
Subject: Re: Musing on IDL's Future Direction
Posted by [R.Bauer](#) on Mon, 17 Nov 2008 08:19:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the idl projects license would have used an open source license then one would be able to do a fork.
This possibility to do a fork forces a company usually to watch their users.

Reimar

David Fanning schrieb:

> Folks,
>
> Jumping through more hoops to create both display and
> PostScript output this morning got me thinking about
> our old Top 10 list. I was surprised to see we started
> that in July 2000. Whoa! It seems like only yesterday.
>
> There were 159 posts in that thread, and a lot of good
> ideas. Just browsing through them now, I found, well,
> one that was implemented. We now have the COMPLEMENT
> keyword in the Where function. You could count that
> as progress, I suppose. (There may have been more, but
> after a couple of pages I was too depressed to read
> further.)
>
> I am not unmindful of the fact that IDL is a lot of
> things to a lot of users, and that one person's
> nonsense is another person's essential feature, but
> really...
>
> If ITTVIS could just spare one engineer for six
> months or so to work on a couple of things that
> were important to research users of IDL it would make
> a tremendous difference to a lot of people. I've had
> two e-mails *this morning* from people confused about
> the PostScript device, and it is not an unusual morning.
>
> There is too much cynicism showing in this newsgroup
> lately to risk another Top 10 List. (And, given the
> success of our last campaign, maybe it would be better
> from a psychological point of view to start a Bottom
> 10 List. More chance of it getting implemented, probably.
> But I digress, and in completely the wrong direction!)

>
> I guess my point is this. There are a lot of people,
> myself included, who use and are extremely happy with

> what I have come to think of as IDL's "old" features.
> Line plots, image display, good ol' direct graphics,
> sent to a PostScript file for nice output. We could
> be made happy and a LOT less cynical, I think, if
> along with the bright new gewgaws someone threw in a
> lagniappe of a PostScript device that worked the way
> it was suppose to work in this day and age.
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
>
