

Packages - Freedom Issue #1334

[referenceassemblies-pcl] Microsoft redistributable assembly EULA

2017-05-21 02:07 PM - bill

Status: fixed	% Done: 100%
Priority: freedom issue	
Assignee: isacdaavid	
Category:	
Description Such is the license according to the Arch PKGBUILD . You tell me if that looks libre to you. -> blacklist	
Subtasks: Freedom Issue # 1337: [referenceassemblies-pcl]: re: blacklisted monodevelop not-a-bug	

History

#1 - 2017-05-21 02:41 PM - bill-auger

here is a plain text version --> <https://github.com/mono/linux-packaging-referenceassemblies-pcl/blob/master/debian/copyright>

on first look - its seems this is a OSS-friendly license but incompatible with the GPL - one caveat especially caught my attention - about not being able to use it with any "Excluded License" - defined as any license that requires sources to be available or allows the user to modify the sources

```
"You may not" .... "modify or distribute the Distributable Code so that any part of it
becomes subject to an Excluded License. An Excluded License is one
that requires, as a condition of use, modification or distribution,
that the code be disclosed or distributed in source code form;
or others have the right to modify it."
```

that looks to me like a copyleft deal-breaker - it's not very clear what this package actually is for - isn't this what the dotGNU prject is aiming to replace? <https://www.gnu.org/software/dotgnu/pnet.html>

#2 - 2017-05-22 01:53 PM - jxself

A free program doesn't necessarily have to be compatible with the GPL but at the same time there are things in this license that are clearly non-free.

The third bullet point in 2.a.iii is one example. About including Distributable Code in malicious, deceptive or unlawful programs. It conflicts with freedom 0. Or the other part of section 2 that only allows distribution as object code.

So clearly non-free, although not necessarily for the reasons you were asking about.

#3 - 2017-05-22 07:40 PM - bill

Thanks for the plain text. It's all object code and it talks only about object code. I'm 99% confident the matching source code isn't available publicly. It's a proprietary tool created so you can create proprietary software more easily, it needs to go away asap.

#4 - 2017-05-22 07:44 PM - bill

Someone should examine all non-blacklisted Arch packages that have license=custom. Can't do it because I don't have a parabola install anymore. It's probably been done when Parabola began, but the piece of software we're talking about has been published recently so that's probably why it went under the radar.

#5 - 2017-05-22 09:28 PM - isacdaavid

- % Done changed from 0 to 100
- Assignee set to isacdaavid
- Status changed from open to fixed

#6 - 2017-05-22 10:05 PM - bill-auger

ive been asking ppl about this package today to find out what it actually is for - the answers have been vaguely like the one bill mentions - it seems something like an SDK of redistributable binaries for ppl who want to make dotnet engines or other core libs

<https://www.parabola.nu/packages/community/any/referenceassemblies-pcl/>

this package has 2 reverse dependencies on parabola: 'emby-server' and 'monodevelop' but on debian there are zero packages that depend on it - on

debian this package 'breaks' and 'replaces' many packages that monodevelop does depend on - on parabola this package 'provides' and 'conflicts' with 'mono-pcl' so this dependency can probably be re-arranged for parabola too - if so then it is almost certain that no parabola user is going to miss this if is blacklisted

#7 - 2017-05-23 12:59 AM - isacdaavid

- Related to Freedom Issue #1337: [referenceassemblies-pcl]: re: blacklisted monodevelop added

#8 - 2022-01-17 08:00 AM - bill-auger

- Related to deleted (Freedom Issue #1337: [referenceassemblies-pcl]: re: blacklisted monodevelop)