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=========================
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\_\_\_\_\_

<6.1> What preceded the first deployment of R. Depew's ARMM?

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Julf's anonymous server seems to me to be contributing to the

> erosion of civility and responsibility that have been the

> hallmarks of the more traditional parts of USENET. More than

> that, Julf has refused to even discuss a compromise to his

> position that all hierarchies should be open, by default, to his

> server.

>

> I am testing a shell script to carry out "Automated Retroactive

> Minimal Moderation" in response to Julf's (and your) suggestion

> that the only way to control anonymous posting to groups that

> don't want it is through moderation. It cancels articles posted

> from anon.penet.fi. I've tested it on recycled postings with a

> "local" distribution and it works nicely. I propose to arm

> "ARMM" with an unrestricted distribution for the "sci" hierarchy

> this weekend if Julf doesn't accept the proposed compromise or a

> reasonable alternative by then.

Francisco X DeJesus <dejesus@avalon.nwc.navy.mil>:

> this ARMM script is another bad idea. If there is a way to simply

> "ignore" control messages (cancels, at least) from the specific

> site where this bass-ackwards non-service to the net is

> originating from, please let me (and every other news admin who's

> not an expert but wants to do something about this) know...

Karl Krueger <kkrueg@ukelele.GCR.COM>:

> Fascinating idea, both in programming and in application of

> ethical values. So this shellscript will, in essence, not only

> affect your own users but also users netwide? And you make a

> threat to Julf as well? This sounds a lot like terrorism: "I'm

> going to blow up your citizens (read: users) if you do not agree

> to my demands!" "Minimal Moderation" in the sense of ARMM is

> like calling a missile "Peacekeeper".

>

> Censorship is not the way to go about things, neither is the

> "ARMMing" of cybernetic missiles. It is a difficult problem, the

> only solution to which is to rely on the precedent: freedom.

Perry E. Metzger <pmetzger@snark.shearson.com>:

> My site pays for news, and would prefer to get it uncensored by

> Mr. Depew. We pay to get a full newsfeed for our money, not just

> one with those messages Mr. Depew thinks are o.k. for us to read.

Rick Harrison <bbs-hrick@jwt.oau.org>:

> Anyone who would volunteer to render a "service" such as

> cancelling other people's messages must be a control freak.

Mike Schenk <M.R.Schenk@research.ptt.nl>:

> And for canceling all postings from the anon server. This is, in

> my opinion a very severe case of censorship. While, I am aware

> that the net is not a real democracy I've always thought that it

> wasn't a police state either.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>

> I am writing to inform you that if Julf, admin@anon.penet.fi, does

> not soon block anonymous postings ... then I will activate an

> "Automated Retroactive Minimal Moderation" script that will

> cancel postings ...

>

> Rest assured that there is nothing personal in this. I have not

> read your postings, and I have no reason to believe that they

> were out of line in any way ...

David Sternlight <strnlght@netcom.com>:

> I support the automatic cancelling of anonymous posts to those

> newsgroups whose members vote in the majority so to do.

Michael L. Kaufman <kaufman@eecs.nwu.edu>:

> Ah, but that is not what Mr. Depew was advocating. Mr Depew wants

> to cancel all anonymous post to newsgroups that don't vote not to

> cacel them. The difference is important. He has a view and he is

> not saying, "if your group agrees with me, this is what I will

> do." He is saying, "I am just going to assume that everyone

> agrees with me unless I hear otherwise." Furthermore, he chose

> not to wait and see how the various votes would go.

Brad Templeton <brad@clarinet.com>:

> There are laws ... which prohibit users from deleting files on

> computers when they do not have authorization to do this.

>

> It's ... clear that many site admins consider only the poster and

> a few other people at most authorized to cancel a posting.

>

> So if you cancel like this, you may well ... be committing a

> computer intrusion offence.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> There shouldn't be much controversy over this, but there will be

> anyhow. :-)

David Clunie <dclunie@pax.tpa.com.au>:

> I presume that cancel messages can be cancelled ... though I

> haven't experimented with this yet, but it looks like I might

> have to. In fact I think I will probably just turn off response

> to cancel messages totally if you go ahead with this scheme, and

> I encourage other news administrators to do the same ... they

> were a bad kludge in the first place and still are. It seems to

> me they are rarely used for other than controversial purposes

> like you are proposing (I don't like other people's postings so I

> won't let anyone else read them).

>

> I hope you are prepared to take responsibility for what is going

> to happen to your institution's news and mail servers if you go

> ahead with this plan.

>

> ... you are way out of line here Richard, regardless of how many

> smileys you tack on the end of your message.

Richard E. Depew <red@uhura.neoucom.edu>:

> That (disabling cancel messages) would be unfortunate. They have

> many legitimate uses. Cancelling inappropriate postings is one

> of these legitimate uses.

>

> ARMM, the "Automated Retroactive Minimal Moderation" script, has

> been activated ...

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.2> Was R. Depew's first ARMM `automated censorship'?

<Ray.Lampman@FullFeed.Com>:

> RICHARD DEPEW imposes automated CENSORSHIP on the Net.

>

> For the past few weeks, there has been an on-going debate in

> news.admin.policy concerning anonymous postings to newsgroups

> which have not invited such postings. It is an understatement to

> say there has been disagreement.

>

> This debate has recently resulted in the automated CENSORSHIP of

> postings by one of the principles of the debate. This system of

> automated CENSORSHIP, called ARMM, the "Automated Retroactive

> Minimal Moderation" script, has been activated (Sat, 13 Mar 1993

> 14:28:00 GMT) by Richard E. Depew (red@redpoll.neoucom.edu). ARMM

> automatically cancels or deletes postings which it "judges" to be

> in-appropriate or un-acceptable.

Catherine Anne Foulston <cathyf@is.rice.edu>:

> It is NOT censorship, any more than a private individual sneaking

> into the library and cutting objectionable (to him) articles out

> of all the magazines is censorship. It's a form of vandalism,

> perhaps sabotage, and it's obnoxious, but it is not censorship.

