

Re: Dev-C++ compiling problem in Vista

Source: http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2008-05/msg00345.html

- *From:* santosh <santosh.k83@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 04 May 2008 17:08:53 +0530
-

jacob navia wrote:

santosh wrote:

jacob navia wrote:

santosh wrote:

[...]

Deplorable indeed. I wonder why everyone doesn't build their own Linux system like Gerard Beekmans. That's how real hackers do it!

Do you have a recommendation? (URL, best way to download it, etc?)
thanks

Sure:

<<http://www.linuxfromscratch.org/>>

but I doubt you'll like this when Ubuntu is apparently too difficult for you.

Of course it is not "difficult", and I have been doing Unix since 1987... I can solve all those problems if I wanted to, but the point is that now it just bores me, still in 2008 fiddling around with the X config files, chasing drivers, installing this and that, fixing the bugs...

What bothers me more is that the old versions of linux did not have this kind of problems that often, and that now the point is not to make a simpler system for everyone, but just to make server side software that pleases the people that finance linux (IBM,

Re: Dev-C++ compiling problem in Vista

RedHat, and some others) but doesn't care at all of the normal user.

Try distributions like PCLinuxOS, Mandriva, CentOS, Ubuntu etc. They are aimed at ordinary users for the desktop. They should be as easy to use as Windows.

Microsoft software is much more user friendly not because they have a BIG BUDGET, but because they care about the end user a bit more... Unix has this problematic attitude of relying in the "systems administrator", and just being unfriendly for no reason.

What you call problematic has saved Unix from the innumerable security holes and exploits that plague Windows due to the latter failure to strongly separate privileges (until 2000 appeared).

Systems like OpenBSD are even more secure by default.

Personally I have tried to make a system that it is easy to use. lcc-win tries (not always with success) to be easy to use, easy to install, without adding features without need.

Easy to use for newbies certainly. But rather frustrating for advanced programmers that appreciate the wealth of command-line options and tunable parameters that are supported by compilers like gcc, Intel C++ etc.

Microsoft had a different attitude towards the end user as the unix people. Unix was for the "higher ups"... Microsoft choose to cater the end user...

Yes. They realised the great potential of producing a GUI based system that "Just Worked" for the then exploding PC market and the incipient WWW.

Remember that Unix's origins are far earlier. During the 70s GUIs were really rare and there was no concept of WWW, and non-technical users using computers.

That's why Unix assumes are certain amount of technical knowledge and aptitude for hacking around. It great for those who know (or have learned) and love doing this, but admittedly hostile towards the average Jane user. But recent Linux distros have covered a lot of ground towards user-friendliness.

Re: Dev-C++ compiling problem in Vista

Soon they will be everybit as user-friendly as any Windows, and in addition benefit from the advantages of being open source and secure by default.

It was a strategic mistake from the Unix guys, and linux has taken that wrong tradition, that is why it bothers me.

No. It was simply a different direction, different focus and priorities. We don't want homogenisation and uniformity beyond where it is really needed. In general, diversity is better.

I thought that they would try to make what Steve jobs did: make unix user friendly.

Well, Steve Jobs did do that. Why should everyone else ape him or Bill?

No, they choose to follow the old unix path: just suppose there is a "system administrator" and do not care about the end user.

You are not appreciating the constraints of multi-user systems. All modern Windows too have an Administrator account. In fact one consistent negative criticism of Vista is that it prompts the user annoyingly frequently for granting privileges to processes or running programs.

And that is why linux doesn't get any more market share.

No. The reason that Linux doesn't get more market share is because the very vast majority of PC sold come bundled with Windows and it proves adequate for most purposes for most users. The majority of computer users don't know and don't care about things like system details, programming, security, open source etc. They just switch on their computer, work on Word and Excel, check mail, play Minesweeper and switch off.

In addition most organisations demand Windows knowledge even if a particular task is doable with other systems (often even better with those other systems), accept only Word documents etc. Also upto recently most hardware devices were tailored towards Windows and there were poor or no drivers for Linux. Now Linux actually has more drivers and less driver issues than Windows Vista.

The big advantage of Microsoft is monopolisation of markets and

Re: Dev-C++ compiling problem in Vista

mindshare, in which they are a practised hand. Making gains in such a situation is always difficult, not only for open source but even commercial systems like say Apple or OS/2.

The reaction from many people here is so telling:

"You screwed your installation". Always the fault of badly designed software is in the end user!

I downloaded the ubuntu software, burned it into a DVD and followed the instructions. Nothing else.

Gnome is not installed by default. Sorry. Nor KDE, nor nothing.

Strange. Unless you specifically deselect it, X and GNOME are installed automatically. Maybe you downloaded the server version of Ubuntu?

When it reboots after the first installation it shows you a "login" prompt, that is all. You have to call "aptitude" to install the rest.

And many of the programs you'll need are on the install CD itself. In any case it's a matter of firing up your friendly package manager, selecting what you want and hitting APPLY.

How is this any different from scouring the Web, downloading .msi or .exe files and installing them. And official repositories provide tested, certified versions of most software. With Windows you'll just have to trust the site you download from.

Remember, a typical Linux install provides a complete desktop environment. Almost all the functionality you want is instantly available. With Windows a default install provides very little utilities, no development s/w, very little PIM s/w, very little games, no office or DTP s/w, no selection of editors, no scientific s/w, no nothing.

And after a while I know "aptitude", its quirks, etc.

But would my wife know how to use that?

Learning to fully use something like Vista and all the additional software that you download from the Net is also not a simple task. Computing is not simple, period.

Re: Dev-C++ compiling problem in Vista

And sorry, mp3 are not recognized by default because mp3 is NOT an open format for music. OGG is, but mp3 is not. And the debian based Ubuntu has the same "political" line of boycotting the formats that are proprietary or somehow not to the latest taste of GNU;

No it's more subtle. They will have to pay royalties to the Fraunhofer Institute. Systems like Windows, Apple, Linspire, PCLinuxOS etc., do this for their users (because their s/w is sold, not free as in beer). Free (as in beer) distributions can't do this (at least it's not very feasible). That's why you must manually install MP3 codecs.