
Subject: C64 Patent

Posted by [The Godfather](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 18:38:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

Just wondering if it possible at all,or to even think of producing an old machine like the C64.

I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it from financial POV, but still.... is is possible ?

Thanks in advance.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Riccardo Rubini](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 23:09:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Godfather wrote:

> Hi,

>

>

> Just wondering if it possible at all,or to even think of producing an old machine like the C64.

>

> I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it from financial POV, but still.... is is possible ?

It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how to use a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double faced PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some chips have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II, etc.).

It's not a technical issue, I think it all goes down to the patents and the market. The patents' holder is the new Commodore, as far as we know, and the market isn't quite there. Nobody would produce an product that is not going to sell a sufficient number of figures to make a profit.

Riccardo

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Groepaz](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 23:18:09 GMT

Riccardo Rubini wrote:

- > It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how to use
- > a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double faced
- > PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of
- > production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some chips
- > have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II, etc.).
- >
- > It's not a technical issue, I think it all goes down to the patents and
- > the market. The patents' holder is the new Commodore, as far as we know,
- > and the market isn't quite there. Nobody would produce an product that is
- > not going to sell a sufficient number of figures to make a profit.

you are confusing patent with trademark. neither the c64, nor any of its components are protected by patents anymore.

--

<http://www.hitmen-console.org>
<http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>
<http://www.pokefinder.org>
<http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

Foolish man give wife grand piano. Wise man give wife upright organ.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 23:29:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Frans

"Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:44a700ab\$0\$5084\$4fafbaef@reader2.news.tin.it...

- > The Godfather wrote:
- >> Hi,
- >>
- >>
- >> Just wondering if it possible at all, or to even think of producing an
- >> old machine like the C64.
- >>
- >> I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it from
- >> financial POV, but still.... is it possible ?
- >
- > It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how to use
- > a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double faced

- > PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of
- > production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some chips
- > have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II, etc.).

If there is no SID sub, how do they make a HARDSID and a SID station?

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Sam Gillett](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 04:12:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Groepaz" wrote ...

- > Riccardo Rubini wrote:
- >
- >> It's not a technical issue, I think it all goes down to the patents and
- >> the market. The patents' holder is the new Commodore, as far as we know,
- >> and the market isn't quite there. Nobody would produce an product that is
- >> not going to sell a sufficient number of figures to make a profit.
- >
- > you are confusing patent with trademark. neither the c64, nor any of its
- > components are protected by patents anymore.

However, the code for the Kernal and the Basic interpreter is still under copyright, and, I think, held by the company that holds the new Commodore trademark. They agreed to let Jeri use the code on her projects as part of the compensation she recieved for her work for them on the C64-DTV project. Anyone else wishing to use the code for another project would have to make some sort of arrangement with them.

Reverse engineering the Kernal isn't really practical because most games, and lots of other software for the C64 will crash if everything isn't at the exact same address.

I don't know if a market niche would exist for something like a modern C64 or not. We already have the Gameboy for games, WebTV for net access, and my cell phone has a better PIM built-in than anything I used on an XT Clone back in the '80s.

Don't get me wrong. I still like my C128, but my cell phone has more raw processing power and RAM than my C128, plus a built-in display!

--

Best regards,

Sam Gillett

Change is inevitable,
except from vending machines!

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 04:48:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: dog_meat_phantom

> "Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:44a700ab\$0\$5084\$4fafbaef@reader2.news.tin.it...
>> The Godfather wrote:
>>> Hi,
>>>
>>>
>>> Just wondering if it possible at all, or to even think of producing
>>> an
>>> old machine like the C64.
>>>
>>> I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it
>>> from
>>> financial POV, but still.... is it possible ?
>>
>> It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how
>> to use
>> a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double
>> faced
>> PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of
>> production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some
>> chips
>> have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II,
>> etc.).
>
> If there is no SID sub, how do they make a HARDSID and a SID station?

I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.
Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.

--

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Charles Richmond](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 07:54:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dog_meat_phantom wrote:

>
>> "Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
>> news:44a700ab\$0\$5084\$4fafbaef@reader2.news.tin.it...
>>> The Godfather wrote:
>>>> Hi,

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Just wondering if it possible at all,or to even think of producing
>>>> an
>>>> old machine like the C64.
>>>>
>>>> I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it
>>>> from
>>>> financial POV, but still.... is is possible ?
>>>
>>> It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how
>>> to use
>>> a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double
>>> faced
>>> PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of
>>> production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some
>>> chips
>>> have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II,
>>> etc.).
>>
>> If there is no SID sub, how do they make a HARDSID and a SID station?
>
> I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.
> Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.
>
Well, possibly *not* indefinitely, but probably for longer than
anyone posting here is going to be alive...

--

+-----+
| Charles and Francis Richmond richmond at plano dot net |
+-----+

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Pheuque](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 08:08:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Godfather wrote:

> Hi,
>
>
> Just wondering if it possible at all,or to even think of producing an
> old machine like the C64.
>
> I am not sure who holds the patent rights, and if it's worth it from
> financial POV, but still.... is is possible ?

>
>
> Thanks in advance.

Given that there is no one is left to make the custom chips, and they would have to emulated in something like FPGA, it make more sense to just implement the whole unit in an FPGA. The DTV would have been perfect if it had built REU emulation, or a cartidge port.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Riccardo Rubini](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 08:28:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Charles Richmond" <richchas@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:44A77BC5.F6E113C0@comcast.net...

>> I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.
>> Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.
>>
> Well, possibly *not* indefinitely, but probably for longer than
> anyone posting here is going to be alive...

If I am not wrong, copyright and trademarks expire after 100 years, here in Italy. So... Around 2080, somebody could... :-)

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Groepaz](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 18:16:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sam Gillett wrote:

>> you are confusing patent with trademark. neither the c64, nor any of its
>> components are protected by patents anymore.
>
> However, the code for the Kernal and the Basic interpreter is still under
> copyright, and, I think, held by the company that holds the new Commodore
> trademark. They agreed to let Jeri use the code on her projects as part
> of the compensation she recieved for her work for them on the C64-DTV
> project. Anyone else wishing to use the code for another project would
> have to make some sort of arrangement with them.

the interisting point is that infact mammoth toys/ironstone/whoever is "commodore" now does _not_ own the copyright on any commodore property. they _only_ own the trademark "commodore" (and the logo, and maybe some more related stuff). the actual status of the software is pretty much

unknown.

