
Subject: Re: Working on new installer / makeinstall...

Posted by [Rishi](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2010 13:03:13 GMT

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

Can we make U++ GPL incompatible (for direct modification)? We don't need advertising clause--Future GPL may support Adv. clauses.

GPL will ruin our plans.

All we have to do is publicly saying that derivatives can't be GPL but you can link GPL apps into it.

We don't have to allow one-way road--Better to close it.

We are allowing GPL, but GPL doesn't allow code to be put on looser licenses. That is the only fault we did. The GPL will end Proprietary and everything - It also ends Open Spirit. If MS die, can you expect a better 'Linux/UNIX'?

They have been the best competitors. But one thing I can Say is -- If your project is taken over by LGPL by someone, The project will go w/o traces (like X11 and Xlib)::(:.

Can you imagine a world w/o proprietary?

People are becoming selfish.

We have to put the copy-left world to end -- in which everyone is selfish and jealous About others.

We don't need the 'advertising clause' for it -- later GPL and LGPL may allow advertising clause:(.

We have to publicly say that we don't allow copy-left direct modification in the license.

Quote:

Real Freedom is Worth much more than ~\$300 million

Consider the value of the Apache HTTPD server. If you developed a method to quantify the economic impact of a given technology, Apache HTTPD would probably rank as the most economically significant open source product to date (other than sendmail or bind). Although

figure in the hundreds of billions possibly more. This figure would not only factor in the value of the technology itself, but the value of the commercial ecosystem built atop it - services and products. Chances are high that the majority of people reading this blog entry have in some form or another profited from the work of the HTTPD server project. The key difference between the economic impact of a product like HTTPD and the economic impact of a product like JBoss is that the

from IBM than a GPL-licensed project owned by Red Hat. Even if IBM is going to take my effort

Apache licensed project, there is a level playing field, there is an open ecosystem. Geronimo can welcome the participation of individuals and corporations like Virtuas alike, they all have equal right to benefit from the intellectual property developed - there are no second class citizens. I (or you) could take the Maven or Geronimo codebase tomorrow, customize it and sell it to some corporation for thousands of dollars without distributing source of my customizations - the FSF

sees that as a bad thing, I see it as encouraging participation and allowing people to create a

What causes the most damage? When a community is mediated by a single corporate commercial entity, you fail to attract those with casual, but valuable interest, and you end up creating a top-down corporate structure. Open communities like the Apache Software Foundation serve as a sort of neutral referee, they can more easily scale to meet market demand and keep up with the pace of innovation. This is not to say that open source foundations are perfect, the Apache Software Foundation itself tends to get bogged down in the governance process, but at

PMC. In my view, the ASF exists to encourage open communities, and, IMO, the license is central to that effort.

Imagine if there was a single company in 1996 that funded HTTPD development and licensed it

corporate and individual participation it has seen over the last ten years. A company like IBM probably would have balked at extending and enhancing such a system knowing that such altruism was simply subsidizing the operations of the controlling corporate organization. You

company controls the community, you also tend to expect them to take care of the documentation.

entity, I know what would have happened to that corporation in early 1997, They would have been purchased by Microsoft, and this would have affected the Linux adoption curve as well. If Apache

environment. Microsoft would have not only had a monopoly on the browser, they would have had a monopoly on the server-side as well. Java would have been dead on arrival. Technologies like

a lot more for software, and Microsoft would have brought httpd development to a close.

All of these GPL plays will fall off the radar one by one, InnoDB purchased by Oracle. MySQL will eventually be acquired, etc. These companies are buying these products because they want to be the original copyright owner and they want to eventually dual-license, extend and sell commercial

Source

Some people are shy to say that they disallow copy-left and they put alternative barriers to copy-left. (Apache, BSD). We can't trust GPL-- Some day it will allow the 'Alternative methods' mentioned
