

Open Source

Freedom for a digital world

William Jagels, Jonathan Turner, and Nikolas Vanderhoof

Binghamton University

April 25, 2016

Overview

Overview

Open Source...

- ▶ Benefits users
 - ▶ Protects liberties
 - ▶ No DRM
- ▶ Is practical
 - ▶ No vendor lock in
 - ▶ Extensible
 - ▶ Repurposable
- ▶ Is good for the economy
 - ▶ Free of cost
 - ▶ Open innovation
 - ▶ Skilled community
- ▶ Is secure
 - ▶ Community of bug fixers
 - ▶ Provably secure instead of obscurity

Summary

The Four Freedoms of Free Software

- ▶ Freedom 0–Use
- ▶ Freedom 1–Study
- ▶ Freedom 2–Copy
- ▶ Freedom 3–Improve

Free Software and Education


- ▶ Free software in schools
- ▶ Fosters sharing and helping
- ▶ Dependence on Windows
- ▶ Lots of code to read

Threats to Freedom

- ▶ Surveillance
- ▶ Censorship
- ▶ Software That Is Not Free
- ▶ Internet Services
- ▶ Computers For Voting
- ▶ The War On Sharing
- ▶ Rights in Cyberspace

Swindle2

Amazon introduces the next solid chapter in gadget fetish reading.




(Amazon Swindle, 2009)

Analysis

Stallman's Argument: Basis

- ▶ A deontological standpoint
- ▶ Stallman as an ethical essentialist
 - ▶ proprietary software
 - ▶ restricted data formats
 - ▶ internet services
 - ▶ surveillance
- ▶ “always bring up [free software] as an ethical issue” (Stallman, 2011, para. 63)



(Immanuel Kant (painted portrait), 2014)

Stallman's Argument: Logos

- ▶ Deductive reasoning
 - ▶ tobacco and proprietary software comparison (Stallman, 2011, para. 55)
- ▶ Contradictory premises
 - ▶ dismissing economics of free digital society (para. 34)
 - ▶ later addressing economics of digital media (para. 109)

Stallman's Argument: Pathos

- ▶ Use of strong characterizations
 - ▶ “Computers are Stalin’s dream” (Stallman, 2011, para. 3)
 - ▶ All DRM should be illegal (para. 30)
- ▶ Strong appeals to tradition
 - ▶ values derived from a non-digital society
 - ▶ Amazon Kindle (para. 98)
- ▶ Calls Amazon Kindle (para. 98)
 - ▶ an immediate end to digital surveillance
 - ▶ “you can’t wait until there is another dictator” (para. 13)


Practical Advantages of Open Source

Software for Freedom vs. Freedom for Software

- ▶ Needs fulfilled by free software
 - ▶ a need for software
 - ▶ a need for ethical software and practices
- ▶ Stallman's emphasis on a "free digital society"
- ▶ Consequentialist stance on free software
 - ▶ open source vs. free software
 - ▶ a less radical approach
 - ▶ weighing the utility of open source
 - ▶ need-driven software (Bisson, 2007, p. 17)

GNU + Linux, GNU/Linux

- ▶ The GNU operating system
 - ▶ “written for your freedom” (Stallman, 2011, para. 48)
- ▶ The need for a kernel
 - ▶ 1990: GNU Hurd
 - ▶ 1991: Linux
- ▶ Fusion of Linux and GNU
 - ▶ GNU + Linux, or just Linux?
 - ▶ Torvalds vs. Stallman



(*Tux*, 2012), (*Heckert GNU white*, 2011)

Linux: open source success principles

- ▶ Using / creating the best tools for the job
- ▶ Not started with open source in mind (Torvalds, 2016, 3:30)
- ▶ Open source contributions
 - ▶ GPL and copyleft
 - ▶ Collaborative efforts and development
 - ▶ Formation of a communities around open-source code
- ▶ Flexibility
 - ▶ Availability of source code promotes reuse
 - ▶ power saving on Linux cellphone benefit Linux supercomputers (Zemlin, 2013, 11:34)

Another Success Story: Apache HTTP Server

- ▶ Most popular web server since 1995
- ▶ Open source project
- ▶ Inherited the NCSA Common Gateway Interface.
- ▶ Repurposed software components
 - ▶ enabling efficient software development (Bisson, 2007, p. 17)



(*Feather*, n.d.)

Preventing Obsolescence

- ▶ Vendor lock-in
 - ▶ warned against by Stallman (2011, para. 54)
- ▶ Proprietary software creates vendor dependency
 - ▶ maintenance
 - ▶ updates
 - ▶ support
- ▶ Case Study: Electronic voting machines (Colannino, 2012, p. 916)
 - ▶ migration to electronic voting machines
 - ▶ software escrow
 - ▶ code was licensed for testing, not deployment.