--

<http://www.hitmen-console.org>
<http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>
<http://www.pokefinder.org>
<http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

Es ist schon alles gesagt worden, nur noch nicht von jedem.
<Karl Valentin>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Anders Carlsson](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 19:32:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Groepaz <groepaz@gmx.net> writes:

> whoever is "commodore" now does _not_ own the copyright on any
> commodore property.

How can you be sure? Have you seen any documents stating so? Maybe Yeahronimo (and previously Tulip) rather not speak publically about which copyrights, patents and whatsnot they have legal access over.

--

Anders Carlsson

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Groepaz](#) on Sun, 02 Jul 2006 20:29:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anders Carlsson wrote:

> Groepaz <groepaz@gmx.net> writes:
>
>> whoever is "commodore" now does _not_ own the copyright on any
>> commodore property.
>
> How can you be sure? Have you seen any documents stating so? Maybe
> Yeahronimo (and previously Tulip) rather not speak publically about
> which copyrights, patents and whatsnot they have legal access over.

well, there are a lot more reasons to assume they dont, than that they do.
(for example, IF they really owned the rights on the roms, they would be

more than stupid to not say so, and actively take actions. they could be the one and only legal source for a c64 emulator with builtin roms. oh, and they dont have any commodore software in their library. and and and.)

--

<http://www.hitmen-console.org>
<http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>
<http://www.pokefinder.org>
<http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

Digital files cannot be made uncopyable, any more than water can be made not wet.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 00:04:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Sam,

On Sun, 2 Jul 2006, Sam Gillett wrote:

> I don't know if a market niche would exist for something like a modern C64 or
> not. We already have the Gameboy for games, WebTV for net access, and my
> cell phone has a better PIM built-in than anything I used on an XT Clone back
> in the '80s.
>
> Don't get me wrong. I still like my C128, but my cell phone has more raw
> processing power and RAM than my C128, plus a built-in display!

When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer that has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.

In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program, and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of today's game machines.

Could that be produced? Does anybody else than me, think that could be the computer of the next "64" revolution? Where every kid would want and have one at home for programming games, utilities, demos etc.... IOW FUN.

Hernan

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anton Treuenfels](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 02:18:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0607030921000.29859@localhost...

>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer
that

> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or
> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be
> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or
> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc
> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.

>

> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program,
> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
> today's game machines.

>

> Could that be produced? Does anybody else than me, think that could be the
> computer of the next "64" revolution? Where every kid would want and have
> one at home for programming games, utilities, demos etc...

I doubt "every kid" would want one any more than "every kid" wants to learn
everything there is to know about how automobiles work. But there will
always be a niche market for the kids (young and old) who really want to
understand how computer hardware and software works.

Today's off-the-shelf systems are almost always used just to run
pre-packaged software. And last time I checked my local computer store,
they'd stopped selling any kind of programming languages or tools. So it's
hard to get the kind of hands-on experience in learning the nuts and bolts
of this kind of stuff outside of a college classroom. Whereas it was very
easy in the 80's, and those kids grew up to be today's best programmers.

Sure, I'd like to see a cheap hobby-oriented computer available again.
Instead of state-of-the-art I'd probably go trailing edge to keep costs
down. Maybe something like the Sega Dreamcast turned into a real computer.
Put a SuperH 4 CPU, the NEC GPU, some sound hardware, a big memory chip,
flash ROM, USB support, keyboard and power supply in a portable box.
Basically no moving parts in the box (except the keyboard). All other
hardware peripherals are extra, and already manufactured by someone else.

Built-in software would be "the best" open source that can be found.

- Anton Treuenfels

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [dowcom](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 06:11:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Group: comp.sys.cbm Date: Mon, Jul 3, 2006, 2:18am (CDT+5) From: atreuenfels@earthlink.net (Anton Treuenfels)

script:

> "Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> >wrote in message

I can see both points. High end (for 'cheap') would be the most fun.
Trailing-edge (based on PC104?) probably easiest to sell.

salaam,
dowcom

To e-mail me, add the character zero to "dowcom". i.e.:
dowcom(zero)(at)webtv(dot)net.

--

<http://community.webtv.net/dowcom/DOWCOMSAMSTRADGUIDE>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [John Selck](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 08:24:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Am 02.07.2006, 10:28 Uhr, schrieb Riccardo Rubini <rubini@despammed.com>:

> If I am not wrong, copyright and trademarks expire after 100 years, here
> in Italy. So... Around 2080, somebody could... :-)

We are talking about patents and not copyright.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Scott Julian](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 11:17:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Herman,

When I think of a modern 64 I think along the lines of a modern PC, but instead of running Windows or Linux its running a "Commodore 64 like operating system", I don't mean a PC just running an emulator pretending to be a Commodore 64 but a ground up newly built operating system that boots into BASIC and allows full access to all the built in hardware. I feel that

it does not need to be compatible with C64 software, but instead it give the look and feel of the classic 8 bit days. Easy to program, easy to expand etc...

These days PC hardware is cheap, with the most expensive parts being the operating system and commercial software which in Australia is usually twice the price of the hardware. I imagine that such a system would meet most if not all the things that we like about the good old days.

Anyway just a thought.

Regards,
Scott

"Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0607030921000.29859@localhost...

> Hi Sam,

>

>

> On Sun, 2 Jul 2006, Sam Gillett wrote:

>

>> I don't know if a market niche would exist for something like a modern

>> C64 or

>> not. We already have the Gameboy for games, WebTV for net access, and my

>> cell phone has a better PIM built-in than anything I used on an XT Clone

>> back

>> in the '80s.

>>

>> Don't get me wrong. I still like my C128, but my cell phone has more raw

>> processing power and RAM than my C128, plus a built-in display!

>

> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer that

> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or

> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be

> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or

> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc

> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.

>

> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program,

> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of

> today's game machines.

>

> Could that be produced? Does anybody else than me, think that could be the

> computer of the next "64" revolution? Where every kid would want and have

> one at home for programming games, utilities, demos etc.... IOW FUN.

