

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Protect soft so it won't leak the Source Code](#)

Jacked - May 12, 2019, 7:36 am

Hey,
I have done some research and I understand that any C# .NET app can be easily decompiled using different reflectors.
I saw some solutions to that (at least make it harder to get the source code) but they all are old.
What are the modern solutions to this problem?
And one more question, is using a Crypter will help me prevent code leaking in this situation?
Just to be clear, I don't make a malware, Just don't want my source code to be public so wondering if a Crypter will help.
Thank you ?

Suspect. - May 12, 2019, 8:15 am

Just use Netguard it's pretty good. Might get some false positives from virus scans but that's a go with any obfuscator really. It's affordable and does the job. It's tricky to reverse engineer but it's not impossible ofc

Dotexe - May 12, 2019, 8:29 am

OP go for Eazfuscator ;)
/thread

JUSTIN - May 12, 2019, 8:35 am

(May 12, 2019 07:36 AM)Qivi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hey,
I have done some research and I understand that any C# .NET app can be easily decompiled using different reflectors.
I saw some solutions to that (at least make it harder to get the source code) but they all are old.
What are the modern solutions to this problem?
And one more question, is using a Crypter will help me prevent code leaking in this situation?
Just to be clear, I don't make a malware, Just don't want my source code to be public so wondering if a Crypter will help.
Thank you ?
What you're referring to is known as obfuscation. There are loads of available programs used for .NET obfuscation, some are better than others. It's important to understand that no matter how hard you try to protect your code, it will always be readable to some extent if a reverse engineer is experienced enough. Sensitive information like server credentials/api keys/passwords should never be stored in a program that's being released to consumers. The only real purpose of obfuscation is to make it more difficult for people to understand/steal/crack your software. It should never be used as a means to protect truly sensitive data.

That being said, I recommend choosing an obfuscator that has Code Virtualization. When you compile .NET, it doesn't turn into machine code. I explain this more in depth in a different post:

JUSTIN pid=" dateline=" Wrote:well .net applications are actually compiled to a CIL, that being MSIL. MSIL = microsoft intermediate language, and it's the instruction set that .net is compiled to. JIT (Just-In-Time) converts the IL to machine code on the fly, but when you're analyzing the assembly itself, you'll typically be looking at either reflected code or IL instructions.
The process of code virtualization in .NET removes the MSIL instructions of a function from the

application and stores encrypted instructions elsewhere in the programs resources. This is much better than standard obfuscation. Whereas some more common methods simply make the code ugly and hard to read, code virtualization completely removes it from any .NET reflection software/decompilers. The reverse engineer would need a tool that can automatically find these functions in resources, decrypt them, and restore them to their original IL code. This is certainly possible and not uncommon, but like I said, obfuscation is simply about making your code more difficult to read.

(May 12, 2019 08:29 AM)Dotexe? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) OP go for Eazfuscator ;)
/thread

By the way, EAZFuscator is one of the programs known for it's code virtualization. I use it on some of my software and I'd recommend it. The developer has his own break down of code virtualization that can be found here: <https://www.gapotchenko.com/eazfuscator.net/features/virtualization>

It's also important to note that EAZFuscator wont automatically utilize this feature, you'll need to add attributes to specific functions that you'd like it to be used on. Obviously anything related to licensing/authentication should have this attribute. I believe Babel also has this feature. Not sure of any other ones, but they're typically paid and cost multiple hundred dollars.

Dotexe - May 12, 2019, 8:41 am

(May 12, 2019 08:35 AM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) *snip*
Exactly, enjoy the +3

VENI - May 14, 2019, 3:53 am

I suggest a virtualizer and not any modded public versions of confuserex. Like koi-vm it is a bit outdated but you can modify it as netguard is easy af to unpack same as trinity

+Haze - May 14, 2019, 11:00 am

(May 12, 2019 08:41 AM)Dotexe? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Exactly, enjoy the +3
What if he doesn't want to enjoy the +3? ?

SwagotMcFaggot - May 14, 2019, 1:56 pm

(May 12, 2019 08:29 AM)Dotexe? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) OP go for Eazfuscator ;)
/thread

You should not go with Eazfuscator. I recommend creating your own obfuscator. There are many open sourced obfuscators online such as ConfuserEX. Otherwise Engima is a good option.

JUSTIN - May 14, 2019, 4:35 pm

(May 14, 2019 01:56 PM)SwagotMcFaggot Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You should not go with Eazfuscator. I recommend creating your own obfuscator. There are many open sourced obfuscators online such as ConfuserEX. Otherwise Engima is a good option.

pretty useless post tbh. somebody who doesn't understand how .NET binaries are compiled and how their code is interpreted is not going to maically be able to create their own obfuscator, or add anything valuable to ConfuserEX. also, isn't Enigma a native packer? does it even obfuscate the .NET? i assume mega dumper or some other .NET unpacker will be able to dump the actual IL code from memory....

unknown2me - May 15, 2019, 3:33 am

You can either use a .NET obfuscator which supports virtualisation or use a obfuscator with a native packer which does (as specified above).

