
Subject: Re: When should objects be used?
Posted by [J.D. Smith](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning wrote:

>
> Richard G. French (rfrench@wellesley.edu) writes:
>
>> My problem is that so much of the discussion of objects
>> seems abstract that I have a hard time figuring out how to
>> translate it to the problems I am trying to solve.
>
> To tell you the truth, I read JD's articles five or six
> times and I'm *still* not sure I have a clue. :-(
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
>
> P.S. Let's just say that object programming is a whole
> lot easier than a lot of people might lead you to believe. :-)
>

Now David, I cannot sit idly by while you indict me on charges of misleading the uninitiated populace ;). The framework I outlined really isn't specific to object-oriented programming, it's just most easily expressed as such. And it sounds complicated, not because it is, but because I haven't worked on it enough.

So my advice is: use whatever style of programming produces a program you can explain in 1 paragraph. Object oriented programming *is* easy. Especially in IDL. 10 minutes will suffice to learn the mechanics of it. However, in the great space of designs, that region labelled Object-Oriented contains vastly more bad designs than good ones, compared to the more familiar regions.

Yes, OO is easy. Sometimes even easier than linear design. If you have modest goals of reuseability and interchange, it's not very different from other design styles. It can produce enticingly elegant solutions, or can lead you far astray of your original goals. So, by all means, give it a try. You'll like it. Just be somewhat cautious before throwing all you eggs in that basket.

JD

--

J.D. Smith |*| WORK: (607) 255-5842
Cornell University Dept. of Astronomy |*| (607) 255-6263

304 Space Sciences Bldg.
Ithaca, NY 14853

|*|
|*|

FAX: (607) 255-5875
