**From:** [Thousand Island](mailto:salad_man@msn.com)

**To:** [MattMan](mailto:mattman69@netzero.net) ; [bone33](mailto:bone33@freewwweb.com) ; [///\ ulTRÅX \///](mailto:ulTRAX@webtv.net)

**Sent:** Saturday, April 01, 2000 5:11 AM

**Subject:** romcache

Speculations:

I wonder how romcache images were uploaded if the romcache images can be accessed through bogus urls like (<http://www.gorby.com/romcache/webtvlogojewel.gif> ) Perhaps these images are not on the web and instead, perhaps the browser is being tricked somehow into uploading its contents....in that case, perhaps the code that makes freeloader work can be adapted to upload other internal webtv files.

Here's another question:  why is the file protocol allocated to a server?  And with the same port as http, ftp, and gopher?   ie in genpak:  209.240.194.215:1650.  This may mean that accessing file, http, ftp, and gopher urls is first directed through webtv's server, and then the server redirects the browser to the file url (or wherever else).  Perhaps the server even grabs the contents of the url it redirects the browser to, making it possible to transload those contents from that server under certain conditions.  But whether or not certain contents could be uploaded (or transloaded)would be decided by the server.  The server could also send back error messages of its choice if it does not want certain file urls accessed.  This way, webtv could make server side changes to control file access. Another thing the server could do is parse the file url request, and then change it in some cases so that it becomes valid. So  <http://www.gorby.com/romcache/webtvlogojewel.gif>  could be parsed and be returned as <file://romcache/webtvlogojewel.gif>.   I wonder what happens if you set up a webpage with a romcache directory....  Could this be used to hide files from webtv users?   I'll have to try it.  Heck, I could put a pic of a dog on my tripod page as <http://fil4s.tripod.com/romcache/webtvlogojewel.gif> and perhaps all a webtv user would get is the webtv logo.   If this works, you have another case against wni, ultrax!

It is  probable that ultimately, file:// addresses are not ultimately resolved into urls, but instead, references to locations on the hard drive or internal memory.  So the true resolution of the file url might be flashb:\romcache\webtvlogojewel.gif.

On the pc, the file protocol accesses the hard drive like this:  [file:///c:/windows/desktop/stupid.gif](file:///X:\DOCUMENTS\windows\desktop\stupid.gif).   This is ultimately resolved to **c:\windows\desktop\stupid.gif**.   So perhaps there is something similar on webtv.

 It intrigues me that romcache files could be uploaded.  Perhaps when the webtv browser sends a request for a romcache file to the server, the server uses the source of the request to tell the browser where to send the romcache file.  But if the browser sends this request through another server   (freeloader's server), perhaps the fact that it originated from the ip of a webtv box causes the server to treat freeloader's server as a webtv proxy server and  thinks it is getting an indirect request from a webtv box.  And when the webtv server  sends its response back through freeloader, perhaps the box is tricked into thinking that freeloader is the webtv browser, and instead of loading the file url to the browser, it sends it to freeloader.   I know this might sound far-fetched, if you can make sense of it at all, but this is my idea of what might be happening when romcache files are uploaded if the file urls are not stored on the server.

**From:** [Thousand Island](mailto:salad_man@msn.com)

**To:** [ÐÅRKMÅ††ÉR](mailto:darkmatter@webtv.net)

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2000 7:12 PM

**Subject:** rom midis

I'm trying to back up my e-mail now, as you might guess from me replying to such old e-mails.

You asked me how I uploaded webtv midis, and I replied that I used a file ripper to extract them from the viewer.  But I forgot to mention that I got some midis from dor, and all dor downloads and tricks videoads get saved in a folder by the viewer, where they can then be uploaded. You might already know that, but I thought I'd mention it just in case.   I wish all webtv files would get saved in folders...then I could upload all files the viewer accesses. It's too bad I don't know of a command that will treat any file the way dor does.

**From:** [Thousand Island](mailto:salad_man@msn.com)

**To:** [///\ ulTRÅX \///](mailto:ulTRAX@webtv.net)

**Sent:** Saturday, April 29, 2000 3:28 AM

**Subject:** Re: viewer hack update

**From:** ///\ ulTRÅX \/// <[ulTRAX@webtv.net](mailto:ulTRAX@webtv.net)>  
**To:** MattMan <[MattMan69@netzero.net](mailto:MattMan69@netzero.net)>  
**Cc:** Bone <[bone\_33@atlascomm.net](mailto:bone_33@atlascomm.net)>; ThousandIsland <[salad\_man@msn.com](mailto:salad_man@msn.com)>; [moneymanc4@netzero.net](mailto:moneymanc4@netzero.net) <[moneymanc4@netzero.net](mailto:moneymanc4@netzero.net)>  
**Date:** Friday, April 28, 2000 6:23 PM  
**Subject:** Re: viewer hack update

You realize that I just started a Big Time fight with Frank Rizzo about  
this. He stole God knows how much info using &codes.   
  
Man, if this is going on I don't want to know. Please pull it.

Well, although I'm not gung ho about using methods like this for any purpose, I'd say that since this method is being used only to slow down the spread of viewer use, it's probably not the same as what Frank did...I don't know why Frank was collecting info, but the usual purpose of that is for a sense of power, whether one intends to use that power or not.  In the case of the viewer, as far as I know, only SSIDs of viewer accounts are being gathered for the purpose of preventing further access to Genpak.  Actually, I'm not totally opposed to the spread of knowledge about viewer access, since some others may find some things we may never have dreamed of.  But I always thought that the advantages of indiscriminate spreading of this knowledge would be outweighed by the disadvantages. And I was very careful to let all of you know whenever I had thoughts of letting anyone else in on the secret...I'm glad I was discouraged from this a couple times.  As for getting SSIDs of viewer users to block their accounts, I was previously taking the attitude that it was too late to do anything about the spread of viewer access, but this idea could actually slow it down quite a bit.  Also, I'm sure webtv would be in favor of less viewer access as well, if they care at all. That would mean less chance of them shutting off Genpak completely.  What do you think?