
Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [davidf](#) on Fri, 20 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

Did I read this correctly?

"The Insight application has been removed from IDL."

Wow! I may just have to stick with IDL 5.2 along with Craig. :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Fri, 20 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

"J.D. Smith" <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> writes:

... other nice details deleted ...

>

> I hope they made the parser smart though -- I'm sure there are some
> variables called "break" in routines out there.

>

Oooo. Probably smart enough to tell the difference between statements
and variables. But anybody with procedures named BREAK or CONTINUE
will be hosed now.

Overall it sounds very promising though.

Craig (still "mostly" at IDL 5.2, or below)

--

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

Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [mole6e23](#) on Fri, 20 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

> can't say enough how much adding break and continue, and switch also,

Those three are probably what I'm looking forward to most. I hated some of the things I did in place of these (can you say "goto"?... I hate goto!)

As for the complement in where and the nbins keyword to histogram, it's sure nice to have them, but truly I think most of us that use IDL regularly have already implemented them in some form or another as our own routine. I still don't know why these weren't there with the original versions of these functions!

A fast array_equal is definitely welcome!

> Printing with C-style formats? Say bye-bye
> FORMAT=(A,T25,A,T36,A,T50,A)

This is perhaps my second favorite. I learned C well before I ever saw Fortran, and I've hated fortran ever since the first day I saw it, partially because of the (IMHO) horrible looking handling of strings. I like C-style much, much better!

I personally think the whole thing with not supporting LZW compression (GIF and compressed TIFFs) is kind of silly, both on behalf of CompuServe (and whatever their parent company is...I can't remember), and on the part of RSI (actually, it's Kodak that did this one, I'm sure). As far as I recall, the licensing for LZW is not all that extreme (I recall a number of \$1/end user, but I could be wrong), and given the cost of IDL, it doesn't seem that would "break the bank", per se. And now you have to get a special license (albeit free) to make MPEG movies? OK, we'll do it because we make MPEG movies, but why? And if you're going to do that, why not do the same thing for LZW? Rant, Rant, Rant....

> Thoughts, reactions, uninformed rantings?

Well, other than the 300+ page "what's new" manual, I'm definitely part of the "uninformed" group. =)

Todd

Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [Harold Cline](#) on Sun, 22 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

Hi Todd,

you wrote:

> As far as I

> recall, the licensing for LZW is not all that extreme (I recall a number
> of \$1/end user, but I could be wrong), and given the cost of IDL, it
> doesn't seem that would "break the bank", per se.

I personally guaranty you that if it would have been this trivial, it
would still be there. They put tools like IDL into a different category
than utilities like Adobe where they do have very reasonable fees.

Just for entertainment, you might note that our competitor has an
identical message, because they had an equally difficult time coming to
an agreement with Unisys who patented both GIF and LZW compression:

<http://www.mathworks.com/support/solutions/data/7388.shtml>

Harold Cline
IDL Product Manager

P.S. You'll have a tough time blaming Kodak for this one.

Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [mole6e23](#) on Mon, 23 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

> I personally guaranty you that if it would have been this trivial, it
> would still be there. They put tools like IDL into a different category
> than utilities like Adobe where they do have very reasonable fees.

I guess I figured that there had to be a reason...that's partially why I
posted what I did, to see if I could flush that reason out. =)

> P.S. You'll have a tough time blaming Kodak for this one.

I'm not blaming Kodak directly - the only "blame" I'm giving them is being
a big enough target for Unisys to care about. Unisys is the 'bad' company
here, and I'm completely aware of that - enforcement of a patent after
however many years and after it's really really popular is just a bad
idea.

However, I'm pretty sure that IDL 5.3 came out after the Unisys patent was
enforced, but it still supported the GIF/LZW compression schemes. How it
seems to a silly end user who doesn't know about these things in detail is
that as soon as Kodak owned RSI, the support for GIF/LZW stopped, so a
correlation is implied. (And please, people, don't flame me for my

statistics on a single data point! ;-)

Todd

Subject: Re: 5.4

Posted by [promashkin](#) on Mon, 23 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT

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

Or, you could put it on the "top 10" list to have it put back in version 6.0 :-) I am sure that *you*, David, are using it every day. But i am afraid, to show how *not* to do things, which gets you in trouble :-(

Cheers,

Pavel

David Fanning wrote:

>

> Did I read this correctly?

>

> "The Insight application has been removed from IDL."

>

> Wow! I may just have to stick with IDL 5.2 along with Craig. :-)

>

> Cheers,

>

> David*
