

# Re: Topic-Organized Object-Oriented Programming

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.object/2007-02/msg00153.html>

---

- *From:* "topmind" <[topmind@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:topmind@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 8 Feb 2007 12:42:17 -0800
- 

Diego wrote:

On Feb 7, 2:29 pm, "topmind" <[topm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:topm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Trees are usually a poor categorization structures beyond the trivial.  
I suggest you read:

<http://c2.com/cgi/wiki?LimitsOfHierarchies>

this c2.com/cgi/wiki is one of worst wiki sites I've seen in my entire life

all articles are a bunch of random quotes, inner discussions and personal opinions disguised as state-of-art :(

I give explicit and real examples. And, how is it worse than the pro-OO literature, which is all here-say and no science?

Where is the literature that clearly shows how OO is better (outside of shapes, animals, and device drivers)???

I will accept the idea that many of my techniques are subjective preferences. However, the implication of the OO literature is that OO has been objectively proven better. NOT. If the authors just said, 'I like my code this way, but don't know why', that is fine. At least the reader is not misled.

In short, let's see an example of it "done right" to compare to my "done wrong", eh?

-T-

.