>

> Hernan

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Scott Julian](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 11:21:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Groepaz,

I tend to agree with you about the ownership of the Kernal and BASIC roms, I feel that it would be just way to easy to crack down on all emulators that use these ROMS and being that the new owners of the Commodore brand haven't done this I would assume that they either don't own the ROMS or simply it way to hard for them to figure out whether they own them or not.

Regards,
Scott

"Groepaz" <groepaz@gmx.net> wrote in message news:44a82cb1@news.ish.de...

> Anders Carlsson wrote:

>

>> Groepaz <groepaz@gmx.net> writes:

>>

>>> whoever is "commodore" now does _not_ own the copyright on any

>>> commodore property.

>>

>> How can you be sure? Have you seen any documents stating so? Maybe

>> Yeahronimo (and previously Tulip) rather not speak publically about

>> which copyrights, patents and whatsnot they have legal access over.

>

> well, there are a lot more reasons to assume they dont, than that they do.

> (for example, IF they really owned the rights on the roms, they would be

> more than stupid to not say so, and activly take actions. they could be

> the

> one and only legal source for a c64 emulator with builtin roms. oh, and

> they dont have any commodore software in their library. and and and.)

>

> --

>

> <http://www.hitmen-console.org>

> <http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>

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

> <http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

>

> Digital files cannot be made uncopyable, any more than water can be made

> not

> wet.

>

>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Scott Julian](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 11:31:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Riccardo,

I think from memory the copyright laws here in Australia say something like copyright expires 99 years after the death of the author.

The problem with BASIC V2 used in the C64 is that the author would be Microsoft, the licensee would have been Commodore, not sure whether or not the licence was transferable from the failed Commodore to the various new owners.

So assuming that Commodore had a licence to use BASIC V2 that expired when Commodore went bankrupt then we would have to wait 99 years after the death of Microsoft to legally be able to play with it?

Now that's a thought :)

Regards,
Scott

"Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:44a783b4\$0\$10067\$4fafbaef@reader3.news.tin.it...

>

> "Charles Richmond" <richchas@comcast.net> wrote in message

> news:44A77BC5.F6E113C0@comcast.net...

>

>>> I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.

>>> Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.

>>>

>> Well, possibly *not* indefinitely, but probably for longer than

>> anyone posting here is going to be alive...

>

> If I am not wrong, copyright and trademarks expire after 100 years, here

> in Italy. So... Around 2080, somebody could... :-)

>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [AxiMaxi](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 18:56:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 3 Jul 2006 09:34:35 +0930, Hernan Vergara
<hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote:

> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer that

> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or
> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be
> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or
> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc
> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.
>
> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program,
> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
> today's game machines.

The first paragraph is contradicting the second:

THE power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.

Using advanced graphics at a high resolution or programming a music-tune with 256 tracks is a different thing altogether.
And having loads more of memory, means a different addressing technique that can't be put in 2 bytes.

If you ask me, there is NO need to reproduce anything like the C64 in a bigger (although not necessarily better) form.

If you want retro, go buy a second hand Commodore
If you want flashing graphics, stunning sound and gigs of memory, buy a Mac or PC and go learn, say, Visual Basic or C++.

Cheers,
AxiMaxi

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [AxiMaxi](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 18:58:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 03 Jul 2006 11:17:40 GMT, "Scott Julian"
<Scott.Julian@alphaworks.com.au> wrote:

> Hi Herman,
>
> When I think of a modern 64 I think along the lines of a modern PC, but
> instead of running Windows or Linux its running a "Commodore 64 like
> operating system", I don't mean a PC just running an emulator pretending to
> be a Commodore 64 but a ground up newly built operating system that boots
> into BASIC and allows full access to all the built in hardware. I feel that
> it does not need to be compatible with C64 software, but instead it give the
> look and feel of the classic 8 bit days. Easy to program, easy to expand
> etc...
>

> These days PC hardware is cheap, with the most expensive parts being the
> operating system and commercial software which in Australia is usually twice
> the price of the hardware. I imagine that such a system would meet most if
> not all the things that we like about the good old days.
>
> Anyway just a thought.

Yeah, indeed, you sum it up:
Instant boot, instant access and access to ALL hardware.
That's what made it fun with the Commodore machines.

Cheers,
AxiMaxi

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Anders Carlsson](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 22:05:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Scott Julian" <Scott.Julian@alphaworks.com.au> writes:

> The problem with BASIC V2 used in the C64 is that the author would be
> Microsoft, the licensee would have been Commodore, not sure whether or not
> the licence was transferable from the failed Commodore to the various new
> owners.

But Commodore bought an one-time license and were allowed to modify
the Basic as they saw fit (and they did), so in that case I doubt
Microsoft has much to say on copyright issues anymore?

--
Anders Carlsson

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Anders Carlsson](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 22:13:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Scott Julian" <Scott.Julian@alphaworks.com.au> writes:

> I feel that it would be just way to easy to crack down on all emulators that
> use these ROMS and being that the new owners of the Commodore brand haven't
> done this I would assume that they either don't own the ROMS or simply it
> way to hard for them to figure out whether they own them or not.

Tulip at one point raised a warning finger, in particular about those
rip-off companies who used the Commodore trademark, but also spoke about

patents for the various buses on C= computers and that a 3rd party hardware manufacturer needed to get a license to sell their stuff. They also hinted that they would protect the intellectual property that once was Commodore's own (mainly early VIC-20 cartridges and alike).

However I think they were sensible enough not try to shut down the whole Commodore retro scene including independent emulators (although they did appoint an official emulator that I've never used), since it would only cause enemies instead of allies.

Whether Yeahronimo have inherited these views from Tulip, nobody can tell. If Tulip were only putting out smoke and shadows, they were on thin ice if they had decided to sue anyone who sells new 3rd party C64 hardware or shut down a file library (that indeed contains copyright protected files, but of little commercial value and most being clones or rip-offs from arcades, in a related note to that one about Microsoft Basic). With so many shareholders and whatnot, I doubt a company like that would lie their way to lawsuit, where it would be proven if they have the rights they claim to have.

--

Anders Carlsson

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 22:19:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: zwsdotcom

Pheuque wrote:

- > Given that there is no one is left to make the custom chips, and they
- > would have to emulated in something like FPGA, it make more sense to
- > just implement the whole unit in an FPGA. The DTV would have been
- > perfect if it had built REU emulation, or a cartidge port.

