

Re: Gates: Buy stamps to send e-mail

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2004-04/17326.html>

From: cquirke (MVP Win9x) (cquirkenews_at_nospam.mvps.org)

Date: 04/19/04

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 2004 01:43:42 +0200

On Sun, 18 Apr 2004 15:32:27 -0400, "Spinner" <spinner@web.cor> wrote:

> "cquirke (MVP Win9x)" <cquirkenews@nospam.mvps.org> wrote in message

>> On Fri, 16 Apr 2004 13:04:40 -0700,

>> ><http://www.cnn.com/2004/TECH/internet/03/05/spam.charge.ap/>

>> >[index.html](#)

>> Geez, what a dumb idea.

>Did you even bother to read the article?

Yes, I did. I wasn't commenting on the URL syntax ;-)

>Gate's idea is an excellent idea.

>> Guess what the latest trend in spamming is? Sending one message to

>> the installed base of malware that looks up email addresses on the

>> infected PC, and then sends the spam to those addresses.

>Latest trend?

>Where have you been hiding? That's old hat.

It's a change from the earlier approach of buying or harvesting email addresses and then spamming out. The trend may be a couple of years old, but spam goes way back to the days of unverified email addresses bought on CD-ROMs. I bet the bottom's dropped out of *that* market!

>And if a user is running a computer that is "infected" then they

>need to be removed from the net as a public nuisance.

Hm. Technocracy of the clueful, eh? That's pretty much how virus coders view the infosphere too; Darwin take the hindmost.

>> "Buying stamps" is going to do squat for that, other than **increase**

>> selection pressure **towards** that method of spamming.

>Read the article again, and this time try to UNDERSTAND what you read.

OK, I'll do just that.

Better yet; I'll quote bits and comment as I go...

*>And just a question, how did someone who appears to dislike Windows as much
>as you ever become an MVP? Did you have to bribe someone?*

Not sure how you deduce I "dislike Windows" from this thread, but to answer your question; no, I didn't bribe anyone. I was nominated, and accepted, that's all. As to disliking Windows, well – if I simply disliked it and used something else, there'd be no fire in my belly.

The stress comes from things that are 95% cool but blemished by 5% inanity, and that combination makes you really wish the faults could be fixed. You'd prolly find many users feel the same way, but where it gets interesting is that they differ on which 5% they think sucks

;–)

"That's why we get so much junk e-mail: It's essentially free to send"

This is true. But it's still free to send if you hi-jack malware.

Look at how anti-spam legislation hasn't really curbed spam – because many spammers operate entirely outside the law anyway.

MS's own security advice states: "If a bad guy can run code on your PC, it's not your PC anymore". Now ask yourself: Why is Windows designed to "extend ownership" to:

- unsolicited email messages (scripts within HTML "text")
- arbitrary web sites (scripts, ActiveX, install on demand)
- arbitrary data files (autorunning scripts in "documents")
- other computers on the 'net (RPC service)

By design, cookies are allowed to contain scripts, which can be executed. It's only when these are executed in "My Computer" zone rather than Internet Zone that MS sees this as a bug and writes up a security advisory on it, as well as patching it.

Does patching block execution of scripts within cookies, or only the mechanism that runs these in "My Computer" zone?

You're right, I skipped the bit about using the sender's computer for problem solving a la SETI in lieu of monetary payment. Prompts a number of Q's; what software? Could you trust it? Would the sware run if you weren't running a PC? Would this software be running underfoot all the time when you were *not* sending email? How would this work with DUN, and would it trap the user into spending more time online? The word "hare-brained" suggests itself at this point.

Nah, this is still a durnfool idea that stinks of greed, more than anything else. IE's left wide open for "business partners" to intrude into the system, and they've grabbed this opportunity with both claws.

Now the vendor that created this issue piously tells us we ought to pay someone (who?) to send our messages? I don't think so.

>-- *Risk Management is the clue that asks:*

 "Why do I keep open buckets of petrol next to all the ashtrays in the lounge, when I don't even have a car?"

>-----