

Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2004-11/1363.html>

From: Beth (*BethStone21_at_hotmail.NOSPICEDHAM.com*)

Date: 11/30/04

Date: Tue, 30 Nov 2004 01:28:02 GMT

hutch wrote:

> *Annie wrote:*

>> *Or need I remind you about the "warning" that was
>> built into WinDoze 3.1x to falsely scare users, if
>> WinDoze detected that it was running under anything
>> other than M\$'s own brand of DOS? Again, the courts
>> found this to be a no-no, and ordered Mikro\$loth
>> to pay multi-millions of dollars to the owners of
>> DR-DOS.*

>

> *It did not help that at times, Windows ran like a bag of sh*t if it
> was strapped onto much else where at least with the ms-dos memory
> management, it worked fine ALL THE TIME.*

Perhaps...but, if so, this could be because Windows was a bag of sh*t and depended on having a poor code base in a broken DOS to function properly...

Oh, this little "trick" of actually making the competition look worse by _Microsoft themselves_ coding things badly has done Microsoft proud over the years...

For example, the Microsoft implementation of the PNG image format in the PC version of IE? Broken...the alpha transparency doesn't work and displays a grey background behind the image, totally ruining the entire point of the "alpha" effect...rendering it useless...

If you totally abandon any pretence to make your HTML code "compatible" across a range of browsers, then you can – Microsoft's suggested "work around" – use the completely proprietary "DirectX filters"...as the fact that these are being supplied by DirectX should immediately tell you, this stuff is completely "Windows-specific"...

Okay, so Microsoft have screwed things up, what else is new? Ah, but consider the web developer's angle:

1. Ignore "compatibility", use the "DirectX filters" to get the transparency effects working well...the site is "Windows IE only" but, on that platform, you get the transparency effects as desired...

alt.lang.asm: Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

2. In the interests of "compatibility" because Windows IE can't do the transparency effects properly, you "downgrade" your website so that it uses simpler standards...it doesn't look as good but it works on all browsers...

3. You decide that if IE is going to be broken, then you'll just have to exclude IE...you use PNG transparency as it's always supposed to have worked...this works fine in all browsers but appears totally screwed up in IE...

Right, remembering that it is Microsoft's Windows IE that is the _BROKEN_ piece of software, review the consequences in terms of a user firing up their IE browser (due to Microsoft's monopoly and "bundling" tactics, this is the browser most people will be using) to point it at the website...

1. The "IE only" site appears to work perfectly and has the fantastic PNG effects working properly...the user viewing the page sees the impressive effects and thinks "Wow! Microsoft use all the best technology...because this is the best webpage I've seen that works properly and it's 'IE only' so it must be doing things other browsers are not capable of doing"...

2. The "compatible with all browsers" site works but had to abandon the "special effects" completely to be able to do so...sticking with older standards, "playing it safe" with simple content...it works but it looks crap...the user thinks: "Oh, in order to make it work on those other crappy non-Microsoft browsers, they've had to make the site worse and it looks crap...those other browsers must be very crap next to IE"...

3. The "screw IE" site, of course, works brilliantly on all other browsers except IE...but the IE user doesn't know that...when they fire up the site in their IE browser, they see _Microsoft's_ screwed up buggy interpretation of PNG and get all the grey background ugliness...they think "oh my gosh, this site doesn't even work properly...it's not just crap looking, it's totally broken...what's that ugly mess in the middle of the page? If this is the best 'other browsers' can do, then I'm glad I've got IE because those others are terrible and don't work properly at all"...

Again, this is the impression the poor, naive impressionable Windows / IE user gets from viewing these three kinds of site...and what they are _seeing_ is easily attributed as being the fault of _other browsers_, not IE...indeed, the "IE only" site seems to work brilliantly and the "not for IE" site looks like a totally broken mess...

This type of user is not savvy enough to realise that things are, in fact, _BACKWARDS_ there...that the "not for IE" site actually is the best one of the lot because, when not used with buggy IE (where the problem _actually_ resides), it comes up looking perfect and does so without a single proprietary hack or any deviation from any standards...and that "compatible for all browsers" site had to "downgrade" to older standards and be a little "crap looking" in comparison because of _IE's buggy implementation_, not because the other browsers could not handle it...and the "IE only" site is only working because it's full of proprietary hacks and is completely

Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

non-standard...

