Subject: Re: IDL 8.0 compile_opt changes
Posted by David Fanning on Thu, 24 Dec 2009 11:44:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

pp writes:

> As I said before, IDL currently has issues that already make its
> upgrade too difficult. It should not have a new obstacle. Keep in mind
> that the most frequent posters in this newsgroup are likely to be
> better informed of IDL's changes and better ways to write code, and
> more willing to make changes, than most IDL users. If idl2 becomes
> default, that majority of users may simply not understand why their
> code stopped working, and so keep using the older versions. And most
> of the well informed users know how inconvenient it is to keep
> limiting what they use in their new code because some if its users are
> still with an old version of IDL. And even if those people do not even
> know it, we can send them our files in the new standard and their
> relatively new compilers will understand it.

You are probably right. But even though it is Christmas
week, and I have suspended my usual cynicism for a few
days, recent events (say since at least IDL 6.1) have not
convinced me that ITTVIS does much of anything out of
concern for their plodding-behind, direct graphics brethren.
If they are willing to make a big break like this, I suspect
it has more to do with making sure those people *can't* keep
up than concern for their future. Changing the file extension
will simply explicitly spell out the doom that awaits those of us
who wants to stick with a *.pro extension.

At least with a compile option there is the illusion of hope.

Peace be unto the World!

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")