

Re: XP is great

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-04/msg02549.html>

- *From:* "Frithiof Andreas Jensen" <frithiof.jensen@xx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Apr 2005 17:23:30 +0200
-

<learner@xxxxxxxxxxx> skrev i en meddelelse
[news:425d2945\\$2\\$woehfu\\$mr2ice@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:425d2945$2$woehfu$mr2ice@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> You are just a microsoft shill. Lots of them live in newsgroups to spread
> the 'good news' that XP is great.

And You are just a lame flamer who are too pussy-whipped from being the last kid collected in kindergarten to even dare have a name to hang your random babble onto. There, I can do names too. happy?

> People who use it, and dislike it, are
> not going to be paying much attention to someone who talks like a
> telemarketer, phrase after phrase after phrase.

Like I care – as if people who perpetually whinge and whine, all the while still putting up with whatever they whine about are known to pay attention; hell, they are not even listening to themselves fer ricekakes.

>
> When you explain, from a purely technical point of view, why an OS would
> have any problems when an application is located somewhere besides the
> default, then you can gain some credibility, but a disk location is a disk
> location, and even the mighty XP cannot look at the table, and decide that
> something is not where it wants it to be, especially when the installation
> program allows for someone to put stuff in a 'non standard' location.

Have you ever noticed how MS seem to re-implement all kinds of functionality such as dialogs, menu schemes, shortcuts and so on across the different applications?

They probably do not talk much between departments – obviously not enough to share common features – and maybe they are even competitive enough to have their own special libraries to handle icky things like configuration parsing and file import/export... an organisation will do what it takes to reach the performance figures set by management. Deadlines Rulez.

If one performance figure is loading word really fast, then maybe it is not so important that word may not load in *all* cases – after all, the bonus

Re: XP is great

money is recieved for reaching targets set by Management, not by keeping users happy.

- > I am dying to here why an XP machine with Photoshop on
- > C:\documents\apps\stuff\downhere\underneath\settings\othercrap\lookatme\adobe\bin\exe\files\photoshop
- > will run rock solid, and one with photoshop on D:\photoshop will crash and
- > burn twice a day.

A Wild Guess: The developers hard-coded something in the way paths are handled, the testers never bothered to check because the tests specification did not mention testing configurability, and since most users just slap the applications in wherever they want to go it works for them and not enough bug reports are generated to exceed the noise floor and make it into a service request.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: XP is great**
◇ *From:* learning

• *References:*

- ◆ **XP is garbage**
◇ *From:* John Larkin
- ◆ **Re: XP is great**
◇ *From:* Mark Jones
- ◆ **Re: XP is great**
◇ *From:* learning
- ◆ **Re: XP is great**
◇ *From:* Frithiof Andreas Jensen
- ◆ **Re: XP is great**
◇ *From:* learner

- Prev by Date: **Re: Doin' it sideways**
- Next by Date: **Re: XP is garbage**
- Previous by thread: **Re: XP is great**
- Next by thread: **Re: XP is great**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**