
Subject: Re: Undocumented functions in IDL

Posted by [timothyja123](#) on Fri, 01 Mar 2013 11:09:29 GMT

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

> I think you miss the point about IDL. It was never meant to be a
>
> superior programming language. It was meant to be something scientists
>
> could use to get their job done. The crappy programs are actually
>
> testament to that. How many other languages would allow you to write
>
> awful programs that still work? IDL is a triumph, not a disaster. :-)
>
>
>
> Cheers,
>
>
>
> David
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
>
> David Fanning, Ph.D.
>
> Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
>
> Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.idlcoyote.com/>
>
> Sepore ma de ni thue. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")

I have to disagree entirely. I hear the I dont care about how it works I just want to get the job done over and over from scientists I work with. The problem is they end up writing code that takes them longer to finish then is almost impossible to maintain. I would hardly call that a triumph. When I'm asked to do something they are often amazed at how fast I can accomplish it. My problem is not with IDL itself its that SOME of the people that use it as wasting more time trying to work on maintaining horrible code than investing the small amount of time to learn how to do things properly to begin with.
