

Re: Flaws in XP SP2

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2004-09/34123.html>

From: Don Taylor (*dont_at_agora.rdrop.com*)

Date: 09/28/04

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 21:36:29 -0500

"PA Bear" <PABear@mvps.org> writes:

>Don Taylor wrote:

>>> As for the [posts] here, the majority of people with no issues have no

>>> reason to post.

>>

>> Prove it.

>I'd say the onus is on you to prove it's **not** true, Don.

Ok, why? You have one camp claiming there are lots of problems. You have the other camp claiming everything they say is meaningless, demand that they provide proof for this, and to do this they should go diagnose the real cause of each of the 850,000 postings and when they get done to come back and tell these folks who are supposed to be the ones providing help what the real causes of each were.

You have the opposite camp claiming there are very few problems, have thus far presented zero evidence for the claims that almost everything is the result of spyware and viruses and stupid users, and when asked to back up their claims... you tell me that you don't have to.

Let's see the supposedly informed folks here go diagnose 85,000 of those postings and determine the real cause. That' 10% of the postings and almost certainly hundreds or thousands of times more than have actually ever had the real cause determined.

So why is it the folks who claim the failure rate is near zero are exempt from backing up their claims while those who disagree must provide such proof? Let's make this bluntly fair here.

And I'd guess, but have no evidence to prove, that the majority, likely even the vast majority, of users never get to posting or reading microsoft.public.* that the number of postings here represent the tiny tip of the iceberg, both for people who don't and people who do have problems with SP2. What the real world ratio is, nobody

microsoft.public.windowsxp.general: Re: Flaws in XP SP2

here has shown any credible evidence that I've seen.