.NET obfuscators with virtualisation:Eazfuscator (best)

NETGuard

Babelsoft

Native packers with virtualisationVMProtect

Enigma

Themida

Worth remembering that this isn't a foolproof method either, you'll benefit from implementing some of your own methods.

Aristocles - May 15, 2019, 4:39 am

- Using a crypter is bad because they are done to get FUD, not to prevent people from checking the source code (to some extent but its not strong). Also you will bring false positive due to the crypter's detection.

- Modern solution is : SaaS, Software as a service, also known as "put your sensitive code in a remote server and execute the code remotely, not on customer's computer". This way nobody will ever decompile your sensitive code. No need obfuscator, crypter or whatever.

+Haze - May 15, 2019, 7:59 am

If you don't want to leak source code, don't give users access to the code. Simple as that.

tweety - May 15, 2019, 8:01 am

host your code on a server where people cant touch it
/thread

edit;

<https://www.codeproject.com/Articles/496593/LiteCode-Remotely-call-methods-over-the-network>

red - May 15, 2019, 11:24 am

(May 15, 2019 04:39 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) • Using a crypter is bad because they are done to get FUD, not to prevent people from checking the source code (to some extent but its not strong). Also you will bring false positive due to the crypter's detection.

- Modern solution is : SaaS, Software as a service, also known as "put your sensitive code in a remote server and execute the code remotely, not on customer's computer". This way nobody will ever decompile your sensitive code. No need obfuscator, crypter or whatever.

Thisss.

Washi - May 15, 2019, 11:48 am

(May 15, 2019 04:39 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) • Modern solution is : SaaS, Software as a service, also known as "put your sensitive code in a remote server and execute the code remotely, not on customer's computer". This way nobody will ever decompile your sensitive code. No need obfuscator, crypter or whatever.

Maybe, but this is not always possible nor always the best solution.

An active network connection is necessary, which is not only always present, and also slows down your program a lot when lots of traffic is going. But more importantly, some code (such file operations, starting or stopping processes, etc.) simply cannot be put on a remote server.

This is exactly like was discussed [a few days ago](#).

SwagotMcFaggot - May 15, 2019, 1:01 pm

(May 14, 2019 04:35 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) pretty useless post tbh. somebody who doesn't understand how .NET binaries are compiled and how their code is interpreted is not going to magically be able to create their own obfuscator, or add anything valuable to ConfuserEX. also, isn't Enigma a native packer? does it even obfuscate the .NET? i assume mega dumper or some other .NET unpacker will be able to dump the actual IL code from memory....

Correct, engima is a native packer, but it does obfuscate the .NET and utilizes virtualization, etc.

Aristocles - May 15, 2019, 3:54 pm

(May 15, 2019 11:48 AM)Washi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Maybe, but this is not always possible nor always the best solution.

An active network connection is necessary, which is not only always present, and also slows down your program a lot when lots of traffic is going. But more importantly, some code (such file operations, starting or stopping processes, etc.) simply cannot be put on a remote server.

This is exactly like was discussed [a few days ago](#).

this is the best anti reverse engineering solution, no matter what, since the data cannot be analyzed directly.

find me one case where this solution is possible and also where this solution is not the best ?

for active connection, its 2019 almost everyone got a decent internet access, at least decent enough to upload the input and download the output of a remote execution code.

slow down your program, well yes and obfuscation too, and for traffic well you compensate the non-existence obfuscation cost with the servers cost.

JUSTIN - May 15, 2019, 10:01 pm

(May 15, 2019 03:54 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) this is the best anti reverse engineering solution, no matter what, since the data cannot be analyzed directly.

find me one case where this solution is possible and also where this solution is not the best ?

for active connection, its 2019 almost everyone got a decent internet access, at least decent enough to upload the input and download the output of a remote execution code.

slow down your program, well yes and obfuscation too, and for traffic well you compensate the non-existence obfuscation cost with the servers cost.

Huh? Obfuscation does not slow down a program nearly as much as remote code execution... and obfuscation is a very broad topic. Different obfuscation methods will affect the speed of your program differently, but none of these methods will slow down your program as much as using networking to call functions.

Some obfuscators even make optimizations to your code and can result in a positive impact. When methods are executed on a client in C# for the first time, their IL instructions have to be compiled to native machine code before they can even run. The JIT compiler, which performs this task, can optimize your code in some cases. This means that your .NET code actually becomes a bit faster the second time it is called, and some modifications made to the IL code by an obfuscator will be

removed on runtime. Every single time you call a function that is executed remotely, you'll have more latency than executing the same function on a users PC, even with a good connection.

Not that this matters, the difference is typically not significant in real world usage. I just figured I'd point that out. Remote code execution is not applicable in every situation. Washi is 100% correct. Some code simply can't be executed on a server, aka literally anything that interacts with your computer/file system/processes directly. Removing code from your client also doesn't necessarily prevent it from being cracked. As long as your server exists and is running, you should assume it's possible to obtain a crack of your software.

Even without taking that into account, it's simply rarely necessary. Any code that you feel must be completely removed from the program should've never been in the program in the first place. When you're writing code in an application that runs on a clients computer, you should assume that everything you're writing can be read by a reverse engineer. If you feel like it's vital that nobody else ever sees a particular function, you should've been writing it to be executed remotely from the get-go.

