

Re: Why would a Home User buy more than Vista Basic?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Vista/microsoft.public.windows.vista.general/2008-07/msg04309.html>

- *From:* the <the@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 12 Jul 2008 12:15:51 -0400
-

Charlie Tame wrote:

MS has three things going for it. It has an O/S no matter what you think about it, it has .Net technology that is an ISO and ECMA standard no matter what you think about it, and it's top dog no matter what you think about it.

The Titanic was also unsinkable...

That's a weak excuse, and it's not going hold, because technology has not changed. So, the players are going to remain in their positions.

I have Vista on 2 very capable machines, on one not quite so capable (circa 2000 but upgraded as far it is practical to go) and Linux on a third which is also very capable.

So?

I was surprised to get the older machine running as well as it does, but for most people / companies such an upgrade path would not make sense – the labor would cost as much as buying new.

I am sorry, you don't know how things work. Some of those machines well be left as is while other machine are brought in brand new, based on business needs.

So when W7 comes out will I have to buy all new again? That means it would make sense for me to hold off and continue with XP doesn't it?

Re: Why would a Home User buy more than Vista Basic?

You either do it if that is the case or you don't use the product. But you're not a business, and you don't know what the business needs may for a company that a need to move to new technology.

Every one of the "Technologies" that you described seems to have brought with it a whole range of new vulnerabilities. If people are going to wait for "SP1" for everything, as you stated above, that does not do much for Microsoft's bottom line now.

They have done it in the past. I did it coming from Win 2k to XP was too wait on the SP to settle done. It didn't seem to do anything to hinder MS.

And there are many vulnerabilities with Java base technology as well, it is just another excuse, and it is no justification for the non use of new technology, which is being used whether you like it or not, because you don't have your finger on the pulse of IT and business needs, by no means do you have it.

The waiting game people play is largely due to experiences of the past, maybe all the bells and whistles are less practical than a simpler system?

It's another excuse and there is no reason not to use new technology.

If your staff are going to have to learn a whole new GUI then in cost terms staying with XP is sensible. Vista, in terms of users doing their own settings etc is as far away from XP as most Linux are. Would have thought the Vista "Classic" mode could have looked more like XP with things in roughly the same places.

What? Are they going to be learning the Vista UI for the rest of their lives? People learn new GUI's all the time. It's the nature of the beast with UI(s) and new technology development.

You don't give people much credit do you?

I am not trying to bash MS by the way, simply saying that they seem to have thrown a number of obstacles in their own path. I definitely do not "Hate" MS, rather I'd prefer to see them get their act together and get things like Explorer faultless, produce a "Business" edition that can be delivered "Locked down" instead of UAC and produce either a secure update system that does not use IE or produce an indestructible version of IE for such a purpose.

Look, I can say a whole lot of things about Linux. Linux is no bed of roses. I am not into the bashing game period. That's because Linux was written by fallible human beings, and nothing we do is perfect. Linux is swiss cheese just like the other O/S(s), but they are not really coming after Linux due to it non popularity.

Re: Why would a Home User buy more than Vista Basic?

Re: Why would a Home User buy more than Vista Basic?

And based again on the 3 things stated before, own O/S, on software development language solutions with 3rd party vendors being able to tap into new technology such as those offered by .Net, and MS being top dog, there is nothing that is going to over take MS in your lifetime. MS saw the mistake IBM made and they won't follow suite.

There is nothing new happening with IT, and the basics have been the same for the last 30 some years, and the players are the same. MS is not going to fall, not in your lifetime.

UAC is only useful if not combined with a user who says "Yes" to everything anyway.

What does this have to do with a company using Vista or not. And if they don't want to use UAC, they can turn it off.

Most users in the work environment are locked down and are not Admins on the machines anyway.

Dealing with Malware is a corporate headache, one that is far less time consuming with Linux.

And most business have resorted to locking down the users, so they can't really do too much anymore. It's not the wild west on the business/corporate LAN as you think.

But business is still not going to change to Linux, due to my reasons stated. They are just not doing it. Linux can be the Rock of Gibraltar. It doesn't mean anything with the day to day business IT needs of a company that's already on the MS platform.

.