

Re: setup 2000 on laptop w/out CD drive?

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.setup/2004-09/0737.html>

From: Pegasus \ (MVP\) (I.can_at_fly.com)

Date: 09/24/04

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 10:42:37 +1000

See below. Here is a summary: If you want to install an operating system then you have two options:

- a) Get a bootable CD drive, or
- b) Ask an expert to do it for you.

"Bilbo" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:037801c4a1c1\$bfd9f970\$a501280a@phx.gbl...

>
>>> *Also, what is drive d:? My laptop only has one hard
> disk
>>> and it's not d:. I also don't have Win98.
>>*** I said "drive D:" – there was no mention of a second
>>*** disk. You can split your existing disk into two or
>>*** more drives. Having Windows on drive C: and your
>>*** data on drive D: has some big advantages, e.g. when
>>*** re-installing the operating system.
>
> I agree that there are advantages to partitioning a hard
> drive; however, you suggested, "I recommend you take your
> laptop to a dealer and pay him a small fee for copying
> your Win2000 CD to your hard disk, preferably to drive D:.
> You could then boot your laptop with an ordinary Win98
> boot disk and start the setup process." If I'm having
> trouble booting my system from the Win2k CD, then why
> should I expect any less trouble trying to boot from a
> Win98 boot disk?*

*** This is getting a little bizarre. In your first post you
*** wrote "... but i have no cd drive to go with it" whereas
*** now you say that you have trouble booting your system
*** from the Win2k CD. That's a completely different scenario!
*** Furthermore, booting from a floppy disk relies on different
*** mechanisms than booting from a CD.

>>> *I do have a Win2k install disk and I keep wondering why a
>>> big, rich, successful company like Microsoft can't make a
>>> product that works better -- i.w., why all us happy W2k
>>> users have to go through all this crap just to reinstall*

> >> *our OS. It just shouldn't be this difficult.*
> >*** *It seems that MS became rich and successful because*
> >*** *they deliver a product that meets the needs of many*
> >*** *people. The Ford Motor Company did this too, yet*
> >*** *few people would be able to exchange an engine by*
> >*** *themselves – yet this is precisely what you're trying*
> *to do.*

>
> *I'm not going to debate how MS became rich, other than to*
> *point out that there are other reasons, including the fact*
> *that their business practices have been declared illegal*
> *in more than one country.*

*** *I don't have the time or inclination to discuss Microsoft's*
*** *business practices.*

> *Also, I would hardly put a*
> *software install in the same category as exchanging a car*
> *engine.*

*** *You're not installing software; you're installing the*
*** *operating system. In other words, you're starting*
*** *with a blank hard disk, without the usual support*
*** *that Windows gives you for installing software.*

> *Few people ever need to exchange a car engine,*
> *but ordinary people need to install software all the*
> *time.*

*** *... and few people (other than experts) attempt*
*** *to install an operating system without having*
*** *a CD drive they can boot from.*

> *Indeed, it is a well-known fact that hard drives*
> *wear out, so installing OS software is obviously something*
> *that many ordinary people need to do. Also, since a new*
> *hard drive contains no other software to cause*
> *conflicts, installing OS software should be the easiest of*
> *all.*

*** *It is fairly easy – if you have the right hardware*
*** *(i.e. a working CD drive).*

> *Sorry, but there just isn't any good reason for*
> *Win2k to be this much of a pain to install.*
*** *Spend the money and get a working CD drive!*

> *I'm not*
> *blaming you, but I am frustrated that a company like*
> *Microsoft doesn't do a better job of simplifying something*
> *that should be a whole lot easier than they have made it.*

>