

# Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2005-12/msg00718.html>

---

- *From:* Mark South <[mark.south@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mark.south@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 09 Dec 2005 11:19:06 +0100
- 

On Thu, 08 Dec 2005 11:46:34 -0800, Daveman750 wrote:

I wrote:

>> 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.

I'm sorry, but in all that there's no answer to my question. Why should it be obvious that binary distribution is better? There are many different architectures and environments, and CPU cycles are cheap. Even my old 133MHz 585 can build Firefox while I sleep.

> 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.

Sad to say, your entire understanding of the topic seems to be based on miscomprehension of the facts leading to misinterpretation of the situation, complicated by mistaken assumptions, and unmitigated by relevant experience.

You really need to do some reading and build a package or two.

—

mark south: world citizen, net denizen  
echo znexfbhgu2000@xxxxxxxxxxxx|tr a-z n-za-m  
"Take it? I can't even parse it!" – Kibo, in ARK

---

- *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: Changing target for a symbolic link](#)
- Next by Date: [Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD](#)
- Previous by thread: [Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD](#)
- Next by thread: [Re: Linux Vs. FreeBSD](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [Date](#)
  - ◆ [Thread](#)