

Re: OT: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Fedora/2006-02/msg01824.html>

- *From:* Jeff Vian <jvian10@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 14 Feb 2006 09:08:15 -0600
-

On Tue, 2006-02-14 at 12:58 +0000, Nigel Wade wrote:

Mike McCarty wrote:

Tim wrote:

Jeff Vian

It is a Microsoft problem as we see stated in the article, "Linux evangelist John H. Terpstra told me: "Microsoft has used its market dominance to coerce OEMs (original equipment manufacturers) and resellers not to sell competing products and services."

Mike McCarty:

co.erce – v co.erced, co.erc.ing v.t. 1 To constrain by force, law, authority, or fear; compel 2 To bring into subjection or under control by superior force; repress 3 To bring about by coercion: to /coerce/ obedience – v.i. 4 To use coercive measures, as in government. See synonyms

Re: OT: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

under COMPEL.

Please state what, exactly, is this "coerce"
that MicroSoft has
done.

Isn't that the cases where Microsoft has done things like:

If you want the information you need to make your device
Windows
compliant/compatible, you have to agree to our terms. The
same tricks
they'd did with ISPs about if you want "help" in some way,
you have to
agree not to support non-Microsoft products.

If you want the right to say Windows compatible (or the
rights to use
similar logo stamps of aproval on the box, etc.), the same
sort of
thing.

Please point out where the coercion is. I still don't see any.
More specifically, where are the "force, law, authority, or
fear"?

Oh, so MicroSoft has done such a good job
of porting its software
to many different hardware platforms, that it
is difficult for
others to do as well? MicroSoft has risked so
much capital
in purchasing the documentation on how to
use some proprietary
hardware that others who are unwilling to do
so have a problem
competing?

Have they really? What other than bog-standard PCs do you
see Microsoft
Windows running on? And with the huge profits they have,
and the almost

Re: OT: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

I thought I regularly see lists of hardware which "Linux supporters" should avoid, because the h/w i/f is proprietary, and so the driver writers for Linux can't/wont get the info necessary to support the new video chips etc. because they can't/wont afford the price it takes to buy the docs.

It's not because they won't/can't afford the price for the docs. It's because the docs. simply are not available. The manufacturer supports Windows and provides device drivers, and updates, for Windows. They built the hardware so they know how to do this. If they won't provide drivers and updates for Linux there is no way to support the device on Linux. The manufacturer will not provide the specs. for their hardware which are necessary for anyone else to write a driver. They normally cite either licensing restrictions (if they have licensed from 3rd parties) or competition – they don't want their competitors to get hold of the specs. for their hardware.

And also because of the threat of refusal to certify the drivers and/or not provide the "designed for ..." decals if the manufacturer tries to do anything that M\$ dislikes (like provide drivers for a competing OS)

Yet Win.. runs on everything I've seen.

Because the manufacturers support Windows. Who do you think provides the drivers?

To put it another way, what PCs do you NOT see Win.. running on?
I don't see mail echoes where a FAQ is "Does Win.. support this or that laptop or whatever" whereas I *do* see this for Linux.

You would if the manufacturer didn't provide the drivers.

And the manufacturer could not provide the drivers if Microsoft did not provide needed information to them (under Microsoft's terms).

complete monopoly they have of the market, how much of a "risk" are they really taking to expand their market even further?

Re: OT: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

They *purchase* information.

Who does? The manufacturers have the information, they don't need to purchase it. They won't sell it to anyone else.

Not true. The manufacturers know what their hardware does, but they have to purchase (in one way or another) the information needed to make the driver "fit" the OS. Their driver has to be compatible with Windows and if they want the "Compatible with Windows" decal then they have to play by the rules that Microsoft creates for their own game. AIUI this even involves paying Microsoft to certify their drivers as compatible.

Why doesn't the "Open Software Community" make the same purchase?

Because you can't buy something which isn't for sale.

—
Nigel Wade, System Administrator, Space Plasma Physics Group,
University of Leicester, Leicester, LE1 7RH, UK
E-mail : nmw@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Phone : +44 (0)116 2523548, Fax : +44 (0)116 2523555

—
fedora-list mailing list
fedora-list@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
To unsubscribe: <https://www.redhat.com/mailman/listinfo/fedora-list>