

## Re: Why I should use FBSD 4.9/10 and not 5.2.1?

**Source:** <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.unix.bsd.freebsd.misc/2004-05/0160.html>

---

**From:** Tim Daneliuk (*tundra\_at\_tundraware.com*)

**Date:** 05/05/04

Date: 05 May 2004 04:50:08 EDT

Michel Talon wrote:

> *Kris Kennaway* <*kkenn@xor.obsecurity.org*> wrote:

>

>>*In other words, the instability was caused by a buggy BIOS on his SMP*

>>*hardware that just happened to be tickled by the newer version of*

>>*FreeBSD.*

>

>

> *This sentence exactly means that recent FreeBSD-4 versions are buggy for*

> *all practical purposes. Ask someone who has one hundred or one thousand*

> *servers to upgrade the BIOS of all machines, with the risks that*

> *represents:*

> *-that the upgrade doesn't succeed and the machine is rendered unbootable*

> *-that the upgrade succeeds but doesn't solve the problem*

> *not to mention that you need DOS partitions or DOS floppies and in this*

> *case floppy drives, etc. My experience on my laptop is indeed that*

> *FreeBSD-4 was much better around 4.5 than it is now. And i will not*

> *upgrade BIOS at any price. I still prefer running FreeBSD-4.9 as is.*

> *As for FreeBSD-5.2 it runs perfectly fine for me on my desktop, but*

> *obviously this depends on the hardware, etc. Clearly it is slower than*

> *it used to be under FreeBSD-4, notably in the network stack, but*

> *nothing dramatic, and i can live with that. It has been perfectly*

> *stable for me, not a single hang since i installed 5.2. I cannot say*

> *the same thing for my other desktop which runs Debian Linux with a 2.4*

> *kernel.*

>

>

>

>>*Kris*

>

I have had just the opposite experience w/5.2.1. 4.x and 5.2 have both run pretty much flawlessly on all the uniprocessor machines I have tried. But an attempt over the weekend to install 5.2.1 on a Dell Poweredge 1300/600 dual processor machine was ... well, less than successful. I got through most of an install