
...ON WARP and WINDOWS 95

The WindoWatch quest to get solid information on WARP was, frankly, side tracked into this thicket of opinion and discussions of "my OS is better than your OS". The author of this piece is unknown. Curtis Brewington picked it up off a BBS and posted it to the RIME OS/2 conference.... I think of this as a pox on both your houses.

"The workers at Microsoft are by contract required to wake up every morning and genuflect in front of pimple-faced figurine of Bill Gates. Tracing the sign of the dollar across their foreheads, they reverently say,

Our Father which art in Redmond, hallowed be thy DOS. Thy Visual BASIC 3.0 come, thy sudden crashes be done in Windows as they were in Desqview. Give us this day our daily upgrade order form, and forgive us our prior versions as we forgive those undocumented calls. Lead us not into DOS 9.23, but deliver us from SNA. For Thine are the platforms, the compilers, and the law-suits forever and ever. Amen.

IBM workers are required by contract to wear blue underwear, and paint their bedrooms baby blue. Every night before taking off for home in their blue cars, they must stop and kneel in the direction of the CEO's office, and sacredly whisper this holy prayer:

Our Father which art in Armonk, hallowed be thy initials. Thy XGA come, thy OS/2 version 3 be done on RISC as it is on CISC. Give us this day our daily press release, and forgive Northgate and Dell as we forgive your mainframe mind set. Lead us not into PC Juniors and Topviews, but deliver us from Unix. For Thine are the profits, the blue skies, and the market domination forever and ever. Amen." **AUTHOR UNKNOWN**

It heats up, and although there are moments of light, the discussion poorly conceals pure vitriol!

On the PC Week Warp evaluation:

IBMer>No , please re-read the Microsoft document. The OS/2 configuration was not "standard".

MSite> YES it was, you are making up stories because OS/2 came out so bad....

An uncommitted observer jumps in and said:

“OS/2 vs Windows 95 Performance! By now you've probably heard the 4M mantra "Performance equivalent to Windows 3.1 on a 4M machine". Here's how we're doing vs. Windows for Workgroups 3.11, and OS/2 Warp. OS/2 performs poorly overall. Performance for Windows 95 is about equal to Windows for Workgroups.”

The IBMer fights back!

IBMer> Yes, I've seen the "benchmarks". These definitely fall into the "lies, damned lies and statistics" category. In all cases, "apples vs. oranges" were compared. Here's my take on how these numbers were generated and a list of several things that are wrong with the way this test was conducted...

- 1) IBM's recommended configuration for running on a 4MB machine were not followed.**
- 2)The High Performance File System was not used.This would improve performance significantly on the 8MB & 16MB configurations.**
- 3) The fast-load option for Windows applications running under OS/2 was not used as this improves Windows load time.**
- 4) Under OS/2, the applications were run in separate Virtual Machines. In this configuration, performance is compromised in order to prevent one Windows application from crashing all of the others. Chicago does not offer this choice.**
- 5) The applications were run in "seamless" mode rather than from a full screen Windows session. This mode compromises video performance in order to gain convenience.**
- 6) No tests were conducted to determine the speed at which Windows can execute OS/2 applications.**
- 7) The graphics cards used and the drivers used were not disclosed. IBM does not recommend this video mode on 4MB systems.**
- 8) Why was the 4MB dual-applications test omitted?**
- 9) Due to NDA agreements and non-availability of Chicago, these benchmarks cannot be verified by neutral 3rd parties.**

It goes on.....

An exchange On WIN95 between an IBM supporter and a Microsoft supporter.

IBMer>All Microsoft has done (with Windows '95) is use their portion of OS/2 develop their own version of WARP.

MSite>Nonsense, they have come out with a MUCH better product than IBM with much better performance. You just sound jealous. You have reason to be from the comments you made. You are trying to fabricate anything

you can to discredit Win 95 from what I can see.

Nat Weiner ® brought this to the RIME community's attention :

Just saw a "WARP" ad on TV. Not the most persuasive ever, but it did cause me to look up the meaning of "WARP". My Random House Dictionary, circa 1967, defines "warp" in part as:

"to bend or twist out of shape; ... to distort ... from the ... true meaning; ... a mental twist, bias or quirk...;"

After reading reports by some of the early users of "Warp", including a detailed factual piece by one Michael Putzel in the Nov. 11, 1994 Boston Globe about his experience, my funnybone wonders if the name was chosen

- (a) by Microsoft;
- (b) by entities from another world;
- (c) at IBM, a warped choice of warped minds;
- (d) by IBM as a description, warning and legal defense; or
- (e) by a comedian who submitted it as a joke?

The final slur from an alleged European Source!

Remember when the New York times blasted OS/2 just recently? I just heard, via post on Internet, that a German Magazine reported that New York Times is HIRING Bill Gates to write columns for them!

I think we have completed the circle!

NEXT

ww