Re: [SLE] Need advice

Source: http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing−Lists/SuSE/2006−02/msg01050.html

- *From*: Art Fore <art.fore@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sun, 12 Feb 2006 20:57:16 −0800

On Sun, 2006−02−12 at 18:35 −0800, Randall R Schulz wrote:

> Carl,
>
> On Sunday 12 February 2006 17:46, Carl Hartung wrote:
>
> > On Sunday 12 February 2006 20:03, Randall R Schulz wrote:
> >
> > > Nonsense. Pixels have rectangular boundaries. That's all
> > > there is
> > > to it.
> >
> > Who told you this? It's not true! There are even imaging applications
> > that let you specify rectangular or circular pixels.
>
> My god! What are you talking about? Pixels are display device entities.
> Are you thinking of half−tone screens? They are completely different
> things. The only control you have over the nature of the pixels is
> choice of which device use use to render the image. Software cannot
> (CAN NOT) do that.
>
> > They absolutely are immune to such artifacts.
> >
> > Nonsense. Show me a real life demonstration of this supposed
> > "immunity." You cannot, ergo the "immunity" is only theoretical.
>
> You insist on conflating the mathematical object and its rendering.
>
> You started by saying that lines drawn on raster devices had the jaggies
> (which they do−−at all angles except those of the raster axes). Then
> you said vector drawing was "less susceptible" to this problem. Either
> it is exactly as susceptible, 'cause to view such a line or curve it
> has to be rendered, or it is entirely immune to such effects because

the line or curve itself is a mathematical entity defined over the reals.

Mixing them up just confuses the issue and leads to incorrect understandings.

> You mislead when you say "less susceptible." They are, plain and
> simple, immune to it.

> See my point above. I think you are being misleading by insisting on imposing theoretical perfection in a real life, practical circumstance.

On the contrary, I'm insisting on making the proper distinctions between the principals and the engineering practice. You're muddling the issue by refusing to separate the two.

> ...

> Feel free to use as few words as you like. Zero's always a safe
> choice.

> OK, Randall, you've proven you have some knowledge but, from a *practical* standpoint, has this tangent contributed one bit to the resolution of Art's original problem? I don't think it has. That's why I hate these kinds of unnecessary technical "wee wee" contests. If you'd weighed the real value of offering your unnecessary 'corrections' to my original advice, maybe "zero" words would have been better choice this time?

Yeah. I've worked in digital and print imaging in both raster and vector realms. I know something about the principles (the math) and the practical matters (the subtleties of film, ink, paper, CRT and LCD displays).

As to why I correct you: When I see someone post incorrect, misleading or oversimplified information and I know it, I like to correct it. There's too much confusion afoot and knowingly letting it stand is not cool to me.

That's why I challenge fallacies when I see them.

> Anyway, the lights just flickered (winter storm) so I've gotta shut down.
>
> Carl

Don't lick any flag poles or lamp posts.

Randall Schulz

I did not get into the discussion on pixels, but I do understand the difference between raster and vector, etc. I can see where the line is jagged because of low resolution, completely understandable. What I don't understand in Gimp, I see the jaggies on the display, but when I print it out on a 600 dpi printer, I would expect them to be much smoother than on a 100 dpi screen. When I look at the same drawing with the rectangles added in Inkscape, I do not see the jaggies anywhere near as much on screen, that is, they are not as obvious. Guess the Pixel resolution for that must be based on the drawing and not the screen resolution in Gimp, where in Inkscape, it is based on the screen resolution, when translated to postscript for a 600 dpi printer, it becomes even less obvious. Is that right?

Art