

## Re: O.T. Harddrive Partitions?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-08/msg00888.html>

---

- *From:* [kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Ken Smith)
  - *Date:* Wed, 9 Aug 2006 13:58:01 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <19jid29kmt3lei88qggsfvj7duehph2kne@xxxxxxx>, Phat Bytestard <phatbytestard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 8 Aug 2006 13:48:58 +0000 (UTC), [kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Ken Smith) Gave us:

In article <c5fcd29n9gpk8iurigasaa5ds20q1ncnk3@xxxxxxx>, Phat Bytestard <phatbytestard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 6 Aug 2006 17:23:17 +0000 (UTC), [kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Ken Smith) Gave us:

Too bad MS dropped the "join" tool at Win95. It would have solved most of the problems with installing on other drive letters.

You sure don't know much about security issues.

LOL is that the best you can do.

There are no problems with security issues and the join command.

Windows 95 was ALL security holes, you dumb fucktard.

Yes but none of them had anything to do with the "join" command. Did they? You claimed that the "join" command introduced a security issue. Since what it does is a subset of what the "mount" command does on a unix or linux box, we know it wasn't the case.

Re: O.T. Harddrive Partitions?

--  
--

kensmith@xxxxxxxxx forging knowledge

.