

Re: text file saved in COM format..

## Re: text file saved in COM format..

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2006-09/msg06076.html>

---

- *From:* "q\_q\_anonymous@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <q\_q\_anonymous@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 17 Sep 2006 04:08:59 -0700
- 

I don't know if this will get posted twice. If it does, it's the same

NoStop wrote:

q\_q\_anonymous@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

NoStop wrote:

q\_q\_anonymous@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Byte wrote:

COM and EXE extensions  
are reserved executable  
formats and cannot  
be used for TXT documents.  
It could put your PC in the  
trash bin.  
Save the documents with a  
txt or doc extension.

--

or if it's an html web page, then .html/.htm

I second what you've said,.

I can't believe that so far 2 posters in this  
thread have gone along  
with him calling this file .com !!!  
\*\*maybe\*\* it'd make sense to call  
a directory .com(many offline browsers do-

Re: text file saved in COM format..

which is fine, it shouldn't  
be confused with a file) But don't call a web  
page file a .com !!

It's because COM executables aren't seen much anymore.  
They can only be  
64KB in size or smaller and are/were created in the old days  
by writing  
assembly language. Today Windoze executables are so much  
larger and  
written in higher level program languages than assembly. But  
Windoze  
still recognizes the COM extension as an executable file and  
hence the  
OP's "problem". :-)

A more sophisticated operating system won't bother doing  
file  
associations based on file extension names, but rather will  
use  
permission bits to designate whether a file is executable or  
not. But,  
Windoze XP isn't that sophisticated and carries around  
within it a lot of  
old DOS baggage.

Cheers.

--

Linux is ready for the desktop! More ready than Windoze  
XP.

<http://tinyurl.com/ldm9d>

Err, which OS is sophisticated and which is primitive?

Hidden files

What about more sophisticated operating systems using attributes to  
make a file 'hidden'. Whereas a primitive operating system might use  
the filename itself to indicate that.

Sure is a lot simpler to start a filename with a dot to hide it rather than  
to have to go and change its attributes. That I'd call "sophisticated".

Of course it's not surprising that linux doesn't include 'hidden' as an  
attribute.. You'd have to know 0-15 in binary, along with 4 column  
headings rwx and h !!

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Why should it when its so much simpler to just "dot" it?

Because

How can you then display hidden files, not hidden directories?

and excluding . and .. ?

In DOS or the command prompt, you can display files with particular attributes, very easily. `dir /a-dh` (all that are not directories, and are hidden).

Also, it works for other attributes, like 'read only'.

Globbering / \*

Reasonably sophisticated operating systems also distinguish well between files and directories. Very easy for the command that lists them, to list either just files, or just directories.

`ls -dl */`

I know that one for just directories. But for teh ake of consistency, surely `ls` should be able to do just files – not directories.

`ls *[^/] <--` doesn't work (why?!) And the alternatives i've seen aren't so pretty!

Something so simple should be possible elegently with `ls`, rather than with a long find command, or by stringing `ls` together with `grep`.

A DOS user doesn't have to string `dir` together with `find` , in order to list files (non-directories)!

Something so trivial should have an elegant solution! Or perhaps elegant is the wrong word.

A low keystroke solution And with only the directory listing command. It should be a basic function of it.

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Just hidden  
files. Just hidden directories.

```
ls -dl */
```

There the same issue as before. How about just non directories.

But further--

How about excluding . and .. ? I want just files, or just directories.  
just hidden files, just hidden directories. I don't want those . and  
... entries.

If could give a reason, but it's only 90% researched, I may have  
overlooked something. Or I may be correct, but for slightly idfferent  
reasons.. I'd rather be able to exclude . and ..  
here one is.. But it's long, and with my lack of experience in linux  
batch scripting, maybe I overlooked something, and don't want it to  
geti n the way of the post!

Here is my reason

DOS doesn't have recursive commands, and it doesn't expand \* like linux  
does. In DOS you can't do echo \* i.e. dir \* or \*.\* doesn't become dir  
.. .. a b c Therefore, . and .. never cause such problematic thought.

The .. is just useful for moving back directories.

Linux is different, ls \*, if \* expands to . and .. (and from my  
preliminary investigations .\* always does, at least in bash) , so it  
will include ls . and ls .. So linux bullies me with that default. .

