

microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp: Re: C# is a proprietary programming language ??

Re: C# is a proprietary programming language ??

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2004-07/0876.html>

From: Mark Broadbent (*no-spam-please_at_no-spam-please.com*)

Date: 07/04/04

Date: Sun, 4 Jul 2004 11:29:32 +0100

I dont believe Microsoft would be legally able to charge for the Framework now it has been submitted (or) at very least would be unable to prevent an open source implementation of the .net runtime for Windows and windows classes. Anyhow Microsoft are not about to start trying to stifle uptake of this technology now or in the future –it opens up too many revenue possibilities with cross Application integration of their product line (e.g. SQL, Exchange, Office etc). Oracle/ Java initiative would love to be in that position.

As for whether it is proprietary well...

You now dont need Microsoft OS and/or their .NET runtime distribution and/or their Development tools (see Linux/ Mono). They cannot prevent this usage and never will.

As to who controls the changes to the language with regards to syntax and semantics Im a little unsure about but I would have thought anything would have to be submitted to the ECMA –and the final say is down to them.

--

Br,

Mark Broadbent

mcdba , mcse+i

=====

"Nick Malik" <nickmalik@hotmail.nospam.com> wrote in message news:K3KFc.21311\$Oq2.12437@attbi_s52...

> Hello Chua Wen Ching,

>

> I am going to disagree with one other responder on this thread. My

> apologies.

>

> > I initially thought that C# is an ECMA standard as Microsoft submitted to

> them. It is open to everyone to create a compiler for C# or anything.

>

> Don't be silly. If Microsoft stopped supporting C# tomorrow, that ECMA

> standard would be meaningless. If a third party commercial corporate

> decided to really try to compete with Microsoft by producing a viable C#

> compiler on the Windows platform, Microsoft would probably attack them and

> destroy them. Don't be fooled with a notion that C# is "open." The

> definition is public and stable. The definition is released and others are

> free to create bits, but it is still proprietary. If MS makes a change,

Re: C# is a proprietary programming language ??

microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp: Re: C# is a proprietary programming language ??

> without asking anyone else, no one will mind. If anyone else makes a
> change, without asking Microsoft, they will be ridiculed, ignored, or
> attacked. Control is with Microsoft. SUN behaves exactly the same way
with
> Java. Both languages are completely proprietary.
>
> >
> > Not like if you want to use C#, you need to buy this and that. I don't
> think it is a must to buy visual studio .net, and .net framework is free
to
> download.
>
> If Microsoft decided to charge money for the .NET framework, what would
you
> do? You'd pay it. You'd have no choice. That is what proprietary means.
> Microsoft won't. But other companies have done this in the past,
including
> IBM. That's what makes folks jittery. Microsoft is not guilty of this
sin,
> but a lot of folks are wary...
>
> >
> > Example, rpg language. If you want to use it, you need to have a
> mainframe. I think this is more to proprietary.
>
> Are you comparing C# to RPG? That's funny. Yes, RPG is proprietary, but
if
> you purchased a mainframe, you are going to use a proprietary OS,
Database,
> Application languages, Productivity suites, etc. Everything is
proprietary.
> If the company that creates the package decides to stop, you are sunk.
> (Just ask former customers of Wang, or Data General).
>
> C# is proprietary, plain and simple. It doesn't matter, but there it is.
> So is Java. I don't care. Most others don't care either.
>
> If you pick something other than a .NET language, or Java, for new
> application development for typical business applications, you should have
a
> very good reason for doing so (like 100,000 lines of working code in
another
> language that you NEED to use). Niche markets and applications still need
> niche languages. But for most of us, that's the only two choices left.
>
> Hope this helps,
> --- Nick
>
>