But when you view the world through Windows IE, you get a false picture...what you see – "seeing is believing" and all that actually inaccurate nonsense – suggests to you that IE is the "best technology" (backed up by Microsoft simply lying in all their adverts to say "this is the best technology" over and over to re-inforce the self-delusion in what's actually an "optical illusion") and it is other browsers which are "broken" with regard to things like PNG...

It's like having one of those fairground distorted "funny" mirrors to do your make-up (okay, you don't do make-up...then you're trying to style your hair with hair gel or something like that instead ;)...in the mirror, all looks well...but because that mirror is distorted, you actually march on out looking like a drunken circus clown (or with the hair, you've unintentionally created a new hybrid "Einstein meets 'Something about Mary' first thing in the morning" style ;) without even realising it...if the lens through which you look at the world is distorted and wrong, then what you're seeing isn't actually quite what's really there...somewhat a disaster when the majority out there tend to blindly follow "seeing is believing" and so long as the mirror lies to them, they'll NEVER question it..."mirror, mirror on the wall", indeed, eh? ;)

[Note to Annie: Don't be predictable...yes, yes...we can hear the "Beth the circus clown" insults already...don't be so obvious and tired in actually saying them out loud and only confirming just how miserably pathetic and bitter you really are :)]

What's interesting – and why I referred to it as "Windows IE" all the way through, not just IE in general – is the suspiciously strange fact that the Mac version of IE doesn't have this "bug" in it...no, no...the Mac version of IE, in fact, has the best PNG support of all...yeah, it's such a good implementation that the PNG group actually point to Mac IE as the "role model"...it has ALL the features which not all other browsers support like "gamma correction"...

Which, in the context, is highly, highly suspect, isn't it? Microsoft use C / C++ so, to a degree, why can't they just use the Mac IE source code to make the Windows IE implementation work? The rendering part might be different but the "decoding" and other such things should be perfectly portable "as is"...

As they have simultaneously the worst and best PNG support with IE on different platforms...well, what is going on there exactly?

What possible reason could Microsoft have for devoting more effort in supporting the Mac version of IE (used by a small handful) and getting it right...while they just don't bother with THEIR OWN PLATFORM, one of their flagship product running on top of THE flagship product? A browser version that isn't for a "small handful" but for the largest majority of users that any browser that exists supports...

alt.lang.asm: Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

And it's not just that Windows IE has this suspicious "bug" (which – lo and behold – has the "work around" of making your website "IE-specific" with _proprietary_ "DirectX filters" and other non-standards that only work for Windows IE) while the Mac version works just fine – from the same company that what's stopping them _sharing code_ or getting the Mac IE developers to come over and teach the Windows IE developers where they are going wrong (indeed, Mac IE has the _best_ "role model" implementation that PNG themselves recommend...they do appear to be the "experts" in how to get it working) – but we really have to ask why the Mac version _implements all features_ (such as "gamma correction") while the Windows version doesn't (and can't even get the alpha transparency feature to work at all without "DirectX filters")...

Now, that is greatly suspicious...what economic and practical reason would there be to put the full effort for _all features_ into the Mac version of IE (a small handful of users) while the Windows IE isn't bothering to support the most basic features in a functional way (the most used browser for the biggest OS, that owns 90+% of the entire computing "market" single-handedly)?

Why, when Microsoft claim the transparency problem is just a "bug", have they done nothing to rectify it? When, from the same company, the "role model" implementation (in C / C++ source code that a healthy chunk should be "portable") is sitting opposite...when that "role model" implementation, even though for a small "niche" market in comparison to the biggest market that exists on the planet, has almost _ALL_ the features supported while the version for their own flagship OS doesn't work at all?

Of course, though none of this is in the slightest bit logical unless Microsoft are doing it _DELIBRATELY_, so long as they say "no, no...a pure accident" then you can't prove it...but logic screams the answer: PNG is an "open source" open standard...something Microsoft can't "control"...a potential "threat"...probably from the same "geeks" who work on Linux kernel hacking otherwise...

