





ing" problem. Its a better solution all around. I wouldn't create anything new in xml, but I wouldn't race to remove it in existing apps/protocols unless I'm doing a total v2.

**Re: (Score:3)**

by [HornWumpus \( 783565 \)](#)

Bullshit. XML with properties is just as tight. Not every property needs to be a subentity. There are decent Wiki articles that lay them out, side by side.

JSON more readable...no comments allowed. No, just no. WRONG.

They are feature for feature compatible, but one is Jave ghetto only, the other is 'everything else'. They should have never have `_started_` on JSON, in hindsight it was clearly a mistake.

"Is this a property of the tag, or data inside the tag"...I see your mistake. Use a library to parse X

**Re: (Score:3)**

by [SQLGuru \( 980662 \)](#)

Actually, JSON is slightly lesser in functionality compared to XML. I can validate XML with an XSD spec (and I can transform it with XSLT). But in this context, it's easy enough to compare them based on how they are typically used.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [organgtool \( 966989 \)](#)

This is an excellent point. I've been extremely frustrated with software that has been using JSON or YAML lately since they don't provide specs for their format. It often takes a lot of guesswork to determine if an entity is a subentity and if so, what is the parent entity, is this entity a list, is the entity a String that requires quotes or a non-quoted data type. These standards are a bit more pithy but a lot more ambiguous.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [t0y \( 700664 \)](#)

Way ahead of you: <http://json-schema.org/> [json-schema.org]

I'm sure there's a xslt equivalent somewhere.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [SQLGuru \( 980662 \)](#)

yes, but what JSON parsers already support JSON Schema validation without having to roll my own? Pretty much all of the XML parsers in the modern languages support XSD out of the box.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [coastwalker \( 307620 \)](#)

I completely agree that RSS is great. If you hotness fans want to use JSON you'd best not break gPodder and the rest of the non Apple iTunes RSS podcast feed world or I will hunt you down and shove your keyboard up your nose. Thank you for your attention!

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [Anubis IV \( 1279820 \)](#)

People making mistakes implementing a spec is not in itself a good reason to drop it.

Were that the sole difference, I'd wholly agree, but that's absolutely not the case here, which is why I tried to draw attention in the summary to some of the more substantive differences involved with this particular format. Had they simply ported RSS to JSON, this wouldn't be a story. Instead, they created a new format that is designed to address the issues they've faced in working with RSS and Atom over the last few decades, and in the process of doing so, it *also* made sense to switch to JSON.

I actually

**Harder to malform the JSON (Score:3, Interesting)**

by [SuperKendall \( 25149 \)](#)

*People making mistakes implementing a spec is not in itself a good reason to drop it.*

It is when the mistakes are frequent enough, obviously implementing RSS feeds is rather hard and most sites are really poor at it.

Adding to that is the simple fact that very few server languages have really easy or good XML generation at this point, compared to JSON library support. There are lots more good JSON libraries around and people are more comfortable with them and used to how they work.

*There will be malformed JSON*

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [CustomSolvers2 \( 4118921 \)](#)

The latest .NET versions are [also moving to JSON](#) [microsoft.com].

**Not at all true (Score:3)**

by [SuperKendall \( 25149 \)](#)

*The only coders using JSON now are java coders.*

What about every web or server developer on Earth? Are you not aware that the entire industry has moved to JSON for client to server transmission? ALL of the server people I have worked with in the last decade now have preferred JSON for REST web service calls too. That includes Ruby servers, PHP servers, not just Java stuff. In fact REST was pretty much using JSON from day one except for a few crazy attempts to use XML instead.

The entire iOS development co

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [dbrueck \( 1872018 \)](#)

Um, you do know that the 'J' in JSON doesn't stand for 'Java', right? JSON is not from Java, nor is it some sort of Java standard.

XML may have its place, but JSON is a pretty good format for storing structured data and is generally far easier to use in a lot of programming languages (no property vs value confusion, it preserves type info for basic data types, maps really well to a lot of languages' native syntax, etc.). It's a great interop format too, is far less "noisy" to read and write, and is wildly po

**Re: (Score:1)**

by Anonymous Coward

The J in JSON literally stands for Java.

It's JavaScript Object Notation.

Now, granted, JavaScript is totally unrelated to Java. Well, sort of: Java now comes with a JavaScript interpreter. Because the Java standard library wasn't already bloated enough. Best of all, though, because it's Java, it attempts to abstract the JavaScript interpreter to the point that it could be any language, making using it basically useless.

