Re: Overview Of New Intel Core i7(Nehalem) Processor

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2009−06/msg03441.html

- *From*: Nobody <nobody@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 22 Jun 2009 03:55:13 +0100

On Sun, 21 Jun 2009 06:51:27 −0700, JosephKK wrote:

> > If you want to download a single file, FTP
> > offers no advantages over HTTP,
> > is more complex, has more overhead, and
> > makes it harder to secure both the
> > server and the network. Also, the lack of
> > metadata with FTP can be a
> > problem for non−English locales.
>
> I have actually looked at the mechanism used in both
> protocols, and
> FTP wins on all counts. When i DL files i always look for
> the FTP
> link as it is more secure for my end

You'll need to substantiate this.

> Check the RFCs.

How long are you going to keep trying this "check ..." or "read up on ..." schtick?

I don't doubt that, if there was actually something in the RFCs to substantiate your position, you would have cited chapter and verse. Vague "read the RFCs" statements tend to be reserved for when you wish to impute ignorance but can't actually find anything to substantiate such a claim (or if you find something which might help but where citing a specific opens the door for refutation).

> In particular the partial support for downloads in
> HTTP, thus the need for a downloader tool to replace much of the

> > functionality native to FTP. e.g. error checking and block retry.

I asked you to substantiate the *security* claims.

FTP doesn't provide any error detection beyond detecting premature termination (which can also be detected for HTTP). Block transfers permit the sender to indicate that portions of the data are missing; they don't deal with transmission errors.

> > > and does not suffer from a bazillion flavorizations.

> > Nor does HTTP.

> Really? Check the various generations, nicely documented in the RFCs.

I'm aware that there is more than one version of the HTTP standard. FTP is hardly immune from having been extended. Neither of these amount to "a bazillion flavorizations", although the process of extending HTTP is rather more formalised. Many of the FTP extensions started out as additions to specific programs which were subsequently adopted by other programs and eventually as part of the standard.

> > > Why would i wish to gunk up my system with 57
> > > varieties of unneeded software to do what i can already do?

> > I don't know, why would you wish to?
> >
> > What extra software (beyond a web browser) do you think that you need?

> Precisely my point, it does NOT need 57 different HTTP downloader
> programs.

Which is precisely my point. HTTP does not need "57 different HTTP downloader programs" either. I've never seen any need to install anything other than the browser itself to download files via HTTP.

Most HTTP download managers are a scam; if you fell for it, that's your problem. The only actual "functionality" which most of them offer is the ability to circumvent the fair sharing of limited bandwidth. If bandwidth is limited, and shared equally by all connections, splitting a download across multiple connections may increase your download speed (or it may just get you banned).

.