
Subject: Re: Message From RSI VP of Engineering
Posted by [Bernard K.](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2001 16:55:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am not familiar with command line IDL on Unix implementations. Could someone elaborate a bit more on what an Aqua-less IDL would probably look like? Just a command line tool that would resemble using the actual command line in IDL for OS9? Apart from loosing the IDL developer environment and its associated menus (file edit search run project macros etc) what else would be missing?

Thanks,
Bernard.

In article <3BCDAF3E.5B496216@astro.cornell.edu>, JD Smith <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> wrote:

> "Pavel A. Romashkin" wrote:

>>

>> I am certainly for this. Mainly because I am sure that if the support
>> for OSX continues in any form, it will eventually include all the native
>> features of OSX, including Aqua. I am *speculating* that many of these
>> features are there already, and taking them out would be more of the
>> effort than leaving them in. For one, I expect graphics already being
>> (mostly) ready in the native OSX form. So, using existing Unix libraries
>> to cut down on the cost of implementation might sustain the OSX version
>> long enough to make it after a while what we all thought it will be.

>

> I think the real situation is this: RSI ran into a lot of work porting
> all of the drawing/widget code to Aqua, which is an entirely different
> API than either earlier MacOS, or Unix/Motif. It offers some
> significant advantages, but represents a pretty major display code fork
> (although with the option of eventually dropping MacOS <=9). So I doubt
> RSI would start with the abandoned OSX fork, try to strip out the Aqua
> interface stuff, and replace it with a X11/Motif subsystem. Instead,
> they'd start with their Linux or Solaris port, and try to migrate it
> over to the BSD layer of OSX + a proprietary X-server, without much more
> than a recompile and some fiddling.

>

> Although obviously something is better than nothing, people should
> realize what they'd be getting with such a product: an undersupported
> and "ugly duckling" IDL knock-off, made explicit to silence the
> critical masses. Their basic lack of commitment to the Mac platform
> would probably remain. On the other hand, I, like Pavel, am hopeful
> this attitude might change with time, and having some Mac development
> remaining would of course help.

>
> JD
