Subject: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 07:00:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For more information, you can have a look here:

Official BSD license: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/bsd-license.php

Current BSD like Ultimate++ license: http://www.ultimatepp.org/appideAbout$en-us.html

MIT licence: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/mit-license.php

MPL (mozilla) license: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/mozilla1.1.php

GNU LGPL license: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/lgpl-2.1.php

GNU GPL license: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/gpl-2.0.php

Other OSI approved licenses: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/alphabetical
Why this poll? Because the current license is not GNU or OSI approved. It's a BSD like license. It's not the official one.

Utimate++ license(total votes: 18)

Keep the old Ultimate++ license 1/(6%)
Use the official BSD license 7/(39%)
Use the MIT license 2/(11%)
Use the MPL (mozilla) license 0/(0%)
Use the LGPL license 0/(0%)
Use the GPL license 0/(0%)
Release Ultimate++ without license (public domain) 2/(11%)
I don't know 6/(33%)

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 07:35:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:Why this poll? Because the current license is not GNU or OSI approved. It's a BSD like license. It's not the official one.
Would distributing it under official BSD license (not just BSD like) make any difference regarding compatibility with GNU/OSI. Sorry, I can't tell by reading the specifications .

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 08:30:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The current BSD like license is not the official BSD one. Nor GNU nor OSI (open source initiative) have read it and approved it.

The official BSD license is OSI+GNU approved.

The official BSD license and the MIT licence are very permissive licence. They are completely proprietary software friendly and in the same time FOSS approved.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 08:48:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I don't know what to say. Current BSD like license is almost identical to MIT (I diffed it), with only a few extra clauses, which make it quite similar to official BSD, yet the wording is different. 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.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 09:57:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by captainc on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 12:26:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Concerning the MIT license (From Wikipedia):
Quote:The license can be modified to suit particular needs. For example, the Free Software Foundation agreed in 1998 to use a modified MIT License for ncurses, which adds this clause:[2]

Except as contained in this notice, the name(s) of the above copyright holders shall not be used in advertising or otherwise to promote the sale, use or other dealings in this Software without prior written authorization.
What are the developers' thoughts on this statement? Is it necessary to have it in the license? This is a key difference between BSD and MIT.

BSD States:
Quote:* * Neither the name of the <organization> nor the
* names of its contributors may be used to endorse or promote products
* derived from this software without specific prior written permission.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 12:37:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein, I don't follow your conclusions about the BSD license. Wikipedia also describes BSD . I *think* "the license" is describing the use of U++ source - in either source or binary form, and does not apply to TheIDE binary itself. Any binaries distributed by U++ need their own license.

If ultimate++ was released with BSD license it might look something like this

<part1>

Copyright (c) 2008, Ultimate++, Mirek Fidler et al...
All right reserved

<part2>
Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met <list of conditions>

<part3> disclaimer

The list of conditions requires that re-distributions of either source or binary must include all of part1, part2, part3 verbatim - part1, part2, part3 we call "the license". "the license" refers explicitly to U++ authors.

In the second of the 3 conditions, there is an implied part (in italics) as follows
Re-distributions of source codein binary form must reproduce the above copyright notice ... etc.

"Re-distributions" means - distributed by me, or my users or my users users etc.

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.

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".

Open to interpretation
"the license" says
<Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided ... 3 conditions are met>

Does this mean that if I want to distribute source, my users can also distribute and use the source (in binary or source form) without payment of royalties to me? Does the license permit me to apply additional restrictions to the use of source I supply - such as additional copyrights and licenses?

What does "source code must retain the license" mean - does "the license" have to be embedded in every source file.

MIT license doesn't seem to require keeping the disclaimer.

I vote we get some clarification on these things before changing the license and then try to make the license itself clearer and not open to interpretation.

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by captainc on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 12:53:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I 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!

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.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 17:59:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Mon, 18 August 2008 04:48MIT doesn't require the source acknowledgment that Mirek wants.

Well, I can live without it It is not important.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 11:56:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein said this
Quote:I am missing something?

I have no idea coz I am totally lost.

According to this
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD_license

the BSD license meets the definition of open source as described here
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Source_Definition

yet item 2 seems to require distribution of source ??

amrein said this
Quote: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.

