
Subject: Re: IDL 6.0

Posted by [Michael Asten](#) on Fri, 28 Mar 2003 01:55:44 GMT

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

Randall Skelton wrote:

>
> My message to RSI is that I don't really need any more GUI tools,
> spread-sheet views or slow pointy-clicky interfaces. What I would like is
> a more complete set of core object programming interfaces so I can
> program more logically and manipulate/visualize my data more efficiently.
> I hate to admit it, but I have been using Matlab a lot recently as it's
> object model is more suited to how I code using data objects. Now if only
> it had pointers :(
>

This viewpoint shows an interesting divergence between different classes of users. I am of the troglodyte school who do not use objects (do I hear a Coyote howling from the next hill?). But I do use guis to drive my programs, and I don't like programming guis - I prefer to use ready-made items; I use IDL to get quick results from my data, not to generate fancy code.

I have found (somewhat to my chagrin) that when I have tried to get professional programmers interested in using idl for all the obvious reasons, they won't touch it; a 4GL is beneath them, and anything idl can do, c++/java can do better etc etc. Which is fine if the outcome desired is a versatile customised piece of software. But if the criterion is to get code to process the data, in half the programming time, at half the development price, then the said pro approach is a lousy answer. The bottom line in my experience is is, those who want the finest software tools may as well follow the pros to c++/java. The fraction of users who like idl for its reduced software development time, will probably say with me, bring on better/more versatile libraries of guis and gui-builders.

Regards,
Michael Asten

>
> I promise this will be my last 'IDL objects' rant for a while.
>
> Cheers,
> Randall
