



Re: Larkin, Power BASIC cannot be THAT good:

Unless you're running a processor running in the single digit megahertz, programmer development time, code reliability and maintainability are far more important than raw speed. It hardly matters if a subroutine finishes in 0.0015ms instead of 0.0012 ms when the process being monitored takes 5ms.

BASIC is a shitty language because no two implementations are compatible. Everything with named variables, constructs, code blocks, parameter passing, if/then/else, case statements, etc. required proprietary extensions.

Do I have to give all the money back?

Nah. Just learn a completely new proprietary language every time you try BASIC with a different vendor.

I use PowerBasic for Windows apps. Why would I change vendors?

If you program C++/.NET, or C#, your programs won't be very portable. If you're careful and a little lucky, you can write Java programs that almost work the same under Windows and Linux.

I'm not a programmer, but I do need to program engineering problems. PowerBasic (the console compiler, not the real Windows thing) is fast and works well. These programs don't need to be portable... all I need them to do is to keep running under future revs of Windows. All my old 16-bit PowerBasic/DOS programs seem to work fine under XP, even the graphics. Only serial i/o is flakey, so we migrate them to PBCC, the 32-bit version, which does serial and TCP/IP just fine.

"Real" windows programming wastes too much effort on the user interface.

John

.