>

> Could whoever did that news-server-wide cancel script, that would

> let me filter out these anon-cancels, please repost it? Certain

> anonymous posters are obnoxious and annoying, but not as much so

> as someone cancelling articles not their own for no other reason

> than that the articles are anonymous. I'd like to filter out

> those cancels from my site.

David Condon <dxc4@po.CWRU.Edu>:

> The person who proposed forging cancels, and who actually did

> forge a few, is a news admin of some sort. By virtue of having a

> higher level of both access and expertise than the average user,

> that makes his act more akin to a \_librarian\_ vandalising books

> than Joe Random Patron doing so. Virtually all librarians would

> consider such an act an egregious breach of professional ethics,

> and most would not hesitate to call it "censorship," even if

> purists assert that that term is only appropriate when carried

> out by the state.

Karl Krueger <kkrueg@ukelele.GCR.COM>:

> M. Richard Depew has, by his own admission, created a weapon

> capable of eradicating all messages from a certain site. I use

> the term "weapon" in the cybernetic sense - it "kills"

> information, not people.

>

> M. Depew seems to believe this to be his responsibility,

> somehow... his contribution to the safety and continued security

> of the USENET, maybe? He proposes that he be allowed to keep and

> bear (and fire) a weapon capable of rendering many people

> "unpersons", in the sense that they are not free to post their

> opinions.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Roy,

>

> Please cancel your recent article entitled: Subject: Re: RICHARD

> DEPEW imposes automated CENSORSHIP on the Net.

>

> That title is libelous. My "civil disobedience" had nothing to do

> with censorship. You have simply fallen for the lie of an

> anonymous slanderer. A public apology would be greatly

> appreciated.

John Stanley <stanley@skyking.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> Your "civil disobedience" was conducted under the guise of

> "moderator of the sci hierarchy" (an official position), and

> caused the removal of material you considered objectionable. That

> is, sir, a definition of censorship.

>

> It was automated, and it happened on "the Net".

>

> The ONLY remaining point in question is whether you really are

> Richard Depew. If you admit to that, then the Subject: above is

> true.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Well, I see the articles are still there ...

>

> To prove that I \*did\* learn something from the brouhahah that

> surrounded the introduction of ARMM, I am giving "a two week

> notice" that if those articles are not canceled within the next

> 24 hours, I am going to escalate. I'll take comments on my

> proposed escalation and promise to reconsider if anyone can make

> any \*good\* arguments against my plan.

>

> I hate to do this, because I understand that my name already is

> "mudd" and any further disturbance is likely to lead to my total

> discrediting.

>

> I've got this \*great\* new idea. I call it the UDP, for USENET

> Depew Penalty. If these people don't cancel their articles soon,

> I'll invoke the UDP:

>

> I'll ban them from my Christmas Card List!

<afzal@divsun.unige.ch>

> I presume you are going to post to ALL sci groups telling them

> that this "service" now exists and that their only way of

> "declining" is to prove to YOU that they have had a vote whereby

> the majority have said that they accept anonymous posting.

> Cancelling posts of others seems to me to be a breach of

> netiquette (especially if people in the groups concerned are not

> informed of this cancelling).

Jim Cowling <jcowling@ophelia.UVic.CA>:

> Even if you disgree with the label "censor" or "censorship", you

> must agree to this statement:

>

> Richard Depew's ARMM system prevents the UseNet community from

> reading publicly-posted messages without their consultation.

>

> This alone is ethically and morally bankrupt, and illegal on so

> many levels that I wouldn't be surpirsed if I could press felony

> charges immediately, even as a foreginer.

John Stanley <stanley@skyking.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> Dick, when will you get the point?

>

> Nobody elected you moderator of any group, much less an entire

> hierarchy. Stop pretending that it was OK for you to try to be

> one.

>

> If you start your ARMM demon again, I am positive there will be

> more than one person starting their own. You WILL NOT like who

> they target.

>

> If you think the anonymous "problem" is bad, just wait until the

> ARMM wars start.

David Weingart <phydeaux@cumc.cornell.edu>

> (Had I been on the Net when ARMM was active, I certainly would

> have been less polite...how DARE anyone decide what I should and

> should not read in an unmoderated group)

>

> No, I'm not an admin, just a net.head, and I consider the concept

> of ARMM to be disgusting.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>

> I owe an apology to "an4312":

>

> You, sir or madam, are the second civilian to be caught in the

> cross-fire between Julf and myself. I tried to warn

> non-combatants off the battle field, but failed in your case.

>

> I apologize.

>

> Do you require immediate medical attention?

>

> Let's assess the damage. One real posting to the "sci" hierarchy

> was cancelled. I've apologized to the author. His priceless

> prose has been delayed from public view for a few hours. Is this

> \*really\* something that you want to get me fired for doing?

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.3> Was anon8785's posting of Depew's address cowardly/justifiable?

<an8785@anon.penet.fi>:

> If you do not think Richard E. Depew's (red@uhura.neoucom.edu)

> threat to censor the postings \*you\* may wish to read by beginning

> a "canceling war," a good idea, please write directly to:

> ...

> Express your concern for this threatened instance of network

> vandalism and damage to academic freedom throughout the world by

> a reputed representative of his organization.

Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu>:

> Dick Depew is accepting full responsibility for his actions. You

> are not. He is the true man of courage here. You are the worst

> sort of coward, starting a battle and hiding under a rock while

> the bullets fly.

Rob Sartin <sartin@88open.org>:

> The coward asked folks to flood Dick Depew's superiors with mail

> and phone calls.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> You (and most USENET readers) have seen the cowardly postings by

> "an8785" calling on readers to contact the chairman of my

> department and the director of computer services at my

> institution by mail or phone to complain about me.

Felix Gallo <felixg@coop.com>:

> There's nothing 'cowardly' about it. The postings are simple

> and factual. If you like, I'll claim I'm an8785, and take

> full responsibility for all his or her actions. It wouldn't

> bother me a bit.

