
Subject: Re: object toddling

Posted by [davidf](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT

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

Martin Schultz (mgs@io.harvard.edu) writes:

- > inspired by my youngest daughter who is taking her first attempts to
- > reach higher objects ;-)) by climbing, I thought I should finally give
- > objects a try as well (for purely educational purposes ... yet).

Just for the record, Martin, I would be perfectly content if you used your copious amounts of free time to fix that Explore program of yours and put the output in draw widgets. But...since you bring objects up.

- > Here is what I don't understand about the IDLgrAxis objects:
- >
- > * why do you have to specify X, Y, or Z for the COORD_CONV keyword? If
- > it is really only one axis, say X, there shouldn't be any need to refer
- > to Y or Z.

How else could you get that nice, fat 3D axis? Your problem is that you are thinking in 2D space, when you want to be thinking in 3D space. (I'll concede that it is more natural to think of axes as 2D or even 1D objects, but you choose the example to build, not me.) The IDL object graphics system is a 3D system, for better or worse.

- > That should be a matter of the Model class, shouldn't it?

It *can* be a property of the Model class. In fact, it often is. But most of these graphics primitives that RSI provides can also be scaled and translated individually. How you do the scaling is completely up to you. You do the same thing whether you do it to the model or to the primitive.

- > * apparently it is not possible to specify coordinate transformations
- > other than linear. In my daily life, I often deal with pressure
- > coordinates or sometimes with Arrhenius plots (i.e. 1000/T). In my
- > understanding of OOP, there should be a method IDLgrAxis::CoorConv which
- > would take care of this, and when you build a plot, you would have to
- > choose between e.g. a IDLgrLinearAxis, IDLgrLogAxis, IDLgrArrheniusAxis,
- > IDLgrPressureAxis, etc. Does this make sense?

Sure. I presume this is why you are building your own axis, right? If you want a pressure axis, you are free to build it and write your own CoorConv method that scales the axis appropriately for your intended use. That is exactly the point of objects.

- > * if the last point is reasonable: how do you deal with on-the-fly
- > object creation (example: a hypothetical widget driven plot program
- > would create a plot with linear axis as default, but the user should be
- > able to switch these to any other defined axis type per drop down list).

I would probably write that `CoorConv` method you want to write above to accept an argument that indicates what kind of axis you want to build: 0 means linear, 1 means log, 2 means pressure, etc.

Changing the axis on the fly only means calling the `SetAxisType` method you are also going to write to change the scaling appropriately.

- > * here comes the most subtle and severe problem: is there any way to
- > dynamically change methods of a superclass? Say you have a
- > `grAxis::DrawLine` method which would take care of drawing the basic axis
- > line. Now someone wants to change the look of the axis line e.g. by
- > giving it a color shading or a 3D effect (pretty gimmicky but it's just
- > an example). Just defining another subclass which would take care of
- > this wouldn't work, because then you "loose" all the derived axis like
- > linear, log, etc.). On the other hand, if you have to rewrite the
- > `grAxis::DrawLine` method, you can't go back (in a sense) and you wouldn't
- > be able to do so if the `grAxis` object was only available as a SAV file.

Object methods are just regular IDL procedures and functions, so creating a "new" superclass draw method would really only involve compiling a "new" IDL program module with the correct name. That would take care of SAVE files.

But I fail to see the need for this, and I think you may be misunderstanding how the draw methods for these objects will really work. I don't think of them, necessarily, as "layering" one draw method on top of another. I think of the method as working with a bunch of graphic primitives to build the object you want to display.

- > There must be some solution to this, because it somehow resembles the
- > problems that you have with different devices. Maybe the trick is to
- > "atomize" even further and have `grAxis` consist of `grLine` objects which
- > could then be replaced by `grFancyLine`? But how do you do this? And how
- > do you do this dynamically? And where do you stop atomizing?

I think this is the correct approach, although I have to admit I feel a little unsure what question you are really asking here. You stop "atomizing", as you put it, when you get to the basic atomic primitives.

- > Let me give
- > another example where this could be a problem: data transformations.
- > Say, we have this great program to plot any data any way we like (of course with the help of a nifty object hierarchy), but now you want to perform calculations with the data that you are plotting. Adding a predefined calculator object would probably not work, because you never know which calculations the user wants to perform. Hence, you should be able to call basically any (mathematical) function from within the object. And when you want to combine values from two or more objects, this problem becomes even messier. Perhaps you could get away with some EXECUTE statement in the obj::Calculate method, but wouldn't that defy the whole concept of OOP?

I fail to see why this would defy the whole concept of OOP. Unless you think there is some stricture in the definition of OOP that would prohibit someone from writing boneheaded programs. If there is, I'm quite sure there aren't enough program police to enforce the rule anyway. :-)

But, in any case, this is what error checking is all about and you have to do it with objects just like you have to do it with everything else.

- > What I didn't like at all when I read it, was the sentence: "Objects are rendered in 3 dimensions ..."

"Get used to disappointment," as Welsey says in the Princess Bride.

- > Shouldn't RSInc have started with a 2D object model and add 3D functionality as sub classes?

In retrospect!? Maybe. But they didn't. And object graphics ain't. And they *sure* weren't going to delay the release of IDL 5.0 for another year and a half more while they backtracked.

- > I would really like to see an "object-shell" around the familiar direct graphics.

Ah, well. Then you definitely want to be first in line to get my new book. There is a LOT of good that can be done with an object shell around the familiar direct graphics. These include faster drawing, *w-a-y* faster printing, and fast development time. (And Dick and I would be willing to sell you something if you don't want to build your own. :-)

- > If you don't think my questions are outright silly, then maybe I can hop on board for this kind of development at some point.

Wouldn't it be fun to get 10-12 people together to write programs for 3-4 days? With the right people we would have so many good programs come out of it that the newsgroup would be using our programs for years to come. :-)

- > One pre-requisite though: I would make it a
- > strong point that plots should be readily "scalable", i.e. you would
- > define a page size and panel size (and plotwindow size), and when you
- > change the panel size, everything in the plot would shrink, unlike in
- > normal direct graphics mode where you are never saved from suprisingly
- > different charsizes, label positions, etc.

You must be reading that book I sent you! :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

[Note: This follow-up was e-mailed to the cited author.]

Subject: Re: object toddling

Posted by [davidf](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT

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

Martin Schultz (mgs@io.harvard.edu) writes:

- > David: are you dealing with these issues in your forthcoming book?

Uh, no. I'm still trying to get through the great blocks of text in your article. Even with my glasses on, my eyes are crossing.

You are just _starting_ with objects, did you say? :-(

Cheers,

David

P.S. I'll have to give this article some thought. (Actually I'm stalling to see if I can't get JD to jump in here.)

--

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

Subject: Re: object toddling
Posted by [Pavel Romashkin](#) on Mon, 03 May 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning wrote:

- > Wouldn't it be fun to get 10-12 people together to write programs
- > for 3-4 days? With the right people we would have so many good
- > programs come out of it that the newsgroup would be using our
- > programs for years to come. :-)

I agree that it would be fun for those involved, for 3-4 days. But I am afraid I know what that would end up like. Since you can never meet the specific needs of others with any general purpose program, they (others) would start calling upon the group and demanding other features. And here comes the beginning of the "Decomposed=0 Inc." - super-efficient custom IDL application builders. And then, once D.S. figures out that this is more profitable than developing IDL itself and, leading a whole bunch of RSI staff, joins the group, it would really become interesting...

Cheers,
Pavel
