

Re: Question for the Group

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2007-06/msg01840.html>

- *From:* AEF <spamsink2001@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 19 Jun 2007 19:01:35 -0700
-

On Jun 18, 10:45 am, m.krae...@xxxxxx (Michael Kraemer) wrote:

In article <1182170373.940695.261...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, AEF

<spamsink2...@xxxxxxxx> writes:

I thought VMS was a higher-margin product than that. Maybe not. I think it certainly used to be and people were willing to pay more for quality.

I don't know either, since the numbers at openvms.org aren't further specified and I'm not inclined to wade through HP's entire business report.

One failure doesn't prove anything. If Windows didn't succeed through marketing, then how did it succeed? Certainly not through technical excellence!

Sure it was also marketing, but Windoze, as buggy as it may be, gave the masses what they wanted, some toy they could play games, edit their letters and (later) surf the internet. That those boxes crashed 10 times a day didn't matter much, apparently. It was second rank.

Pardon my ignorance, but didn't Apple do the same? What did they do wrong?

WTC success stories.

Re: Question for the Group

And how often should I assume WTC-like events will happen ?

And how often do the stories in North Star ads happen? (From the viewpoint of an individual, i.e.?) There are other disasters as JF pointed out.

Just general promotion to at least keep things from sliding further. There's some good promotional material on HP's Web site. Make a few ads from it. Nothing expensive. What would it hurt?

Well, I agree, some "we're still there" message wouldn't hurt. I seem to remember IBM ads for their legacy systems carrying a similar message, every now and then. But beating the big marketing drum without real new stuff behind would be a waste of money.

OK, so let's at least have some "maintenance" ads.

Others advertise security. Why not VMS? Why not back it up with something? What would it hurt?

Nothing, but would it help ? Everybody claims to be "secure" these days. Now if VMS would have some security certificate from NSA or whoever issues such things, putting them five notches above the usual Unix crowd, that would be something to brag about.

And those who claim security are doing better than VMS. So, if VMS claimed security, it should do better, too, no?

OTOH, "security" these days means to organize your IT so that it has minimum cross section to the evil internet, rather than the choice of a particular OS. Raise a firewall, hide business critical systems and important databases etc.

Which isn't really enough. Make ads claiming so and that demonstrate

Re: Question for the Group

how VMS does more than that.

But they need security and quality. I'm not convinced VMS's clustering is so bad.

I wouldn't say it's bad, but the vast majority of sites apart from the usual suspect won't need it that desperately. So it would not be the great differentiator. A vehicle on 6 wheels might be great off-road, but isn't such an advantage if one just drives down-town for shopping (apart from trying to impress people, but that's neither economical nor ecological)

Yeah, not everyone needs clustering. But I think many would benefit from it.

AEF

.