

Chapter I

Free Software Philosophy and Open Source

Niklas Vainio

University of Tampere, Finland

Tere Vadén

University of Tampere, Finland

ABSTRACT

This chapter introduces and explains some of the most relevant features of the free software philosophy formulated by Richard M. Stallman in the 1980s. The free software philosophy and the free software movement built on it historically preceded the open source movement by a decade and provided some of the key technological, legal and ideological foundations of the open source movement. Thus, in order to study the ideology of open source and its differences with regard to other modes of software production, it is important to understand the reasoning and the presuppositions included in Stallman's free software philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

The free software (FS) movement is the key predecessor of the open source (OS) community. The FS movement, in turn, is based on arguments developed by Richard M. Stallman. In crucial ways, Stallman's social philosophy creates the background for the co-operation, co-existence and differences between the two communities. Stallman started the FS movement and the GNU project prompted by his experiences of the early hacker culture and subsequent events at the MIT

artificial intelligence lab in the 1980s. The project was founded on a philosophy of software freedom, and the related views on copyright or the concept of *copyleft*. After the creation of the open source movement in 1998, debates between the two movements have erupted at regular intervals. These debates are grounded in the different ideological perspectives and sociopsychological motivations of the movements. The FS movement has laid technological, legal and ideological cornerstones that still exist as part of the open source movement.

THE SOCIOHISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE FREE SOFTWARE PHILOSOPHY

The first computer systems were built in the 1940s and 1950s mainly for military and scientific purposes. One of the earliest research institutes to use and study computers was the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). The artificial intelligence (AI) lab at MIT was founded in 1958 and became one of the birthplaces of computer science and computer culture.

In *Hackers* (1984), Steven Levy describes the subculture around the AI lab computers in the 1960s. Young male electronics hobbyists devoted their time to programming and studying these machines. They called themselves *hackers*, a word denoting a person who enjoys exploring computer systems, being in control of the systems, and facing the challenges they present. For a hacker, a computer is not just a tool, it is also an end in itself. The computer is something to be respected and programming has an aesthetics of its own (Hafner & Lyon, 1996; Levy, 1984; Turkle, 1982).

A subculture was created among the MIT hackers with traditions and social norms of its own. Important values for the community were freedom, intelligence, technical skills, and interest in the possibilities of computers while bureaucracy, secrecy, and lack of mathematical skills were looked down on. The six rules of this *hacker ethic* as later codified by Levy were:

1. *Access to computers—and anything which might teach you something about the way the world works—should be unlimited and total. Always yield to the hands-on imperative!*
2. *All information should be free.*
3. *Mistrust authority—promote decentralization.*
4. *Hackers should be judged by their hacking, not bogus criteria such as degrees, age, race, or position.*

5. *You can create art and beauty on a computer.*
6. *Computers can change your life for the better. (Levy, 1984, pp. 40-45)¹*

Computer programs were treated like any information created by the scientific community: Software was free for everyone to use, study, and enhance. Building on programs created by other programmers was not only allowed, but encouraged. On one hand, nobody owned the programs, and on the other, they were common property of the community.

In the early 1980s, a conflict arose in the AI lab when some of the hackers formed a company called Symbolics to sell computers based on technology originally developed in the lab. Symbolics hired most of the hackers, leaving the lab empty. This, together with the fact that the software on Symbolics machines was considered a trade secret, caused a crisis. The community and its way of life had been destroyed and Stallman later described himself as “the last survivor of a dead culture” (Levy, 1984, p. 427; see also Williams, 2002).

Stallman saw an ethical problem in the growing trend of treating software in terms of property. In the AI lab, there was a strong spirit of co-operation and sharing, making the code, in a way, a medium for social interaction. Thus restrictions in the access to code were also limitations on how people could help each other.

In 1984, Stallman published *The GNU Manifesto* announcing his intention to develop a freely available implementation of the Unix operating system. He explained his reasons in a section titled *Why I Must Write GNU*:

I consider that the golden rule requires that if I like a program I must share it with other people who like it. Software sellers want to divide the users and conquer them, making each user agree not to share with others. I refuse to break solidarity with other users in this way. I cannot in good conscience sign a nondisclosure agreement or a software

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/free-software-philosophy-open-source/21174

Related Content

Open-Source Technologies for Maximizing the Creation, Deployment, and Use of Digital Resources and Information, by Shalin Hai-Jew

Gozem Gucer-Ucar (2012). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 60-63).

www.irma-international.org/article/open-source-technologies-maximizing-creation/75523

Open Source Developer Layer Assessment: Open Onion

Aminat Abiola Showole (2015). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 31-48).

www.irma-international.org/article/open-source-developer-layer-assessment/170475

Analysis of Free and Open Source Software (FOSS) Product in Web Based Client-Server Architecture

Pushpa Singhand Narendra Singh (2018). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 36-47).

www.irma-international.org/article/analysis-of-free-and-open-source-software-foss-product-in-web-based-client-server-architecture/217413

Open Source Software Adaptation in Africa: Is a Matter of Inferior or Cheap is Not Quality?

Abubakar Diwani Bakar, Abu Bakar Md. Sultan, Hazura Zulzaliland Jamilah Din (2014). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 1-15).

www.irma-international.org/article/open-source-software-adaptation-in-africa/104677

Evaluating the Potential of Free and Open Source Software in the Developing World

Victor van Reijswoud (2007). *Handbook of Research on Open Source Software: Technological, Economic, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 79-92).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/evaluating-potential-free-open-source/21180