I'm thinking about doing something the other way - making silicone casts of the breadbox housing and putting a single-board computer inside there, running an emulator.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Tom Lake](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 22:26:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

- > I'm thinking about doing something the other way - making silicone

> casts of the breadbox housing and putting a single-board computer
> inside there, running an emulator.

Wouldn't it be cheaper to just buy an old VIC-20 or C-64 and
gut it?

Tom Lake

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 03 Jul 2006 23:24:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: zwsdotcom

Tom Lake wrote:

>> I'm thinking about doing something the other way - making silicone
>> casts of the breadbox housing and putting a single-board computer
>> inside there, running an emulator.
>
> Wouldn't it be cheaper to just buy an old VIC-20 or C-64 and
> gut it?

Cheaper, but sacreligious. I have lots of VIC-20s and I am still
restoring some of them, it is no trouble to me to take a casting of the
case parts while I have one of them open.

Besides: if I mold it, I can make it out of a resin that looks like,
machines like and feels like aluminum. Or I can make it out of
transparent plastic, or any color you can think of. I can even mix and
match, and put different colors down different fill points so you get a
multicolored transparent housing.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2006 04:36:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: dog_meat_phantom

> On Mon, 3 Jul 2006 09:34:35 +0930, Hernan Vergara
> <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote:
>
>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer
>> that
>> has mega or gigabyes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or
>> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can

>> be
>> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the
>> 64 or
>> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today
>> etc
>> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.
>>
>> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to
>> program,
>> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
>> today's game machines.
>
> The first paragraph is contradicting the second:
> The power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type
> some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.
>
> Using advanced graphics at a high resolution or programming a
> music-tune with 256 tracks is a different thing altogether.
> And having loads more of memory, means a different addressing
> technique that can't be put in 2 bytes.
>
> If you ask me, there is NO need to reproduce anything like the C64 in
> a bigger (although not necessarily better) form.
>
> If you want retro, go buy a second hand Commodore
> If you want flashing graphics, stunning sound and gigs of memory, buy
> a Mac or PC and go learn, say, Visual Basic or C++.
>
> Cheers,
> AxiMaxi

you are 100% correct AxiMaxi

--

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2006 16:03:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: TJFM

On Sun, 02 Jul 2006 20:16:47 +0200, Groepaz wrote:

> the interisting point is that infact mammoth toys/ironstone/whoever
> is "commodore" now does _not_ own the copyright on any commodore property.
> they _only_ own the trademark "commodore" (and the logo, and maybe some
> more related stuff). the actual status of the software is pretty much

> unknown.

The copyright holder lives in a damp cardboard box in a dingy alleyway. Watching the shopfronts and biding their time. Waiting for the release of a wildly successful product that blatantly violates the copyright. On that day, the person will come forward and sue the pants off the party in violation of said copyrights. Thus ensuring a climb to the heights of wealth. Brutally repressing any product, free or otherwise that uses the copyrighted material. Strangling most of the fanbase in the process.

....or something like that.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 03:44:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Anton,

On Mon, 3 Jul 2006, Anton Treuenfels wrote:

>
> "Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0607030921000.29859@localhost...
>>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer
> that...
>>
>> Could that be produced? Does anybody else than me, think that could be the
>> computer of the next "64" revolution? Where every kid would want and have
>> one at home for programming games, utilities, demos etc...
>
> I doubt "every kid" would want one any more than "every kid" wants to learn
> everything there is to know about how automobiles work. But there will
> always be a niche market for the kids (young and old) who really want to
> understand how computer hardware and software works.

You are missing the point. Besides, there were automobiles back in the 70's and 80's ;-)

> Today's off-the-shelf systems are almost always used just to run
> pre-packaged software. And last time I checked my local computer store,
> they'd stopped selling any kind of programming languages or tools. So it's
> hard to get the kind of hands-on experience in learning the nuts and bolts
> of this kind of stuff outside of a college classroom. Whereas it was very
> easy in the 80's, and those kids grew up to be today's best programmers.

Exactly. I'm happy you agree with me. ;-)

Hernan

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 03:50:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Scott,

Yes, that is exactly what I meant. I would like a new computer built with updated chips and its firmware made "ala 64", that can access today's peripherals.

Hernan

On Mon, 3 Jul 2006, Scott Julian wrote:

> Hi Herman,
>
> When I think of a modern 64 I think along the lines of a modern PC, but
> instead of running Windows or Linux its running a "Commodore 64 like
> operating system", I don't mean a PC just running an emulator pretending to
> be a Commodore 64 but a ground up newly built operating system that boots
> into BASIC and allows full access to all the built in hardware. I feel that
> it does not need to be compatible with C64 software, but instead it give the
> look and feel of the classic 8 bit days. Easy to program, easy to expand
> etc...
>
> These days PC hardware is cheap, with the most expensive parts being the
> operating system and commercial software which in Australia is usually twice
> the price of the hardware. I imagine that such a system would meet most if
> not all the things that we like about the good old days.
>
> Anyway just a thought.
>
> Regards,
> Scott
>
> "Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0607030921000.29859@localhost...
>> Hi Sam,
>>
>>
>> On Sun, 2 Jul 2006, Sam Gillett wrote:

>>
>>> I don't know if a market niche would exist for something like a modern
>>> C64 or
>>> not. We already have the Gameboy for games, WebTV for net access, and my
>>> cell phone has a better PIM built-in than anything I used on an XT Clone
>>> back
>>> in the '80s.
>>>
>>> Don't get me wrong. I still like my C128, but my cell phone has more raw
>>> processing power and RAM than my C128, plus a built-in display!
>>
>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer that
>> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or
>> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be
>> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or
>> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc
>> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.
>>
>> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program,
>> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
>> today's game machines.
>>
>> Could that be produced? Does anybody else than me, think that could be the
>> computer of the next "64" revolution? Where every kid would want and have
>> one at home for programming games, utilities, demos etc.... IOW FUN.
>>
>> Hernan
>
>
>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 03:53:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Scott,

Why get stuck with BASIC V2?

Why not have Super Basic 2010? or something like that?

Hernan.

