

# Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-08/msg06775.html>

---

- *From:* "Alias" <[aka@\[notme\]maskedandanonymous.org](mailto:aka@[notme]maskedandanonymous.org)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 11 Aug 2005 18:45:17 +0200
- 

I downloaded them all except, of course, the malware removal tool and my three machines run like silk so I guess what you say false.

Alias

"MAP" <mikepawlak2REM@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote

- > As with many so called "critical patches" does the average "home user" need
- > them?
- > Before installing these updates it is best to read just what they do,take
- > the
- > PNP patch that you mention, The person exploiting this MUST have their
- > hands
- > on your keyboard! (or "Admin rights" how would they get this if you
- > secured
- > your system?).
- > A couple of years ago hotfix Q811493 (the first release) had this same
- > mitigating factor many installed it because of the "critical update"
- > header,and their system slowed down to a crawl,did they need it NO!
- > It takes longer to install these hotfixes reading each one but on the
- > otherhand it may keep your computer up and running by not installing some
- > that you really don't need which may screw your system up! I have read
- > posts
- > already on this months patch tuesday of problems with computers not
- > booting
- > after installing these updates.
- >
- >
- > Mitigating Factors for Plug and Play Vulnerability – CAN-2005-1983:
- >
- > . On Windows XP Service Pack 2 and Windows Server 2003 an attacker must
- > have
- > valid logon credentials and be able to log on locally to exploit this
- > vulnerability. The vulnerability could not be exploited remotely by
- > anonymous users or by users who have standard user accounts. However, the
- > affected component is available remotely to users who have administrative
- > permissions.
- >

Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches

> Just my 2 cents worth  
> Mike Pawlak  
>  
>  
>  
> Borgholio wrote:  
>> Now before I continue, I just want to let everybody know that I'm NOT  
>> trying to troll here. I'm not a Microsoft-hater, but there are just  
>> some things that are inexcusable and that I MUST rant about. It's  
>> nothing new actually...about a dozen security patches to install.  
>> Happens all the time. Today, however, something just stuck in my  
>> craw. Here are the  
>> descriptions of two patches waiting to be installed:  
>>  
>>  
>> Size: 483 KB – 566 KB  
>>  
>> A security issue has been identified in the Plug and Play service  
>> that could allow an attacker to compromise your Microsoft  
>> Windows-based system and gain control over it. You can help protect  
>> your computer by installing this update from Microsoft. After you  
>> install this item, you may have to restart your computer.  
>>  
>> More information for this update can be found at  
>> <http://go.microsoft.com/fwlink/?LinkId=48900>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Size: 494 KB – 550 KB  
>>  
>> A security issue has been identified in the Print Spooler service  
>> that could allow an attacker to compromise your Microsoft  
>> Windows-based system and gain control over it. You can help protect  
>> your computer by installing this update from Microsoft. After you  
>> install this item, you may have to restart your computer.  
>>  
>> More information for this update can be found at  
>> <http://go.microsoft.com/fwlink/?LinkId=48902>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Plug and Play? PRINT SPOOLER???? Is there ANYTHING that doesn't  
>> have a security hole in it??? What's next, a security hole in the  
>> mouse driver? I mean I understand if there's a hidden security hole  
>> in the TCP / IP stack that nobody noticed, but the Print Spooler?  
>> Plug and Play? For crying out loud...EVERY SINGLE security patch I  
>> downloaded today is to prevent "an attacker to gain control over your  
>> system". From my personal experience, it seems as if Microsoft

Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches

## Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches

>> designed Windows XP to be more accessible to the outside world than  
>> to the actual user! What's their excuse for allowing so darn many  
>> lapses in security to pass through QA?  
>>  
>> In a nutshell, Microsoft's security sucks eggs. Why? Do they just  
>> not care (as they pretty much bend people over a barrel when it comes  
>> to buying an operating system)? Or are they just incompetent when it  
>> comes to security?  
>  
>  
>

---

### • *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches*  
    ◇ *From: MAP*
- ◆ *Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches*  
    ◇ *From: MAP*

### • *References:*

- ◆ *Yet more Windows XP security patches*  
    ◇ *From: Borgholio*
- ◆ *Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches*  
    ◇ *From: MAP*

- Prev by Date: *Re: System shut down after update..*
- Next by Date: *Re: Home Vs. Pro*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches*
- Next by thread: *Re: Yet more Windows XP security patches*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*