

## Re: [OT] .NET Rant

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2004-02/1935.html>

---

**From:** gabriel (no\_at\_no--spam.com)

**Date:** 02/11/04

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2004 21:38:19 +0000

C# Learner wrote:

- > *The thing is, HttpRequest and HttpResponse would be \*ideal\* for*
- > *what I want to do. Since they don't have this fundamental*
- > *functionality, I'm going to have to reinvent the wheel.*

Obviously, if you have to reinvent the wheel, the built in classes are `_not_ideal`...

- > *I will now have to go and make two classes, called HttpRequest and*
- > *HttpResponse, which act exactly like the above two, except that they*
- > *allow "raw" packet access. In this case, .NET is nowhere near ideal*
- > *for the lazy programmer, as has been claimed many a time.*

The lazy programmer would use what is built in. Again, in normal programming I have never had to go beyond the built in stuff, specially look at the raw data from HTTP requests.

- > *Why do MS tout it as the be-all and end-all then? I see now that this*
- > *is \*false\* advertising.*

I don't think they do. There's certainly a ton of stuff you cannot do with it, even at first glance (ie, write an O/S boot loader, write an effective memory manager, etc...) and there's stuff that would take longer if you tried to do it in .NET than in another language (ie, a disk sector editor, low-level o/s intensive stuff, etc...)

Anyway, I better shut up before the "since I only know how to use a hammer, everything looks like a nail" .NET-only gang.

--

gabriel