On Mon, 3 Jul 2006, Scott Julian wrote:

> Hi Riccardo,

>
> I think from memory the copyright laws here is Australia say something like
> copyright expires 99 years after the death of the author.
>
> The problem with BASIC V2 used in the C64 is that the author would be
> Microsoft, the licensee would have been Commodore, not sure whether or not
> the licence was transferable from the failed Commodore to the various new
> owners.
>
> So assuming that Commodore had a licence to use BASIC V2 that expired when
> Commodore went bankrupt then we would have to wait 99 years after the death
> of Microsoft to legally be able to play with it?
>
> Now thats a thought :)
>
> Regards,
> Scott
>
> "Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:44a783b4\$0\$10067\$4fafbaef@reader3.news.tin.it...
>>
>> "Charles Richmond" <richchas@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:44A77BC5.F6E113C0@comcast.net...
>>
>>>> I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.
>>>> Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.
>>>>
>>> Well, possibly *not* indefinitely, but probably for longer than
>>> anyone posting here is going to be alive...
>>
>> If I am not wrong, copyright and trademarks expire after 100 years, here
>> in Italy. So... Around 2080, somebody could... :-)
>>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 04:05:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi AxiMaxi,

On Mon, 3 Jul 2006, AxiMaxi wrote:

> On Mon, 3 Jul 2006 09:34:35 +0930, Hernan Vergara

> <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote:
>
>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer that
>> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or
>> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be
>> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64 or
>> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc
>> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.
>>
>> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to program,
>> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
>> today's game machines.
>
> The first paragraph is contradicting the second:
> The power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type
> some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.

Is it?

You mean to tell me, that given a powerful version of BASIC, I, you or anybody else, could not produce good gfx nor music?

> Using advanced graphics at a high resolution or programming a
> music-tune with 256 tracks is a different thing altogether.
> And having loads more of memory, means a different addressing
> technique that can't be put in 2 bytes.

There would be a lot of kids wanting to have that opportunity to learn, and in the mean tim, I would imagine software packages wold come out to help non programmers.... just like it happens with today's PC's?

> If you ask me, there is NO need to reproduce anything like the C64 in
> a bigger (although not necessarily better) form.
>
> If you want retro, go buy a second hand Commodore
> If you want flashing graphics, stunning sound and gigs of memory, buy
> a Mac or PC and go learn, say, Visual Basic or C++.

I think that's where you have mistaken me. I don't want retro, I want a modern computer that boots from ROM to BASIC, and has all the new technology today's computers enjoy.

Something wrong with that?

I have a PC, I am not happy with it. :-)

Hernan.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Groepaz](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 05:33:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hernan Vergara wrote:

>> The first paragraph is contradicting the second:
>> The power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type
>> some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.
>
> Is it?
>
> You mean to tell me, that given a powerful version of BASIC, I, you or
> anybody else, could not produce good gfx nor music?

no you wont. if you are a non programmer it wont help you. powerful tools make life easier for programmers (or designers or composers or artists or whatever), but without any decent skills you will still not be able to create anything non trivial.

and if you really wanted a modern computer that has the OS in rom and boots up quickly, go for it. get a board, some disk-on-chip solution, customize a linux kernel, tweak it for quick booting. its not like it couldnt be done, now, without a lot of hazzle. still the simple fact that you cant buy such a thing retail shows however that there isnt really much demand for it.

--

<http://www.hitmen-console.org>

<http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>

<http://www.pokefinder.org>

<http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

A critic is a man who knows the way but can't drive the car.

<Kenneth Tynan>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 08:48:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: TJFM

On Wed, 05 Jul 2006 13:23:13 +0930, Hernan Vergara wrote:

> Hi Scott,
>
> Why get stuck with BASIC V2?

Agreed. *Carelessly throws asbestos undies aside* Commodore BASIC V2.0 would have to be the worst basic implementation I have ever used. The later versions were okay though. If I knew of a way of using a later version of BASIC on a c64, I would.
Not that I ever really go near it
anyway, apart from basic file access to load other things.

>
> Why not have Super Basic 2010? or something like that?

Why so far off? I'd use C64 BASIC 05072006CVS0.1 if it existed. It'd get me going again on finishing the ROM flasher for my A500.

>> I think from memory the copyright laws here is Australia say something like
>> copyright expires 99 years after the death of the author.

I thought it was 50 years. Still, the last time I dealt with that was at TAFE, 8 years ago! That long...

--
/* Who is this General Failure and why is he reading my C: drive? */
/* http://blog.myspace.com/13604531 */

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Hernan Vergara](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 14:28:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Groepaz,

On Wed, 5 Jul 2006, Groepaz wrote:

> Hernan Vergara wrote:
>
>>> The first paragraph is contradicting the second:
>>> THe power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type
>>> some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.
>>
>> Is it?
>>
>> You mean to tell me, that given a powerful version of BASIC, I, you or
>> anybody else, could not produce good gfx nor music?
>
> no you wont. if you are a non programmer it wont help you. powerful tools
> make life easier for programmers (or designers or composers or artists or

- > whatever), but without any decent skills you will still not be able to
- > create anything non trivial.

So of the people I know, nobody is a programmer (including me) should not use Photoshop (for example)?

Am I missing something here? I'm sorry for not being a programmer, but I think I could learn BASIC even on windows, right? And if there is a graphics or music package, I could use it. Of course, that will not make me a Picasso or a Chopin instantly.

- > and if you really wanted a modern computer that has the OS in rom and boots
- > up quickly, go for it. get a board, some disk-on-chip solution, customize a
- > linux kernel, tweak it for quick booting. its not like it couldnt be done,
- > now, without a lot of hazzle. still the simple fact that you cant buy such
- > a thing retail shows however that there isnt really much demand for it.

So it is futile to even talk about it. I see.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Sam Gillett](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 04:57:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TJFM" wrote ...

- > On Wed, 05 Jul 2006 13:23:13 +0930, Hernan Vergara wrote:
- >
- >> Why get stuck with BASIC V2?
- >
- > Agreed. *Carelessly throws asbestos undies aside* Commodore BASIC V2.0
- > would have to be the worst basic implementation I have ever used. The
- > later versions were okay though. If I knew of a way of using a later
- > version of BASIC on a c64, I would.

