Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Alex Molochnikov on Sun, 25 Jul 2004 22:34:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

All ISPs have an upper limit on the amount of inbound traffic. If you download that file a billion times, the one to be hit with a mega-bill will be, unfortunately, yourself.

The best way to deal with this stuff is to ignore it.

AM

"Bootstrap Bill" <wrcousert@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:YfJMc.25733$eM2.2842@attbi_s51...
[crap snipped]
> This guy has been posting this crap for days. I'd like to write a program
> that will send his bandwidth bill up the wazoo, perhaps by downloading this
> zip file a billion times or more.
>
> What do you guys think?

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Alex Molochnikov on Mon, 26 Jul 2004 01:46:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Bootstrap Bill" <wrcousert@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:T9YMc.29178$eM2.9777@attbi_s51...
> I get unlimited downloads for $41 per month. Nowhere in my contract does it
> say that they can charge me for excess bandwidth. I regularly download a gig
> or two a day, have been for several years.

The ISP may not charge you for the excessive downloads, but it is more than likely that somewhere in your contract there is a clause setting an upper limit on the amount of data transfer to and from your connection. Not only that, but the ISPs usually distinguish between incoming and outgoing traffic, and set different limits to each.

I, too, often download large files, and most likely exceed my nominal allowance by several orders of magnitude. My ISP never reprimanded me for that, but the point is that the limits do exist. And in order to make the offender feel pain of the excessive downloads of _their_ files, the amount of traffic will have to come close to the threshold beyond which the ISP will start taking notice. And if this happens, your ISP will do the same, for the same reason.

> I think this is a great way to get rid of these jerks. If a bunch of
people
> were to group together and go after them, they'd lose their ISP connection
> in less than a day.

What you are saying (if you agree with my reasoning above) is that a number
of people can share the load and make the offender hit the limit without
coming close to their own "red line". Technically, this might work, but in
reality this will take a dedicated group of vigilantes launching a
coordinated assault on the given website. Not that it is a bad thing to do -
just difficult to orchestrate.

> Anytime a new one shows up, simply change the file name and let it run for
a
> few hours. Ignoring the problem won't make it go away.

Neither will honoring the posters of this crap with response, or downloads -
they might even take it as an encouragement, or as a proof of their tactic
working. Because unless you manage to build the traffic to the point where
they begin to hurt, all you will accomplish is making them happy with
downloads (since there is no immediate way for them to gauge the spread of
their visruses, the number of file downloads is a good approximation of
success).

Regards,

AM

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Roedy Green on Mon, 26 Jul 2004 01:50:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, 26 Jul 2004 01:46:38 GMT, "Alex Molochnikov"
<NOBODY@NOSPAM.COM> wrote or quoted :

> Technically, this might work, but in
> reality this will take a dedicated group of vigilantes launching a
> coordinated assault on the given website. Not that it is a bad thing to do -
> just difficult to orchestrate.

much the way ticks can overwhelm and kill a moose.

Each tick does not need to take much blood.

--
Canadian Mind Products, Roedy Green.

Coaching, problem solving, economical contract programming.
See http://mindprod.com/jgloss/jgloss.html for The Java Glossary.

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Tor Iver Wilhelmsen on Mon, 26 Jul 2004 08:42:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Bootstrap Bill" <wrcousert@yahoo.com> writes:

> This guy has been posting this crap for days.

No, he hasn't. A trojan/virus has.

> I'd like to write a program that will send his bandwidth bill up the
> wazoo, perhaps by downloading this zip file a billion times or more.

Why? What if your machine was infected instead, would you accept such
an attack on your computer?

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Alex Molochnikov on Mon, 26 Jul 2004 14:59:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Tor Iver Wilhelmsen" <tor.iver.wilhelmsen@broadpark.no> wrote in message
news:ubri39n2o.fsf@broadpark.no...
> "Bootstrap Bill" <wrcousert@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>> This guy has been posting this crap for days.
>
> No, he hasn't. A trojan/virus has.

