
Subject: Re: Why IDL Is Not My Favorite Platform (was Re: IDL alternatives?)

Posted by [zawodny](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 1995 07:00:00 GMT

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

In article <3qkvvn\$jkcnntp.Stanford.EDU> zowie@banneker.stanford.edu
(Craig DeForest) wrote this and more in earlier posts:

> I kvetched:

... and had a long diatribe

> Craig DeForest

When I read the original post I thought to myself "This guy has hit the nail on the head and put into words what I have felt for a long time". Then after careful picking by others, it has become apparent that Criag has used a good many words to say essentially nothing. His one real point that I must have originally keyed on is that IDL needs to be able to vectorize further in some undefined, but natural, way so that there is a way to reduce the need for looping. I continually find myself extracting subarrays and performing transposes just to be able to avoid FOR loops, but this can typically only be done at the first level of a task and then I have to resort to FOR loops to perform these tasks repetitively. I do not know exactly what I am asking for here, but I will know it when I see it (if I ever do). The remainder of Craig's comments boil down to his saying "IDL does not look and feel like \$1500 worth of software", but then he goes on to say "despite that I prefer it for some strange reason and it does work."

In the future, please keep your "crufting" and "kvetching" to a minimum and get to the point (and along the way use real words).

--

Joseph M. Zawodny (KO4LW)

NASA Langley Research Center

Internet: j.m.zawodny@larc.nasa.gov

MS-475, Hampton VA, 23681-0001

TCP/IP: ko4lw@ko4lw.ampr.org Packet: ko4lw@n4hog.va.usa.na
