

Re: Word 2003 XML

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Mac/microsoft.public.mac.office.word/2006-06/msg00272.html>

- *From:* "Phillip M. Jones, CE.T." <pjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 18 Jun 2006 10:38:28 -0400
-

Try a test on your vacation for laughs.

Locate some Strictly MS oriented websites, one that use MS FrontPage to design.

View them in IE.

Then Try them in Opera, or FireFox or any other non Ms Web Browser.

Run the sites through the W3C web page analyzers. See how many standards defects are there.

Even web pages designed and saved from Word has issues. Just run the page through MacroMedia's Dreamweaver's command Fix Word HTML defects.

See how many HTML Defects it finds.

Web Pages should be the in the same form the same form regardless of the Browser used. But Ms doesn't want that. They want pages designed in such a way That no one can read or view them except with IE. And On The Mac that puts us out because they have discontinued IE for Mac because Jobs added Safari, just so people could have another choice. So there are many sites That are written that have information Mac users could use, but can't get at it because FronTPage was used to design it, And therefore Only IE users can view it.

John McGhie [MVP – Word and Word Macintosh] wrote:

Hi Phillip:

Thanks — I needed a good giggle :-) But surely not even you believe this stuff?

If Microsoft really had made a life's work out of not using any standards, I suspect the constant references to the RFCs in their knowledgebase would not be there :-)

Bill Gates has announced that he is stepping down from day-to-day involvement with the management of Microsoft. But he will remain chairman for the foreseeable future.

And I suspect we ought to hope that he does. You see, if Bill left and

Re: Word 2003 XML

Microsoft became totally shareholder–profit–driven, ALL decisions would be made by the Pension Funds and HMOs that own the bulk of the shares. And we all know what nice people THEY are :-)

Cheers

On 18/6/06 11:27 AM, in article eSFdsZnkGHA.1272@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, "Phillip M. Jones, CE.T." <pjones@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

MicroSoft and "Open Format" seem an oxymoron to me.

They have made their life's work out of being secretive, and Fighting using any standards.

Look at the World Wide Web Consortium as an example. Microsoft is one of the Major signatories. Yet Their web browser makes use of stuff such as Active–X, and self–healing so That a monkey can write code for a website that will work in IE. But will not work in any other browser.

The main reason for MS joining was to find out what code The W3C was agreeing to settle on as official standards, and then figure out ways to break it so that certain sites can only use IE to view it. Use a captive audience.

Maybe When Billy leaves office and lets other run the show Maybe they can grow business by using "honest" competition. Instead of do it my way or not at all , that we have seen since MS inception.

Jim Gordon wrote:

Hi Steve,

The nail in the coffin of ODF was laid when the European open standards group chose the XML format that Microsoft adopted over the open format that Sun Microsystem's OpenOffice group was hoping for. The short oversimplified story is that the Microsoft XML format is "more open" and "more standard" than Sun corporation's Open Document Format.

–Jim Gordon
Mac MVP

Re: Word 2003 XML

Steve Hodgson wrote:

On 2006-06-16 17:52:00 +0100, Jim
Gordon
<goldkey74@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
said:

Office 2004 is unable to understand the new XML file format for Word and PowerPoint at this moment. Excel 2004 is able to understand the new format (I think – haven't had a chance to try it yet).

Thanks. I think it sounds as though it is best avoided for the moment. I basically work in a Windows world so it is useful to be able to move doc files over to the Mac for homework.

The advantage of XML is that it is human readable, at least to those humans who read XML code. XML is an open format meaning that anyone can create XML code and it will be interchangeable with other documents. It is not proprietary.

The appearance of file sizes being smaller is sleight of hand. The old .doc format is a binary format. Binary formats are more efficient than text, but are not open standards based. XML is text, and hence requires large file sizes. The sleight of hand is because the XML files are automatically zipped (compressed) before

Re: Word 2003 XML

they are saved
they seem to be smaller. For
a fair comparison, zip a .doc
format
document and compare that
size to the same XML
document.

I have to say it didn't strike me as looking
like a zip file when I
opened it in a text editor. When I opened an
ODF file in this way the
PKZIP reference at the top of the file was
immediately striking.

ODF does seem to be a very much more
/open/ format. Having played with
it in the past I really like that one can open
the zip file, edit the
XML that is the text, change the PNG
images then open the file in
OpenOffice with all those changes in place.

--

Phillip M. Jones, CET |LIFE MEMBER: VPEA ETA-I, NESDA, ISCET, Sterling
616 Liberty Street |Who's Who. PHONE:276-632-5045, FAX:276-632-0868
Martinsville Va 24112 |pjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxx, ICQ11269732, AIM pjonescet

If it's "fixed", don't "break it"!

<mailto:pjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>

<<http://www.kimbanet.com/~pjones/default.htm>>

<http://www.kimbanet.com/~pjones/90th_Birthday/index.htm>

<<http://www.kimbanet.com/~pjones/Fulcher/default.html>>

<<http://www.kimbanet.com/~pjones/Harris/default.htm>>

<<http://www.kimbanet.com/~pjones/Jones/default.htm>>

<<http://www.vpea.org>>

.

Re: Word 2003 XML