

---

Subject: Re: Musing on IDL's Future Direction

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Tue, 18 Nov 2008 15:52:57 GMT

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

---

On Nov 18, 8:21 am, Mirko <Mirko.Vuko...@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Nov 18, 12:18 am, Craig Markwardt <cbmarkwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>> On Nov 16, 11:40 am, David Fanning <n...@dfanning.com> wrote:

>

>>> I guess my point is this. There are a lot of people,  
>>> myself included, who use and are extremely happy with  
>>> what I have come to think of as IDL's "old" features.

>>> Line plots, image display, good ol' direct graphics,  
>>> sent to a PostScript file for nice output. We could  
>>> be made happy and a LOT less cynical, I think, if  
>>> along with the bright new gewgaws someone threw in a  
>>> lagniappe of a PostScript device that worked the way  
>>> it was suppose to work in this day and age.

>

>> Yep, a better postscript driver would be nice. Actually I was  
>> developing a new device driver to replace X/Postscript, but... it was  
>> hard!

>

> I don't even upgrade my IDL. That is how exciting I find the new  
> releases.

>

> But that may point to my age. Do the younger folks actually  
> appreciate the new features more?

People apparently joke about me using old versions of IDL [\*]. The truth is, when I have a version that works, I stick with it. Nothing frustrates me more than an application that wants to self-update itself every day.

New features in IDL are fairly useless to me, because they are \*new\*. My stuff often needs to run on IDL 5.x, but also IDL 7.x. It would be not-so-useful to take advantage of new features in that kind of environment. And is object graphics really that useful anyway?

Craig

[\*] - by people, I mean David Fanning. Anyway, I usually run IDL 6.3 these days which is not too ancient.

---