In situations where you feel remote code execution is necessary (and there are plenty of these scenarios) you should use it somewhat sparingly. Use it on functions that you have to use it on, don't use it on every function in the program. Most code that can be remotely executed via C# can also be accomplished by other languages that are meant to run on a servers back end.

It definitely has it's place, and I use it frequently, but I think a lot of people on HF simply don't know what to use it with and throw it around as if it's magic. Nowadays I'll try to write these super-secret functions in PHP so I can run the code from a cheap HTTP/web hosting server rather than an RDP or VPS that should have higher specs to try to minimize the latency added by remote code execution. If your client side code isn't secured, people will be able to call your remotely executed functions on their own. They wont know how it works, but they'll be able to access it.

0xDEAD10CC - May 15, 2019, 10:17 pm

(May 15, 2019 03:54 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) this is the best anti reverse engineering solution, no matter what, since the data cannot be analyzed directly.

find me one case where this solution is possible and also where this solution is not the best ?

for active connection, its 2019 almost everyone got a decent internet access, at least cedent enough to upload the input and download the output of a remote execution code.

slow down your program, well yes and obfuscation too, and for traffic well you compensate the non-existence obfuscation cost with the servers cost.

You are just making the assumption that all software is targeted at home users that have the typical basic internet package. Regardless, there are cases where software might need to scan a network, and analyze data, and maybe create a report or something. How are you going to do that all server-sided exactly? Even if you delegated the non-scanning portion of that software to your SAAS solution, tighter corporate networks may be entirely locked down from having internet access at all, and there are still security critical situations where requirements are in place for everything to be done locally for risk mitigation reasons, even outside of the government world. There are other examples too aside from this where an internet hosted solution wouldn't be ideal.

Aristocles - May 16, 2019, 6:35 am

Ok so both of you haven't read me I suppose now ? Because

1) my question is : "find me one case where this solution is possible and also where this solution is not the best ?" none of you answered that and you simply repeated what Washi wrote.

2) optimization on obfuscation-side is nearly insignificant since the compiler already do an amazing job.

3) "Even if you delegated the non-scanning portion of that software to your SAAS solution, tighter corporate networks may be entirely locked down from having internet access at all, and there are still security critical situations where requirements are in place for everything to be done locally for risk mitigation reasons, even outside of the government world." what are you on, keep me some. Since I propose a SaaS solution with remote server execution, that means you can do whatever you want on the server side, analyze data, create report or something, scan a network. You will have to adapt, or send encrypted data from customers computer to remote server to then analyze it.

I am well aware every product cannot be protected by that method. But find me one case where this is a possible solution AND where this is not the best solution ? I'm still waiting

Washi - May 16, 2019, 11:47 am

(May 16, 2019 06:35 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Ok so both of you haven't read me I suppose now ? Because

...

I am well aware every product cannot be protected by that method. But find me one case where this is a possible solution AND where this is not the best solution ? I'm still waiting

Gotta be honest, could say the same about you now as you completely missed the point of my post :/

The point of my post was not to prove that remote execution is bad. In fact, it can be very useful and strong as you explained. The point is that your solution will not work for every use case, which means that it can never always be the best way to protect an application. As I, and both Justin and 0xDEAD10CC have briefly expanded upon, you cannot get past some limitations of either the program itself, the environment where the program is going to reside in, or the interest of the customer.

Reasons may include physical limitations. As mentioned before; no active permanent connection to the internet, doing file operations, or performing network scans etc. make it impossible to deploy a setup like this. Another thing people tend to forget is the introduction of security risks. Methods that are offloaded to a server have to be very securely implemented to prevent side-channel attacks or illegitimate usage and need to operate very carefully (think of input sanitization, or potential data leakage in the output, proper encryption for the traffic between client and server). Most methods are not coded to overcome these hurdles, as they were originally designed to be invoked locally and only serve one purpose.

Even if it were possible to overcome all these potential issues, investing in solutions that will allow for this kind of setup is not always what the programmer and/or customer is willing to do. You might lose potential customers if they hear your program can only operate with an active internet connection. Concrete example: I commute a lot, and work while I do so, which means I don't always have a permanent internet connection. I would absolutely hate to see if my favourite IDE prohibits me from using it because of this limitation. I know a few of my friends use Adobe Photoshop and Premiere on a daily basis for which a similar argument could be made. If we allow ourselves to mobile data usage, then just try to imagine how much data these kinds of programs will require you to transmit and receive. Not great for the customer's wallet.

To touch on the security part: A programmer will have to invest time in adjusting their code to allow for secure remote execution if it wasn't setup this way from the get go. The list of reasons goes on... Which brings us to exactly the point Justin was making. If you wanted to have methods executed

remotely, the system should have been setup this way in the first place, not as a final thought.

I know you like promoting your product, even though you might do it without explicitly mentioning the name (e.g. nudging people into using an obfuscator with features that coincidentally match all the features you are providing in your own obfuscator). I don't blame you for that. We're not to downplay your service. But you gotta acknowledge that even though your product might be cool and all, it won't save the world from hunger and poverty. Not everything is an attack on you or your business.

