

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Fedora/2006-02/msg01978.html>

- *From:* Mike McCarty <mike.mccarty@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 14 Feb 2006 23:57:38 -0600
-

Les Mikesell wrote:

On Tue, 2006-02-14 at 22:17, Mike McCarty wrote:

Its a 2.4GHz
Athlon box.

Something
wrong with
your 58
second
machine
there Mike
:-(

take his commentary with a
grain of salt and recognize
that he is using
FC-2 which I am sure few
will argue was better
abandoned for FC-3

Are you suggesting that FC4 would load it
any faster?

Probably but I think you have a specific problem on that
machine.

I suspect the specific problem I have is lack of RAM.

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

Or too many programs loaded. Adding RAM is easier than sorting out what you don't really need to run, though.

I've got a dual pII-450 running FC1 that starts OO in about 10 seconds. The first instance of Firefox with google as the home page takes about 5 seconds, another window about 2. Does `hdparm -T -t` show somewhere near 30MB/sec for buffered reads?

```
# hdparm -T -t /dev/hda
```

```
/dev/hda:
```

```
Timing buffer-cache reads: 1096 MB in 2.00 seconds = 547.54 MB/sec
```

```
Timing buffered disk reads: 66 MB in 3.02 seconds = 21.86 MB/sec
```

Is that close enough to 30MB/s?

It's less than my ancient PII-450 gets with an almost-as-old 66 mHZ IDE card. A 2.4 gHZ P4 that should be closer to your specs gets 60MB/s. Do you see something like:
hda: 234441648 sectors (120034 MB) w/8192KiB Cache, CHS=16383/255/63, UDMA(100)
if you look at 'dmesg | less'? (The UDMA and speed being the relevant part).

Well, I unloaded everything from memory and did a test.

Nothing running except one "terminal" window, memory usage order.

```
top - 23:42:46 up 7 days, 5:42, 2 users, load average: 0.21, 0.44, 0.34
Tasks: 73 total, 1 running, 72 sleeping, 0 stopped, 0 zombie
Cpu(s): 1.7% us, 0.3% sy, 0.0% ni, 98.0% id, 0.0% wa, 0.0% hi, 0.0% si
Mem: 248088k total, 176968k used, 71120k free, 9752k buffers
Swap: 524120k total, 116036k used, 408084k free, 66088k cached
```

```
PID USER PR NI VIRT RES SHR S %CPU %MEM TIME+ COMMAND
```

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

```
4159 root 15 0 176m 24m 3512 S 1.3 10.3 965:11.32 X
4536 jmccarty 15 0 34008 11m 4388 S 0.3 4.7 4:26.04 gnome-terminal
4466 jmccarty 15 0 97840 7856 3600 S 0.0 3.2 1:23.81 nautilus
4474 jmccarty 25 10 33040 5968 2348 S 0.0 2.4 2:28.74 rhn-applet-gui
4514 jmccarty 15 0 21776 4704 3132 S 0.0 1.9 3:49.59 wnck-applet
4407 jmccarty 15 0 14640 4356 3336 S 0.0 1.8 7:55.35 metacity
```

Loading OO took 24 seconds. So simply low RAM is not the complete answer. Exiting OO and then restarting it took about 8 seconds, which corresponds to what others have reported. So it looks like perhaps a disc bandwidth problem. But I don't know what the cause would be. At 20 MB/s and achieving, say 20% actual throughput, 22.3% of 256MB is 57MB, which would take at 4 MB/s 14 secs. Hmm, actually not far off (<2x). I really did do that computation based on my experience with the disc throughput achieved on other systems I've used. Hmm. But flushing to virtual should only really double the time, and 2x14 is not *very* close to 58.

OO loaded, again memory usage order.

```
top - 23:45:03 up 7 days, 5:44, 2 users, load average: 0.35, 0.41, 0.34
Tasks: 74 total, 1 running, 73 sleeping, 0 stopped, 0 zombie
Cpu(s): 1.0% us, 0.7% sy, 0.0% ni, 98.0% id, 0.0% wa, 0.3% hi, 0.0% si
Mem: 248088k total, 241832k used, 6256k free, 11456k buffers
Swap: 524120k total, 115968k used, 408152k free, 110196k cached
```

```
PID USER PR NI VIRT RES SHR S %CPU %MEM TIME+ COMMAND
3214 jmccarty 15 0 181m 54m 36m S 0.0 22.3 0:07.31 soffice.bin
4159 root 15 0 177m 25m 3640 S 1.0 10.5 965:14.26 X
4536 jmccarty 15 0 34008 11m 4448 S 0.3 4.7 4:26.97 gnome-terminal
4466 jmccarty 16 0 97840 7884 3600 S 0.0 3.2 1:23.90 nautilus
4474 jmccarty 25 10 33040 5988 2348 S 0.0 2.4 2:28.78 rhn-applet-gui
4514 jmccarty 16 0 21776 4712 3136 S 0.0 1.9 3:49.83 wnck-applet
```

Mike

--

```
p="p=%c%s%c;main(){printf(p,34,p,34);}";main(){printf(p,34,p,34);}
```

This message made from 100% recycled bits.

You have found the bank of Larn.

I can explain it for you, but I can't understand it for you.

I speak only for myself, and I am unanimous in that!

--

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

Re: Two ways Microsoft sabotages Linux desktop adoption

fedora-list mailing list

fedora-list@xxxxxxxxxx

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