

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

## Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

---

*Source:* <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Full-Disclosure/2006-08/msg00074.html>

---

- *From:* wac <[waldoalvarez00@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:waldoalvarez00@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 3 Aug 2006 04:56:01 -0400
- 

On 8/1/06, Eliah Kagan <[degeneracypressure@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:degeneracypressure@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On 7/27/06, wac wrote:

>>> Now, Linux is definitely not a natural migration pathway. That theory  
> of  
>>> adapting server oriented operating systems to the desktop, and believe  
> if  
>>> was going to be a succes has proven to be wrong.  
>>  
>> Really? Windows 2000, Windows XP, and Mac OS X seem to work pretty  
>> well for novice users...  
>  
>  
> Sorry I don't get the point here.  
>  
>> Or are you belaboring the misguided claim that Linux is fundamentally  
>> a server-based system but that Windows NT is not?  
>  
>  
> There was Windows NT workstation ;). With windows was the other way.  
From  
> desktop to server. Of course you can change Linux so much that it won't  
be  
> Linux anymore. Definitely putting an X server on top of unix won't make  
it  
> ready for desktop, that's a fact.

Are you honestly claiming that Windows NT Server has a nonintuitive user interface and yet Windows NT Workstation has an intuitive user interface? (Or was that a joke?) They are the same operating system except for additional executables and registry tweaks.

Of course not, they are almost the same. Hey! take a look at winNT

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

4.0resources in explorer some bitmaps say windows NT server, workstation and there was a 3rd one, I don't remember very well. I don't even consider windows OS server oriented at all (that is why I mentioned the workstation thing if interested). I can say then something similar. Adapting desktop oriented OS to server ... And yes numbers proof that. Anyway I guess is a problem of selling more or having it installed on more computers. But then that's not my problem. Mine and many others are having their problems solved. And yes I can tell you a couple of stories about that. I have some windows servers. And guess what. I'm praying for a linux/freebsd or whatever \*nix you can name. But then the persons across the sea just can't install that. Then I guess that would give you an answer about the installer interfaces you talk later. No, they just can't intall a Linux at all, and beleive me, I tried hard to make that happen. Imagine a FreeBSD or something else. My only chances would have been for example to use some virtualization software and install other OS in some partition and then pray that a boot loader installer from windows would wake up correctly the other OS. As you can see that was a big IF we were not ready to take. Anyway I was left without choices and now the software those servers run had to be built on top of Windows. Well IOCompletionsPorts work OK as long as the non paged pool doesn't drains out when the number of opened sockets goes too high. Yes even with the registry hack to increase its size. Also the use of windows for example included having to install a comercial SSH software instead of OpennSSH (no the cywin port was not ok, it hanged the server sometimes because of it's emulation created a process for every user logged in). Ohh yes we are talking about real money here. Beleive me I really prayed for a damn good user friendly installer once.

When you said,

"server-based" I thought you meant "designed for enterprise client-server situations." If you mean "designed to be used exclusively on a dedicated server box operated by a technically learned network administrator" then (by definition) no general purpose operating system (be it Windows, Linux, FreeBSD, OpenBSD, NetBSD, or any other) is server-based. Saying that noobs can't use Linux doesn't make it so. FreeBSD is a particular general purpose operating system that is perhaps almost exclusively used by people who know well what they are doing (or are willing to put in the time and effort to learn)—and Mac OS X is based on FreeBSD. (To be fair, some elements are based on NeXTstep, which is another operating system used almost exclusvely by the technically inclined.)

This notion that you can't

take an operating system that has been traditionally hard to use and make it easier is senslessly defeatist and unsupported by evidence, though it may be partially self-fulfilling.

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

Ok where is that evidence? MacOS X is not a good example when you have little choices you can make. What would you install in a mac instead? Linux? Then I guess we have the same situation here. But also keep in mind that the only thing that Mac OS got from FreeBSD was the kernel. Anyway I'm not an expert here so I guess that I can't talk very much about the subject. So far I see that Windows is more used on the desktop than any other OS and yet you have to pay for the license (or violate it) and all the rest of the sh.. we all know. And now some Macs have Intel inside. Are we going to see the Apple selling Wintel too in the future? Maybe, when they realize that they are probably going to sell more computers.

As an aside, if you're saying that Windows NT is even based on Windows

9x, I would take argument with this.

This is a claim I never did.

Would you say that OS/2 is based

on Windows 9x?

Of course not. It was based somehow in MS-DOS. It was supposed to be the successor of that one. But then M\$ dropped the whole thing to IBM and made Windows.

