## Subject: Re: idl2matlab translate-o-matic
Posted by Mike Schienle on Wed, 23 Feb 2000 08:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <8914kf$2l6$1@skates.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
thompson@orpheus.nascom.nasa.gov (William Thompson) wrote:

> Mirko Vukovic <mvukovic@taz.telusa.com> writes:
>
>> In article <88v2b8$pj1$1@ra.nrl.navy.mil>,
>>  "tb" <tbowers@nrlssc.navy.mil> wrote:

...

>>>  If IDL wants to be *the* scientific software development leader, then
>> it
>>>  first needs to be a true application development environment.
>>>
>> AND it needs to use emacs as official editor. (semi seriously but
>> 100% wishfull)

...

> Personally, I mainly use IDL on Unix workstations, and never use
> idltool--I
> tend to feel it just gets in the way.  I certainly would never use the
> editor
> built into idltool except in desperation, even on a PC, simply because I'm
> so
> used to using emacs.  :^)
>
> My vote is for allowing a user-defined alternative editor.
>
> William Thompson

Add another vote for a user-defined alternative editor. I'm a fan of
BBEdit on a Mac. Although it's no Emacs, it's certainly far beyond the
IDL editor on the Mac and allows text files from any platform to be
used. I've asked RSI several times to provide some sort of link to
BBEdit, which is very extensible. BBEdit has a great link to Perl
development that allows you to compile and run perl programs through the
MacPerl environment. At this point, I use IDL and BBEdit much like it
was in a vi and UNIX environment. Edit in BBEdit, switch to IDL and
compile. It's not worth using a half-assed editor to work with IDL.

--
Mike Schienle                        Interactive Visuals, Inc.
mgs@ivsoftware.com                   Remote Sensing and Image Processing