
Subject: Re: How far is OO implemented in IDL?
Posted by [mvukovic](#) on Wed, 05 Sep 2001 19:47:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.15ffce623d91ea6989694@news.frii.com>...
> Olaf Stetzer (olaf.stetzer@imk.fzk.de) writes:
>
>> I know that Object Oriented Programming is supported
>> in IDL but I wonder how far this concept is supported?
>
> Almost never as far as you would have hoped if
> you know much about real object-oriented programming.
> Remember, objects were graphed onto a language
> that was nearly 20 years old at the time.
>
stuff deleted...

With all due respect to David and RSI, I am wondering how valid this
argument in defense of RSI is. So, shooting off the hip:

It seems that a 50 year old language is going object these days
(fortran).

Yes, RSI will have a problem improving IDL if they keep to the old
core. Are we supposed to keep working with that old and tired
language? Will RSI get new users with such an outdated product?
Unless RSI works actively on rejuvenating IDL, they will loose out.

As a side-note, IDL was written in fortran 20 years ago, and
re-written in C some 10 years ago.

feeling much better :-), and expecting corrections to the arguments
above,

Mirko
