

## Re: Not very encouraging :(

**Source:**

[http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\\_admin/2002-11/19005.html](http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windowsxp.security_admin/2002-11/19005.html)

---

**From:** Max Burke ([mlyburke@%\\$%#@.nz](mailto:mlyburke@%$%#@.nz))

**Date:** 11/22/02

From: "Max Burke" <mlyburke@%\$%#@.nz>

Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 16:53:21 +1300

> *XP Slave scribbled:*

>> *"Max Burke" wrote in message*

> *I don't believe*

> *you've never had a problem with any Windows OS or application.*

>> *Did I say I had NEVER had any problems with any windows OS or*

>> *application? No \*I\* didn't.*

>> *Try reading \*again\* what I did say.*

> *It was implied.*

Not it wasn't; That just the 'slant' you put on it.....

>> *But I'll clarify it for you, any and all of the \*minor\* problems I*

>> *have ever had with using windows OS'es and MS applications have*

>> *nearly always been of my own making through incorrect use of said OS*

>> *and/or application; A \*very few\* have been through*

>> *incompatibilities with hardware or third party applications, and*

>> *again they only happened because I was trying to do something that*

>> *could not be done....*

> *When you actually try doing something more with your system than an*

> *initial install and then letting it sit in a corner we'll talk....*

I do a lot with that system; For example, can you run dual radio pager decoders that are feed signals from communications receivers on your system? Can you run communications receiver control programs on your system? Can you build your own serial port decoder interfaces to run on your system? That's just three of the unusual applications and hardware I run on my 486 which runs Win95.....

> *That's virtually an impossibility.*

microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\_admin: Re: Not very encouraging :(

>> *Naaaa, that's just \*your\* opinion that it's an impossibility.....*

>>> *Even Mr. Gates himself*

>>> *experiences problems due to bugs in his OS's. LOL*

>> *Because \*you\* say so????*

> *No, because it occurs when he's attempting to demo his products such  
> as when his systems crashed at the Chicago Trade show when he was  
> introducing WIN98. And, the fact that with each new revision of  
> Windows he makes the statement of how prone to crashing the previous  
> revision was.*

And that's the *\*basis\** of this fiction of yours is it?

>> *Sure users \*can\* have problems with MS OS'es and applications, but  
>> show \*any\* OS and/or computer program that cant; Then show me how  
>> PEBCAK problems are the fault of MS, it's OS'es, and/or  
>> applications..... The biggest bug that causes computer problems are  
>> ones sitting in front of the computer.....  
>> Or to put it another way (as stated so eloquently by another  
>> participant in this thread):  
>> It's awfully hard to refute fiction.....*

> *Based on your writings I'll have to admit that you're the expert on  
> fiction.*

Well gee it's you making up fictions and then trying to pass it off as  
fact that ALL windows users are subject to.....

>> *Try reading COLA (Comp.os.Linux.advocacy) for one week, then get  
>> back to me and tell me how Microsoft.public.windowsxp.general is no  
>> different....  
>> I'll expect your report on Thursday 28th November; Make it no more  
>> than 500 words, with verifiable examples from both groups showing  
>> how both are \*no different\*.....*

> *Again, there are Windows newsgroups of the same ilk. Proves nothing  
> one way or another.*

Then you wont have any trouble doing this report will you..... ;-))

>> *Because it's their \*CHOICE\* to do so. That I DONT have any problems  
>> with at all, mostly because it will make MS do the best it can for  
>> those of us that choose to use their products and services.....*

>> *No matter how you look at it MS alone provides for anyone who wants  
>> to use a computer the means and ability to do so far better that  
>> any other 'corporate entity' does. That's why the vast majority of  
>> personal computers throughout the world run MS OS'es and  
>> applications....*

Re: Not very encouraging :(

microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\_admin: Re: Not very encouraging :(

> *Again, not true at all.*

>> *Of course it is.*

> *Mac's and newer flavors of linux give users  
> access to anything they need.*

>> *Yeah RIIIGHHHTT....*

>> *I guess that's why you have to troll the WWW to find all manner of  
>> patches, drivers, updates, etc, etc, etc just to \*install a distro of  
>> Linux, let alone get it running....*

> *Yep, never have to do this with Windows products!*

To get the OS installed and running? No you dont.....

> *Thank goodness  
> they make half of your hardware obsolete with each new revision so we  
> can all by new hardware with nice bug-free drivers.*

I guess that's why \*I\* have run a 486 DX100 since 1992 with DOS/Windows  
3.1/Windows 95A on it huh.....

Ten years and look at all the upgrades I wasn't forced to install.....

Now what was it you were claiming again?

> *Yeah, Yeah, I  
> know, it's up to the manufacturers to write the drivers.*

For their own products? For sure it is.....

> *It couldn't  
> be that Microsoft is constantly changing core OS functions each time  
> rather than concentrating on just delivering a stable and secure  
> platform for a change.*

No it couldn't; what it (the above comment) is, is simply an opinion  
being passed off as fact....

>> *No version of Linux gives me access to the CDRom on my 486, and  
>> apparently never will.*

> *If you open your PC case you'll see a little white plug with red,  
> black and possibly yellow wires. That needs to be plugged into the  
> back of your cdrom drive.*

ROTFLOL.....

The CD rom and sound card it's attached to works just fine under DOS,  
windows 3.1, Windows for workgroups and windows 95; It even runs well as  
a third CD Rom on my networked XP box. Running various distros of Linux  
from a Boot floppy, and trying to get them to recognise that there is a

Re: Not very encouraging :(

microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\_admin: Re: Not very encouraging :(

working CD rom attached to the system is the problem; Even a 1995 slackware distro that claimed to have support and drivers for that particular sound card/CD Rom setup cant find the CD Rom to install from. It's not as though it's an unusual or obscure setup; Creative Sound Blaster Pro multimedia kits with a Sony CD Rom weren't (and aren't) exactly unusual let alone obscure.....

