
Subject: Re: Z-Buffer question

Posted by [Robert Moss](#) on Fri, 21 Feb 1997 08:00:00 GMT

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

David Fanning wrote:

>
> I've seen this reductionist tendency before. But, of
> course, this doesn't go far enough. We could have
> left the whole Z-buffer completely out of it! :-)
>

We could have, but Kuhr wrote:

>I have a question during using the Z-Buffer:

> The only *problem* with this line of reasoning, so
> far as I can see--but you understand I got a Ph.D. in
> Biochemistry--is that without the Z-buffer we don't
> have much of a question here. I just presumed there
> was some reason the guy was fooling around in there,
> but he wanted us to see the essential part of the problem.
>

Well, just for the record, I based my "reductionist" answer on the following clue from Astrid Kuhr's original post:

Astrid Kuhr wrote:

>(I am a beginner user of IDL).

I took this to mean that Kuhr may not have been familiar with the Z_BUFFER keyword to the DEVICE routine.

Astrid Kuhr wrote:

>Want I want to get is a picture, same as without using the z-buffer.

Perhaps I assumed incorrectly that Kuhr may have been using the Z device simply to avoid using the screen (as in a batch process, for example).

> Well, the other possible moral is that more of us should
> have paid attention during that reductio absurdo (I skipped
> the Latin class) lecture in Philosophy 101. :-)
>

Well, the moral for me is to be sure not to specifically mention anyone when I post replies if I am going to post something that may be taken as some kind of criticism.

--

Robert M. Moss, Ph.D. - mossrm@texaco.com - FAX (713)954-6911

This does not necessarily reflect the opinions of Texaco Inc.
