

## Re: Is email scanning necessary?

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2005-05/msg00483.html>

---

- *From:* "sdlfkj" <blah@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 6 May 2005 20:54:32 -0500
- 

>> I read that its redundant to have email scanning turned on because  
>> of the resource load it places on the computer and that email is  
>> going to get scanned sooner or later anyways by other means. Does  
>> that make sense to you people here?  
>  
> Also, you can allows save any attachments and scan them manually,  
> if and when you are in doubt.

I already do that. What this writer was saying was that scanning automatically doesn't improve security. I'm not worried about attachments as I already scan those with daily updated antivirus software. I'm worried about infections that can occur in the message body. I guess I'll go back to reading messages in Plain Text most of the time. Its kind of dull, but its sure safer.

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ *Re: Is email scanning necessary?*
    - ◇ *From:* GO
- *References:*
  - ◆ *Is email scanning necessary?*
    - ◇ *From:* sdlfkj
  - ◆ *Re: Is email scanning necessary?*
    - ◇ *From:* GO
- Prev by Date: *Re: Windows 2000 Professional SP4*
- Next by Date: *Re: Is email scanning necessary?*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Is email scanning necessary?*
- Next by thread: *Re: Is email scanning necessary?*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*