

# Assignment 3

The BSD 3-clause license would be my choice if I were to release software into the public domain since it would grant nearly limitless flexibility with the program as long as the BSD copyright notice and the license's warranty disclaimers are upheld. The BSD 3-clause license permits redistribution and usage in source and binary versions, with or without modification, as long as the copyright notice, disclaimer, and other terms are preserved in source code redistribution. The third requirement is that the copyright notice, the list of requirements, and the disclaimer must be reproduced in the documentation and/or additional materials given with the distribution if the software is transferred in binary form. The last condition is that without explicit prior written consent, neither the name of the copyright holder nor the names of its contributors may be used to support or promote goods developed from the program. This license shields me from being held accountable for any and all damages, regardless of how they were brought about or what theory of responsibility was used to bring about the damages, including tort, strict liability, or contract claims, and even if I was informed of the likelihood of such losses. It would protect my privacy and I will not be missing out on profits if someone would want to use my name to support or promote programs developed from the program. It would protect me very well too. Therefore, it makes a lot of sense to use it.

Similar to the BSD 3-clause license is the BSD 2-clause license. The non-endorsement rule, which states that the name of the copyright holder and the names of its contributors may not be used to endorse or publicize goods developed from the program without explicit prior written consent, is where they diverge. The usage of this license could result in the loss of potential revenue because the names of the contributors and the copyright holder could be used to support or advertise derivative items. This is why I'm not going with the BSD 2-clause license.

The copyright notice, license text, or disclaimer are not required to be present in either the source code or the binary form under the BSD 0-clause license. In other words, our labor would not be acknowledged. Consequently, I wouldn't select this license.

The original software's commercialization is to be restrained by the MIT FPA License, but personal and educational rights are still protected. In educational and private environments, the program may be used, copied, modified, merged, published, and/or distributed. Every copy of the software or a significant portion of it must have the copyright notice. Under the terms of this license, the Software may be sold and/or distributed for commercial purposes if substantial changes are made, such as the addition, deletion, or modification of significant portions (but not the rearranging of the software's logic). Therefore, I would not be picking this license. Although this is a very good license to ensure that the software would not be replicated and sold for profit, it would not guarantee the lack of liability as much as the BSD 3-clause license. Therefore, I would not be picking it.

When using the MIT X11 license, the copyright notice and permission notice must be included in all copies of the software or substantial portions of it. The X11 license allows anyone who has a copy of the software and the related documentation files to deal in the software without restriction. It also allows the people who receive the software to do so. Without X Consortium's prior written consent, you are not permitted to utilize "X Consortium" for any type of Software marketing, including usage, sale, or usage-related promotions. The license shields X Consortium

from responsibility for any claim, loss, or other liability resulting from, out of, or in connection with the program or the use of, or other transactions in, the software, whether in a contract, tort, or other legal action. Overall, I'd say this is a fantastic license; however, since it permits merging, publishing, sublicensing, and selling of the software, I wouldn't use it.

The MIT No Attribution License permits anybody who owns a copy of the program to use, copy, modify, merge, publish, distribute, sublicense, and/or sell copies of the software without any restrictions or limitations. I would strongly oppose utilizing this license due to the absence of credit, much as the BSD 0-clause license.

Anyone getting a copy of a work with a GPL applied to it must be provided with the terms and conditions of the GNU GPL. Any licensee who complies with the terms and conditions is allowed to alter, copy, and distribute the work or any derivative version. The licensee is permitted to provide this service for free or for a fee. According to the GPL, a distributor is not allowed to put "new limits on the rights provided under the GPL." The distribution of the software under a non-disclosure agreement or contract is one example of a prohibited action. Programs that are distributed as pre-compiled binaries must also be accompanied by a copy of the source code, a written offer to distribute the source code through the same mechanism as the pre-compiled binary, or a written offer to obtain the source code that the user received when they purchased the pre-compiled binary under the GPL. All receivers must be provided a copy of the GPL license together with the Program, which is a necessity. Unless an author specifically grants the FSF copyrights, the FSF does not possess the copyrights for a work distributed under the GPL. Copyleft is then used to make sure that end users still have the freedoms outlined above. For sales or distribution, the whole source code must be made accessible to end users, including any code changes and additions. The software code, however, can be altered and sections reused for solely personal use without the need to provide the source code. I would not be choosing this license because it gives those who will use the software and adhere to the terms and conditions permission to modify, copy, and redistribute the work or any derivative version for a fee or for free. This could result in reduced profits.