
Subject: Totally OT

Posted by [xpam_mark](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 01:44:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes, caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

Just curious if it's me.

W. Mark Wilson

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 01:57:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LOL! Hehe... nope! Doesn't work for me either!

Weirdest thing ever! ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"W. Mark Wilson" <xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:

>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,

>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

>

>Just curious if it's me.

>

>W. Mark Wilson

>

>

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 02:12:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, so what does that mean? XP already comes with a hidden folder called "con"?

Neil

"Kim" <hidensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>
>LOL! Hehe... nope! Doesn't work for me either!
>
>Weirdest thing ever! ;o)
>
>Cheers,
>Kim.
>
>"W. Mark Wilson" <xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:
>>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,
>
>>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?
>>
>>Just curious if it's me.
>>
>>W. Mark Wilson
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [audioguy_editout](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 02:17:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Try to create *anything* with that name... :-)

David.

W. Mark Wilson wrote:
> Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,
> caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?
>
> Just curious if it's me.
>
> W. Mark Wilson
>
>

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 02:38:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I googled this.....

It's not that weird. 'con' is a reserved word from the old DOS days, simply meaning 'console'. If you wanted to create a new text file in DOS you could type 'copy con newfile.txt' meaning copy from the console to newfile.txt. This would let you type some lines and when you ended the file with ^Z (DOSish for 'end of file') you would have a file called newfile.txt containing whatever you wrote in the console. This is indeed still possible in the Windows XP console, and can you see what mess it would cause if you let files or folders have the name 'con'? What would 'copy con newfile.txt' then mean? BSOD?

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message news:46e74e11\$1@linux...

> Try to create *anything* with that name... :-)

>

> David.

>

> W. Mark Wilson wrote:

>> Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,

>> caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

>>

>> Just curious if it's me.

>>

>> W. Mark Wilson

>>

>>

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 02:47:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I tried making a "con" directory on OSX and it worked fine. But then I tried to make a directory called "neocon" and that didn't work out at all...

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

Dave(EK Sound) wrote:

> Try to create *anything* with that name... :-)

>

> David.

>

> W. Mark Wilson wrote:

>> Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the
>> quotes, caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?
>>
>> Just curious if it's me.
>>
>> W. Mark Wilson
>>

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 03:03:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>I tried making a "con" directory on OSX and it worked fine. But then I
>tried to make a directory called "neocon" and that didn't work out at all...

What happened when you tried to make a directory
called: "iamaonetrickponyglobalwarmingliberalranter" ???

Anything?

Got any more political posts ready to go for me?

:)

Neil

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 03:29:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil wrote:

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> I tried making a "con" directory on OSX and it worked fine. But then I
>> tried to make a directory called "neocon" and that didn't work out at all...
>
> What happened when you tried to make a directory
> called: "iamaonetrickponyglobalwarmingliberalranter" ???

I tried it and got this message:

"Climate science is a non-partisan issue"

But the main thing you should get out of my report is this: If you get a

Mac (or install Linux), you can have all the "con" directories you could ever want. Which is clearly the best reason yet to switch. :^)

> Anything?

>

> Got any more political posts ready to go for me?

Newt for pres.

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKrutz.com

> :)

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 03:51:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>Neil wrote:

>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>> I tried making a "con" directory on OSX and it worked fine. But then I

>>> tried to make a directory called "neocon" and that didn't work out at all...

>>

>> What happened when you tried to make a directory

>> called: "iamaonetrickponyglobalwarmingliberalranter" ???

>

>I tried it and got this message:

>

>"Climate science is a non-partisan issue"

Yes, you are correct, it is a non-partisan issue that manifests itself in extreme ways every 10,000 years or so, regardless of how much or how little we decrease our "carbon footprint" (which is simply rich-liberal-speak for: "I'll fly on private jets that burn more fossil fuel in an hour than your car burns all year, while I tell you how to live your life, and assuage my own personal guilt by paying dubious firms to make me feel like they'll actually spend my donation on something that will reduce industrial emissions, even though I really

kinda think they may not, but at least I get a "carbon credit", which is a fictitious idea that enables me to continue telling you how should live your life while I fly on my private jet.....") and so on & so forth.

>But the main thing you should get out of my report is this: If you get a

>Mac (or install Linux), you can have all the "con" directories you could

>ever want. Which is clearly the best reason yet to switch. :^)

Good deal, if for some unknown reason I find myself needing lots of "con" directories, I'll keep that key point in mind.

>Newt for pres.

Why you would want to elect a small lizard, I have no idea, but since it's probably better than any of your alternative picks out there, I say go for it.

