Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 09:57:30 GMT

cbpporter wrote on Mon, 18 August 2008 10:48
MIT doesn't require the source acknowledgment that Mirek wants. And MPL is far too complicated and might confuse other people.

So I think BSD would be the choice.

- With the BSD license, the current BSD like license or the MIT one, acknowledgment is require only if you release the complete TheIDE+U++ in binary or source form without modification.
- The BSD license and the current BSD like license don't force acknowledgment if you release a modified TheIDE+U++ (bin or src) and you can use any license you want for this modified TheIDE+U++ (src and bin).
- The BSD license force you to change the (c)opyrigth accordingly if you make any modification into TheIDE+U++ (src or binary release).
- The MIT licence force you to keep the (c)opyrigth and license in the provided source if you make part or wall of TheIDE+U++ source available.

BSD license = Do whatever you want. If you release unmodified source, you must keep the copyright and license in the source. If you only release an unmodified TheIDE+U++ binary, you must tell about this license + keep the copyright. You can release modified TheIDE+U++ (binary or source) with whatever license you want but you must change the copyright.

U++ BSD like license = BSD licence + "you can also keep our copyright in the source code even if you make modifications. You can tell that this wall source is our source code without saying anything about your modifications."

MIT license = BSD license - change copyright holders if you modify TheIDE or U++ + even in part or modified source code from us you must use MIT license with our copyright

Hopping I'm not doing any mistake here.

I voted for the official BSD licence. It protect against malicious use of U++ authors names in modified release.