

## Re: kernel 2.6.8 pwc patches and counterpatches

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2004-08/8175.html>

---

*From:* Wouter Van Hemel ([wouter-kernel\\_at\\_fort-knox.rave.org](mailto:wouter-kernel_at_fort-knox.rave.org))

*Date:* 08/27/04

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 2004 02:21:51 +0200 (CEST)

To: Greg KH <[greg@kroah.com](mailto:greg@kroah.com)>

On Thu, 26 Aug 2004, Greg KH wrote:

> *Having a hook in the kernel (in GPLed code) for the explicit purpose of*  
> *allowing a binary module is not allowed. Go read Linus's statements*  
> *about this in the archives.*  
>

I understand that loading binary pieces in a stand-alone driver is an undesirable situation, but I think you take things too strict. Sometimes you must look at the meaning behind a rule, and not just take things as universal law. It is certainly not 'illegal', as Philips has clearly given permission and helped out on getting this driver included.

Indeed, as far as I understand, there is hope that this binary part will once be open sourced. However, rejecting Philips' contribution completely will not aid in getting their products supported, and we desperately need support for some of these devices. As I already told you, I tried 3 other webcams which failed to work, and I've ordered this camera (and received it today, for crying out loud) precisely because it works in Linux, just like many other people have.

> *Then talk to Phillips, or Nemosoft. I didn't rip the driver out of the*  
> *kernel, only the hook. Nemosoft asked that the driver be ripped out, and*  
> *that's his option.*  
>

But look where he has come from... He has gotten support from Philips, he has received lots of information (mostly under NDA apparently, sadly enough), and with some patience, he might have gotten a full opensource version. Ripping out code that Philips already supported, will not help in getting them to open up more.

>> *Binary code is not illegal. Undesirable, maybe. But not illegal. It's not*  
>> *even included in the kernel code. Only a hook, and it's not even a forced*  
>> *dependency.*  
>  
> *Great, then use the version I did without the hook. That's fine with*

## Linux-Kernel: Re: kernel 2.6.8 pwc patches and counterpatches

> *me.*  
>

You don't seem to understand that your sense of righteousness is setting back a lot of people, and if you would stand up and tell them you'd contact Philips yourself, perhaps people would be more understanding, but now you just pulled one of the only (and major, and supported, and working) drivers without as much as an alternative or promise to attempt to rectify the problem thusly created. Have you at least tried to contact Philips to improve things constructively?

Yes, I do think that if you want to see the whole driver as opensource, you should at least have tried once to get it in a way you can agree with, and not just start removing things other people seem to have worked hard for to achieve. With which I don't mean that I think it's a good idea of Nemosoft to pull all code – he too should remember it's not only about him, but also about all people using this driver, and about Philips, who seem to have been quite supportive in the development process.

–

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to [majordomo@vger.kernel.org](mailto:majordomo@vger.kernel.org)  
More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>  
Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>