Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by David Fanning on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 13:49:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

David Fanning writes:

> Some of you may remember my struggles trying to get a breakpoint
> set in an IDL 6.2 project. I eventually discovered a way around
> that problem and got things working correctly.
>
> Now I've run into *another* problem. It seems I can't add
> another file to the project! :-(

OK, I guess I've found a work-around for this, too. It seems
if I rename my project, then I can add a file to it. Sheesh.

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/

Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by Michael Wallace on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 14:11:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> I'm retreating to IDL 6.1. There is really nothing in IDL 6.2
> I'm interested in anyway. This is the first time in a long time
> that I've thought a new release has gone backwards.

Oh, you know you love IDL 6.2. Just don't use the IDLDE. :-)

-Mike

Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by David Fanning on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 15:12:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Michael Wallace writes:

> Oh, you know you love IDL 6.2. Just don't use the IDLDE. :-)

Uh, well, this is the *Windows* version, so I don't have much
choice in the IDLDE matter. And, besides, projects are the
one and only thing I can still lord-over the EMACS guys. It's
hard to feel superior though, when the only thing you have that
works better than their stuff does, doesn't work. :-(

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/

On Tue, 06 Sep 2005 09:12:53 -0600, David Fanning wrote:

> Michael Wallace writes:
>
>> Oh, you know you love IDL 6.2. Just don't use the IDLDE. :-)
>
> Uh, well, this is the *Windows* version, so I don't have much
> choice in the IDLDE matter. And, besides, projects are the
> one and only thing I can still lord-over the EMACS guys. It's
> hard to feel superior though, when the only thing you have that
> works better than their stuff does, doesn't work. :-(

Here's a project for you:

% mkdir my_project
% cd my_project

  ... add routine files to the "project" aka directory.

  ... later that day, continue work on the "project":
% emacs my_project/*.pro

What am I missing here? A single file included in more than one
project? Doesn't this encourage sloppy path/naming conventions (and
is nothing "ln -s" couldn't handle)?

JD

Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by David Fanning on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 18:30:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

JD Smith writes:

> Here's a project for you:
>
> % mkdir my_project
> % cd my_project
>
>   ... add routine files to the "project" aka directory.
>
>   ... later that day, continue work on the "project":
> % emacs my_project/*.pro
>
> What am I missing here? A single file included in more than one
> project? Doesn't this encourage sloppy path/naming conventions (and
> is nothing "ln -s" couldn't handle)?

Alright, so there is *nothing* to feel superior about.
Let's just say that doesn't exactly improve my current
disposition. :-(

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/

Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by JD Smith on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 19:18:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, 06 Sep 2005 12:30:08 -0600, David Fanning wrote:

> JD Smith writes:
>
>> Here's a project for you:
>>
>> % mkdir my_project
>> % cd my_project
>>
>>   ... add routine files to the "project" aka directory.

```
>>
>>    ... later that day, continue work on the "project":
>> % emacs my_project/*.pro
>>
>> What am I missing here?  A single file included in more than one
>> project?  Doesn't this encourage sloppy path/naming conventions (and
>> is nothing "ln -s" couldn't handle)?
>
> Alright, so there is *nothing* to feel superior about.
> Let's just say that doesn't exactly improve my current
> disposition. :-(
```

No really... I wasn't trying to be cheeky, just expressing ignorance. Are
projects more than collections of files easily called up at once? What
are their advantages?

JD

Subject: Re: Another IDL 6.2 Project Problem
Posted by David Fanning on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 19:44:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

JD Smith writes:

```
> No really... I wasn't trying to be cheeky, just expressing ignorance.  Are
> projects more than collections of files easily called up at once?  What
> are their advantages?
```

In theory, I think projects are designed so that you can
leave programs in library directories and add them to
your project without moving them. Then, when you "build"
the project, you get one file with all the executable
code.

In practice, I don't think too many people ship executable
files. I think they ship source code too. Then the whole
project idea breaks down completely because IDL doesn't
store the build order with the project. So you have to
dump all the damn program files in a single directory to
make it work on someone else's machine anyway.

So, come to think of it, there probably isn't a single
good reason for *using* projects, except that I find it
a reasonably good interface for organizing and finding
source files as I am working on something. Paltry, I know,
but Windows users are used to grasping at straws. :-)

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/