

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.kernel/2005-12/msg00161.htm>

- *From:* "Hector Santos" <nospamhere@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 7 Dec 2005 13:08:04 -0500
-

Tony, you been around. You know the drill.

MS made a very profound statement about WIN32 compatibility many moons ago during the 16 bit to 32 bit transition days. I expect MS to hold this fundamental statement of WIN32 compatibility guarantee. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of companies and applications world wide are financially at stake and it needs to be made very clear to MS that they realized how important this is.

I'm sure they realize this, but I can't help but feel MS is forcing the "issue" some how. It is making me worry.

That said, I have been thinking about the same thing with the latest renditions of the OS with or with the .NET foundation, and/or with VS2005.

Just the other day, I compiled a old C/C++ console utility, something I can do very quickly with VS2005 (version 8 of CL.EXE), to test the theory. No compile errors or warnings and I was able to run it all WIN32 test machines we have. I asked in MSDN support forums about VS2005 MFC/C/C++/RPC development as the response was that it was still supported. I was wondering if we would need to have both VS 6.0 and VS2005 development environments.

I think we should expect BACKWARD compatibility if you are compiling for WIN32 on a newer OS. Distribution to any WIN32 OS should work.

Yes, I agree. I think it is extremely and vitally important that Microsoft take a step back and comfort their long term developer base and not got lost in all this wishy washing, glorified, .NET, C# dependency. That's all good, but they need a commitment (and as I will go as far as saying LEGAL commitment) to their WIN32 developer base.

The link would be the WIN32 support statement. I am now interested in googling it so I can have a copy on record. They should restate it and make it clear what are the plans.

The same goes for the WIN 3.1 SUB-SYSTEM and DOS SUB-SYSTEM.

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

—
Hector Santos, CTO
Santronics Software, Inc.
<http://www.santronics.com>

"Tony Proctor" <tony_proctor@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

- > Does anyone know of a link that describes Microsoft's official stance on
- > backwards compatibility?
- >
- > The terms upwards and backwards compatibility are a little ambiguous, and
- > depend on which way you're looking through the telescope. In this context, I
- > refer to the expectation that products compiled on a higher O/S version can
- > be distributed and run on older O/S versions.
- >
- > Most people would expect upwards compatibility. For instance, if you
- > compiled a well-behaved program under W2K then it should run under W2003.
- > Few people who have been involved in large-scale software development, across different platforms (e.g. UNIX), would expect the latter. For
- > instance, if a "versioned" struct had been changed in size then older
- > versions of the O/S may not know how to handle it.
- >
- > I personally would not expect backwards compatibility (as defined above)
- > because I've seen the issues that can arise. However, I'm looking for a link
- > to any statement on the subject in relation to the Windows O/S
- >
- > Tony Proctor
- >
- >

.

-
- **Follow-Ups:**
 - ◆ **Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?**
◇ From: Tony Proctor

 - **References:**
 - ◆ **Statement on backwards compatibility?**
◇ From: Tony Proctor

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

- Prev by Date: [*Re: GINA stub problem*](#)
- Next by Date: [*Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?*](#)
- Previous by thread: [*Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?*](#)
- Next by thread: [*Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?*](#)
- Index(es):
 - ◆ [*Date*](#)
 - ◆ [*Thread*](#)