

Re: OT: OpenOffice not 100% compatible?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-05/msg01256.html>

- *From:* "JeffM" <jeffm_@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 May 2006 12:43:20 -0700
-

I tried OpenOffice after some fellow newsgroupers suggested it but so far I am not enthused. It takes many times longer [than] Word (!) to load the Writer program, it has no file preview AFAICT and gobbles up a huge amount of RAM resources.
Joerg

All that you have said is true.
Now compare the relative ages of the packages from the 2 vendors. [1]
How many tries did it take to get things "correct" in M\$ Office? [2]

The version-dependent annoyance which is the main topic of this thread is the most obvious flaw in the M\$ product and its "standard".
If M\$ can't even hit the target, should others be expected to get it correct 100%? [3]

..
..

Word 97: Reads it fine.
Word 2000: Reads it fine.
Word XP: Blank page, can't see drawing.
OpenOffice: Blank page, can't see drawing.

Frankly, *usually* the inverse is noted WRT OOo:
When MS-Office won't open a M\$-format document, the usual fix is to open it with OOo and save it again. [4]
<http://slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=166546&cid=13889831&pid=13889831&threshold=1&mode=threaded#1389101>
<http://linux.slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=184880&cid=15262999&threshold=2&mode=nested#15266452>

There appears to be a solution on the horizon (if folks will adopt it):
Move away from the .DOC "standard" [5]:
<http://slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=06/05/07/0346201&threshold=4&mode=nested#15280371>
(Of course M\$ is going to do everything possible to break OpenDocument Format compatibility.)
<http://slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=06/05/07/0346201&threshold=4&mode=nested#15280371>
Remember "DOS isn't done until Lotus won't run."?

Re: OT: OpenOffice not 100% compatible?

The bad news for Joe Average

is that the OpenDocument Format plug-in isn't available to him yet.

<http://linux.slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=06/05/04/1246256&threshold=5&mode=nested#15262547>

..

..

[1] as well as what you paid for them.

[2] Like THAT is not STILL an issue.

[3] As Nico's post suggests, combining *content* with *formatting* in a proprietary binary protocol is a recipe for disaster.

The use of Cascading Style Sheets with HTML

is an acknowledgement of a better concept for these things.

[4] If you do revert to the M\$ product, you may find that keeping OOo around for exactly this reason could save your butt. (Just once will be worth the purchase price. Heh.)

[5] Which everyone in the know realizes is only a "standard" IF YOU SPECIFY A VERSION NUMBER.

.