

---

Subject: Re: bitwise operators in IDL?

Posted by [marc schellens\[1\]](#) on Wed, 23 May 2001 05:14:02 GMT

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

---

> It would be really nice if IDL had any logical operators, other than  
> implied in the ambiguous usage of bitwise op's for different types.  
> Specifically, having a "short-circuiting" AND and OR operator set would  
> be exceptionally useful.  
>  
> How often do you find yourself doing something like:  
>  
> if ptr\_valid(a) AND \*a ge 0 then...  
>  
> only to find that it can't work, because AND always evaluates everything  
> it operates on. Most decent languages offer short circuiting AND's (and  
> OR's etc.), that stop as soon as the true solution is known. Here, if  
> ptr\_valid(a) is not true, there would be no need to continue to try to  
> dereference 'a' (which generates an error), and this snippet would be  
> correct.  
>  
> I guess for now we're stuck with  
>  
> if ptr\_valid(a) then begin  
> if \*a ge 0 then begin...  
>  
> Oh the tedium.  
>  
> JD

To late for short circuitry.

Consider a case when the second function in the if case  
has a side effect (e.g. modifying a global variable).

After once defining the language this way, to change it  
would mean to introduce incompatibility.

But you can write:

```
if ptr_valid(a) then if *a eq b then begin
```

```
...
```

which looks a little bit nicer (IMHO).

cheers,  
:-) marc

---