

---

Subject: src release

Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 09:57:13 GMT

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

---

I would like to start a discussion about 'true' source package.

I believe that at this moment, we are close to the ability to build U++ on most modern posix system with X11.

Please check the latest version, especially if you have anything else than ubuntu or even linux

<http://code.google.com/p/upp-mirror/downloads/list>

I believe we do not need ./configure; the only reason I can see for that is warning about missing libraries - if somebody is willing to create such script, I would be happy to add it.

BTW, to resolve problems with different directory structures, I think one possible solution is to put ALL possible paths to include/lib lists - am I right?

What is sort of missing is 'make install'.

I guess 'make' should call external script there; and my initial plan is as follows:

- if it is run as root, it would install into /usr/local
- if not, it would install into '~'; if there is 'bin' in '~', put theide there, otherwise to '~/'.

Any more ideas?

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: src release

Posted by [sergeynikitin](#) on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 13:33:59 GMT

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

---

Whether to remain with the binary packages?

Or now remain only source?

---

---

Subject: Re: src release

Posted by [cocob](#) on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 15:06:08 GMT

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

---

You don't need a configure script if you build with a recent version of gcc.

Actually upp can't be built with a lot of proprietary compiler on many systems.

---

---

Subject: Re: src release  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 15:51:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cocob wrote on Sat, 21 March 2009 11:06 You don't need a configure script if you build with a recent version of gcc.

Excactly. All we need to know is in predefined macros (and that is why I have moved to Core/config.h too...).

Quote:

Actually upp can't be built with a lot of proprietary compiler on many systems.

Well, I guess there are not many proprietary compilers left

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: src release  
Posted by [masu](#) on Mon, 23 Mar 2009 09:38:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Mirek,

I will check source release this week.

Concerning the install script, I would say we should respect a user specified make define for install path.

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: src release  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 23 Mar 2009 09:46:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

masu wrote on Mon, 23 March 2009 05:38

Concerning the install script, I would say we should respect a user specified make define for install path.

Sorry for my ignorance, but what you mean by that?

In any case, I expect and respect alterations to the src package - I will be happy to improve the thing over time.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: src release

Posted by [masu](#) on Mon, 23 Mar 2009 10:15:11 GMT

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

---

Quote:Sorry for my ignorance, but what you mean by that?

Something like this:

```
make INSTALL_PREFIX=/usr/local/share
```

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: src release

Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 23 Mar 2009 10:19:52 GMT

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

---

masu wrote on Mon, 23 March 2009 06:15Quote:Sorry for my ignorance, but what you mean by that?

Something like this:

```
make INSTALL_PREFIX=/usr/local/share
```

Matthias

Well, make is there, ready to be edited

Note that there are two makefiles. The real makefile, exported using theide, and 'user' makefile that calls this hidden one. User makefile is not exported, means you can easily edit it. install belongs there.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: src release

Posted by [masu](#) on Mon, 23 Mar 2009 10:26:34 GMT

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

---

I know, I prepared these for the latest release .

What I want to be sure is that the user has full control and that we do not introduce something like if a then install there else if b then install somewhere else.

For me this adds more confusion then is needed. We should rather use a default install path like users home dir and the mechanism to alter this install path quiet easily.

Matthias

---