
Subject: Re: IDLDE refresh in Windows XP (IDL 5.2.1)

Posted by [cees](#) on Wed, 18 Dec 2002 13:54:35 GMT

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

David Burridge wrote:

> "Mark Hadfield" <m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz> wrote in message
> news:ato3h6\$at4\$1@newsreader.mailgate.org...
> <Snip>
>
>> Let's stress this again, just so the Unix people won't get too smug: There
>> is no technical reason why IDL for Windows could not include a
>
> console-mode
>
>> executable. Such an executable would be able to generate widget and
>
> graphics
>
>> windows, just like on Unix. (Just look at Python as an example.) The
>
> reasons
>
>> why such a beast does not exist are historical (IDL for Windows was first
>> developed on 16-bit platforms) and/or related RSI's perceptions of Windows
>> users' needs.
>
>
> The way I understand it - and I'm **sure** I'm way behind you guys! - the Unix
> IDLDE is simply a wrapper around the core IDL executable, whereas on the
> Windows (and Mac?) the IDLDE **is** the Windows executable. That's why the IDL
> runtime is a separate exe on windows, but a command-line switch on Unix.
> Even my limited Windows API programming expertise tells me I certainly
> wouldn't like to be the one to part the interface and core! I'm guessing
> it'd be a close run thing between that and chromacoding on Unix as the bum
> engineering task at RSI? :-)
>

Hmmmm, I think you're not quit right on this one.

AFAIK The core and the interface are already seperated (IDL32.DLL and IDLDE.EXE). That's why callable IDL is possible (you call the DLL)I think the Windows IDLDE is better than the Unix IDLDE because it has to be !!! In other words, in Windows there are no "good, globally used" editors (like Emacs and VI(M)) available. So they had to make their own.

(I think that a couple of versions ago (4.x ?)they used Visual Basic to program the IDLDE, but I'm not sure if that memory is correct ;-)

Regards,

