

# Re: not genuine Windows

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2006-08/msg04141.html>

---

- *From:* arachnid <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:12:56 -0500
- 

On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 01:03:11 +0000, Leythos wrote:

In article <pan.2006.08.17.13.29.08.328952@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx says...

On Thu, 17 Aug 2006 12:49:54 +0000, Leythos wrote:

In article <ec0jnr01sh9@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, nostop@xxxxxxxxxxxx says...

What you're suggesting just makes no sense  
– as so much of what you  
say around here, is just unbelievable, even if  
you decide to shout  
it out in caps.

Keep trying, you can't prove anything I've written is  
incorrect, in  
fact, you can only keep ranting and trying to divert from the  
truth,  
but it won't work.

The problem with that is that we have three Linux users here confirming  
that Linux installs/updates aren't as slow as you claim.

No, you have three users that claim to have experience and only one of  
them claims to have use FC, and it was FC3, which is not what I've said  
I was using.

At least two of us have used FC and I never said which version I use. For  
the record it's FC5.

## Re: not genuine Windows

Hop on over to comp.os.linux.misc and ask, and a whole newsgroup full of linux users will confirm it. I don't know what you're doing wrong, but I suspect you're updating a whole lot more than the core and one office application.

No, as I've said several times, I did not install the entire package.

See below.

Just out of curiosity, what was your update command, what did you use as your MS Office equivalent, is it running under gnome or KDE, and what other applications were installed?

Gnome, Open Office, I just invoked the auto installed update tool that scans the computer for installed apps and then selected to update them, it YUM, it does not pull updates for apps not installed.

It was a trick question. Gnome and KDE both come with a whole lot of extra applications baggage. If you do a general update then worst case could be 200–400 megabytes of downloads to bring them up to date. Since this includes a lot of extra applications, some of which are quite large, this is NOT the same as comparing to Windows core/office suite to Linux core/office suite.

Now it wouldn't surprise me if OpenOffice pulled in dependencies that then pulled in gnome or KDE. If so then it may be impossible to do a "fair" comparison except by loading up Windows with an equivalent amount of software. However, if it doesn't, then XFCE or Enlightenment would avoid all that extra baggage and lead to a more even comparison.

Maybe instead of claiming you know a bunch of things, you might try proving that you know a bunch of things by stating facts, so far I've not seen you provide any technical facts on anything you've suggested.

The only "technical fact" you've provided is a subjective claim that three experienced Linux users don't find credible.

No, three users that have not used FC4 or 5, none have said they have

## Re: not genuine Windows

used Mandrake or SUSE, and all of them appear to be non-technical types.

I worked in Electronics R&D for 25 years before I turned to trucking to escape the tech treadmill. My specialty during the latter half of my electronics career was designing, building, and programming micro-controller circuits. I started using Linux (somewhat) and FreeBSD (a lot) around 2001, and later went 3 blissful years without Windows. For the past few months I've been checking out most of the top Linux distro's – Fedora FC4 and FC5, SuSE, SLED, Ubuntu, Debian, PCLinuxOS, SimplyMEPIS, Knoppix, and Kanotix – and those are just the ones I remember off the top of my head. Also I installed NetBSD and OpenBSD just to see what they're doing nowadays. My goal in all this was just to find the one OS that I want to stay with for the next 15 years. At first it looked like Fedora, but when the smoke cleared Debian was the only one left standing.

Is that technical enough for you?

Every install of FC4 or 5 has taken several hours for a based install and then many hours to pull updates, every single time, period.

Two hours for a basic install minus downloading updates? Oh, please. I can do that in a half hour. Here's someone who did it in under 20 minutes, not counting partitioning time:

<http://www.partha.com/installation.html>

"Fedora told me that it would take 20 minutes to install. I was impressed that it only took 19 minutes!"

Of course, you can probably also find someone who took a day or a week to get Fedora "installed", but that just means they spent a lot of time futzing with incompatible hardware or spinning their wheels because they didn't know their way around yet. A half hour should be pretty typical for an experienced user with compatible hardware.

Now, keep this in mind, I'm not here bashing Linux, I love it as much as my Windows XP/2003 machines, and I'm also not here bashing Windows XP.

I might believe that if not for things like claiming that it takes several hours to do a base install of Fedora.

I don't care if you believe the times – but it's kind of funny to watch nostonp claim Linux doesn't fragment, rant and rave that I don't have a

## Re: not genuine Windows

It's a common enough myth so I can forgive him. Linux docs are vague on the subject and often say things like, "fragmentation isn't a problem with Linux". People misunderstand that to mean that Linux filesystems don't fragment. What it really means is that Linux filesystems fragment but are designed in such a way that fragmentation isn't a problem. It does cause some rather minor slowdown but not the serious degradation you get with FAT32. If that's a problem for someone, they can always do continuous background defragging.

clue, and then see qualified people in major linux sites talking about how it DOES fragment files and how it can be a performance issue, etc... But you never see him come back with anything to disprove what I've said – he only makes suggestions and then runs away with his tail between his legs to not bring it up again.