Try Commodore BASIC 7.0 on the C128. :-)

It has such nice improvements as DO and LOOP commands, both with WHILE and UNTIL conditions that can be set. Also an EXIT command that can be used to jump out of the LOOP with an IF/THEN statement.

The DO/LOOP can even be used to emulate SELECT CASE which is available in even more advanced BASICs.

--

Best regards,

Sam Gillett

Change is inevitable,
except from vending machines!

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [RobertB](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 05:49:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 6 Jul 2006, Sam Gillett wrote:

> Try Commodore BASIC 7.0 on the C128. :-)

There is Basic 8, too. :-)

CommVEx info at <http://www.commodore.ca>
and click on ComVEX,
Robert Bernardo
Fresno Commodore User Group
<http://videocam.net.au/fcug>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [Lance Lyon](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 11:46:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TJFM" <nintendologist@nospam.gmail.com> wrote in message
news:pan.2006.07.05.08.45.41.326771@nospam.gmail.com...

> Agreed. *Carelessly throws asbestos undies aside* Commodore BASIC V2.0
> would have to be the worst basic implementation I have ever used. The
> later versions were okay though. If I knew of a way of using a later
> version of BASIC on a c64, I would.
> Not that I ever really go near it
> anyway, apart from basic file access to load other things.

What about Simon's Basic ?

Lance

--

// <http://landover.no-ip.com>
Commodore 128 forums & more! //

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

"Groepaz" <groepaz@gmx.net> wrote in message news:44a702b0@news.ish.de...

> Riccardo Rubini wrote:

>

>> It surely is possible. You can even do it at home, if you know how to use
>> a CAD program and have the required equipment to create a double faced
>> PCB. You need essentially the integrated circuits, which are out of
>> production, or some suitable substitute, keeping in mind that some chips
>> have had and have no substitute at all still (ie. SID, VIC-II, etc.).

>>

>> It's not a technical issue, I think it all goes down to the patents and
>> the market. The patents' holder is the new Commodore, as far as we know,
>> and the market isn't quite there. Nobody would produce an product that is
>> not going to sell a sufficient number of figures to make a profit.

>

> you are confusing patent with trademark. neither the c64, nor any of its
> components are protected by patents anymore.

>

There maybe some lingering patents and patents are renewable in the US and that is where they were patented in. However, it is unknown if they had been renewed at the time of ESCOM or Tulip. In whatever case, it is pretty much said a dead-stick. It is clearly renewable, since at least noone is producing SIDs, VIC-IIs and such on actual silicon based directly on MOS Technology design. The DTV VIC and DTV SID are ASIC and are not fabricated from original MOS Technologies's design but re-created. Basically, Commodore can renew their patents for some more time.

The proper term is Extension of Patent Term. However, the patents maybe active upto 20 years after they had been registered - so a patent is not totally dead until 20 years after they had been issued a patent number. The SID may not be fully dead until July 7th 2007 (1 year from now). SID - US Patent # 4,677,890. The VDC filed May 29, 1987 - (fully registered July 25, 1989 when patent was issued (not pending) - # 4,851,826). TED - US Patent # 4,569,019 - was filed June 3, 1983 but was not fully registered until Feb. 4, 1986.

The VIC-II Sprite engine -> Patent # 4,561,659 fully registered in Dec. 31, 1985 (filed originally on Jan. 6, 1983) (Display logic circuit for multiple object priority)

Another part of the sprite engine (the movement controls) - patented filed June 3, 1983 - but was fully registered and given patent # 4,572,506 Feb. 25, 1986. This patent is the Raster Line Comparator part.

I think the last remaining part of the VIC-II is the raster scan monitor circuit's patent - #4,813,671 - filed Sept.22,1986 and registration complete

Mar.21, 1989. However, it might have to do with something else.

Either way, I would say to be safe, all C= 64/128 patents will be dead by in 2009.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [rick balkins\[1\]\[2\]](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 21:38:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Anders Carlsson" <anders.carlsson@sfks.se> wrote in message news:wkbqs6cpff.fsf@sfks.se...

- > Tulip at one point raised a warning finger, in particular about those
- > rip-off companies who used the Commodore trademark, but also spoke about
- > patents for the various buses on C= computers and that a 3rd party
- > hardware manufacturer needed to get a license to sell their stuff.
- > They also hinted that they would protect the intellectual property that
- > once was Commodore's own (mainly early VIC-20 cartridges and alike).

Yes and the SID and any patents that hasn't been extended in anyway years ago and any patents that may still be active is not likely to be active past 2009 unless they were extended.

- > However I think they were sensible enough not to shut down the whole
- > Commodore retro scene including independent emulators (although they did
- > appoint an official emulator that I've never used), since it would only
- > cause enemies instead of allies.

Alot of this had to do with a voiced concern and I had a part in this among others that are remained anonymous. They also could not shut down whole libraries of Commodore games because 99% of the games were owned and copyrighted by companies like Activision, Epyx, Electronic Arts, Mastertronic, ect. Therefore, very few Commodore games were EVER owned by Commodore. Commodore had only a very small assortment of games, utilities, ect. that they actually owned.

Commodore to this very day has as much to say about Commodore games as Microsoft has to say for games, utilities, ect. that are made by third-party companies. Microsoft can not speak with legal authority on games that has nothing to do with Microsoft except for it being runnable on their OS. Only lawyers can speak on behalf of a copyright holder in the court of law. RIAA can not legally speak and be held in violation if they try to speak in behalf as attorneys because it is against the law for someone to practice law without passing the bar and received their license as an attorney.

- > Whether Yeahronimo have inherited these views from Tulip, nobody can tell.
- > If Tulip were only putting out smoke and shadows, they were on thin ice

- > if they had decided to sue anyone who sells new 3rd party C64 hardware
- > or shut down a file library (that indeed contains copyright protected
- > files, but of little commercial value and most being clones or rip-offs
- > from arcades, in a related note to that one about Microsoft Basic). With
- > so many shareholders and whatnot, I doubt a company like that would lie
- > their way to lawsuit, where it would be proven if they have the rights
- > they claim to have.

