

DEBUNKING APPLE'S FALSE SECURITY CLAIMS

Competition and Choice Would Make Apple Devices More Secure

Apple is fighting hard against lawsuits, regulations, and legislation around the world that would give consumers more choice in the digital marketplace. The company argues that it needs total control over what apps iPhone and iPad users download on their devices in order to protect them from malware, viruses, and scams. But Apple's arguments are nothing more than scare tactics designed to protect their monopoly (and 30% commission for all digital goods and services) at the expense of developers and consumers. Let's break it down with a reality check:



Security is Provided by the Device, Not the App Store

- iOS device security comes from [numerous built-in hardware security measures](#) (encryption of data, firewall, antivirus) and a 'sandbox' model that limits apps' access to the phone's resources. App Store review provides marginal – if any – additional security protections.
- Apple's own Mac desktop and laptop computers allow consumers to download and install software outside of the App Store. Consumers deserve the same freedom and choice from the "computers in their pockets" as they already have with the computers on their desks and in their backpacks.



Apple's Claims of Perfect App Store Security Give Users a False Sense of Security

- Apple's boasts about its App Store review measures can encourage users to let their guards down.
- However, the CEO of Headspace has complained of "repeated, egregious theft of our IP in the Apple App Store," and that "[s]hockingly, Apple [is] approving these apps, and when the users buy the apps they are left with nothing but some scammy chat rooms in the background." And this is just one example of many.
- Scammers [regularly bypass Apple's App Store review](#) by submitting a non-harmful app, and then transforming it after it is approved.
- One Apple engineer compared Apple's App Store security reviews to bringing a "butter knife to a gunfight," and it's estimated app reviewers would spend an average of [15 minutes reviewing an app](#) – if they don't take any breaks.
- A Sensor Tower study found [134 scam apps](#) on the App Store, with an estimated \$365 million in revenue for Apple.



Lack of Competition Hurts Security and Consumer Choice

- Consumers purchase and own their devices – they should have the right to use them as they see fit.
- Experts agree that Apple’s App Store policies **actually hurt user security**:
 - One app store means one target for scammers, rather than having to bypass security rules and reviews through multiple stores or by allowing customers to download software directly from a trusted developer. Developers are motivated to provide a secure experience for users – if their customers lose trust in their app to provide a safe and secure product, they will simply go to a competitor.
 - While no software can ever be 100% bug-free, security experts claim “**Apple’s self-assured hubris is just unparalleled.**”
 - **Apple feels no competitive pressure to improve security – because there is no alternative.**
- Allowing alternative app stores on iOS devices, or offering the same access on iPhones as Apple already does on Macs, would give users more choice and force Apple to compete to provide the best service and security.
 - With the introduction of competition, the Apple App Store will continue to exist and consumers can choose to continue to use it if they feel it provides the best experience.
 - Offering the same access for developers and applications or allowing alternatives would enable competition in the app store ecosystem, incentivize further enhanced security in the space and deliver higher quality and lower prices for consumers.
 - Yet Apple continues to seek to retain complete control of the app economy in order to maximize its own profits at the expense of developers and consumers alike.

Conclusion:

Apple’s false claims should be seen for what they are: a pretext for its anti-competitive practices that have burdened developers and consumers with higher fees, less opportunity, and fewer innovations.