

Re: Linux Advocates Fear Solaris 10.

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.unix.solaris/2004-12/2768.html>

From: Hamilcar Barca (*hamilcar_at_tld.always.invalid*)

Date: 12/24/04

Date: Fri, 24 Dec 2004 15:49:47 -0700

In article <41cc9827\$0\$6204\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl> (Fri, 24 Dec 2004 22:28:55 +0000), Casper H. S. Dik wrote:

> *Hamilcar Barca <hamilcar@tld.always.invalid> writes:*
>
>>*Sun does want to get new customers for Solaris. Schwartz' rants make it*
>>*clear he expects to get at least some of these customers at the expense of*
>>*Linux and especially Red Hat.*
>
> *Red Hat is in business to make money and so are we. Business is done*
> *"at the expense of" other businesses, the competition.*

That's well put, and it's what I meant to say.

> *How one could do something "at the expense of" a free operating system is*
> *beyond me.*

I'm sure it is. That's one of the reasons Linux is becoming a danger to moribund corporations.

>>>>>*Solaris/x86 is a joke.*
>>>>
>>>>> *A a Linus Parrot.*
>>>>
>>>>>*I don't think name calling bolsters Sun's arguments, even if its CEO*
>>>>>*thinks it's a positive move.*
>>>>
>>>> *Linus said the nearly the same thing;*
>>>>
>>>>*So, you do think name calling bolsters Sun's arguments.*
>>>>
>>>> *You parroted Linus;*

No, I didn't; you're quoting someone else. I only said that name calling, especially when it originates from a corporate site, doesn't bolster your arguments.

> *Now, perhaps you didn't know that Linus used the exact same phrase.*

No, I didn't, but it's irrelevant.

>>*It's a commercial operating system from a for-profit corporation. Taking
>>insults aimed at Sun's products as personal is not wise.*
>
> *You're insulting Sun's customers and Sun's engineers.*

I don't think I agree, but I see your point. Personally, I don't think Solaris for the PC is a joke. It hasn't been very successful, to date, but it's still not a joke.

> *A, I see, the old "commercial is bad" "for-profit is bad"?*

No, you don't see. I didn't say that.

> *Personally, I find "you can use any operating system as long as it's Linux"
> far more threatening than "commercial" or "for-profit".*

As well you might, but that's nothing more than a straw-man argument injected by you.

> *Red Hat is "for profit" and "commercial" as well.*

Yes, they are. Good for them; good for Sun.

>>*I see no valid argument to the contrary, and have nine years experience
>>proving that Linux is free, Free, "open", and "open source".*
>
> *Yet you continue to side step any and all arguments.*

You've made no argument worth sidestepping. You claimed, falsely, Linux wasn't open, but provided no evidence. You claimed, falsely, GCC featured "embrace and extend", but your evidence did not support your claim.

> *I did, just now, the fact that gcc forces other compiler vendors
> to be "compatible"*

Please provide evidence of force.

> *just as others have to follow M\$ on some of their stuff
> makes them as bad.*

I believe Sun's new agreements with Microsoft, giving them access to closed protocols, puts you into this position. Clearly, the FSF has no agreements to do similarly.

> *I have no problem with experimenting with new
> language features; I do have a problem with not flagging them by default.*
>
>>*No, it isn't.*
>

> *You haven't really tried, have you?*

I've programmed using GCC from 1990–3 and 1995–2003. From 1993–5, I used SGI's compiler and I liked it much more than I did GCC. I never had any problems producing compliant source code.

>>*Then, in your words, you don't know what is. Why not read the record of
>>DoJ v. Microsoft or Sun v. Microsoft, and stop using pejoratives which do
>>not boost your arguments.*
>
> *At least, I am using arguments and you're not.*

Pejoratives are not arguments.

> *Neither. (Though the plague can generally be cured using an appropriate
> antibiotic as long as you diagnose it early enough; I also tend to avoid
> rodents of any sort whenever I am in California as that is one of
> the few places where the plague is indigenous in the rodent population;
> there's no known cure for gcc)*

Point taken.

>>*Yes, it was. I can't say with any certainty whatsoever that no programmer
>>would choose gcc before choosing the plague.*
>
> *That's not what "avoiding like the plague" means.*

It's what it says.

--
"By design, we've always moved out service and support from the core part of our pricing because we invest in the channel quite heavily."
-- Martin Taylor. General Manager, Platform Strategies. Microsoft.