

Re: Windows Firewall and Routers

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.help_and_support/2007-06/msg01381.htm

- *From:* "Kayman" <kayhkay~nospam~@gmail.com>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Jun 2007 11:13:27 +0700
-

"Daave" <dcwashNOSPAM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:OCijIPJsHHA.1172@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Kayman wrote:

"Daave" <dcwashNOSPAM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:eq52VHIsHHA.1212@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Kayman wrote:

"Bruce Chambers"
<bchambers@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message
news:%23xgjHWDsHHA.4180@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

(Remember: Most antivirus
applications do not even
scan for or
protect you from
adware/spyware, because,
after all, you've
installed them yourself, so
you must want them there,
right?)

Nonsense. If you 'force-install' malware
even (free) AV applications
such as AntiVir or AOL's AVS will detect
and prompt for appropriate
action.

Wrong.

The free version of AntiVir (and most other antiviruses,
AFAIK) do

Re: Windows Firewall and Routers

not scan for spyware/adware. See:

Courtesy Gary S. Terhune
MS MVP Shell/User

Q: Do you think that the free AV can be really as efficient that the other ones?

A: Absolutely. In fact, when it comes to real efficiency, the ability to scan accurately for viruses without getting in the way of the rest of the computer's functions, some of the free ones are more efficient than some of the most expensive. For instance, Norton and McAfee, and even Trend Micro in some packages, are among the most *inefficient* applications out there, whereas Avast!, AVG, and other free offerings are among the most efficient. After that, it's a question of the definitions used, and whether or not they're free has absolutely no bearing on those stats.

So? That doesn't contradict what Bruce wrote at all. Gary's talking about viruses, and Bruce is talking about spyware and adware.

Of course :)

.