I haven't got the slightest idea how you can conclude this when the BSD license says this
Quote:Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are

permitted provided that the following conditions are met:

i.e. the terms of distribution are the same whether the source is modified or not - and - the only requirement is that the license is included verbatim/unmodified - meaning that the distributor can charge money for it if he wants and I cannot ask for royalties.

Also, what do you mean by "wall software" - I don't understand this term.

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by bytefield on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:17:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I vote for MIT license because it is most permissive than others... you can modify the source code and release it with a new copyright and a new license. You have to retain copyright in source code just when you do a redistribution of full copy.

What about public domain and forgetting all license stuff and incompatibility? See SQLite copyright for example.
BTW, i like sqlite source files...
Quote:** The author disclaims copyright to this source code. In place of
** a legal notice, here is a blessing:
**
** May you do good and not evil.
** May you find forgiveness for yourself and forgive others.
** May you share freely, never taking more than you give.
It is free to our conscience how we use the source...
Maybe after we clarify which license is better for Upp and for us, we should re-post this pool for people who answered with " I don't know" to have chance to choose a license...

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 14:25:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Tue, 19 August 2008 13:56amrein said this
Quote:I am missing something?

I have no idea coz I am totally lost.

According to this
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD_license

the BSD license meets the definition of open source as described here
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Source_Definition

BSD license yes. BSD like license = status unknown. On the U++ website you can read BSD licence but this is not the official licence but a modified one.

Quote:
yet item 2 seems to require distribution of source ??

amrein said this
Quote: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.

I haven't got the slightest idea how you can conclude this when the BSD license says this
Quote:Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met:

i.e. the terms of distribution are the same whether the source is modified or not - and - the only requirement is that the license is included verbatim/unmodified - meaning that the distributor can charge money for it if he wants and I cannot ask for royalties.

In the U++ BSD-like licence, they give you the right to deal in the Software without restriction. They make a difference between "Software provided" = "TheIDE+tools+U++", "libraries provided by this software" = "U++", "Your own source".

If you copy the software provided (src or bin) => "copyright notice and this permission notice shall be included.."

If you modify or merge the source => Well, no part of the license restrict your right. They already give you all right "without restriction" at the beginning

This is an English language issue. "Software" has no plural. And when you say "source code", you don't know if it means the entire tarball or part of the source code.

Quote:
Also, what do you mean by "wall software" - I don't understand this term.

Graeme

Entire software. The complete tarball. "TheIDE+tools+U++".

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 15:21:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So let me see if I understand: with BSD, MIT and MPL we can distribute our software that links with U++ libraries under any license we desire. And we are not required to acknowledge in about box/copyright/documentation that the software was developed with U++ (I will do that anyway). And with BSD we can promote our product as being written with U++, but we can't promote our fork of U++ as being developed by U++ team.

With LGPL we can do the same as long as we keep dynamic linking (which is not yet possible), and with GPL we have to go GPL and opensource any software developed with U++.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 17:07:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Tue, 19 August 2008 17:21So let me see if I understand: with BSD, MIT and MPL we can distribute our software that links with U++ libraries under any license we desire. And we are not required to acknowledge in about box/copyright/documentation that the software was developed with U++ (I will do that anyway). And with BSD we can promote our product as being written with U++, but we can't promote our fork of U++ as being developed by U++ team.

With LGPL we can do the same as long as we keep dynamic linking (which is not yet possible), and with GPL we have to go GPL and opensource any software developed with U++.

Well yes.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 00:23:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote
Quote:In the BSD licence, they make a difference between "Software provided"

The BSD license at the link posted by you
http://www.opensource.org/licenses/bsd-license.php
doesn't mention the word "provided" and only mentions the word "software" in the third of the three conditions, so I'm guessing that when you use the term "BSD license" here, you're referring to the U++ license - which makes it pretty hard to have a meaningful discussion with you when you're so imprecise in your terminology.

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 01:25:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Your guessing is good.

Thanks. I will fix it.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 02:19:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 13:25Your guessing is good.

Thanks. I will fix it.

I wouldn't bother fixing it coz it seems nobody else is having a problem understanding anything except for me.

For example, cbpporter says

Quote:with BSD, MIT and MPL we can distribute our software that links with U++ libraries under any license we desire. And we are not required to acknowledge in about box/copyright/documentation that the software was developed with U++

If you link with U++ libraries then you are redistributing "the software" in binary form and the BSD license says
Quote:Redistributions in binary form must reproduce the ... <license>.

