
Subject: Re: Object Graphics + Convolution with Point Spread Function
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Mon, 26 Jan 2004 16:59:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nuno Oliveira writes:

> I heard somewhere that object oriented languages were more easy and
> practical to use. Or you just don't like the way IDL's graphic objects are
> build?

No, no. You misunderstand. I *love* object oriented programs.
Nearly all the programs I write for clients are object oriented.
They are slick, easy to maintain, easy to write (once you have
a decent library of routines) and elegant.

But that doesn't mean they don't require a lot more code
up front. They do. The payoff is on the back end, once you
have a number of building blocks for creating functionality.

I have no objection at all to object graphics, except that
they are mostly overkill and unnecessary for the kinds of
programs my clients want. For me, direct graphics objects
are much simpler to use and write.

Of course, if you are doing anything at all in 3D space,
object graphics are hard to beat.

Cheers,

David

P.S. I have recently had occasion to see a 2D application
that was written in object graphics and I must admit, I was
greatly impressed with the look and feel. In fact, it was
spectacular! I couldn't come close to it's look and feel
in direct graphics (at least until RSI gives us some decent
direct graphics fonts). But having some idea of the work
involved, I'm not sure the polish was worth the elbow grease. :-)

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155
