

microsoft.public.security: Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.security/2004-09/0664.html>

From: news.microsoft.com (*nobody_at_nowhere.abc*)

Date: 09/11/04

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 12:02:29 -0700

I am not claiming that IE, MOZ, NN, or any other modern browsers are "missing features." Please re-read the posts.

My comments are about Internet Explorer.

I am claiming that Internet Explorer has fallen behind the Gecko Browser pack. The lack of decent popup blocking software is one example. The MSN toolbar doesn't cut it.

I am also claiming that the ability to control security in Internet Explorer is too coarse grained for today's internet. We need to be able to restrict or allow specific capabilities for specific sites and even specific ports. The current approach is closer to being "all or none."

I am also claiming (MOST IMPORTANT) that trying to incorporate security and stability in a browser that must also allow hitherto unknown innovation is a contradiction. IF WE KNOW ABOUT IT AND CAN TEST IT, THEN IT ISN'T INNOVATION!!!

Secure browsing needs everything to be carefully defined and tested so it can be secured.

Innovation needs to be able to change the definition without an Act of Congress.

You cannot get these in one package, without some fancy footwork behind the scenes.

This has been the point of my posting all along.

–G

www.gerardvignes.com

"Jeff Cochran" <jeff.nospam@zina.com> wrote in message
news:414cbd86.1531216032@msnews.microsoft.com...
> On Thu, 9 Sep 2004 03:59:37 -0700, "news.microsoft.com"

Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

microsoft.public.security: Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

> <nobody@nowhere.abc> wrote:

>

> >The needs of high–security internet access are not cutting edge. We need
> >STABLE, RELIABLE BROWSERS that DO NOT OFFER ANY FEATURES BEYOND THE
> >SPECIFICATION. These armored browsers must be 100% predictable and

provide

> >STANDARDIZED FUNCTIONALITY. Adding cool new features, and retaining
existing

> >unnecessary features is destabilizing and creates the potential for more

> >security problems. Ship and patch will not work. Get it right first and
then

> >ship.

> >

> >The needs of gamers and innovators are cutting edge. They need POWERFUL,

> >FLEXIBLE BROWSERS that EASILY INCORPORATE NEW FEATURES. These souped–up

> >browsers must allow enterprising developers and users the maximum
headroom

> >to grow their ideas on the Internet. This would be akin to an OPEN SOURCE

> >ENVIRONMENT for new products and technologies to emerge with the least

> >possible resistance. This would be global laboratory.

> >

> >These are extremes of Internet Browsing. THESE REQUIREMENTS ARE MUTUALLY

> >EXCLUSIVE.

> >

> >Interestingly enough, the Armored Browsers can borrow and incorporate
ideas

> >from the Souped–Up Browsers—–AFTER THOSE IDEAS HAVE MATURED and been

> >CODIFIED IN STANDARDS.

>

> What of these is missing in available browsers on the market now?

>

> Jeff

>

>

> >Microsoft has the resources and the opportunity to break away from the
Gecko

> >Pack and forge a new direction in Internet Browsing.

> >

> >–G

> >www.gerardvignes.com

> >

> >

> >"S. Pidgorny <MVP>" <slavickp@yahoo.com> wrote in message

> >news:eQA8BNlIEHA.2968@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...

> >> I strongly disagree with proposed approach and urge Microsoft to keep
one

> >> quality product.

> >>

> >> G, your approach isn't very practical. Remember, Microsoft is a
software

> >> development company, and they must eliminate security vulnerabilities

Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

microsoft.public.security: Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

and

> >> *other software bugs. To allow compromises means not only maintaining three*

> >> *code bases (in your proposal), but also is encouraging developers not to*

> >>*pay*

> >> *attention to bugs. Too bad, especially when the practice will apply to*

> >> *Windows.*

> >>

> >> *Two more things. Firstly, there are at least two more versions of internet*

> >> *Explorer that are different from IE6: Pocket internet Explorer for Pocket*

> >>*PC*

> >> *and the smartphone IE. Both don't have widely known vulnerabilities – make*

> >> *an armored race car. Secondly, your plan doesn't provide seamless*

> >>*migration*

> >> *path from awesome dude to the suit. Too bad.*

> >>

> >> --

> >> *Svyatoslav Pidgorny, MVP, MCSE*

> >> *-- F1 is the key --*

> >>

> >> *"news.microsoft.com" <nobody@nowhere.abc> wrote in message*

> >> *news:uar2CmklEHA.3612@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...*

> >> > *I would like to propose a more rational approach to browsers.*

> >> >

> >> > *There are three basic classes of browsing, with three very different*

> >> *needs.*

> >> >

> >> > *1. Secure (critical work and online purchases)*

> >> > *security and reliability are a premium---can you say LAW SUIT*

> >> > *this browser should follow ecommerce/secure standards to the*

letter

> >> > *under pain of death*

> >> > *this is the "Armored Car" of browsers*

> >> >

> >> > *2. Cutting-Edge (gamers and other innovators)*

> >> > *performance and new features are a premium---can you say AWESOME*

> >> *DUDE*

> >> > *this browser should allow anything and everything*

> >> > *this is the "Race Car" of browsers*

> >> >

> >> > *3. Newbies (learners and less demanding users)*

> >> > *ease of use and simplicity are a premium---can you say DUHHHHHHH*

> >> > *this browser should support commonly needed functions*

> >> > *this is the Minivan of browsers*

> >> >

> >> > *Now Microsoft already has a browser that morphs back and forth*

between

Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

microsoft.public.security: Re: A more rational approach to Browsers – Microsoft please read this

> >> > *Internet Explorer and Windows Explorer seamlessly (sometimes when you
> >> don't
> >> > even really want it to).*
> >> >
> >> > *Why can't Microsoft make THREE DIFFERENT INTERNET BROWSERS that morph
> >> > between themselves depending on the specific application.*
> >> >
> >> > *I know that the ppl at Microsoft are smart enough to figure out how
to
> >> share
> >> > cookies, caches and sessions between all three versions of browsers.*
I
> >> know
> >> > *they can make this idea work. I know they can probably come with an
even
> >> > better idea than this one.*
> >> >
> >> > *I can't figure out why Internet Explorer is three years behind the
times
> >> and
> >> > unsafe at any speed.*
> >> >
> >> > *I can be reached at www.gerardvignes.com (certified genius)*
> >> >
> >> > *-G*
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >
>