

---

Subject: Re: Installing 6.2 on Fedora Core 5

Posted by [Michael Wallace](#) on Sat, 25 Mar 2006 21:15:35 GMT

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

---

> I am starting to appreciate my Windows machine at work. I get an IDL  
> CD, pop it into the drive, run the installation, point it to the  
> license file, and I'm done.

Then why not use a Windows machine if Linux gives you so much grief?  
You do realize that maybe, just maybe, one reason that things didn't  
work right out of the gate is because Fedora Core 5 was released just a  
few days ago? You know, there might have been an update or two to some  
of the system libraries in the new release. ;-)

If you take a look at the release notes for IDL 6.2 you'd see that the  
supported platforms are Redhat Enterprise Linux 3.x and Fedora Core 3.  
Because the IDL binaries are linked against the libraries distributed  
with Fedora Core 3, you will typically need to install compatibility  
packages if you upgrade to a later version. The compatibility packages  
provide the functionality that was deprecated so that programs built  
against the old libraries will continue to work correctly. As a user,  
it probably seems nothing more as an annoyance, but it's a really nice  
and valuable feature for those working on the development of the OS and  
the core libraries.

All that you should need to do is install the appropriate compatibility  
package for FC5. I'm in the dark ages and still running FC4, but I had  
to install compat-libstdc++-33 when I first got FC4. I don't know if  
that package name is the same for FC5 or not. If you use yum to handle  
system updates, you can lookup the precise name of the package with: `yum  
list compat-libstdc++*`

Install that package and things should be able to rock and roll.

> But now, if I try to run an iTool, IDL complains about a missing  
> "libstdc++.so.5" file. It turns out that I have "libstdc++.so.6" file.  
> Assuming (foolishly?) backward compatibility tried to trick IDL, I  
> created a soft link from .6 to .5.

"Foolishly" is correct. Version numbers exist for a reason and changing  
them or linking too them like that can cause all sorts of havoc. I once  
saw a guy bring down a machine to where it was unbootable trying such a  
trick. And the trick hardly ever works as well.

> If RSI were to drop linux/unix support, I may have an inkling why.



Oh, don't be silly. If they dropped \*nix support there would be mass hysteria and pandemonium. ;-)

-Mike

---