Aristocles - May 16, 2019, 12:28 pm

Who is talking about my product ? Because I'm not, i'm explicately telling OP not to use an obfuscator.

Nowadays people sell product that need internet no matter what you say. If you want to stick to 1999 go for it, the world is moving.

Again, find me one case where remote execution is a possible solution AND where this is not the best solution.

Washi - May 16, 2019, 12:41 pm

(May 16, 2019 12:28 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Who is talking about my product ? Because I'm not, i'm explicately telling OP not to use an obfuscator.

Nowadays people sell product that need internet no matter what you say. If you want to stick to 1999 go for it, the world is moving.

Again, find me one case where remote execution is a possible solution AND where this is not the best solution.

I did ?

Quote:Even if it were possible to overcome all these potential issues, investing in solutions that will allow for this kind of setup is not always what the programmer and/or customer is willing to do. You might lose potential customers if they hear your program can only operate with an active internet connection. Concrete example: I commute a lot, and work while I do so, which means I don't always have a permanent internet connection. I would absolutely hate to see if my favourite IDE prohibits me from using it because of this limitation. I know a few of my friends use Adobe Photoshop and Premiere on a daily basis for which a similar argument could be made. If we allow ourselves to mobile data usage, then just try to imagine how much data these kinds of programs will require you to transmit and receive. Not great for the customer's wallet.

Nice of you for ignoring literally everything I said, and giving me that generous bytes donation.

0xDEAD10CC - May 16, 2019, 2:20 pm

(May 16, 2019 06:35 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) "Even if you delegated the non-scanning portion of that software to your SAAS solution, tighter corporate networks may be entirely locked down from having internet access at all, and there are still security critical situations where requirements are in place for everything to be done locally for risk mitigation reasons, even outside of the government world." what are you on, keep me some. Since I propose a SaaS solution with remote server execution, that means you can do whatever you want on the server side, analyze data, create report or something, scan a network. You will have to adapt, or send encrypted data from customers computer to remote server to then analyze it.

You think a server is going to be able to scan an isolated network that it isn't even connected to? Have you even thought about the stupidity in what you believe to be true here? ? Any workaround

for allowing this would be exposing a network to the public too, and I did mention "isolated network" so the context of what you're saying isn't really even on point with what I'm talking about here.

I know you can do all that on the server side, but it would require you to send the data to the server first if you're creating reports from data. With that said, now please re-read what I said because you obviously missed this part: "and there are still security critical situations where requirements are in place for everything to be done locally for risk mitigation reasons"

... In other words, for security reasons, sometimes the cloud is not a solution when dealing with sensitive information. Clearly you don't work in a corporate environment or you would be able to reason with these statistics instead of saying that it is the only way to go. It is not about not having the capabilities to get internet access, it is about whether it is feasible to do so, and sometimes it is not. Why do you think networks are separated into VLAN's and locked down with firewall rules? (Hint: There are other reasons, but a big one is security.) Not every part of the network needs internet access either, and allowing it so just so someone can use some features provided by an internet service is not how most corporations do things. Also, if you're hosting the service internally, then there's almost no need to worry about SAAS for a source code protection measure (although that wasn't the scenario I was describing).

Your solution may always be the best solution for HF kids, but in the real world it doesn't work the way you think it does.

JUSTIN - May 16, 2019, 6:58 pm

(May 16, 2019 06:35 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 2) optimization on obfuscation-side is nearly insignificant since the compiler already do an amazing job.

i just explained to you that the code is optimized again before being used in memory... whether or not the obfuscator itself does a good job is irrelevant, i'm just letting you know that obfuscation typically wont result in a program running slower.

however, remote code execution WILL result in a program running slower 100% of the time.

(May 16, 2019 12:28 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Again, find me one case where remote execution is a possible solution AND where this is not the best solution.you're supposed to read a post before responding to it. now a total of 3 people have explained this to you.

i'm not going to bother repeating what I've said, or what Washi said, or what 0xDEAD10cc has said.

Aristocles - May 17, 2019, 6:43 am

Welp again none of you answered my question so you are just showing off really. The thing is, when the remote execution solution is possible, it's always the best.

"Your solution may always be the best solution for HF kids, but in the real world it doesn't work the way you think it does." good, the guy asking for help nickname is Qiwi and he run <https://leetsms.pw/> do you think i'm talking to someone ELSE than HF kids ? Nop. So your show off is irrelevant, and my solution is very accurate : remote execution, or get your thing cracked.

"i'm just letting you know that obfuscation typically wont result in a program running slower."

In general, obfuscation by renaming variables, methods, and classnames to more meaningless names does not impact performance (note that it CAN). Some vendors of obfuscation software even claim that aside from obfuscation, there is also a performance gain as much as 30%. Although I have never tested these claims, have never seen them proven, and therefore find them hard to believe.

However, do keep in mind that some software also enables flow obfuscation: adding meaningless control loops to statements so the code is harder to follow. That does have a negative effect on performance, albeit small.

th3s3cr3t0n3 - May 17, 2019, 7:39 am

Not sure if anyone has dropped this yet: <https://github.com/yck1509/ConfuserEx>

ConfuserEx is a pretty good tool, I've used it and automated the obfuscation by writing a batch file that runs on a build action.

