



Saeed Rasooli <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

GPL and Hiding the Modified Source Code

10 messages

saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 3, 2009 at 10:02 PM

To: rms@gnu.org

Hello Mr. Stallman

And thanks a lot for starting and leading the GNU Project and Free Software Movement.

I am a GNU/Linux user, and not a beginner in it, and a open source programmer. Here is the list of my projects:

<http://ospdev.net/users/ilius/>

I readed and listened your speech when releasing GPLv3, it was realy great, and I have been read an listen that your speech for many times.

I think there is a hole in GPL that alowes to the advesories of freedom to hide the real source code of a modified program! But how? Imagine that a person(a programmer) gets the source code of a GPL covered program that is written in C (or C++ for example), then he changes it, and compiles the C code to the assemply code, then releases the binary version and the assemply code as it's source code, and he profess that his changes was only after compiling to the assemply code, and he has not changed the original C code!! Who can proof not?!

Can GPLv3 block this practic? If not, we may find a way, and you may apply a change in GPLv4 to block such ways. What's your idea?

Also I have two quessions from you:

- 1- Can everyone relicense a program from BSD License to GPL (or LGPL) ? Which licenses allow this work(relicensig to GPL or LGPL) ?
- 2- About codes in a FDL licensed documentation. What licenses are allowed for using of this codes?

Thanks
Saeed

Richard M. Stallman - Autoreply Message <rms-autoreply-control@gnu.org>

Tue, Feb 3, 2009 at
10:01 PM

Reply-To: rms-autoreply-control@gnu.org

To: saeed.gnu@gmail.com

I am not on vacation, but I am at the end of a long time delay. I am

located somewhere on Earth, but as far as responding to email is concerned, I appear to be well outside the solar system.

After your message arrives at gnu.org, I will collect it in my next batch of incoming mail, some time within the following 24 hours. I will spend much of the following day reading that batch of mail and will come across your message at some point. If I can write a response for it immediately, the response will go out in the next outgoing batch--typically around 24 hours after I collected your message, but occasionally sooner or later than that. As a result, you should expect a minimum delay of between 24 and 48 hours in seeing any response to your mail to me.

If you are having a conversation with me, please keep in mind that each message you receive from me is probably a response to the mail you sent 24 to 48 hours earlier, and any subsequent mail you sent has not yet been seen by me.

If you are in big hurry to speak with me, and one day's delay would be a serious problem, you can ask my assistant to phone me. Send mail to [<rms-assist@gnu.org>](mailto:rms-assist@gnu.org) saying what you would like to talk with me about, and giving your telephone number. You can also call the Free Software Foundation office at 617-542-5942 (weekday Boston business hours) and ask them to phone me on your behalf.

If you aren't in such a hurry that phoning me is needed, please don't bother contacting them; just send me mail directly. The message you send me directly will reach me sooner than any message forwarded by someone else. I will get back to you as soon as I can.

If you do not wish to receive this message ever again, please send a message to rms-autoreply-control@gnu.org with the subject "OFF". Otherwise, you might receive a reply like this one up to once a month.

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Mon, Feb 9, 2009 at 9:00 AM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

Also I have two questions from you:

1- Can everyone relicense a program from BSD License to GPL (or LGPL)

There are two different BSD licenses -- see

<http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/bsd.html>.

One of them is compatible with the GNU GPL and can be relicensed to the GNU GPL. The other is incompatible and can't be relicensed to the GNU GPL.

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Mon, Feb 9, 2009 at 9:00 AM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

2- About codes in a FDL licensed documentation. What licenses are allowed for using of this codes?

If the code is big enough for copyright to be a real issue, you should release the same code in another file under the free software license of your choice. That is the normal practice.

In the future, please send questions like this to licensing@gnu.org. Those are the people who normally answer such questions.

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Mon, Feb 9, 2009 at 9:01 AM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

changes it, and compiles the C code to the assembly code, then releases the binary version and the assembly code as it's source code,

Don't worry, this is not the real source code. Neither GPLv2 nor GPLv3 permits this.

