

I don't get the point: Why use GDL if you already have a licensed copy of IDL. I see GDL as an alternative solutions for people who cannot cough up the \$\$\$ for the in my opinion overprized IDL license fees. Since you already own IDL, just ignore the fact that it does way more than your brain can handle and live happily ever after. :-)

Haje

PS: You could ask a lawyer to check into that for you, but they are overprized too and the IDL license may seem cheap compared to your legal fees.

"Y.T." <ytyourclothes@p.zapto.org> wrote in message
news:1120669967.155972.166240@g14g2000cwa.googlegroups.com.. .
> So I've been playing around with GDL, simply because I like IDL. I like
> GDL's focus on the essentials - I wouldn't mind widget-tools, but I
> consider them a luxury, really. And if GDL never acquires the
> incomprehensible object junk of IDL, it'll be too soon.
>
> However much of the power of IDL lies in the library, of course - and
> thus GDL's weakness lies in the lack of that library.
>
> For now, I figure, there shouldn't be a problem with my re-using the
> routines from my valid, legal IDL installation -- it is just a massive
> pain when such an essential tool like "linfit" is unavailable. So I
> copy it from my /usr/local/rsi to a local GDL-directory. No big deal.
>
> Or is it a big deal? The routine is copyrighted by RSI, no? Am I
> allowed to use it on a program like GDL that is quite blatantly
> intended to be a free replacement for IDL? Can I use my idl/lib
> routines as long as I have a functioning IDL installation? Do I have to
> stop using them as soon as my license expires? But the license is only
> for IDL, no? That's why the hasp-thingee only protects use of the
> binary, right? So the library should be considered "acquired" and still
> be allowed to be used with GDL even in the absence of a working IDL.
> No? Yes?
>
> The longer I think about it the less sure I am that running GDL might
> not be in violation of the "reverse engineering" clause in the IDL
> license agreement or some such -- except that that would only apply to
> people who actually have a valid installation of IDL since only those
> would ever have agreed to that license.
>

> And the IDL license actually never spells out what the "software"
> really is that is being licensed -- whether it is IDL itself or also
> the contents of idl/lib/*
>
> Since I'm already pretty confused by the whole notion of "intellectual
> property" (and much more so on the 'net) I figure I'll throw this out
> as an open-ended question -- can I continue to use basic, trivial
> functions like "poly.pro" or "factorial.pro" with GDL after IDL has
> expired? How about more complex stuff? Why or why not? What's the
> status of the routines that were originally from NR?
>
> I'm just baffled.
>
>
> cordially
>
>
> Y.T.
>
> --
> Remove YourClothes before you email me.
>