Steve Simmons <scs@iti.org>:

> Though I disagree with Depews actions, he stood up and took the

> heat. an8785 engaged in an act of moral cowardice, and is now

> hiding behind the shield of anonymity. Previously my opinion

> was that the an8785 should simply be disabled. Given that an8785

> has actively urged people to take actions to harm Depew and

> refused to adequately reverse those actions, I now think an8785

> should be unmasked. Should Depew come to actual harm, the

> anonymous service might find itself in interesting waters.

Karl Krueger <kkrueg@ukelele.GCR.COM>:

> I disagree. an8785 did what s/he felt was necessary, and voicing

> one's opinions (even anonymously) is the better path than not

> doing so.

Perry E. Metzger <pmetzger@snark.shearson.com>:

> In any case, I really can't see anything wrong with someone

> posting the list of the board of trustees of your institution if

> they like, anonymously or non-anonymously. If you feel what you

> are doing is right, then you must be prepared to justify it to

> people who can stop you.

>

> As for "blackmail", I'd say that ironically refering to your own

> actions in the way described can hardly be construed as extortion

> under any statute I am familiar with.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> In other words, anonymous servers with inadequate safegards

> protect law-breakers from the consequences of their actions.

> \*That\* is what I oppose.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> I agree that servers that shield lawbreakers are a potential

> problem. I \*don't\* agree with your implied assertion that Julf

> has shielded anyone who's broken the law (an8785 included) nor do

> I agree that the existance of that possible problem gives you the

> right to take unilateral netwide action against all postings

> issued through anonymous servers.

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.4> How should the first Depew ARMM incident be remembered?

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> The time has come to share a few of the insights I have gained

> from this whole messy affair.

>

> In \*this\* note I want to offer an olive-branch to Julf.

>

> Someone else said I was on a "quixotic crusade". \*That\* struck a

> responsive chord. I'll accept that characterization with pride:

> call me an electronic Don Quixote trying to fight evil and rescue

> the oppressed in a chivalrous but unrealistic way. :-)

>

> I'd like to call it the confrontation of "Don Quixote and the Guru

> of anonymity". The "evil" that I was fighting was not the Guru,

> but those few sociopaths who were abusing his service. While I

> was tilting at windmills, the Guru was meditating on his mountain

> top.

>

> Unfortunately, one of the windmills was an8785. The scene

> metamorphosed into "Bambi meets Godzilla" -- \*\*THUMP\*\*.

>

> Someone called it the confrontation of the "net-cop" vs. the

> "net-outlaw". I think that's a little harsh. :-)

Mark Brader <msb@sq.sq.com>:

> Well, "net-outlaw" is a little harsh on Julf. But "net-cop" is an

> extreme euphemism. What Dick was playing was "net-vigilante

> armed with assault weapons", and this sort of thing is simply out

> of bounds.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Out of bounds, sure, but undeniably within long established USENET

> tradition. :-)

Mark Brader <msb@sq.sq.com>

> ... one reason I'm posting this is to make it clear that, if

> "automated moderation" is to be implemented through cancel

> messages, it is simply not acceptable. Indeed, I would consider

> it ample cause for the removal of the cancelling site from

> Usenet.

>

> The fact that Dick was willing to stand behinds his actions is

> creditable, but it doesn't excuse the fact that the actions were

> wrong for Usenet, \*even if\* the anonymous service was everything

> that Dick thought it was. The cancels are just too damaging to

> Usenet's distribution algorithm -- and I would like to see Dick

> say he agrees with this paragraph.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> OK, I agree.

>

> I made several mistakes, and I have apologized for them. I have

> "sentenced" myself to "community service" for a few weeks to try

> to repair some of the harm I caused.

>

> I \*would\* appreciate a few apologies from the "lynch mob",

> however. Few if any of the participants have yet to understand

> that I was only trying to get Julf to talk about a possible

> compromise. The mob overreacted very badly two weeks ago. I was

> being rude and provocative, but what I got in return exceeded all

> bounds of decency.

John Stanley <stanley@ruby.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> What you got in return for your self-appointed moderation of an

> entire hierarchy was much less than the last auto-cancellor got,

> and less than you deserve.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> In my opinion, you gave up the right to expect decency when you

> took advantage of the open nature of this electronic community

> and attempted to unilaterally impose your views of what's right

> and what's wrong upon it. Your actions deserved the reaction they

> received, and you're not likely to get any apologies for that

> reaction.

Richard E. Depew <red@uhura.neoucom.edu>:

> How would you and Julf like to join me and a few other friends in

> a T-shirt pyramid scheme: ARMMway distributors? You can have Oz.

> :-)

>

> Our corporate mascot will be a turkey wearing one of these

> T-shirts. Our ad will be a poster showing this turkey and our

> corporate slogan: "How can you soar with eagles when you have to

> work with turkeys?". I'd think every system administrator will

> want one.

Vincent Fox <vincent@cad.gatech.edu>:

> The whole thing I dislike about the Depew vs Anon thing is that

> both sides were forcing it on me wholesale. If this anon-thing

> had kept up being spread across all newsgroups, you can bet your

> ass I would have put a filter on to drop all anon-postings on the

> floor for \*my\* server. On the other hand I am apalled at Depew's

> plan to forge cancels since he also is trying to force his ideas

> on me. \*I'll\* make those decisions thank you both very much

> gentlemen.

Chuq Von Rospach <chuq@Apple.COM>:

> I mean, what Depew is doing is obnoxious, but I can tell him so to

> his face (and he can tell me to stuff it to my face, if he

> wishs). On the othe side, though, we have a character

> assasination attempt going by someone who has no name. That's

> being an upright citizen?

>

> I think both sides are being real twitheads, and both side are

> showing the worst aspects of USENET culture. May everyone's disks

> crash, and may the replacements be misrouted to Angola.

Richard E. Depew <red@uhura.neoucom.edu>:

> The clinical trial was successful, at least in temporarily

> eradicating the pathogen from the patient's brain, but the

> patient unexpectedly suffered a severe allergic reaction, so I

> halted the test out of compassion.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> Is this what you teach your students? That it's somehow "okay"

> for them to spend a few weeks in the lab breeding up "harmless"

> organisms and then releasing them into the general population?

