system-priorities '(iso-8859-1 iso-8859-15 utf-8))
>
> in the .gnus (or .emacs). I have it, although I doubt it's needed anymore
> with my version
>
> (GNU Emacs 27.1 (build 1, i686-pc-linux-gnu) of 2021-03-27, modified by Debian).

>
>>>> Emacs 20.7. Just so.
>>>
>>> Where did you did that up...
>>>
>>> GNU Emacs 27.1
>
> Then it automatically should deal with charäktërß outside the ASCII
> range, no?

Sure does. Emojis, Bi-directional text. All just works.

--
Dan Espen

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [usenet](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2021 05:48:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 6 Oct 2021 02:11:43 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:
> On 10/1/21 1:57 PM, Questor wrote:
>> On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 23:17:53 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:
>>> On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:
>>>> Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this
>>>> thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my
>>>> computer screen! ;-)
>>>>
>>>> Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good
>>>> too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to
>>>> alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...
>>>
>>> Amen. I would like this hierarchy to move away from oppressive
>>> political bullsh!t. You guys seem to mostly have some nice and nostalgic
>>> discussions here that are a nice escape from the circus. But wherever
>>> people are, as soon as politics or religion enter the discussion, we can
>>> expect the combatants to circle the wagons with their camp and ready a
>>> romper.
>>>
>>> If you want to argue politics and mangle the dictionary, please try
>>> talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh. On these political
>>> hierarchies you can:
>>>
>> I find it curious that you, who just started participating in this forum
>> literally just days ago, are going to tell the regulars, who have been here for
>> years, how to conduct themselves.

> The same is done with the natives of countries even to this day and
> hardly anyone bats an eyelash. Why not advance conquest on Usenet? The
> Ubernummer can colonize and seize some trollingsraum. No need to be
> fragile over digital turf. We can always make more so Ubernummer can
> take more.

I cannot even make sense of this gibberish.

> I find it curious that quite literally, political discussion is about
> telling others how to conduct themselves. And my objection to that is
> seen as telling others how to conduct themselves. Voicing any opinion at
> all can be seen as telling others how to conduct themselves.

Telling us we should go post in talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh is certain telling us how we should conduct ourselves in this forum. And I note in another thread that you reguarly talk down to people, and tell them what to do -- what software to run, how to configure it, and more. When they raise an objection -- "voicing their opinion" -- then you subject them to insults. In short, your behavior on alt.folklore.computers has been as obnoxious as your signature, and you have contributed almost nothing in the way of computer folklore.

> How long you incorrectly think I have been participating is of no
> relevance to the discussion, nor is it a accurate gauge of the relevance
> of my opinion on such a universal matter.

I don't care if you've been on Usenet for forty years -- if you act like a newbie, then you are a newbie. You've ignored the standards and norms of this community and insulted it's long-time participants. That's what a newbie does. You've already earned a placed in several kill files. I think a shunning is in order. Ideally, no one should read or reply to any of your posts. I'm sure that you're going to insult me in your reply, just as you have with others. I won't be reading it, nor replying to anything you write in the future.

> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object. Don't expect me to be
> moved by it. I will generally ignore political points except to say that
> whatever political camp you belong to, you're all crazy.

Politics is an integral, unavoidable component of all human interactions. The question isn't one of politics versus no politics, but of good politics versus poor politics. Regrettably, there many poor politicians these days, which certainly sours people's opinion on politics. I also note that the vociferous objectors to politics never announce that they are going to run for

public office in order to do a better job. Where do people think politicians come from? They are citizens who step up and say, "I'm going to take that job." In any event, if you want better politics, you should get involved on some level.

"Too bad all the people who know how to run the country are busy driving cabs, tending bar, and cutting hair."

