Subject: Re: Interesting Rant Posted by Maarten[1] on Wed, 15 Nov 2006 15:17:27 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kenneth Bowman wrote:

> In article <1163597154.282197.250510@m7g2000cwm.googlegroups.com>,

"Maarten" <maarten.sneep@knmi.nl> wrote: >

- >> \* Default integer size is 16 bits (how long have computers been at
- >> 32bits by now; how much code will break if you change that to 32 (or
- >> even 64 bits)? How can code break on such a change? I think the code
- >> was broken in the first place if it relies on this bit-size.

>

This one, at least, can be fixed easily. Just put >

>

> COMPILE\_OPT IDL2

in your startup.pro.

> I include that line in \*all\* procedures and functions.

Have it, do it, well something similar: compile\_opt defint32, strictarr, strictarrsubs (the first two are the same as idl2). Still I would like it to be the default for \*all\* functions. I mean, IDL2 came out how long ago?

>> \* Individual floating point constants are float, not double.

> I'm happy with that the way it is, but I expect they could add a

>

DEFFLOAT64 >

> option to COMPILE\_OPT if enough people requested it.

That would be nice. Where was that feature request box again?

- >> \* Direct graphics seem to be dead, object graphics are not practical
- >> for interactive use. Hello, the I in idl stands for interactive, right?

- > I can't say that I've been born again (yet), but I am finding the iTools
- > to be very useful for interactive graphics. The user interface is
- > awkward in several ways, the learning curve is steep, and hardcopy output
- > remains a real problem, but there are a number of really handy features
- > in the iTools.

Perhaps, but as long as my primary task is to produce printable output as well, I don't feel the need to learn \*two\* graphing methods. Just give me \*one\* that really works. WaveMetrics got it right with Igor

## around 1990, so what is ittvis waiting for?

## Maarten