> Handing out free samples of a vaccine that kills the thing off

> doesn't make it right to let it out of the lab in the first

> place.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Julf and I have been engaged in bilateral negotiations to forge a

> "peace treaty" between us.

>

> USENET is a cooperative anarchy. If enough of you do your part,

> we are confident that we can apply the important lessons we have

> learned from recent events and set a better example for future

> anonymous servers and automated moderation demons.

>

> I am a humble servant of the net. I have learned my lesson.

>

> Time to cobble up Edition 4 of ARMM in case any group ever votes

> to use it.

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.5> What preceded the second incarnation of R. Depew's ARMM?

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> ARMM has evolved. Expect a post on the subject shortly. I am

> trying to rustle up a volunteer to serve as the "target" of

> another demonstration. I expect you will find the latest

> incarnation of ARMM to be acceptable.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> You just absolutely refuse to get the point, don't you Richard?

> Unless you have an explicit consensus that ARMM is welcomed by

> the people it is going to affect, you have absolutely no business

> activating it on this network. Period. \*You don't have any right

> to make these decisions for the rest of us!\*

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> Spoken like a true fanatic, Lazlo.

>

> I should have expected that my attempt to calm things down would

> frighten the extremists.

John Stanley <stanley@ruby.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> I haven't the slightest doubt that I will find the latest

> incarnation of ARMM to be as totally repugnant as your first

> attempt at self-appointed moderation.

>

> It seems that you have now proven that you still think that ARMM

> is a good thing and are continuing to try to get it accepted.

>

> You just still don't get it, do you Dick. You didn't have, and

> still don't, the right to decide to cancel postings that you

> don't like.

Lasse Hiller|e Petersen <lassehp@imv.aau.dk>:

> If I can have a wish, I'd wish you'd delete your ARMM and never

> write one again, and certainly never activate one. It is not and

> will never be the right way to deal with general anonymous

> servers.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> I've decided to follow in the honorable tradition of the

> pioneering microbiologists who tested their hypotheses, and their

> possibly pathogenic isolates, and their experimental vaccines, on

> themselves! (As you probably know, several of them died from

> their own experiments.)

>

> I have just now armed ARMM5 to "minimally moderate" my own posts,

> and nobody else's. This moderation will be restricted to the

> single newsgroup, news.admin.policy.

>

> I don't, at the moment, see how anyone can object to \*this\*

> demonstration, but I expect \*someone\* will find a way. :-)

Juha Laiho <jlaiho@ichaos.nullnet.fi>:

> What do you think about this approach? At least it looks ok to me,

> if it's used properly. No more final cancellation of messages,

> but some way to put a warning in the beginning of a message. Now

> forget any possible personal hatred for the creator of that

> software, and think about the idea.

John Stanley <stanley@skyking.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> Hmmm. It sounds like Mr. Depew is not only planning on cancelling

> other people's articles, but taking the article and editing it

> and then forging it back onto the net.

>

> This is supposed to be better?

Ken Weaverling <weave@apache.dtcc.edu>:

> \*Please\*, I humbly request that you not activate this ARMM thing.

>

> I have not posted on this subject. I, like many other sys admins,

> do not have a lot of time to twiddle with things. In fact, I

> don't have ANY time. My users are always at my thoughts, I am

> understaffed, and I can't keep up.

>

> Asking me to learn what ARMM is, how to alter my feed files to

> accept, not accept, ignore, or whatever it does, is asking a

> lot. A REAL LOT.

>

> I, as many other news admins, will not do anything. This means

> that by default, your ARMM whatever it is will operate and do its

> nasty deeds. I feel that the "cure" is far worse than the

> disease.

>

> Somehow, in the grand scheme of things, this is wrong.

G. Lee Owen <gowen@jade.tufts.edu>:

> Mr. Depew, I've just read your "evolution of ARMM" and I think I

> have a fairly good grasp of what you are trying to say. It seems

> to me that ARMM has evolved to the point of overkill.

>

> I think ARMM has evolved into a rube goldberg machine, an

> overcomplicated solution, where all we need to do is sit down,

> discuss what we all want anon sites to do, and formalize a

> consensus.

>

> I admired the cooperation that julf@penet.fi and red@redpoll

> reached a few days ago. Lets work further on that model, and

> reach a constructive compromise.

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.6> What was the Second Depew ARMM Fiasco?

Richard E. Depew <red@uhura.neoucom.edu>:

> Friends (if I have any left at this point),

>

> <Blush>

>

> You have undoubtedly noticed the flood of ARMM posts that I caused

> last night.

>

> I made mistakes in both implementation and testing. That was truly

> bone-headed implementation error! I seem to have a real talent

> for spectacular screw-ups!

>

> I agree, though, that my fate is richly deserved. The net loony

> bin seems to be the safest place for me right now.

>

> Thanks for your understanding. It was an honest mistake.

Francisco X DeJesus <dejesus@avalon.nwc.navy.mil>:

> The problem isn't you screwing up, it's you screwing EVERYONE ELSE

> up.

Joel Furr <jfurr@nyx.cs.du.edu>:

> In the sober light of day, I'm laughing as I re-read the comments

> on the March 30 ARMM Massacre. Last \_night\_, on the other hand,

> I had a mental image of a machine sitting atop a hill, making a

> low droning sound, releasing infinite numbers of Frankenstein's

> Monsters on the surrounding environs. Frankenstein's Monsters

> here, Frankenstein's Monsters there, lurching about

> stiff-leggedly, arms outstretched, and all muttering the same

> word over and over: ARMM ARMM ARMM ARMM ARMM.

Duke Robillard <duke@osf.org>:

> So, do you suppose Dick has now sent out more bogus messages than

> every bad anon post every made, combined?

Richard E. Depew <red@uhura.neoucom.edu>:

> Nope. Nowhere close. However, I expect to make it into the "top

> 25 posters by number of articles" list for the first time. There

> is just no way I can compete in volume, however. Hmmmm... maybe

> ARMM6 should carry a GIF file...

