
Subject: Re: My explanation of why Ultimate++ is not mainstream

Posted by [amrein](#) on Fri, 15 Aug 2008 15:50:17 GMT

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

Ok

<http://fedoraproject.org/wiki/Licensing#GPLCompatibilityMatrix>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT_License

But which one?

<http://fedoraproject.org/wiki/Licensing/MIT>

Or this one (OSI approved)?

<http://www.opensource.org/licenses/mit-license.php>

There is no much difference between the MIT licence and the modified BSD licence. It's a mess to know which version your software is using. Confusing. It's a good thing for lawyers thought, because if a company want to use your software, they will have to know what they can do and what they can't do with it.

-----8 < --- from wikipedia.org -----

The MIT License is similar to the 3-clause "modified" BSD license, except that the BSD license contains a notice prohibiting the use of the name of the copyright holder in promotion. This is sometimes present in versions of the MIT License, as noted above.

The original BSD license also includes a clause requiring all advertising of the software to display a notice crediting its authors. This "advertising clause" (since disavowed by UC Berkeley[5]) is only present in the modified MIT License used by XFree86.

The MIT License states more explicitly the rights given to the end-user, including the right to use, copy, modify, merge, publish, distribute, sublicense, and/or sell the software.

A 2-clause BSD-style license used by FreeBSD (and is the current preferred license for NetBSD) is essentially identical to the MIT License, as it contains neither an advertising clause, nor a promotional use of copyright holder's name prohibition.

-----8 < --- from wikipedia.org -----

From the two, I found the modified MIT licence published on the OSI website more easy to understand (<http://www.opensource.org/licenses/mit-license.php>, and it's FOSS compatible too). It's less restrictive.