Subject: Re: Sub or dom ; does it really matter?
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 12 Oct 2021 15:26:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: 711 Spooky Mart

On 10/9/21 12:48 AM, Questor wrote:

> On Wed, 6 Oct 2021 02:11:43 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:

>> On 10/1/21 1:57 PM, Questor wrote:

>>> On Thu, 30 Sep 2021 23:17:53 -0500, 711 Spooky Mart <711@spooky.mart> wrote:

>>>> On 9/29/21 12:03 PM, Charles Richmond wrote:

>>>> > Has anyone considered putting on their fire-proof suits and moving this

>>>> > thread to "alt.flamewar"??? :-) Some of this is starting to singe my

>>>> > computer screen! ;-)

>>>> >

>>>> > Of course if folks want to continue this "discussion" here, that's good

>>>> > too. At least these posts beat having *no* one posting to

>>>> > alt.computers.folklore. :-) I hope...

>>>>

>>>> Amen. I would like this hierarchy to move away from oppressive

>>>> political bullsh!t. You guys seem to mostly have some nice and nostalgic

>>>> discussions here that are a nice escape from the circus. But wherever

>>>> people are, as soon as politics or religion enter the discussion, we can

>>>> expect the combatants to circle the wagons with their camp and ready a

>>>> romper.

>>>>

>>>> If you want to argue politics and mangle the dictionary, please try

>>>> talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh. On these political

>>>> hierarchies you can:

>>>

>>> I find it curious that you, who just started participating in this forum

>>> literally just days ago, are going to tell the regulars, who have been here for

>>> years, how to conduct themselves.

>

>

>> The same is done with the natives of countries even to this day and

>> hardly anyone bats an eyelash. Why not advance conquest on Usenet? The

>> Ubernummer can colonize and seize some trollingsraum. No need to be

>> fragile over digital turf. We can always make more so Ubernummer can

>> take more.
>
> I cannot even make sense of this gibberish.
>
>
>> I find it curious that quite literally, political discussion is about
>> telling others how to conduct themselves. And my objection to that is
>> seen as telling others how to conduct themselves. Voicing any opinion at
>> all can be seen as telling others how to conduct themselves.
>
> Telling us we should go post in talk.politics.misc or alt.fan.rush.limbaugh is
> certain telling us how we should conduct ourselves in this forum. And I note
> in another thread that you reguarly talk down to people, and tell them what to
> do -- what software to run, how to configure it, and more. When they raise
> an objection -- "voicing their opinion" -- then you subject them to insults.
> In short, your behavior on alt.folklore.computers has been as obnoxious as
> your signature, and you have contributed almost nothing in the way of
> computer folklore.
>
>
>> How long you incorrectly think I have been participating is of no
>> relevance to the discussion, nor is it a accurate gauge of the relevance
>> of my opinion on such a universal matter.
>
> I don't care if you've been on Usenet for forty years -- if you act like a
> newbie, then you are a newbie. You've ignored the standards and norms
> of this community and insulted it's long-time participants. That's what
> a newbie does. You've already earned a placed in several kill files.
> I think a shunning is in order. Ideally, no one should read or reply to any of
> your posts. I'm sure that you're going to insult me in your reply, just as you
> have with others. I won't be reading it, nor replying to anything you write
> in the future.
>
>
>> If you don't like my opinion feel free to object. Don't expect me to be
>> moved by it. I will generally ignore political points except to say that
>> whatever political camp you belong to, you're all crazy.
>
> Politics is an integral, unavoidable component of all human interactions.
> The question isn't one of politics versus no politics, but of good politics
> versus poor politics. Regrettably, there many poor politicians these days,
> which certainly sours people's opinion on politics. I also note that the
> vociferous objectors to politics never announce that they are going to run for
> public office in order to do a better job. Where do people think politicians
> come from? They are citizens who step up and say, "I'm going to take that job."
> In any event, if you want better politics, you should get involved on some
> level.
>

> "Too bad all the people who know how to run the country are busy driving
> cabs, tending bar, and cutting hair."
>

> "I'm sure that you're going to insult me in your reply, just as you
have with others. I won't be reading it, nor replying to anything you
write in the future."

No, you're sure I will defend myself and my integrity against your moo
poo accusations. Here you are trying to spin doctor my response before
I've even made it. You probably won't be reading it, but most everyone
else will be reading it.

