

Friday, July 17. 2009

A removed article

Just in case you wonder about a missing article. There was an article quoting an Oracle employee. The quoted article has been removed from the blog. So i put my linking article into draft mode, as I assume the employee removed it out of a good reason and a linking article doesn't make sense without the linked article. I will put back into "publish mode" at an appropriate point in time for documentary purposes. Nothing is lost, the comments are still there, too.

Posted by Joerg Moellenkamp in English, Oracle at 08:12

Not sure why the original Oracle blog post has been pulled. I don't think there was anything controversial or even out of line in it. It'll be interesting to see if it does come back, and if it changes.

(PS. Google cache is a wonderful thing.)
Anonymous on Jul 17 2009, 10:30

Well ... the world of legal implications is full of wonders. I assume you can't welcome people when the merger is far from legally closed. The probability got higher yesterday, but it's still not a closed deal.
Anonymous on Jul 17 2009, 10:33

There is an anecdote do legal wonders:

We have to remove mp3 from a product, since the customers thinks he can be sued.

1. Switch of mp3

Not enough

2. Don't install mp3

Not enough

3. Remove mp3 form menues and help files

Not enough

4. Don't link to our comapnies homepage, since mp3 is mentioned ther

Not enough

5. Don't show windows build in codecs, which mention mp3

To be continued ...

The funny part is: We have all the licenses for mp3 you need.

And:

The patents for mp3 are phasing out.
Anonymous on Jul 17 2009, 12:32

Joerg,

I think there is just a problem with the permalink to the item ... I found the artichel via <http://blogs.oracle.com/otn/2009/07/> fine, but the permalink at the end does not always get resolved. Possibly a blog software problem at Oracles end (hope its not roller!), rather than any ulterior motive

Craig
Anonymous on Jul 17 2009, 14:14