

## Re: Back to VB6 and .NET

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VB/microsoft.public.vb.general.discussion/2008-02/msg00537.html>

---

- *From:* Robert Morley <[rmorley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rmorley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 05 Feb 2008 13:30:16 -0500
- 

Paul Clement wrote:

Well actually no, it indicates support for Visual Basic has declined since the Classic version is lumped with the .NET version. I would speculate that many of the Classic developers never moved to the .NET version. But wow, I would have thought that C# would have been the most popular .NET language. ;-)

"The last statistic is an interesting one, what it tells us is that VB was the most popular language, and by mid 2005 VB.NET had managed to attract less than half of those VB had prior to the move to .NET."

You might be right that they moved to some other language, like C#, but what does that tell you about the popularity of VB.NET?

Nice distortion of the "FACTS" though. ;-)

Not at all. I pointed you to the article; the article itself was clarifying the facts. Paul Vick's quotes from Forrester were the ones being distorted...Forrester was making much the same point, that support for VB.NET was down sharply compared to the market penetration VB6 had. It went from "#1" (period) as VB6 to "#1 .NET language" as VB.NET. Bit of a change there, don't you think?

You also failed to mention that desktop application development is down considerably. Web application development opens up quite a few different options for developers.

I'm moderately convinced that that's a fad. I know in our shop, we tried moving some stuff to Intranet, and while some of it is quite nice there and very convenient since we don't have to roll out desktop apps, my boss quickly realized that not EVERYTHING belonged there, and that the Desktop version was far more functional under the clunky old Access 2000-