

From: Mike  
Posted At: Monday, April 12, 2004 6:57 PM  
Posted To: spywareworkshop2004  
Conversation: Spyware Workshop - Comment, P044509  
Subject: Spyware Workshop - Comment, P044509

Imagine this scenario: You go to Office Depot and suddenly you see the sign of Office Max covering the sign of Office Depot. Would Office Depot stand for it? Of course not and this would not be permitted on their physical location. But what if you, the visitor, said that so long as I get my office supplies, I don't care. Should Office Depot then swallow it? Again, not on their physical location. If however, you were to go to officedepot.com and out popped a new browser window displaying officemax.com, then Office Depot would HAVE TO swallow it. Why? Because a couple of court cases say so. Ads from competitors that are driven by Software such as WhenU and Gator etc. are ok, according to law, because end-users clicked through the EULA while installing the software. My question is: If this kind of marketing is legal today, should it be allowed to stay so?

I am a webmaster and my client spends a lot of money on marketing and advertising his site to get orders. When I found that his competitor's website was opening in front of his, I tried to figure out how to combat this problem. What I have learnt is that there is nothing I can do except to fight fire with fire and do the same to his competitors. I believe that this type of marketing is unethical. Then again, my client is losing business. Necessity wins out as it has before. I see a force of nature, persistent and clandestine, gradually and inconspicuously eroding values. It is powerful because it makes small moves. If you see the same way, then help stop it.

My friend, however, does not agree that it is unethical. He says, "This is about those who can and those who can't. Don't whine. Get even if you can or shut up". Well, that's another way of looking at it. It will be interesting to see how all this works out.

Thanks,

Roger