

The open source initiative has approved over 60 softwares as per the OSI. Around 122 licenses, they are not being used a lot but there are present.

Some licenses are linked to trademarks and corporations. e.g. PHP license, and Python license. EU public license as well. We must understand and take into account the license incompatibility issues. Some are not compatible. Due to a subtle legal issue

This incompatibility also increases the cost of the expansion etc. We need to understand the way to distribute it as well. This is also called the proliferation issue of the free software licenses. Free software started as a digital collective ownership of software that can be re-used, within the framework of copyrights, but if we start creating a huge number of licenses, we lose one of the major advantages for having that part of the reusable software. So Max said we should dig deep into these software licenses.

Some projects are using 2 licenses mainly like the GPL v3 and the Apache licenses and they are compatible as well. There is no incompatibility issue between but there may be between others. Classifications:

Copy left and non copyleft licenses. Some examples are the MIT license for copyleft definition eg. Sometimes if making a protocol, then write/use it with a non-copyleft license. Check which to use to make a proprietary software.

Weak copyleft allows the linking to use a library so it is not considered a breach. Strong copyleft does not permit the code re-use in a non copyleft process. GPL & Affero GPL are strong copyleft and are not meant for the final users. For e.g. network service, WordPress which is a framework for website and when we use that but the software will be used on the server side. Even if we modify it on the server, we don't have to distribute again since it is all on the company server. Users of the WordPress will always be using the modified source code of the servers so many projects in this field use the Affero GPL. This Affero requires that if you deploy a modified version for the users, then you need to provide users the source code of the original modified version of the programs. That is a way of creating an obligation on who is using the framework for deployed services to give back to the community.

It is even stronger for the GPL principle, now you are not distributing it just using it. So use of the software is not restricted. Affero requires that further step so any modified DEPLOYED version must be available in source code for the use of that app.

Weak copyleft licenses, like if we change a library apply copyleft, if only using the library, no need to abide with the GPL. Mozilla public license became the open sourcing of the Netscape browser at the end of the 90's. It required the creation of the Mozilla foundation. Even though Mozilla might have been using the dual licensing schemes. Mozilla went on to become Firefox. They lost the market share it used to have.

Non copyleft licenses → permissive free software licenses, so check the MIT as non copyleft licenses.

If there is a need to use the non free software that can be done with the other licenses.

The configurable licenses are the Creative Commons licenses. After trying to fight against the 1998 copyright act, that extended the duration of copyright to 25 years, the famous Mickey Mouse act as well.

The 0 level allows all reuse etc. combines the 0 with the authorship of the original author as well.

Understand the authorship but also use the same license to distribute the derivative works. Further redistribution or the derivative must be done with the same license share etc alike. Moreover, creative common added another layer, which is the non commercial one.

The non commercial will prohibit the use of the intellectual work in commercial environments to generate profits. There are other clauses as well like ND which means non derivative works are allowed. So as we see by adopting and combining the since normal CC does not restrict the use. I am not enforcing my copyright but it is my copyright. It is a flexible approach not just in programs, but also other creative domains and environments. A lot of music is released with creative commons so can use in commercial as well even in yt monetizable videos. With these clauses/rules we can create any known proprietary license. This is something one may take into account.

So if we see on the wikipedia the text of wikipedia is available as the creative commons on. Yes derivative works, and commercial use yes, but if u want to modify the text, then share like a creative commons on the wiki as well. Lot of good data taken from wikipedia lol thanks to licenses. There is a brilliant mind behind the creative commons, lorence hezig is name, legally speaking, it is amazing to have these copyrights.

BSD & apache

The original version of the BSD was pasted . Can get myself as well. Original bsd license. The advertising must mention use of the copyright holder became a strong requirement. The advert clause (must make mention etc of the original etc) was removed in 1999, now the bsd license has just the top 3 clauses.

Apache license was derived from bsd, but they also needed to remove the advertising clause.

The apache web server gaining success, and the developers created the apache software foundation and created the apache license 1 , originally based on the bsd is. Then later they adopted a new version 2 to improve compatibility with the Gpl. Now compatible with the gpl version 3. There are differences in gpl version 2 vs version 3, why we need all that legal terminology. That makes it more difficult for more lawyers to understand. The judge will not be intimidated with a license terms etc it is not true. Also gpl was enforceable with using the legal terminology. A coder should be able to read them that is what gpl version 2 was intended for.

There are also some important additions,

- the compatibility layer with the apache 2 license, provided in gplv3 section 10,
- the other is the privatization

so the Sony Corp of America vs Universal Studios Inc. there was a litigation at the end decided by supreme court, what is said was , that technology may be used for infringement but it can also be used for the legit activities like time shifting lol u can watch the recorded at the later time as well etc so tech may have dual uses, but it also has legal issues so we cant prohibit.

The wipo copyright treaty of 1996, article 12 and 11, protect technological measures. 11 is important as it states that an effective tech measure is if used to restrict acts that are not authorized, then then I shall circumvent the technological measures as well and provide legal remedies to fix. If one tries to break the law using some tech and breach , it will become liability. e.g camera used to record different things etc, so try to prevent misuse is a must. The american law got converted into the eu law as the digital millennial copyright act eliminated the final requirement that states that the technological measures in order to be protected, must restrict acts which are not authorized or

not permitted. If we remove that req, every effective measure (regardless of what types of acts). If I can buy a software, I can resell it as well. If I have some tech measures, and I don't have the physical copy, which will prevent me from uninstalling and giving the source code to someone else, that is permitted by law. If the technological measures make it impossible, it should not be protected by the law. If one tries to circumvent the intended use, it can become illegal or a liability.

GPL version 3

so if u write code that implements a technological measures within the meaning of article 11 as per the wipo treaty and as a gpl version 3 as well, u are stating that the tech measure is not protected by the law. The basic working is simple. When u use, gpl v3, the software covered is not technological measures, and if someone circumvents it, you are not allowed to sue the person who misused your software.

There are technological inside the iphone kernel on the gpl version 2 , the linux didn't switch to v3 since the circumventing will be allowed thanks to gpl version 3 without any legal consequence. The anti circumvention clause took a long discussion.