

Re: Incoherent E-mails

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/alt.computer.security/2005-10/0306.html>

From: BillW50 (BillW50_at_aol.kom)

Date: 10/17/05

Date: Mon, 17 Oct 2005 19:56:14 GMT

"Moe Trin" <ibuprofin@painkiller.example.tld> wrote in message
news:slrndl517s.mg7.ibuprofin@compton.phx.az.us...

Date: Sun, 16 Oct 2005 17:32:37 -0500

> *In the Usenet newsgroup alt.computer.security, in article*
> *<8Je4f.1213\$q%.433@newssvr12.news.prodigy.com>, BillW50 wrote:*
>
> *>Funny Moe... I hated Windows and I wouldn't have it until '93. My father*
> *>purchased a Windows 3.1 machine and wanted me to help him set it up. And*
> *>I found it quite pleasing and went out and bought the same machine as he*
> *>did. And I've been happy ever since. In fact, I still enjoy working on a*
> *>Windows 3.1 machine. <grin>*
>
> *I was assigned a PC (a genuine PC-AT) in 1983 because the system development*
> *tools (basically assemblers for the TI 9900, Intel 8080/8085 and Fairchild*
> *F8 microprocessors and a EPROM zapper with the interface program running*
> *on DOS) were only available for that platform. I finished that program in*
> *1992, and there went the need for DOS/windoze. It was far to limiting an*
> *O/S - single user, single tasking, lacking much of the capabilities that I*
> *had in the UNIX boxes I was also using.*

I was using DEC, CP/M and Commodores back in those days. I wasn't
burning EPROMs until a few years later.

> *>And while I believe you actually don't always have to have experience to*
> *>be some sort of expert with a given subject. But in this case, I believe*
> *>you are in trouble.*
>
> *Actually, not - we don't have any windoze boxes, either at work (an R&D*
> *facility) or at home. So, I really could care less what happens to windoze.*

Thus my question... what makes you any kind of Windows expert if you
just don't care? I at least care and that makes me a bit more of an
expert than you are, right?

> *>As you have no idea whether the reports of Windows problems are really*
> *>do to Windows or not. Believe it or not, most have nothing to do with*

- > >bugs within the software at all.
- >
- > *I think everyone is aware that most people using computers really shouldn't*
- > *be – they lack the incentive to learn, and therefore don't – which results*
- > *in a huge number of cracked or bOrken boxes. However, if that were the*
- > *only reason, microsoft wouldn't be issuing those monthly updates, would they.*

In the early beginning I used to be part of the computer elite gods as well. But I didn't like the idea that *we* computer elite gods *shouldn't* hand over the power of the computer to the masses. Thus I branched off and isolated myself so to speak.

- > *Of course, another problem is users who can't be bothered to learn more*
- > *than one piece of software, and insist on using the only tool they've*
- > *partially learned (9a web browser) for mail, news, web, and the*
- > *auto-installation and operation of malware. The "brighter" ones then*
- > *go out and buy extra crap like spyware removal tools, anti-virus, and*
- > *anti-trojan tools – and don't bother to think why the huge after-market*
- > *even exists in the first place. Is Symantec (one example) capable of*
- > *writing more secure code than microsoft? Seems so.*

Yeah so? There are people who don't get into computers as we do. All they want computers for is to do their bidding for them. I see nothing wrong with that, if that is all you want.

- > >Say, did you know Linus Torvalds secretly runs Windows? Yup, he says so
- > >right in his book.
- >
- > *You want to think about that? If it's secret, why would he be writing it*
- > *in his book? I run windows too – except it's called "The X Window System"*
- > *and is just a shade incompatible with the stuff from Redmond. I assume*
- > *you realize microsoft isn't the only one using that term.*

That isn't what I call Windows (tm). What you are talking about is windows (lowercase) and GUI.

- > >I guess his own Linux isn't as productive (and fun) as Windows.
- >
- > *What ever. It does seem to keep him occupied, and Bill Allen was happy*
- > *as a clam to have him working for Transmeta. I really don't care what*
- > *he, or anyone else uses. You seem to not understand GPL or the BSD*
- > *license and what they imply.*

It's Paul Allen for starters. And maybe I don't fully understand GPL/BSD licenses. Why don't you tell us about it? Although I'd be really surprised if you say something that I didn't already know.

- > >I don't know what Bugtraq is saying,
- >
- > *Surprise yourself – take a look. Some of it is hilarious. You don't even*
- > *have to subscribe if you don't want to*

>
> [compton ~]\$ grep -c bugtraq .newsrsrc
> 19
> [compton ~]\$
>
> *The news server I use (giganews) carries 19 separate feeds.*

Giganews might be important to you, but I'm still waiting to form opinion about them.

> *>Unfortunately, including the viruses, trojans, etc. But that is
> >the users fault, now isn't it?*
>
> *Yup – thats why microsoft.com got shut down in early 2003 with the
> Slammer (aka Sapphire) worm. Personally, I don't follow the latest
> malware – I'm seeing more reports of unopened mail on windoze boxes
> managing to bypass all security, but that's of passing interest at
> most. Sort of like your daily fix from rec.humor.funny.*

All caused by one employee. So who do you blame, MS or the employee?
I blame both. Although that one employee actually caused the
problem. As the rest of them didn't cause a problem, now did they?
Except the one responsible from keeping a virus from the inside LAN.

> *>Maybe better, stay away from XP if you can help it and use Windows
> >2000 instead.*
>
> *Why? I haven't seen a need to run any version of windoze at home or
> at work in years.*

Well if you don't want to run Windows, then more power to you. What
can I say? Although I can't do the same since drivers and software
is plentiful in the Windows environment that others can't match.
Thus the single *big* reason why most of us use Windows. Can others
offer the same? Hell no!

