

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2006-06/msg01098.html>

- *From:* "Radek Cerny" <radek.cerny@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 8 Jun 2006 07:34:50 +1000
-

Wow. I love anchovy pizza – never had that as a result. Maybe its all true and you are psychic.

Its sad how so many otherwise helpful and intelligent people are so anti-MI. Maybe its what you grow up with and get used to – like having legs, arms and eyes. If you've never had them, you dont miss them.

"Shawnk" <Shawnk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:9EBE253D-7AEE-4407-816A-EB4D22F89270@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Thank you for letting me know of Anders 'Over my dead body' statement.

I have secretly harbored a suspicion that Java (and lately C#) is inherently 'evil' because there is 'No Multiple Inheritance'. With Anders' statement above I now KNOW C# is inherently evil.

.....

And if C# IS inherently evil, AND today IS 6/6/6 (666), we MUST consider the possibility that Anders as actually evil incarnate masquerading as a 'being of light' :-)

All of that great stuff (reflection, events, generics, LINQ) was actually an EVIL FACADE to force us to live without MULTIPLE INHERITANCE. (I see it all now !!!).

And since Anders IS such a wonderful and likeable guy (just a clever masquerade) it all makes sense!

Strange as it may seem I had a dream (nightmare) last night in which Anders played a flute leading the world's programmers to the 'Gates' of hell.

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

As I entered the gate turned into a couple of giant legs.

I looked up and there was Bill 'Gates' as the devil (which makes Anders just a subservient demon) shouting 'No Multiple Inheritance for .NET' and then he laughed wickedly.

The C# development team all had fiery tridents and keep prodding the incoming programmers into teeny tiny cubicles. The C# Experts and MVPs walked on walls just above the cubicles with whips and threatened code reviews.

And finally I saw Jon Skeet himself sitting on a high platform beating a big drum saying to each beat..

- No
- Multiple
- Inheritance
- No
- Multiple
- Inheritance

.....

Suddenly .. - I woke up in a cold sweat and couldn't get back to sleep without the light being on.

.....

Interesting how synchronicity and occult insights work on these new age date kind of things :-)

Thanks for the comment :-)

Shawnk

PS. Of course it could have been the anchovy pizza....

"Radek Cerny" wrote:

I guess all of us MI proponents stopped even dreaming when Anders uttered those words "MI? Over my dead body!".

I miss MI dearly and would forego any and all other .NET improvements to have it.

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

Cheers

"Shawnk" <Shawnk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:81A82AA4-21DC-4248-9774-B7AE4C7962D6@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Nicholas,

Thank you for your response.

The numbers in points [1] and [2] are completely contrived.

We wanted to articulate the difference between (1) understanding and (2) use of II (Implementation Inheritance). We also wanted to establish a metric level for change (by evolution, user migration to other languages, user loyalty (as in C++)) that would account for the lack of MI (Multiple Inheritance) in recent language offerings (java, C#, D++).

The metrics of 'less than 1%' seemed to be a reasonable way to account for the apparent 'level of interest' (lack of interest) in MI/SFM among 'expert' and 'senior' level programmers in the non-C++ programming communities.

As to 'why MI is not supported' – the lack of interest or the response to this post is an indication that verifies (informally) the 'less than 1%' water mark. And yes, ... it appears that the II, MI and SFM are not used/understood/desired in the non-C++ programming communities :-)

We wanted to post this question in several language communities prior to

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

any other actions (such as recommendations, etc). Also, making recommendations would be distracting to an audience/community that has no interest/understanding/desire of the utility of MI/II/SFM.

Your good point about a recommended design implementation for MI in C++ (in my mind) is really hinged/connected to Anders position of 'no MI in C#'. Since all the videos, interviews, etc. (That I have seen) indicate he has NO interest in MI/II/SFM it is reasonable to assume that C# will always be a less expressive (relative to functional orthogonality) and powerful language compared to C++.

Note that C# is an excellent language and wonderfully expressive from a productivity standpoint (type safety, etc). Its current contribution via LINQ is excellent as its historic introspective (reflection) and binding (delegates,events) mechanisms. As a mechanism for automated pattern detection and refactoring it fails (IMHO) because of the importance of functionally orthogonal mechanisms (such as MI/II/SFM, etc).

The lack of use of .NET in the Microsoft Vista implementation is something of interest (to the MI/II/SFM issues) that we will pursue (as opposed to C# recommendations) to get a feel for MI/II/SFM issues in various programming communities.

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

Thanks again for your input.

Shawnk

PS. The lack of MI/II/SFM in .NET is a basic, serious and fundamental flaw (IMHO) of the 'operating system' (as in .NET) itself. This, of course, hinges on the validity of point [3] which is the basis for Ander's position on MI in C#.

"Nicholas Paldino [.NET/C# MVP]" wrote:

I would be interested in knowing how you came to the numbers that you have in points 1 and 2.

While I agree that implementation inheritance would be useful, if the numbers that you claim are anywhere near correct, you have already answered why MI is not supported in modern languages (meaning most .NET languages, Java).

In all of this, I didn't see a recommendation on how such functionality might be included in C# (proposed language syntax, rules, etc, etc). Why not show something of that nature?

--
- Nicholas Paldino [.NET/C# MVP]
- mvp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

"Shawnk"
<Shawnk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

wrote in message

news:37B632C2-66E7-433A-A449-27FA734BB33D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Some Sr. colleges and I have had an on going discussion relative to when and if C# will ever support 'true' multiple inheritance.

Relevant to this, I wanted to query the C# community (the 'target' programming community herein) to get some community input and verify (or not) the following two statements.

[1] Few programmers (3 to 7%) UNDERSTAND 'Strategic Functional Migration (SFM)' (see PS below).

[2] Of those few, even less (another 3 to 7%) are GOOD at Strategic Functional Migration (or 0.9% to 0.49%).

Do these percentages seem about right? (less than 1% of the target programming community are GOOD at SFM)

Thanks ahead of time for any relevant QUALITY input.

Shawnk

PS.

Strategic Functional

Re: Strategic Functional Migration and Multiple Inheritance

Migration (SFM) is
described in the post
following
this
one.

PPS. I submit to my fellow
colleges that the answer
(point spread)
determines

[A] Short term mitosis of
the few to pioneer a new
language
incorporating
C#
productivity with C++
(SFM) powers

[B] Long term community
evolution and industry
migration away from
C#
as a
'core competency' solution
(subtle point)

Both A/B, in turn,
instantiate the 'early adopter'
model in the
compiler
market.

PPPS.

I have a 'core competency'
project I want to do that
would be a lot
easier
if I
could use SFM with C#.