Hilariously, although Java comes with an entire JavaScript interpreter, it does NOT come w

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [dbrueck \( 1872018 \)](#)

LOL, nice trolling - well played. Have a great day!

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [worf\\_mo \( 193770 \)](#)

Um, you do know that the 'J' in JSON doesn't stand for 'Java', right?

You woke my nitpick mode: The J in JSON literally stands for Java (and the S for Script).

I agree with the rest of your post, though.

**Re:Harder to malform the JSON (Score:4, Interesting)**

by [gmunick \( 701343 \)](#) on Wednesday May 24, 2017 @02:26PM ([#54478867](#)) [Homepage](#)

The only coders using JSON now are java coders. They made a mistake selecting their flat file, hierarchical data format. Should have just build a good XML library in java to start.

Point of order: I've read several messages in this thread where you misassociate JSON with Java, but JSON didn't come from Java.

Its source is right there in the name: Javascript Object Notation.

Now on to subjective matters: XML is a disgusting standard which should die a fiery death. And I say this as

someone who works with XML on a daily basis (but more and more JSON these days, thankfully). The fact that good libraries exist to work with it doesn't make it any more palatable to me. JSON is vastly simpler, maps easily to

the most common data types, and is (get this...) usually easy (for humans) to read.

Java and XML were stuck together at an early age, and their forced marriage was unfortunately very fecund... but even many Java developers have seen fit to move on, if they're lucky enough to have the chance.

[Reply to This](#)   [Parent](#)   [Share](#)

[twitter facebook linkedin](#) 

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [arth1 \( 260657 \)](#)

I agree, that JSON is easier to read than XML, but not easier enough to change the standard now.

Easier to read, perhaps, but I am not sure about writing.

It's not obvious when you use `|` or `{`, or `|`, when `;` or quotes are required, and when spaces are significant.

XML seems to me to be far less error prone on the writing side, and they *still* manage to mess that up.

**Kickstarted blogging platform? (Score:3)**

by [Vyse of Arcadia \( 1220278 \)](#) on Wednesday May 24, 2017 @12:55PM ([#54478025](#))

Why are people crowdfunding blogging platforms?

[Reply to This](#)   [Share](#)

[twitter facebook linkedin](#) 

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [hmckee \( 10407 \)](#)

Good question. It made me curious so I checked it out. It's not a blogging platform but a micro-blogging platform. First thing I thought was, "So what?" Turns out they're using it as an alternative to bloated social websites that hoard your data.

This micro-blog makes it easier to retain your own data, share it with others and easily move it to another service provider. Something like this might have the chance to do what Diaspora couldn't, namely, put ownership of the data with whom it belongs and make soc

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

And frankly, there are libraries to correctly build & sanitize the contents of both XML and json, so there is no excuse for that

Other than trying to interoperate with existing sites' incomplete or invalid feeds while avoiding copylefted code.

**Re: (Score:1)**

by [mrbuster \( 200927 \)](#)

There's no such thing as malformed JSON. It is either JSON or it is some garbled hot mess that needs hacky shit to parse.

**Obvious solution (Score:5, Interesting)**

by [mwvdlce \( 775178 \)](#) on Wednesday May 24, 2017 @12:58PM ([#54478045](#)) [Homepage](#)


Problem: XML is harder to write than JSON.

Proposed solution A: Invent an entirely new format based on JSON and have the entire world adopt it.

Proposed solution B: Write a small library that translates JSON to XML and just use any of the dozens of libraries that already exists to parse RSS feeds.

Let's go for solution A.

[Reply to This](#)   [Share](#)

[twitter facebook linkedin](#) 

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

**Re: (Score:3)**

by [Anubis IV \( 1279820 \)](#)

You've listed one problem, and were that the only one, you'd be right. But it wasn't. The summary itself obliquely mentions three other problems...

Problem: Duplicate entries frequently appear in feed clients.

Problem: It's expensive to serve up a feed that contains all of a site's content stretching back for years.