The fact that the software was developed with U++ is irrelevant - it's only what gets distributed that matters. If you distribute "U++ software" (whatever that is - open to interpretation) you must "include" <the license>. Since U++ libraries are part of U++ software by any reasonable interpretation, then you must acknowledge that in documenation/ about box, regardless of whether the libraries are modified or not.

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 10:24:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 05:19
If you link with U++ libraries then you are redistributing "the software" in binary form and the BSD license says

The fact that the software was developed with U++ is irrelevant - it's only what gets distributed that matters. If you distribute "U++ software" (whatever that is - open to interpretation) you must "include" <the license>. Since U++ libraries are part of U++ software by any reasonable interpretation, then you must acknowledge that in documenation/ about box, regardless of whether the libraries are modified or not.

Graeme

I could very well be that I don't understand to much out of these licensing issues. But if I must include the U++ license verbatim, then how is it possible to distribute my own software under another license?

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 11:48:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I looks like BSD is going to win.

I guess it is the most logical and least "expensive" step, in fact we are not changing anything, just fixing the license wording.

Should we wait more or should I just "fix" it?

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 13:20:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 23:48Well, I looks like BSD is going to win.

I guess it is the most logical and least "expensive" step, in fact we are not changing anything, just fixing the license wording.

Should we wait more or should I just "fix" it?

Mirek

I don't think you should change the license yet. As far as I can see, with BSD license, you can't use U++ to develop commercial software because if you use any U++ source in your product, you have to include the BSD license in your product (even if you only supply binaries), which potentially gives your customers the right to sell or give away your product.

The BSD license says
Quote:Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met:

My question is : "redistribution and use of what?"

The BSD license doesn't make it clear that what is meant is
Redistribution and use of the source codein source and binary forms ...

Also, I would like to see clarification of whether you can distribute U++ derived source code along with your own source code, with your own non-BSD license applying to your own non-U++-derived source code (even though it #includes U++ headers) - meaning that you can distribute all your source code without making your product worthless.

With BSD license, if all you distribute is binaries, you still have to include the license in about box or something - why is that ??? If the license applies to source code only then what is the point of including a license saying "permission is granted to redistribute ..." when you haven't given them any source code to redistribute. The "about box" should only have to include the copyright part and disclaimer, not the list of permissions.

BSD license is murky.
http://www.groklaw.net/article.php?story=20070114093427179

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 18:17:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, sure, when someone want to choose a good license it becomes a mess.

BSD, MS, GNU. They all have good lawyers.

I voted for BSD but if I could, I would choose now "public domain" as Luzr was proposing in another thread. SQLite is the most widely deployed SQL database engine in the world. It is used in countless desktop computer applications as well as consumer electronic devices including cellphones, PDAs, and MP3 players. The source code for SQLite is in the public domain.

- If someone release a modified version in the "public domain", U++ team can get it and merge the good change.

- If someone release it as proprietary software, well, as long as www.ultimatepp.org exist, I don't see why U++ team can't produce better code and completely open. FOSS is now so wide. You can't get a proprietary version without knowing about the open source one somewhere else.

- If a company want to use it, they can tell in their about menu that they use it and can release the modified source as "public domain" without any implication on their software and license.

This is the real meaning of free as in freedom. "Do whatever you want".

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 19:28:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Minor problem with Public Domain: GoogleCode does not allow it.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 19:38:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think since we started down this path, we should at least get to the point where we can say: "yes, by using FOSS/GNU compatible license X we get Y distribution rights for U++ and complete freedom to distribute software built with U++ under any license".

We shouldn't give up only because we can't figure out so stupid licenses! Let's mail Linus !

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 21:57:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 21:28Minor problem with Public Domain: GoogleCode does not allow it.

Mirek

There is a solution. You can still select the license you want without relying on GoogleCode snv mirror.

Creating a read-only mirror of your SVN repository with SVK and sync it to sourceforge.net:

http://www.howtoforge.com/read_only_svn_mirror_with_svk

Another article, "Synchronizing SVN Repositories With Svk":

http://wiki.developer.mindtouch.com/User:PeteE/Synchronizing _SVN_Repositories_With_Svk

And last but not least, an on-line versions of the snk book:

http://svkbook.elixus.org/

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 23:12:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well I didn't want to put anyone off BSD, I just wanted to be sure the implications are understood. BSD suited Berkeley coz they don't care what happens downstream very much.

