Re: Why is OO Popular?

Source: http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.object/2004−05/0210.html

---

From: Eric Kaun (*ekaun_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 05/04/04

Date: Tue, 04 May 2004 14:16:49 GMT

"Thomas Gagné" <tgagne@wide−open−west.com> wrote in message
news:z6ednX−9z7MLPwrdRVn−gQ@wideopenwest.com...
> *Eric Kaun wrote:*
>
> *>This is just great − having advanced philosophy, math, logic,*
linguistics,
> *>and science over thousands of years, it's time to base our computer*
systems
> *>on the interactions of young children.*
> >
> *>Should we introduce CPU nap times as well?*
> >
> >
> >
> *No, but it sounds like programmer nap times are a good idea!*

zzzzzz...

> *To follow your argument, to catch a ball I would have to calculate its*
> *trajectory, its starting speed, air density and friction, its mass, the*
> *affect of gravity, gross motor skills, and any number of things just to*
> *catch a ball thrown at me.*

That's not the argument I was making (as you probably guessed).

> *Perhaps some of us do (or try to which is*
> *why some aren't athletically inclined) but I suspect not. Children do*
> *all kinds of things using much simpler models*

I don't see a model aspect to catching a ball, or at least don't see that
the unconscious complexities of human brain function (motor response) apply
to the argument at hand.

> *than those that propose*
> *more complicated ones must exist and be understood. The evidence is to*
> *the contrary (IMO).*

The human brain and body encapsulate those more complicated models. That work has been done for us, though we continue to try to understand it. In modeling businesses that we're inventing, that's not the case − we're creating the abstractions, the mechanisms.

> *Want to study how brains work? Study the simple ones. Want to study*
> *intelligence? Observe the development of a child from birth through the*
> *first 12 months and measure what it is they've discovered without the*
> *benefits of philosophy, math, logic, linguistics and science.*

Agreed.

> *Using your argument nothing would be developed (including children)*
> *because of the lack of a prerequisite education.*

Again, not the argument I was making − I was overly terse, and didn't explain.

> *Or, I may have missed your whole point because I lack the*
> *prerequisites. Time to roll a ball to my 9−month old to see if he's*
> *conquered motor skills, friction, acceleration/deceleration,*
> *objects−in−motion, etc.*

No, I wasn't trying to be condescending. I was simply suggesting that although the conceptual basis of OO is intuitively appealing, that we have as a species discovered more powerful metaphors for many aspects of logic and math (types are an important part of this, but not the only part). Math arose from simple needs, but our understanding is now very different, and we've accomplished much. I was suggesting simply that we take advantage of this progress in our computer languages and systems.

− erk