Subject: Free as in freedom
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 00:53:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neat, thankfully the version of scripts.dll that i download didn't contain any licensing, so i can use it as i like

You might wanna uhmm.... license your software before saying it is licensed.

Quote:
If you develop a new program, and you want it to be of the greatest possible use to the public, the best way to achieve this is to make it free software which everyone can redistribute and change under these terms.

To do so, attach the following notices to the program. It is safest to attach them to the start of each source file to most effectively convey the exclusion of warranty; and each file should have at least the "copyright" line and a pointer to where the full notice is found.

<one line to give the program's name and a brief idea of what it does.> Copyright (C) 19yy <name of author>
This program is free software; you can redistribute it and/or modify it under the terms of the GNU General Public License as published by the Free Software Foundation; either version 2 of the License, or (at your option) any later version.

This program is distributed in the hope that it will be useful, but WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY; without even the implied warranty of MERCHANTABILITY or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. See the GNU General Public License for more details.

You should have received a copy of the GNU General Public License along with this program; if not, write to the Free Software Foundation, Inc., 59 Temple Place - Suite 330, Boston, MA 02111-1307, USA

Also add information on how to contact you by electronic and paper mail.

pretty sure you forgot that part, thanks for the free source code

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 01:04:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

After getting off the phone with the Free Software Foundation, creators and enforcers of the GNU license.

You are actually in fact in violation of this license if it does in fact exist, as you don't include any

licensing information in the current downloadable release which is said to be protected by this license.

By burning a disc and sending it to my companies backup service, which uses a government timestamping system to validate dates and times of files, the software that I know have in my possession is under no license, and is "free source code".

You should really be more familiar with your licenses Jon, im really suprised you would oversight this. Not one single copyright notice in any of the readme.txt or source code.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 01:36:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If a library is released under the GPL (not the LGPL), does that mean that any program which uses it has to be under the GPL? Yes, because the program as it is actually run includes the library.

You'd better start making Renegade open source if you plan on enforcing that threat of yours. Until then we're ignoring your pathetic threats and have worked ways into our scripts to prevent reverse engineering.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 01:45:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OH, forgot one thing...

Where is BHS.dll's source code?

Quote:
Can I apply the GPL when writing a plug-in for a non-free program?

If the program uses fork and exec to invoke plug-ins, then the plug-ins are separate programs, so the license for the main program makes no requirements for them. So you can use the GPL for a plug-in, and there are no special requirements.
If the program dynamically links plug-ins, and they make function calls to each other and share data structures, we believe they form a single program, which must be treated as an extension of both the main program and the plug-ins. This means that combination of the GPL-covered plug-in with the non-free main program would violate the GPL.

Quote:
  if ((!Exe) || (Exe == 1))

```
  {
  bhs = LoadLibrary("bhs.dll");
  LastError = GetLastError();
  if (!bhs)
  {
   FILE *f = fopen("dllload.txt","at");
   fprintf(f,"bhs.dll failed to load, error = %d\n",LastError);
   fclose(f);
   MessageBox(HWND_DESKTOP,"Error","bhs.dll not
found",MB_OK|MB_ICONEXCLAMATION);
   exit(1);
  }
  atexit(NotifyHookUnhandledExceptionFilter);
  }
```

BHS is an invoked interactive plugin for scripts.dll, without it, the scripts.dll does not function
properly, thus needing to release it under the GPL.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 01:47:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gah, forgot one other thing...

its cute that you are doing this, but technically you are in violation of EA's License agreement on
Renegade and in enforcing your license they would need to release the source code to
renegade.exe and game.exe and server.dat and etc...

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Crimson on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 05:11:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Instead of having a pissing contest, why don't you all shut up and mod?

If you believe (or know) that his GPL on scripts.dll isn't legally binding, then go ahead and do what
you like with it.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by jonwil on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 06:29:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My new leveledit actually makes code changes. As far as I know, leveledit dev just changes the
resources around to enable the hidden menu options, it doesnt fix bugs (like the always2.dat not

---

loading properly bug, the "crash on loading non-existant w3d file" bug etc) OR add new features like reading scripts.dll from the renegade folder.

Also (for the new leveledit version 1.0.0.5 that I may be doing), I need to confirm the load order of always.dat, always.dbs, always2.dat and *.mix to confirm that it reads files in the same order as renegade itself does (I am 99% sure its right) but I need to check.