What is the benefit of having a GNU or OSI approved license?

You could also try making BSD a bit clearer without a long list of definitions of what "software" means and what "retain" means etc - then submit to OSI.

Also, I'd really like to know how BSD can be OSI approved when it doesn't require distribution/ availability of source code.
http://www.opensource.org/licenses
I think I must be missing something.

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 09:16:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Thu, 21 August 2008 01:12...
Also, I'd really like to know how BSD can be OSI approved when it doesn't require distribution/ availability of source code.
http://www.opensource.org/licenses
I think I must be missing something.

His conclusion about the BSD license is not the conclusion of MS+GNU+OSI+Apple lawyers.

OSI is not the Free Software Fondation. As long as you release the source and permit modification+sell+redistribution, they don't care if the receiver release the new package as proprietary software. They accept license that are proprietary software friendly like BSD. FSF doesn't (or just with the LGPL but LGPL license protect the original source from been closed).

Quote:
What is the benefit of having a GNU or OSI approved license?

GNU + OSI + Proprietary software friendly => Your market can't be bigger. Your audience is the entire software market.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 10:41:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote
Quote:His conclusion about the BSD license is not the conclusion of MS+GNU+OSI+Apple lawyers.

His? Who is "his"?

As usual, I can't understand a word you say amrein!

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by captainc on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 12:50:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:What is the benefit of having a GNU or OSI approved license?

Advocacy and recognition, applying for grants given to free software projects, Google SOC and others like it, free versions of open source based enterprise software (Ie. Collaboration software like launchpad and others), other free services given to open source efforts (Ie. Coverity), participation in Open Source conferences, eligibility for Open Source awards (cash or recognition)...

Many benefits, just have to keep an eye open to them.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by captainc on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 14:29:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just took a look at the Common Public License (CPL) and I like it too.
http://opensource.org/licenses/cpl1.0.php

I also like the Common Development and Distribution License (CDDL)
http://opensource.org/licenses/cddl1.php

I like them because they cover things like patenting, where it disallows patenting original works.
From CDDL:
Quote:
2.1. The Initial Developer Grant.
...
(d) Notwithstanding Section 2.1(b)
above, no patent license is granted: (1) for code
that You delete from the Original Software, or
(2) for infringements caused by: (i) the
modification of the Original Software, or (ii) the
combination of the Original Software with other software
or devices.

3.1. Availability of Source Code.
Any Covered Software that You distribute or otherwise
make available in Executable form must also be made
available in Source Code form and that Source Code form
must be distributed only under the terms of this License.
You must include a copy of this License with every copy of
the Source Code form of the Covered Software You
distribute or otherwise make available. You must inform
recipients of any such Covered Software in Executable form
as to how they can obtain such Covered Software in Source
Code form in a reasonable manner on or through a medium
customarily used for software exchange.

3.5. Distribution of Executable Versions.
You may distribute the Executable form of the Covered
Software under the terms of this License or under the
terms of a license of Your choice, which may contain terms
different from this License, provided that You are in
compliance with the terms of this License and that the
license for the Executable form does not attempt to limit
or alter the recipients rights in the Source Code
form from the rights set forth in this License. If You
distribute the Covered Software in Executable form under a
different license, You must make it absolutely clear that
any terms which differ from this License are offered by
You alone, not by the Initial Developer or Contributor.
You hereby agree to indemnify the Initial Developer and
every Contributor for any liability incurred by the
Initial Developer or such Contributor as a result of any
such terms You offer.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by cbpporter on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 14:55:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Isn't there a license that considers using a library with static or dynamic linking and distributing a software that uses it as not redistributing the given library, or as redistributing a public binary which does not imply any restrictions as long as that public binary has not been altered?

So that I can distribute my software under a license that demands, for example the soul of my users, but which says: "This software uses U++. Here is it's license. You can obtain it from ... and do with it whatever it's license allows you to".

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 15:14:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

IMO, before going for exotic options, one of reasons to fix the license is to choose something well known.

IMO, there are 3 most widely known and used licenses: BSD, GPL and LGPL.

BSD got most votes in this poll, we already claim that we are BSD licensed (and we are with different wording), so the most straightforward fix to me appears to be copying "official" BSD over current license files.

