

RE: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/securityfocus/vuln-dev/2002-09/0079.html>

From: Burton M. Strauss III (bstrauss3@attbi.com)

Date: 09/13/02

From: "Burton M. Strauss III" <bstrauss3@attbi.com>

To: <vuln-dev@securityfocus.com>

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 16:46:43 -0500

I'm not a lawyer, but the mfg would have a heck of an argument that you have exceeded the specifications for the vehicle. Remember that phrase in the owners manual telling you to observe the posted speed limit and other traffic laws???

Under the doctrine of contributory negligence, the jury would be required to apportion the blame – to all the parties that contributed to the tort.

The closing argument for the defense in the penalty phase. "Please remember that – while you the jury have found that our product possessed a manufacturing defect – only because THAT MAN (point dramatically) CHOOSE to recklessly exceed the posted speed limit by OVER 45 MILES AN HOUR, weaving in and out of traffic and endangering everyone around him... ONLY because of his own reckless acts was he so badly injured. Please, please, when you are considering the damage award, remember how HIS VERY OWN ACTIONS contributed to the accident. Thank you"

There is NO WAY that Microsoft can be responsible for somebody making changes to internals and to un-published interfaces. Not legally and not morally. If you want to run xp-antispy, then un-install it (returning the system to the manufacturer's configuration), apply the update and then re-install the OEM product. That way, if the OEM product breaks something, well, you can take it up with the proper party – the OEM. Not Microsoft.

If you want to keep the car analogy, take your vehicle into the dealer for service when you've changed out the engine control chip for a performance-mod one. "Sorry, sir, but we can't service the vehicle because you've altered the manufacturers settings."

-----Burton

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Jacobsen [<mailto:nick@ethicsdesign.com>]

Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 3:45 PM

To: Tyson Leslie; vuln-dev@securityfocus.com

RE: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

Subject: Re: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

> *I would challenge you to show me another business that is required to
> provide fixes for a product that you have stolen.*

Tyson, I don't think microsoft was just talking about the software industry.
Lets take cars for instance...

Lets say you steal a car, and that car has a manufacturing defect –
feasible so far? Ok, now, when the police are chasing you down the freeway
at 100MPH, that manufacturing defect causes something to happen, say a CV
joint to break, which causes the vehicle to start rolling – still feasible?
Now, the way our legal system works, the manufacturer could be sued
successfully, even though the car was stolen... get it, got it, good?
Anyone disagree, I would love to hear you...

Nick Jacobsen
Ethics Design
nick@ethicsdesign.com

----- Original Message -----

From: "Tyson Leslie" <Leslie.Tyson@colteng.com>
To: <vuln-dev@security-focus.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 11:49 AM
Subject: RE: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

> > *Access to upgrades and service releases is a benefit that Microsoft
> > offers to those who have acquired and use genuine Microsoft products
> > only. There are no exceptions to this.*

> >>

> >> -----

> >>

> >> *Comment: In ever other business, product fixes and recalls are not
> >> a benefit, but something that is either legally required or done to
> >> avoid legal liability.*

>

>

> *I would challenge you to show me another business that is required to
> provide fixes for a product that you have stolen. They are limiting the
> updates to legitimate licensees. If said licensee has decided to (for
> whatever reason, good or bad) modify the code and / or files so that the
> software does not 'function as designed' (Product Activation...), can you
> not expect that there is a possibility that the patch/update won't work?*

>

> TL

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Max Kennedy [<mailto:mxkennedy@fuse.net>]
> Sent: September 13, 2002 1:47 AM
> To: vuln-dev@security-focus.com
> Subject: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