Yeahronimo - now Commodore International Corp. has the copyrights to any material actually copyrighted by Commodore. Even though the BASIC was derived from Microsoft - Commodore bought the proprietary rights to the version made for the PET and ultimately by the time of the C64, the version of BASIC in the C64 was owned entirely by Commodore. So was the Kernal and CBM DOS and any of the utilities disks like those for with the C-128. (Exception: GEOS, Quantum Link and CP/M and maybe a few others). The utilities for detecting the REU for example is owned by Commodore. Some games actually made by Commodore and is given a (c) Commodore Business Machines (preceded by the year - was owned by Commodore and thusly - Commodore International may be able to legally have something to say about those programs.

Games like Ace2 by Cascade is owned by Cascade or whomever that acquired Cascade (Artronic?). Commodore can not do anything about it unless they pick up the copyrights to the companies that are dead.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [rick balkins\[1\]\[2\]](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 22:01:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Hernan Vergara" <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0607051325050.28155@localhost...

> Hi AxiMaxi,

>

>

> On Mon, 3 Jul 2006, AxiMaxi wrote:

>

>> On Mon, 3 Jul 2006 09:34:35 +0930, Hernan Vergara

>> <hvergara@videocam.net.au> wrote:

>>

>>> When someone asks for a modern 64, I immediately envision, a computer
>>> that

>>> has mega or gigabytes of memory, high resolution output 1024 x 768 or

>>> whatever as minimum, boots from ROM, has a sound chip (like SID) can be

>>> another chip with 12 or 256 voices(?) :-) it has a startup like the 64

>>> or

>>> 128, IOW to BASIC2006(?), IDE EIDE or whatever is up to snuff today etc

>>> etc... and that it is priced in the \$300.00 max to \$500.00.

>>>
>>> In other words, a computer that once you open it you can start to
>>> program,
>>> and what you produce looks like the same or better to XBOX, or any of
>>> today's game machines.
>>
>> The first paragraph is contradicting the second:
>> The power of the C64 was it's simplicity. Anyone could master to type
>> some simple basic code or even assembly to produce graphics.
>
> Is it?

POKE 4290500368,65535

?Why not

32 bit addressing and 16 Bit data. Sounds like what BASIC would look like if written up for WDC Terbitum (whenever it would become available). There is no excuse. It just a matter of adding an addressing mode for absolute 32 Bit addressing. Just a Opcode for "LAS" (Load Accumalator Super-Long) where you would have one byte represent the load address and 4 following bytes would be the address. It would then load in the data in 16 bit chunks.

"LAS" is a made-up mneumonic for what it might look like. Of course, you would automatically be in 16 bit data mode.

> You mean to tell me, that given a powerful version of BASIC, I, you or
> anybody else, could not produce good gfx nor music?
>
>
>> Using advanced graphics at a high resolution or programming a
>> music-tune with 256 tracks is a different thing altogether.
>> And having loads more of memory, means a different addressing
>> technique that can't be put in 2 bytes.
>
> There would be a lot of kids wanting to have that opportunity to learn,
> and in the mean tim, I would imagine software packages wold come out to
> help non programmers.... just like it happens with today's PC's?
>
>> If you ask me, there is NO need to reproduce anything like the C64 in
>> a bigger (although not necessarily better) form.
>>
>> If you want retro, go buy a second hand Commodore
>> If you want flashing graphics, stunning sound and gigs of memory, buy
>> a Mac or PC and go learn, say, Visual Basic or C++.
>
> I think that's where you have mistaken me. I don't want retro, I want a
> modern computer that boots from ROM to BASIC, and has all the new

> technology today's computers enjoy.

However, the "digital computer" era has reached the end for new innovative programs. There is a program for about everything a human being could use a computer for. There is no more desire for programmers unless it is something like quantum computing because everything that can be done - basically had already been done.

> Something wrong with that?

>

> I have a PC, I am not happy with it. :-)

People's interest in programming has declined. My local college had stopped offering degrees in microcomputer programming and networking. There is more interest in networking but not in programming. This is because there is no desire among people to program because any program a person need can be downloaded or bought and is made. We are already over inundated with programs for every kind of need. 100s of antivirus programs, 100s or music players. Windows has BILLIONS of programs that runs directly or indirectly (via emulation) on it. Including C64 programs. So noone has the desire like it was in the 80s.

In the 80s, it was part of necessity but then a swarm of programs had been created over the last 20 years.

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Groepaz](#) on Fri, 07 Jul 2006 05:10:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rick Balkins wrote:

>

> "Anders Carlsson" <anders.carlsson@sfks.se> wrote in message

> news:wkbqs6cpff.fsf@sfks.se...

>

>> Tulip at one point raised a warning finger, in particular about those
>> rip-off companies who used the Commodore trademark, but also spoke about
>> patents for the various buses on C= computers and that a 3rd party
>> hardware manufacturer needed to get a license to sell their stuff.
>> They also hinted that they would protect the intellectual property that
>> once was Commodore's own (mainly early VIC-20 cartridges and alike).

>

> Yes and the SID and any patents that hasn't been extended in anyway years
> ago and any patents that may still be active is not likely to be active
> past 2009 unless they were extended.

>

>> However I think they were sensible enough not try to shut down the whole

>> Commodore retro scene including independent emulators (although they did
>> appoint an official emulator that I've never used), since it would only
>> cause enemies instead of allies.

>

> A lot of this had to do with a voiced concern and I had a part in this
> among others that are remained anonymous. They also could not shut down
> whole libraries of Commodore games because 99% of the games were owned and
> copyrighted by companies like Activision, Epyx, Electronic Arts,
> Mastertronic, ect. Therefore, very few Commodore games were EVER owned by
> Commodore. Commodore had only a very small assortment of games, utilities,
> ect. that they actually owned.

>

> Commodore to this very day has as much to say about Commodore games as
> Microsoft has to say for games, utilities, ect. that are made by
> third-party companies. Microsoft can not speak with legal authority on
> games that has nothing to do with Microsoft except for it being runnable
> on their OS. Only lawyers can speak on behalf of a copyright holder in the
> court of law. RIAA can not legally speak and be held in violation if they
> try to speak in behalf as attorneys because it is against the law for
> someone to practice law without passing the bar and received their license
> as an attorney.