Otherwise, more we digg into this issue, more nonsense we produce. Let us do it and move on...

Mirek

P.S.: That said, I voted for MIT. But I respect the majority and BSD really makes the best sense.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 15:23:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Thu, 21 August 2008 12:41amrein wrote
Quote:His conclusion about the BSD license is not the conclusion of MS+GNU+OSI+Apple lawyers.

His? Who is "his"?

As usual, I can't understand a word you say amrein!

Graeme

The one who wrote:
http://www.groklaw.net/article.php?story=20070114093427179

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 02:59:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:P.S.: That said, I voted for MIT. But I respect the majority and BSD really makes the best sense.

Well it's not a majority any more coz I hadn't voted, and now I've voted for "don't know". Also amrein says he rescinds BSD vote.

If it makes the best sense, how come I didn't get a sensible answer from you or anyone else on all the questions I asked in this thread?

Anyway it's your software so you should do what you want but do you think everyone who voted BSD realises they have to include a license with their executable which says - "redistribution in source and binary forms is permitted ...".

If you don't think this is an issue then why does the existing U++ license say "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."

Graeme

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 06:19:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Thu, 21 August 2008 22:59Quote:P.S.: That said, I voted for MIT. But I respect the majority and BSD really makes the best sense.

Well it's not a majority any more coz I hadn't voted, and now I've voted for "don't know". Also amrein says he rescinds BSD vote.

We cannot have "I don't know" license. Means BSD still has the majority of voices:)

Quote:
If it makes the best sense, how come I didn't get a sensible answer from you or anyone else on all the questions I asked in this thread?

Because I guess nobody really cares. I do not think the logic in wording is that much important, this is not code but lawyer's stuff.

IMO much more important is how BSD is commonly interpreted.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 11:11:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:IMO much more important is how BSD is commonly interpreted

ok, well it's universally accepted that "new BSD" license is permissive and "ok" for proprietary software.

Since you will be the owner of any such "new U++" license, can you answer these questions?

If I sell an executable (but no source code) built partly from U++ source, I have to include the "new U++" license somewhere in the documentation. Can I also include an EULA that says whatever I like (e.g. this software can be used on one computer only), and if it can't say anything I like, what restrictions are there on what the EULA can say?

If I develop some source code that is NOT derived from U++ source (but might include U++ headers), can I distribute/sell this source (along with U++ source), but prevent anyone else from selling/distributing my source?

Can you explain what the BSD-related re-licensing issue on this page is (approx the 7th question) and whether it's relevant to U++?
https://osi.osuosl.org/wiki/help/license

Can you explain why the OSI link is https and not http?

Graeme

<here's a copy of the faq question from the OSI page>

Q: Can I always "relicense" BSD licensed-software under a new license?

If you define relicensing as "sublicensing, possibly under additional terms and conditions which do not contradict the terms and conditions of an original licensor's permissive license", then the answer is generally "yes" -- provided you also retain the original copyright information. However, strictly speaking, you can only modify the license of a "derivative work", and opinions differ on how much change is required to qualify as a derivative work. The MIT license and Academic Free License, for example, freely allow "trivial" sublicensing (without any other changes) as long as the copyright is preserved. Conversely, the Apache 2.0 license only allows sublicensing for "Derivative Works", which it defines as "original works of authorship" -- meaning non-trivial additions. The new BSD license, unfortunately, is silent on this point. If you are planning to "trivially relicense" BSD software, you are encouraged to first check with the copyright holder and/or your own legal counsel.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 11:30:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gprentice wrote on Fri, 22 August 2008 07:11

If I sell an executable (but no source code) built partly from U++ source, I have to include the "new U++" license somewhere in the documentation. Can I also include an EULA that says whatever I like (e.g. this software can be used on one computer only)?

Yes. (answering as U++ coauthor).

Quote:
If I develop some source code that is NOT derived from U++ source (but might include U++ headers), can I distribute/sell this source (along with U++ source), but prevent anyone else from selling/distributing my source?

Yes.

Quote:
Can you explain what the BSD-related re-licensing issue on this page is (approx the 7th question) and whether it's relevant to U++?
https://osi.osuosl.org/wiki/help/license

No.

Quote:
Can you explain why the OSI link is https and not http?

