
Subject: Re: Woes of Software Distribution, Re: Something else
Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Wed, 17 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:

>
> I have the same problem with my library. If you make
> programs that are *designed* to work together, then
> you have to get all of them. If you try to put a small
> utility routine (CMCongrid is a good example) in all
> the dependent routines, then it is virtually impossible
> to make a change to the utility routine, because you
> can't find all the copies.

I agree with most of your sentiments. This is kind of the same philosophical difference between Microsoft and Unix. Microsoft tries to abide by the KISS principle (Keep it Stupid, Simpleton!), whereas Unix users tend to be forced to figure everything out themselves. I try to take the middle road. I reckon that a lot of people don't really understand about having your own IDL path with your own custom programs. Why burden people too much more?

I also had the same problem of modifying utility routines in my published programs. I solved the problem this way: in my personal IDL directory, the utility programs are kept in separate files. When I put them on my web page I run a little script which inserts the appropriate utility routines directly into the code. If you look at PLOTIMAGE or PLOTBIN, you will see something like "insert HERE," which is a remnant of the script's cue to insert the utility routines. Kind of ugly, but it keeps things organized.

Craig

P.S. And yes, I'm a Unixer.

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
