I certify that this submission is my
Original work and meets the Faculty's
Expectations of Originality

Christopher McArthur
40004257
ENCS 393 AA
June 11th, 2018

Credit Versus Protection

One of the most powerful features of the internet is the freedom of information. Crossing national boundary means there is no ownership of sovereignty and thus no application of laws govern the internet. Suddenly this great feature becomes a great weapon. For the twentieth century, the copy wright system existed to protect the creator of any material and make sure they received recognition for their work and could also be paid for their efforts. In today technological western society where everyone has the internet in their pocket, it has become incredibly difficult to protect the work of any individual because it can be shared with the world without their permission. This is a particularly hot subject amongst software developers within the open source community between using *creative commons* and open-source licenses, but we can not forget the infamous no-license. For the cultural space and technical details, the open-source license, specifically the MIT license, does the best for addressing licensing of software. Open source licenses provide the credit but still allows for the sharing of new ideas, which is at the heart of computer technologies, and the ability to build upon what others have done. Many software projects are vast, required several areas of expertise and would take too long for any individual to complete in a reasonable time frame.

The computer technologies industry and software development in particular have a unique principal. At its core, we find the idea of sharing what we have done in order to allow other to build upon that in order to advance the field as a whole. This is in stark contrast with other creative industries such as arts or literature; works produces by an artist or author are no allows to be copy, reused or reproduced in any form. The music industry has been hit hard by the up rise of the internet, the industry was formally based of record labels owning the rights, through the copy right system, as selling individual songs, albums of the right to play or use the song. This is no longer the case in the internet age where songs are illegally uploaded and/or download for free very easily such that now the most profitable music organizations are those selling online subscriptions. The software industry is not like this, at its core of information studies in the idea that knowledge can and should be transferred freely. In order to do so while maintaining credit for the work you have done many, this is why many open source projects have a copyright with a bullet list of terms and conditions to use, modify and distribute (in any form) known as the open source license. Some open source licenses are "copy left" which means any derivative must use the same license; which restricts organizations from leveraging the contribution. The MIT license fits perfectly into the software development industry because it allows the contributors to maintain a title of ownership to the portion they wrote while upholding the core belief for the free flow of information.

The creative commons work very well for other fields but don't allow for the level of collaboration and everyday development on a technical or legal stand point. The creative commons have been extremely successful with photographers and graphic designers. This is in part due to the fact it is quite easy to prove a photo is a copy or modification of another which covers the possible no derivative clause. Imagen recognition software is also very common and proving an image has been used for commercial gain without prior consent is also feasible giving coverage to the non-commercial usage clause. The concept of originality, or proofing you are the first one to right a certain program is much more abstract. Main of the basic principals and practices implemented in any given problem would look a like. The exact same logical sequences could have a different syntax or variable naming convention but still execute in the same manner. This technical issue of proving creative origin limits the usage of the creative commons within software development. The bit signature of an application is always unique, this is useful for identifying duplicates and is often used in proprietary software owners for catching unpermitted duplicates which is useful for no-license software. The creative commons do hold over software designs similar to books in which the story line and the presentation uniquely identify each piece of work. These licenses leave the main component of software develop, the code, unprotected which is what any software developer would want to maintain the rights to. The MIT license fits in because it does not require proof of creative originality just proof of contribution which is must easier to display with software development taking place on code tracking software.

Beyond meshing with the cultural environment, the MIT license also meets the technical or legal context present in software development. The collaboration and heart of software development being the transferring of information make open-source licenses are the most appropriate choose for maintaining credit as an author to a piece of software. This is solidified by producing a relaxed requirement to be meet legal such that copyright can be applied. For this cultural and technical open-source license are most conducive with software development over creative commons and no-licence licenses.