

Re: RAID 1

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.networking/2003-12/1558.html>

From: Les Mikesell (*lesmikesell_at_comcast.net*)

Date: 12/31/03

Date: Wed, 31 Dec 2003 03:42:28 GMT

"P.T. Breuer" <ptb@oboe.it.uc3m.es> wrote in message
news:c1drsb.t2a.ln@news.it.uc3m.es...

>

> *Stop focusing on the (leafnode) server – it is a straw man. I've said
> so!*

Agreed – you obviously understand how to configure programs.

> *I really resent your ignoring the proper explanation! Do you want me to
> give it again? You snipped it all away.*

Since you chose the programs and know how to control them, nothing
about the programs or their default way of working is relevant. They
do exactly what you've told them to do.

> *Only to keep wailing about
> servers, despite my saying many times that it's an irrelevancy.*

You are the one who previously blamed the software for your
problem in following threads. I won't quote your comments but
anyone interested can easily find where you said the messages
aren't threaded. I mistakenly wasted a lot of time reviewing
the actual capabilities of the software when in fact nothing
is relevant but your choices.

> > *Yet, while you are cluttering the archives with unnecessary demands
> > for repetitions or complaints about *where* people put the unnecessary
> > repeated context that also clutters the archives, others often answer
> > the question as asked.*

>

>

> *This is false. Or at least mendacious.*

No, it isn't false. All 17,700 of your posts, most of which contain no
usable information are just in the way when I look for answers in
technical newsgroups. I suppose I should have given up on usenet
having any content years ago. A relevant quote from one of the

people who had a lot to do with usenet being possible circa 1988:

<http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=4829%40umich.cc.umich.edu&oe=UTF-8&output=plain>

But, he didn't have google to help sift through the cruft and probably never considered that I could pinpoint this exact posting which seems almost the way I remembered it this many years later.

> *I'm sure it can do "the same", because I use it. But not while I am
> reading a post. And not while I am replying to a post. It can do many
> things, but exactly one of them at a time. Just as I can. Just as it
> has always been.*

Do you want your computer to show more than one thing at once? "man X" Glad that problem is solved.

> *But as it happens, I don't care, since I don't use any such mechanism.*

So, why didn't you just come out and say that you don't care how annoying your style is in the first place instead of beating around the bush about how the software works (which is really how you work the software...)?

> > *So, just like the people who refuse to look through easily available
> > archives to see if their question has already been answered, you
> > clutter the network and archives with uninteresting gunk that no
>
>
> You are verging on the argument you should be making. Go ahead and make
> it, instead of supplying the above amateurish junk!*

The only argument I have is about the bulk that has to be bypassed when trying to find the actual solution to a problem. If you enjoy taunting people I don't really object, I just wish you would keep it private and between consenting adults instead of in a public medium with an already horrible noise to sound ratio that is archived for posterity.

> > *one needs to see. Note that TCP networking works very well
> > with no such thing as a negative ACK or request for a repeat. If
> > you simply ignore things you don't understand the sender will
> > repeat the request on his own.
>
>
> I must say I think that is a valid socio-economic tactic. Hmm ...*

And, in fact what makes networking usable. Although in the initial release of Windows 95 Microsoft made the mistake of adjusting the retry interval the wrong way so on a network that is already congested one of these would beat it to death instead of quietly backing off when not acknowledged.

> >

http://groups.google.com/groups?safe=images&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&as_uauthors=ptb@oboe.it.uc3m.es&as_scoring=d&lr=&num=100&hl=en

>

> > *Looks only a few have any useful content, let's say 10%. So if all*

>

> *Stop making up the figures. It's a silly tactic. I don't know what that link shows, but it seems to be a page of threads to which I have contributed recently. As usual on google I can't see a damn thing for their heinous interface, but it says:*

It shows parts of your 100 most recent posts with links to the full text and the full threads. Once again your software works the way you have chosen. If the display isn't laid out nicely with everything just a mouse click away for you it is because you have chosen for it to be, as you say, heinous.

> *Let me see: on post 1 I answer his question (for the throd time, as I recall!).*

>

> *Did you have some problem doing the man pppd /log thang? For the third time of asking ...*

I can easily see that the question was not 'how do I display the manual for pppd' and have no trouble knowing that your reply does not answer the question no matter how many times it is repeated.

> *(he wanted to know how to log pppd messages to a file – it shows up when you do what I told him to do).*

It might; it might not depending on a lot of things. Even if it did, the problem remains of wading past the irrelevant parts. Perhaps this isn't a problem for you. It is for me. I suspect it is for every person who asks a question and does not have the problem solved with the first answer. Man pages were great 15 years ago when they all fit in 3 little books, were up to date, and generally matched the programs shipped by the vendor. None of those are true now so it would make more sense to give the command line to retrieve the source code from CVS if you want to say that the answer is always there. The real problem these days is information overload. Terrabytes of data are available at your fingertips, most of it irrelevant but the worst is that which looks somewhat relevant but isn't specifically what you need.

> *This is boring. I'm not going to struggle with googles html interface any longer.*

Html has the usual problems of standards designed by committees, but you don't 'struggle' with it. It is a markup language to be displayed by the tool of your choice. If you choose a tool that makes you struggle, you can't blame anyone else for that. Blaming html is

like refusing to read man pages because the nroff source is ugly. Google is in fact the most significant thing that has happened since the printing press since it actually gives people fairly direct access to anything they can describe that has been discussed on usenet, mailing lists or web pages.

If Socrates' students had had access to Google he wouldn't have annoyed everyone into killing him with all of those boring dialogs. They could have found their answers immediately.

> > *who tries to find answers in the archives or the groups in realtime wade
> > through 15,930 unneeded messages.*
>
> *False. Do you really want to be made into a plonk?*

That, like everything else so far is all your own choice. Just please don't claim that the software or usenet made you do it.

> > *Now back to Grub...*
> > *No, with SCSI, both the bios and the linux device name mechanism
> > will install the first working drive the same whether the broken one
>
> That's the problem – the same bios code will now indicate a different
> disk. Since you installed the boot sector when 0x81 meant the second
> disk (i.e. 0x81 is referenced on the second disks boot sector), when
> the sda breaks, 0x81 now indicates what was sdc, not what is now sda
> (and was sdb).*
>
> *You'd have to install the boot sector everywhere with references for
> 0x80.*

That's the magic of the:

```
grub> device (hd0) /dev/sdb
```

in the commands I posted. If you followed the link I gave to the full text you would have seen the commentary saying that it makes grub write to the second drive's boot sector pretending that it is the first drive.

```
Les Mikesell  
lesmikesell@comcast.net
```