The latest IPCop distro fails to recognise the CD Rom as well; just like Knoppix failed to. Had to copy that distro to the hard drive to install it and try it out; But it didn't even recognise the audio hardware on my XP box, and it ran like a one-legged dog on my XP box as well.

>> *You can claim it's because of the business practices of MS, and got  
>> to court to get legally enforced judgements against MS just so you  
>> can compete with MS if you want, but in the end all you do is make  
>> lawyers rich, and miss the crucial fact that to compete against MS  
>> you need to be providing what your potential customers want, and  
>> are willing to pay for, NOT \$1000 per hour fees to a lawyer so  
>> they can tell some judge you dont think it's fair you cant do what  
>> MS is doing.....*

>>> *Where in the h\*ll did this court shi\* come from? I happen to  
>>> believe the market place will end up dictating to MS how they will  
>>> have to change their business model, not the other way around.  
>>  
>> Well gee you are complaining about the way MS conducts it's business  
>> in the market place aren't you?*

> *No, I'm lamenting the fact that they constantly change their products  
> and implementation philosophy every three years forcing companies to  
> upgrade and retrain.*

It's called developing, upgrading, and creating new products and services. Dont you think they should be allowed to do that?

> *And you can't fathom the fact that these  
> organizations AREN'T free to just go out and convert everything  
> overnight to another OS platform.*

Who said they do? They however do have the power and choice to decide what their upgrade path will be. That's what you have to do when running a \*succesfull business. It's NOT something MS makes them do; To claim it is, is simply more fiction on your part.

>> *# I'd be all in favour of legislation that mandates Open Standards  
>> where applicable, and requires government bodies to seriously  
>> consider Open Source alternatives. But what we're getting is  
>> attempts to \*require\* use of Open Source software – effectively  
>> criminalizing an official's decision to buy commercial software to  
>> meet their needs. First in Peru, and now here. And at LinuxWorld it  
>> is apparently being preached and accepted as part of the "party*

Re: Not very encouraging :(

microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\_admin: Re: Not very encouraging :(

>> doctrine." <http://www.oreillynet.com/cs/user/view/wlg/1840>

- > *They won't have to force it. It's already happening because*
- > *companies are fed up with the ever changing licensing schemes,*
- > *bloatware, buffer overruns, short life cycles, etc....It's great to*
- > *watch capitalism at its best.*

And MS will just disappear in a puff of smoke huh..... ;-)))

Some reading for your 'enlightenment'..... Enjoy.

# The Trusted Computing Platform Alliance, or TCPA, was formed by Compaq, HP, IBM, Intel and Microsoft. All five companies have been individually working on improving the trust available within the PC for years. These companies came to an important conclusion: the level, or "amount", of trust they were able to deliver to their customers, and upon which a great deal of the information revolution depended, needed to be increased and security solutions for PC's needed to be easy to deploy, use and manage. An open alliance was formed to work on creating a new computing platform for the next century that will provide for improved trust in the PC platform.

<http://www.trustedcomputing.org/tcpaasp4/index.asp>

TCPA usage models:

[http://www.trustedcomputing.org/docs/USAGE\\_MODELS\\_020702.pdf](http://www.trustedcomputing.org/docs/USAGE_MODELS_020702.pdf)

TCPA will undermine the General Public License (GPL), under which many free and open source software products are distributed. The GPL is designed to prevent the fruits of communal voluntary labour being hijacked by private companies for profit. Anyone can use and modify software distributed under this licence, but if you distribute a modified copy, you must make it available to the world, together with the source code so that other people can make subsequent modifications of their own.

At least two companies have started work on a TCPA-enhanced version of GNU/Linux. This will involve tidying up the code and removing a number of features. To get a certificate from the TCPA consortium, the sponsor will then have to submit the pruned code to an evaluation lab, together with a mass of documentation showing why various known attacks on the code don't work. (The evaluation is at level E3 – expensive enough to keep out the free software community, yet lax enough for most commercial software vendors to have a chance to get their lousy code through.)

Although the modified program will be covered by the GPL, and the source code will be free to everyone, it will not make full use of the TCPA features unless you have a certificate for it that is specific to the Fritz chip on your own machine. That is what will cost you money (if not at first, then eventually).

You will still be free to make modifications to the modified code, but you won't be able to get a certificate that gets you into the TCPA system. Something similar happens with the linux supplied by Sony for the Playstation 2; the console's copy protection mechanisms prevent you

Re: Not very encouraging :(

microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\_admin: Re: Not very encouraging :(

from running an altered binary, and from using a number of the hardware features. Even if a philanthropist does a not-for-profit secure GNU/Linux, the resulting product would not really be a GPL version of a TCPA operating system, but a proprietary operating system that the philanthropist could give away free. (There is still the question of who would pay for the user certificates.)

People believed that the GPL made it impossible for a company to come along and steal code that was the result of community effort. This helped make people willing to give up their spare time to write free software for the communal benefit. But TCPA changes that. Once the majority of PCs on the market are TCPA-enabled, the GPL won't work as intended. The benefit for Microsoft is not that this will destroy free software directly. The point is this: once people realise that even GPL'ed software can be hijacked for commercial purposes, idealistic young programmers will be much less motivated to write free software.

<http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/tcpa-faq.html>

What will the OSS/\*nix community do when TCPA becomes part of the OSS/\*nix products and services of all the above companies?  
Find some other OS to use?

--

mlvburke@#%\*.net.nz

Replace the obvious with paradise to email me.

See Found Images at:

<http://homepages.paradise.net.nz/~mlvburke>

Re: Not very encouraging :(