Karl Krueger <kkrueg@ukelele.GCR.COM>:

> What is the reason for this nonsense?

>

> ... a destructive cyberspatial act on a massive scale has

> occurred.

>

> I assume that it is not deliberate viciousness, because I believe

> M. Depew to be well-intentioned, if a little misguided. It seems

> to me to be a simple bug - ARMM is re-ARMMing its own output.

<wrowe@reed.edu>:

> Who the hell is responsible for this major-league mishap?

>

> Please, if I see the letters ARMM again I'm gonna kill someone.

\_\_\_\_\_

<6.7> How should the Second Depew ARMM Fiasco be remembered?

Joel Furr <jfurr@nyx.cs.du.edu>:

> Alt.fan.dick-depew is hereby newgrouped. This group is intended

> to serve as a forum for the MANY, MANY fans of Mr. Richard Depew

> of Munroe Falls, Ohio, who has made himself famous for:

>

> \* unilaterally asserting the authority to cancel ANY anonymous

> posts made to groups he likes to read

> \* his God complex

> \* spamming news.admin.policy with a robot poster that attempted to

> cancel its own articles but failed and instead generated

> articles containing subject lines and headers dozens of screens

> long.

Ed Hall <dhall@rand.org>:

> I'd like to comment, though, that even though Mr. Depew's blunder

> might seem a bit comic on the morning after, I doubt many people

> have forgotten the serious side: he was using the mechanisms of

> the net as his own private toy. That, in my honest opinion, is a

> distinctly anti-social act, even in a place known for its

> anti-social acts--the Net.

>

> The whole episode is a bit like a burglar getting stuck in the

> chimney; we might laugh, but we still want him treated as a

> burglar. In Mr. Depew's case, I'd be happy if he just stopped

> mucking with control messages, both now and forevermore. If he

> doesn't--well, I'm sure there are others here who will figure out

> something.

Timothy C. May <tcmay@netcom.com>:

> My God! You mean you were actually logged-in and reading

> news.admin.policy as all this was happening? In real time?

>

> That's like happening to be outside and looking up as a giant

> meteor goes overhead...others can \*read\* about it or see it

> replayed on t.v., but you actually \*experienced\* it! You were

> \*there\*. (Of course, watch for tens of thousands of false claims

> as the years go by..."Yep, there I was, logged in, when all of a

> sudden smoke started comin' out of my computer. Yes sirree, it

> was a sight to behold.")

>

> To mix metaphors by using earthquake terms, what DePew did was a

> "microMorris," but still an interesting one.

George William Herbert <gwh@soda.berkeley.edu>:

> ------------------------------------------------------------------

> | Official March 30th ARMM Massacre Scorecard |

> | |

> | Dear Mr. Depew: |

> | |

> | We have determined that you have earned the following score |

> | in the Usenet Activities Contest: |

> | |

> | 6488 Supercedes @ 1 point each: 6488 pts. |

> | 2 Clueless Newbies (1) @ 30 pts: 60 pts. |

> | 28 Flaming Non-newbies (2) @ 25: 700 pts. |

> | Recursive Runaway Award (3) : 500 pts. |

> | Bonus: New World Record for Largest Cascade: 1000 pts. |

> | Total: 8,748 pts. |

> | |

> | This has earned you the rank of: Aspiring Usenet Legend |

> | |

> | Thank you for your continuing to grace Usenet with your |

> | presence. Your daemon's antics have made our day here. |

> ------------------------------------------------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_

<7.1> What caused the Helsingius server shutdown?

<beezer@cc.utah.edu>:

> Being a former sysadmin of two years, I can understand the

> bullshit the anon.penet.fi server was put through. The 'gawds

> above' reacted more out of ego and fear of the FCC than out of

> fairness.

>

> Your service has been appreciated.

<mathew@mantis.co.uk>:

> Excuse me, but I fail to see why the legal climate in the United

> States justifies meddling with the administrative policy of a

> site in Finland. Could someone explain?

Derrick J. Brashear <db74+@andrew.cmu.edu>:

> To all of you who had a hand in the demise of anon.penet.fi in any

> way shape or form, allow me to congratulate you. You've succeeded

> in screwing over 10000 legitimate users of the anon server

> because: a) a few, and I mean a few, posted abusive or

> inappropriate messages b) people didn't find anonymous messages

> appropriate outside alt.\* and a handful of other groups.

>

> Who loses? All the people who used anon.penet.fi for what it was

> intended for. Yet those responsible will likely escape unscathed,

> and as of 2 AM US Eastern Standard Time, no "notable usenet

> personality" has stepped forward to take responsibility for the

> shutdown of the server.

>

> Once again, thank you.

Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu>:

> I am disappointed that the anon server was completely shut down in

> the manner that actually occurred. While I think Julf's service

> needed to be cut back, I would much rather that this have

> happened of Julf's own free will, becuase he saw it as the Right

> Thing, instead of being imposed from outside.

Jon Noring <noring@netcom.com>:

> And it seems to me that things were getting settled. Julf was

> finally beginning to respond to several criticisms (some

> justified) as to how he was conducting his service. Again, this

> is a blow to Usenet since outside power was used to enforce a

> certain Usenet structure, rather than letting the users of Usenet

> decide what is best. This unfortunately sets a dangerous

> precedent. It also takes more control of Usenet out of the hands

> of the users and puts it in the hands of the control-phreaks.

Dave Hayes <dave@jato.jpl.nasa.gov>:

> This is truly the proof by example of the elitist nature of

> USENET. It is also an example of "my way is the only way and the

> right way"-itis. Most news administrators of this type exist as

> such only to feed their egos, and not as they are in a position

> of service.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> I know everyone's calling for the head of the "personality"

> involved, but I'd like to hear a little more about what \*exactly\*

> is making it "politically impossible" for anon.penet.fi to

> continue operation. The above paragraph paints things in tones a

> little too scandalous to take seriously without more evidence --

> it strikes me as quite possible that a routine complaint

> (\*conincedentally\* from Net Personality <X>) reached someone in a

> position of power over penet who decided that the service was

> causing too much controversy for the site. No conspiracies

> there.

