
Subject: Re: Interesting Rant

Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 18:36:47 GMT

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

David Fanning wrote:

> Folks,

>

> Someone sent me a link to this interesting IDL rant this morning:

>

> <http://www.sccs.swarthmore.edu/users/07/sstvnc2/research/stupid.html>

Hee hee. I thought it was pretty funny. I probably would've done something similar back when I was one of dem young whippersnappers (well, I would've if anything but Fortran was available....)

Apart from the fact that some of the info was just wrong, the rant shows the writers lack of experience with programming languages in general. To say nothing of exiting college and entering the real world where being able to distinguish and effectively handle the differences between the the way things **should** be and the way they actually **are** are a definite plus.

Ah... the innocence and passion of youth. :o)

Seeing as the ranter states he/she is a CS major, I think the following quote is somewhat topically pithy (seeing as the original article was brought to my attention on this newsgroup... I think):

"Formal logical proofs, and therefore programs $\frac{1}{2}$ formal logical proofs that particular computations are possible, expressed in a formal system called a programming language

$\frac{1}{2}$

are /utterly meaningless/. To write a computer program you have to come to terms with this, to accept that whatever you might want the program to mean, the machine will blindly follow its meaningless rules and come to some meaningless conclusion. In the test the consistent group [good programmers] showed a pre-acceptance of this fact: they are capable of seeing mathematical calculation problems in terms of rules, and can follow those rules wheresoever they may lead. The inconsistent group [so-so programmers], on the other hand, looks for meaning where it is not. The blank group [bad programmers] knows that it is looking at meaninglessness, and refuses to deal with it."

From: www.cs.mdx.ac.uk/research/PhDArea/saeed/paper1.pdf

If one can program well in IDL, I reckon one's "utterly meaningless" detector must be pretty well calibrated. :oD

cheers,

paulv

--

Paul van Delst Ride lots.
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP/EMC Eddy Merckx
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7748
Fax:(301)763-8545
