

Re: VMS Cracked! [was: Linux is the favourite hacker target]

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2003-09/2221.html>

From: Keith Parris (keithparris_NOSPAM_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 09/28/03

Date: 28 Sep 2003 14:19:48 -0700

"Dave Weatherall" <djweath@attglobal.net> wrote in message news:<DTiotGxQ0bj6-pn2-5vsHnx20rsFe@localhost>...

> *On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 21:28:58 UTC, keithparris_NOSPAM@yahoo.com (Keith Parris) wrote:*

> > *JF Mezei <jfmezei.spamnot@istop.com> wrote in message news:<3F7489E1.5487941D@istop.com>...*

> > > *But when they hired Cuttler and al to write NT, (and windows 95)*

> >

> > *Windows 95 was not Cutler's -- that's what NT had to be compatible with.*

>

> *My memory tells me that issues about NT/Win95 compatability came about with NT4.*

JF indicated Cutler's team also wrote Windows 95. My point was that Cutler did not work on Windows 95 -- his team worked on NT.

And my second point was that NT had to be compatible with the existing applications portfolio from Windows 3.1/95/etc.:

> > *You can't have a clean slate and backward compatability at the same time.*

>

> *I get the impression that there is general 'down' on backward compatibility at the minute. Is it vogue? It is not a bad thing. It is one of VMS's major strengths.*

Backward compability in general is very good, and is demanded by users. The problem on the Windows platform is that backward compatability requires giving applications the same low-level, direct (and thus unprotected) access to hardware that early Windows versions provided, which is a very bad thing for security.