<styri@balder.nta.no>:

> I too would be very interested in knowing what really happened. I

> don't care who the "extremely highly regarded net personality"

> would be, but it would be nice to know what kind of "situation"

> was "created".

>

> Just for the record: It was sad that the anon server went down in

> flames, but it was not without reason. I think there is a case

> for a pseudonym service on Usenet, but it will take some more

> thinking and discussion to figure out how it should work. I think

> we are a bit wiser after Julf's experiment and that we should use

> the knowledge we gained in a positive way.

Tom Bryce <tjbryce@unix.amherst.edu>:

> I don't believe it for a damn minute when people say abuse of the

> anonymous posting service was what caused anon.penet.fi to be

> shut down.

>

> It's just a lesson in power, the net administrators don't like

> having certain things taken out of their control and power and

> the user be damned, they're going to keep things in line. Tough

> shit, I say. You don't have to know who I am, and if I'm abusing

> the network anonymously, take the proof to the admin- instrator

> of the anonymous service, and have them lock me out.

>

> Julf's posting was way too apologetic. You've nothing to apologize

> for, I hope you or someone else gets another one going.

Karl Kleinpaste <anonymus+0@charcoal.com>:

> Generally, these server deaths have been due to abuses by an

> extremely small number of maladjusted individuals who have done

> something sufficiently heinous to attract the attention of Those

> Who Matter. TWM is a context-sensitive group, and has consisted

> of, at various times and in relation to various anonymous

> servers: the facilities management group of the site in question;

> politically powerful individuals with influence regarding the

> network connection of the server host; large numbers of irate

> users inundating the server or its adminstrator in mail.

<an10757@anon.penet.fi>:

> I have SEEN Mr. Big's letter to Julf, and I have SEEN the articles

> pulled out of talk.politics.mideast. If you read that group, you

> know it's about 451 degrees in there. The articles consist

> mostly of a nym fighting with some guy at a big University. ...

> there was nothing you wouldn't expect to find there, and the fact

> that one of the participants was a nym was totally irrelevant,

> and certainly violated no laws, or even Usenet decorum, such as

> it is, Mr. Big's self-important,, inflated opinion to the

> contrary notwithstanding.

>

> Mr. Big's gripe has nothing to do with the content of the

> articles, that's all bullshit, just a sham. The only thing he

> cares about is that one of the flamers is a nym. I agree with

> whoever called him a bigot and a hypocrite.

\_\_\_\_\_

<7.2> What were sentiments on the Helsingius shutdown?

Ze Julf <julf@penet.fi>:

> The anonymous service at anon.penet.fi has been closed down.

> Postings to netnews and mail to arbitrary addresses has been

> blocked. To enable users who know each other only by their anon

> ID's to arrange alternate communication paths, mail to anonymous

> users will still be supported for two weeks. After this period

> all database entries will be deleted.

Solomon Yusim <syusim@bcm.tmc.edu>:

> I think it is also outrageous and deeply embarrassing to the whole

> net community as to the secretive, back-handed, and authocratic

> measures of how this shutdown had happened.

Leonard Norrgard <vinsci@brando.uwasa.fi>:

> This stinks. I'm sure something could've been worked out without

> going to this extreme. I'm sorry to see it happen, and in this

> way.

Howard S Shubs <hshubs@cis.umassd.edu>:

> I think that the loss of this anonymous server is a shame.

David A. Clunie <dclunie@pax.tpa.com.au>:

> This is very sad.

>

> Having been the victim of a similar attack on my anonymous server

> I sympathize.

>

> Even your most vocal detractors in this group would seem to regard

> this as an unfortunate outcome.

Hannu Sepp{nen <hjseppan@hila.hut.fi>:

> Demanding him to reveal the net person(s) behing the shutting down

> of anon.penet.fi is not the point; there are always people around

> that use their power for forcing... I'm concerned about the fact

> that such forcing can be done, anonymously... It can be done,

> because that person has a clear target, Julf. If the idea of

> anonymous servers is supposed to be kept alive, it requires

> several sites running such, in different organizations, in

> different countries... That would be the only way to avoid what

> happened to Julf?

Dr. Cat <cat@wixer.cactus.org>:

> I do have to say I'm most sorry for a good friend of mine who had

> a very pressing need to use an anon service in the near future,

> for personal reasons I can't go into. If anyone knows of any

> alternatative anon servers she could use instead, please email me

> information on them. Julf's was the only one I knew about.

Rob Knauerhase <knauer@pegasus.cs.uiuc.edu>:

> I'm constantly amazed at all the people who are outraged that the

> anon server has gone down, but are unwilling to do anything about

> it. For crying out loud, Karl Kleinpaste's sources are available

> -- you don't even have to be sophisticated endough to write it or

> even understand it -- get them and put one up yourself. If

> you're not a sysadmin, then start campaigning the admins on your

> machine. But \_please\_ stop whining that this one is gone.

<EUCLID@vmd.cso.uiuc.edu>:

> I, too, thank Julf, and am sorry to see the anon server go. There

> are subjects of discussion for which anonymity is appropriate

> (e.g. sexual abuse, suicide, etc.). Abuse of the service is

> regretable, but i think an alternative way of handling that

> beside shutting it down could have been found.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> It was never my aim to completely shut down anon.penet.fi. I was,

> and remain, a proponent of compromise - of setting some

> reasonable limits on the uses of anonymity. It was fanatics like

> yourself who insisted on "all or nothing" that brought down

> anon.penet.fi.

Lazlo Nibble <lazlo@triton.unm.edu>:

> I do not insist, and never have insisted, on an "all or nothing"

> approach to anonymous posting. My fanaticism is limited to the

> idea that \*you\*, as an individual, have no business determining

> what people at other sites can read unless the people in charge

> of those sites expressly empower you to make that decision.