Windows 9x is based on,

and essentially the same

operating system as, Windows 3.x,

No. That's wrong. It maybe is essentially the same that Win 3.x + Win32 (9x was superior of course). But hey Win 3.x was 16 bits and was pre-emptive to name a few.

but Windows NT is wholly different

(and wholly superior).

Not as different as win9x and win3.x. But yes that 16 bits superlock, kernel writable memory zones, and the not secure at all FAT that 9x had makes NT a lot superior. There were more things too ;) but that is written on msdn.

- > Have them install ReactOS without assistance, and get back to me.
- >> (Hopefully their machine doesn't have fake parity RAM.)
- >
- >
- > Is the same way as windows 2000 and they have done that already.

It is the same way as Windows 2000 when it works...but if they have installed it successfully, and they are technically clueless, then that does speak well of ReactOS—it says that its installer can compete with the installer in Ubuntu, or Fedora, or Mandriva...all stable systems compared with ReactOS.

- >> Or you could use NDISwrapper in Linux (or FreeBSD) and run your
- >> Windows drivers, without rewriting any driver code. Sure, it doesn't
- >> work for everything. Neither does ReactOS.
- >
- > Why try to put patches to linux when you can have a non patched system ready
- > to go? And with 0 learning time too ;). From the security point of view
- > that's important since it starts right at the user. Remember how many
- > security problems we see today with incorrectly configured systems. Observe
- > also that you have to patch the thing from 2 sides, putting an emulation
- > layer on top of it and down in the kernel.

If your purpose is to run Windows programs in a Windows environment, only, then ideally ReactOS is better than Linux—when ReactOS becomes stable enough to be suitable for production environments, this will really be the case.

It is worth mentioning that NDISwrapper is not a "patch" for Linux in the sense that has all the connotations—it is a part of the kernel. You don't have to be running a forked-off kernel to use NDISwrapper—you just have to enable the module.

Is a patch in the sense that you have to put something extra that maybe works if properly configured. Too much ifs. Looks like compiling something for cygwin in order to make it run in windows. Jeje I could tell you about that a couple of things. And yes luckily we now have modules in the linux kernel if enabled. Anyway I doubt that my next door neighbour will do that ok. Jeje I would have to have a look at the manual before even using

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

modprobe. Jeje imagine making him manually install a driver made for windows using that. Guess what. I will tell you a little secret. I once tried to run WINE just to look how that worked. Well it started giving troubles here and there and since I was only doing that for mere curiosity well I have never emulated a damn thing in there. I probably have managed to end up running something there but then with Windows/ReactOS thing are so simple. And then that is the whole point. Why waste your time when you don't have too? Keep in mind that if something doesn't runs in ReactOS then it probably doesn't works in WINE either since that layer is the same. So aside from stability there is not much that a WINE+Linux+NdisWrapper will fix things.

Many of the incorrectly configured systems are Windows systems, and

many are Linux or other \*nix systems as well. These days, most are due to network administrators going and turning services on that were off by default without securing them. Almost all popular Linux distributions today ship with services turned off by default or with their ports firewalled by default.

> Yes there is sense. I'm making a critic to those that make things hard  
> without need. Also why adapt a server oriented OS when you don't have to?

The operating systems you are referring to as "server oriented" seem to be the ones that would be better-labeled "stable and powerful enough to be used in big enterprise environments.

No I refer to server oriented OS to those that are better designed prepared to.... Run in server scenarios. For example not havig a GUI when you don't need it eating memory that could be spent in for example more threads or opened sockets or cache. And that also eat bandwidth. Or for example having remote management tools that really work. With windows sooner or later you end up using terminal services (for example to install software remotely but not reduced to that). Ohh well I have dialup. And no ADSL or some high bandwidth connection is not an option sometimes. Jeje that takes ages. Not to mention that you have to leave an opened port (that puts open to the internet another gimme user password ready to be bruteforced/list forced or something if not properly configured to delay succesive attempts) in order to allow that comunication unless for example you route all that traffic over an SSH channel. Tricks and patches here and there. Well fortunately it works. But never for example as a linux would do. Come on even to acces the help you can't open a man page or something like it.

" Desktop

environments deserve to not crash and not suck too. 'Nuff said.

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

Re: [Full-disclosure] 70 million computers are using Windows 98 right now

Of course but then that goes for all the software.

What is more effective, that some people develop something suitable or  
> millions have to learn something without need? Definitely less resources  
> will be wasted. And we are talking about a big difference.

Would you care to tell me about all the arcane skills that Mac OS X  
users have had to learn to run their UNIX variant?

You have just given another example then ;). \_\_\_\_\_

Full-Disclosure – We believe in it.

Charter: <http://lists.grok.org.uk/full-disclosure-charter.html>

Hosted and sponsored by Secunia – <http://secunia.com/>