

## Re: Loyal Microsoft Fan

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2004-03/26451.html>

---

**From:** Tom (tom\_at\_sympatico.ca)

**Date:** 03/26/04

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2004 12:30:10 -0500

Wah... cry me a river. Those things have been dealt with. Now was that a MS person or a pushy stupid sales man from MS? And what's to say about the store? Would you run a store or company and not turn around and go to the press about MS pressuring you to go with their OS? I would and it doesn't take a genius. I never bought any of those stories.

In the end there is NOTHING stopping you from installing Linux and there NEVER WAS OR IS RIGHT NOW.

As I said in my other post. MS should pull completely out of the business of including their OS on PC's. People should have to single handedly grab a box off the shelf. Period. It wont change at all the fact most people will choose Windows. Windows is simply easier and more supported. To deny that just proves you're a moron.

Tom

"E McCann" <love.nodotshere.myquadra@mad.scientist.com> wrote in message news:OkTGUmREEHA.3064@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...

>

> *"Jupiter Jones [MVP]" <jones\_jupiter@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:u6ZpTDrEEHA.3568@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...*

> > *Perhaps you live in the wrong area if no computers with Linux are available.*

> > *Here is just one source:*

> >

>

<http://www.walmart.com/catalog/catalog.gsp?cat=106562&path=0%3A3944%3A3951%3A41937%3A106562>

> >

> > *The stores will sell whatever people will buy.*

> > *If the stores do not stock something it is because they do not think people will buy it.*

> >

> > *Since it is the consumers that choose, perhaps it is not all the fault of the "monopoly".*

> > *Just maybe the "monopoly" is the fault of the consumers that choose what they think is best for them in their situation.*

- >
- > JJ,
- >
- > *The monopoly's not a recent event. One of the (historic) complaints.*
- Several
- > years ago OEMs brought up the fact that the way MS licensed the OS to them
- > made it economically infeasible to offer *\*any\** other OS. Some OEMs came up
- > trying to offer OS/2 and couldn't – there were complaints that MS *\*did\**
- > strongarm them into only offering Windows (and IIRC MS DOS at the time.)
- > Others (Digital Research) complained MS went "above and beyond" to scare
- > people away from other OSes (fake errors in Windows– 3.0, IIRC – if
- > installed on DRDos 5, Windows (not for workgroups) 3.11 which had no real
- > active changes, just broke the OS/2 2.1 For Windows installer, etc.)
- >
- > Similar complaints were heard from ISPs and others who were told they
- \*could*
- > *not\* offer Netscape instead of Internet Explorer.*
- >
- > *This was not "consumer choice." Actions such as these are what brought*
- about
- > *the lawsuits in the first place.*
- >
- > <http://web.archive.org/web/19961220124227/caldera.com/news/> (1996, not on
- > the current site... since it's partially SCO now. Of course, that makes
- the
- > *OpenLinux bit offered there interesting....)*
- >
- > <http://www.planetpapers.com/Assets/474.php>
- >
- >
- [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/jan-june98/microsoft\\_1-13.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/jan-june98/microsoft_1-13.html) ->
- > *interview about one of the cases.*
- >
- > <http://www.aufait.net/~garnet/muse/lla.html> -> *reasonably interesting...*
- > *mentioning how even free company-made OSes (such as BeOS) weren't allowed*
- > *and forced away, and why Linux is still around (no one company to go*
- against
- > *because of development model.)*
- >
- > *Just a few things to look at. The history of antitrust and complaints of*
- > *anticompetitive behavior from MS go \*well\* back – you could say they went*
- > *from a clever way to compete with the IBM deal to being anticompetitive*
- > *themselves. This was, frankly, allowed because of how \*slow\* the justice*
- > *system is, and the relative lack of knowledge of "how things work" in the*
- > *computer / software industry by the legal system. So, for the most part –*
- > *consumers weren't \*allowed\* to choose.*
- >
- > *FWIW, this is where I'm coming from – I started running DOS 5 and*
- Windows.
- > *Jumped to OS/2 when I could, while watching what was going on on the*
- Windows

- > *side (Win95, which seriously annoyed me just with upgrading a modem. Long*
- > *story there.) Got annoyed with IBM's attitude after OS/2 Warp 4 (great OS,*
- > *lousy attitude toward non-corporate users.) Looked into Linux which was*
- > *mostly command-line (still have my old Slackware CD somewhere,) had lousy*
- > *hardware support at the time, etc. so ended up "by default" on Windows*
- with
- > *a new PC.*
- >
- > *XP is the only Windows OS I've made a conscious decision to \*choose\* for a*
- > *PC. Over a decade, remember? XP is, IMHO, where Windows should have been*
- > *several years ago. (Yes, I think MS should have switched completely over*
- to
- > *NT - based OSes around the time of NT 4.) Had they done so, I'd probably*
- > *have ignored Linux, OS/2 v4, BeOS and others (outside of curiosity.)*
- >
- > *Currently running both Windows and a Mac (OS X.2.8)*
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > ---
- > *Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.*
- > *Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).*
- > *Version: 6.0.620 / Virus Database: 399 - Release Date: 3/11/2004*
- >
- >