Paul Hughes <hughes@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu>:

> I wanted to register my formal complaint with anyone who felt it

> was a valid, justified action in closing the anonymous server. I

> object to the treatments Julf and the remaining non-abusive

> members of the anonymous community have had to endure...ranging

> from simple categorization to near slander. I also believe many

> people are hurt by this recent event. All of the abuse and

> recovery groups, alt.sex, alt.sex.wizards, and even the a.b.p.e

> group (whose usage of the anon server was of questionable merit

> anyway), I predict, will find at least temporary slow downs in

> net.traffic due to people afraid to ask for help because of

> private concerns that need only be their own. Educational,

> healthy purposes for posting anonymously are now going to

> frighten many back into a hiding period, wishing for a new server

> to free them to speak with people who can identify with their

> problems.

Bert Medley <medley@sun44.synercom.hounix.org>:

> In any case, if I were a person who did not believe in such a

> service, I would have used a Kill file rather than shut the

> service down. THERE ARE MANY VALID REASONS FOR SUCH A SERVER TO

> EXIST.

Dana Tyler <dwt8413@ritvax.isc.rit.edu>:

> To: Julf@penet.fi

>

> Sorry to hear what has happened to your server. I think the net

> community as a whole will suffer from it's loss. Posting to

> alt.personal groups as well as other risque groups such as

> alt.sex.movies will slow to nothing. I think the people of the

> world have a right to express thier opinions while revealing

> their identity. It eliminates pressure from one's peers to

> conform to norms of scociety. I'll really miss it.

Richard M. Hartman <hartman@ulogic.UUCP>:

> This is too bad. I have been perhaps one of the most vocal

> against your service, but I have ALWAYS maintained that it was

> not anon postings per se that I was against, as the MANNER in

> which the service had been started, and the lack of strong policy

> statements.

Richard E. Depew <red@redpoll.neoucom.edu>:

> The Guru was leaving his mountain.

>

> I was shocked. I was disappointed. I was saddened. I was also

> proud of Julf for the way he admitted errors and took

> responsibility. He has nothing to be ashamed of. A few of his

> users betrayed him.

>

> A hurried exchange of email showed that several of my allies felt

> the same way -- that \*this\* wasn't what we had been arguing for

> -- we didn't want a complete shut-down, what we wanted was to

> make the anonymous service more accountable and thereby more

> acceptable.

Alexander Chislenko <sasha@ra.cs.umb.edu>:

> I could hardly overstate my respect to Julf's work. I expect that

> any future textbook on the history of the Net will mention

> anon@penet.fi and Julf personally.

Ze Julf <julf@penet.fi>:

> I'm probably not the only one who has been really surprised at the

> very strong reaction in support of anonymous services that the

> suspension of the anonymous posting service at anon.penet.fi

> caused. This proof of support (evidenced, among other things, by

> the fact that I have received more than 350 personal mail

> messages since the announcement of the suspension of the service.

> Of these, only 6 have been against resuming the service) have

> vastly improved my chances of resuming full operation. I really

> want to thank everybody who expressed their support for the

> service, both on news and in e-mail. I don't have the words to

> express how much I appreciate it!

\_\_\_\_\_

<7.3> Was the `net personality' involved in the Helsingius shutdown?

Ze Julf <julf@penet.fi>:

> Due to the lawsuit-intensive climate in the US, many anonymous

> services have been short-lived. By setting up anon.penet.fi in

> Finland, I hoped to create a more stable service. Anon.penet.fi

> managed to stay in operation for almost five months. The service

> was protected from most of the usual problems that had forced

> other services to shut down. But there are always going to be

> ways to stop something as controversial as an anon service. In

> this case, a very well-known and extremely highly regarded net

> personality managed to contact exactly the right people to create

> a situation where it is politically impossible for me to continue

> running the service.

Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu>:

> I call for the "net personality" responsible to come forward and

> accept responsibility publicly for this action, and explain his

> reasoning (which may well be valid, but we won't know until we

> hear it).

Dave Hayes <dave@jato.jpl.nasa.gov>

> There is no such thing as a "highly regarded" reputation...anyone

> who did this act is a net.asshole and deserves any condemnation

> he or she gets. They obviously are not acting for the good of the

> USENET community.

David A. Clunie <dclunie@pax.tpa.com.au>

> Tell us who the bastard was this time ! He or she may have been a

> "very well-known and extremely highly regarded net personality"

> but they won't be for much longer.

Leonard Norrgard <vinsci@brando.uwasa.fi>:

> \*I\* expect to see this person step forward and and admit it, if

> they're that well-respected.

Howard S Shubs <hshubs@cis.umassd.edu>:

> Who and what happened? Why didn't you give this info in public?

> Is the person who stopped you ashamed of his/her actions?

<styri@balder.nta.no>:

> I'll add some fuel to the flame war at this point. Julf is making

> a very vague statement, aiming at a group of people. He does not

> state what really happened, that would probably have been easy

> without telling us the identity of this "extremely highly

> regarded net personality".

>

> I don't know \_why\_ Julf doesn't reveal the identity of this

> person, but the way he phrased his article it looks like he's

> attacking some kind of backbone cabal or high profile person. On

> the other hand, Julf may have had only good intentions by not

> telling us the identity. However, that doesn't justify his

> description of the prson as an "extremely highly regarded net

> personality."

H Keith Henson <hkhenson@cup.portal.com>:

> I wish to express my appreciation to Julf for running

> anon.penet.fi. It is a shame that those opposed could not evolve

> better ways to cope than just shuting him down. I also request

> that the person(s?) who did so would step forward and engage in

> discussion as to why they felt this to be necessary.

Dr. Cat <cat@wixer.cactus.org>:

> I'll add my voice to those who want to know who did this to Julf,

> and why. Further, I would really like to know HOW it was done.

> It sounds like there may have been some heavy-handed,

> manipulative user of power involved. But certainly I'm willing

> to hear the "well known net personality" give their side of the

> story before passing judgement.

Pat Myrto <pat@rwing.UUCP>:

> Other than some folks being irritated by some anon postings, what

> was the problem? Surely not as irritating as some un-named

> individual dictating that only activity that \*HE\* approves of may

> occur on the net...