It works really well and breaks any deobfuscation tool that tries to read it when you use the correct configurations. I've never asked anyone to try and reverse engineer the resultant DLLs though.

Washi - May 17, 2019, 7:50 am

(May 17, 2019 06:43 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Welp again none of you answered my question so you are just showing off really. The thing is, when the remote execution solution is possible, it's always the best.

Are you doing this on purpose? Maybe the colours of your screen are broken because I even highlighted the relevant part in my post. Let me try again:

(May 16, 2019 12:41 PM)Washi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Even if it were possible to overcome all these potential issues, investing in solutions that will allow for this kind of setup is not always what the programmer and/or customer is willing to do. You might lose potential customers if they hear your program can only operate with an active internet connection. Concrete example: I commute a lot, and work while I do so, which means I don't always have a permanent internet connection. I would absolutely hate to see if my favourite IDE prohibits me from using it because of this limitation. I know a few of my friends use Adobe Photoshop and Premiere on a daily basis for which a similar argument could be made. If we allow ourselves to mobile data usage, then just try to imagine how much data these kinds of programs will require you to transmit and receive. Not great for the customer's wallet.

Even though it is possible for your app to have a permanent connection (in the example, the developer using the IDE on a desktop), that does not mean it will in every environment (e.g. the developer using the IDE on a laptop). I also like how you keep ignoring any of the security risks we mention. Again, not saying remote execution is bad. It is just not always the best solution.

Instead of just saying "no I am right", actually provide a counter-argument. Now you're just making a fool out of yourself.

tweety - May 17, 2019, 8:50 am

(May 17, 2019 06:43 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Welp again none of you answered my question so you are just showing off really. The thing is, when the remote execution solution is possible, it's always the best.

"Your solution may always be the best solution for HF kids, but in the real world it doesn't work the way you think it does." good, the guy asking for help nickname is Qiwi and he run <https://leetsms.pw/> do you think i'm talking to someone ELSE than HF kids ? Nop. So your show off is irrelevant, and my solution is very accurate : remote execution, or get your thing cracked.

"i'm just letting you know that obfuscation typically wont result in a program running slower."

In general, obfuscation by renaming variables, methods, and classnames to more meaningless names does not impact performance (note that it CAN). Some vendors of obfuscation software even claim that aside from obfuscation, there is also a performance gain as much as 30%. Although I

have never tested these claims, have never seen them proven, and therefore find them hard to believe.

However, do keep in mind that some software also enables flow obfuscation: adding meaningless control loops to statements so the code is harder to follow. That does have a negative effect on performance, albeit small.

calm down buddy, i think the two you're arguing with know how obfuscation works better than you, and you still didn't address/understand/acknowledge what @washi has said.

not sure why you fail to understand that remote execution isnt always the solution, even though saas is is a good way to keep your codebase safe depending on the nature of the software.

GhostCode - May 17, 2019, 11:46 am

Not to mention there are systems that are - on purpose - isolated and not permanently connected to the internet.

Yes, there are many cases where remote code execution is a good choice, but its not always the case.

0xDEAD10CC - May 17, 2019, 4:49 pm

(May 17, 2019 07:50 AM)Washi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Instead of just saying "no I am right", actually provide a counter-argument. Now you're just making a fool out of yourself.

This is all I'm observing too at this point. I emphasized my main points yet he continues to ask the same question as though he can't see what has been posted. I will let those who want to be right believe what they want, as it isn't going to change reality. If they ever open up to the real world they will see that not everything is as they see it.

JUSTIN - May 17, 2019, 7:05 pm

(May 17, 2019 06:43 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) "i'm just letting you know that obfuscation typically wont result in a program running slower."

In general, obfuscation by renaming variables, methods, and classnames to more meaningless names does not impact performance (note that it CAN). Some vendors of obfuscation software even claim that aside from obfuscation, there is also a performance gain as much as 30%. Although I have never tested these claims, have never seen them proven, and therefore find them hard to believe.

However, do keep in mind that some software also enables flow obfuscation: adding meaningless control loops to statements so the code is harder to follow. That does have a negative effect on performance, albeit small.

I am in absolute awe that you've just plagiarized a StackOverflow post, quite literally copying it word for word: <https://stackoverflow.com/a/2454559/5699643>

I've already explained why this person isn't correct twice. The only methods of obfuscation which will typically have a true impact on performance are related to virtualization, which need to interpret two sets of instructions rather than one. I don't think you understand how .NET assemblies are even compiled. I recommend reading this article, even though I know you wont, since you seem to have trouble with reading: <https://www.telerik.com/blogs/understanding-net-just-in-time-compilation>

Even disregarding the performance implications that remote code execution has on an application, there are other reasons that it's not always the best choice.

You've made is apparent that you refuse to admit that you're wrong despite being corrected by 3 people. You also copy/pasted somebody's response from StackOverflow, which is embarrassing enough as it is. This feels like a waste of time.

