

Re: Mail Server

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2004-08/1747.html>

From: Paul Lutus (*nospam_at_nosite.zzz*)

Date: 08/21/04

Date: Sat, 21 Aug 2004 11:22:06 -0700

da wrote:

>>>

>>> *How does a user know when their content is ready?*

>>

>> *By visiting the site or by having their own personal robot download the*

> new

>> *document (or alert the user) when the target document's date changes.*

>> *This is why they call it a "computer".*

>>

>

> *Physicians and health care workers have very limited time, and they won't*

> stop to "surf the net"

You have totally misrepresented the argument. The robot method doesn't require human intervention, any more than e-mail does. It automatically downloads updated documents on a watch list.

> *to determine whether a particular patients readings*

> *have gone out of range – if they are going to be convinced to use a system*

> *at all, they will want the system to *tell them* when someone interesting*

> *has ocured. They will want it to notify *them*.*

That is exactly what the robot system does. Client machines poll servers for updated documents, and download those that are newer than the local cached documents. The end user doesn't have to take any action.

This is not the current practice, but it is much more efficient than current practice, and it confronts those mass-mailing practices that are indistinguishable from spam (those in which it is difficult or impossible to stop the flow).

> *(Remember "publish and subscribe" from computing 101? That's the software*

> design pattern employed for this kind of scenario.)

Remember common sense? That is what is supposed to kick in when the prevailing practice stops working. When more than half of all e-mail traffic is spam, it's common sense time. It's time to rethink our entire

approach, one developed before outright criminals appeared on the Net.

>

> *And they're *not* going to use a "personal robot" – that's an absurd
> notion.*

What a terrific argument. Not long ago, a personal computer was once an absurd notion. If you think "an absurd notion" constitutes meaningful argument, why are you wasting your time posting?

> *And it is not likely that there is a lot of leeway as to what can
> be installed on the computers in their offices, so relying on something
> like this to put a seamless solution in place is a non-starter.*

Do you often argue in this post-modern way? You might as well argue that these individuals can't afford the space and annoyance of having a computer in their offices. They clearly disagree with you.

> *Email notifications, on the other hand, are (fairly close to being)
> perfect for this.*

It represents the worst possible solution to alerting a large number of recipients to the existence of a single new document. It would be like General Motors shipping everyone a copy of its new model car, and accepting the inevitable heat from those who happened not to want it.

--

Paul Lutus
<http://www.arachnoid.com>