

Re: I've dumped Linux and moved to Windows XP.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-06/1929.html>

From: Mike (*abc_at_def.ghi*)

Date: 06/13/04

Date: 13 Jun 2004 17:47:04 -0500

Jim Backus wrote:

> *Congratulations on a thoughtful piece on the benefits, not
> superiority, of Windows.*
>
> *As I've added comparisons to OS/2, this is now cross-posted to
> c.o.o.a.*
>
>> *From what I hear, the XP version of Windows is at last delivering the
> robustness that users should expect of an operating system. Based on
> my own experience of a variety of operating systems, OS/2 is the most
> robust, followed by Mac OS (version 5 was probably the one I used),
> Windows NT, Windows 98 with Windows 95 and Windows 3.1 as the worst –
> I have no experience of Win2000 or XP.*
>

Having no experience with Windows 2000 or XP pretty much rules you out for commenting on Windows. These are by far the most robust and stable versions. Also, claiming MacOS 5(!) as being robust and stable leads me to question your sanity.

>
> *Starting with OS/2 – two points that support its robustness. First:
> OS/2 appears to repair its initialisation files at restart. Even when
> badly broken, the operating system will generally return to a workable
> state after a number of restarts. Windows does not do this – if
> anything it is likely to become more broken.*
>

Not true. Your ignorance of Windows 2000 and XP is showing. Both maintain snapshots of the system before each major change, so it's easy to "rollback" to previous configurations.

>
> *Mac OS – this was the first graphical OS I used. Although I disliked
> the way that the internals were hidden and inaccessible, my experience
> of 3 years constant use was that the operating system was very stable
> – crashes were rare and I don't recall any occasion when the system
> had to be reinstalled. Many 'power users' recommend that Windows*

sci.electronics.design: Re: I've dumped Linux and moved to Windows XP.

> *should be re-installed annually.*

>

Not true. Your ignorance of Windows 2000 and XP is showing again.
Re-installing Windows 98 was common. It's not needed for 2000 or XP.

>

> *I used Windows NT4 at work for a couple of years and found it to be*
> *relatively reliable and robust – about half that of OS/2 in*
> *qualitative tests. Crashes did occur and occasionally it would run out*
> *of resources and need a restart. The non-Microsoft email client had a*
> *noticeable memory leak and was usually the cause of the operating*
> *system running out of resources. The 'repair' technique used by the IS*
> *department was to re-install.*

>

Sounds like you needed a different email client and some IS guys who knew what they were doing.

>

> *My most recent employer provided Windows 98se. It generally allowed me*
> *to get my work done but crashes and essential restarts were common.*

>

I used to do development on 98se, before we moved to 2000. I can tell you that 98se *can* be stable, and I never re-installed it in 4 years of use (except when I got new machines). However, 95/98/98se were not designed with stability in mind (obviously!), they were designed for backwards compatibility with DOS/Win3.1 apps and games.

>

> *Windows 3.1 and Windows 95 were so bad it constantly amazes me that*
> *these appalling operating systems enabled Microsoft to become so*
> *successful. The only explanation is that heavy advertising and keeping*
> *the computer press on-side helped Microsoft to dupe a gullible*
> *marketplace.*

>

Nonsense. At the time, they were outstanding, and were the only game in town. OS/2 – as good as it was – was never in the running. you can thank IBM for that.

>

> *This comparison of operating systems does not address availability of*
> *applications – without the necessary applications it becomes*
> *irrelevant how good the OS is. Conversely users may have to tolerate*
> *unmaintainable and unreliable operating systems that support their*
> *essential applications.*

>

True, and this probably explains why some companies are still using OS/2 – the apps have not been/will not ever be ported to Windows (or Linux or whatever).

Re: I've dumped Linux and moved to Windows XP.

>

>*Regarding the quoted text:*

>*Where does one learn 'basic Windows internals'? The Windows registry is so arkane that it might as well be written in Mayan. The on-line help in Windows is aimed squarely at the least knowledgeable user. For example the advice to 'ask your system administrator' is no use to someone trying to set up a network at home. It is also common to find that Windows help assumes knowledge of the purpose and effect of a setting so only explains the mechanics of entering a value – there is no expert knowledge to back up the basics. Most computer books regurgitate the on-line help – based on the OS/2 editions I had a high opinion of Sams 'Unleashed' series but found Windows 95 Unleashed to be almost useless.*

>

Again, you're basing your opinion of Windows of Windows 95(!), an almost 10 year old product!

The registry is no more "arkane" than OS/2's config.sys file, or the ini files. If you're smart and resourceful, you can figure out either.

>

>*What are the 'right tools' and how much is one supposed to spend on them? Some are listed but what about the 'few other 3rd party tools'?*

>

What are the 'sound protocols' for loading and removing software?

>*Presumably Windows own 'Add/Remove programmes' does not qualify?*

>

>

Again, Windows 2000 and XP's Add/Remove programs is all you need. Everything that was changed during install will be reversed during un-install. The "System Clean" utilities were only needed on 95/98/98se.

I'm not trying to incite a riot here, but I can't just sit here and let you spout this nonsense. What would **your** reaction be to someone claiming all sorts of defects in OS/2 (or Linux), but basing his reasoning on OS/2 2.1 (or Red Hat 5).

Mike