Quality Assurance

- ▶ Linus's Law
 - ▶ 6,782 lines of code added/subtracted from Linux daily (Zemlin, 2013, 12:03)
- ▶ Software peer-review
- ▶ Core developers and user developers
- ▶ Mozilla bug reports (Wang, Shih, & Carroll, 2015, p. 352)
 - ▶ value differences
 - ▶ skill differences
 - ▶ reciprocal skill transfer
 - ▶ disorganization preventable



(Mozilla Firefox logo 2013, 2014)

Economic Advantages of Open Source

Apache Web Server

- ▶ 66% of major sites (Powell, 2012, p 696)
- ▶ Web server development is expensive
- ▶ Lowers requirements for web companies
- ▶ Allows publication of ideas and research

Open Simulator

- ▶ Open entrepreneurship case study
- ▶ Powerful developer network
- ▶ Used to start software companies
- ▶ Sharing benefits all parties
- ▶ (Yetis-Larsson, Teigland, & Dovbysh, 2014)



(OSCC13 Track Leaders Meeting in UCI vLab, 2013)

Red Hat

- ▶ \$524M in revenue last quarter (Red Hat Inc., 2015, p. 24)
- ▶ Red Hat Enterprise Linux
 - ▶ “Free” alternative CentOS
- ▶ Support & Certifications
- ▶ Software licensed by GNU GPL
- ▶ Open technologies (ex. GlusterFS)

id Software

- ▶ Creators of Doom and Quake
- ▶ Example of delayed open source
- ▶ Doom engine
 - ▶ Cutting edge technology when released
 - ▶ Eventually outperformed by competitors
 - ▶ Open sourced engine 1997
 - ▶ Continued to sell content packs for engine
 - ▶ (Caulkins et al., 2013, p. 1188)
- ▶ Makes economic sense for companies to open source
- ▶ (Caulkins et al., 2013)

Economic Benefits

- ▶ Efficient use of human resources
- ▶ Reuse of works
- ▶ Shared knowledge
- ▶ Lower costs
- ▶ Greater quality of living
- ▶ Powerful community

Security Differences between Open Source and Closed Source

Security Through Obscurity

- ▶ Malicious hackers cannot see source
- ▶ Any code found is obfuscated
- ▶ In-house code reviews find bugs
- ▶ Developers have time to correct bugs

Security Through Transparency

- ▶ Community will find bugs
- ▶ Developers less likely to inset malicious code
- ▶ Users that find bugs can propose fixes quickly

Microsoft Office and Apache OpenOffice

- ▶ Microsoft Office had 108 total vulnerabilities
- ▶ OpenOffice had only 16
- ▶ Similar number of low severity vulnerabilities
- ▶ Microsoft—7 times medium and high severity risks
- ▶ Speed of Apache's patches
- ▶ (Schryen, 2009)

Source Dependent Attacks

- ▶ Buffer Overflow
- ▶ SQL Injection
- ▶ Patch Reverse Engineering
- ▶ (Clarke, Dorwin, & Nash, n.d.)

Source Independent Attacks

- ▶ User Participation
- ▶ Brute Force
- ▶ Protocol Vulnerability
- ▶ Inside Jobs
- ▶ (Clarke et al., n.d.)

Conclusion

Closing Thoughts

- ▶ Stallman's ideas are not as radical as they seem
- ▶ Open source promotes freedom and learning
- ▶ Gives developers a starting point
- ▶ Suited for tinkerers
- ▶ Helps users feel involved and invested

References I

- Amazon swindle*. (2009). Retrieved from <http://meltingclocktimes.com/images/swindle1.jpg>
- Bisson, C. (2007). What makes open source work? *Library Technology Reports*, 43(3).
- Caulkins, J. P., Feichtinger, G., Grass, D., Hartl, R. F., Kort, P. M., & Seidl, A. (2013, Jun). When to make proprietary software open source. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 37(6), 1182-1194. doi: 10.1016/j.jedc.2013.02.009
- Clarke, R., Dorwin, D., & Nash, R. (n.d.). Is open source software more secure?
- Colannino, J. C. (2012). Free and open source software in municipal procurement: The challenges and benefits of cooperation. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 39(4), 903 - 929.

References II

- Feather*. (n.d.). Apache Software Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.apache.org/foundation/press/kit/>
- Heckert gnu white*. (2011). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Heckert_GNU_white.svg
- Immanuel kant (painted portrait)*. (2014). Retrieved from [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/file:immanuel_kant_\(painted_portrait\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/file:immanuel_kant_(painted_portrait).jpg)
- Mozilla firefox logo 2013*. (2014). Retrieved from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/file:mozilla_firefox_logo_2013.svg
- Osc13 track leaders meeting in uci vlab*. (2013). Retrieved from <https://blog.inf.ed.ac.uk/atate/2013/06/05/opensimulator-community-conference-research-track-submissions-site-opens/>

References III

- Powell, A. (2012, Sep). Democratizing production through open source knowledge: from open software to open hardware. *Media, Culture & Society*, 34(6), 691-708. doi: 10.1177/0163443712449497
- Red Hat Inc. (2015, Nov). *Form 10-Q*. Retrieved from <https://www.nyse.com/quote/XNYS:RHT/sec>
- Schryen, K. R., G. (2009). Open source vs. closed source software: Towards measuring security. In *Sac '09 proceedings of the 2009 acm symposium on applied computing* (p. 2016-2023). doi: 10.1145/1529282.1529731
- Stallman, R. M. (2011, October 19). *A free digital society - what makes digital inclusion good or bad?* [Lecture transcript]. Retrieved from <http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/free-digital-society.en.html>

References IV

- Torvalds, L. (2016, Feb). *The mind behind linux* [Video file]. TED. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/linus_torvalds_the_mind_behind_linux#t-199962
- Tux*. (2012). Retrieved from <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Tux.svg>
- Wang, J., Shih, P. C., & Carroll, J. M. (2015). Revisiting Linus's law: Benefits and challenges of open source software peer review. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 77, 52-65. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2015.01.005
- Yetis-Larsson, Z., Teigland, R., & Dovbysh, O. (2014). Networked entrepreneurs: How entrepreneurs leverage open source software communities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(4), 475-491. doi: 10.1177/0002764214556809

References V

Zemlin, J. (2013). *What the tech industry has learned from Linus Torvalds* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7XTHdcmjenI>