So that you can be sure you are really on OSI page.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by gprentice on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 11:52:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ok, thanks.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by bytefield on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 06:19:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I know that Upp license is a solved issue but i want to know what others think about Boost license.
For me it seems almost similar with BSD license...
The part which i don't understand is that:
Quote:... and to permit third-parties to whom the Software is furnished to do so, ...
that means that my executable and future derivations from that software to be covered by Boost license? Someone please enlighten me.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 13:40:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

bytefield wrote on Wed, 27 August 2008 08:19
I know that Upp license is a solved issue but i want to know what others think about Boost license.
For me it seems almost similar with BSD license...
The part which i don't understand is that:
Quote:... and to permit third-parties to whom the Software is furnished to do so, ...
that means that my executable and future derivations from that software to be covered by Boost license? Someone please enlighten me.

Yes apparently.

For me, Boost license = Do whatever you want but keep the license in all distributed source code (modified or not or derivative). If you release source code (modified or not or derivative), receiver must have the same right on it as we grant you, and you must keep the same license. If you release only binary, there is no need to display this license.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by bytefield on Thu, 28 Aug 2008 13:16:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ok, thanks for explanation

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 12:30:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I made bigs mistakes in previous posts... (thanks to my friend who takes the time to corrected me)

The "New BSD license" gives you the same right as the "U++ BSD like license" because of IP law. The "New BSD license" just adds the need to tell if the original software has been modified.

My mistakes:

- You can't modify copyright if the authors doesn't give you the right to do so.

- The license apply to any parts of the software, source or binary (all parts identified as been covered by the license).

- Any part of the software, binary or source, modified or not, are copy of the software and are still covered by the license.

- Any modified part of the software, binary or source, are still covered by the license but you have a right on those modifications.

So, BSD license tells you: do whatever you want, any part or the software (binary or source, modified or not) are still covered by this license. If you use any parts of this software you must acknowledge the use of this software and display the original license (meaning, show that you include software using this license). Your own parts of the final software can use the license you want (commercial, FOSS, ...) as long as they don't conflict with the BSD license.

So, if you use "New BSD licensed" software:

- You can release commercial software or FOSS.

- You must acknowledge about using this software and show its original license (the copyright is included in the license). Your acknowledgement must be included with the software distributed and can be wherever you want (in doc, "About", ...). Could be: "This software use U++ which has the following license...".

- If you modify the original software, you must add that it has been modified in your

acknowledgement. Could be: "This software use a modified version of U++. The original U++ software has the following license...".

- If you release source, any modified part of the original software must be clearly identifiable.

- If you release source, any part added to the original software (part with your own copyright and license) must be clearly identifiable.

- Any modified part of the software is still under the same original license (copyright+license). Those modifications can't use anything else then this original license. However, you don't give your right on those modifications. (Note: you can't add your name into the original copyright of the BSD licensed software but you have rights on those modifications).

- If you release source, the original copyright holders can merge the modifications back into the original source without your permission because the license permit it. But, whatever the original copyright holders do, they can't change the BSD license of your contribution if you don't agree.

Conclusion:

Note 1: U++ original copyright holders needs to find the modified parts themselves if they want to include them back. If not, they can be sued if they change the license or the copyright in the future. U++ should really adopt the "New BSD license".

Note 2: With U++ "Copyright (C) 2008 Mirek Fidler, Tomas Rylek and various contributors (see AUTHORS)", you can't modify the original copyright nor the external file named "AUTHORS". The only ones that can add or remove lines in the files "AUTHORS" are the authors and only if they all agree. To ease external contribution or been able to commit modifications from external source code easily, the authors list shouldn't be modified.

Note 3: Their are several "AUTHORS" files in U++. Each of them contain Mirek or Tomas, or sometimes both. They should be removed. The "(see AUTHORS)" statement should too. Anyone in "AUTHORS" have control over copyright of his contributions. No one can change the license or the copyright if all copyright holders don't agree. "AUTHORS" file is not accurate. A "CONTRIBUTORS" file could be added instead, just for information, and no need to include "CONTRIBUTORS" or "AUTHORS" into the license statement. This creates conflict with external submissions. If you want to know who has made contributions, just use svn repo. If your are not the authors and commit a patch from an external contributor, add his name into the "svn commit" comment. That way, you will know who, where, when and won't have issue with merging external modifications because of different "AUTHORS" listing. Different "AUTHORS" listings = different licenses.

