Martin Schultz wrote:
>
> Hi all,
>
>   With almost a week delay, I finally get around to release the first
> version of a new class of IDL objects: the MGS_GUIObject hierarchy.

I think it only fair to let people know that I tend to shy away from
distributed code with people's initials in the name. I know, it sounds
stupid, but I'm not sure I'm the only one. It seems to be a reasonably
common practice here (Craig, you listening?), but one which I think
might be best to avoid, for the following reasons:

1. It conveys a sense of ownership or heavy expectations that are
perhaps unjustified, and not intended. (Can I *change* such a routine,
should I feel guilty, etc...).

2. It takes up space in a name which could perfectly well have been
used for more descriptive characters.

3. If the routine/class/function/widget name following, e.g., JDS, is
so ambiguous as to require the initials to discriminate it from another
of the same name, either the routine/class/function/widget isn't that
useful, or its name is entirely too inspecific. And the way I think
about it, since IDL doesn't do any shadow checking (but cf. idlwave!),
the *best* routine with a given generic name will rise to the top.

4. The author(s) can always be found in a proper documentation header.

That's just my feeling on it. Anyone else have an opinion? I could
suggest lots of descriptive names for this class. SuperGUI?
GUIMaster? WidgetMaster? GUIBuilder? (no pun intended, RSI)...

JD