
Subject: Re: IDL 8.2.2 released

Posted by chris_torrence@NOSPAM on Thu, 07 Feb 2013 17:11:10 GMT

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

On Thursday, February 7, 2013 9:20:55 AM UTC-7, Matt wrote:

> Mark Piper writes:

>

>

>

>> This is a tough one, and IDL's blessing/curse of a single namespace is the

>

>> problem.

>

>

>

> I understand the curse of a single namespace, what are the blessings? This

>

> is actually a serious question. I can see no advantages to a user that we

>

> are stuck with a single namespace. Is there any remote hope of this in the

>

> future?

>

>

>

>

>

> Cheers,

>

> Matt

>

>

>

> --

>

> Matthew Savoie - Senior Software Developer

>

> National Snow and Ice Data Center

>

> (303) 735-0785 <http://nsidc.org>

Hi Matt,

That is a great question. IDL's path management was based off of a Unix/Vax operating environment. If an executable is on your path, then your call will succeed. If it's not on your path, then your call will fail. If there are two copies on the path, then the first one wins.

This is simple, easy to understand and explain, and works well, up to a point!

IDL was designed and marketed as a "complete" solution, where you get everything in the box. There have been very few "add-on" packages where you might need to worry about namespaces and libraries. As Mark pointed out, we encouraged outside developers to use a prefix when creating their libraries, like David has done with his "cg" routines. That is an excellent approach.

Perhaps IDL has reached the threshold where we need to start worrying about namespaces, libraries, and packages. But if we do add support for that, we need to do it in a way that is backwards compatible, and is actually useful for a majority of our customers (both current and future users).

Hope this helps.
Cheers,
Chris
IDL Project Lead
ExelisVIS
