

## Re: Visual Basic on Vista: try not to laugh

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VB/microsoft.public.vb.general.discussion/2006-10/msg00822.html>

---

- *From:* "mayayana" <[mayaXXyana1a@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mayaXXyana1a@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 10 Oct 2006 13:44:37 GMT
- 

⌘ Please reread OP, this was clearly stated (IDEs).

Yes but your conclusion was false. The .NET Framework 1.1 has not been deprecated as you \*clearly\*

stated and the subsequent statement that 2.0 will not work properly is erroneous.

For some reason you chose not to make a distinction between the IDE and the .NET Framework. ;~)

It was clear to me. He started out talking about IDEs. That was implied at the end of his post. I never got the impression that the whole .Net mess was kaput on Vista.(Assuming that Vista comes out in time for back-to-school-shopping, I expect it will be at least another year before they break .Net v. 2. :)

I certainly haven't been having any significant issues porting source code from 2003 to 2005. Have you?

It leaves my jaw hanging loose to see how often Microsoft shills say things like that. What about the cost of VB.Net 2005?! What about time spent on the transition? What about the fact that maybe someone

Re: Visual Basic on Vista: try not to laugh

just doesn't want to switch, for whatever reason?  
What about the fact that Microsoft sold a product  
and then shamelessly broke it?

There's a consistent implication that the actual monetary  
cost of Microsoft software is so trivial as to not be  
worth even talking about. But it's about \$40 a year trivial.

Imagine if they stopped making  
parts for your car and someone from the company's  
fan club said to you, "Well, I don't see what the  
problem is. I didn't have any trouble buying a new car."

Maybe that wouldn't bother you. You could just  
pick up your new car on the way back from the  
software store when you pick up 4 new copies of  
Vista Ultimate for your home PCs.

.