
Subject: Re: Physical constants in IDL with !CONST

Posted by chris_torrence@NOSPAM on Thu, 20 Dec 2012 19:10:32 GMT

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

On Thursday, December 20, 2012 10:36:21 AM UTC-7, Heinz Stege wrote:

> On Thu, 20 Dec 2012 06:24:31 -0800 (PST), wlandsman wrote:

>

>

>

>> I wonder if the constants should be !DtoR and !RtoD (or RADEG and DEGRA) to correct the earlier inconsistency in the ancient history of IDL. I'm not sure about this, though. --Wayne

>

>>

>

> A lot of discussions for a little thing, that everyone can do her or

>

> himself within a startup file.

>

>

>

> However, I think Wayne is absolutly right.

>

>

>

> A similar point is, that I wouldn't name the elementary charge "eV". I

>

> know, there is a name conflict with the Euler's number. However the

>

> Euler's number can simply be calculated by `number=exp(1d)`. Therefore I

>

> suggest to simply remove it from the table.

>

>

>

> Please realize, that most of the "constants" are from physics and

>

> chemistry and the Euler's number is a mathematical number which never

>

> will change. (You may argue, that pi also is a mathematical constant,

>

> however it is needed [even though by definition] for the calculation

>

> of the magnetic constant $\mu_0 = 4\pi \cdot 10^{-7}$

>

>

>

> The name "ev" for the elementary charge is confusing, because the

>

> definition of the elementary charge constant has nothing to do with
>
> the energy unit "electron volt". The reason for 1 eV being 1.602...
>
> 10^{-19} J only reflects, that changing the potential of a charge e
>
> about 1 V means an energy change of 1.602... 10^{-19} J.
>
>
>
> Thats what I wanted to say.
>
>
>
> Cheers, Heinz

On Thursday, December 20, 2012 10:36:21 AM UTC-7, Heinz Stege wrote:

> On Thu, 20 Dec 2012 06:24:31 -0800 (PST), wlandsman wrote:
>
>
>
>> I wonder if the constants should be !DtoR and !RtoD (or RADEG and DEGRA) to correct the
earlier inconsistency in the ancient history of IDL. I'm not sure about this, though. --Wayne
>
>>
>
> A lot of discussions for a little thing, that everyone can do her or
>
> himself within a startup file.
>
>
>
> However, I think Wayne is absolutly right.
>
>
>
> A similar point is, that I wouldn't name the elementary charge "eV". I
>
> know, there is a name conflict with the Euler's number. However the
>
> Euler's number can simply be calculated by $\text{number} = \exp(1d)$. Therefore I
>
> suggest to simply remove it from the table.
>
>
>
> Please realize, that most of the "constants" are from physics and
>

> chemistry and the Euler's number is a mathematical number which never
>
> will change. (You may argue, that pi also is a mathematical constant,
>
> however it is needed [even though by definition] for the calculation
>
> of the magnetic constant $\mu_0 = 4\pi \times 10^{-7}$)
>
>
>
> The name "ev" for the elementary charge is confusing, because the
>
> definition of the elementary charge constant has nothing to do with
>
> the energy unit "electron volt". The reason for 1 eV being 1.602...
>
> 10^{-19} J only reflects, that changing the potential of a charge e
>
> about 1 V means an energy change of 1.602... 10^{-19} J.
>
>
>
> Thats what I wanted to say.
>
>
>
> Cheers, Heinz

Hi Heinz,

That's a really good point. I had the same dilemma about "eV" when I put it in. I like your idea of getting rid of "e".

Also, yes, I'll make the "DtoR" and "RtoD" consistent. Maybe "DegRad" and "RadDeg", so at least they are somewhat human-readable?

-Chris
