

Re: Great SWT Program

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-11/msg03954.html>

- *From:* blmblm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx <blmblm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Nov 2007 02:30:23 GMT
-

In article <7b967285-5495-4b93-8728-b13b94f4f44c@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, <nebulous99@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Nov 22, 11:49 am, blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx <blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

It wouldn't matter which one you were "normally" in, although not being "normally" in the mode where it actually accepts new text seems rather strange.

To you, I suppose it does: I seem to remember that you've said that mostly when you're editing a file you're entering new text, whereas I'm more apt to be making changes to existing text.

Different patterns of usage then. But I imagine replying to a usenet post to be something of a pain with vi, as you're alternately selecting and deleting chunks of quoted material and typing paragraphs of response to same. And the editing style becomes less fluid if you have to think more about explicitly switching gears to go from adding new text to fixing a typo or rewording a bit of a sentence you just wrote. I can't imagine finding a natural workflow with a tool that forced me to artificially structure it into separate and delineated blocks of "inserting new text" versus "fixing typos and other shit". :P

I can believe that your description might be accurate for a new user. Since I've been using this tool (vim, and vi before it) to compose many kinds of text for almost twenty years now, however, it bears little resemblance to my perception of what I'm doing. All of the mechanics of switching between modes, remembering what to type to do stuff -- it's no more conscious than deciding which pedal to press to make the car go faster and which to press to make it stop. I guess it's possible that it's actually costing me lots of brain power, in ways I'm not even

Re: Great SWT Program

aware of, but I'm not sure how one could measure that. That it seems obvious to you is not, frankly, very convincing to me. After all, you think my brain's broken.

In that example "what comes next" was absolutely nothing; it was just "n:" without any more input besides the enter keypress that submits the command.

No, it was ":n", not "n:".

Whatever; nothing came after the ":n". It was not ":n foo", just ":n". :P

This is so silly I said that ":" indicated something about what came after it, you said "nothing came after it", but clearly something ("n") did Whatever.

[snip]

No normal human being can keep all of the hairy syntax of those things in their head 24/7 and not need to refer to anything...Quick quiz: which comes first in the argument list for System.arraycopy, the source or the destination array?

I have no idea.

Well, there you go then.

Right. I don't have the entire Java API in my head. So? Where did I claim I did? Oh right, you apparently **think** I said something like that, but -- a misunderstanding, possibly explained in another post today.

How is one supposed to discover <shrug> Maybe by reading a good tutorial on Unix CLI tools?

Re: Great SWT Program

What good tutorial? I don't seem to recall stumbling onto any, let alone one being clearly advertised, the last time I worked with such a system. There were man pages, as usual, and very little else.

I also am not aware of anything for Unix analogous to Sun's Java tutorial — i.e., something widely recognized as canonical. But a Google search for "Unix" and "tutorial" turns up lots of hits. I can't be bothered to sort through them and look for good ones, but the first few at least look promising. Whether the situation has improved dramatically since you last worked with Unix — hard to say, but it seems possible.

[snip]

Still awkward compared to the natural visual-selection way of doing it that my tools support, while still enabling more archaic methods, of course, if I decided to use CLI commands instead of Explorer for some strange reason. In practise, even if I need the CLI (e.g. to do a `ren *.foo *.bar`) for something I'd use Explorer's search to find the files, then move the matches to a working directory,

"Working directory"? Isn't this as clunky as those temporary files I sometimes use to get around not having easy access to a clipboard? Just askin'.

perform the CLI command there, and move the files back. This is easy if they all come from one source directory. It's a bit trickier if they don't, but I can exploit the fact that Explorer's undo doesn't see operations done from the CLI and doesn't see undeletes either:

So you're exploiting the fact that the interface lies to you. Uh-huh.

do the search, `*delete*` the matches, do a same-scoped search for `*`, move the results, mass-select the just-deleted files in the recycle bin and "restore", which puts the original matches back in their original respective locations, then rename everything in the search scope with the CLI, followed by "undo move" in Explorer to put the non-matches back. But that situation's very rare. Most often if I needed to do something like this the search scope is everything with a given file extension, and then the rename at the CLI is scoped correctly by the wildcards anyway, obviating the need for any other commands. There's two

Re: Great SWT Program

situations that call for mixing the two. One is this sort of rename, but the criteria include file contents, which Explorer's search can use to decide matches but can't be expressed as a wildcard expression at the CLI, and the other is when I want to rename everything that does NOT match something, in which case an Explorer move of the things that do can be followed by a CLI rename and then an "undo move" in Explorer. Of course there's a CLI "move" command but there's no "undo" for this, so if the files came from multiple directories and get jumbled into one temporary directory there's no easy way to unscramble them all back to their places of origin at the CLI, while Explorer's undo should remember what came from where, just as its undelete does (recycle bin "restore" command). Most commonly I use the "move" command in the CLI as a more powerful rename, able as it is to change the path of any object to an arbitrary new path in general. (AFAICT, a typical unix CLI provides *only* a "mv" command, which is used for renaming in place as well as actually moving files.)

Very interesting. I'm not sure I followed all of that; I suspect I'd have to boot up a Windows system and try stuff, and I can't be bothered right now. Maybe some other time. The fact that "undo" puts renamed stuff back into its previous location — interesting. I wouldn't have suspected that, though I can sort of vaguely imagine how it might be done.

(You are correct that the Unix "mv" command performs both renames and moves. The Linux systems I've used (RedHat and Fedora) also provide a "rename" command that will do the kind of mass renames that previously required a shell loop. FYI, I guess.)

A lot of what you describe strikes me as relatively straightforward to do with my tools of choice, though I strongly suspect that what I regard as relatively straightforward here — well, you might not agree.

You're so used to the complexities that you no longer notice them as much.

Probably so. But this has never been about what's easy for a newbie — or at least, that's not what *I've* been arguing about.

You seem to be similarly adept with features that wouldn't be obvious to a newbie — or at least, not to this newbie. Of course, with my poor broken brain (Are you sorry yet you used that phrase? No, probably not.)

Re: Great SWT Program

I *am* curious about how you sort search results by image size in pixels, or audio by bitrate; I don't remember seeing that kind of information displayed in graphical file browsers, but then I don't use them much,

Explorer, since Windows ME, is aware of such data for a wide range of supported media formats (generally anything either the Microsoft-supplied image previewer or Windows Media Player would recognize) and I think this is susceptible to third-party extension also. Out of the box, it can sort a directory of MP3s by bitrate or duration, or JPEG images by dimensions. Any Explorer window can be put in "details" mode, and there's a View->Choose Details... option to check and uncheck various things, but it tries to guess based on the prevalent file types in a directory how to present it. (Sometimes it guesses wrong but you can change it, and it will remember your overriding choices for that directory for a while.)

"For a while"? that seems a little, um, imprecise and unpredictable? but I may be projecting my overall impressions of Windows as a platform on which strange and unpredictable things happen routinely.

So you can make sure it's including duration and bitrate, or whatever, and there will be columns for this. It's like a "super 'ls -l'", I suppose. Clicking columns sorts by that column. Search result windows are subject to the same general behavior.

Interesting

[snip more stuff that might be useful next time I try to get better with Windows]

—

B. L. Massingill

ObDisclaimer: I don't speak for my employers; they return the favor.

.