
Subject: Re: IDL 6.0

Posted by [mmiller3](#) on Fri, 28 Mar 2003 15:51:37 GMT

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

>>>> > "Michael" == Michael A Miller <mmiller3@iupui.edu> writes:

> That and access to command line arguments like every other
> language on the planet would go a long way to streamlining
> my IDL use.

To clarify my point a bit - what I'm getting at is that much of what we do here with IDL is interactive, so the "I" in IDL is really great. Even more of what we do is along the lines of "take what we've developed interactively and repeat it over and over and over ad infinitum." The cumbersome methods that are needed to pass parameters to IDL codes from outside IDL has resulted in some really ugly kludges around here.

One source of that seems to be that many of us new-old-schoolers (troglodytes that is :-)) tend to want to string a collection of programs together in sequence with a script. To do that with IDL, every tool we develop with IDL needs to have an additional layer of code wrapped around it to handle the fact that IDL has no access to command line arguments. That's something that we (well, ok, I) got used to back in the 80's and it is hard to give up. Even though IDL has lots of wonderful features, that "I" for interactive makes some harder to get at than I'd like.

Ok, I'll get off that soap box now ;-)

Mike

--

Michael A. Miller

mmiller3@iupui.edu

Imaging Sciences, Department of Radiology, IU School of Medicine
