

Re: Cryptogram Comment

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2004-06/1157.html>

From: Tom St Denis (tom_at_securescience.net)

Date: 06/18/04

Date: Fri, 18 Jun 2004 13:05:18 GMT

Daniel James wrote:

> *In article*
> *news:<yejAc.6850\$MD7.5404@news04.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com>, Tom St*
> *Denis wrote:*
>> *MFC, # and .net are just gimmicks to scam people into thinking*
>> *Windows is "growing".*
>
> *No that's not it. I agree that MS have an agenda of their own behind*
> *the development of these technologies, but they're not just a scam.*

I'd say they pretty much are. Could you imagine if KDE was written in C++ this week, C# next week and then Java the week after "just to embrace technology"?.

> *MFC was originally an abstraction tool so that people could write one*
> *application and compile it for both 16-bit and 32-bit Windows. It's*

You could already do that. The Win16 and Win32 APIs were so similar that porting an application to Win32 [what Win95/98/ME/XP are essentially] was a matter of recompiling and minor source changes at best.

> *also a fairly functional C++ wrapper around the Windows API that does*
> *make coding quite a lot easier than in the bare Win32 API. (It's a*
> *piss-poor example of object oriented design, though, largely because it*
> *had to be supportable on MS's old 16-bit compiler for pre-standard*
> *C++.)*

I don't know about that. With just C and MSVC you can drag-and-drop design GUIs, code the callbacks and have nice flashy pretty gui applications. MFC doesn't help that.

> *C# and .NET are MS's response to Sun preventing them from using Java.*

Response as in "look we can do it too!" That's marketing not engineering. C# and .NET [and .ASP and .whateversnext] won't enable you to write an application any easier than before. I mean C is a simple language. Resource editors take care of the GUI. Additional baggage need not apply.

sci.crypt: Re: Cryptogram Comment

>> ... that aside, none of this makes MSFT responsible for the actions
>> of people who steal their [crappy] software.
>
> That's a tough one ... I can see both sides of the argument. MS made
> the crappy software, and they have a (moral, if not legal) duty to fix
> it and to provide the fix FOC for paid-up customers. I think we can
> agree on that much.

Bingo.

> If the effect of the crappiness was only to the detriment of the users
> of the software themselves – and not to innocent and uninvolved third
> parties – I'd certainly agree that MS had no responsibility to provide
> the fix to those who've just ripped the software off; but as the nature
> of the crappiness is that it also affects third parties I'd say MS had
> a (moral if not legal) duty *to those third parties* to offer the fix
> to all users, including pirates.

Well then you would be for SP2 disabling pirated WinXP installs? I mean that would stop them from running an unpatched OS.

Why should they take the stance of making a pirated install better?

Tom