

Re: To the OP: Wintroll FUD about alleged insecurity refuted (was: Re: Linux why?)

## Re: To the OP: Wintroll FUD about alleged insecurity refuted (was: Re: Linux why?)

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2006-12/msg00727.html>

---

- *From:* William Poaster <[wp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:wp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 08 Dec 2006 16:57:33 +0000
- 

On Fri, 08 Dec 2006 16:54:18 +0000, Aragorn wrote:

On Friday 08 December 2006 17:27, Tony Lawrence stood up and addressed the masses in /comp.os.linux.misc/ as follows...:

On Dec 8, 10:37 am, Aragorn <[stry...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:stry...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Friday 08 December 2006 16:02, Tony Lawrence stood up and addressed the masses in /comp.os.linux.misc/ as follows...:

Aragorn wrote:

Enter Windows NT. A microkernel which was largely stolen from VMS, onto which a 32-bit Windows kernel was bolted. Security was also bolted on via the NTFS filesystem and ACL's. But this security was \*clearly\* only bolted on, because Windows could still be installed on a FAT32 partition, which doesn't support ACL's.

I so wish I could find this, but I think it's been expunged from the

Re: To the OP: Wintroll FUD about alleged insecurity refuted (was: Re: Linux why?)

Net: at one time Bill Gates said something like "Windows NT is effectively Unix" – he was referring to the Mach kernel parts of course..Actually, what he said was that "Windows NT is a better UNIX than UNIX". ;-)

My memory was a little different – but in any case, do you have a link to the source of that? I've been trying to find it for years..

Unfortunately that information seems to have vanished together with Bill Gates's "640 KB ought to be enough for everybody"... :-/

But Windows NT isn't UNIX at all. In fact, all NT versions have a compound kernel, comprising of the NT kernel itself and a Win32 kernel – now a Win64 kernel for /x86-64/ of course.

Yes, of course. At the time though, Microsoft at least had some grudging respect for the value and power of Unix (heck they even sold Microsoft Xenix way back when).

Yes, that is why Bill Gates said it. Back then, they were looking to compete with proprietary UNIX in the server and workstation market. Just look at the hardware platforms that were (initially) supported by NT. All of those systems natively ran a UNIX operating system: SGI's MIPS, Sun's SPARC, IBM's PPC and DEC's Alpha.

Up until NT 4.0, NT even had a 16-bit compatibility ABI for POSIX and OS/2. This was later on revisited with the SFU (Services For UNIX) add-on.

I think that's WHY he said that, but I don't think it went over well with Marketing. I'd love to find the source and refresh my memory of context..

Microsoft has been very thorough in censoring the web... :-/

The NT kernel was written by Dave Cutler of DEC – Digital Equipment Corporation, usually just referred to as "Digital", but not to be

Re: To the OP: Wintroll FUD about alleged insecurity refuted (was: Re: Linux why?)

confused with Digital Research, who developed CP/M and  
who have later  
on released the successful DR DOS versions.

And Helen Custer wrote a book about it – I have that kicking around here  
somewhere..

Interesting... I didn't know about that...

But even next to VMS, NT doesn't compare. Because – as  
you say – they  
added on a bunch of crap. And this crap was called  
Windows... ;-)

Well, yes. But Vista once again was a "total rewrite" – and once again  
they poured the old crap back in (  
[http://aplawrence.com/Security/windows\\_vista\\_hooks.html](http://aplawrence.com/Security/windows_vista_hooks.html) cited  
previously)

The "total rewrite" of Vista was not a total rewrite at all. It was an  
incisive revision in which they had to redefine the code dependencies as  
the whole thing had become "a code spaghetti", as one of their senior  
developers called it.

There is however a rumor that they're already working on something  
completely different. I'm not sure they still are, but either way, they  
were already working on this long before Longhorn got renamed to Vista.

Microsoft called it "Singularity", and it was an entirely new operating  
system written from scratch, but not for commercial purposes. The idea  
was – or so Bill Gates said – to develop the OS for internal study  
purposes only.

I have no idea what this new OS would look like, but I presume that given  
the nature and possibilities of modern hardware, it would be focused on  
virtualization and computing-intensive stuff like clustering. Steve  
Ballmer already uttered that Microsoft would start competing with current  
clustering operating systems – of which GNU/Linux is one, of course ;-)  
– early last year, if my memory serves me right.

However – and this is the rumor part – a computer magazine over here  
reported on the successor to Vista, which Microsoft was already working on  
late last year, and which would be codenamed "Dark Star". In cosmology, a  
"dark star" is just a synonym to a singularity, otherwise known as a black  
hole.

Re: To the OP: Wintroll FUD about alleged insecurity refuted (was: Re: Linux why?)

So quite possibly, the successor to Vista will be based upon the Singularity project, which "was not intended for commercial release".

On the other hand, if you want a good laugh, check out...

<http://www.mslinux.org>

;-p

Two most interesting & informative posts there, Aragorn. Thanks. :-)

.