

## Re: UPDATE ON "WARNING ON RED HAT"

**Source:** <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/alt.os.linux.redhat/2004-04/0199.html>

---

**From:** Gonzalo (nomail\_at\_nomail.com)

**Date:** 04/11/04

Date: Sun, 11 Apr 2004 17:19:47 -0400

straydog wrote:

> *chris@nospam.com* wrote:

>>

>> *On 10 Apr 2004 18:16:18 -0700, straydog@sdf.lonestar.org (mystery man)*

>> *wrote:*

>>

>> *>A few weeks ago I reported that RH Enterprise Linux (ver 3.0) could  
>> >not find my CDROM drives on several of boxes and thus my attempt to  
>> >install this OS (& aps) ended in serious disappointment (bear in mind  
>> >I had great success with RH 5.2 and 6.2 on at least a dozen other  
>> >boxes).*

>> >

>> *>I tried to see if RH EL would recognize any more CDROM drives I had  
>> >(most are vintage mid 1990s, which may have been the problem), but  
>> >finally I aquired a used box (400 mhz, 64 mb of ram) today and  
>> >lo-and-behold the software could find the CDROM drive and the  
>> >installation proceeded without problems AND it even booted up and just  
>> >barely got the graphical desktop up and running. Almost everythign  
>> >else I tried to load caused, from the sound of the HD, the swap file  
>> >to work. Ergo, since the install was successful, I have some  
>> >motivation to go out and get more memory for the box so I can speed it  
>> >up. So far, I tried the RH EL disks on about five other boxes with  
>> >CDROM drives that the software could not find.*

>> >

>> *>The main points of this story: i) the drivers that RH provides  
>> >definitely don't work on at least some CDROM drives (these are in  
>> >boxes that have or have had prior Linux versions, OS/2 versions, Win  
>> >NT versions, and DOS/Win3.1 with CDROM access, so its not faulty  
>> >hardware). ii) you can have faulty hardware show up with some OSes and  
>> >not others.*

>> >

>> *>Thanks to a few guys who responded to my post, but I'm sorry if some  
>> >guys say "Gee, I didn't have any problems, therefore your problems are  
>> >in your head" or something like that. Same rationalization as "I don't  
>> >have cancer, therefore cancer does not exist."*

>> >

>> *>I've been working with linux (and reading those 800-1000 page books on*

>> >linux) since 1999. Yes, I'm happy that I finally got RH EL installed  
>> >and that it is working.  
>> >  
>> >Art S.  
>>  
>> >Ok, how about – "Gee I haven't had problems installing RH on hardware  
>> >that's listed in their Hardware Compatibility List."  
>  
> >OK, how about I'm Bill Gates, Michael Dell, or the DoD and have the time  
> >and resources to look up that list (its pretty long and incomplete), then  
> >go hunting around and buy all the components new (or spend hours tearing  
> >up my box and maybe find that none of the numbers on any of the boards or  
> >devices match anything on the list [because the assemblers just get  
> >'generic' components that are unlabeled and thats the way a lot of them  
> >are]) . OK, how about you read what I wrote above again. Understand--  
> >I'll re-explain it again to you--that since I had ZERO (that means  
> >'none') problems with RH 6.2 and 5.2 installs on over a dozen boxes with  
> >a wide variety of components), I wanted to find out if RH EL had any  
> >backwards compatibility with vintage '95-'99 CDRom drives. At least one  
> >guy who posted to my prior post said his drive was late '90s so at least  
> >there are some out there that might be OK. So, after trying a total of  
> >five boxes on my desk that have RH 6.2 loaded (and working fine), I can  
> >say RH EL 3.0 didn't find any of the CDRom drives that both 6.2 and 5.2  
> >could find. 5.2 is vintage '95-99, and 6.2 is vintage 2000 (its in the  
> >manuals I have [and I read them, cover to cover]).  
>  
> >I made this post as a FAVOR to people who might be wondering. Fine if  
> >their boxes install RH EL without problems. They are lucky.  
>  
> >And, for the record, if you want to go back to the newsgroups in 1999 and  
> >2000 you will find a LOT (i.e. many) people who were having a lot of  
> >trouble getting Linux installed and running. And, I'm NOT saying this to  
> >be anti-linux. Linux is GOOD. Microsoft is BAD.  
>  
> >Are the CD-Rom  
>> >drives in question IDE drives?  
>  
> >All but one. And, the one that is NOT, has an interface card AND it  
> >installs either 5.2 or 6.2 just fine. When I got 6.2, I did a fresh  
> >install over the 5.2 that was on that box. I've even had 5.2 running on a  
> >486 box with 8 mb of ram. Command line bootup was fine, GUI was glacial.  
> >But it worked.  
>  
>> >If not, that's probably your problem.  
>  
> >The problem (not MY problem) is that RH does not put out drivers for  
> >certain CDRoms any more. ALL of mine are non R-RW, i.e. old. Maybe that  
> >is the problem (but another guy said he had an old CDRom and it worked).  
> >Well, now, a used computer I picked up yesterday for \$50 installed RH EL  
> >just fine. So, at least when the CDRom drivers are there, and there is no  
> >hardware compatibility problem, and there are no defects in the CDRom

alt.os.linux.redhat: Re: UPDATE ON "WARNING ON RED HAT"

> disk (I've had these, too), then you might get an installation.  
>  
> Back in 1999 when I was just getting into this stuff, I was amazed that I  
> was in the sub-population of installers that had zero problems and lots  
> of other guys were in the sub-population of installers that had lots of  
> problems.  
>  
> And, the disclaimers on the box are poor. And, the instruction manual has  
> a lot of errors in it as well as poor explanations. I say this after  
> having read many 800-1000 page books on Linux.  
>  
> Yes, I 'play' with my computers as well as use them to do gainful  
> employment. Now, what is YOUR history of experience?  
>  
> Art S>  
>  
>> -Chris

Well, you could always copy the CDs to the one computer that you say you got going and do a network installation. You don't need CDs for those.