

Re: Standard way of graphics in Linux

Re: Standard way of graphics in Linux

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.development.apps/2006-09/msg00176.html>

- *From:* Jan Panteltje <pNaonStpealmtje@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Sep 2006 16:29:31 GMT
-

On a sunny day (Wed, 13 Sep 2006 16:52:23 +0200) it happened Herbert Kleebauer <klee@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in <45081B27.451A162C@xxxxxxxxxx>:

Wolfgang Draxinger wrote:

Herbert Kleebauer wrote:

No, I don't consider high level toolkits. I want to play around at the lowest level using assembly code.

Ok, have to accept that all the things are much more complicated in Linux than in Windows. Either I have to spend a huge amount of time reading documentation or stop my trip to Linux.

No they are actually simpler, as you have the source and can SEE what happens.

The lowest level you can use, is the one, the kernel gives you. That are the syscalls.

Would like to use an int 80 function, but found nothing which opens a window and does a bitblt to it. Didn't even find something for keyboard input.

If you want MS DOS, install it.

Linux is a multitasking operating systems, which means, you can't just manipulate each and every pice of the hardware like you want.

Re: Standard way of graphics in Linux

Windows is also a multitasking operating systems and has no problem to provide a built-in graphics interface.

It is as far as I know not so simple, or rather moronic.

Sorry, it's just not possible. The kernel is responsible for the low level stuff, you're doing high level.

Exactly that's the problem, the kernel is responsible for the low level stuff but doesn't provide any support for graphics output (as far as I understand it).

Thank God for that.

This is done by add-ons, but the problem is, there seems to be no (or better many) standard for this add-on.

Well X is the standard, if you do not like X you can use svgalib. I have written several programs that use *xlib*, they are fast, small, portable to all Linuxes. But it is much EASIER to use something like xforms. Qt-4 is a big monster that takes 3 hours to compile..... I never programmed for Gtk and related... no need.

I don't think Linux will be able to compete with Windows on the end user desktop market as long as there is no reference system for a Linux desktop system specified.

What a lot of bull, are you one of the MS payed trolls? You should be happy with X and all its graphical tools, KDE if you are a C++ addict, Gtk, many more, stop blabbering nonsense. It is exactly that versatility that Billy The Dark Emperor always tried to prevent because of fear of losing market share, that makes Linux suitable for many more applications than 'just a desktop'. Why do you not install opensuse (www.opensuse.org) for example, now Billies ex club can learn a lot from that.

Re: Standard way of graphics in Linux

And a program (graphic + sound) designed for such a reference system must be executable on any current and future x86 Linux system which calls itself a "Linux Desktop System" without recompilation (I still can execute 20 years old DOS binaries in XP).

Bullshit, running vrs slingshot on even win 98 fails, there are many more. The occasional non demanding stuff may sometimes work, but y'r old games wont.

My current feeling is, Linux is a nice server system (I have a Linux 1.1.18 continuous running since 12 years now on a 486DX2 as an FTP server without any problem) but as a desktop system it can't compete with Windows.

What windows? There is MS windows (bad bad bad) and X windows (good good good). Not a difficult choice.

Seems you are 12 years behind!

.