

Re: Controversial paper – Good response article on ZDNet

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2003-10/1724.html>

From: Mack (macckone_at_a_nospamjunk123_ol.com)

Date: 10/15/03

Date: Wed, 15 Oct 2003 11:06:44 GMT

On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 06:17:33 GMT, George Ou
<533george_ou234@netzero234.com> wrote:

>On Mon, 13 Oct 2003 13:46:16 GMT, Mack
><macckone@a_nospamjunk123_ol.com> wrote:
>>>The point is, you can't punish a car maker for the actions of a
>>>malicious individual and you can't punish a software maker because a
>>>malicious individual uses a compromised system to take down the
>>>Internet.
>
>>In my state if you leave the keys in the ignition it is a crime and
>>you are liable if someone then steals your car and runs over someone.
>>If the car maker made a car that didn't need a key they would
>>be liable. Right now the software is the car without a key.
>>Right now the software does fail mysteriously way to often.
>>If it were a car the manufacturer would be held liable under
>>the "lemon laws".
>
>That's still absurd. In most small towns, people don't even lock
>their doors or their cars.

And most people on the internet don't lock their computers.
Weekly they get hijacked and most of the ones hijacked
don't even know it.

>
>>>If an OSS software had a design flaw that systematically attacked a
>>>website and brought it down, I don't care if it's free, the author
>>>should be liable. The same goes for pay software.
>>
>>If it is systematic then it is unlikely to be a design flaw.
>
>It's happened. Netgear's routers recently did a systematic DoS on a
>Universities time servers and network. It was a flaw.
>

sci.crypt: Re: Controversial paper – Good response article on ZDNet

Now that is nasty didn't hear about that one. I am sure Netgear is getting sued over that one.

>>*As for companies charging for software I believe they should*