

---

Subject: Re: external GIT clones differ in HASH --> problem when merging

Posted by [kohait00](#) on Thu, 17 Mar 2011 09:02:31 GMT

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

---

seems as if i found out why svn 281..

the comment to that revision states 'svn layout change', which has introduced trunk/branches/tags.

the offered git repo in downloads has, like i did, sure been created with

'git svn clone -s <http://upp-mirror.googlecode.com/svn> .'

where the -s stands for standard svn layout (trunk/branches/tags).

since the previous revisions 1-280 have not been using them, the clone ignores them.

i have used the same approach in [http://www.ultimatepp.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&&th=3486&goto=24387#msg\\_24387](http://www.ultimatepp.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&&th=3486&goto=24387#msg_24387)

but since the svn had to be rebuild, maybe the hash has changed, so i had another one than the one in gitorious.

now is the question, are the first revisions 1-280 worth it to be included in common history in git?

the problem is that it'd have to be checked out \*without\* the -s flag, which results in full history, but renders a git repo whit trunk/branches/tags folders. -s translates them to real branches and tags in git history..

i'd prefer to have a well running git history, the first 280 revs are not too important if you ask me.

so the current starting hash would remain the one in the public git repo from tojokey or andrejnikitin?

6abd54c7c1415955b79c152cfc132d42c3d615a8

cheers..

EDIT:

i tried both clones, with autocrlf = false (no changes) and autocrlf = input (changes) under linux, hash values are the same. even autocrlf = true under windows produced the same thing.