

---

Subject: Re: New experimental Linux/FreeBSD release

Posted by [amrein](#) on Fri, 03 Apr 2020 20:20:41 GMT

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

---

[quote title=mirek wrote on Fri, 03 April 2020 18:24]amrein wrote on Fri, 03 April 2020 17:17mirek wrote on Fri, 03 April 2020 16:59

Is this Makefile ok for you? I mean, should I continue working on it than commit the change after test on BSD and Linux?

I want to be able to `./install U++` (actualy, maybe instead of `./install`, the better name is `./config`). Actually, at this point, even if I am persuaded by community to drop it, I will probably keep maintaining it for myself.

What you are trying to do is formally correct, but it is just a new slightly improved iteration of current tarball.

Instead of trying that, I think it would be better to invest time to provide binary packages (again). For tarball, simple Makefile with readme is enough. I plan to start autogenerating Makefile to repo really soon.

Oh, and BTW, pkg-config is not enough to identify missing packages, fresh fedora does not even have 'make' installed.

Yes. Pkg-config is not enough. This is why the last Makefile search for make pkg-config and c++ binaries.

I need to test this makefile on BSD and MacOS to see how it works. It's certainly too much gmake dependent.