

Re: why not like linux ?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.development.device.drivers/2004-05/0848.html>

From: Maxim S. Shatskih (*maxim_at_storagecraft.com*)

Date: 05/16/04

Date: Sun, 16 May 2004 18:06:52 +0400

> *As always a smell of "inferior copy" around a Microsoft product.*

Sorry.

I'm too lazy to list the "inferiornesses" of UNIX (even good UNIX like FreeBSD) compared to NT. Some of them do still persist. Some do persist for 20 years.

"UNIX Haters Handbook" listed some. Like:

a) shell does the command line wildcard expansion, so that the app does not know the command line as typed by user.

b) swap _partition_ instead of swap file. Combine this with non-resizeable filesystems in most UNIXen and to resizeable NTFS and pagefile.sys.

c) X11 "does not enforce any policy". Yes, IMHO that's why X11-based UNIXen will never be major on the desktop. And never were. The only major UNIX on the desktop is Mac OS X, which has a sane policy-enforcing windowing system, and X11 as a toy to please Linuxoids.

Note: Windows 3.x GUI runned fine in 4MB of memory (well, it needed 9MB to run the whole MS Office simultaneously). At the same time, the UNIX's X11 GUI required 16MB just to start up. The functionality was a bit poorer due to lack of OLE in UNIX (still lacking it).

Let's look more: in GDI, colors are specified as RGB. In X11 – sorry, but as device-dependent pixel values. X11 has no means of converting bitmaps of different depths – UNIX people need another library called SDL to do this. GDI can do all of this, and could do all of this even in Windows 3.x, where GDI.EXE was 220KB and the card driver around 100KB. X11 server was > 1MB in all UNIXen of that time.

d) lack of decent removable media handling. Typing "umount" on any CD change is boring.

e) Byzantine disk partitioning schemes like FreeBSD uses. Windows can be

microsoft.public.development.device.drivers: Re: why not like linux ?

installed on any partition on the drive. FreeBSD requires the partition to be in the primary table (among the first 4).

Now Linux in particular. Lack of support compared to both FreeBSD and Windows. Lack of patch distribution scheme.

In FreeBSD, there is a notion of "world", which is the source for the kernel and all essential base OS apps (/usr/bin). The set of apps is rather rich, includes Perl, for instance. You can synchronize your source control with FreeBSD.org and pull patches at source level, then automatically rebuild the whole OS. You can even upgrade across the minor OS versions, BTW.

Any other FreeBSD software is installed either as packages (upgradeable from the same tree) or as "ports" which is a source package maintained by FreeBSD.org (but not necessarily written by them).

So, you have a central point of support for the whole OS. You can guarantee that it is the same as on the machines of their authors – if you want so.

The same is with Microsoft, though patches are binary. Windows Update is the same thing technically.

Now compare to Linux. RedHat and similar companies bear no responsibility over anything. The kernel? Hey, it's Linus's private property, distributed from kernel.org. The shell? "bash" is from gnu.org. The command-line tools? Again from gnu.org. And so on.

Yes, you can download the source for a newer kernel, build it and boot it. After this, a good deal of startup scripts from RedHat will broke, broke due to /proc structure changed in the new kernel.

Amazing level of supportability. Just imagine installing such an OS on a server farm or in the corporation. I can imagine FreeBSD in such role and saw server farms (mainly website hosting) on FreeBSD. I can imagine Windows in such role and saw server farms (mainly running Exchange) on Windows. But Linux???? sorry, how will you do updates to the machines???

--

Maxim Shatskiy, Windows DDK MVP
StorageCraft Corporation
maxim@storagecraft.com
<http://www.storagecraft.com>