
Subject: Re: Global variables and IDL

Posted by [davidf](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Folks,

In returning to this newsgroup after a short absence I have been shocked and appalled to see evidence of the ever quickening pace of moral decay in the world today. I refer, of course, to the large number of IDL programmers confessing to the use of COMMON blocks in their programs.

I, too, used a COMMON block--once. I think I stored the seed of a random number in it until I realized I could just as well include the seed in my info structure along with all the other stuff I needed in my program. And there is evidence that even more programmers might soon come forward with the same confession. It is hard to imagine how it could be otherwise, what with RSI supplying example code liberally sprinkled with COMMON blocks and most of us cutting our teeth on FORTRAN programs. (Is it my imagination, or are most of the people confessing to COMMON block usage at least middle aged?)

But, alright. The evidence is overwhelming--even to me. There are some very good reasons why a COMMON block may be used for some good purpose. Just because I've never stumbled onto one in the course of my own programming doesn't make it any less true. It's probably because I don't have enough programming imagination to see how clever using a COMMON block would be.

But I would like to correct a few misconceptions about COMMON blocks, if I may.

Martin Shultz writes:

> But here are two examples where I used common blocks --
> and I would be happy
> to learn how I could have avoided them:
>
> * in my EXPLORE tool (which can handle several "instances" at least if
> opened from within), I use
> a common block to keep track of the drawing windows that have been
> opened and used.

There is absolutely no need for a COMMON block in this instance.

Widget programs can easily keep track of drawing windows through the use of draw widget IDs, even draw widgets that are detached from the main window. See, for example, the SLICE program on my web page, which can spawn any number of copies of itself, or--for a simpler example, the ZIMAGE program which can tell if the zoom window is open and on the display or not. If it is not on the display (it had, perhaps, been killed by the user) the program simply creates another.

<http://www.dfanning.com/programs/zimage.pro>

Martin goes on to write this, which scares me very much indeed:

- > This is
- > needed to kill a window when the associated widget is closed as well as
- > to open a new window
- > for a new widget instance. At first it would seem that I could simply
- > use the /free keyword to WINDOW and store the window number locally with
- > the widget, but I have to close **all** windows when I exit the program.
- > Should I use the event notification method?

Using normal IDL graphics windows from within a widget program is a **terrible** idea! (No offense to Martin, who I know is a VERY good IDL programmer.) But if you display graphics in normal IDL windows you have absolutely no control over them from within your widget program. You would, indeed, probably need a COMMON block to account for them. If you need to display graphics inside a widget program I can say categorically, without exception, that you need a draw widget in which to display them! (I'm not saying it can't be done. I'm saying you don't want to do it.)

Cheers,

David

P.S. After thinking about it for a long time I just put a COMMON block back into one of the programs on my web page. (I won't say which one, because I'm not certain that I am going to leave it there.) Whew! It wasn't as bad as I thought it was going to be. ;-)

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155