>

>> Whether Yeahronimo have inherited these views from Tulip, nobody can
>> tell. If Tulip were only putting out smoke and shadows, they were on thin
>> ice if they had decided to sue anyone who sells new 3rd party C64
>> hardware or shut down a file library (that indeed contains copyright
>> protected files, but of little commercial value and most being clones or
>> rip-offs from arcades, in a related note to that one about Microsoft
>> Basic). With so many shareholders and whatnot, I doubt a company like
>> that would lie their way to lawsuit, where it would be proven if they
>> have the rights they claim to have.

>

> Yeahronimo - now Commodore International Corp. has the copyrights to any
> material actually copyrighted by Commodore. Even though the BASIC was
> derived from Microsoft - Commodore bought the proprietary rights to the
> version made for the PET and ultimately by the time of the C64, the
> version of BASIC in the C64 was owned entirely by Commodore. So was the
> Kernal and CBM DOS and any of the utilities disks like those for with the
> C-128. (Exception: GEOS, Quantum Link and CP/M and maybe a few others).
> The utilities for detecting the REU for example is owned by Commodore.
> Some games actually made by Commodore and is given a (c) Commodore
> Business Machines (preceded by the year - was owned by Commodore and
> thusly - Commodore International may be able to legally have something to
> say about those programs.

>

> Games like Ace2 by Cascade is owned by Cascade or whomever that acquired
> Cascade (Artronic?). Commodore can not do anything about it unless they
> pick up the copyrights to the companies that are dead.

ladies and gentleman.... and here is the winner for the *drumroll*
stating-the-obvious award july 2006. congratulations!

--

<http://www.hitmen-console.org>
<http://www.gc-linux.org/docs/yagcd.html>
<http://www.pokefinder.org>
<http://ftp.pokefinder.org>

Wanted dead and alive: Schroedinger's cat

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [RobertB](#) on Fri, 07 Jul 2006 07:47:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 6 Jul 2006, Lance Lyon wrote:

> What about Simon's Basic ?

For the C64, there is Tuned Simon's Basic (TSB), which is a
bug-corrected Simon's Basic. It can be downloaded at Arndt Dettke's
website -- <http://www.godot64.de>

CommVEx info at <http://www.commodore.ca>
and click on ComVEX,
Robert Bernardo
Fresno Commodore User Group
<http://videocam.net.au/fcug>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent
Posted by [rick balkins\[1\]\[2\]](#) on Sun, 09 Jul 2006 00:36:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, it is 99 years after death of author or death of the current
copyright holder.

But actually, the 99 years after death of author is pertaining to copyrights
of books. You have to look specifically under the copyright laws pertaining
to works for hire. BASIC v2 is a works for hire. When copyrights are
transferred from owner to owner, it is until the remainder of the term.

If I recall, works for hire (works made for a company and thusly copyrighted
by the company and not the actual person) is copyrighted to a prescribed

number of years. We are looking at 75 years.

Since it was done in the United States, look here:

<http://www.copyright.gov/help/faq/faq-duration.html#duration>

How long does a copyright last?

The term of copyright for a particular work depends on several factors, including whether it has been published, and, if so, the date of first publication. As a general rule, for works created after Jan. 1, 1978, copyright protection lasts for the life of the author plus an additional 70 years. For an anonymous work, a pseudonymous work, or a work made for hire, the copyright endures for a term of 95 years from the year of its first publication or a term of 120 years from the year of its creation, whichever expires first. For works first published prior to 1978, the term will vary depending on several factors. To determine the length of copyright protection for a particular work, consult chapter 3 of the Copyright Act (title 17 of the United States Code). More information on the term of copyright can be found in Circular 15a, Duration of Copyright, and Circular 1, Copyright Basics.

In US, for books and other material that is produced by an author is copyrighted for life+70years after death of author. For anonymous work, a pseudonymous work or a work made for hire, the copyright lasts for 95 years after its first published or 120 years after its creation. Whichever expires first. This is for works produced on or after Jan.1, 1978.

For works prior to 1978, - <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap3.html>
Any copyrighted material in their first term and is still active on January 1, 1978 shall endure for 28 years from the date it was originally secured and is open for renewal at that point - the proprietor of the copyright shall be entitled to a renewal/extension of the copyright for a further term of 67 years.

CBM BASIC - (which Commodore acquired proprietary rights to back in 1978-1980 time - before the VIC-20 came out) has a right to renew in 2005-2008. This means that Commodore International could have easily renew/extend the term for the original PET/CBM BASIC back at that time for an additional term of 67 years. The version of BASIC in the C64 is not for renewal until 2077. So guys, CBM BASIC v2 in C64 is not up for grabs until 2077 and it is still in its first term.

Australian laws would not make any real difference. They may honor it for upto 4 more years.

"Scott Julian" <Scott.Julian@alphaworks.com.au> wrote in message
news:%d7qg.20537\$ap3.16766@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

> Hi Riccardo,

>

> I think from memory the copyright laws here in Australia say something
> like copyright expires 99 years after the death of the author.

>

> The problem with BASIC V2 used in the C64 is that the author would be
> Microsoft, the licensee would have been Commodore, not sure whether or not
> the licence was transferable from the failed Commodore to the various new
> owners.

>

> So assuming that Commodore had a licence to use BASIC V2 that expired when
> Commodore went bankrupt then we would have to wait 99 years after the
> death of Microsoft to legally be able to play with it?

>

> Now that's a thought :)

>

> Regards,
> Scott

>

> "Riccardo Rubini" <rubini@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:44a783b4\$0\$10067\$4fafbaef@reader3.news.tin.it...

>>

>> "Charles Richmond" <richchas@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:44A77BC5.F6E113C0@comcast.net...

>>

>>>> I think the C64 ROM images are copyright protected indefinitely.

>>>> Unlike patents, which last about 20 years.

>>>>

>>> Well, possibly *not* indefinitely, but probably for longer than
>>> anyone posting here is going to be alive...

>>

>> If I am not wrong, copyright and trademarks expire after 100 years, here
>> in Italy. So... Around 2080, somebody could... :-)

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: C64 Patent

Posted by [Fabrizio Gennari](#) on Sun, 09 Jul 2006 08:48:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pheuque ha scritto:

> The DTV would have been

> perfect if it had built REU emulation, or a cartridge port.

>

or datassette port
