Subject: Re: My explaination of why Ultimate++ is not mainstream
Posted by amrein on Fri, 15 Aug 2008 16:46:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

One thing about the current licence:

Quote:(1) Permission is hereby granted, free of charge, to any person obtaining a copy of this software and associated documentation files (the "Software"), to deal in the Software without restriction, including without limitation the rights to use, copy, modify, merge, publish, distribute, sublicense, and/or sell copies of the Software, and to permit persons to whom the Software is furnished to do so, subject to the following conditions:

(2) The above copyright notice and this permission notice shall be included in all copies of the Software and its Copyright notices. In addition publicly documented acknowledgment must be given that this software has been used if no source code of this software is made available publicly. This includes acknowledgments in either Copyright notices, Manuals, Publicity and Marketing documents or any documentation provided with any product containing this software. This License does not apply to any software that links to the libraries provided by this software (statically or dynamically), but only to the software provided.

(3) THE SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED "AS IS", ...

I study the present U++ licence to know exactly what it permit. If I understand the U++ licence well, at present, anyone can fork U++ or build software using any copylefted licence (copylefted licence from GNU.org: http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/copyleft.html). To be clear, I can fork U++, remove all your copyright from your files, then put LGPL or GPL in each of them with my modifications and my copyright then release my new U-- software (binary or source) as long as I use GPL or LGPL for example. Why? Because the modified software is not inbound in the paragraph (2) only the wall software. And also because LGPL or GPL force people to release the U-- code as required in section (2), so no need for your copyright. And you can still read the last sentence in (2) as a confirmation of what I just said.

So sorry if I said it wasn't GPL compatible. I'm not a lawyer. It's just not OSI approved and GNU approved (want to submit to know exactly if it's FOSS compatible?).

The MIT licence will give you the right to force people to let your copyright in any sources files from U++, even if they are modified. People will be able to distribute their application without acknowledgements in their about menu (nor show the licence for U++ binary if they release it as .dll).

I'm wrong?