

---

Subject: Re: [POLL] Should we upgrade umk command line behavior ?

Posted by [amrein](#) on Tue, 14 Apr 2020 13:12:12 GMT

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

---

mirek wrote on Tue, 14 April 2020 13:38I have fixed the poll to make it more clear...

Still, I think that there is no reason to sacrifice compatibility. The differences in what is possible without sacrificing it and what is possible while doing so are IMO negligible.

EDIT: Actually, the only meaningful difference there is that you insist that 3rd non-option parameter is "output", while backward compatibility requires "build method" (which you want to supply with -b only). Is that really worth it?

Mirek

"Should we upgrade umk command line behavior" => "Should we sacrifice backward compatibility in umk to make command line nicer?"

It's clearly a more oriented question. Only early adopters who adapt easily to new things will say "yes, we should".

And personally, my understanding of this modified question is: "Should we break umk or not".

It's important to note that at present, noone has replied "I depends on umk current behavior and I can't stick with an older binary".

---