Note 4: Google code doesn't give you choice: your software must use "New BSD" and not BSD like. If you don't want to, you can't be hosted there. Read the the google code hosting doc.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 16:46:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote on Wed, 24 September 2008 08:30
Conclusion:

Note 1: U++ original copyright holders needs to find the modified parts themselves if they want to include them back. If not, they can be sued if they change the license or the copyright in the future. U++ should really adopt the "New BSD license".

Note 2: With U++ "Copyright (C) 2008 Mirek Fidler, Tomas Rylek and various contributors (see AUTHORS)", you can't modify the original copyright nor the external file named "AUTHORS". The only ones that can add or remove lines in the files "AUTHORS" are the authors and only if they all agree. To ease external contribution or been able to commit modifications from external source code easily, the authors list shouldn't be modified.

Note 3: Their are several "AUTHORS" files in U++. Each of them contain Mirek or Tomas, or sometimes both. They should be removed. The "(see AUTHORS)" statement should too. Anyone in "AUTHORS" have control over copyright of his contributions. No one can change the license or the copyright if all copyright holders don't agree. "AUTHORS" file is not accurate. A "CONTRIBUTORS" file could be added instead, just for information, and no need to include "CONTRIBUTORS" or "AUTHORS" into the license statement. This creates conflict with external submissions. If you want to know who has made contributions, just use svn repo. If your are not the authors and commit a patch from an external contributor, add his name into the "svn commit" comment. That way, you will know who, where, when and won't have issue with merging external modifications because of different "AUTHORS" listing. Different "AUTHORS" listings = different licenses.

Note 4: Google code doesn't give you choice: your software must use "New BSD" and not BSD like. If you don't want to, you can't be hosted there. Read the the google code hosting doc.

The license was changed to "new BSD 2 clause" on Sep 13, svn revision 436. In the process, "Authors" and "Copying-plain" files were removed.

It is of course possible I have missed something, please check.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 21:08:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I used http://www.ultimatepp.org/appideAbout$en-us.html :/

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 21:37:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, this one I definitely missed

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 22:10:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Too fast. I was editing my answer. There are more. I wanted to do a complete search job to find all of them.

svn up
At revision 481.

md5sum $(find svn/trunk/ -iname Authors) | sort
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppbox/CppBase2/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppbox/uppweb/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppbox/Uvs2/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppbox/WinInstaller2/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppbox/WinInstaller/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppdev/CoreTopics/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppdev/MySql/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppdev/TTFChars/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppdev/VectorDesA/AUTHORS
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/AnalyzeMap/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/CbGen/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crash/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crypto/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Docedit/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/docpp/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/DocTypes/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Coords/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Ctrl/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Draw/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/PaintGL/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/rw/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCommander/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCtrl/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCore/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCtrlLib/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/TDraw/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/TSql/Authors

a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Updater/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/VectorDes/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/ctrl/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/SSL/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/TServ/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/weblink/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/wisapi/Authors
a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f svn/trunk/uppsrc/x86disas/Authors
bfc24fbc6cbc5eda46d373c0f9702c8f svn/trunk/uppdev/agg_aris_main/authors
bfc24fbc6cbc5eda46d373c0f9702c8f svn/trunk/uppdev/plugin/agg24/authors
c59ceed82ad766de6a1d79f940352945 svn/trunk/uppdev/ezcomm/AUTHORS
c59ceed82ad766de6a1d79f940352945 svn/trunk/uppdev/ezcommon/AUTHORS
d3f2b4bd516c149b76b5e54a3465e81a svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uar/Authors
d3f2b4bd516c149b76b5e54a3465e81a svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uld/Authors
d41d8cd98f00b204e9800998ecf8427e svn/trunk/uppdev/trayicon/AUTHORS
d41d8cd98f00b204e9800998ecf8427e svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Browser/AUTHORS
d894445a3bf610c66e649aadbf43691f svn/trunk/uppsrc/plugin/ndisasm/lib/Authors

"a362751e136e800463efff2a97ee968f" -- Copyright Mirek and Tomas
"d3f2b4bd516c149b76b5e54a3465e81a" -- Copyright Tomas
"d41d8cd98f00b204e9800998ecf8427e" -- Empty files with zero size
"bfc24fbc6cbc5eda46d373c0f9702c8f" -- Anti-Grain Geometry
"c59ceed82ad766de6a1d79f940352945" -- ezproject
"d894445a3bf610c66e649aadbf43691f" -- NASM project

