
Subject: Re: dlm question

Posted by [Randall Skelton](#) on Thu, 21 Nov 2002 13:34:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 21 Nov 2002, Randall Frank wrote:

- > Consider the IDL naming scheme for objects and consider the
- > mechanism for calling a C++ method from C in something like VC++
- > (take DirectX as an example). This should give you some idea.
- > Ronn is correct in that RSI has not released this information and
- > there is no direct way of doing this. That having been said,
- > with some creativity, one can write some accessor functions that
- > will get you 90% of the way there, along the lines of what Ronn
- > suggests (playing with the 'self' reference creatively) until RSI
- > exposes the necessary functions. I'm not sure what this buys you
- > over a object written as a .PRO file that happens to call out to
- > some 'C' functions in a DLM however (an approach that will not
- > break over time)...

I tend to agree-- I've been writing IDL object code that calls my C dlms for the past year now. Last year I begged and pleaded with RSI to release this interface (even with a non-disclosure agreement) and had no luck getting it. I even did my bit to reverse engineer the interface which was quite successful. I would post what I learned but fear Craig-like repercussions. My main comment is that while gaining access to the object API would be nice, the holly grail would involve stable, direct access (via a C API) to the IDL heap variable. This, along with my request for proper operator over-loading in IDL objects are my top two requests. Are any of the lurkers at RSI listening?

Note to DF: Are you ready to compile a new top 10 list?

Cheers,
Randall
