Subject: Re: Another VM conundrum
Posted by JD Smith on Fri, 12 Dec 2003 16:24:43 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003 07:18:02 -0700, Ben Tupper wrote:

> JD Smith wrote:
>> On Thu, 11 Dec 2003 12:46:11 -0700, David Fanning wrote:
>>
>>
> SNIP
>
>> I'm thinking I can probably get away
>> with:
>>
>> device,DECOMPOSED=0,RETAIN=2
>>
>> which will always run since you need IDL>=6.0 to run the VM. What I
>> worry about is how this will interact with various other systems (like
>> Windows, Solaris, or MacOSX). Can anyone offer any feedback as to
>> whether this call succeeds in doing what I asked without creating other
>> problems?
>>
>>
> Hello,
>
> I tested the routine appended below as a VM on MacOSX X11. It seems to
> work fine when other windows cover/uncover and the window is
> minimized/restored.
>
> I noticed that the terminal session I used changed from tcsh to idl and
> the the x11 terminal shows two windows: an xTerm (which I have to have
> up and ruu=ning but don't use for the idl command prompt) and viola!
> Test_VM. So, unlike Windows, you can track down the the widget even
> when it's hiding.
>
> I wonder if you might have in mind a different kind of test - something
> we code build as VM-ware and test out. I'd be happy to give it a whirl
> if needed.
>
> Is this potential weakness/problem limited to direct graphics?
>

Thanks Ben. Glad to hear it works well enough. The test I wanted was
just the "device,DECOMPOSED=0,RETAIN=2" you use, and could have been
done in the VM or normal version. The reasons the VM even comes into
the question at all is that, with command-line IDL, you can just
instruct the user to use a DEVICE setting which works in their IDL

startup file, whereas in the IDLVM, no startup file is ever consulted,
so you must compile in a best-guess DEVICE call.

JD