Firstly, Logan, please update your virus definition files as it is clear
that
you have an outlook virus. Nobody on this newsgroup needs to see where you
get your porn.

> ===== Original Message From "Logan Lindquist" <llindqusit@mrdoc.cc> =====

> The graphic user interface between different operating systems is only a
tool
> used to created by different companies to allow you to perform work and
create
> things using the hardware that is available to that particular system. The
> major debate over the GUI's does not really matter when the hardware aspect
is
> not considered. THE CAUSE OF THE MAC OS VS PC OS DEBATE IS BASED SOLELY ON
> WHAT GUI YOU ARE MOST FAMILAR WITH. That is all that should be considered.
How
> quickly can you get the work you need to get done on a particluar operating
> system is based on previous amount of time spent using that operating system
> IN ADDITION TO WHAT HARDWARE YOU MACHINE HAS.

Apple employs a team of cognitive psychologists who understand how people
interact with computers. This is the core reason that Apple operating
systems
have books defining how applications must behave and how a gui is to be
presented. The fact that RSI is choosing to ignore this and develop IDL
based
on an antiquated/illogical unix interface is disappointing to many mac
users.
Microsoft's windows API doesn't define the same standard which is why each
windows developer can use different control/function keys, menus, and
widgets
in a windows application.

[snip]

> I do not know the details of porting stuff that has been written for Linux
> over to OS X but I wouldn't image that they would be much different, since
OS
> X is based on a Linux kernel. IDL already supports Linux on Alpha's and x86.
> So the real question is if they already have a compilation that is somewhat
> similar, and there is enough support to figure out the details of porting
the
> x86 Linux or the Alpha Linux over to OS X, why not start an open sourced

> development of such?

Why do windows users make such a habit of writing things they know nothing about? OS X isn't based on linux, it is based on FreeBSD and IDL does not natively support FreeBSD. Admitidly, FreeBSD and Linux are both unix like, but they are hardly the same. I suspect that RSI will never open-source IDL because of licensing issues with the PV-WAVE people... I understand that each
took a copy of the core language code and licensing restricts who they share it with.

FYI: Applescript != DirectX || Callable Windows dll.

> I just went and reviewed what the VP of RSI said about this issue.

[snip]

> So it looks like the big gripe that many of you have is unfounded, because RSI
> can't afford to pay a graphic artist/computer scientist to redesign the GUI
> of IDL OR they don't want to change the look because of IDL is a professional
> product. Thus the redesign would make the interface less professional looking.
> At least they are considering porting to OS X. It all then comes down to a
> usability issue. OS X users would have to get used to a slightly different
> interface. I suggest stop complaining and wait to see they decide to support
> it.

Imagine if RSI told you that they weren't going to natively support the new 64-bit version of windows that will ship shortly after the next generation intel chips ship (spring 2002ish). Moreover, what if they told you that they
were tired of dealing with the Microsoft Windows API and decided that all you
really needed was a dos or NT shell (i.e. type 'command.com' under start menu->run). With regard to graphics, you can probably cope with using X11 from windows, right? You, of course, would need to buy Xwin32 or install cgynus + xfree86 in order to display plots, but that is a small price to pay for the privilage of using IDL (I suspect that you have no idea what I just wrote-- nevermind). This isn't about RSI making software that looks 'professional', this is about making a product that is natively supported on a
given platform.

Complaining is what has RSI considering the support OS X at all! In case you
didn't read the RSI site yourself, while RSI initially pledged native OS X

support in the spring, they unilaterally decided to halt work on the project
2
weeks ago. The talk of supporting a lesser version of IDL is all fine and
dandy, but I for one will not waste my money on it-- I have nearly a decade
of
IDL code on my macs.

> Their business people are looking at the financial information related to
how
> many Mac users buy or renew licenses each year. The decision so far seems to
> be a preliminary one. Business people will change their mind if it is deemed
> profitable for the company.

Profit margins in scientific software have always been poor compared to
other
markets. If RSI is really interested in making money, they ought to drop
IDL
all together. With that being said, RSI never used to be this concerned
about
profit... All this is easy to write whey you use the lowest common
denominator OS.

> About the pricing. If everyone would remember back to economics, the
> quantity/demand curves and the price/cost curves will give us some useful
tool
> to analyze their decisions.

[snip]

> When compared to mathematical programs such as MatLab or Mathmatica, I think
> that those are better targeted towards Math majors. I haven't used either
> extensively. The trick is to get future users to become familiar with the
> language. You do not do this by limiting the number of copies that an
> institution can buy. These future users will hopefully equal future dollars
> spent once they graduate and get a job.

IDL *is* a mathematical program?

At least we agree about your last point. Academic institutions and students
should be offered very competitive pricing.   IDL and Matlab are fighting
for
the same user base and I suspect RSI is feeling a loss because of their high
pricing.

> That's all I have to say for now. It's lunch time and I'm hungry,

Enjoy your lunch, and don't forget about those pesky virus definitions!

PS: I was a idl-pvwave newsgroup lurker, before RSI dropped macos.