Paul Woodford, cpwoodford@spamcop.net writes:

> The Macintosh IDLDE was obviously written by
> someone who cared about the interface and
> understood Mac users. That's one of the
> reasons why RSI's decision is so disappointing.

 I agree. IDL on the Mac has its quirks, but it didn't feel like
an ugly port, which is important for some of the people who use my
programs.

 I've written my letter to RSI, re-hashing many of the points made
in this and other threads. I'm not a big user, but I have been an IDL
evangelist and I still think IDL has advantages over the mish-mash of
programs and code libraries I'll probably replace it with. I'm sad to
have to swap, but for me and my users cross-platform compatibility was
the only thing that made IDL truly stand out from its competitors.

 Those competitors are actively courting me. Perhaps I just feel
extra warm and fuzzy because I'm on the IDL rebound, but significant
price reductions for academic users and help with porting from
IDL-trained technicians are not to be sniffed at.

> I'm holding onto my maintenance dollars for now.

 Me too. I will use IDL 5.5 with pleasure, but active programming
is suspended for the duration, and the ION-based teaching project I
just finished the grant application for is headed for the dustbin. My
impression is that RSI is more interested in servicing its few large
customers than using people like me to kick-start interest in IDL
among new users. So be it.

Struan