Subject: Re: 8-bit vs. 24-bit color on Windows
Posted by steinhh on Fri, 29 Jan 1999 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <MPG.111a547f221756b5989683@news.frii.com> davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:

> Liam Gumley (Liam.Gumley@ssec.wisc.edu ) writes:
>>> Almost everybody I know of with a 24-bit graphics cards on a Unix box opts
>>> for pseudo-color in IDL.
>>
>> As I said earlier, this is how everyone here works on Unix boxes.
> All right. I concede I am a romantic when it comes to software.
> How else would you dare write a book? :-)

Just to stress the point a bit, I think Bill Thompson is right
wrt. how many (most?) scientists work with data/color tables,
at least some of the time.

To them (and me), the "I" in IDL stands for exactly what he
described (interactive use of commands and xloadct in unison),
and no widget programmer can ever imagine in advance *everything* a
scientist would want to do with his data before/during/after
displaying them (the scientist doesn't know in advance, either:-),
so the interactive command line is an extremely valuable part of IDL.

Not having the possibility of exploring an image by tweaking
the color table in pseudo-color mode would take away a lot of the
original appeal of IDL, IMHO, so this should be taken very seriously
by RSI.

I think Bill has a good point in saying that:

> To you, maybe that's a minor annoyance which you're willing to put up
> with for perceived advantages of a more complicated 3-plane color
> system. For you that's great, and IDL should be able to provide that
> for you. However, for me, a color-table methodology is much simpler
> and more appropriate. I argue that IDL should be taking me into
> account too, and all those more basic users who don't subscribe to this
> newsgroup.

I think a large market segment would feel left out if the color-table
methodology got lost...

Regards,

Stein Vidar