>

SecurityFocus Vuln-Dev: RE: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

- >
- >
- > *If anyone has any problems installing service pack 1 for windows xp there*
- > *have been some changes to windows activation which may be incompatible*
- > *with the OS settings you've changed.*
- >
- > <http://www.microsoft.com/piracy/basics/activation/mpafaq.asp#wxpsp1>
- >
- > *I recently ran xp-antispyspy on my system. Ironically, only a day or two*
- > *before I installed the new service pack. I've already implemented most*
- > *changes made with antispyspy anyway, but I was in the mood to fiddle.*
- > *Naturally I grabbed the service pack as soon as it came out.*
- >
- > *The service pack makes changes in the product activation feature*
- > *and requires licdll.dll and possibly regwizc.dll to be running, two*
- > *features xp-antispyspy enable you to disable. Normally, my settings*
- > *haven't interfered with installing hotfixes.*
- >
- > *Attempts to install from windows update lead to four failures in*
- > *a row, all neatly logged by microsoft's install log on the site.*
- > *I have a validly licensed xp, so I wonder how that looks.*
- >
- > *There wasn't any error message saying what the reason was, and*
- > *it took a little time to figure out what service or setting I needed to*
- > *start again, although perhaps I should have picked the regwiz change*
- > *as the cause sooner. I've made a lot of changes to my system over*
- > *the last six months.*
- >
- > <http://www.microsoft.com/piracy/basics/activation/mpafaq.asp#wxpsp1>
- > *SNIP*
- > *What changes have been made to product activation in SP1? How will these*
- > *changes impact customers?*
- > *Microsoft will introduce additional technological measures in Service Pack*
- 1
- > *for Windows XP aimed at ensuring legally licensed customers receive the*
- full
- > *benefits of owning their valid license. These changes include denying*
- access
- > *to*
- > *the Windows XP SP1 updates for PCs with known pirated installations,*
- product
- > *key validation during activation, and the repair of cracks to activation.*
- > *Additional features have been added to provide a better customer*
- experience
- > *including an additional three-day grace period to re-activate after*
- > *significant*
- > *hardware changes and the ability for volume license customers to encrypt*
- > *their*
- > *volume license product key in unattended installations.*
- >
- > *Licensed customers are not impacted by any of these changes.*

SecurityFocus Vuln-Dev: RE: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation

>
> *Will these changes also occur in a service release or update for Office XP?*
> *No, these changes are specific to Windows XP.*
>
> *Does installing Windows XP Service Pack 1 affect my activation state? Will I*
> *be*
> *required to reactivate after I install SP1?*
> *No, installing Windows XP Service Pack 1 does not affect the activation*
> *state*
> *of Windows XP. If Windows XP needed to be activated before applying SP1,*
> *it*
> *will still need to be activated after applying SP1. In this situation, you*
> *will*
> *find that your activation grace period will also be extended to 30 days*
> *(60*
> *days if you install from MSDN). If Windows XP was already activated before*
> *applying SP1, it will still be activated after applying SP1.*
>
> *What happens to a customer who tries to install SP1 onto a Windows XP*
> *install*
> *made with one of these pirated keys? Are there any exceptions to this?*
> *They will be unable to install the update until they have acquired genuine*
> *software and installed that software with a valid product key. Nothing*
> *will*
> *happen to their underlying Windows XP installation. Access to upgrades and*
> *service releases is a benefit that Microsoft offers to those who have*
> *acquired*
> *and use genuine Microsoft products only. There are no exceptions to this.*
>
> -----
>
> *Comment: In every other business, product fixes and recalls are not a*
> *benefit,*
> *but something that is*
> *either legally required or done to avoid legal liability. I wonder how*
> *much*
> *bad will Microsoft*
> *generate by not taking legal responsibility for its own actions while at*
> *the*
> *same time holding*
> *everyone else responsible for the last nickel and dime?*

-
- **Previous message:** [KF: "Re: Linux Slapper Worm code"](#)
 - **In reply to:** [Nick Jacobsen: "Re: Windows XP Service Pack1 problem with activation"](#)
 - **Messages sorted by:** [\[date \]](#) [\[thread \]](#) [\[subject \]](#) [\[author \]](#) [\[attachment \]](#)