

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.setup/2006-08/msg00579.html>

- *From:* "news.cogeco.ca" <BushIsATraitor@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 18 Aug 2006 04:40:00 -0400
-

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Piggybacked? No it uses both the BSD and the GNU open source software originally developed for Unix.

That's called piggybacking you Shit Licking moron.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

No. They use X windows. That is the amazing thing about open source software. Others can use it.

No, they don't use X windows, they have modified X-windows and hooked into it. It ain't X no more. But it still is networkable, which is both a benefit and a limitation. But given the sluggish nature of the OS, it's clear that the bottleneck of networkability is not without some rather large speed penalty.

Why hasn't growth of Linux been equally strong in both the server market and in the desktop market?

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Because Windows is preinstalled on all machines sold, and people do not have the technical knowhow to appreciate that changing to something else would be advantageous. People running servers do.

Windows has't come on any of the machines I've ever purchased. Further, Linux has been available preinstalled on machines from Dell, HP, IBM and

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

even Walmart for fuck sakes, for several years.

Yet over those years Linux Market Share on the desktop has actually DECLINED.

Hahahahahahaha..... Why is that?

I'll tell you why... Because Linux is a user hostile ShitSickle.

The answer is simple. Linux, like Unix, has always been, and remains user

hostile, and unsuitable for the desktop market.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Hostile to what user? Not me, not my family (none of whom are "computer literate").

Hostile to any user who needs to install it, maintain it, install applications onto it, or develop for it.

The server market is different because the server market is maintained by trained experts who largely enjoy the challenge of dealing with complexity.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

No, they enjoy NOT having to deal with complexity. Install it and forget about it. That leaves them time to do what they actually enjoy— helping users.

No It professional enjoys "helping users". Users are the dumbest people alive with the only exception being the current crew occupying the U.S. White House, and Republican Controlled congress, and C/C++ pushers.

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

The desktop market, on the other hand, consists of people trying to get
real

work done.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:ebl69o\\$g75](mailto:news:ebl69o$g75)

The word is trying.

And mostly succeeding as history shows. But with Linux, life suddenly becomes a long stream of installs and uninstalls as you move from one nonfunctioning distro of Linux to another.

Now lets be clear, SIGNIFICANT improvements have been made in the way

Linux

operates over the last decade, and the GUI has matured to the point where

it

is almost as good as the GUI provided by Windows 2000 and XP. Yet Linux continues to be rejected by 98% of desktop users and 75% of those implementing web servers.

Why?

This answer is also clear. Unix has always been an extremely user

hostile

OS. The fundamental design philosophy behind Unix and therefore Linux

has

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:ebl69o\\$g75](mailto:news:ebl69o$g75)

You are repeating yourself.

"Sometimes you have to repeat yourself in order to catapult the

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

propaganda" – George W. Bush

always been extremely flawed, and hopelessly inferior to the design philosophy of Apple – later adopted by Microsoft. The Unix and by

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:ebl69o\\$g75](mailto:news:ebl69o$g75)

You are joking aren't you? Microsoft adopted Apple's philosophy?

In spades, all the way down to the garbage can icon. Microsoft went as far as to hire Apple programmers away from Apple to work on Windows. In general structure, Microsoft windows was very much Mac Like, including the placement of application components in the Mac/Windows system directory.

Billy was inspired by the Mac.

As an example, while looking over a random snippet from a Linux driver file

the other day I found a setting called "HappyMeal". Professional programmers do not engage in such puerile behavior.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:ebl69o\\$g75](mailto:news:ebl69o$g75)

Have you ever looken inside Microsoft source, or Apple?

Microsoft yes, Apple no. I actually disassembled and documented a good portion of DOS back in the mid to late 80's. I uncovered some interesting tidbits that made it impossible to compete with Microsoft on one level or another if you followed Microsoft's own programming guidelines.

In the early days of Microsoft, when machine cycles were relatively scarce,

and time was measured in microseconds, not the picoseconds measure that is

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

used today, Microsoft too used relatively cryptic commands typed from a keyboard to command the OS. But while the Unix computing universe was

busy

suing itself into near oblivion and issuing commands like grep, yak, ls, chron, and building tarballs, Microsoft was busy listing directories, finding files, and building file archives.

Microsoft won the war for the desktop, even when the desktop was a

command

line interface because in part, Microsoft recognized that nomenclature matters. Ease of use matters. Clarity of design matters. Consistency matters, and yes, documentation matters.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

You must be joking again.

