

Back to youtube war

Posted by Tunes - 13 Feb 2010 23:25

Well, i'm still tired of BS with firefox (now mine at home, crashes with nothing open every now and then.. fun) crappy framerates and stuff.

If I had any idea that youtube will be only supporting chrome and safari (apple), now i'm absolutely certain of it.

www.youtube.com/html5 onclick=">window.open(this.href);return false;

Drop dead flashplayer!

And another thing, me and a few other millions were choose for a new youtube page template testing, I must say, its a lot more simplistic.. alot more with very nice features and less crumped.

To optin.. just browse youtube with chrome.. easy as that.

I'm not a youtuber, but most of my time off work, gameplay and my child, goes into youtube.

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by liger - 14 Feb 2010 01:30

its simplistic coz no1 uses it -> no ads

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by Tunes - 14 Feb 2010 12:12

not really, everyone will use it and it has ads. (or will)

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by liger - 14 Feb 2010 14:36

i sure hope youtube will support the free codec on their html5 website

otherwise we are again screwed in the battle of 2 video formats

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by Tunes - 14 Feb 2010 14:45

problem is, is not youtube that will need to support the open codec format on the new html5 spec, its the browsers.

Currently only chrome and safari support the format.

Believe me, the new coded is quite a lot better than flash, at least i don't see the processer topping like a stupid because of a single flash video window open, even the adobe site kicks the processor.

I mainly browse and work on a single proc Sony Vaio, a pentium m @1.78Ghz, so this things really do matter.

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by liger - 15 Feb 2010 23:10

Tunes wrote:

problem is, is not youtube that will need to support the open codec format on the new html5 spec, its the browsers.

Currently only chrome and safari support the format.

Believe me, the new coded is quite a lot better than flash, at least i don't see the processer topping like a stupid because of a single flash video window open, even the adobe site kicks the processor.

I mainly browse and work on a single proc Sony Vaio, a pentium m @1.78Ghz, so this things really do matter.

no actually it IS up to youtube to support OPEN codec. Thats coz youtube chooses in which codec they offer videos

Firefox: supports FREE codec ->Ogg Theora, does not support

Chrome/Safari (read \$\$\$): support H.264

When they were standardizing html5 2 sides appeared: free and "better";

Problem with "better" is that mozilla would have to pay licenses and so would have to do other video sites. No problem for google and apple tho. Coz of the opposition from both sides, no codec made it out to standard and so we have this going on now.

Ian Hickson wrote on Monday that he was reluctantly dropping the open standard due to opposition from Apple, and said the rival H.264 codec could also not be specified due to opposition from other browser vendors. This means HTML 5 will not specify a single codec for web development.

news.zdnet.com/2100-9595_22-318208.html" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Anything is better than flash. Well new one is "ok" coz of video acceleration (still beta)

PS: you are wrong and i am right 🍌

=====

Re: Back to youtube war

Posted by Tunes - 16 Feb 2010 23:31

Lets just say, i'm somewhat wrong and you are somewhat wrong too.

Patents are a pain, codec patents are even a greater pain, since 1972 there are codec wars and since

they are here for such a long time, they will be forever.

There is peanuts to say about video compression. NOTHING is new and horizons on something "new" are.. rather impossible.

The problem, the "free" open coded Theora is SHIT, its suckz, lacks hardware support manufacturer acceptance and may be touching some areas where they subject to current patents, so it might be "illegal" for even theora exist.

Problem, there is no current reason on who owns what, licences being paid today to some organization may be paid tomorrow to another one.

Problem with Firefox and Opera, as they are "open" (not really) or "free" and due to the recent refusal to both of these on paying a license to use h.264 spec on html5, thats something I must say.. I don't care...

Already today, there lots of patent disputes over html2, 3 and 4 technologies.

However, I wouldn't bother to pay a small fee or have some other arrangement to support a full h.264 implementation and BAN the hell out of adobe.

Leaving opera out on this, firefox folks should shut up and obey to the paying monster behind them, google/youtube and license the peanuts needed to have h.264 support for html5.

If you've never fiddled with codecs, please do and tell me the advantages of using a aged technology (dubious "open" of ogg theora, maybe because on2 were not in the mood for being squished with patents war.

Main thought on this for me, h-264 decoding is a lot less easier then decompressing thora frames, adobe flash near this, is a complete cpu hogger.

www.vcodex.com/videocodingpatents.html onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

www.appleinsider.com/articles/09/07/06/o..._squabble.html"

onclick=">window.open(this.href);return false;

(firefox crashed while I was writing this.. as it crashes every now and then on this machine, prolly a windows vista all messed up by to be able to play games here.. its on its way to install 7, so I don't bother, also after killing the process, the twk tab came up with the text all there.. cool)

Let me say, i'm not against this browser or that one or what codec is better and such.

I've deeply tested, during my already long life on this scene) and I know whats best or not.

I this case, ahead with the h.264! period... nuff said and ban the hell off adobe for video streaming, this includes audio only support with aac, flac or mp3, being flac the best one but still lacks hardware support.

Mozilla eat the thing and do as they main \$\$\$\$ supplier says.

Opera has a marketing business on the embeeded browser, nintendo wii and nokia (my old 6680 plays h.264 streams with opera partly rom and partly app, 5 year old phone), so pay the codec and please continue, otherwise jump off the bus.

Safari and chrome are really nice browsers, I have all of them installed, including netscape 4 and 5 for web testing, due to the nature of my business, chrome does a nice thing anyother does, every tab is a separate 100% independant process, however this may look like resource waste, they all share code base ram and diff containers, is like having a vmware for each tab, this makes it the most rock solid (OS point of view and process safety) browser.

Firefox owns for web devs. period

IE doesn't even fits to take out the trash... gezz, however with M\$ portals... no other does the job, as is the only capable of reading the SSO token (Single Sign On) the OS gives only to ms apps on good will, all other would be BUUUM headshot if any would even thing on supporting SSO on M\$ enviroments.

Curious M\$ standing on these... merely as an observer

Tired of reading? I'm over 🙄

Money is right, everything else is wrong 🤨

=====