0xDEAD10CC - May 17, 2019, 8:56 pm

(May 17, 2019 07:05 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am in absolute awe that you've just plagiarized a StackOverflow post, quite literally copying it word for word:

<https://stackoverflow.com/a/2454559/5699643>

?

Why google any of this to write a response with unless you don't know what you're talking about? I think now it's pretty evident who is dictating web content and who is speaking from experience within this thread. Waste of time.

zrcccc - May 18, 2019, 12:15 am

(May 17, 2019 07:39 AM)th3s3cr3t0n3 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ConfuserEx is a pretty good tool, I've used it and automated the obfuscation by writing a batch file that runs on a build action.

It works really well and breaks any deobfuscation tool that tries to read it when you use the correct configurations. I've never asked anyone to try and reverse engineer the resultant DLLs though. CEX is SO old and if you don't mod it A LOT will be easily cracked.

Washi - May 18, 2019, 1:39 am

(May 17, 2019 07:05 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am in absolute awe that you've just plagiarized a StackOverflow post, quite literally copying it word for word:

<https://stackoverflow.com/a/2454559/5699643>

Lmao legendary find ?

This is a textbook case of "you done goofed".

Thanks for making my day ?

Aristocles - May 18, 2019, 10:16 am

Nothing wrong to copy an SO reply ? Again if you don't want to understand no problem, continue to show off on such forum while claiming there are only HF kids etc. Clearly OP is not coming from the professional world at all. Hence why my advice is the best. No matter what you say.

Also JUSTIN I'm the owner of an obfuscator, so I know how obfuscation and MSIL compilation works. Hence why I'm right to state (SO copied) that obfuscation will, nowadays, slow your app. "The only methods of obfuscation which will typically have a true impact on performance are related to virtualization" this is absolutely false. Head over ConfuserEx, or beds github current project and apply bunch of features on a test app, you will see no virtualization-related feature yet it will make the app slower.

0xDEAD10CC - May 18, 2019, 11:18 am

(May 18, 2019 10:16 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nothing wrong to copy an SO reply ? Again if you don't want to understand no problem, continue to show off on such forum while claiming there are only HF kids etc. Clearly OP is not coming from the professional world at all. Hence why my advice is the best. No matter what you say.

Also JUSTIN I'm the owner of an obfuscator, so I know how obfuscation and MSIL compilation works. Hence why I'm right to state (SO copied) that obfuscation will, nowadays, slow your app. "The only methods of obfuscation which will typically have a true impact on performance are related to virtualization" this is absolutely false. Head over ConfuserEx, or beds github current project and apply bunch of features on a test app, you will see no virtualization-related feature yet it will make the app slower.

You tried to credit it as your own words, so you can't say that there's nothing wrong with "copying"

an SO reply because typically people copy to make a citation, rather than to copy and paste it as the body of their own text. You even copied it from a Java thread on SO which is pretty silly, even though the reply is still relatable.

If he's not coming from the professional world, then what makes you think he'll be able to create an appropriate back-end for a full SAAS solution, regarding scalability, security, etc. There are other challenges involved in doing this properly that you haven't mentioned. If it is freeware too, then he'd also be losing money on having a hosted service provided to his users.

Without knowing what his project specific needs are, you'd be pretty naive to claim that your solution is the best with such a lack of information. He hasn't even explained what his program does.

Lastly, being the owner of an obfuscator doesn't inherently mean you know anything, it just means you have the rights to a product (that may or may not be all your work internally). Otherwise, using your logic I could say that I know everything about websites because I created one with Wix, lol.

You fail to see the perspective that other users are taking when they reply to you saying that it may not always be the best solution, in your deluded omniscience.

Aristocles - May 18, 2019, 12:00 pm

(May 18, 2019 11:18 AM)0xDEAD10CC Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You tried to credit it as your own words, so you can't say that there's nothing wrong with "copying" an SO reply because typically people copy to make a citation, rather than to copy and paste it as the body of their own text. You even copied it from a Java thread on SO which is pretty silly, even though the reply is still relatable.

If he's not coming from the professional world, then what makes you think he'll be able to create an appropriate back-end for a full SAAS solution, regarding scalability, security, etc. There are other challenges involved in doing this properly that you haven't mentioned. If it is freeware too, then he'd also be losing money on having a hosted service provided to his users.

Without knowing what his project specific needs are, you'd be pretty naive to claim that your solution is the best with such a lack of information. He hasn't even explained what his program does.

Lastly, being the owner of an obfuscator doesn't inherently mean you know anything, it just means you have the rights to a product (that may or may not be all your work internally). Otherwise, using your logic I could say that I know everything about websites because I created one with Wix, lol.

You fail to see the perspective that other users are taking when they reply to you saying that it may not always be the best solution, in your deluded omniscience. I never claimed it was my reply, I never took credit for it, I even inserted spaces and new lines you can clearly see its different but if you say that I took credit go for it.

Also whats wrong with java ? nothing, you are making useless proposition.

He's not comin from a profesionnal world that doesn't mean he can't afford already-existing SaaS solution for what he wants. Again, you are making useless proposotion.

I don't need to know what his program does to know my solution is the best when its a possible solution. That's what I originally stated, and you guys came with your fake argument etc.