One word (Microsoft's own): "De-commoditisation"...

Knowing they have the "monopoly" on Windows then the IE implementation is _deliberately_ broken so that web developers are forced (because, like it or not, Windows IE has the _numbers_ and if you want the widest audience to view your website, you've got to make it work for Win/IE) to simply choose not to use PNG...users get the impression that IE is "the best technology" from this (because only those who code "IE only" sites – which typically have a big badge announcing with pride that they only work on IE – and abandon any audience besides IE can think of using PNG on their sites)...

And Microsoft are laughing because they _put_ the "bug" into Windows IE solely to destroy their competition, while actually re-enforcing – ironically – the false perception amongst users that IE is "the best"...the fact that it's broken won't effect their sales in any way and they know it 100%..."I'm #1...why try harder?", as is written on the T-shirt of the

Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

alt.lang.asm: Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

front cover of Fatboy Slim's album (outside the US, anyway...long story...the cover legally had to be different in America)...

And the Mac version being the "near perfect" role model implementation that copes with almost all features of PNG? Simple...Microsoft have no "monopoly" on the Mac...so they face "competition" and that makes them TRY, for once...to get Mac users to even look at Microsoft browsers on that platform, it actually MUST be good, competitive software...demonstrating that if Microsoft weren't in a "monopoly" on the PC, then this would be the standard – an acceptable, reasonable, good standard – they'd be forced to work to, at all times...to produce "role model" implementations...be exact to the standards that PNG themselves point people to this version because Microsoft, basically, pulled out all the effort possible to make the Mac/IE version as perfect as they possibly could...

And this standard could be normal for Microsoft on the PC too, if only "monopoly" wasn't there and they were forced to COMPETE...Capitalism IS competition...without competition, they are NOT "Capitalists" because there is no Capitalism in "monopoly"...it is the state of the ABSENCE of competition...this is simple corrupt dictatorship...this "PNG affair" an example of the equivalent of corrupt "vote rigging" to win an "election"...the "private communism" of Sir Bill (hey, look: He's even officially an "honourary aristocrat" these days ;)...

I've seen DR's stuff before...they may not be the greatest programmers in the universe but I've never found any serious faults in any of their work I've encountered...indeed, GEM originally kicked Windows' arse quite clearly...their DOS has support Microsoft never came near...

If Windows 3.x ran like a "bag of sh*t" with DR-DOS then the evidence suggests we've got another "backwards" situation, in fact...that perhaps Windows 3.x itself was BROKEN, depending on crap, broken implementations in MS-DOS underneath it that, yes, DR-DOS didn't do because it was concerned with, well, you know, actually working properly...not being full to the brim with bugs and broken functionality...

If you want to peddle copies of MASM, hutch, like a "dodgy geezer" palming off fake Rolexes running up the full length of both arms at the local market with "fell off the back of a lorry" prices and excuses, then okay...whatever...in this corrupt world of ours, the black market – it's sad to say – cannot always be totally condemned...

But if you are now trying to sell Microsoft as "angels of programming" or that, like some modern-day "Fagan" that you're "practicing the noble art" doing so, then, pull the other one, hutch...it can be demonstrated quite satisfactorily what Microsoft truly are...let's remember: Legally, they ARE criminals because they were found guilty in the DoJ case for bribery and such dubious quite illegal practices...the dilution of their punishment into non-existence is just a demonstration that the rich can escape anything and the law is theirs, not ours...

Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

alt.lang.asm: Re: Herbert, Herbert, wherefore art thou Herbert ?

Their strategies are a plague eating on the fabric of competition,
Capitalism, technological progress, societies, individual freedom, etc....

They are _SCUM_...pure and simple...peddle and palm off your fake Rolexes,
hutch, if you like (indeed, such "black market" tactics harm _them_, not
anyone else)...but if you bring your false gods and Golden Cows here, then
I will endeavour to melt that Golden Cow down...its worth is only in the
value of melting it down and distributing it where it might serve a
useful purpose...

Beth :)