

Re: [SLE] Rhetorical question

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/SuSE/2006-09/msg02150.html>

- *From:* "Jeff Rollin" <jeff.rollin@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Sep 2006 03:35:57 +0100
-

On 21/09/06, Darryl Gregorash <raven@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 20/09/06 17:58, Jeff Rollin wrote:

- > <snip>
- > I can see no reason for complaining that people who do not comply with
- > the
- > Linux licensing requirements are not given quarter; if a company
- > disclosed
- > confidential Windows specs or code, in breach of a Windows licence, in
- > order
- > to write a driver under the GPL (or any other), the response from
- Redmond
- > would be a lot heavier and nastier than a snide remark or 20 on a
- mailing
- > list.

Your point being what? That the disclosure of confidential and/or copyright and /or patented hardware specifications or driver code is somehow in the same league as the lack of open-source code for the same device?

My point being, that you seem to have no problems with Windows licences limiting you to closed-source drivers, therefore I can see no reason to object to Linux licencing which limits you to the reverse. Since it's precisely the "lack of hardware specifications or driver code" which prevents people writing open-source drivers for operating systems whose licences require them, I'd suggest that it's you who needs to:

Get real.

I might add, that despite your complaints about how people who want to run

ndiswrapper/closed source drivers are treated, so far in this thread the only person I've seen being rude or abusive is you.

Jeff.