

The Proprietary Software Lobby Against FOSS/Copyleft

By *Roy Schestowitz*

Created *03/05/2019 - 6:11am*

Submitted by Roy Schestowitz on Friday 3rd of May 2019 06:11:49 AM Filed under [Microsoft](#) [1] [OSS](#) [2]

- [5 factors for using open source code in proprietary software](#) [3] [Ed: As usual, treating copyleft as a nuisance rather than a moral feature]

Developers can easily obtain, modify and integrate countless open source code packages into diverse software projects. Using open source code to enable basic features and processes in a proprietary software project can shave time off of development cycles and free code creators to focus on core and business-enabling functionality.

While open source elements confer tangible benefits for software development projects, they can impose challenges and limitations on a proprietary application, especially if the project is intended for commercial use. Organizations should evaluate the management and integration of software components from other creators, their project priorities, liabilities, licensing and security before selecting open source code for a project.

[...]

While open source software is free to obtain, change and otherwise work with, it is not in the public domain. Open source software is released under a license, such as Apache License 2.0; BSD license; GNU General Public License (GPL), GNU Library, or Lesser GPL; MIT License; or Mozilla Public License 2.0. Each license outlines the terms of use and distribution.

Generally, open source software licenses do not significantly restrict a business's ability to acquire and use them. So, a proprietary and commercial software product can rely on open source components.

However, businesses must know if and how a license can cause problems. The GNU GPL requires users to release any derivative works under the same GNU GPL license. If a business obtains and modifies open source code under GNU GPL, it must copyleft the modified code -- meaning release it to open source, as well.

- **[Open source security: The risk issue is unpatched software, not open source use](#)** [4] [Ed: Microsoft 'proxy' Black Duck still dodges an honest discussion about back doors that cannot be patched because they are there by design in proprietary software (like [everything from Microsoft](#) [5])

[Microsoft OSS](#)

Source URL: <http://www.tuxmachines.org/node/123480>

Links:

[1] <http://www.tuxmachines.org/taxonomy/term/62>

[2] <http://www.tuxmachines.org/taxonomy/term/72>

[3] <https://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/tip/5-factors-for-using-open-source-code-in-proprietary-software>

[4] <https://www.helpnetsecurity.com/2019/05/02/open-source-security-risks/>

[5] http://techrights.org/wiki/index.php/Black_Duck