

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

# Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-04/msg03096.html>

---

- *From:* [learning@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:learning@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Sat, 16 Apr 2005 17:15:11 -0600
- 

In <p76dnWptJYVpBPzfRVn-1g@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>, on 04/16/05 at 07:04 PM, "Charles Schuler" <charleschuler@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:

>> Aww, we ain't friends, and your responses won't win any prizes for  
>> debating. In fact, you have yet to reply with anything beyond a dopey  
>> quote. Debating? Anytime my 'friend' any time.

>Dopey quote? And your credentials shadow his? You should let his  
>employer know that you are much better and that you should replace him.

I don't think that his employment has anything to do with it. In fact, everything else aside, I am not able to see what his quote has to do with anything. Seems to me the issue was the poor architecture of the windows operating system, which simply allows too easy access to all services on the computer, whereas other operating systems have been built from the ground up with security in mind to where they do not allow outside hackers access to the file system, and their services. I believe this is a true fact.

Always when this comes up, people twist the topic as if to say that if it was Linux number one, linux would be as virus infected as windows, but that is just not relevant. The key to viruses on windows machines is the ability of it to move itself across any connected network. I will never say never, but that is not really possible to do on an \*nix or even an OS/2 system.

Therefore, the effect of the virus is quite limited, and would hardly be worth the effort to create in the first place, as the damage would barely make the local news. Somehow, this always gets overlooked, and so most people walk away thinking poor old microsoft is just a victim, when they are providing the vehicle to spread the virus in the first place. That point, and your quote have nothing to do with each other.

>> Heck, you didn't even pick no my spelling :-)) It should have been written  
>> "you're such an asshole"

>Your spelling is eclipsed by your attitude. Interesting that folks who  
>can't spell "chamois" can spell "asshole." But, that's another issue.

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

I assume you spelled "chamois", since without a definition, you could be trying to say pretty much any word, and still misspell it. You could be referring to women's underwear for all know.... :-) Besides, its rather fascinating to note that you can infer that I am stupid and cannot spell, and that is not denigrating, but when I call you an asshole, it is. Who sets these rules, anyway? Better to avoid it all together. I will work harder at that.

>I have found that it is fruitless to debate with zealots.

If you were paying attention to the thread, I espoused that theory some time back when I walked away from a never ending argument with folks who refuse to actually discuss the issues. Sounds like you think the same way.

>The quote was used as it is a reasoned reponse from someone with  
>experience and credentials. I qutoed it because it sums up what I  
>believe.

I can live with that, but you posted it half a dozen times in response to posts that had nothing to do with your man's position.

> It is a moderate position and admits to product  
>vulnerabiliities, on all fronts.

The vulnerability of linux or OS/2 was not the topic at hand, until folks walked off with the subject, as if to say that since linux \*might\* be vulnerable, then its okay for microsoft to completely ignore its own weakness. That is hardly a defense.

On a larger scale, linux is not mainstream, it is not all that popular in the real world, and its strengths and weaknesses have no bearing on whether M\$ should be held accountable for the inherent flaws in its products, and its complete and utter failing to deal directly with the cause.

When Ford Pintos were blowing up left and right, we didn't defend Ford by saying that "well, other cars might explode if they are hit just right." We expected Ford to deal with the problem to the best of their ability. Cars, death, and computers may not be on the same plane, but the fact is, we forced Ford to fix it, and we ought not let M\$ off the hook, just because someone else knows how to infect Linux. That does not sound like the kind of attitude that will get us all better products to work with.

> When one posts "absolutes", one can expect my kind  
>of response.

Could there possibly be a more 'absolute' and outlandish statement than yours, wherein you answered a well thought out, and point by point commentary by merely declaring "you are dead wrong?" Doesn't get more absolute than what you said, so consider that if it bothers you when

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

someone speaks absolutes, its quite possible that the effect will also arise ino thers, when you do the same thing.

> Nothing personal about any of this, by the way.

Can't take anything too personal on usenet

>Personally, I don't like Windows but happen to be tethered to it to make  
>a buck. Is it terrible, heck no ... it's useable and I prove that every  
>day.

I am in the same boat, and I am unwilling to just let it be crappy, and not at least desire that microsoft do a better job. Posting on usenet is not the only time I let my position be known. Whether microsoft reads their mail or not, I do not know, but I am unable to just sit by and watch them torture people just because there is no one to challenge them.

People use inferior products all the time. Failure to stand up and demand quality is how we got here in the first place. Very few have ever seen an operating system outside of windows, but I know for an "absolute" fact that when they do, many of them are stunned to know that another one even exists, that things can work, they are easy to maintain, interfaces can be logical and useful, and even tho most are tethered to windows, it can only help to have more and more people know that we didn't have to wait 12 years to get an OS that did not crash on a daily basis, that multi-threading multi-tasking is not something new, and that virused can be mostly emliminated with a little investment of time and effort.

Another 'fact' is that if Microsoft has approached its system design with security in mind, most of all of this could have been avoided, and we would not have to buy addon tools, and deal with virus and spyware issues on a daily basis. The only entity that can work this problem, seems to be an entity that simply does not care, being as they are a monopoly, and all competition has been destroyed. legally or not, it happened, and what we have today is a result of that monopoly, for surely if OS/2 was allowed to compete on fair, level ground, Microsoft would not be able to sit back and watch viruses spread around the globe because of the shortcomings of their system architecture. They would be forced to solve the problem, or lose their position on the desktop.

I think those are all valid points. Certainly open for discussion, but "you are dead wrong" is not the correct response to them.

JB

.

---

Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Charles Schuler

- **References:**

- ◆ **XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: Guy Macon
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: Fritz Schlunder
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: Fritz Schlunder
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: Fritz Schlunder
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs that any significant number of users want fixed**  
◇ From: Fritz Schlunder
- ◆ **XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Fritz Schlunder
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Charles Schuler
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Charles Schuler
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Charles Schuler
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: learning
- ◆ **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**  
◇ From: Charles Schuler

- Prev by Date: **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**
- Next by Date: **Re: OT: Air America makes a year!**
- Previous by thread: **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**
- Next by thread: **Re: XP has no significant bugs other than those of its defenders**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**