If you have to take a programming course to change a program then the price to change is not free, for some it may be impossible, and therefore this is a kind of restriction

Additionally, even if you can program, some projects are so complex as to be very difficult to even compile, let alone make modifications to at a source-level

Software that its users can't change without having to know code is not "free"

FSF is concerned with practicality, and not just moral theory

If you have to take a course, or hire a team to modify a program, then you might just as well create a new program. What does that say about the software's configurability?

Open + free as in freedom is not enough, it has to be accessible

The software problem

"Freer" software

"Configurable software"

Software should not require a config file, or special, custom UI to change each program

Configuration should be built into software from the ground up!

merely be open source, you have to enforce that changes to that source cannot be distributed closed. This is keeping with the spirit of empowering the end-user.

FSF (re GPL) says: it's not enough to

This includes logical decision making and processes: button click events, interpretation of commands, timers, state transformations, etc.

You need a way to build, and a way to make changes

This includes constants (numbers, strings) for e.g. ports, ips, names, percentages, rates, times, etc.

This includes visual layout, in a terminal or GUI setting, whether to include or not include buttons, sort order, text, colors, sizes, arity, etc.

You should be able to choose to accept or ignore, or modify, incoming changes to the software, without compromising its function or hosing it An interactive means of seeing "mock" state happen in reaction to your changes would be invaluable

New releases of software should be diffs, not complete replacements, of your software.