
Subject: Re: Interactive Objects, Was: Simple GUI question

Posted by [mvukovic](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 19:57:26 GMT

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

Paul van Delst <paul.vandelst@noaa.gov> wrote in message
news:<3EA93481.88D1DE12@noaa.gov>...

> MC wrote:

>>

>> My wish list:

>>

>> 1) Whatever is available in object graphics is also made available in direct

>> graphics. And leave the choice of style to the individual.

>

> <RANT>

> Hmm. When I use IDL it's typically to look at data. That pretty much it. You know the

> usual stuff, plot, surface, contour, etc. And once I have the first plot up, I want to do

> things like change the scales (e.g. zoom), or rotate the surfaces - you know, play around

> with the numbers. I realised after a bit of a rant the other day that I don't really care

> *how* the images are created/displayed onscreen, I just want them to appear, and I want to

> be able to manipulate them.

>

> Why can't the mechanism behind someone type PLOT on the IDL command line be totally

> transparent? When I plot something I certainly don't care if it was done via direct or

> object graphics, I just want to see the darn plot.

>

> So, I have to admit it sort of confuses me that RSI introduced all this whiz bang object

> graphics stuff, but no "value-added" tools that use them. It's almost like buying a

> meccano (sp?) set - you get all the structural members and nuts and bolts and tools, but

> if you want anything interesting to play with ya gotta build it yourself. I don't want to

> write a whole bunch of code to do plots, surfaces, contours, whatever in object graphics

> so I can utilise their superior capabilities - that's what we pay so much moola for in the

> first place isn't it?

> </RANT>

>

> Off for more coffee....

>

> paulv

You could use ``live" tools. I tried, and never liked them very much. The design, interface, and looks just struck me as clunky. But then again, maybe I did not give them enough of a chance.

Mirko
