

Re: Wronghorn

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2004-04/4705.html>

From: Sender's name (*anonymous_at_discussions.microsoft.com*)

Date: 04/04/04

Date: Sun, 4 Apr 2004 16:38:10 -0700

>-----Original Message-----

>"Sender's name" <*anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com*>

wrote in message

>*news:137e901c41a67\$e3790790\$a001280a@phx.gbl...*

>> *>I've never felt compelled to upgrade anything just*

>> *>because there was a new*

>> *>version and no IT decision-maker does either.*

>>

>> *As I see it, the point made by the OP has nothing to do*

>> *with that.*

>

>>*From the piece: "Microsoft has built its business on a model that forces*

>*customers to spend money on software upgrades every few years."*

>

>*This is relevant to the piece because the author obviously implies "forced"*

>*premium upgrades in the quoted statement.*

Forced by security patches. If you want to be able to test and apply the M\$ security patches for your machine, you MUST have SP1 installed. That is not 6 years of support for Windows XP (with no service pack) when it comes to security. That's more like 3 years. THAT is what forces customers to upgrade their proprietary M\$ software.

>

>> *>What's the "forced upgrade every few years" the author*

>> *refers to? You mean*

>> *>the six-year product life-cycle offered by Microsoft?*

>>

>> *6 years, 6 YEARS?!? Bwahahahahah, Now THAT is what is*

>> *laughable. What about the fact that Windows 2000 sp3 is*

>> *the oldest OS you better have loaded if you have any*

hope

>> *of even having limited extended security patch support?!?*

>> *What about the fact that Monopolysoft doesn't even release*

>> *security patches for XP gold in recent security*

>> *patches?!? And XP gold is not much more than 3 yrs old.*

>> *6 years my hiney!*

>

>*If you had talked about Windows ME, then you might have a case. I don't*

Windows ME is also a good example.

>*know how you think Service Pack level effects life-cycle, but I don't*

>*believe they are related. I can install Windows 2000 Pro from the orinigal*

>*CD and receive the same level of support as I can with a Windows 2000 SP3*

>*(or SP4 for that matter) installation.*

But M\$ only tests and supports the patches on SP3 and up now, just like for XP sp1. The patches couold break or screw up your pre windows 2000 sp3 machine or your XP pre sp1 machine, and then you are screwed.

>

>*I'm not a long-term XP user since I was going to skip the whole XP thing*

>*altogether until someone bought me a copy to work with.*

However, it seems

>*XP Gold is still supported with security patches,*

assuming you've downloaded

>*SP1.*

You are restating my point with your statements about 2000 and XP.

>

>> *The author apparently*

>> *>wasn't around when Solaris 2 was rolled out on the new*

>> *Sparc 5/20 model*

>> *>workstations. By the way, I can run the same Windows*

>> *version of MOTU's*

>> *>Digital Performer on Windows 98 or Windows XP. Tell the*

>> *author to try*

Re: Wronghorn

>> >installing the OS 9 version of Digital Performer on
>> Apple's OS X...
>>
>> The OP made no mention of Apple and OSx or Solaris.
>> Backwards compatibility, although I have never found it
to
>> have an effect in all of my attempts to make older
programs
>> work in Windows XP, is also OT for this topic.
>
>No, it is not off-topic... From the article: "Every
successive upgrade
>restricts Microsoft's client base to fewer options and
increased dependence
>on its platform. Each version has a new framework that
cannot be used with
>previous versions. Developers must continually update
their skills, which
>costs customers time and money."
>
>Here, the author not only makes a statement that is
absolutely false, but he
>also implies this is somehow unique to Microsoft's
business model.

Visual

>Basic 6 developers can write code that runs side-by-side
with .NET code.
>The new .NET Framework version 1.1 is available for
Windows 98 and later.
>Instead of being forced to buy upgraded development
components, as with
>those other operating systems I mentioned, I just
completed the task of
>converting an old pdqcom32.ocx ActiveX control to a .NET
compatible dll,
>including the C# source code for customization, all
possible in the freely
>available .NET SDK.
>
>So, I can continue to program in VB6 or C++ 6 or I can
learn VB.NET or
>C++.NET. I can deploy .NET apps to Windows 98
workstations, I can deploy
>VB/C++ 6 apps to Windows XP workstations, and I can use
older VB/C++ 6
>components and libraries in my .NET projects. The only
option not
>supported, as far as I know, is developing .NET
applications with VB/C++ 6.

Yes, my point exactly. M\$ will make their new stuff like .NET compatible with their own old PROPRIETARY software, which is not "Windows supporting open standards".

>
>> *Well, I'd rather be "mor-on" topic than more off topic*
>> *like yourself.*
>
>*Hmmm...*
>
>- *carl*
>
>
>.
>