
Subject: Re: IDL produced postscript files in latex
Posted by [Joseph B. Gurman](#) on Wed, 18 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <8siknl\$g4k\$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Simon Webster
<simon@nonsense.co.uk> wrote:

> Hi,
>
> I'm producing postscript files with idl to go in a latex article.
> Everything is fine when i just have one plot on the page, but when i
> used !p.multi=[0,2,0] latex acted as though the second graph didn't
> exist, overwriting the plot with text. Is this a known problem and is
> there any way around it?

Given the comments from the previous posters, I woul guess that the problem lies in the macro (usually called something like "psfig") you're using to insert the PostScript graphic, or even more likely the arguments you pass it. I remmember one macro (mercifully, I forget its name and that of its author) that misdocumented the order of the height and width parameters, and that prodced the sort of behavio[u]r ypu're seeing.

By the way, the macros are written in TeX (as opposed to LaTeX), so they may look a little strange to LaTeX users. (This is definitely a usage in which "user" matches that of "drug user." I wish we could forget about LaTeX entirely, but many professional journals and conference proceeding publishers appear enamored of this fine, 1980's technology. They claim it's "free," not counting the number of sys admin hours required to get dvi2<output device> software to work, user time to wrestle with recalcitrant, publisher-provided macros, and so on. We should free ourselves of LaTeX and paper at the same time, and have someone in the community develop a good equation-display facility [based on Donald Knuth's formalism for TeX, so no one has to relearn how to do it] for HTML. IMHO, of course.)

Unopinionated as ever,

Joe Gurman
