
Subject: Re: no backwards compatibility in IDL 5.6
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 27 Feb 2003 16:07:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Craig Markwardt (craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu) writes:

> David, are you saying that RSI *accidentally* changed the functional
> interface to an established function? No, I think it was quite
> deliberate. I too was bitten by this change.

Whoops! I was afraid that post was going to step on toes.
If I hadn't of lost most of my sleep last night with this
damn sore throat maybe I wouldn't have been so cranky. :-(

No, what I was saying was I don't know what happened.
But if the situation is as you say it is, then I would
like to hear RSI's side of the argument along with the
(apparently justified) vitriol. The chances of making
a deliberate knuckleheaded decision can't be too much
less than making an accidental one. I'm just (at the
moment) interested in fair play.

Cheers,

David

P.S. And I was also interested in how something like
this could be construed as "dangerous", rather than
as "terribly, unbelievably annoying". :-)

P.S.S. I know you are not yelling at me. :-)

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155
