



Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>

Looking for the copyright holder/author for "uwmslide"

4 messages

Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
To: eric.benedict@analog.com

Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 6:24 PM

Eric,

I am the Fedora packager for "texlive", a collection of TeX scripts which contains a component called "uwmslide". This component was released in 2000 under the "Artistic 1.0" license, which, thanks to some established case law, is no longer considered safe or open source.

If you are the same Eric Benedict who wrote this component while at UW Madison, would you be willing to grant permission for "uwmslide" to be used under an additional, alternative open source license?

Most of the components in TeXLive are under the LaTeX Public License v1.3c:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/LPPL-1.3c.html>

Alternately, the "MIT" license is rather permissive and widely used:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/MIT.html>

If you're willing to grant permission for uwmslide to be distributed under one of these licenses (or any other open source license, really), please just reply and say so. We will keep a copy of this email correspondence in our distribution of uwmslide to acknowledge the additional licensing..

If you're not the same Eric Benedict, please accept my apologies for the noise in your INBOX.

Thanks in advance,
Tom "spot" Callaway

Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
To: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Cc: Eric Benedict <madriveneric@gmail.com>

Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 7:47 PM

Hello Tom,

Yes, I am the creator of the uwmslide.cls (and withesis.cls though it doesn't appear you've included the thesis class in your package).

I'm fine with upgrading the license to a currently accepted free license. I don't specifically have an objection to the LPPL license; however, I note that the Perl Artistic License 2.0 is listed as currently being as free. My quick read through of the LPPL suggests that it requires additional text to be added to the file, where as it appears that upgrading to the Perl Artistic License 2.0 version doesn't appear to need anything other than the 1.0->2.0 change.

Note I've copied this email to my personal email which you can save for future reference since this email address will only be valid while I continue to work for ADI.

Eric

From: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 6:25 PM
To: Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
Subject: Looking for the copyright holder/author for "uwmslide"

[External]

Eric,

I am the Fedora packager for "texlive", a collection of TeX scripts which contains a component called "uwmslide". This component was released in 2000 under the "Artistic 1.0" license, which, thanks to some established case law, is no longer considered safe or open source.

If you are the same Eric Benedict who wrote this component while at UW Madison, would you be willing to grant permission for "uwmslide" to be used under an additional, alternative open source license?

Most of the components in TeXLive are under the LaTeX Public License v1.3c:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/LPPL-1.3c.html>

Alternately, the "MIT" license is rather permissive and widely used:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/MIT.html>

If you're willing to grant permission for uwmslide to be distributed under one of these licenses (or any other open source license, really), please just reply and say so. We will keep a copy of this email correspondence in our distribution of uwmslide to acknowledge the additional licensing..

If you're not the same Eric Benedict, please accept my apologies for the noise in your INBOX.

Thanks in advance,
Tom "spot" Callaway

Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
To: "Benedict, Eric" <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
Cc: Eric Benedict <madriveneric@gmail.com>

Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 8:25 PM

Thanks for the quick response.

You're correct, the Artistic 2.0 license was written to address the issues in the 1.0 license, so if you would prefer to permit use of your TeX code under that license version, it would resolve our licensing issue in Fedora.

Is that what you would like to do? (I'm asking this explicitly for the record so there's no ambiguity)

Thanks,
Tom

On Tue, Jan 27, 2026, 1:47 AM Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com> wrote:

Hello Tom,

Yes, I am the creator of the uwmslide.cls (and withesis.cls though it doesn't appear you've included the thesis class in your package).

I'm fine with upgrading the license to a currently accepted free license. I don't specifically have an objection to the LPPL license; however, I note that the Perl Artistic License 2.0 is listed as currently being as free. My quick read through of the LPPL suggests that it requires additional text to be added to the file, where as it appears that upgrading to the Perl Artistic License 2.0 version doesn't appear to need anything other than the 1.0->2.0 change.

Note I've copied this email to my personal email which you can save for future reference since this email address will only be valid while I continue to work for ADI.

Eric

From: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 6:25 PM
To: Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
Subject: Looking for the copyright holder/author for "uwmslide"

[External]

Eric,

I am the Fedora packager for "texlive", a collection of TeX scripts which contains a component called "uwmslide". This component was released in 2000 under the "Artistic 1.0" license, which, thanks to some established case law, is no longer considered safe or open source.

If you are the same Eric Benedict who wrote this component while at UW Madison, would you be willing to grant permission for "uwmslide" to be used under an additional, alternative open source license?

Most of the components in TeXLive are under the LaTeX Public License v1.3c:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/LPPL-1.3c.html>

Alternately, the "MIT" license is rather permissive and widely used:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/MIT.html>

If you're willing to grant permission for uwmslide to be distributed under one of these licenses (or any other open source license, really), please just reply and say so. We will keep a copy of this email correspondence in our distribution of uwmslide to acknowledge the additional licensing..

If you're not the same Eric Benedict, please accept my apologies for the noise in your INBOX.

Thanks in advance,
Tom "spot" Callaway

Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
To: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Cc: Eric Benedict <madriveneric@gmail.com>

Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 8:26 PM

Yes, please use the Artistic 2.0 license for my TeX code.

Eric

From: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 8:25 PM
To: Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
Cc: Eric Benedict <madriveneric@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Looking for the copyright holder/author for "uwmslide"

[External]

Thanks for the quick response.

You're correct, the Artistic 2.0 license was written to address the issues in the 1.0 license, so if you would prefer to permit use of your TeX code under that license version, it would resolve our licensing issue in Fedora.

Is that what you would like to do? (I'm asking this explicitly for the record so there's no ambiguity)

Thanks,
Tom

On Tue, Jan 27, 2026, 1:47 AM Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com> wrote:

Hello Tom,

Yes, I am the creator of the uwmslide.cls (and withesis.cls though it doesn't appear you've included the thesis class in your package).

I'm fine with upgrading the license to a currently accepted free license. I don't specifically have an objection to the LPPL license; however, I note that the Perl Artistic License 2.0 is listed as currently being as free. My quick read through of the LPPL suggests that it requires additional text to be added to the file, where as it appears that upgrading to the Perl Artistic License 2.0 version doesn't appear to need anything other than the 1.0->2.0 change.

Note I've copied this email to my personal email which you can save for future reference since this email address will only be valid while I continue to work for ADI.

Eric

From: Tom Callaway <spotrh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 6:25 PM
To: Benedict, Eric <Eric.Benedict@analog.com>
Subject: Looking for the copyright holder/author for "uwmslide"

[External]

Eric,

I am the Fedora packager for "texlive", a collection of TeX scripts which contains a component called "uwmslide". This component was released in 2000 under the "Artistic 1.0" license, which, thanks to some established case law, is no longer considered safe or open source.

If you are the same Eric Benedict who wrote this component while at UW Madison, would you be willing to grant permission for "uwmslide" to be used under an additional, alternative open source license?

Most of the components in TeXLive are under the LaTeX Public License v1.3c:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/LPPL-1.3c.html>

Alternately, the "MIT" license is rather permissive and widely used:

<https://spdx.org/licenses/MIT.html>

If you're willing to grant permission for uwmslide to be distributed under one of these licenses (or any other open source license, really), please just reply and say so. We will keep a copy of this email correspondence in our distribution of uwmslide to acknowledge the additional licensing..

If you're not the same Eric Benedict, please accept my apologies for the noise in your INBOX.

Thanks in advance,
Tom "spot" Callaway