

Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2005-12/msg00658.html>

- *From:* George Ellison <notamisfit@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 08 Dec 2005 15:22:14 -0500
-

"Daveman750" <dsimcha@xxxxxxxxx> writes:

>> BSD and Linux are each highly compatible within their flavours, and
>> between each other to a surprising degree. Binary compatibility is only
>> important if you think that distribution of binaries is the correct way to
>> move software around. Why is that so obviously the case to you?
>> --
>
> Simple: Being able to see the source code is only an important
> personal, as opposed to collective, freedom, for the small minority of
> people who are actually programmers. On the other hand, compiling
> source code is annoyingly slow and relatively difficult when it comes
> to things such as build environments. It's nice to know that with free
> software, anyone can see the source code and is free to hack it, but
> given that I only have minimal programming skills, it really is of no
> use for me *personally* to be able to see the source code, along with
> about 99% of other users. For us, binaries are just plain easier.
>
> Elaborating on the whole binary compatibility thing, if you try to
> install something intended for one distro on another, different GCC
> versions, library versions, etc. make it virtually impossible, as I
> understand it. Debian vs. Fedora is actually a bad example, because
> they use different package managers. A better example would be Fedora
> vs. Suse. You usually can't install a Fedora package on Suse or vice
> versa. Correct me if I'm wrong on this one, but I can't imagine why
> else they would package things separately for each of these distros.
> This is an extreme pain in the you-know-what for users who don't want
> to compile source themselves and are using anything but the most
> popular, well-known distros.

This is an RPM problem, not a binary problem, and it is a well-known and much-ridiculed one. If you were to use, say, `rpm2tgz` (or whatever it's called), and turn those packages into a tarball and extract them, if you met the required dependencies (actually met them, not met whatever your distro chooses to call them), you can run that program. Most programs worth using usually make a few binary forms available, and a plain tarball is usually one of them. Don't go blaming Red Hat's idiocy, and the idiocy of those who follow them, on a binary incompatibility problem that by and large does not exist.

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Daveman750

- *References:*

- ◆ **Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Daveman750
- ◆ **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Ed Heagle
- ◆ **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Daveman750
- ◆ **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Mark South
- ◆ **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
◇ From: Daveman750

- Prev by Date: **Re: command line vs gui**
- Next by Date: **Re: fastest way to print a lot of pdf files?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
- Next by thread: **Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**