Fair enough, but give me a setting to turn that setting off, if linux  
claims to be so flexible, it should let me! By the way, dir  
understand you may want just the files or directories and not the . and  
..., and dir /b wil exclude them, and given the way \* or \*.\* works in  
DOS, you can do dir \*.\* /b and it won't include . and .. Thisi s  
useful, if you need those results and don't want . and .. processed.

Consider--

how many hidden files or directories do I have..

```
ls -l .* | wc -l
```

But if I want to exclude the . and .. entries. I can't from ls. So I  
must subtract 2 from the result. That's not so many more keystrokes  
than necessary, it's a hack, it's a little bit ugly for something so  
simple, and it's functionality that should be within ls.

You see it'd be nice if linux was flexibility enough to give at least  
the elegance that DOS offers... There's no reason why linux shouldn't  
in this case. I'm not asking linux to be DOS, but i see that linux has  
its own ways of doing things. But in this comparison of ls and dir, the  
demand I make, is not asking linux to not be linux. On the contrary! If  
linux could do what I suggest, it'd be good linux philosophy!

Re: text file saved in COM format..

But in linux, it often makes more sense to

<snip>

#### Scripting

They say, but the Bash (the standard interpreter for scripts in \*nix) is so powerful!! Well, QBASIC for DOS was more powerful. Try writing a game in Bash.

QBASIC was a interpreted "programming language". On the Linux side you have many that are far more powerful, such as python or perl ... and there are many more.

Well, python and perl exist as windows ports too.

So at best we're even here. I don't have such an issue here ..and nowadays people aren't using QB with win xp.

Qbasic fitted well with DOS. Came with it. It wasn't like a 3rd party thing. And it was so easy.

I wouldn't say that python and perl are part of linux or windows or dos. But QBASIC is very much part of DOS.

They say Linux is just a kernel, so really we should speak of Linux/GNU. But then you've got a whole ton of software to wade through. I imagine that people gradually discovered python or perl, soon after it came out, by word of mouth, by being in the business, or by having internet access in the early 90s and reading about it. Everybody with DOS that was into DOS had and knew QBASIC. Any 12 year old, that didn't have the benefit of internet access or being in the profession, or knowing anybody else that liked computers.. He could go far into DOS with dir \*.exe dir \*.com, help <Enter> he'd find qbasic.

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Though i'm not sure if QB lives in NT anymore, so that criticism is only half fair.

Multi-user

For somebody running his own computer, the whole multiuser attributes thing is a hassle.. Too much information.

Maybe a bit of a hassle for the newbie, but that's what keeps the user space separate from the kernel space AND keeps one user space separate from another user space. A sophisticated operating system has these builtin safe guards for security purposes. Malicious code run by one user can't impact on the o/s (kernel space) nor on other user's data/files. The lack of this in Windoze is what makes viruses and trojans so destructive on that "operating system".

this is a very sad state of affairs nowadays

Back in the days of DOS,

—

there was no problem of browser hijacking.. I first ran into that in 2003.

I didn't have internet access at the time I was using just DOS.. We ran into viruses, usually from a friend's floppy disk (where on earth knows had that been?).

It seemed that there weren't new viruses coming out all the time. We had the Anti-virus, MSAV to get rid of them, and VSAFE. These were really good. And at that time, they were fine. The viruses didn't tend to format or wipe partitions. They just attacked EXEs and COMs.

And it was adequate.. It's possible to have so much security as to make a system uncomfortable to use.

DOS didn't need its whole OS redesigned to deal with such a small threat that its technical users could deal with themselves.

Regarding nowadays though.

—

Most \*technically minded\* Windows XP users can browse around as Administrator. And simply by not using 'internet explorer' and not running dangerous programs, they are safe.

I don't need many user accounts in my windows xp system.

Many people working in the security world, may still work as Administrator. And do so safely, and have done for years , without problems.

I can see the attributes of a file from a command prompt, without the irrelevance of seeing what premissions other users may have.. I don't

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Re: text file saved in COM format..

even care how that works. Because I am the only user of my system.. If somebody else uses my computer, it's rare, and i'll watch them like a hawk.. Not because they want to read my files – they don't. But because they don't know what they're doing. If they knew what they were doing, they'd want their own computer. I don't really need to inconvenience myself with such security concerns which really don't apply in my nice environment. It is a LUXURY to be able to do this. If I am running a server and a firewall, and somebody breaks in, then congratulations to them if they're that good. And if they're that good, then even if I was running in a limited account, i'd bet they could escalate to Administrative. Maybe install a key logger. It's my home machine. Should I inconvenience myself making things take so much longer, making the OS far nastier to use, all in the hope that somebody as smart or 20\* smarter than me can't break in? You draw a balance between comfort and security.