As for the licence of the scripts.dll, here is what I say in the readme.txt file for the scripts.dll 2.2.2:

Also, in order to meet the licence obligations for the scripts.dll, I ask that you:
1.Link back to http://www.sourceforge.net/projects/rentools/ and Credit me for creating the scripts.dll
2.if the DLL is modified with your own scripts, include the complete source code to the dll either directly in the mod zip or as a seperate zip next to the mod zip on the download page). This applies even for beta-testers (give the source to any beta testers)
and 3.if the DLL is unmodified, linking back to http://www.sourceforge.net/projects/rentools/ should be sufficient to satisfy the "distribute source" requirements.
See the file COPYING for the actual text of the GNU General Public Licence which the scripts.dll is licensed under.
I am granting a special exemption to the GNU General Public Licence such that you only need to release source for anything in the same binary module as the scripts.dll code

Said "COPYING" file IS included in the 2.2.2 zip file on sourceforge BTW.

This licence says "if you use code covered by it" (i.e. the scripts.dll source code), all code in the same binary module (e.g. .dll on windows or .so on linux) must be made open source.
The exemption specifically says that its ok to use this code with binary modules that are not open source and do not contain scripts.dll source code. (which includes bhs.dll, server.dat, game.exe, renalert.dll from renalert, bandtest.dll, mss32.dll etc). So, EA does not have to open source anything because the licence specifically says it is ok to link with closed source modules as long as they dont include scripts.dll code. (which they dont)

However, just to make it 100% clear, when I make scripts.dll 2.2.3 I will add headers to each file (and to the readme.txt) clearly spelling out the copyright and licence terms (so that its not burried away at the bottom of the readme file anymore)

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Sir Kane on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 16:51:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You are violating your own license.

jonwil wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 00:29
The exemption specifically says that its ok to use this code with binary modules that are not open source and do not contain scripts.dll source code. (which includes bhs.dll, server.dat, game.exe,

renalert.dll from renalert, bandtest.dll, mss32.dll etc).

Search for #include "../scripts.h" in your bhs.dll project and you will know what I mean.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 17:50:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 December 2005 21:11Instead of having a pissing contest, why don't you all shut up and mod?

If you believe (or know) that his GPL on scripts.dll isn't legally binding, then go ahead and do what you like with it.

thats all i was pointing out crimmy, making it sound like he is going to go sue crazy in the post about watching mod teams for license violations was just sickening when i know for a fact he reverse engineered the game just to get information about it, thus violating a much more powerful entities license.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 17:52:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jonwil wrote on Thu, 22 December 2005 22:29My new leveledit actually makes code changes. As far as I know, leveledit dev just changes the resources around to enable the hidden menu options, it doesnt fix bugs (like the always2.dat not loading properly bug, the "crash on loading non-existant w3d file" bug etc) OR add new features like reading scripts.dll from the renegade folder.

Also (for the new leveledit version 1.0.0.5 that I may be doing), I need to confirm the load order of always.dat, always.dbs, always2.dat and *.mix to confirm that it reads files in the same order as renegade itself does (I am 99% sure its right) but I need to check.

As for the licence of the scripts.dll, here is what I say in the readme.txt file for the scripts.dll 2.2.2:

Also, in order to meet the licence obligations for the scripts.dll, I ask that you:
1.Link back to http://www.sourceforge.net/projects/rentools/ and Credit me for creating the scripts.dll
2.if the DLL is modified with your own scripts, include the complete source code to the dll either directly in the mod zip or as a seperate zip next to the mod zip on the download page). This applies even for beta-testers (give the source to any beta testers)
and 3.if the DLL is unmodified, linking back to http://www.sourceforge.net/projects/rentools/ should be sufficient to satisfy the "distribute source" requirements.
See the file COPYING for the actual text of the GNU General Public Licence which the scripts.dll

---

is licensed under.

I am granting a special exemption to the GNU General Public Licence such that you only need to release source for anything in the same binary module as the scripts.dll code

Said "COPYING" file IS included in the 2.2.2 zip file on sourceforge BTW.

This licence says "if you use code covered by it" (i.e. the scripts.dll source code), all code in the same binary module (e.g. .dll on windows or .so on linux) must be made open source.
The exemption specifically says that its ok to use this code with binary modules that are not open source and do not contain scripts.dll source code. (which includes bhs.dll, server.dat, game.exe, renalert.dll from renalert, bandtest.dll, mss32.dll etc). So, EA does not have to open source anything because the licence specifically says it is ok to link with closed source modules as long as they dont include scripts.dll code. (which they dont)

However, just to make it 100% clear, when I make scripts.dll 2.2.3 I will add headers to each file (and to the readme.txt) clearly spelling out the copyright and licence terms (so that its not burried away at the bottom of the readme file anymore)

hate to tell you, it wasn't in the one i downloaded yesterday.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by =HT=T-Bird on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:33:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The GPL is enforced not by legal action, but by constructive techniques where the enforcer and the enforcee work together to resolve the issue.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by jonwil on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 21:31:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I hold the copyright on those files (scripts.h etc) so I can use them under a different licence (in addition to the licence for the scripts.dll)

I wont be going sue crazy, all I want is that mod teams respect my work and release such source code as is required by my licence.

