

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-06/msg02043.html>

- *From:* "Richard Henry" <rphenry@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 9 Jun 2006 07:41:55 -0700
-

"Fred Bloggs" <nospam@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:448982AC.50602@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Spehro Pefhany wrote:

On Fri, 09 Jun 2006 13:15:09 GMT, the renowned Fred Bloggs
<nospam@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Spehro Pefhany wrote:

On Fri, 9 Jun 2006 12:36:01 +0200, the
renowned "Frithiof Andreas
Jensen"
<frithiof.jensen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

<langwadt@xxxxxxx>
wrote in message
<news:1149798428.627827.281820@xx>

I
believe
they
"only"
want
to
store

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

sender
and
receiver
information

not

the actual
content. But
thats scary
enough.

Very. Think "All IP
network" – the
sender/receiver information
is in
every package and must be
there regardless of
encryption so the
legislation neatly sidesteps a
nasty technical issue.

Apart from that, the really
interesting information
about you is in
the network of people you
communicate with; f.ex.
how many links are
incoming to you, how many
outgoing and call
frequencies on each
decides your spot in the
hierachy.

Guilt by association. Your neighbor down
the street is a
communist/jihadist/boogy man. Your kid
talks to his kid for an hour at
a time sometimes, on your phone. You've
got some 'splainin to do. Cast
a wide enough and loose enough net and
you'll find such people with
additional simultaneous inconvenient
coincidences that make them look

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

even more guilty. Maybe they lost their temper and said something that a jerk neighbor will repeat. Maybe they made an angry comment they thought was anonymous in a chat room or on a blog. Maybe they were curious and went to some web sites as a result of a news report. Start with ten thousand people or a hundred thousand and you'll probably end up with a handful who are absolutely innocent but look guilty as hell.

Of course if you're afraid of that sort of thing happening, you might change your habits out of fear and to avoid suspicion. This kind of electronic monitoring could make a police state far more practical than those using humans. Part of the reason even some nominally communist countries feel more free than here is that they are still cash-based and also just don't have the technology to track every move everyone makes.

Best regards,
Spehro Pefhany

You mean you wouldn't want the government to know that some of your neighbors have just purchased a ton of ammonium nitrate, are discussing strategies for terrorizing the city, and meeting with others of their ilk?

Not if it involves unacceptable levels spying on *everyone*. The police will always ask for more and more powers, and therefore will always have to be limited on a rational basis.

And how should we define "unacceptable" – an extension of Learned Hand?

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?

Moving to more mundane matters, you wouldn't want the government to know the 24 hour whereabouts and activities of the habitually criminal, the predators, and murderers? Your so-called freedoms of privacy do not extend to your movements in public and they never have. As society becomes more complex and vulnerable to massive disruption by the few, it will be necessary to move to 100% implanted trackers.

I'd like to see people convicted of a violent crime (armed robbery, rape, murder) or with long rap sheets of minor crimes fitted with such devices for *life*, and I think the information should be available to storekeepers, security guards, barkeeps etc. Anyone who wants to spend \$100 for a receiver could know when such a lowlife was entering their place of business or home.

Best regards,
Spehro Pefhany

Haha- good one!- the catch is that many of the storekeepers, security guards, barkeeps etc. are just such lowlifes themselves:-)

So, like all the other mother-rapers and father-stabbers, they will just shake hands, smoke cigarettes, and have a great time talking about all kinds of groovy things.

Re: RoHS => tin whiskers?