>> How about long procedure names? I would think this would be even worse
>> than the long data file names. I have a huge idl application I've been
>> working on for almost 3 years under various flavors of unix and on the
>> Mac (> 12,000 lines of code). Lots of procedure names like
>> "define_colors.pro", "set_contours.pro", "widget_window.pro," etc that
>> don't conform to DOS limits.
>
> I haven't tried to use IDL under the newer flavors of Windows, but in Windows 3
> one could reference a procedure by its name, and it would find it with the 8.3
> filename. E.g., calling set_contours would look for a file called
> "set_cont.pro". This causes problems when one has multiple routines which
> start with the same eight characters.
<snip>

Sadly, this is bust under NT and 95 if you retain the source files' long
names (on disk).   But if you go and rename the files 8.3 style it'll work
as under win3.1x.

But things are not as bad as they seem - you don't have to rename all
your source files to port to Windows if you're willing to "compile" your
source and distribute a .SAV file instead of source.   A .SAV file compiled on
one platform will work on another, as long as the IDL versions are the same.
If you develop under Unix and you use long names for your routines this
won't be a problem under Windows - IDI calls a routine using the full
routine name (once compiled).
And the only filename you have to worry about is that of the .SAV file itself.

Peter Mason