-----Original Message-----
From: I Am Malkav
Sent: Saturday, January 05, 2013 2:38 AM
To: SoftwareRoundtable2013
Subject: Software patent boundaries

Dear United States of America,

please get your s***(redacted) in order. Software is a language as math is a language. It should not be patentable at all, just as math is not patentable. The quicker you realize this the quicker the world will move on and stop wasting resources on frivolous lawsuits. How much money gets wasted in the US economy alone over this retarded issue; the answer -- too much.

If you allow software patents and they must be tied to a specific machine to qualify for an invention, where do you draw the line. For instance, if I code a basic bubble sort on paper and then compile it to run on a generic personal computer how is that any different than compiling it to run on a Raspberry PI or Texas Instruments calculator?
There is no major difference, just the compiled code that is generated to make it work for the specific hardware. But, you may say that the bubble sort cannot be patented because of prior art. Okay, fine. Let's then say I write the code on paper to perform a great new previously unknown encryption process and then compile it to run on my Android Phone. The issue here is that the code can be compile for any machine that supports the language that I wrote it in so there is no specific machine that can meet the test for software patents. If it is transcribed into hardware directly that may be specific enough, but wouldn't that be great to fix if I find there is a bug in it? Oh excuse me Google, Apple and everyone else that built billions of devices that have this new hardware, but you all have to replace your chips to get the bug fixes. By trying to tie code to specific hardware you are forcing manufacturers to make literal hard coded circuits to do the tasks. Following this methodology to enforce software patents will be a huge folly and cost countless billions. So, separate the code from the hardware and what do you get? You get the equivalent of written expression which is not covered by patents.

Malkav

P.S. While you're at it please take a look at design patents because patents over a rectangular prism with rounded corners should not be patentable either.