I am a GNU/Linux user, and not a beginner in it, and a open source programmer.

I am not an open source programmer; in fact, I disagree with open source. I'm a free software activist and a free software developer.

Do you know the difference between free software and open source?

saeed.gnu@gmail.com <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 10, 2009 at 12:30 AM

To: rms@gnu.org

Hello

> Don't worry, this is not the real source code.

> Neither GPLv2 nor GPLv3 permits this.

But who can proof thats not the real source code? Who can proof whether that person modified the original code(before compiling to assembly) or not?

> I am not an open source programmer; in fact, I disagree with open source. I'm a free software activist and a free software developer.

>

> Do you know the difference between free software and open source?

Yes I know the difference between free software and open source. My projects are under GPL (and lately v3) then I am also a free software developer, but I folowed the vogue word, forgive me.

I think that open source is a shortcut for free, when we talk with who doesn't know what means free. And we always have no time to describe those four freedoms for such persons we talk about free software. But when we talk to a person that know the meaning of free software, we should use free instead.

My tongue language is persian(farsi) and fortunately there is no common word for this two meanings(free and free), the I will try to use the equivalent of free(like free speech, "آزاد") rather than open source, always, while talking to everyone.

But being open source is a part of being free, and the main part I think, because the most of open source programs are also free.

Specially with the official definition of open source(www.opensource.org/docs/osd), seems that open source is nearly the same free software(if not?). Then why you disagree with open source?!

Another question: for non-software-related books (about math or physics or literature for example), what license you recommend? GNU FDL or CC or Public Domain or...?

Thank you for your help

Saeed

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Tue, Feb 10, 2009 at 11:32 PM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed.gnu@gmail.com

But who can proof thats not the real source code? Who can proof whether that person modified the original code(before compiling to asembly) or not?

In practice it should not be hard.

A court can make the defendant turn over the source code he uses.

If he really does edit the program at the assembler level, then it is real source code. If he really edits something else, then the assembler code is not source code.

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Tue, Feb 10, 2009 at 11:32 PM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed.gnu@gmail.com

I think that open source is a shortcut for free, when we talk with who doesn't know what means free.

I wish that were true, but it isn't. The ideas associated with "open source" are totally different from the ideas associated with "free software". If you say "open source" you promote the ideas of open source.

If you want to promote the ideas of free software, you need to say "free software", and explain (when necessary) "free as in freedom, not

as in price."

Does the word "azadi" mean "free" in Farsi? (I can't read what you sent.) I think it is used in Urdu, and I suspect it came from Farsi.

Instead of the English word "free", use the clear local word!

saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 11, 2009 at 4:06 AM

To: rms@gnu.org

> Does the word "azadi" mean "free" in Farsi? (I can't read what you
> sent.) I think it is used in Urdu, and I suspect it came from Farsi.
The word "azadi" means freedom, and "azad" means free. But there is
not a common phrase for open source in farsi, "open-source",
"code-baz", "baz-code", "matn-baz", "baz-matn",...!! But free is
always free("azad") :-) a beautiful word that I will use more in the
future.

I see the most of GPL-covered programs are not still relicensd to
GPLv3 !! After aboat two years of releasing GPLv3 and that your nice
speech and exhortation. Is not there needed any reminder to the
community?

After reading and listening that your speech (and translating to
farsi), I decideded to relicense my programs to GPLv3, starting by
PyGlossary (A perfect tool for working with dictionary glossaries:
<http://ospdev.net/projects/glossary-pywork/>).

Thanks for your guide.

[Quoted text hidden]

Richard M Stallman <rms@gnu.org>

Thu, Feb 12, 2009 at 12:27 AM

Reply-To: rms@gnu.org

To: saeed <saeed.gnu@gmail.com>

I see the most of GPL-covered programs are not still relicensd to
GPLv3 !! After aboat two years of releasing GPLv3 and that your nice
speech and exhortation. Is not there needed any reminder to the
community?

I would like to encourage this, but pushing too hard might offend
developers, and that would not be a good thing.