Subject: Re: woofer shorting rings
Posted by Wayne Parham on Fri, 08 Aug 2003 21:32:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pretty cool. On a quick read, it looks like a flux stabilization or Faraday ring, pretty much the same that JBL uses, and has since they switched from alnico to ferrite motor structures in the seventies. Seems like I've seen links to other similar patents and lots of manufacturers use Faraday rings now days.One should realize that a patent can be obtained on the basis of a single patentable claim. You can literally obtain a patent based on a device that is exactly the same as that covered by another patent, but with one small change. An example would be to install a part of the patented device upside down, and to claim additional functionality from this configuration. I know of a case just like this, where a clamping mechanism was installed backwards. The claim was that this made the mechanism "easier to release." Ha! - No kidding, the clamp is essentially malformed in this way. But it was a factual claim and the patent was awarded for the "new mechanism."I didn't bring up this point to say who is better or worse, first or second. Just an observation of the PTO, and of the patent process in general. Nine times out of ten it is done to gain a marketing edge, and not to protect intellectual property. There is a value in marketing with the phrase "patented" or even "patent pending." It tends to give the impression of significance, whether or not there is any real value. And while you must provide a prototype to be able to obtain a patent, there is nothing that says the prototype must be of sufficient quality to be useful.My point is that original ideas certainly have merit, but the best implementations are much more important, in my opinion. Being able to talk about light speed and being able to attain it are two different things. So to me, performance is what counts.