
Subject: Re: Undocumented functions in IDL

Posted by [timothyja123](#) on Fri, 01 Mar 2013 22:39:46 GMT

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

On Saturday, March 2, 2013 2:43:40 AM UTC+11, Craig Markwardt wrote:

> On Friday, March 1, 2013 6:09:29 AM UTC-5, timoth...@gmail.com wrote:

>

>

>

>> 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.

>

>

>

> There are often priorities *other* than having one's code run as fast as possible.

>

>

>

> Thank you for your interest in IDL.

>

>

>

> CM

When I said "longer to finish" I meant it takes longer to write the code, not longer to run the code (although that is often a side affect). Your point is what I'm taking about if you take some time, lets call it an investment then you will be able to use your tools better and faster and get on with those other priorities rather than wasting time coding. Anyway I'm going to leave it at that I'm not trying to offend people this is just a frustrating observation I've made. I don't know of any other job where someone says I dont care about using my tools properly as long as I get the job done.
