
Subject: Re: IDL 7 on LINUX Question

Posted by [Doug Edmundson](#) on Mon, 03 Dec 2007 16:26:02 GMT

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

David Fanning wrote:

> Doug Edmundson writes:

>

>> I hope all this has made sense. We had many a debate among ourselves as
>> to the best way to achieve that ease-of-use design goal. Ultimately we
>> decided that the IDL Workbench should pretty much do what a user would
>> likely do... add new directories to the path preference. Not good for
>> everyone, hopefully good for most, and it can be disabled.

>

> And it is likely to open up a whole new class of
> IDL conundrums for the IDL newsgroup to chew on, too! ;-)

>

> "How come my program fails if I open A, then B, but
> if I open C, it fails with a completely different error?"

>

> I recommend you send someone out to teach an IDL
> class with different path configurations on each computer
> before you come to a final conclusion on this question. :-)

>

David,

I think you're right. I've fretted over this, but not so much as to
lose sleep. Maybe I'll be losing sleep over it in the near future. ;-)

One thing we thought about doing to mitigate the issue was to alert
users when they had multiple versions of identically named routines.
The warning would show up in the "problems" view, indicating the order
and locations of the duplicate routines. Obviously, this would be
beneficial regardless of who/what manages the path.

Doug
