
Subject: Re: Top 10 IDL Requests

Posted by [Nicolas Decoster](#) on Thu, 27 Jul 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

"Joseph B. Gurman" wrote:

>

> 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.

I use objects. I am new in IDL (few month): I was not stuck to old stuff. I use object graphics to draw my figures since the begining.

In fact I am a "scientist programmer": I don't work for a dot.com, I write code for (my) scientific research. As a programmer I think objects are very usefull to build clean application or data processing. As a programmer I think that some IDL features are badly conceived. As a scientist I think that there are very interesting features, that do all the work without pain. As a scientist sometime I need to know how IDL do the work: I need to inspect the IDL-hidden-code.

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).

I agree, I don't want to pay for direct graphics: I never use them. :-)

Later.

Nicolas.

--

Ti ½l. : 00 (33) 5 62 88 11 16

Fax : 00 (33) 5 62 88 11 12

Nicolas.Decoster@Noveltis.fr

Noveltis

Parc Technologique du Canal

2, avenue de l'Europe