The posting was done by a virus. But the downloadable file the post points
to comes from a specific website that deserves being attacked
(counterattacked?) and brought down for hosting and distributing the virus.

>> I'd like to write a program that will send his bandwidth bill up the
>> wazoo, perhaps by downloading this zip file a billion times or more.
>
> Why? What if your machine was infected instead, would you accept such
> an attack on your computer?

The attack would not be directed at senders' machines, but at the vipers'
nest. And the only difficulty, as I pointed out before, is not moral
implications, but the organization of such a collective action.

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Alexandr Molochnikov on Mon, 26 Jul 2004 21:45:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It just occurred to me (I must be slow today) that the posting could not be
done from an infected machine at all. If must have come from a single
computer - or we would see thousands of these posts in a single NG, one from
each infected machine, which is not the case.

Still, IMHO, a DoS attack against the virus-spreading server would be
entirely justified as a legitimate self-defence.

"Alex Molochnikov" <NOBODY@NOSPAM.COM> wrote in message
news:o%8Nc.112911$Mr4.61331@pd7tw1no...
>> Why? What if your machine was infected instead, would you accept such
>> an attack on your computer?
>
> The attack would not be directed at senders' machines, but at the vipers'
> nest. And the only difficulty, as I pointed out before, is not moral
> implications, but the organization of such a collective action.
>
> AM

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by kuyper on Tue, 27 Jul 2004 03:05:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Alex Molochnikov" <NOBODY@NOSPAM.COM> wrote in message
news:<o%8Nc.112911$Mr4.61331@pd7tw1no>...
...
> The posting was done by a virus. But the downloadable file the post points
> to comes from a specific website that deserves being attacked
> (counterattacked?) and brought down for hosting and distributing the virus.

You can't be sure that it's actually responsible for hosting and
distributing the virus. Some people attack a web site by making it
appear to be the source for spam/viruses; the counterattacks performed
by people like you are what actually kills the site.

Rule of thumb: you can't trust anything spam/viruses say about
themselves, especially including any hint they might contain as to who
was their source.

Commercial spam can be tracked down: in order to make a profit, sooner or later they have to hit you up for money. In some cases (not all), they will ask for payment in a manner that makes it possible to tracke them down. You might have to actually pay the money in order to track them down, but it is possible.

Viruses aren't usually greedy, at least not in that sense, so that approach won't work with them.

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by Alex Molochnikov on Tue, 27 Jul 2004 03:20:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"James Kuyper" <kuyper@wizard.net> wrote in message
news:8b42afac.0407261905.6f011065@posting.google.com...
> "Alex Molochnikov" <NOBODY@NOSPAM.COM> wrote in message
news:<o%8Nc.112911$Mr4.61331@pd7tw1no>...
[snip]
> You can't be sure that it's actually responsible for hosting and
> distributing the virus. Some people attack a web site by making it
> appear to be the source for spam/viruses; the counterattacks performed
> by people like you are what actually kills the site.
[snip]

We are not talking about a spam as an unauthorized mass-distribution of e-mail with phoney return address and headers, rather about the specific post that directs users to a downloadable file. The file undoubtedly contains a virus/trojan. One cannot make this file "appear" to come from somewhere else: either it is there, or it is not. A massive number of hits against the file will disable the server that hosts the file.

Which, in and out of itself, should be a desirable goal.

AM

Subject: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger Commits Suicide
Posted by kuyper on Tue, 27 Jul 2004 11:22:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Alex Molochnikov" <NOBODY@NOSPAM.COM> wrote in message
news:<lSjNc.122762$ek5.11592@pd7tw2no>...
...
> contains a virus/trojan. One cannot make this file "appear" to come from
> somewhere else: either it is there, or it is not. A massive number of hits

---

You have a lot less faith in the ingenuity of these people than I do.
Computers are fundamentally very flexible things, and the internet
even more so. I know that it's quite feasible to redirect internet
connections so that they connect to a different computer than the one
you think they're connecting you to.

Even if the file actually is where it seems to be, it might have been
placed on that system without the owner's knowledge or consent.