

Re: Great SWT Program

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-12/msg04821.html>

- *From:* bcd@xxxxxxxxxxxx (Bent C Dalager)
 - *Date:* Mon, 31 Dec 2007 02:36:33 +0000 (UTC)
-

In article <232df502-30f1-45ac-b50e-9cb0ad77c8c9@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, <twerpinator@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Dec 27, 9:42 pm, b...@xxxxxxxxxxxx (Bent C Dalager) wrote:

The accumulated future benefit is as large as needed, if you look far enough ahead.

No

YES ... IF, that is, you look far enough ahead.

No. You see, people have a limited life expectancy and you cannot reasonably calculate them as being productive after they've died.

Call the startup cost x and the net benefit per unit time y .

Your mathematical model is too simple. There is also a maintenance or retraining cost that must be paid if the person stops using emacs for some period of time.

Least of all the especially insidious suggestion that perhaps I *admire you*. Shudder. No way! There are slime molds that I admire more.

Heh. So you /do/ admire me, if only a very little :-)

I don't know /what/ you guys are. I suggest you call a session between Twisted, Bbound, Twerpinator and whoever else you have rummaging around in there and try to reach some consensus.

Re: Great SWT Program

We are the Ghosts of Christmas Past, Present, and Future, and we foresee that you are heading for a dismal end in the near future, E-Bent-neezer Scrooge!

You appear to have been watching too much telly during the holidays :-)

Especially if you honestly believe that Economics 101 is wrong.

Economics 101 assumes a very simplified, naive model of the market. This model works for some things and falls completely apart for some others. It is "wrong" in some of the same ways that Newton was "wrong": it works for the normal stuff, but for more complicated stuff we need different theories.

(You may want to look up "Newton" and perhaps "Einstein" to understand the above – they are both well-known physicists and will be mentioned in all decent encyclopedia.)

The last bunch of people to hold that belief had their little workers' paradise implode under the growing strains of an inability to actually achieve decent productivity, as I recall

You are mistaken again. The communists understood market economics very well and Marxist theory is quite clear about how one needs to have a capitalist system before a socialist one can take over since capitalism creates wealth whileas socialism destroys it. And then one needs to alternate into capitalism again to build more wealth for the next period of socialism, etc. Marxism is naive in an entirely different manner: in believing that people will not exploit a socialist system for all that it is worth – and I also suspect that this intermittent switching between different systems will prove untenable in practice.

(Of course, the communists went and screwed it all up completely because the head honchos were, after all, a bunch of frightened, greedy little pigs :-)

, and millions upon millions starved before wise old Gorbachev finally pulled the plug on that particular failed experiment in Bent-world economics.

Re: Great SWT Program

You can't even pick you already erroneous examples correctly? Can't you do /anything/ right? If you want to lambast communism for its millions of deaths, you use China's cultural revolution, or their Great Leap Forward, or the Khmer Rouge of Cambodia.

[Bent reluctantly concedes my point, but also insults me]

Since I never said that there /was/ no web browser usage measuring going on, there is of course nothing to concede. [implied insult deleted]

But you'd said that no free software HAS such a thing as market share.

It doesn't. It has a user base.

Go to hell, liar.

Cheers,
Bent D

—

Bent Dalager – bcd@xxxxxxx – <http://www.pvv.org/~bcd>
powered by emacs

.