

Re: Microsoft making vendors remove drivers

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-06/msg03949.html>

- *From:* Jeff Liebermann <jeffl@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 22 Jun 2008 09:21:54 -0700
-

On Sun, 22 Jun 2008 08:32:08 -0700, JosephKK <quiettechblue@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Your experiences with various M\$ OS products is very different than mine.

I just fix computers. I don't use them.

That's actually fairly accurate. In the repair biz, I only see broken computers. I'm sure that there are users and systems out there that work the first time, are totally stable, and do all the right things. It's just that I don't see any of these. What I see are the one's that don't work.

That also applies to customers. You are apparently knowledgeable in the art of keeping a computer alive. You wouldn't do something dumb, like simultaneously install several virus scanners (a common practice incidentally). You probably put some effort into keeping your machines fairly well organized and free of junkware.

Well, that's not what I see. I get customers that are lacking in either the time or patience to deal with such mundane tasks. That's fine, as I will gladly separate them from their money and do it for them. It's easy enough.

I found MSwin 3.1 to be a fine reasonably stable product. I had it running for weeks nonstop.

I accidentally found something interesting about Windoze 3.1. While doing battle with Windoze 95, the speed and memory capacity of the motherboards had increased substantially. For fun, I setup Windoze 3.1 to run from a 16MByte RAM disk on a fast (for it's time) machine, which I think was a Pentium 200MMX. Not only was it blindingly fast, but it was amazingly stable. Something about the older 386/486 motherboards apparently was giving Windoze 3.1 a bad reputation. On

Re: Microsoft making vendors remove drivers

fast hardware, it worked just fine.

Another anecdote from the time was my customer from hell. I'll spare you the details. She constantly complained that her Windoze 3.1 machine was crashing. My office machine was similar and totally stable, so I just traded machines. I found no problems using her machine in my office, but she continued to see stability problems with my known good machine. I don't know what she was doing to cause problem. Maybe her computer is situated over a tiny black hole that sucks in bits. Dunno.

M\$Win95 however i could not get to boot as often as not. Totally flaky. Never got it to run more that a day or so at a crack

I didn't have much of a problem with the operating system. I was about the same quality as Windoze 3.1 with the same issues. The problems I had all revolved around newly minted applications and ported Windoze 3.1 code. More often than not, the application would crash the operating system, which sorta hints that the operating system is not going a very good job of defending itself.

Did not use any NT though.

I did. NT3.5 and NT4.0. I just killed off a customers NT4 servers (PII/450) that had been running continuously and reliably for perhaps 8 years. I never bothered using it for a desktop application, but 4.0 was just fine for a server.

MSWin98 was alright though. I still have running on older machines that will not run XP.

Methinks Win98SE (second edition) was the best of the bunch. When W2K came out, MS tried to stop Win98SE development. That didn't work because W2K wasn't really ready, so they rushed out WinME as an interim solution. Incidentally, the timing is why it's impossible to do an in-place upgrade from WinME to W2K. Anyway, WinME was a patch job of bug fixes, half implemented features, and new bugs. I managed to get it stable by disabling many of the half implemented features (i.e. system restore) that were causing problems. It's ok, but methinks Win98SE is slightly better.

Moved to XP for my first dual CPU unit. I liked the faster boot times.

Re: Microsoft making vendors remove drivers

It won't last. Ever notice that XP takes more and more time to boot as it gets older? I've been forced into doing some rather painful reinstalls from scratch (usually on a new hard disk) to recover. None of the speed improvement and registry cleanup utilities have done anything beyond minor improvements.

I have a machine in the office setup to dual boot W2K and XP. It spends most of its life running XP. I use it to demonstrate the speed difference between W2K and XP. For system level operations (copying files, scanning for viruses, burning DVD's) the speed is about the same. However, for CPU and memory intensive tasks (CAD, spreadsheet benchmarks, rendering, batch photo edits), W2K is about twice as fast. I have a similar dual boot setup for comparing Vista and XP, but unfortunately have not done much in the way of benchmarking. My general impression is that XP is considerably faster than Vista for just about everything, but don't have any numbers yet.

Of course i have been Linuxing since the early W98 days as well. WINE is so good now that i can run almost all of my legacy applications now. Just a few more really old ones and one new one and i will be able to sell off my excess XP licence/install media, new and sealed original factory packaging.

Sigh. I maintain a few Linux systems. They're all servers, not desktops. I have a Compaq P4 2.4Ghz box where I install various Linux desktop mutations, with the intention of it eventually becoming my main desktop. However, since there's no revenue generated in this exercise, the box just sits there, doing nothing most of the time. By the time I find time to work on it, the next release is out and I have to start over. Incidentally, my main machine and mail server is a 486DX40 with 8MBytes of RAM running SCO ODT 3.2v4.2 from about 1988. I've been planning a Linux replacement since Yggdrasil 0.98.3. I recently found a long forgotten DNS server running RH 2.1.

Incidentally, I had an odd thing happen on eBay yesterday. I needed some Compaq laptop Windoze XP installation media. I found what I wanted on eBay and submitted a bid. A bit later, I received an email from eBay informing me that the auction had been withdrawn by eBay apparently due to some kind of policy violation. I've bought such recovery CD's on eBay in the past, so this is something new (to me). Apparently, Microsoft is getting a bit more aggressive in its campaign to kill off XP.

--

Jeff Liebermann jeffl@xxxxxxxxxxx
150 Felker St #D <http://www.LearnByDestroying.com>

Re: Microsoft making vendors remove drivers

Santa Cruz CA 95060 <http://802.11junk.com>

Skype: JeffLiebermann AE6KS 831-336-2558