

## Re: The pros and cons of .NET

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.general/2004-09/2862.html>

---

**From:** Cor Ligthert (*notmyfirstname\_at\_planet.nl*)

**Date:** 09/27/04

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 13:27:13 +0200

*>Let's look at the whole post then, shall we – including your totally  
>inappropriate insults to the OP:*

I have directly answered Tim on the question about this, I am in normal and in good speaking terms with Tim in the newsgroup.languages.vb. I am quiet sure that Tim is keen enough to answer me himself when he does disagree, he real does not need advocacy from Jon Skeet.

Again you contstructivily misquoted me, in the same way you did before, I now deleted that text, where I am telling from in every message to you that I have already corrected it in one of the first threads telling that the meaning was when you saw it in the context "extra" runtime.

*>That's not obvious in the slightest though. When I send someone "a .NET  
>program" I just send them the executable which requires that they have  
>the .NET framework installed. I think most people would understand your  
>post in the same way. Note that you also used "a Net program" in that  
>way later in the thread.*

What do you mean with that, why do you always telling that other people are understand in my text where in is not one word in I wrote , and than I get some Jon Skeet friends who are (as it seems invited) to give a reaction to help you and are flaming me because what you told that I wrote?

*>Are you seriously disputing the idea that most users don't have the  
>framework installed at the moment? I certainly have no proof, but I'd  
>be surprised if you really disagreed.*

Yes, read for that the messages from Cablito to you, in what I of course do not agree his tickling part about Brittain, however in its context agree. (And read "Context")

*>> There's no point in demanding that people find you a link saying that  
>> .NET is nothing but a runtime, as no-one's claimed that in the first  
>> place.  
>  
> Just read this two parts of messages in this thread bellow, reading it in*

> *this thread is to difficult it seems for you.*

>

>> <http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=O4qpcHWOEHA.1308%40TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl>

>

> [http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=T\\_05d.110056%24D%25.103044%40attbi\\_s51](http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=T_05d.110056%24D%25.103044%40attbi_s51)

> *I note that you didn't quote any of my posts there. Are you retracting*

> *your claim that I suggested you could run .NET programs without*

> *anything other than the CLR?)*

If "any" in your part of England means the same as I have learned, my first answer to you

<http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=%23Pvvo4VoEHA.2864%40TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl>

In what I by the way write what you denies in all your following messages.

> *What do you think the "R" bit of CLR stands for?*

--the answer in that link

is -----

I am glad I can help you with your question. It stands for Runtime in the word Common Language Runtime.

However that is not an installable runtime. It is a part of the OS layer which has the name Net framework. And which is not distributed as a Servicepack however with that name.

I hope that this clears your question?

-----

Why would I quote you with all other answer from you where you tried to proof what I wrote above to me.

I am not your teacher checking your homework.

The only part I did disagree consequently in your text is that you told "that I told that there runtime is not a part of the framework".

It was a question from you to me, I knew it, and gave you an answer. Maybe was that my misunderstanding. You never asked me if I could explain to you what was a runtime, I thought you knew that. However please ask that in another thread, than I give you some links where you can learn that.

> > *You, however, \*did\* claim that no runtime is needed with .NET programs*

> > *- a false statement. If you'd said that no runtime was needed in*

> > *addition to the framework itself, no-one would have disagreed with you.*

> > *It may well be that that's what you \*meant\* to say, but it's not what*

> > *you \*did\* say.*

>

> *Read this what is written me much earlier that Nick came in*

>

> <http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=e1PW38WOEHA.1644%40tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl>

>Yup, and I still disagree. You said that no runtime is needed, but a  
>runtime *\*is\** needed. It's installed as part of the framework. Would you  
>also say that the class library isn't required?

So because that "Extra" is in my message above you are now "for the first time" telling that there is beside the framework an "Extra" runtime and you maybe even "Extra" class library is needed. Maybe that is my fault I thought that you knew that that was not needed. I showed a page to JD (I thought yesterday in these threads where that is very short explained), maybe you can have a look at that.

>>In addition I surely did not write it completely clear the first time,  
>>however this was a message to Tim and written in that context, however  
>>again  
>>directly answered by Jon Skeet while I have not seen him answering much  
>>other questions the last months than about multithreading.

>groups.google.com reckons I've posted messages in 229 threads since  
>August 1st. Many of those are about threading, but certainly far from  
>all.

Did I say something else, I did not say only, and you are free to do it as you want, however that I have so check every word in this newsgroup that I write because otherwise I get a message from Jon Skeet.

Do you know what a..... is? And than a very simple question, that in my opinion every almost beginner in dotNet should know. Is really annoying.

> For me, you obvious did not look at the page from Tim and only took the  
> one  
> line from me and started again to shout that I am stupid.

Really? Please explain then how there's a comment from me on his web page (11:38) before your post was made (11:57). I'm surprised you didn't even check this – it wouldn't have taken long...

Nice explained. I comment never on a page and do not even look for that when the message is in the newsgroup. When you thought it was for the community than in my opinion you should have placed that message as well here, however you are free to do that of course.

> As I said much times before, you cannot give me a lesson about this.  
> Moreover, assuming that I and many others do not know what is JIT or what  
> is  
> the CLR is really an affront.

>Well, you claimed that a runtime wasn't required to run .NET programs.  
>It is. Whether you understand that really and just expressed yourself  
>badly (repeatedly) or whether you don't understand it, the statement is  
>just as untrue.

microsoft.public.dotnet.general: Re: The pros and cons of .NET

Can you really not tell anything else than that, I have said you have placed text out of its context hundreds times in this thread, and you did not even give one answer on that.

And as I asked before please give no conclusions of my knowledge anymore in this newsgroup, they give me only an idea about your referentionbase.

Cor