> "Politics is an integral, unavoidable component of all human
interactions."

No, politics is war by other means, just as war is politics by other
means. (see von Clausewitz) Politics is the result of one group of
people desiring to rule over another group of people. That's all it is,
and that's all it's ever been. That is the beginning of war and
conquest. My metaphor about conquest of trollingsraum went right over
your head, didn't it?

> "I also note that the vociferous objectors to politics never announce
that they are going to run for public office in order to do a better job."

A better job at what? How does joining a criminal gang improve anything?
Have you seen the kinds of villains that inhabit public office? In case
you haven't noticed, the government is nothing but a criminal racket,
and no matter who gets elected, the march to complete authoritarianism
never stops.

Beginning 1950 years ago a group of people who refused to participate in
politics changed the world more dramatically than it had ever been
changed. After 200 years of their influence and refusal to participate
in politics, the most oppressive, bloodthirsty empire of that age
crumbled into ruin. All of its mass murders and blood sports ceased
because of the influence of those conscientious objectors to politics.
None of those people ran for office to bring about that transformation.
Rather, they refused to submit to the people who had been elected to
office. The people who held public office murdered them in droves, but
still could not stop the transformation their faith would bring to society.

> "Telling us we should go post in talk.politics.misc or
alt.fan.rush.limbaugh is certain telling us how we should conduct
ourselves in this forum. "

Hyperbole and metaphor is lost on your authoritarian pea brain. I didn't

make threats of shunning and ostracism. You did. You're the one who is trying to tell me what to do, trying to intimidate and pressure me to conform, then hiding your hypocrisy behind a hyperbolic statement I made. You are intrinsically dishonest.

> "You've ignored the standards and norms of this community and insulted it's long-time participants."

These standards and norms you speak of are vague and inexplicable and only come into play when you want to target someone, like any good little authoritarian does. Authoritarianism is tribalism with tech.

You hear what you want to hear. You believe what you want to believe. Your characterization of me is a lie and a slander and turns the facts on their head, as any reader of my messages can verify.

The issue here is that a clutch of authoritarian beta males have ganged up on someone who doesn't kowtow to the (vague) tribal norms that they wish to enforce. You are attempting to exert peer pressure on me to make me obedient, while trying to mask the authoritarian nature of your mentality. You're not upset that you perceived me as insulting. You're upset because you perceive the insult being toward your tribe.

That is why you spout like pollied, "You'll be added to killfiles." This is why your tribal companions started a row about my signature. You will use whatever lie fits the moment to project what you are actually doing, onto the person you are doing it to.

It is your tribe who have been talking down to me. I retorted to the passive-aggressive abuse and you define that as "talking down." Your tribal companions drew first blood. I will not fall into line with the as yet inexplicable, hidden rulebook on what you consider norms or acceptable behavior. I'm not your cow and I don't bow to peer pressure from tribalists who think being in this group for a long time gives them a form of entitlement to command how others express themselves.

It is people like you who burned men and women at the stake. Thankfully in this age, all you have had is a killfile--until recently, since now your tribe has the syringe.

The world loves its own and hates those from above the fray. You put out a general call for everyone on the group to shun me. This shows your true, authoritarian colors. I don't care if you've been here for 40 years. You don't own this newsgroup and you have no right to use pressure to chill my free expression. You are on the side of censorship and authoritarianism, which is contrary to the spirit of Usenet, and contrary to the human spirit of the living. The dead know nothing at all.

I don't care if you shun me. It's your loss, not mine. You have nothing to offer me, because I am living, and you are from the tribe of the dead.

You must equate my freedom and individuality with an attack on your sense of tribal order. It must rankle you sore to see someone so far out of line.

To everyone else reading this exchange: I do not encourage you to killfile or shun anyone. I encourage you to call your friends out for their moo poo. I encourage you to ask yourself why someone would put out a general shunning call. If that isn't tribalist authoritarianism, then what is?

If people don't stand up to this streak of authoritarianism in Western society, there won't be anywhere to form an opinion in the future.

--