>

> Surely this person does not want to hide behind anonymity

> \_himself\_, does he, seeing as he apparantly strongly opposes

> others using it? Actions are a much stronger indicator of where

> someone is at than statements, and it would be nice to know who

> is, in effect, dictating overall net.policy, and who gave him

> this authority...

<EUCLID@vmd.cso.uiuc.edu>:

> if the people responsible for shutting down the service decline to

> indentify themselves, that would be an example of blatant

> hypocrisy.

<mathew@mantis.co.uk>:

> I think that the highly regarded net personality should announce

> his name here. Surely it would be hypocrisy of the highest order

> for him to try to remain anonymous?

Eddy Robinson <Baphomet@temple.demon.co.uk>:

> I find it highly ironic that so many people were flamed for

> advocating anonymity, whether they used it or not; and now Julf

> is referring to a "net-personality" presumably in a diplomatic

> attempt to preserve that person from a flamefest. If this centres

> around a particular poster (as opposed to the 500th complainant

> about anonymity or something), then I fail to see why they do not

> "have the courage of their convictions" and stand up to take the

> credit.

Tom Gift <tomgift@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu>:

> Isn't it just a wee bit hypocritical that the alledged net

> luminary who is quoted as saying there's no legitimate need for

> anonymity is him(her)self not willing to publicly take

> responsibility for his/her actions in this mess?

Alexander Chislenko <sasha@ra.cs.umb.edu>:

> I find it very ironic that people who forced Julf to shut down the

> anonymous service, choose to stay \*anonymous\* themselves. Looks

> like they think that their reasons for using anonymity in this

> case are more legitimate than any other reasons anybody else

> might ever have.

\_\_\_\_\_

<7.4> Was the `net personality' not responsible for the shutdown?

Tarl Neustaedter <tarl@sw.stratus.com>:

> A reality check; The "net personality" didn't shut Julf down. At

> most, such a person could ask others (who do have power over

> Julf) to review Julf's policies and make their own decisions.

> From Julf's article, that appears to be what happened.

Michael Friedman <mfriedma@us.oracle.com>:

> Will you conspiracy theorists please make some effort to get a

> clue? Julf is almost certainly lying or, at the very least,

> distorting the truth.

>

> In fact, Julf's new announcement that his service is resuming

> clearly indicates that he made the decision to eliminate the

> original service.

>

> In short, Julf, I think you lied.

John Kennedy <warlock@ecst.csuchico.edu>:

> I happen to think it's amazingly funny. Here you have a whole lot

> of people, fighting tooth and nail for a service and this

> mysterious net entity manages to get it shut down.

>

> Suddenly, you have people you've never seen crawling out of the

> woodwork crying foul, and demanding to know said net-person's

> name. Some of these are almost certainly people who used the

> anonymous service to protect their \_own\_ identity from just this

> sort of abuse. \_Regardless\_ of how this person behaved, he

> deserves his anonymous status, don't you think?

Elioc S. Nevets <scoile@mason1.gmu.edu>:

> He has the right to complain; he has the right to remain

> anonymous. Maybe he didn't make himself known to the USENET

> community at-large because he knew people like you wouldn't be

> able to understand that all he did was complain, that he did not

> shut down the anon.server, and that he has not authority to.

> Just because he exercises his right to free speech, standing up

> for what he believes in, and complains, doesn't mean he has to

> submit himself to public debasement.

<news@wolves.Durham.NC.US>:

> This is getting so boring.

>

> Julf, with some admirable restraint, gives us the bare outline of

> what happened to convince him that his anonymous server machine

> should be shut down.

>

> Everyone \*now\* jumps in to say that the person who triggered this

> action is a net.idiot (or other unkind epithets), some of them

> being the same folks who were jumping on Julf's case for being

> too liberal with the way he ran the machine.

Michael Friedman <mfriedma@us.oracle.com>:

> I'm saying we can't trust him because he lies...

>

> Oh, and does anyone still believe his claim about some important

> net-person getting his server shut down? If so, how do you

> explain his sudden ability to restart it?

Jon Noring <noring@netcom.com>:

> to: "somebody"

>

> I am writing you to get your opinion and advice concerning

> universal anonymous posting services such as anon.penet.fi which

> was recently closed down. Of course, I am aware from several

> net.people that you, for whatever reason, played a major role in

> this particular closing...

>

> ... When I first heard of the closure, I was upset and fired off

> a post, before getting the facts, saying not-so-nice things about

> the so-and-so net.personality who was instrumental in the closing

> of anon.penet.fi. But...

>

> ...you must have had a good reason for doing so that had to remain

> unstated. Thus, I apologize for my statements, since I now

> realize that there must be more to this closure than meets the

> eye. Julf even alluded to that as well in his e-mail to me - but

> he's been very tight-lipped about specific details...

>

> (p.s., I'm sure you know by now that there are a lot of angry

> people out there in Usenetia who would hang you from the highest

> tree if they knew you were the famous net.personality (as Julf

> called you) - but of course they don't yet know the background

> information.)

"somebody":

> Despite what you may have heard, I did not play a "major" role --

> I sent one mail message to Julf urging him to shut the service

> down. I did what any other person with knowledge of the net

> might do, too -- I cc'd the administrator of his service

> provider. The shutdown occurred because of some interaction

> between Julf and the admins -- probably aided by mail from other

> objectors. I played no active role in the events.

John Stanley <stanley@skyking.OCE.ORST.EDU>:

> I would hate to contradict a well-known net authority, but sending

> mail is an active role.

Ze Julf <julf@penet.fi>

> A lot of people have also asked me to reveal the exact events and

> names that caused the suspension of the service. I don't feel

> that that would serve any useful purpose at this point, as things

> have turned out pretty favourable and any public flame wars would

> only mess things up again. I once again repeat that I'm convinced

> the individuals involved acted out of their regard for the best

> of the net, and didn't realize the special circumstances that

> caused their actions to have such an impact.

\* \* \*
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