

Re: Why complicated directory structure in Linux

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.setup/2006-09/msg00302.html>

- *From:* mydejamail@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 22 Sep 2006 07:36:04 -0700
-

Matt Giwer wrote:

mydejamail@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Dave Uhring wrote:

If you cannot even perform such a simple subtraction perhaps you ought to continue to use that Microsfot shitware you used to post your question.

I installed Linux around 93/94 played with it for a few weeks and uninstalled it.

My first shot at it was Slackware 3.0 in pure text mode and after a stupid think on my part ...

It was only in 98 that I installed a Redhat 5.2 server

... first got started seriously with RH 5.2 but as a stable home computer system against windows. Great minds and all.

and even then I never saw much of it because it just performed its job of serving files without any hassle except with power failures.

If Microsoft is shitware why is Bill Gates the worlds richest man and in a position to donate more to charity than the combined earnings of all the pure Linux/Open Source companies?

Re: Why complicated directory structure in Linux

It is a matter of the business model. Remember first that his father was an indulgent billionaire who bankrolled him. It was an aggressive "who do you trust" playing off of the IBM connection. Not condemning the strategy.

And when he arrived on the scene a Unix OS cost \$10,000 (ten thousand) at a minimum. I once worked for Softech and they charged \$5000 just for a Pascal compiler in addition to a piece of the action for anything written using their compiler. Unix had a similar deal for the C compiler.

Not that this was a bad model as there were so few users and the developers and improvers had to be paid. But when the first million PCs were around that price model collapsed. (And with Softech is was layed off.)

He simply had a product that served many companies and people when Unix didn't and Linux didn't exist. Is it a crime for him to have taken advantage of the opportunity that he saw?

As I was around back when I switched from the Atari 800 to the shit PC AFTER it was cloned and not a grossly overpriced IBM product I remember it well. There were serious objections to the PC itself in those days in regard to the chip it was based on but it remained the best game in town.

There were not problems with Gates in the beginning. He kept meeting the customer demand with improvements. But there were problems from about DOS 5 when he started charging \$10,000 plus monthly payments to get the documentation on the internal calls of DOS. NO ONE like me could afford that even though I had bought the same thing from Atari for \$200 years before.

Then came Windows and it was a kludge not a wrapper on DOS. And over the years to whatever it popular now that kludge non-wrapper has come to pretend to be an OS in itself and excluded direct DOS style access. Sort of like a DOS window runs in a chroot.

And then on top of it all Gates betrayed his customers with Digital Rights Management. Not that the idea is wrong but in doing so he took away functionality from his loyal customers.

Not to make it worse he also let his OS be extremely vulnerable to outside attack. Let is the operative word BECAUSE he let vendors change libraries. He let them be changed at the expense of other vendors whose products would stop working.

There is a huge list of similar problems which turned people against Gates. I presume you have your own pet peeveS. Everyone does.

The one that got me to linux was the regular disk crashes where I had to reinstall and lost everything I had saved if not on backup some place. I can't believe I was once expert in downloading all programs I used like Qedit in only

Re: Why complicated directory structure in Linux

one day before getting back on line. I have NEVER had a similar bad experience with linux.

...

But why should enshrining this concept in a license result in the coming together of a lot of people who share such a dislike for Microsoft's financial success? I am sure Microsoft wouldn't engender so much hatred if they were not so financial successful.

The issue has NEVER been his success. The issue has been the shit product. The product went downhill as time went on.

...

There is a story about a country which faced a political crisis and some illiterate guy off the street was picked to be leader. He stood before a crowd reading a speech and someone in the crowd yelled out that the paper he was reading from was upside down.

Then the new leader retorted, 'What difference does it make if a document is held upside down so long as you can read it?'. The whole crowd cheered.

That is the reality those who consider themselves more knowledgeable and insightful face in this world. The media know it, the marketeers know it and so do the politicians, and they all exploit for what its worth. You might call it cynical but that is the world we live in.

Perhaps Bill Gates should donate a lot of his charity money to the development of open source software and Linux and that would make a lot of the likes of you happier.

Who gives a rat's ass what it is called. All the folks from a century ago like Rockefeller and Carnegi who did the same thing have clauses to hire direct descendents if they cannot find gainful employment.

I do not have a dog in this fight. I know exactly why I switched and it was the disk crashes. The same computer, same disk and I had no problem keeping it running without turning off for a month or two and never had the triennial disk crashes of Windows.

—

Bush has announced himself as a Christian Zionist.
That means he is a traitor to America.

— The Iron Webmaster, 3693

Re: Why complicated directory structure in Linux

nizkor <http://www.giwersworld.org/nizkook/nizkook.phtml>

antisemitism <http://www.giwersworld.org/antise/ a1>