

## Re: [SLE] Empty Trash

**Source:** <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/SuSE/2004-11/1215.html>

---

**From:** Carlos E. R. (*robin1.listas\_at\_fiscal.es*)

**Date:** 11/10/04

Date: Wed, 10 Nov 2004 01:08:10 +0100 (CET)

To: SLE <suse-linux-e@suse.com>

The Monday 2004-11-08 at 18:22 -0800, Randall R Schulz wrote:

> > *I don't care much about the backbone, I do care about the last mile,*  
> > *because that it is my bottleneck ; -)*  
>  
> *Really? The quantity of data received on the SuSE-Linux-E list is a*  
> *significant proportion of your link's capacity? You must be on one damn*  
> *slow link!*

Yes, it is. It can cope, of course, but if everybody in this list were using html, my ISP inbox would fill up easily: some have 3 Mb, some 25Mb. I could not take a few days out, because it would fill up quite soon.

A quick calculation is below.

> > *I know that, you do not need to post them. Notice that some of those*  
> > *headers were added by your own machine, by the way.*  
>  
> *OK. I guess it's "only" 1700+ bytes...*

But it doesn't go up.

About 80% of the list is over 3000 bytes, 10% is over 5Kb, and only a few are over 20Kb. Those 20Kb, minus 2 is 18. Plus 200% for the html part, thats 36. Total 36+18+2=56Kb (meaning around 10 second for each to download). Those of 5Kb would increase to about 11Kb.

For example, last Monday I got 298 emails from this list alone: assuming 4Kb each, thats around 1.2 Mbytes; including a html part, it would increase to 2.4Mb per day. That means that it would fill up in 3 or 4 days for the average 10 Mbytes account - with this list alone.

> > *And, you should not forget that there are many people - me, for*  
> > *example - using plain text programs. Pine can show some html, but not*  
> > *all. Some X clients do not handle html well, or not at all. Even if*  
> > *we are on the 21th century, that is a fact.*

## SuSE: Re: [SLE] Empty Trash

>  
> *That's another part of the point. Using antiquated software is not a  
> reason to resist using a richer medium of communication. Not when it's  
> supported by bona fide standards.*

Yes, it is.

It would force us to use certain kind of email clients.

>  
>  
> *Thus, the list is designed for the minimum common denominator.*  
>  
> *Which is silly, but nonetheless is a value judgement on the part of the  
> list administrator. We should keep in mind, too, that with a change in  
> proprietorship for SuSE as a whole, all these things are potentially  
> subject to change. Perhaps Novell is more enlightened than the old SuSE  
> folks. After all, isn't Germany part of "Old Europe?" (Sorry, I  
> couldn't resist... I hate Bush at least as much as any fundie hates the  
> devil, by the way.)*

Then it would be the time to quit the list and SuSE :-|

>  
> > *And again, I'm advocating styled text only, not full-blown HTML  
> > mail, though I find that quite useful at times, too. I'll only view  
> > such mail from known and trusted senders, of course.*  
> >  
> > *But I only complain about html mail, not styled mail – however, I  
> > have never seen such a thing. And the original poster used html.*  
>  
> *Barely. But still the point applies. Electronic mail is simply one means  
> of communication. If HTML, with its embedded style, layout and images,  
> is a useful medium for communication—and I think we all agree it  
> is—then why should it be excluded from electronic mail?*

Not from electronic mail, but from this list. That's what we are complaining about. There is no real need for it, there are technical reasons against it, and so are the rules of this list.

I simply don't care, here, about what other lists do, or other users do with their private email.

> > *Hey, you just said "I'll only view such mail from known and trusted  
> > senders". What about the list? Do you trust everybody on it? Because  
> > the issue here is using html on the list.*  
>  
> *Is it? My issue is styled text, not HTML.*

But ours is html in the list. The original poster email used html.

## SuSE: Re: [SLE] Empty Trash

> > *But it doesn't exist! I wouldn't care much about the ability to say*  
> > *"this is bold" or whatever... In fact, perhaps I would like it. But*  
> > *there is no such standard, I think; for example, Pine knows nothing*  
> > *of such "styled text". There is only html, and to be polite it means*  
> > *sending both plain text and html, the second one been twice as big.*  
> > *A small mail is not much, but some reach 60Kbytes. I know, I get a*  
> > *few newsletters and such every day. It is not only "font style" they*  
> > *use, but boxes, charts, logos, and who knows what. 60Kb for a page or*  
> > *two. :-/*  
>  
> *(I wish English used the 'i')*

Oops! O:-)

Writing in both languages means that they will get mixed now and then.  
Yes, I also think the opening mark is clearer, but... it is not my  
language, my opinion is not important :-)

>  
> *What doesn't exist? You're simply wrong, you know. There most certainly*  
> *is such a standard. Do you think I'd go on like this over a fantasy /*  
> *hallucination? <URL: <http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1896.html>>. <URL:*  
> *<http://mango.human.cornell.edu/kens/etf.html>> is a nice explanatory*  
> *page.*

/usr/share/doc/rfc/rfc1896.txt.gz is nearer to me ;-)

Ok, it does. What programs support it, in Linux?

> *I guess I was just spoiled by Eudora. It has long had support for RFC*  
> *1523 and successors. Short of it's lack of threading, it's definitely*  
> *the best email client I've ever used. KMail is good, but it's not quite*  
> *as nice as Eudora...*

I think I have received emails from Eudora clients, and they were a pain  
to read in more than one email client. I don't know what is the situation  
now.

--

Cheers,

Carlos Robinson

--

Check the headers for your unsubscription address  
For additional commands send e-mail to [suse-linux-e-help@suse.com](mailto:suse-linux-e-help@suse.com)  
Also check the archives at <http://lists.suse.com>  
Please read the FAQs: [suse-linux-e-faq@suse.com](mailto:suse-linux-e-faq@suse.com)