

## Packages - Freedom Issue #2699

Freedom Issue # 972 (forwarded upstream): TeXLive freedom verification

### Re-evaluate [texlive-latexextra]

2020-04-14 05:48 PM - theova

<b>Status:</b> confirmed	<b>% Done:</b> 70%
<b>Priority:</b> discussion	
<b>Assignee:</b> oaken-source	
<b>Category:</b>	
<b>Description</b>	
<pre># remove nonfree packages # no specific free license rm -v {authoraftertitle,clock,fnpara}.tar.xz # nonfree license (CC BY-NC) rm -v axessibility.tar.xz  ...  # remove nonfree packages references from package list sed -ri '/^(axessibility authoraftertitle fnpara) /d' CONTENTS</pre>	
Looking at the removed packages, I found the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The non-free package "axessibility" was removed from texlive, see [1]</li><li>• The package "authoraftertile" is "released to the public domain" [2] which qualifies it as being a free package.</li><li>• The package "clock" is apparently free and has not to be removed [3]</li><li>• The package "fnpara" has a copyright AND is included under the LaTeX Project Public License v1.3 or later</li></ul>	
So all of them are free. I suggest to distribute them. As a consequence, Parabola's PKGBUILD would not have significant changes compared to Arch's PKGBUILD. I suggest to un-blacklist [texlive-latexextra].	
[1] <a href="https://tug.org/pipermail/tex-live/2019-June/043727.html">https://tug.org/pipermail/tex-live/2019-June/043727.html</a>	
[2] <a href="https://www.gnu.org/licenses/license-list.html#PublicDomain">https://www.gnu.org/licenses/license-list.html#PublicDomain</a>	
[3] <a href="http://mirror.kumi.systems/ctan/macros/latex/contrib/clock/COPYING">http://mirror.kumi.systems/ctan/macros/latex/contrib/clock/COPYING</a>	

### History

#### #1 - 2020-04-14 05:48 PM - theova

- Parent task set to #972

#### #2 - 2020-04-14 06:02 PM - theova

- Subject changed from Re-evaluate [texlive-latexextra] to Re-evaluate [texlive-latexextra]

#### #3 - 2020-04-18 02:28 PM - oaken-source

- Assignee set to oaken-source

- Status changed from unconfirmed to confirmed

I checked all four of the packages named above and your assessment seems to be correct.

I have checked the pkgbuild, and there is one more trivial batch script removed from the package, but that does not constitute a freedom issue.

I'll wait for a second opinion on this, but I think we can unblacklist this as well.

#### #4 - 2020-04-18 02:53 PM - oaken-source

I retract my statement. the issue here is the declaration of code into the public domain, which, depending on the circumstances, may be void:

[https://fedoraproject.org/wiki/Talk:Features/TeXLiveLegalAudit#Public\\_Domain](https://fedoraproject.org/wiki/Talk:Features/TeXLiveLegalAudit#Public_Domain)

**#5 - 2020-07-01 10:32 PM - bill-auger**

so this ticket can be closed?

**#6 - 2020-07-15 04:40 PM - theova**

I would really like to contribute to resolve this issue.

As for now, only the license of the package "authoraftertile" needs to be resolved, right?

How can I do this? E.g.

- ask fsf whether it qualifies as free

- ... ?

if it is definitely not free:

- Ask author to change license

- Ask TeX Live maintainer to remove this package

**#7 - 2020-07-19 10:11 PM - nona**

My 2 cents: send the e-mail from the link above ([Resolving public domain confusion](#))

I just did to Matthias Bilger (matthias [lives at] bilger dot info)

**#8 - 2020-07-20 02:57 PM - nona**

- File *authoraftertile\_license.txt* added

I am attaching the answer by Matthias Bilger, and the [package has been updated on CTAN](#) to have the CC0 license.

What remains to be done is to contact upstream so that they remove accessibility from the source files. Who can do this? (i'm thinking of you theova or bill :D ).

**#9 - 2020-07-20 09:33 PM - theova**

- % Done changed from 0 to 70

nona wrote:

I am attaching the answer by Matthias Bilger, and the [package has been updated on CTAN](#) to have the CC0 license.

Great news! Thanks for the email.

What remains to be done is to contact upstream so that they remove accessibility from the source files. Who can do this? (i'm thinking of you theova or bill :D ).

accessibility was already removed from TeXLive. See:

<https://tug.org/pipermail/tex-live/2019-June/043727.html>

<https://tug.org/pipermail/tex-live/2019-June/043728.html>

So, AFAIK there are no more freedom issues with texlive-latexextra and it can be unblacklisted.

**#10 - 2020-07-22 01:25 AM - nona**

- Priority changed from freedom issue to discussion

theova wrote:

So, AFAIK there are no more freedom issues with texlive-latexextra and it can be unblacklisted.

In fact, it is now the package itself which needs to be updated (the tar--or zip that is brought from Arch Linux by the PKGBUILD, and the tar that is on the Parabola GNU/Linux repos). The changes need to be reflected there (how do we achieve that?).

**#11 - 2022-05-10 12:29 PM - theova**

Looking again at this issue, I see no obstacle for removing this package from the blacklist.

What is the state? Can somebody remove it from the blacklist?

**#12 - 2022-06-07 11:46 PM - gap**

To clarify, which versions are affected with freedom issues and which version is the earliest free version?

As others have pointed out, if there are no more freedom issues then it should be removed from the blacklist.  
Are we sure the newer versions don't have any new freedom issues?

## Files

---

authoraftertitle_license.txt	11.6 KB	2020-07-20	nona
------------------------------	---------	------------	------