

Re: Proposed enhancement to scp

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.ssh/2004-02/0388.html>

From: Dimitri Maziuk (*dima_at_127.0.0.1*)

Date: 02/27/04

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2004 01:04:17 +0000 (UTC)

Steve Turner sez:

> *Dimitri Maziuk wrote:*

>

>> *Steve Turner sez:*

>>

>> ... *Where would GNU software be today if*

>>

>>> *they had decided that making improvements on the original code was a bad*

>>> *idea?*

>>

>>

>> *Exactly where it is now -- in "Not Unix" land.*

>

> *I think you're wrong;*

Which part: "Not Unix"? That's what NU in GNU stands for, you know.

"Improvements over rcp"? OpenSSH website says right on the front page: "... scp which replaces rcp ..." Which makes the argument "scp won't do it if rcp does not" perfectly valid.

>> *FYI, one of the first lines in openssh license reads "there is no*

>> *GNU code here". Just letting you know.*

>

> *Ok, but I don't really see how that relates to the discussion. I only*

> *used GNU as an example of "Continuous improvement helps lead to software*

> *that people actually continue to use".*

Also known as "featuritis", or "bloat".

Want to know what GNU "enhancements" do IRL? Run "hostname -s" as root on a Solaris box. Type "killall" without parameters on IRIX or Solaris (also as root). Hell, most of GNU software won't even compile on unix (Is Not GNU) with C (Not Gunk) compiler. Thanks to the GNU "enhancements". Hates it, we doesss.

comp.security.ssh: Re: Proposed enhancement to scp

Dima (while we're at it, OpenSSH is one of the very few free software projects that's actually portable. Kudos to OpenSSH folks.)

--

...the mainstream products of major vendors largely ignore these demonstrated technologies... [Instead, their customers] are left with several ineffective solutions collected under marketing titles like "defense in depth".

-- Thirty Years Later: Lessons from the Multics Security Evaluation