:)

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 03:58:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil wrote:

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>> Neil wrote:

>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>> I tried making a "con" directory on OSX and it worked fine. But then

> I

>>>> tried to make a directory called "neocon" and that didn't work out at
> all...

>>> What happened when you tried to make a directory

>>> called: "iamaonetrickponyglobalwarmingliberalranter" ???

>> I tried it and got this message:

>>

>> "Climate science is a non-partisan issue"

>

> Yes, you are correct, it is a non-partisan issue that

> manifests itself in extreme ways every 10,000 years or so,

> regardless of how much or how little we decrease our "carbon

> footprint" (which is simply rich-liberal-speak for: "I'll fly

> on private jets that burn more fossil fuel in an hour than your

> car burns all year, while I tell you how to live your life, and

> assuage my own personal guilt by paying dubious firms to make

> me feel like they'll actually spend my donation on something
> that will reduce industrial emissions, even though I really
> kinda think they may not, but at least I get a "carbon credit",
> which is a fictitious idea that enables me to continue telling
> you how should live your life while I fly on my private
> jet.....") and so on & so forth.

Heh. Who's ranting now? :^)

I see that you are distracted by your resentment of Al Gore. Go ahead, get it all out. Don't hold back.

But then go to the science. There are sound reasons that most climate scientists (regardless of political party affiliation) see possible human causes for the current, measurable post industrial, post population boom climate changes. There are reasons that this event differs from previous events. Scientists are taking all the possible causes into account.

>> But the main thing you should get out of my report is this: If you get a
>
>> Mac (or install Linux), you can have all the "con" directories you could
>
>> ever want. Which is clearly the best reason yet to switch. :^)
>
> Good deal, if for some unknown reason I find myself needing
> lots of "con" directories, I'll keep that key point in mind.

Good! My work here is done.

>> Newt for pres.
>
> Why you would want to elect a small lizard, I have no idea, but
> since it's probably better than any of your alternative picks
> out there, I say go for it.

You asked for a political post for you, so I made one, custom! :^)

The other post was for Mark, and I hope he found it as helpful as you found yours.

BTW, I haven't made my pick for president yet. Way to early!

Maybe Al Gore will jump in. ;^)

Cheers,

-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> :)

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Paul Braun](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 04:04:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 12 Sep 2007 13:51:42 +1000, "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>
>>Newt for pres.
>
>Why you would want to elect a small lizard, I have no idea, but
>since it's probably better than any of your alternative picks
>out there, I say go for it.
>

And here is exactly why we shouldn't let Neil vote.

A newt is an amphibian. You have just insulted every freakin' member of the Reptile Party through sheer, unadulterated ignorance.

Lizard. Sheesh.

I got yer lizard right here, pal.

;-P

pab

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 05:49:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>Heh. Who's ranting now? :^)
>
>I see that you are distracted by your resentment of Al Gore.
>Go ahead, get it all out. Don't hold back.

Actually I was referring to Leonardo DiCrappio, Thom Yorke of Radiohead, and Bono... if I was going to rail on Al Gore, I

would've used his fuckingridiculouslyinefficient house as an example. Family estate or not, if he REALLY feels the way he feels, he'd gut it & make it energy-efficient. Otherwise, he's just telling us how to live our lives without really practicing what he preaches - typical hypocrisy. I'll grant Al the private jet - he's a former Vice President of the United States - he can't be expected to travel on Southwest Airlines.

Want to talk about Al's house? :)

- >But then go to the science. There are sound reasons that most
- >climate scientists (regardless of political party affiliation)
- >see possible human causes for the current, measurable post
- >industrial, post population boom climate changes. There are
- >reasons that this event differs from previous events.
- >Scientists are taking all the possible
- >causes into account.

No they're not...

There could be some human contribution, but it's really the equivalent of a fart in a windstorm - Krakatoa changed the world's climate for a few months - we could drop every nuke we have & still not equal the effect of that blast, it was heard in what is now Mauritius, off the coast of Africa, over 3,000 miles away and in populated parts of Australia over 2,200 miles away. It's estimated that this loudest sound in history reached 180 db over 100 miles away from the source and the blast pushed small rocks & pumice/ash/dust up as much as 50 miles high... yet you think WE changed the climate? Krakatoa changed the global climate for about 5 years, average temps around the globe dropped by (wait for it) one-point-two-degrees celcius in the first year! OMIGOD the glaciers all doubled their size as a result!

Oh, wait, no they didn't.

Or maybe they DID, since it took five years for the global climate to start returning to normal? Ever hear about the Year Without a Summer? It was 1816 - go check it out. Another year wherein the climate was affected by a volcano - in this case, Mt. Tambora... actually there had been a few years of crappy climate fom about 1812 on, but the real kicker seemed to be triggered by Tambora's eruption in 1815.

