Subject: Re: can i place a job advert Posted by Paul van Delst on Mon, 26 Nov 2001 17:13:35 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

William Thompson wrote:

```
> Paul van Delst <paul.vandelst@noaa.gov> writes:
> "Pavel A. Romashkin" wrote:
>>> Oh, people have done much worse things here and got away with it. Like
>>> admitting to using common blocks. Go ahead...
> Wot's wrong with common blocks? They seem like quite useful beasties to me.
> Paul:
> You obviously don't belong to the right religion. ;^)
```

Well, my comment was meant to try to get those that swear profusely that common blocks are a Bad Thing to explain why. I place common blocks in the same category as GOTO statements - if used incorrectly they can lead to unbelievably bad source code that may or may not work. However, used correctly and judiciously they can greatly simplify the code - for both the programmer and subsequent user/readers. Having dealt with particularly blech f77 code replete with common blocks (anonymous, named, different lengths, etc.) I can sympathise with those that despise common blocks but, to use a building analogy, it's not the hammer's fault when the framing for the house falls down....

- > Seriously, I also use common blocks. I use them because:
- > 1. They're easy, and get the job done.

I even use them in Object programs!!! :o)

- > The main objections to common blocks have been:
- > 1. Sloppy programming can cause problems, if different programs have different
- > versions of the common block. That's pretty easy to get around, though.
- > Typically, I use include files, so that all programs have exactly the same
- > common blocks.

No argument there, but sloppy programming can cause problems regardless of what construct one

uses to manage variables, memory, etc. Pointers are what come immediately to mind..... with objects a close second.

paulv

>

--

Paul van Delst Religious and cultural

CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP purity is a fundamentalist

Ph: (301)763-8000 x7274 fantasy

Fax:(301)763-8545 V.S.Naipaul