
Subject: Re: Solve memory problems

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Wed, 14 Jan 2009 16:23:05 GMT

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

On Jan 14, 9:03 am, David Fanning <n...@dfanning.com> wrote:

> Craig Markwardt writes:

>> Uh, like using any other high-level language that doesn't force you to

>> free your own variables?

>

> My goodness, people, whatever happened to craftsmanship?

> I feel like I'm working with a bunch of Wal-Mart furniture

> builders here. Quick, easy, cheap. :-(

Uh, I wasn't defending the use of HEAP_GC, but it's monumentally silly that the IDL language designers had the choice to implement automatic freeing of dangling pointers ("garbage collection") and did not [*].

I mean, would you really enjoy the "privilege" of freeing every *regular* variable before returning from each IDL procedure? Of course not. The IDL runtime has enough information to know *exactly* when a pointer becomes dangling, so why not use that information?

I think I understand craftsmanship -- I hope my public code speaks for itself. But I don't think that has anything to do with masochistic worship at the alter of POINTER_FREE.

Snark-Craig

[*] - I understand that for debugging purposes, automatic garbage collection may be a nuisance. It would be straightforward to disable it with a system variable.

>

> Cheers,

>

> David

>

> P.S. I guess you probably know it is time to give it up when

> you get to the point where you believe the world will go

> straight to hell in a handbasket if you *do* give it up.

> Just don't be sending me any code with HEAP_GC in it. Even

> Coyote wouldn't lower himself *that* much. :-)

>

> --

> David Fanning, Ph.D.

> Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

> Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming:<http://www.dfanning.com/>

> Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")
