Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 15:46:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Mon, 18 August 2008 14:37
...
As far as I can see, this means

1. If I distribute object code, executable code or anything at all (binary) that was built (partially or entirely) from any or all of the U++ source, whether modified or not, "the license" must be distributed with it, including explicit reference to U++ authors. I must require that all subsequent distribution of such binary by anyone, must be accompanied by "the license". I can ban re-distribution of the binary by my users if I want.

In the U++ BSD like license, they tell you: 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.

This license make a difference between "TheIDE + tools + U++" (the software provided), "Your application" (Your source - U++) and the provided libraries (U++). It doesn't apply to "Your source" but only to "TheIDE + tools + U++". Your are not distributing "TheIDE + tools + U++" but only "Your source" + "U++".

So, the question could be, should you acknowledge for U++, a part of the wall "Software provided"? In this license, nothing force you to. BSD license don't clearly state that a part should style be covered by the BSD license. It only talks about "TheIDE + tools + U++" combinations (the software provided).

As long as an interpretation is possible, you can't force the receiver to follow yours. You can't have something smaller than a source file (we don't care about not saved bytes in computer memory). You could think: The only way to prevent this issue to happen is to include the (c) and a reference for the licence in each source file. Like this, all source files are protected from redistribution without BSD license acknowledgement. But even if you put the license into each files, the problem is back if someone take part of the source code and add it in his own source file.

Note: There's no (c) nor BSD licence reference into the Ultimate++ source files. Only one file with the license for the wall provided software (TheIDE + tools + U++).

To resolve this, GNU ask you to add the (c) and reference into each covered files. Their licenses (LGPL & GPL) state clearly the difference between part and complete source and cover them both.
The MIT license tell you that the wall software and also part of it are still covered by the MIT license. As you can see, they make the distinction between part and complete source to prevent this issue.

I am missing something?

Quote:
2. I don't have to release source code, either my own or that derived from U++. If I re-distribute source that is derived from U++ source (modified or un-modified), it must retain "the license".

This is where the problem is. BSD and BSD like licenses don't make a difference between part and wall source code or binary. They tell you to keep the license + copyright if you distribute the source and to acknowledge if you distribute the binary only. U++ libraries is a part of the provided software. See my previous explanation about how the license apply to a part of the source.

captainc wrote on Mon, 18 August 2008 14:53I have a second question:
What do the devs think about relicensing? Do they want to prevent derivative works from being completely relicensed?

Relicensing:
Option 1: Any derivaties (additions or modifications) of the software can be relicensed without restriction.
Option 2: Derivatives of the software must contain the same license. Proprietary additions, in the form of new add-on modules, to the software can be licensed however you want.

One question to answer that will influence this is: Do you want persistence in derivative works? There are good and bad sides to this. Ie. It could be an under-performing derivative with your name on it. Or it could be a great piece of software with your name on it!

This is why I prefer the official BSD license (=Don't keep the copyright if you make a modification in our software).

I'm not answering your question. I'm not one of the copyright holder, only a messenger.