

Re: Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Copyright and Patent Law?

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-07/msg02782.html>

- *From:* Twisted <twisted0n3@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 31 Jul 2007 05:03:06 -0000
-

On Jul 30, 1:20 pm, "Oliver Wong" <ow...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
[snip a whole lot of BS]

Aww, crap. Did you have to!?

Here we go again...

An alternative, yes. A perfect one, no.

So there we go. Software does not need to be 100% compatible in order to be an alternative.

This is entirely beside my point. My point is that it serves no useful public purpose for the government to enforce that I can only do certain things if I have Windows, and in effect copyrights have that as one of their many useless against-the-public-interest consequences by a) letting software vendors refuse to port to any other platform, b) letting the same vendors refuse to allow someone else to make such a port, c) letting Microsoft refuse to allow some other vendor to make a perfect Windows-substitute, and d) making law enforcement actually enforce b and c.

This doesn't seem like policy in the service of the public interest to me. It looks like policy in the service of Bill Gates, who is rich enough that if anything he should be expected to completely fend for himself