Up until 0.993x when RenAlert added scripts3.dll, everything was perfectly fine. All mods including RenAlert were following the licence. In 0.993x, the renalert team added a new closed source scripts.dll and have rejected all calls to give the full code for it to a trusted-third-party so that it can be established if they are using my code or not. (I am making no statement either way as to whether they used my code for the closed-sourde scripts.dll, just that they may have done)

I am not picking on any one mod team here. If reborn were violating the licence, I would enforce it. (in fact, at one point in the distant past before the current team came along, they DID violate it but they fixed it right away)

Ever since I jointed the renegade community, my goal has been simple. Poke into the depths of the renegade engine. Find out how it works. Produce enhancements to make it better. And, tell the whole world about my discoveries.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by DreamWraith on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 23:10:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jonwil wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 15:31I hold the copyright on those files (scripts.h etc) so I can use them under a different licence (in addition to the licence for the scripts.dll)

I wont be going sue crazy, all I want is that mod teams respect my work and release such source code as is required by my licence.

Up until 0.993x when RenAlert added scripts3.dll, everything was perfectly fine. All mods including RenAlert were following the licence. In 0.993x, the renalert team added a new closed source scripts.dll and have rejected all calls to give the full code for it to a trusted-third-party so that it can be established if they are using my code or not. (I am making no statement either way as to whether they used my code for the closed-sourde scripts.dll, just that they may have done)

I am not picking on any one mod team here. If reborn were violating the licence, I would enforce it. (in fact, at one point in the distant past before the current team came along, they DID violate it but they fixed it right away)

Ever since I jointed the renegade community, my goal has been simple. Poke into the depths of the renegade engine. Find out how it works. Produce enhancements to make it better. And, tell the whole world about my discoveries.

how exactly does making vague threats to that community you so kindly decide to donate your services to amount to infact, furthering that community?

Last time I was threatened, I did not feel like I was being helped...

Subject: Re: Free as in freedom
Posted by YSLMuffins on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 06:45:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jonwil wrote on Thu, 22 December 2005 17:34

...5.Watch the RenAlert team (and any other mod team that makes a release) for any scripts.dll licence violations.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 07:07:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jonwil wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 13:31I hold the copyright on those files (scripts.h etc) so I can use them under a different licence (in addition to the licence for the scripts.dll)

I wont be going sue crazy, all I want is that mod teams respect my work and release such source code as is required by my licence.

Up until 0.993x when RenAlert added scripts3.dll, everything was perfectly fine. All mods including RenAlert were following the licence. In 0.993x, the renalert team added a new closed source scripts.dll and have rejected all calls to give the full code for it to a trusted-third-party so that it can be established if they are using my code or not. (I am making no statement either way as to whether they used my code for the closed-sourde scripts.dll, just that they may have done)

I am not picking on any one mod team here. If reborn were violating the licence, I would enforce it. (in fact, at one point in the distant past before the current team came along, they DID violate it but they fixed it right away)

Ever since I jointed the renegade community, my goal has been simple. Poke into the depths of the renegade engine. Find out how it works. Produce enhancements to make it better. And, tell the whole world about my discoveries.

would you mind faxing me the paperwork for your copyright? as in this case, scripts.h could not be included under the GPL, its one way or the other, not both.

either way, this is how i figure, stop pressuring them for making a scripts3.dll, and if you like, i will be that 3rd party as im sure SK and you will believe me when i say either way.

Subject: Re: Free as in freedom
Posted by Dante on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 07:09:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

my suggestion jon, after reading this thread again.

just make your own license, don't try to adhere to the GPL, as you are modifying it way to much for your own needs, at that point you should just create your own EULA.

Subject: Re: Free as in freedom
Posted by jonwil on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 09:00:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I am giving one specific exemption to the GPL and that is as follows:
In addition, an exemption is given to allow Run Time Dynamic Linking of this code with any closed source module that does not contain code covered by this licence.
Only the source code to the module(s) containing the licenced code has to be released.

It is a rather simple exemption and similar exemptions are given for other packages.

As for using the same code under GPL and under a different licence, see this page:
http://www.trolltech.com/company/model.html
Trolltech release their code under both the GPL and a closed source licence.
And they arent the only ones, several others do it to.
If you own the copyright to something, you can release it under as many licences are you like.

Subject: Re: xmas break project update
Posted by Dante on Sun, 25 Dec 2005 00:32:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dante wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 23:07
would you mind faxing me the paperwork for your copyright?

Subject: Re: Free as in freedom
Posted by spazbeast on Sun, 25 Dec 2005 13:44:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pwned... By a copyright.