

---

Subject: Re: umk (small) improvements

Posted by [Novo](#) on Tue, 14 Apr 2020 14:48:14 GMT

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

---

mirek wrote on Tue, 14 April 2020 03:54

Anyway, I agree about functions to be added, however as you might have noticed, many current users depend on current umk commandline definition, so we cannot break backward compatibility just to have it nicer...

I personally do not depend on it. I'd love to see a better umk ...

I vote for amrein's proposal.

---