

---

Subject: Re: direct graphics or object graphics ?  
Posted by [wtt](#) on Sat, 14 Jun 2008 12:32:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <MPG.228a6a87bee296919896f9@news.frii.com>,  
David Fanning <news@dfanning.com> wrote:

> Brian Larsen writes:  
>  
>> that isn't exactly a resounding endorsement of object graphics :)  
>  
> Really!? I guess I was remembering back to the time when I  
> was an object graphics newbie. :-)

I am sort of an object graphics newbie. I think it works really well,  
and I would recommend it (in a newbieish sort of way). One thing that  
I've noticed is that if I'm rendering a very large view, the IDL  
process's memory size can grow to be enormous (upwards of 2-3 GB  
sometimes).

On the machine I'm rendering on, this wouldn't be a problem except that  
IDL does not seem to relinquish that memory after the view has been  
rendered and the objects destroyed. Its only after the IDL process quits  
that the memory is recovered by the OS. This seems contrary to the way  
IDL manages its heap.

So I was thinking that this memory is overflow from the videocard's ram  
and is allocated by the operating system independent of IDL, and so it  
is not under IDL's direct control. Does that seem reasonable?

Thanks,  
Bill

>  
> Cheers,  
>  
> David  
>  
> P.S. I can be a \*lot\* more excited about object graphics  
> if we are talking about doing something in 3D space!

---