

## Re: Summary: experiences with NanoBSD, successes and nits on a Soekris 4801

**Source:** <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/current/2005-06/1059.html>

---

**From:** Daniel Eischen (*deischen\_at\_freebsd.org*)

**Date:** 06/20/05

Date: Mon, 20 Jun 2005 15:18:28 -0400 (EDT)

To: "M. Warner Losh" <imp@bsdimp.com>

On Mon, 20 Jun 2005, M. Warner Losh wrote:

> *In message: <Pine.GSO.4.43.0506201507010.11816-100000@sea.ntplx.net>*  
> *Daniel Eischen <deischen@freebsd.org> writes:*  
> *: On Mon, 20 Jun 2005, M. Warner Losh wrote:*  
> *:*  
> *: > In message: <Pine.GSO.4.43.0506191610170.7472-100000@sea.ntplx.net>*  
> *: > Daniel Eischen <deischen@freebsd.org> writes:*  
> *: > : How about NO\_FOO[\_INSTALL], where NO\_FOO = no build and no install,*  
> *: > : and NO\_FOO\_INSTALL just prevents the install. In theory, you could*  
> *: > : build the complete system, then use NO\_FOO\_INSTALL instead of rm(1).*  
> *: >*  
> *: > What's wrong with making sure that NO\_FOO will work in the install*  
> *: > case to not install foo when it is set, even if it was unset in the*  
> *: > build process?*  
> *:*  
> *: If it works or can be made to work, then nothing.*  
>  
> *Actually, looking at the code, it would cause devd to be built, but*  
> *not installed without changes. Since NO\_GXX is defined in the above*  
> *scenario. I've started to think about how this might be fixed. It*  
> *really is a 'don't build this because of toolchain depends' as a*  
> *'don't build his because I don't want this feature' intertwinement.*

Also, what about dynamic executables that need libstdc++, but you still don't want the build tools?

--  
DE

---

freebsd-current@freebsd.org mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-current>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-current-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"