
Subject: Re: Top 10 for old farts
Posted by [davidf](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2000 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mark Hadfield (m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz) writes:

- > Objects were a necessary development in IDL and are certainly a good thing
- > IMHO. Well, OK some of the design decisions were debatable.
- >
- > Object graphics were also a necessary development but are less obviously a
- > good thing. The main problem with them is that producing a simple plot using
- > IDL's standard object graphics facilities is ridiculously difficult. It's
- > possible to finish RSI's job by writing a set of smarter, higher-level
- > graphics classes & routines but it's a lot of work. Hence my comment about
- > productivity.

Amen to this. But I would like to reiterate (for what, the fourth time? I've got to give up on this horse) that they are not so difficult that *someone* (not RSI, apparently) wouldn't be willing to go to the trouble if there was some indication they would be compensated for the effort. And I mean by "compensated", rewarded in some other way than by the eternal gratitude of the IDL newsgroup community, with all the resultant adulation and prestige (which doesn't count for much with the bank manager) such acknowledgement implies. :-)

Cheers,

David

P.S. I've already got Joe's order written down. Anyone else ready to anti-up for some decent (direct or object) graphics programs, written as objects? In the meantime I'm going to get on with my life. You will hear no more from me on this subject. (Unless someone provokes me, of course.)

--

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