Being the owner and main dev of an obfuscator for .NET Framework compiled programs doesn't mean I know anything about MSIL, obfuscation, yes you are right. Of course no you are not right, on the contrary you are again making some useless proposotion.

? bang bang got a couple bytes from my last donation next guy to reply is gonna have full load of bytes

Jacked - May 18, 2019, 12:05 pm

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) i never claimed it was my reply, I never took credit for it, I even inserted spaces and new lines you can clearly see its different but if you say that I took credit go for it.

Also whats wrong with java ? nothing, you are making useless proposition.

He's not comin from a profesionnal world that doesn't mean he can't afford already-existing SaaS solution for what he wants. Again, you are making useless proposotion.

I don't need to know what his program does to know my solution is the best when its a possible solution. That's what I originally stated, and you guys came with your fake argument etc.

Being the owner and main dev of an obfuscator for .NET Framework compiled programs doesn't mean I know anything about MSIL, obfuscation, yes you are right. Of course no you are not right, on the contrary you are again making some useless proposotion.

? bang bang got a couple bytes from my last donation next guy to reply is gonna have full load of bytes
something related or anything

0xDEAD10CC - May 18, 2019, 12:43 pm

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) i never claimed it was my reply, I never took credit for it, I even inserted spaces and new lines you can clearly see its different but if you say that I took credit go for it.

Also whats wrong with java ? nothing, you are making useless proposition.

He's not comin from a profesionnal world that doesn't mean he can't afford already-existing SaaS solution for what he wants. Again, you are making useless proposotion.

I don't need to know what his program does to know my solution is the best when its a possible solution. That's what I originally stated, and you guys came with your fake argument etc.

Being the owner and main dev of an obfuscator for .NET Framework compiled programs doesn't mean I know anything about MSIL, obfuscation, yes you are right. Of course no you are not right, on the contrary you are again making some useless proposotion.

? bang bang got a couple bytes from my last donation next guy to reply is gonna have full load of bytes

You really don't know how to form an educated comprehension of what others post do you? ?
Alright, I will paraphrase, and respond to the ridiculous accusations and conclusions in your response.

>> i never claimed it was my reply, I never took credit for it, I even inserted spaces and new lines you can clearly see its different but if you say that I took credit go for it.

I don't think anything needs to be said about how senseless this reasoning is. Spaces separate words, and newlines separate paragraphs, they have never in history, implied a difference in content source.

>> Also whats wrong with java ? nothing, you are making useless proposition.

Who said there being anything wrong with Java? My point was clearly that it isn't fundamentally related to .NET, and the fact that you had to source information from a post about Java on SO for this thread, is useless.

>> I don't need to know what his program does to know my solution is the best when its a possible solution. That's what I originally stated, and you guys came with your fake argument etc.

Back to this again... That's actually not what you originally said, and all you need to do is review the first post Washi made in response to you to see that he was the first one to point out that is isn't always a possible solution. What you said was that SAAS is the modern solution, without mentioning anything else at first. What kind of game are you trying to play here? ? Honestly, this entire thread is self-evident that you lack comprehension and humility.

The point we were trying to make is that you don't know that it is a possible solution here within the context of all the information that has been provided so far. Do you not understand the meaning of the word "may" that both Washi and myself have been throwing around in the past dozen posts? It wasn't until after this was pointed out to you that you had started to claim that this was what you meant, and again, the thread is evidence of this.

Not sure if you're trying to fool anybody but yourself here...

>> Being the owner and main dev of an obfuscator for .NET Framework compiled programs doesn't mean I know anything about MSIL, obfuscation, yes you are right.

Yes, I'm sure that makes a big difference when the majority of the product I bet is based on someone else's creation. If you knew so much, you wouldn't have had to find a post originating from a question about Java to defend your side on .NET obfuscation or protection, so it wouldn't surprise me in the least that it isn't all of your work.

/thread?

Washi - May 18, 2019, 1:25 pm

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) i never claimed it was my reply, I never took credit for it, I even inserted spaces and new lines you can clearly see its different but if you say that I took credit go for it.

Hey let me tell you about this cool feature that MyBB comes with. It's called quoting and it works like this:

Code [quote=Author]Hello I am a quote[/quote]It produces:

Author Wrote:Hello I am a quotePretty cool huh? Generally we quote or cite the people using this tag if we want to convey the same point they made, as it provides nice markup and a name of the original author. We, the readers, are kind of bad at distinguishing the normal whitespaces from your "quoting" whitespaces and guessing out of thin air who was the original author (Apart from Justin, our lord and saviour who found the SO thread).

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Also whats wrong with java ? nothing, you are making useless proposition.

Obviously the point was not about Java...

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't need to know what his program does to know my solution is the best when its a possible solution. That's what I originally stated, and you guys came with your fake argument etc.

Could you please break it down for me, why exactly my example is a fake argument? So far you still

have not given me anything on why this example is considered a fake argument, other than just "No I am right". If you missed it, scroll back a bit and look for text that is highlighted in red and type-set using very big font, should be very hard to miss ?.

