

Re: Evil Designers Guide to Copying Patents

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-03/msg06645.html>

- *From:* don@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Don Klipstein)
 - *Date:* Sun, 25 Mar 2007 06:13:12 +0000 (UTC)
-

In article <19h903lfgk4gghi15qnotq2gql5p1kqa3e@xxxxxxx>, MassiveProng wrote:

On Fri, 23 Mar 2007 22:07:45 -0800, John Larkin
<jjlarkin@xx> Gave us:

On Fri, 23 Mar 2007 21:41:29 -0700, MassiveProng
<MassiveProng@xx> wrote:

On Fri, 23 Mar 2007 15:49:47 -0700, John Larkin
<jjlarkin@xx> Gave
us:

Businesses are run by people, and all people
have their own ethics.
IBM has a history of ethical behavior (and
good products), and
Microsoft has a history of dishonesty and
ruthlessness (and crap.)

And you have a history od spewing horseshit and bullshit.

I have a history of designing electronics.

Your remarks have no foundation or basis in fact.

IBM reamed the banking industry for decades. Doesn't matter that
they had SOME good products.

Billy is just a shrewd businessman that chumps like you are jealous
of. Tell us of his "dishonesty".

Re: Evil Designers Guide to Copying Patents

I can surely tell an example of advancement by mainly ability to be a bully. I think that reasonably web-searchable is "Microsoft Tax".

That was first and maybe mainly noted to apply back when the current version of Windows was 3.1 or something like that.

How the "Microsoft Tax" worked, at least at some critical time: In order to sell computers with a MS OS installed, a computer seller had to pay Microsoft on basis of number of computers sold regardless of OS or lack thereof, as opposed to sales of copies and/or installations of MS operating systems.

A computer seller/reseller/retailer had to have at least two different sales locations, in order to sell both computers with a MS OS and ones without (such as a non-MS OS or no OS at all) without paying \$\$ to MS per unit sale of computers without a MS OS. At least this is the way I heard it, through channels where I expected good ability of denial of this if this was not true.

This reminds me of some case where 3M sells "Scotch Tape" to retailers at a lower price if they do not sell competing tapes. I remember that one becoming some Federal court case ending up being decided in favor of 3M. I think that Congress needs to pass a law expanding the definition of "Restraint of Trade", although that may not occur until voters vote on a basis other than candidates selling themselves best via lobbyist \$\$\$\$\$, especially in primary elections.

(Please keep in mind – in some US "states", in at least some even number years there is more than one primary election – an early chance to vote against an offending Congresscritter may not be on the same day as opportunity to vote fo a President candidate! Furthermore, keep in mind that in a few US "states" a Presidential primary election vote is called a "beauty contest" while votes for specific-candidate-committed-delagates that "are what really count" are a separate vote, and I am not sure that in none of USA's 50 "states" the "springtime vote that counts" and the "beauty contest" are on different dates!)

– Don Klipstein (don@xxxxxxxxxx)

.