In article <MPG.13e75cd8534ddf9a989b63@news.frii.com>,
davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) wrote:

> Joseph B. Gurman (gurman@gsfc.nasa.gov) writes:
>
>> 3. with NO object interfaces, since it's scientists who are doing a lot
>> of the programming, and I can't see why we're paying for features we
>> never use (however gnarly).
>
> Uh, Joe. Don't look now, but that kid walking behind
> you has his eye on *your* job. :-)
>
> Cheers,
>
> David

   David -

   No, that kid can get a _real_ job as a programmer for a dot.com, and
doesn't have to work the same hours for beans as a civil servant
scientist. Since programmers are now worth more to society than
scientists (as measured purely by salaries), it's clearly a waste of a
high-demand resource to have real programmers write code for scientific
research. ;-)

   And I'm very serious about the point above. I may be stuck knowing a
bunch of old farts (not, actually), but maybe one person in twenty here
actually uses the object capabilities when given a choice.

   Best,

        Joe

--
| Joseph B. Gurman, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Solar Physics
| Branch, Greenbelt MD 20771 USA / Federal employees are still
| prohibited from holding opinions while at work. Therefore, any
| opinions expressed herein are somebody else's.