

---

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Mon, 01 Sep 2008 13:00:39 GMT

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

---

amrein wrote on Mon, 01 September 2008 15:43It would be so cool to have libupp.so.x.y.z and a clean version number before releasing anything into popular Linux distro. It's not a simple work (need to modify TheIDE, ...).

U++ is a monolith. It's so far from "re-use my lib" policy of all other FOSS software and libraries...

The "build all from source" is very interesting for proprietary companies (and for debugging too) but for FOSS... it's another universe. How can I port the entire Gnome 2.x interface to upp if I don't have a lib to do a thin gnome 3.0 for example?

(Yes, Gnome, because those guys are still using C. They don't have a powerful and thin C++ library to replace GTK+. KDE use Qt.)

I wouldn't call it a monolith, since it is very modular. And this is the problem: how to build a single lib? Some apps need just some packages, and the most natural would be to have a so for every package. But that's quite some work and not very convenient.

Also, as Mirek said, we do not have a x.y.x versioning system. Our versioning system boils down practically to "year" (not counting dev releases). And I don't think we have the man power to do such versioning, especially that we have to increment a given number anytime we break link compatibility, which is very easy in C++. I honestly don't know what the solution for this problem is, except to link statically.

Or maybe we consider x 2008, and y 1 .

And I don't understand the part about Gnome? Who wants to port Gnome? And they do have GtkMM, but with all the gobject crap that's in the background, I wouldn't call it thin.

---