(May 18, 2019 12:00 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Being the owner and main dev of an obfuscator for .NET Framework compiled programs doesn't mean I know anything about MSIL, obfuscation, yes you are right. Of course no you are not right, on the contrary you are again making some useless proposotion.

Great job on clicking the fork button of the ConfuserEx repository, and slightly changing one or two things. Did you know that the ConfuserEx unpackers out there pretty much work on all binaries that .NET Guard produces with just a few minor tweaks here and there?

JUSTIN - May 19, 2019, 3:03 am

(May 18, 2019 10:16 AM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Also JUSTIN I'm the owner of an obfuscator, so I know how obfuscation and MSIL compilation works. Hence why I'm right to state (SO copied) that obfuscation will, nowadays, slow your app. "The only methods of obfuscation which will typically have a true impact on performance are related to virtualization" this is absolutely false. Head over ConfuserEx, or beds github current project and apply bunch of features on a test app, you will see no virtualization-related feature yet it will make the app slower.

yes bro, ofc you're right! i must've been an idiot all along! can you please point me to the instruction set architecture that MSIL falls under?

you can sit here on HF and pretend you know what you're talking about, but in reality, you've made it more than obvious that you're pretty clueless.

you know how "obfuscation" and "MSIL compilation" works, and yet you don't understand how those instructions are processed in memory?

i typically don't dislike people for being wrong or not understanding something, but you refuse to accept you're wrong after being corrected by multiple people who are seemingly more knowledgeable than you. when somebody else makes a valid point that you don't know how to respond to, you claim they're "showing off" when they're simply trying to explain something to you.

somebody who refuses to learn and accept when they're wrong is not fit for any academic field, including programming.

this thread should've been over when you copy/pasted a response from a Java question thread on StackOverflow.

Aristocles - May 19, 2019, 3:35 pm

"this thread should've been over when you copy/pasted a response from a Java question thread on StackOverflow." so thats your mentality; SO was made to be able to find answers. I never claimed it was my text.

"blah blah blah just fork confuserex blah blah blah",

my answer to OP is : if its a possible solution, go for remote execution, your program will be safe. it will need you to rework some stuff here and there but its definitely worth a couple of hours of coding ! if its not, then its a whole other problem.

i see for instance a lot of combo checker, here you should move to a SaaS with online panel and different servers meant to actually do the combo check with different proxies. this way its impossible to get the checking source code and hackers need to bypass your auth on panel, but its if safe enough it should be ok.

if its a game hack, its a pitty. what you can do is either doing MITM from computer to your server to the game server, but its relatively hard (Dofus bot do that) so you can interfere with the data from both of the parties, or you will need to deploy cheat as an homebrew for console (works for console only...) binded with console key and psn/xbox account.

if its a program to send / receive SMS -i just guess following your previous threads- its totally ok to make an app to go to the customerr computer and have the sendSMS method online as a remote method, the original method I suggested is perfect and will work effortless in this case.

0xDEAD10CC - May 19, 2019, 4:11 pm

(May 19, 2019 03:35 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) "this thread should've been over when you copy/pasted a response from a Java question thread on StackOverflow." so thats your mentality; SO was made to be able to find answers. I never claimed it was my text.

It must be really convenient for your argument to imply that it needs to be said that anything which is posted and doesn't come with a reference also needs to be explicit about whether or not it is your own text. ? (Hint: that's not how copyright works, so why should it work in your case for this logic?)

You're confusing the idea of the site, with your usage of it to benefit your side of the argument here in a very illogical way.

(Btw, this is my text - I guess I'll have to explicitly say this in every one of my posts so that people don't get me confused with a random StackOverflow member that I didn't reference. ?)

edit: Why haven't you just been able to admit that your argument is wrong by now? It's blatantly obvious that this is the case. The longer you prolong it, the more foolish you're going to look. Your conclusion is essentially what we've been trying to say all along, yet you make it seem like you always implied this.

Anyways - If you're not capable of doing so, there's no longer any point in arguing about this thread lol. The point has been solidified in a collection of ranting, with tons of comedic relief.

Washi - May 19, 2019, 4:12 pm

(May 19, 2019 03:35 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) "this thread should've been over when you copy/pasted a response from a Java question thread on StackOverflow." so thats your mentality;And it seems your mentality is to ignore my very simple question about my fake argument. Did you add me to your ignore list ? ?

(May 19, 2019 03:35 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) SO was made to be able to find answers. I never claimed it was my text.

Yet you copied a piece of text with words such as "I have". Not sure but as far as I can tell the English language has only one meaning to the word "I". What did you expect us to think, that someone from stack-overflow wrote this? SO is for finding answers yes, and so is Google, MSDN, Wikipedia etc. I'm sure that you learnt in school that if you look something up, credits, a reference, or at least a clear indication that you did not come up with this. Should be obvious, no? Anyway this is not the most pressing question I have.

My most pressing question is why my argument is fake D:

(May 19, 2019 03:35 PM)Aristocles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) "blah blah blah just fork confuserex blah blah blah",

Correct me if I am wrong but I think I spotted an actual fake argument here. Although this does confirm you do read my posts! I'm not on the ignore list yet! ?