Mt Laki in Iceland caused temperatures in the entire Northern Hemisphere to drop by about 1 degree (C) in 1783.

Mt. Pinatubo erupted in 1991, cooling the globe for about 2-3 years by almost a full degree (C), and pushed more aerosol particles into the atmosphere than any eruption since Krakatoa, causing MASSIVE destruction of the ozone layer, which contributed to temp increases after the cooling cycle.

How do we know that all the panic about global warming isn't just the globe returning to where it NORMALLY SHOULD BE at this point in the cycle? We also had St. Helens in 1980, as well on our continent - that just added to the long-term volcanic winter effect.

Point is, compared to these events, we don't influence the climate much, if at all. Having said that, now that we know aerosol particles can damage the ozone layer, should we try to reduce them? Yes. Now that we know burning fossil fuels could be detrimental should we look for substitutes? Sure. Do we have the capacity to alter the climate of a planet so big that you can barely see the sum total of all the lights of the most densely-populated areas from space? Doubt it. We (and all our emissions) are essentially gnats compared to major climactic events that we have no control over one way or the other.

>BTW, I haven't made my pick for president yet. Way too early!

Just go with Hillary, that way a Republican will win for sure.

>Maybe Al Gore will jump in. ;^)

Maybe, but I doubt it, he's having too much fun being rich & famous & out of Clinton's shadow.

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 08:46:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can't do it in Vista, either--

Martin Harrington
Lend An Ear Sound
Sydney, Australia
0414 913 247

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 08:58:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

zippo here.

On Tue, 11 Sep 2007 18:44:41 -0700, "W. Mark Wilson"

<xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:

>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,
>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

>

>Just curious if it's me.

>

>W. Mark Wilson

>

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 11:42:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nope ! No "con" for us !

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 12:41:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil wrote:

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>> Heh. Who's ranting now? :^)

>>

>> I see that you are distracted by your resentment of Al Gore.

>> Go ahead, get it all out. Don't hold back.

>

> Actually I was referring to Leonardo DiCrappio, Thom Yorke of

> Radiohead, and Bono... if I was going to rail on Al Gore, I

> would've used his fuckingridiculouslyinefficient house as an

> example. Family estate or not, if he REALLY feels the way he

> feels, he'd gut it & make it energy-efficient. Otherwise, he's

> just telling us how to live our lives without really practicing

> what he preaches - typical hypocrisy. I'll grant Al the private

> jet - he's a former Vice President of the United States - he

> can't be expected to travel on Southwest Airlines.

>

> Want to talk about Al's house? :)

I wouldn't mind checking out his place. But he never calls. None of

those guys ever call.

>> But then go to the science. There are sound reasons that most
>> climate scientists (regardless of political party affiliation)
>> see possible human causes for the current, measurable post
>> industrial, post population boom climate changes. There are
>> reasons that this event differs from previous events.
>> Scientists are taking all the possible
>> causes into account.
>
> No they're not...

I guess climate scientists are ignorant then. They wasted a lot of money on advanced degrees, and a lot of their lives doing scientific studies, just to miss out on the obvious things that any non-scientist can clearly see...

That seems extremely unlikely. Seriously.

Science is a very competitive pursuit and what comes out of it is what survives intense peer review. It would be virtually impossible to create a scientific consensus in 2007 based on ignoring the obvious.

> There could be some human contribution,

That's what the evidence shows. And that is why the world is now working on mitigation. Including the USA.

> but it's really the
> equivalent of a fart in a windstorm - Krakatoa changed the
> world's climate for a few months - we could drop every nuke we
> have & still not equal the effect of that blast, it was heard in
> what is now Mauritius, off the coast of Africa, over 3,000
> miles away and in populated parts of Australia over 2,200 miles
> away. It's estimated that this loudest sound in history
> reached 180 db over 100 miles away from the source and the
> blast pushed small rocks & pumice/ash/dust up as much as 50
> miles high...

Pretty cool, eh? :^)

> yet you think WE changed the climate?

Based on the evidence, yes.

You are right that non-human causes can change the climate. However that doesn't mean that human causes can't change the climate.

The evidence shows that human causes are now contributing to climate change. Here's an overview from the U.S. Government (EPA):

<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/index.html>

Quote:

"As through much of its history, the Earth's climate is changing. Right now it is getting warmer. Most of the warming in recent decades is very likely the result of human activities. The National Oceanic and

the climate are also changing such as precipitation patterns and storminess."