Windows XP is fantastic like that!! It has the Administrative account, and limited accoutns. You can put an ignoramus on a limited account. But you can run on an Administrative account. Any commands you run from DOS related to dir, or file attributes (attrib), do not tell you anything about what permissions they have on your files.. Nice and simple. And secure. Though as I said.. I rarely have other people using my computer. If they are, they are ignoramuses + I watch them like a hawk. This happens for 5 minutes a month. Not much of an inconvenience.

In NT, I can use DOS  
commands without care as to other peoples's read/write attributes..

As can any malware you download and run. :-)

It's my own machine anyway!! I don't have other people using it.

There's more to a multiuser o/s than just the human user. There are other "users" associated with different things that also are protected by file permissions. Think of a user named "apache" and you'll get my drift.

i'm new to linux.. though i did once set up an apache server. I set 'other' to r. and didn't put executable access to the directory. Anybody logging in should have the same permissions. If they can log in. That was fine.

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Re: text file saved in COM format..

I don't really have the experience in linux to answer that one properly. However, regarding windows, .. and windows was fine like this!

I've set up web servers and ftp servers in windows with 3rd party apps.. Tiny apps, they didn't create any new OS users at all. the http server is read only of course. And the FTP server let me choose which users have which permissions. The users I think were within the ftp server, not users of the OS – if that's what linux would do i don't know.. It was very simple. Setting up those servers had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with multiuser abilities in the OS.

So if windows does it fine without making a web server user for that 3rd party web server, or involving itself in such multiuser issues I don't see why linux has to do anything of the sort. It has nothing to do with multiuser.. at least not in windows. And that was fine for me.. Simple and made sense.

Nevertheless, I shall keep playing with the linux command line, since I am technically inclined, and I do have some time on my hands!

I'm sure that the more you play the more you'll come to appreciate its power and usefulness.

And linux users keep insisting that I will see the light.

You will. :-) When the light bulb finally comes on, you'll see the light.

So I will dig deeper and broader.

Considering what i've described, as linux annoyances. I'd say windows annoyances are better documented, thanks to the thousands of people complaining on usenet! With windows, the annoyances is usually found and solved immediately! And if that fails – then reinstall the OS. And that works!!

HAHA, right. Nothing like having to reinstall the OS because something has gone bad. Sure makes keeping ones configurations, data and installed apps fun to redo and redo and redo.

Re: text file saved in COM format..

Re: text file saved in COM format..

I wont' try the linux GUIs (I mean 'window managers'). I know if I did i'd get so mad I could write a book critiquing them!

I was a KDE user for a long time and just didn't appreciate Gnome until I started using it with Ubuntu. I must say, I'm impressed! As for eye-candy it's pretty hard to beat E17. That's truly impressive.

I don't want eye candy!!! Maybe this is why linux GUIs are so bad!!  
They think window is successful because it's all eye candy.  
somebody in an ms newsgroup, (maybe you), posted a youtube clip of a 3D linux desktop.. I was already put off trying a Linux GUI . But tat one made me laugh. The last time that happened was picking up the Linux Osbourne book, you might've seen the great big osbourne linux reference.. it had a picture about linux being the future.. saying .. well.. i won't ruin it.. if I had a working scanner i'd scan it in. It was priceless. The funniest part was the linux fanatic wasn't kidding!  
One day i'll posta reply to you with the picture.. I don't mind looking at clips of pictures of linux GUIs. Especialyl recommended ones. They are funny. It's using them that causes a lump in my throat!  
Last time I tried a linux GUI I had a lot of work to do and the GUI kept sliding off the screen. I can't remember what GUI it was, anyhow, that was in 2002, I am still recovering. If that was a vid clip it'd have been hilarious. I know, I know, "they've improved".. ;-) I bet tthey said that in 2002. I'll wait a few more bundles of years before I try another GUI. I'm more serious about the command line.

..

.

Re: text file saved in COM format..