Of course, some of them shouldn't be removed.

md5sum $(find svn/trunk/ -iname Copying) | sort
393a5ca445f6965873eca0259a17f833 svn/trunk/uppdev/ezcomm/COPYING
393a5ca445f6965873eca0259a17f833 svn/trunk/uppdev/ezcommon/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppbox/CppBase2/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppbox/uppweb/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppbox/Uvs2/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppbox/WinInstaller2/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppbox/WinInstaller/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppdev/CoreTopics/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppdev/MySql/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppdev/TTFChars/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppdev/VectorDesA/COPYING
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/AnalyzeMap/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CbGen/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uar/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uld/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crash/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crypto/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Docedit/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/docpp/Copying

46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/DocTypes/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Coords/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Ctrl/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Draw/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/PaintGL/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/rw/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCommander/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCtrl/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCore/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCtrlLib/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TDraw/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TSql/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Updater/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/VectorDes/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/ctrl/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/SSL/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/TServ/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/weblink/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/wisapi/Copying
46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6 svn/trunk/uppsrc/x86disas/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/art/BlueBar/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CodeEditor/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/binobj/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Core/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CppBase/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CtrlCore/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CtrlLib/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Draw/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Esc/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/GridCtrl/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/HexView/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/IconDes/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Browser/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Builders/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Common/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/Debuggers/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/IconDes/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/LayDes/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/ide/QuickTabs/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/MySql/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Ole/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/OleDB/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Oracle/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/PdfDraw/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/plugin/bmp/Copying

a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/plugin/gif/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/plugin/png/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/PostgreSQL/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/RichEdit/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/RichText/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Sql/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/usvn/Copying
a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/Copying
b0717d0dfa1369ef37aeca8f95384896 svn/trunk/bazaar/UnitTest++/COPYING
b0717d0dfa1369ef37aeca8f95384896 svn/trunk/bazaar/UnitTestTest/COPYING
d931372ce89ff33392dbf8dc89aa8409 svn/trunk/uppsrc/plugin/ndisasm/lib/Copying
ef716cbd7e92828beeacda67d82a0bb1 svn/trunk/uppdev/agg_aris_main/copying
ef716cbd7e92828beeacda67d82a0bb1 svn/trunk/uppdev/plugin/agg24/copying

"46913aca2c10edd7d835cb994926f8e6" -- the old U++ BSD like license.
"a2dc361508860f17be73ebc53184d304" -- the New BSD license.
"393a5ca445f6965873eca0259a17f833" -- the GPL license
"d931372ce89ff33392dbf8dc89aa8409" -- the LGPL license
"b0717d0dfa1369ef37aeca8f95384896" -- the "Noel Llopis and Charles Nicholson" license
"ef716cbd7e92828beeacda67d82a0bb1" -- the "Noel Maxim Shemanarev" license

md5sum $(find svn/trunk/ -name Copying-plain)
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppdev/TTFChars/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppdev/CoreTopics/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TDraw/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCtrl/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/SqlCommander/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/VectorDes/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Updater/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Docedit/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/rw/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uld/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/coff/uar/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crypto/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Coords/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Draw/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Ctrl/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Geom/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/DocTypes/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/PaintGL/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Crash/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/AnalyzeMap/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/CbGen/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCtrlLib/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TSql/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/docpp/Copying-plain

8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/x86disas/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/TCore/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/weblink/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/wisapi/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/SSL/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/TServ/Copying-plain
8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194 svn/trunk/uppsrc/Web/ctrl/Copying-plain

"8ed55dee2108cc0e38d22b75d66d1194" is the old Copying-plain file

---

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Thu, 25 Sep 2008 08:48:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm now checking out a clean svn repo to be sure...

Well. No errors. Those files are still there.

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by amrein on Fri, 26 Sep 2008 19:11:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No answer so far. Did you read those last messages ?

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Sun, 28 Sep 2008 18:16:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I was out. On ToDo list. Will happen soon.

Mirek

Subject: Re: What license Ultimate++ should use? Tell us!!!
Posted by mirek on Thu, 02 Oct 2008 10:27:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Should be now fixed....

Mirek
