"Joseph B. Gurman" wrote:

>   As is usual (among scientists, IDL users, and Mac users), I do have
> a couple of quibbles with his statements in earlier posts, if applied to
> all of us Mac IDL users.

It wouldn't be a proper gathering if opinions did not outnumber attendees.

>   We went heavily into G4's in anticipation of the Mac OS X version of
> IDL, and the implicit understanding that it would support Unix-like
> features, such as envrionemnt variables --- which would allow us to run
> a large, ross-platform codebase on this best of all platforms.
>
>   Linux would not help us at all;...

Joe,

Let me apologize, then. I am fairly ignorant of the differences between Linux and Unix. I've dabbled
over the last decade in, what, 5 or 6 *ux/*ix systems (and VMS, and a couple others way back). Jack
of several trades (well, maybe a 6), Master of none. Given that I probably mis-spoke because of this
ignorance, I should tell you RSI and Apple were talking Unix yesterday, not Linux, but that's
basically all I know until they finish their evaluation.

>   If Apple isn't able to make it worth RSI's while, I suggest forming
> a non-profit consortium to but the existing OS X IDL code, get it
> finished, and do that community Q & A of which RSI appears to be so
> scared. We could even promise to give whatever license fees aren't spent
> on the development and Q & A effort back to RSI --- what have they got
> to lose?

My suggestion- wait out the next week and see what flies. If it unsatisfactory, see if a consortium
of volunteers can be gathered (one that would be willing to sign some kind of contract with RSI to
protect the license), and pitch the case.

Noam