

---

Subject: Ide console

Posted by [unodgs](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 11:32:36 GMT

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

---

For my UltimateGit project I borrowed Console class from TheIDE and I came to the conclusion this class could be separated like CodeEditor. It's very useful. The only problem is it's connected with Web package because of SlaveProcess class which IMO could go somewhere to Core. What do you think?

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 12:16:11 GMT

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

---

I was having the same problem for my svn project... Looking for a sort of System() call, which is bound (by now) to Ide and Web package.

I also think that would be an handy addition to core package.

Max

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [unodgs](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 12:36:56 GMT

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

---

Great I'm not alone.. Mirek tell me what to do with SlaveProcess (and what you think generally about this idea). I think maybe it is worth to get all Execute/Run and connected methods out of console and create Process package. SlaveProcess could be located there too. Then to modify Console package so it was connected with Process package.

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 15:33:24 GMT

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

---

That would be perfect... will you implement all that stuff ?

Max

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [unodgs](#) on Fri, 23 May 2008 16:15:54 GMT

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

---

Quote:That would be perfect... will you implement all that stuff ?  
Sure. I'm waiting for green light

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:39:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I was actually thinking (for quite a long time now , that some of Web package should be moved into Core.

That includes Socket and SlaveProcess.

Anyway, Core starts to be too fat. So another idea is to split it to "HardCore" and "Core", which hardcore playing similar role to CtrlCore (that is, most of system dependent stuff and basic \*hard\* things like memory allocator or String). In Core then would be things like Value, XML etc...

I think Console package is definitely a good idea.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 19:00:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luzr wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 20:39

.....  
Anyway, Core starts to be too fat. So another idea is to split it to "HardCore" and "Core".....

Mirek

Well, "HardCore" will sound a bit funny indeed

Max

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [tojocky](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 21:55:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Maybe BaseCore or Kernel?

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 12 Jun 2008 15:38:27 GMT

---

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

---

Hm, what is wrong with "HardCore"?

In fact, there are some pieces of really hard-core coding in there...

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [unodgs](#) on Thu, 12 Jun 2008 15:52:00 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Thu, 12 June 2008 11:38Hm, what is wrong with "HardCore"?

In fact, there are some pieces of really hard-core coding in there...

Mirek

Hard core means real, true, that one core which in our case is Core..

So IMO Core should still name Core, and "your HardCore" should name CoreUtils, CoreEx, CoreTools or just Utils.

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Thu, 12 Jun 2008 16:20:06 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Thu, 12 June 2008 17:38Hm, what is wrong with "HardCore"?

Absolutely nothing

Quote:

In fact, there are some pieces of really hard-core coding in there...

Well, I guess will find many, many news upp-fans

Max

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 08:16:56 GMT

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

---

unodgs wrote on Thu, 12 June 2008 11:52luzr wrote on Thu, 12 June 2008 11:38Hm, what is

wrong with "HardCore"?

In fact, there are some pieces of really hard-core coding in there...

Mirek

Hard core means real, true, that one core which in our case is Core..

So IMO Core should still name Core, and "your Hardcore" should name CoreUtils, CoreEx, CoreTools or just Utils.

Well, maybe you misunderstood the issue. Hardcore is supposed to be more "Core" than "Core" Memory allocator, String, Stream and other low-level stuff should be there.

Anyway, the main problem is that we have tons of software that is using "Core". We do not want to break it. So we need to keep current Core and have something Core is using.

Mirek

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 08:23:50 GMT

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

Well, if I understand correctly, and if you still want to separate NTL, it would be something like this: Core uses NTL which uses Hardcore?

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 09:21:49 GMT

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

Actually, I do not want to separate NTL to package - that does not make sense IMO.

Mirek

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 09:31:20 GMT

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

Well if I remember correctly, you said not long ago that you needed somebody to separate and maintain NTL from Core. What did you mean by separate?

---

Subject: Re: Ide console

Posted by [tojocky](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 10:44:16 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 21:39Well, I was actually thinking (for quite a long time now , that some of Web package should be moved into Core.

That includes Socket and SlaveProcess.

Anyway, Core starts to be too fat. So another idea is to split it to "HardCore" and "Core", which hardcore playing similar role to CtrlCore (that is, most of system dependent stuff and basic \*hard\* things like memory allocator or String). In Core then would be things like Value, XML etc...

I think Console package is definitely a good idea.

Mirek

Maybe "Common" or "System", because will be base methods wich links from any package?

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 11:14:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ehm, actually, I do not understand all the buzz. Should have done it without discussing

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Ide console  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 13 Jun 2008 11:17:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cbpporter wrote on Fri, 13 June 2008 05:31Well if I remember correctly, you said not long ago that you needed somebody to separate and maintain NTL from Core. What did you mean by separate?

Well, I guess something like script that takes U++ sources and converts NTL related parts into something more digestible.. (like library..)

IMO has nothing to do with packages.

Mirek

---