Take a look at this report from the National Academies of Science in the U.S.A., Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Russia and England.

<http://nationalacademies.org/onpi/06072005.pdf>

A few quotes:

"The existence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is

temperatures would be about 30 centigrade degrees lower than they are today. But human activities are now causing

including carbon dioxide, methane, tropospheric ozone,

Carbon dioxide levels have increased from 280 ppm in

levels that can be reliably measured (i.e. in the last 420,000 years)."

"Major parts of the climate system respond slowly to changes in greenhouse gas concentrations. Even if greenhouse gas emissions were stabilised instantly at

it adapts to the increased emission of recent decades. Further changes in climate are therefore unavoidable. Nations must prepare for them."

"The scientific understanding of climate change is now sufficiently clear to justify nations taking prompt action. It is vital that all nations identify cost-effective steps that they can take now, to contribute to substantial and long-term reduction in net global greenhouse gas emissions."

- > Krakatoa
- > changed the global climate for about 5 years, average temps
- > around the globe dropped by (wait for it) one-point-two-
- > degrees celcius in the first year! OMIGOD the glaciers all
- > doubled their size as a result!
- >
- > Oh, wait, no they didn't.
- > Or maybe they DID, since it took five years for the global
- > climate to start returning to normal?

Make up your mind. :^)

Suspended particulates can cool the earth but they rain out relatively quickly. So you can get a blip like that. That's different from the effect of accumulated greenhouse gases which take a lot longer to dissipate.

- > Ever hear about the Year
- > Without a Summer? It was 1816 - go check it out. Another year
- > wherein the climate was affected by a volcano - in this case,
- > Mt. Tambora... actually there had been a few years of crappy
- > climate fom about 1812 on, but the real kicker seemed to
- > be triggered by Tambora's eruption in 1815.
- >
- > Mt Laki in Iceland caused temperatures in the entire Northern
- > Hemisphere to drop by about 1 degree (C) in 1783.
- >
- > Mt. Pinatubo erupted in 1991, cooling the globe for about 2-3
- > years by almst a full degree (c), and pushed more aerosol
- > particles into the atmosphere than any euption since Krakatoa,
- > causing MASSIVE destruction of the ozone layer, which
- > contributed to temp increases after the cooling cycle.

Volcanoes are amazing. They've been around much longer than just the last few hundred years. They can and do affect the climate. However they do not explain the current climate change event.

<http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2006/12/17/223957/72>

Ozone depletion is a separate problem.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ozone_depletion#Ozone_depletion_and_global_warming

- > How do we know that all the panic about global warming isn't
- > just the globe returning to where it NORMALLY SHOULD BE at
- > this point in the cycle? We also had St. Helens in 1980, as well
- > on our continent - that just added to the long-term volcanic
- > winter effect.

After decades of study, we know a lot more than some folks give us credit for.

- > Point is, compared to these events, we don't influence the
- > climate much, if at all.

There are a variety of natural climate drivers. But that doesn't change the current evidence for human caused climate change now.

- > Having said that, now that we know
- > aerosol particles can damage the ozone layer, should we try to
- > reduce them? Yes.

By international agreement, we already have.

- > Now that we know burning fossil fuels could
- > be detrimental should we look for substitutes? Sure.

Agreed.

- > Do we have
- > the capacity to alter the climate of a planet so big that you
- > can barely see the sum total of all the lights of the most
- > densely-populated areas from space? Doubt it.

It may seem counter-intuitive at first. But the evidence is there.

If it were just the greenhouse gases produced by a single night's city lights on the momentary night side of the earth, today that's a lot of energy with tons of greenhouse gases produced. But still, one night's worth is probably not significant enough to worry about.

However, when we consider each of those lights burning every night for decades, and more lights added every week, the energy it takes to do that adds up. If you could imaging overlaying every night's lights for the last fifty years, you'd have a very bright image. A lot of those lights are powered by burning fossil fuels (coal being the most popular), and over the years, a lot of greenhouse gases have been released.

When we include other human activities (transportation, mining, manufacturing, agriculture, military activities, lighting during the day, heating, cooling, etc.), we're talking about significantly higher amounts of greenhouse gases released than just one night's lighting produces. Since greenhouse gases take long periods of time to dissipate, they are accumulating ever faster. Meanwhile our output continues to grow. Since industrialization, our contribution to greenhouse gases has gone on long enough, and grown fast enough, to become a noticeable factor in the earth's climate.

Human causes not are the only factor in determining climate, no one is claiming that. But our contributions to greenhouse gases bring a new element to the equation. Changing the balance.