> >>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_8859-1
> >>
> >> *I've never considered them an authority.*
> >
> *>So what are you saying?*
>
> *wikipedia.org isn't noted as being the final authority.*

Doesn't matter! Is the group for ISO-8859-1 is supporting it or not?

> *>Every RFC document seems to me to be a draft standard. Is it just me?*
>
> [compton ~]\$ zgrep -c '[0-9]' rfcs/rfc-index.10.14.05.txt.gz
> 4176
> [compton ~]\$ zgrep -A1 Status rfcs/rfc-index.10.14.05.txt.gz | tr -s ''

alt.computer.security: Re: Incoherent E-mails

```
> \n' | tr '\n' ' ' | tr ')' '\n' | grep 'Status: [A-Z]' | sed s'/.*/'
> / sort | uniq -c | column
> 112 Status: BEST CURRENT PRACTICE 1269 Status: INFORMATIONAL
> 116 Status: DRAFT STANDARD 1220 Status: PROPOSED STANDARD
> 241 Status: EXPERIMENTAL 86 Status: STANDARD
> 145 Status: HISTORIC 909 Status: UNKNOWN
> [compton ~]$ zgrep -c '[0-9]* *Not Issued' rfc/rfc-index.10.14.05.txt.gz
> 78
> [compton ~]$
>
> I could say "it's just you" – but I won't. There are a few. For example,
> RFC0821 and 0822 are standards for SMTP and text messages and both have
> been "obsoleted" (by RFC2821 and 2822), but the original docs remain listed
> as "STANDARD", and the replacements are only a "PROPOSED STANDARD". (In case
> you can't follow the commands above – first one says there are 4176 RFCs.
> The second strips out the status term and counts them – the last notes that
> 78 were not issued.)
```

The problem with standards is they disallow innovation. The best you can do with RFC is patch the dang thing. It is a sorry ass standard today. And it holds us back technology-wise today.

```
> >You could do what I do. View most (or in your case all) HTML messages as
> >ASCII.
>
> Why? The people who send me legitimate mail know I don't do HTML – in
> fact, their mail server bounce the mail so they know they screwed up.
> Others – obviously I could care less.
```

If you could careless, then what is the big deal? Some of us approve of HTML email. So leave us alone. Why force your will upon us? After all, your beloved RTC standards even support it patch-wise.

```
> >But to be able to, but delete them without reading doesn't
> >make any sense to me (unless they are spam).
>
> Spam, noise – I don't _have_ to care. They are irrelevant.
```

Same here, but not to others.

```
> >Yup, the ASCII standard is about 50 years old now. Remember daisywheel
> >printers? I still have one. Ah life before GUI. <grin>
>
> So, you don't count Baudot? It's just a bit older, though I haven't used
> a Teletype since the late 1950's. Most people don't know what they are
> unless they've seen movies made in the 1930's and 1940's where these were
> seen/heard clanking away in "the news room".
```

Sorry I know nothing about Baudot. I got into computers in '74.

alt.computer.security: Re: Incoherent E-mails

- > >I'm using a character based OS, I love color monitors. As the colorful
- > >menus allows one to make things easier to find.
- >
- > Where's the menu item that runs that zgrep/strip/count routine above?
- > I do run a GUI – there are 20 text terminals on six panes of this desktop.
- > Funny thing is – not one icon. Not one menu in sight, although there is
- > one used to stop the desktop, or create a new terminal. Old saying:
- > "A mouse is a device used to point at the xterm you want to type in."

All GUI stuff.

- > >Same is true for HTML email as well. And all of this linking sure beats
- > >plain text only messages.
- >
- > Funny – I have four browsers on this box – lynx, links, opera and netscape
- > in order of use. I don't recall the last time I used either of the last
- > two. The first two are text only – lynx doesn't do frames, though links
- > does. I also have 'wget' but I don't count that as a browser. I can often
- > do a google search with lynx and be done in less time than it takes to
- > kick netscape out of hibernation. As I say – I haven't seen much use of
- > HTML, except for the occasional web search engine visit.

Living behind the times. Good for you. Although the rest of us needs to keep up with the latest.

- > One of the major security holes with HTML is klowns clicking on URLs. A
- > lot of problems are eliminated with just a cut and paste (never mind
- > manually typing the URL), but as noted above – that's way to hard for
- > the average computer user, and the bad guys can exploit this trivially.

Well to some users this can fool them. But to more experience users, this is just a foolish attempt. MS has fixed this in Outlook Express by only allowing plain text to show through.

- > >Making things easier to see and understand are fine uses of CPU time. As
- > >let the computer do most of the work while you relax a bit. That makes
- > >sense to me.
- >
- > That's what I use them for.

Why don't I believe you?

- > >No I also use other word processors and text editors as well.
- >
- > I use precisely three editors. You can see one of them demonstrated
- > above, called 'sed'.

WordStar is a classic and sed isn't. Oops!

- > >the original WordStar is still better IMHO.
- >

Re: Incoherent E-mails

alt.computer.security: Re: Incoherent E-mails

- > *When I was using a PC, the guy in the next office used WordStar over DOS 3.1.*
- > *I honestly can't recall that much about it, other than he had it set with a*
- > *light blue background and white text, and he could make it produce ASCII.*
- > *I used something else – I think it was called SpellBinder – but after 14*
- > *years, I've recycled those neurons.*
- >
- > *Old guy*

Recycling neurons is one the worst thing you can do for knowledge.
Yes, some things slip away from me too, but I don't allow it if I
can help it.

Bill (using a Toshiba 2595XDVD under Windows 2000)
— written and edited within WordStar 5.0