

## Re: [ML ISSUE] reply-to field ?

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Debian/2007-03/msg05258.html>

---

- *From:* Joe Hart <[j.hart@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:j.hart@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 30 Mar 2007 18:53:15 +0200
- 

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

Hash: SHA1

[galevsky@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:galevsky@xxxxxxxxxx) wrote:

IMAP is not interesting for me at work, and there is reply-to-all feature yet, so I am not sure the problem is coming from Google MUA, but from the reply-to field instead. I read the Celejar link (thanks for him to have brought it up) and tried to think that it was the reason why we don't have it in debian ML. But I totally disagree with it.

Next italics-bleu text is coming from  
<http://www.unicom.com/pw/reply-to-harmful.html>  
<<http://www.unicom.com/pw/reply-to-harmful.html>>.

It Adds Nothing

Reply-To munging does not benefit the user with a reasonable mailer. People want to munge Reply-To headers to make "reply back to the list" easy.

? Of course there is a plus. You don't have to pay attention to what kind of reply you are doing. (Nor what kind of MUA you are using...)

It Makes Things Break

It, in fact, /decreases/ functionality. Reply-To munging destroys the "reply-to-author" capability. Munging makes this command act effectively the same as the "reply-to-group" function. We haven't added anything new, we've only taken away. Reply-To munging is not merely benign, it is harmful.

? it missed something.... we are talking about adding Reply-to to ML, not to day-to-day emails. It is a wrong way not to take the use into consideration: most of the replies are done to the ML, so we can easily consider replying to the whole ML as a default behaviour. In very particular cases, when you don't want to share, you can do the cut/paste effort to target only one contributor, can't you ? So what's broken ?

Re: [ML ISSUE] reply-to field ?

Freedom of Choice

Some administrators justify Reply-To munging by saying, "All responses should go directly to the list anyway." This is arrogant.

? choice of what ? In our case we are talking about more convenience, and one point that can be checked is having the default behaviour matching the needs. No choice is bad. But what about the defaults tuned up ?

Well, I still can't see any problem using reply-to. For ML usage, of course. (And there is also other usage, but no the matter here.)

Gal'

2007/3/30, Ron Johnson <ron.l.johnson@xxxxxxx  
<<mailto:ron.l.johnson@xxxxxxx>>>:

On 03/30/07 08:32, galevsky@xxxxxxxxx <<mailto:galevsky@xxxxxxxxx>> wrote:

I am forwarding previous answers.... and adding that I do not want to pop these mails since I suscribed lots of ML, not only debian

ones, and

it is more convenient for me to read&write from gmail than popping 3 times (work - home - laptop) thousands of mails.....

Complain to Google that their MUA is lacking an important feature.

Reply-to-list  
OR  
IMAP functionality.

Before you contunue ranting, please read:

<http://www.debian.org/MailingLists/#codeofconduct>

There you would learn that this sort of behavior is not acceptable here, nor is the type of message (meaning formatted with HTML) the format we use because not everyone can read it.

All you are doing is rehashing an argument that has taken place over and over. You don't like the list, then unsubscribe. Simple.

Re: [ML ISSUE] reply-to field ?

Re: [ML ISSUE] reply-to field ?

Joe

---

Registered Linux user #443289 at <http://counter.li.org/>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: GnuPG v1.4.6 (GNU/Linux)

Comment: Using GnuPG with Mozilla - <http://enigmail.mozdev.org>

iD8DBQFGDUB7iXBCVWpc5J4RAi29AKCo1/0+iQz24buhnabbbZWCstVN0QCgnXLG  
tKfez/kuSFmwHD4YKGeV2SA=

=QVod

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

--

To UNSUBSCRIBE, email to [debian-user-REQUEST@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:debian-user-REQUEST@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
with a subject of "unsubscribe". Trouble? Contact [listmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:listmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Re: [ML ISSUE] reply-to field ?