Subject: Re: LINUX version of IDL
Posted by larkum on Thu, 06 Oct 1994 07:36:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article 8oi@netnews.upenn.edu, mark@ginger.biophys.upenn.edu (Mark Elliott) writes:
>
> I'm interseted in persuading RSI to support IDL under LINUX. LINUX
> is the free, GNU-like version of UNIX for use on Intel-486 based machines (i.e.
> DOS machines). Our experience with LINUX has been terrific. It is a complete
> implemtation of BSD-Unix which turns a $2000 PC into a Unix workstation as
> powerful and functional as any $10,000+ workstation (SUN,SGI,IBM,...)
> The only thing lacking for us is a binary of IDL which will run under LINUX.

Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes!!!!!!!
We feel exactly the same way. What's more, I expect the conversion of IDL to
LINUX from a Sun implementation would be relatively trivial. There are
plenty of programs that compile without problems under LINUX and those
that don't never require much changing. Well, that's using gcc I suppose, and I
don't know what RSI use.

I wonder if RSI have really come into contact with LINUX? The normal reaction
to LINUX on first hearing about is, "Oh yeah, sounds too good to be true", and
I've never seen anyone left unmoved when they actually see it running. My
486DX2-66 runs faster than our Sun workstation under LINUX. It would probably
be a good environment for RSI to _develop_ IDL under. Just think, all the
programmers could work on an individual workstation for a fraction of the cost
and could also go home and work on their own PCs with equivalent ease. On
second, thoughts, maybe they don't want to hear about taking their work home
with them.

Matthew.
larkum@optolab.unibe.ch

Subject: Re: LINUX version of IDL
Posted by hahn on Thu, 06 Oct 1994 19:23:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <3709dv$dgb@aragorn.unibe.ch> larkum@optolab.unibe.ch (Matthew Larkum) writes:
> From: larkum@optolab.unibe.ch (Matthew Larkum)
> Subject: Re: LINUX version of IDL
> Date: 6 Oct 1994 07:36:31 GMT

> In article 8oi@netnews.upenn.edu, mark@ginger.biophys.upenn.edu (Mark Elliott) writes:
>>
>>   I'm interseted in persuading RSI to support IDL under LINUX. LINUX
>> is the free, GNU-like version of UNIX for use on Intel-486 based machines (i.e.

>> DOS machines).

... stuff deleted ...
> Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes!!!!!!!

... more deleted ...

Some companies are reluctant to sell their product to a machine with a public
domain OS. However, RSI will not be the first product. There is at least Maple.

I will adress this on the next IDL user's meeting in Wiesbaden, Germany.

Norbert Hahn
University at Darmstadt
Germany

Subject: Re: LINUX version of IDL
Posted by miff on Sun, 16 Oct 1994 10:44:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

First things first : This is _not_ meant to be an operating system flame.
I aim to 1) support the original poster's intentions, and 2) correct
some of his obvious errors.

larkum@optolab.unibe.ch (Matthew Larkum) writes:

>> I'm interseted in persuading RSI to support IDL under LINUX. LINUX
>> is the free, GNU-like version of UNIX for use on Intel-486 based machines (i.e.
>> DOS machines). Our experience with LINUX has been terrific. It is a complete
>> implemtation of BSD-Unix which turns a $2000 PC into a Unix workstation as
>> powerful and functional as any $10,000+ workstation (SUN,SGI,IBM,...)

Bear in mind that Linux is _not_ an implementation of BSD unix.

FreeBSD and NetBSD are BSD implementations. Linux is a unix-like operating
system originally developed by Linus Torvalds. All are freely available,
and perform wonderfully on low-priced hardware.

>> The only thing lacking for us is a binary of IDL which will run under LINUX.

Binaries for a number of operating systems would be nice. There are those
of us who would like to run IDL in extremely harsh environments, where
ruggedised PC hardware has a significant price advantage, and a high-
-reliability PC unix like FreeBSD would be preferable to, say, Intel Solaris
or Linux.

The PC BSD's and Linux share a very similar programming model, and a clean

port to any one would make a port to the others extremely trivial. Given the low cost of hardware, this would potentially produce a sigificant market slice for RSI.

The only question I would ask is, would your departmental head be willing to support any of the free Intel unices?

--
mike smith : miff@apanix.apana.org.au - Silicon grease monkey
"The question 'why are the fundamental laws of nature mathematical'
then invites the trivial response 'because we define as fundamental
those laws which are mathematical'". Paul Davies, _The_Mind_of_God_.