> We (and all our
> emissions) are essentially gnats compared to major climactic
> events that we have no control over one way or the other.

We have been releasing a lot of carbon from fossil fuels. Carbon that had been locked up slowly, and for millions of years. And we're doing it relatively quickly.

Yes, this is on top of all the natural cycles. Clearly it's a new factor that we cannot overlook. When scientists look at the data, they can see and account for natural cycles (including volcanoes), AND they can see the effect of our contributions.

Let's say for the sake of discussion that the effect of mankind is still relatively small. Then why would we matter?

Keep in mind that we are part of a system, a system that has been fairly balanced, overall, since about the last ice age.

Even a small change can tip a scale.

If you added just one extra player to a football team, making it 12 vs. 13 players, that could be enough to change the outcome of a game. The balance changes. The team with the extra player has an advantage, the extra player tilts the game.

Or, put it this way, it doesn't take much of Blair's 16 Million Reserve (<http://www.chez-williams.com/Hot%20Sauce/hothome.htm>) to change the taste of a recipe.

>> BTW, I haven't made my pick for president yet. Way to early!
>
> Just go with Hillary, that way a Republican will win for sure.

It's not important to me that either a Democrat or Republican win. It's important to me that we have a competent president, and that we work toward a future that gives our kids and their kids better opportunities than we have, in a free, successful society living on a healthy and sustainable planet.

>> Maybe Al Gore will jump in. ;^)
>
> Maybe, but I doubt it, he's having too much fun being rich &
> famous & out of Clinton's shadow.

True, he does seem to be enjoying himself.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 13:28:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K wrote:

> If you added just one extra player to a football team, making it 12 vs.
> 13 players, that could be enough to change the outcome of a game. The
> balance changes. The team with the extra player has an advantage, the
> extra player tilts the game.

Meant to say 11 vs. 12 players. OK, I'm going back to bed. :^)

> Or, put it this way, it doesn't take much of Blair's 16 Million Reserve
> (<http://www.chez-williams.com/Hot%20Sauce/hothome.htm>) to change the
> taste of a recipe.

BTW, I can only imagine the devastation this would cause to any recipe. They would probably have to evacuate a ten square mile area around any kitchen using this stuff.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 13:28:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's reserved name in Windows. Same goes for trying to create a file named 'COM1' or 'LPT2' and so forth. If for some reason you really need a file or folder with one of those names (probably not a good idea in any case) you can do it from the command line. If you're in a directory c:\temp and you open a command window you can type

```
C:\temp>mkdir \\.\c:\temp\con
```

or lpt1 or whatever, and it will work.

Many *NIX systems also reserve names.

TCB

"W. Mark Wilson" <xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:

>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,

>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

>

>Just curious if it's me.

>

>W. Mark Wilson

>

>

Subject: Re: Totally OT
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 13:58:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mark,

That's wacky. CON is an old DOS logical device referring to the console, and as such was a reserved word.

You could do things such as create files using this device

copy con test.txt

Then whatever you typed on the CONsole went to the file. When you typed CTRL+Z the file would be terminated.

similarly there was PRN, a logical device representing the printer. You could do things like copy a file to the printer

copy test1.txt > PRN

you can see that if you are able to copy a file to a 'device' called PRN, then you could never use the name PRN for a file, because it would be ambiguous as to which PRN you were trying to copy to :-)

The hangover remains because PC users demand that every old piece of shit app from 1988 on, and every old shitty batch file STILL WORK under WINDOWS!.

Similarly, you should not be able to create a folder or file with any of the following names:

CON COM1 - COM4
PRN AUX LPT1

Chuck

"W. Mark Wilson" <xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:

>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,

>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?

>

>Just curious if it's me.

>

>W. Mark Wilson

>

>

Subject: Re: Totally OT

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 13:59:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, you can't do it from the command line. It would break compatibility for wordperfect for DOS 3.0 :-)

Chuck

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>It's reserved name in Windows. Same goes for trying to create a file named

>'COM1' of 'LPT2' and so forth. If for some reason you really need a file

>or folder with one of those names (probably not a good idea in any case)
>you can do it from the command line. If you're in a directory c:\temp and
>you open a command window you can type
>
>C:\temp>mkdir \\.\c:\temp\con
>
>or lpt1 or whatever, and it will work.
>
>Many *NIX systems also reserve names.
>
>TCB
>
>"W. Mark Wilson" <xpam_mark@avidrecording> wrote:
>>Can anyone here with XP create a new folder called "con" without the quotes,
>
>>caps or none, anywhere on their drives, under XP as OS?
>>
>>Just curious if it's me.
>>
>>W. Mark Wilson
>>
>>
>>
>
