

"Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks"...Why care?

By *stmok*

Created 24/10/2007 - 10:55am

Submitted by stmok on Wednesday 24th of October 2007 10:55:33 AM

What the heck am I talking about? Here's the articles in question.

Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks - Part 1: Search

http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil.html [1]

Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks - Part 2: Compiz Fusion

http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_1.html [2]

Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks - Part 3: X11

http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_2.html [3]

Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks - Part 4: Applications

http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_3.html [4]

Why Ubuntu (Still) Sucks - Part 5: Epilogue

http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_4.html [5]

These are clear cut cases of how to make money for your IT/tech news company. The tactic is becoming very old, but for some reason, most people fall for it! (Tech columnist John C Dvorak is well known for doing it to Apple fans!)

So how does it work?

(1) Get someone who is intentionally biased to write.

In this case of the above articles, Randall Kennedy. Clearly anti-Linux and Pro-Microsoft. Don't believe? Check his past articles and you'll see a general pattern. (Notice how those who are biased ALWAYS say they aren't? They even go the extra mile by saying they use those products that they knock down on. LOL! They can try the sympathy card, but it doesn't work on me. Their words over time are clear and intentional. They are BIASED.)

(2) Write headlines that deliberately spark controversy.

That's right! Deliberately start crap and attract attention! This is the bait, so watch out for it!

(3) Leave a backdoor for yourself.

This varies from author to author. Some intentionally write with a "nothing to lose" attitude. Others will retract later on. Depends on mood and how much ad money they want to make.

(4) Stretch it out.

Make it multi-part! (Like in this case).

OR

Write a retraction article at later time.

The more its stretched out, the more people will return! Which means? Ad money!

Notice how in this case, this attempt by Randall Kennedy is quite childish? You'd think a grown man in the tech industry would come up with some good, logical complaints. Nope, you won't see that. Why? Because they're desperate to attract attention. Its their job. They're paid to BS. (like marketing spinners of a certain corporation we're all so fond of!)

If the human race was categorized as a file system, people like him, Paris Hilton, etc would be under **/tmp**. They get attention for a bit, then its gone after a reboot, and no one gives a crap.

So how do you counter this?

(1) Just ignore it.

That's right. Ignore it. What? You can't? Why not? I don't see anyone pointing a gun to your head, do you? What happens when you ignore it? You'll be far less agitated, that's for sure! Why add more stress to your life when you don't need to?

(2) Learn to meditate.

To become a true master in life, one must master your emotions. Learn to be mindful. Their words are just words. Are they gonna stop you from using Linux? (or whatever you do in your life?). Of course not! The most basic form of meditation is the breathing one. As mentioned here: <http://www.fast-stress-relief.com/breathing-meditation.html> [6]

(3) Don't waste your time responding to their feedback.

Why do you need to defend Linux from these jerks? Why? What happens when you don't? Will Linus and the gang, RedHat, Novell, Canonical, etc die or give up? Nope. They will continue coding and keep doing what they do.

(4) Block how they generate their money.

This is what I do sometimes if a website really annoys my web browsing experience. If you use Firefox, Adblock or Adblock Plus is the way to go.

In the above article case of infoworld.com, add these to Adblock:

=> *edgeio.com/*

=> *quantserve.com/*

=> https://mt.infoworld.com/*.* [7]

=> *doubleclick.net/*

=> *adsonar.com/*

=> http://www.infoworld.com/script/ads/*.* [8]

What can they do if you block their stream of income? Absolutely, positively NOTHING. They'll go broke? That's too bad for them, isn't it? Hey, life is tough. I don't complain about the weather, I do something about it.

I also apply the same methods to authors like **Thom Holwerda** of OSNews.com, **George Ou** of ZDNet.com and of course, **John C Dvorak** of pcmag.com.

Remember, they're just opinions with the intention to stir emotion in order to profit. They can express them as much as they want. Doesn't mean we have to listen to them or read their work! 😊

Opinions don't represent what's really happening in the IT world: Opensource is inevitable, despite the critics.

Links:

- [1] http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil.html
- [2] http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_1.html
- [3] http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_2.html
- [4] http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_3.html
- [5] http://weblog.infoworld.com/enterprisedesktop/archives/2007/10/why_ubuntu_stil_4.html
- [6] <http://www.fast-stress-relief.com/breathing-meditation.html>
- [7] https://mt.infoworld.com/*.
- [8] http://www.infoworld.com/script/ads/*.