

Re: master / detail datagrid...

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2004-10/2681.html>

From: clintonG (*csgallagher_at_REMOVETHISTEXTmetromilwaukee.com*)

Date: 10/12/04

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 22:24:42 -0500

Aha. Curious huh? :-) Well thank you for replying Alex.
Its good to converse with you once again.

When viewing the source of any page generated by Macromedia's tools you will see much of the source prefixed with MM_ which Macromedia uses to 'brand' their source code noting that doing so is secondary to other processing objectives but is a form of branding regardless.

Macromedia uses their prefix in the exact same way an XML Namespace is intended to be used: to resolve ambiguity and allow two or more instances of similar code to coexist in the same document.

I really don't know if Macromedia has used the law to ensure the use of their prefix remains unique to them and them alone. If I were Macromedia I would sure try to do so.

I have been working on an XML Web Services initiative and have been using the root element and specific prefixed namespaces to brand the initiative in the same manner as Macromedia uses their prefix. It was Macromedia from whom I intuitively derived the idea to do so in the first place. There is apparently nothing however that prevents others from also doing so while using the same root element and prefixed notation as I. Thus, a malicious or envious competitor could compromise or destroy the viability of my services unless my works can be protected.

I happen to be much more adept at trend analysis than software development and I can virtually guarantee that this issue will become a matter of contention with regard to trademark, copyright, and/or patent law as the use of XML and web services continue to evolve as the defacto text and document processing methodology which I believe you know and I believe you will agree are fundamental to a Service Oriented Architecture that must by its nature function semantically for both man and machine.

Registering a copyright in the U.S. is dirt cheap which makes it the perfect type of protection for small potatoes. A registration is required to enter the courts to litigate the use of the property. It is defending the property in court where the larger costs accrue. As a matter of fact, most infringers stop infringing after receiving a 'cease and desist' letter from one's lawyer as it is widely known that penalties for copyright infringement are quite substantial if the infringer proceeds to court and loses.

A patent on the other hand can be obtained but unlike the paltry \$30 or so for copyright registration a patent registration can easily cost more than \$5,000 making the acquisition of a patent a costly and non-trivial process.

Despite the recognized problems we have with an archaic U.S. government that continues to approve the assignment of 'business process' patents for processes that are obvious as implemented I think we could all agree that we all have a right to at least preserve and protect our work by name.

We may all be what those of us from across the pond call "sh!t out of luck" though. After weeks and weeks of calling around I finally found a lawyer who specializes in intellectual property, has a degree in electrical engineering, and claimed to have had actually developed some time ago allowing me to consider him credibly conversant.

The lawyer explained that U.S. copyright applies to the 'entire' expression. That is, the entire XML file. A copyright could not apply to just the namespaces and their respective prefixed notation. He stated the courts would consider XML and any fragment thereof to be a 'file structure' and used an example to explain.

It seems file structures can not be copyrighted which is why a word processing application can be made to open and read the files of a word processor from a competing vendor.

So, regardless of the lawyer's opinions I may be in denial as I continue to argue that XML is analogous to musical composition and an XML Namespace is the equivalent of a short musical passage such as a jingle. If it is a fact that composers who write jingles can have their work copyrighted — which it is — I see no reason why the copyright office and the courts should disallow copyright for XML Namespaces an avenue of consideration I am compelled to continue to pursue until such time as they grant me a copyright or they lock me up for trying.

By the way, in case you are not familiar with the jargon, a 'jingle' is a short musical passage that is played as background music during a radio or television advertisement.

Sing along with me now...

"You get more for your money when you eat at Bunny's
so drop on in for a bite at Bunny's greasy spoon."

Did you 'hear' that melody? :-)

```
--
<%= Clinton Gallagher, "Twice the Results -- Half the Cost"
    Architectural & e-Business Consulting -- Software Development
    NET csgallagher@REMOVETHISTEXTmetromilwaukee.com
    URL http://www.metromilwaukee.com/clintongallagher/
"Alex Homer" <alex@stonebroom.com> wrote in message
news:eypJ2D%23rEHA.3868@TK2MSFTNGP15.phx.gbl...
> Interesting - I have to say I haven't considered this. You mean something
> like MS might copyright "asp" as a namespace prefix for use with ASP.NET
> controls? Can't say that I can see that coming, but I guess the past
> performance of the US patent office might cause one to wonder...
>
> As to a namespace itself (the URI bit) I always use my own domain name.
But
> I guess there's nothing to stop someone patenting a domain name they don't
> own if it's not already copyrighted. Have you come up with a particular
> example, or can you expose a little more of your thinking behind the
issue?
> I haven't heard any mention from publishers - we have enough problems
> getting permission to shown screenshots of non-MS software!
>
>
> "clintonG" <csgallagher@REMOVETHISTEXTmetromilwaukee.com> wrote in message
> news:ebyEv4yrEHA.348@TK2MSFTNGP15.phx.gbl...
> > Thanks for pointing that out Alex.
> > Having access to "ASP.NET 1.1 Insider Solutions" is a real treat.
> >
> > If you are feeling up to a bit of controversy I would ask you if you
> > were interested in discussing how XML namespaces may or may not
> > result in copyright issues associated with their use.
> >
> > The highbrows building the markup languages do not want to speak
> > about this but since you are a working man with a job I figure you
> > probably have had reason to formulate an opinion or to have been
> > involved with publishers who have become aware of the considerations
> > involved.
> >
> > --
> > <%= Clinton Gallagher, "Twice the Results -- Half the Cost"
> >     Architectural & e-Business Consulting -- Software Development
> >     NET csgallagher@REMOVETHISTEXTmetromilwaukee.com
> >     URL http://www.metromilwaukee.com/clintongallagher/
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > "Alex Homer" <alex@stonebroom.com> wrote in message
> > news:OQagFGxrEHA.3988@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
> > > Nesting one "repeating control" such as a Datagrid or Repeater within
> > > another is the way to go. There are several ways you can do it, and
> > > there's
> > > a bunch of examples with a [view source] link at:
```

