

Re: OT: a Win XP "trap for amateurs"?

Re: OT: a Win XP "trap for amateurs"?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2007-10/msg00094.html>

- *From:* Michael <NoSpam@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 17 Oct 2007 15:08:33 GMT
-

Stanislaw Flatto wrote:

Michael wrote:

Stanislaw Flatto wrote:

Michael wrote:

Last month I installed Win-XP ... for the first time. The last Win I had experience with was v3.1, and a lot has changed since then, apparently. I put the OS and about a dozen video card & motherboard apps. in a 2 GB partition of a 700GB drive; the rest of the drive is unpartitioned. Data is on a separate hard drive.

Now the 2 GB Win-XP partition is bursting at the seams and I want to expand it. But no!! Can't expand the OS partition, says Win-XP. So am I well and truly screwed? Or is there a way to increase that 2 GB partition *WITHOUT* re-installing Win-XP and all those apps? (^%\$#! Micro\$oft ... mutter-mutter!)

Michael

A Linux user here.

If you survived till now with Win 3.1, how come you went XP?

For me Windows95 was the straw that broke camels back when it told me

"Sit there, you idiot, we know what is best for you!". After

Re: OT: a Win XP "trap for amateurs"?

years with
DOS and 'primitivski' Win 3.11, which needed learning to
make it
perform. I was not ready to submit my computer to secretive
'wizards'.
Few weeks later Linux presented itself on my screen and still
is the
resident OS. It needs the 'Linux steep learning slope' which
for someone
coming from DOS+Win 3.1 is very well excersized.

So do what you want but there are choices around and you
will end in bed
that you prepared for yourself.

Have fun

Stanislaw
Slack 12 user from Ulladulla.

I didn't actually "go to XP". Since it's available, I've used it to capture
some video. Just fooling around.

This XP install was on a brand new system that I built. The single system
replaces two old ones (circa 1997) and is shared by two people, each using a
different operating system on its own HD. Each drive is in a tray; remove
one,
slide in the other, and boot. My OS's are OS/2 and Linux; my mate knows
only
Win. This separate-drives methodology insures that my system files and data
on
FAT partitions are never exposed to any nasties that creep in through the use
of
Win.

I agree with your estimation of Win and reasons for not using it. I would add
another important point: Win is bloated and therefore slow. And since Win
rules, huge HD's, screaming processors, and vast amounts of RAM have
become
common.

Amen.

But as your other OS's are OS/2 _and_ Linux those things are known.
So recite 100 times slowly the 'old' Linux phrase "If it ain't broke,
don't fix it!"

Re: OT: a Win XP "trap for amateurs"?

You are preaching to the choir. ;-)

Am in similar situation, the 'one that has to be obeyed' is on XP, worse, she heard the word 'Vista' somewhere, and not one of mine computers has the power (CPU and memory) of the _must have_ video card for this animal.

I've been there! When my sister "felt me out" about the chances that I would do the work of upgrading her to Vista, I declined. Told her she'd have to do it and that I would no longer support her when she got into Win trouble. Haven't heard another word from her about "upgrading".

Oh, why we started with computers?

Having fun

Stanislaw