
Subject: Re: idl2matlab translate-o-matic
Posted by [thompson](#) on Wed, 23 Feb 2000 08:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mirko Vukovic <mvukovic@taz.telusa.com> writes:

```
> In article <88v2b8$pj1$1@ra.nrl.navy.mil>,  
> "tb" <tbowers@nrlssc.navy.mil> wrote:  
>> "Craig Markwardt" <craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu> wrote in message  
>>>  
>>> Forgive him, he knows not what he says.  
>>>  
>> [Snip good talk on why you need stuff that alot of people  
>> always seem to ask, "Why do you need that stuff?"]  
>>  
>> Dammit! You beat me to it!  
> stuff deleted  
>> 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)
```

Well, I'm also a big emacs fan, but I wouldn't go quite that far. However, I would recommend that one be able to use a user-defined editor. Editors are always very personal things, and one should be free to use whatever editor one wishes.

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