It's a simple fact of history. Unix was around long before DOS. It was present and available while DOS was being developed. It was present and available with increasing interest while DOS peaked in popularity and was replaced with Windows.

Through that entire period, UNIX in various forms, Xenix, Coherent, SCO, BSD, etc, were available for IBM PC's and more readily available for superior machines some of which were portable 68,000 based machines. Even desktop machines like the Tandy's Xenix PC obviously had Xenix (A Unix derivative) available to it.

Yet every version of Unix that was available at the time is now defunct and only SCO – partly owned by Microsoft – survives as a shell company that is more parasite on the Unix community rather than producer of product.

Why did Unix fail on the desktop even when it had to compete against DOS?

Simple answer. It was inferior to DOS because it was too difficult to operate, didn't provide adequate screen control for sophisticated text manipulations, supported graphics much more poorly than did DOS, – which didn't support graphics at all (ha), and required more expensive hardware to run <slower> than DOS.

Unix/Linux is the Operating system who's time has never come.

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

5 years ago, Microsoft saw Linux in it's rearview mirror and saw it is a potential threat. 5 years later, Microsoft has developed DotNet

programming

paradigm, and now it has a completely new VISTA API set to stave off the

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

They may have it. Noone else does, nor can anyone else use it.

It's in beta and thousands of people are using it as I write this sentence. There are tens of thousands of installs of Vista.

Linux challenge. During this time, Linux has matured, but at the same time

stagnated at a point where it can no longer offer a serious challenge to Microsoft.

Indeed, not only has Linux stagnated, but has actually declined in functionality. I have been told by several people that Mandrake Linux was

significantly more functional and manageable, than current versions of Linux.

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

?? It is a "current version of Linux"?

I know many people who claim that Mandrake – 2 years was much more usable than any of the current Linux Distro's.

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

The hope of Linux was that it could provide interoperability with Windows through the Wine emulation layer, support for NTFS, MACos, etc. This is

no

longer possible with Vista of course. Proprietary interfaces can be

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Nor wanted.

Eric Raymond, one of the high priests of open source, has told the community that painful compromises are needed to the way it deals with closed source platforms and formats to avoid losing ground on desktops and new media players.

Raymond said the community is not moving fast enough to engage with non-technical users whose first-choice platform is either an iPod, MP3 player or Microsoft desktop running Windows Media Player.

....

Raymond, a champion of all things open, said it is vital to the future uptake of Linux that the community compromise to win the new generation of non-technical users aged younger than 30. This group is more interested in having Linux "just work" on their iPod or MP3 player and "don't care about our notions of doctrinal purity",

What you want is for Linux to continue to be destroyed by Microsoft.

developed faster than they can be reverse engineered. Where is Linux

NTFS

support? Further, Wine has taken 15 years to develop, and the new Vista

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Where is VISTA?

Sitting on 10,000 hard drives all around the world, and 4 months from

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

general release.

Meanwhile Linux continues to Lose Marketshare to Windows on the desktop.

interfaces are large and complex enough that it will take considerably longer to clone. Where will Windows be in 30 to 40 years when viable clones of Vista might be coming available?

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

Why in world would one want to clone vista?

Why would anyone want to clone Windows?

Simple reason. To provide a way to run Windows programs. You might have noticed that most Linux applications are crap.

Ahahahahahahahahah.....

*I and a circle of friends, collectively represent about 200 years worth

of

computing experience, and we are all looking to jump from the bloated Microsoft Windows platform, and have been for years. Yet we are all

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

??? I thought windows was wonderful?

The UI is great, but the innards are crap.

But rather than create a clean and superior competitor to Windows, you Linux Shit Lickers have wasted your time reinventing every Unix Failure possible and then thrown in some new ones of your own.

absolutely disgusted by the equally bloated, still buggy and incomplete state of the Linux/Unix environment. Linux/Unix is today as Unix has

Re: Linux no threat to Microsoft

always

been, user hostile and inferior, which is a shame, and a shame that is directly attributable to the underlying design philosophy of C/C++. and

by

"Unruh" <unruh-spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eb169o\\$g75](mailto:news:eb169o$g75)

And Windows is programmed in Basic?

Some parts on the periphery are ya. Installers, some database interfaces, some tools. But mostly it's written in C or C++, and that is why it has suffered (as Unix/Linux) does, from exploits caused primarily by buffer overflows that can be traced back to either the standard C programming Library or to the same shit stained philosophy that produced that library.

C is by far one of the worst programming languages ever created. Brain dead from start to finish, just like Unix

.