
Subject: Re: Grouping Program Modules
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Fri, 30 May 2003 20:36:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul van Delst (paul.vandelst@noaa.gov) writes:

- > For most things I would agree. But for the case of data structures, I prefer to think of
- > grouping routines in a single file in terms of their dependencies. E.g., if I define a
- > structure, I want the data object constructor and its methods in the same file --
- > independent of the language. That seems more logical to me.

This must be a result of hanging around FORTRAN like you do, Paul. With other languages (including, especially, IDL) most of us oldsters have learned that "what makes sense" doesn't always correlate well with "what works". :-)

Cheers,

David

P.S. Not that I'm a big fan of "what works" programming. Goodness, some of the IDL code I have seen... Makes your hair stand on end, just as if someone were screeching their fingernails along the blackboard. (Whoops! Sorry, that's an analogy that only about three people here are going to understand.)

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: Grouping Program Modules
Posted by [K. Bowman](#) on Mon, 02 Jun 2003 12:01:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <MPG.19416ec95e269819989bbe@news.frii.com>,
David Fanning <david@dfanning.com> wrote:

- > ...as if someone were screeching
- > their fingernails along the blackboard. (Whoops! Sorry,
- > that's an analogy that only about three people here are going
- > to understand.)

I still have a (real) blackboard in my office ... but it is an old

building.

Ken Bowman
