
Subject: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac

Posted by [Dave\[1\]](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2002 12:56:07 GMT

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

Hi,

I am in a bit of a bind. Some years ago I downloaded a demo copy of the subject program and RSInc was kind enough to provide me with a key for the 30 day evaluation to do some image analysis for my PhD. I am still working on that research and would like to re-run some analysis, but RSI, it appears, no longer supports the Mac versions of ENVI. If there is anyone out there that might have a license key and would be prepared to 'share' it I would be grateful. I don't know if this would actually work with the installer that I have, so some advice about this might be helpful also.

Note: I don't normally monitor this group, so I'd appreciate a direct reply if possible (as well as to the newsgroup if you wish).

Thanks,

Dave

Subject: Re: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac

Posted by [gutmann](#) on Sat, 23 Feb 2002 21:38:44 GMT

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

"Pavel A. Romashkin" <pavel_romashkin@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<3C769308.224CAA64@hotmail.com>...

> It does? How does it do that? I have no issues with it. Uh, my computing
> is too undemanding.

For some reason I managed to crash it with some frequency. The only thing I run in classic is IDL, I have a relatively minimal extension set active, and it crashes. RSI is no help because they "do not support classic". I suppose this is much better then previously when it took the entire OS (OS9) out with it, now I can keep working in other programs, but it is very frustrating, esp. if I have a lot of work that dies with it. This is in addition to the lack of window buffering, inability to take advantage of multiple processors, and just general poor integration with an OS (X) that IDL was never designed to run on. Top that off with even worse ENVI performance and life gets frustrating. It could be worse, I am glad that it works in classic at all, but it gets frustrating none the less.

ethan

Subject: Re: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac
Posted by [Pavel Romashkin](#) on Sun, 24 Feb 2002 00:18:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can understand your frustration. I have none of the problems you mention, specifically - multiple processors are supported, as is AltiVec; What is window buffering? Poor integration with OSX may be an issue but not for me because I have no software for it at all, so why set it up? IDL for OSX is not there, and bulging toolbar makes me sick. I love multilayering of editor windows that I can have on Classic (as opposed to oWindows). I am sticking with it until I hear a *good* reason to leave it.

Good luck,
Pavel

"Ethan" <gutmann@colorado.edu> wrote in message
news:3de2e497.0202231338.19b3a77c@posting.google.com...

>

> For some reason I managed to crash it with some frequency. The only
> thing I run in classic is IDL, I have a relatively minimal extension
> set active, and it crashes. RSI is no help because they "do not
> support classic". I suppose this is much better then previously when
> it took the entire OS (OS9) out with it, now I can keep working in
> other programs, but it is very frustrating, esp. if I have a lot of
> work that dies with it. This is in addition to the lack of window
> buffering, inability to take advantage of multiple processors, and
> just general poor integration with an OS (X) that IDL was never
> designed to run on. Top that off with even worse ENVI performance and
> life gets frustrating. It could be worse, I am glad that it works in
> classic at all, but it gets frustrating none the less.

>

> ethan

Subject: Re: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac
Posted by [gutmann](#) on Mon, 25 Feb 2002 20:42:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Pavel Romashkin" <pavel_romashkin@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<a59bgl\$scuv\$1@mwrns.noaa.gov>...

to stray further off topic...

> specifically - multiple processors are supported, as is AltiVec; What is

hmmm. I'm running IDL 5.4 and I've never seen it use more than one processor, I should check their website and see what it says. I'm also not sure just what their altivec support means. I seem to recall that I can write a simple loop in C code (no altivec) that beats IDL

doing a large array op hands down. I wouldn't really expect this if IDL was making heavy use of altivec, but I haven't done any real careful testing. Do they list the areas that have been altivec enhanced? It seems like IDL should really benefit from altivec. Does anyone know how well optimized for altivec IDL is? clearly there are substantial differences in IDL optimization between platforms (eg the recent Linux vs Windows commentary).

> window buffering? Poor integration with OSX may be an issue but not for me
Roughly, Window Buffering/double buffering = the OS stores a copy (or two) of the picture in each window, that way the app never needs to redraw it until it changes. Otherwise everytime you cover it up and uncover it the app needs to redraw. It isn't a serious performance issue so much as an annoying artifact that was present in OS9 as well (and is still present in windows). I get used to the beauty of X and get frustrated going backward ;)

> not there, and bulging toolbar makes me sick.
heh, the Dock is actually really powerful, you can turn off magnification, make it really small, and even hide it. I've grown to love it though initially I too had an aversion.

> I love multilayering of editor
> windows that I can have on Classic (as opposed to Windows).

I thought you could do this in windows, just don't maximize the individual editor windows. It's not quite the same but similar.

ethan

Subject: Re: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac
Posted by [Pavel A. Romashkin](#) on Tue, 26 Feb 2002 16:45:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ethan wrote:

>
> hmmm. I'm running IDL 5.4 and I've never seen it use more than one
> processor

You need 5.5 for that.

> Roughly, Window Buffering/double buffering = the OS stores a copy (or
> two) of the picture in each window, that way the app never needs to
> redraw it until it changes.

This has never been an issue for me. Instant redraws is what I am used

to, and I have no idea what it is to have frustratingly slow redraws of partially hidden windows. How is your backing store set up? One can use pixmaps in IDL if he wanted more than one layer of buffering.

>> I love multilayering of editor
>> windows that I can have on Classic (as opposed to Windows).
>
> I thought you could do this in windows, just don't maximize the
> individual editor windows. It's not quite the same but similar.

All editor windows are nested inside IDL DE under Windows. As you know, on Mac I can have them anywhere on my multiple monitors, and I find it very convenient.

Cheers,
Pavel

Subject: Re: ENVI v 3.1 for Mac
Posted by [gutmann](#) on Wed, 27 Feb 2002 20:56:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Pavel A. Romashkin" <pavel_romashkin@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<3C7BBBAE.59950CED@hotmail.com>...
> You need 5.5 for that.

ah... and ENVI 3.5 (to run on top of IDL 5.5) isn't available for the mac... While much of my work is in IDL, it is extremely useful to have ENVI around for looking at data rapidly. I suppose I should look around for some good IDL image display routines with greater functionality/ease of use than tvscl (read a graphical interface).

> This has never been an issue for me. Instant redraws is what I am used
> to, and I have no idea what it is to have frustratingly slow redraws of

This comes up in a few places. In OS X (and with iTunes in os9 if I recall correctly) all windows are dragged opaquely. Thus if the system is under a heavy load when you drag an opaque window across an unbuffered background window, the background window takes some time to redraw. Try dragging an iTunes window back and forth across an IDL window, you should see a "tearing" effect where white space is left underneath the rectangle that iTunes occupied.

This is particularly a problem if IDL crashes. If it crashes it CAN'T redraw it's window. This makes it difficult to debug a program if you want to leave it running in the background for a long period, then switch to it and look at the output log. yes there are more elegant methods of debugging, but on really odd bugs that only crop up on rare occasions this is sometimes easiest (and sometimes I'm just lazy).

As I said, more a cosmetic issue than anything else, but in the debugging instance it can be a pain. This strikes me as typical of using IDL in classic mode, it just feels old fashioned and unfinished.

This is not to say a good deal of useful work can not be done in this mode, most of my IDL work is, merely that it is an annoyance akin to the problems one runs into using freeware/opensource apps such as octave that just aren't quite "ready for prime time", if you will.

> on Mac I can have them anywhere on my multiple monitors, and I find it

I can see how multiple monitors would make the mac solution much more elegant.

Ethan
