

# Re: Netiquette Guidelines

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-04/msg13275.html>

---

- *From:* "Donald L McDaniel" <[donmcdaniel2005@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:donmcdaniel2005@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 23 Apr 2005 10:39:22 -0700
- 

Lil' Dave wrote:

> "Måç" <[H@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:H@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> [news:OCe\\$B2RFHA.1348@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OCe$B2RFHA.1348@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>> Are these guidelines still the ideal in this NG (or any others for  
>> that matter)?  
>>  
>> <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1855.txt>  
>>  
>> If not, and I feel a lot of these old guidelines are out of date,  
>> what are to reference?  
>>  
>> I see a lot of regular posters here that don't follow the spirit of  
>> this document. Obviously they feel they are free to follow some other  
>> "code" that may have evolved – but is it documented?  
>  
> Just because it has some internet site (documentation), doesn't make  
> it valid.  
>  
>>  
>> Extracts –  
>>  
>> A good rule of thumb: Be conservative in what you send and liberal  
>> in what  
>  
> Nope, not enough information flushes out many solutions. None of  
> which may be accurate as enough information was not provided to  
> describe the problem.  
>  
>> you receive. You should not send heated messages (we call these  
>> "flames") even if you are provoked. On the other hand, you  
>> shouldn't be surprised if you get flamed and it's prudent not to  
>> respond to flames.  
>>  
>  
> Flamers should be dealt with by the news server maintenance personnel  
> by deleting those flames from the server if the flame is rude enough.  
>  
> Speaking politely in provoking a flame is just as bad.

## Re: Netiquette Guidelines

- >
- > Personal attacks, rather than attacking the information, should
- > always be ignored.
- >
- >> If you are sending a reply to a message or a posting be sure you
- >> summarize the original at the top of the message, or include just
- >> enough text of the
- >
- > MS decided by default (MS OE) to put the response at the top of the
- > response post. So, OE users have to manually force the response at
- > the bottom.
- >
- > Responding to parts of a post, inserting the response underneath each
- > part as I'm doing now, is appropriate when it calls for a response to
- > each part. Rather than making all the response at the bottom. Its
- > less messy for the reader as he/she doesn't have to bounce back and
- > forth from the top then the bottom to understand.
- >
- >> original to give a context. This will make sure readers understand
- >> when they start to read your response. Since NetNews, especially, is
- >> proliferated by distributing the postings from one host to another,
- >> it is possible to see a response to a message before seeing the
- >> original. Giving context
- > helps
- >> everyone. But do not include the entire original!
- >
- > This is something abused to promote a point. Avoiding including
- > important information from the original post, in the response, in
- > order to make a point that is not accurate to the entire context of
- > the original post.
- >
- > Rather, the respondent uses part of the original post to promote
- > their own agenda rather than to answer the question or respond to the
- > entire information provided by the original post. This ruins the
- > entire thread.
- >
- >>
- >> If you should find yourself in a disagreement with one person, make
- >> your responses to each other via mail rather than continue to send
- >> messages to the list or the group. If you are debating a point on
- >> which the group might have some interest, you may summarize for
- >> them later.
- >
- > So if a respondent places inaccurate information on the response, one
- > does not point that out for the group of readers is what this
- > promotes. This promotes urban legends, mis and dis information.
- > Only the email recipient receives the proper information.
- >
- >>
- >
- >>

Re: Netiquette Guidelines

>> Avoid sending messages or posting articles which are no more than  
>> gratuitous replies to replies.  
>  
> Poppycock. A simple thank you response does many things. One being  
> that it promotes participation by others that don't normally as they  
> feel more confident in asking questions since they know suitable  
> solutions were provided.  
>  
>>  
>> Mac

That is your take. Since there is no "LAW" which governs the way people post to the Usenet, noone can say "this is the way you do it, and it must always be done this way." After all, a "convention" only has as much force as people let it have. If someone decides not to follow the convention, it has no force over him. Until the Government decides to make laws controlling speech on the Internet, that is all the force a convention will have on anyone who decides not to follow it.

Many others think differntly. Many think that the Usenet is a wilderness where anything may be said at any time. This comes from our American habit of upholding the 1st Amendment to the Constitution.

However, anyone who posts to the Usenet for any length of time comes to the conclusion that politeness is better than having rights if they want to communicate with others.

--

Donald L McDaniel

Please reply to the original thread,  
so that the thread may be kept intact.

=====

.

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Netiquette Guidelines**  
    ◇ From: David H. Lipman
- ◆ **Re: Netiquette Guidelines**  
    ◇ From: kurtrail

• *References:*

- ◆ **Netiquette Guidelines**  
    ◇ From: Maç
- ◆ **Re: Netiquette Guidelines**  
    ◇ From: Lil' Dave

- Prev by Date: **PC goes into standby/hibernate while I'm online working.**

Re: Netiquette Guidelines

- Next by Date: ***Re: MPEG problems***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Netiquette Guidelines***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Netiquette Guidelines***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***