Problem: Clients have to implement their own searching and scraping to find favicons, images, or other resources. Given all of those, a new format is not just the *obvious* solution, it's the **only** sol

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [Anubis IV \( 1279820 \)](#)

A) The duplicate issue is a model problem. RSS doesn't require unique identifiers, so clients can't distinguish between outdated entries that have been *removed* and edited entries that have been *replaced*. We need to keep the former so the user can read them, but the latter need to be eliminated, lest we have both the original and edited versions in the client. Even if the publisher and the client both follow the RSS spec, it's still left to the clients to implement their own special sauce to recognize duplic

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [chispito \( 1870390 \)](#)

Most of what you're saying amounts to, "I haven't had any problems, so there aren't any", whereas I've actually had problems with each of these areas, so I'm looking forward to seeing the possibility of some movement in the space.

I'm just looking forward to a human-readable and more concise feed. XML is great for things that should be complicated, and terrible things that should not.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [Anubis IV \( 1279820 \)](#)

Sure, which is why RSS was able to be built using XML. But if you want to fix the problems in RSS, you need something that *isn't* RSS. They could have implemented their ideas in XML and given it a different name, but if you're already creating a new format, why use XML when the library support in the relevant software stacks makes it far easier to export to JSON in far fewer lines of code?

**YAML (Score:2)**

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

I propose we improve this by using human readable text files for feeds. Just straight old readable text. Something like [YAML](#) [yaml.org], a more "human-readable" serialization intended to fill some of JSON's niche?

**"something interesting" + "world of news feed" (Score:2)**

by [CustomSolvers2 \( 4118921 \)](#)

Only in Slashdot! Is this something to be proud or ashamed of? LOL

I developed a small application to check some sites regularly and discovered that there are quite a few posting lots of information which don't have any (RSS) feeds. I also found the feeds in some of them either horribly formatted or with faulty/delayed data? Most of nowadays websites are dynamically generated and adding just one tiny layer of automation seems pretty straightforward, how can be this possible?

Regarding the JSON format, I ho

**It's about ads (Score:2)**

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

I guess some sites don't want to appear in feed readers. Instead, they want the user to check back on the site's front page (and look at front-page ads) or to download and install the site's associated app for Apple iOS or Android with Google Play (and look at the app's ads, which are even harder to block without rooting).

Or the RSS feed might be delayed on purpose to discourage too-rapid polling. Slashdot, for instance, is known to [ban IPs that retrieve its feed too often](#) [slashdot.org].

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [CustomSolvers2 \( 4118921 \)](#)

You might be right, but I don't think that any of this beneficial to them.

People willing to download an app or only interested in visiting the site will probably do that right away. On the other hand, those looking for feeds and not finding them might get a bad impression and even stop using it completely. If my business consisted in generating relevant amounts of public information, I would do my level best to make sure that everyone could access it as easily as possible.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

If my business consisted in generating relevant amounts of public information, I would do my level best to make sure that everyone could access it as easily as possible.

You start by "generating relevant amounts of public information," accepting that your audience will include a small fraction of viewers who don't pay, be it through a subscription or through attention paid to advertisers who in turn pay you, counting on there still being a substantial fraction of viewers who do pay. But as viewers who pay become a smaller fraction of your audience, not enough viewers are paying to cover the cost of generating said

information. The threat of operating at a loss means you nee

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [CustomSolvers2 \( 4118921 \)](#)

So is this a business or a charity?

Nothing to do with charity, but with doing what is best for your business in the long term. If you are already posting the information publicly, everyone could get it automatically without you adding feeds (they could directly parse your web pages). The feeds aren't giving away anything, but showing a caring, adaptable and even professional attitude which you customers will always prefer over restrictions.

Let's say that you expect 100 visitors, out of them, 65 will only use the easiest alternative without

**Are there any good RSS client out there... (Score:2)**

by [creimer \( 824291 \)](#)

I haven't used RSS in a long time. I previously used Thunderbird to manage my RSS feeds. Are there any good RSS clients that also accept JSON feeds?

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [SQLGuru \( 980662 \)](#)

I use RSS all of the time.....just indirectly. I subscribe to a lot of podcasts which are under the covers, just glorified RSS parsers.

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [Anubis IV \( 1279820 \)](#)

I linked to three clients in the summary. Of those, I personally use Feedbin and have been a huge fan of it ever since Google Reader shut down. It's operated as a for-pay service, but the developer open sources all of the code, so if you have your own servers you can run it yourself.

**Re: (Score:1)**

by [dgaller \( 849242 \)](#)

I like Tiny Tiny RSS, though it's web based so you need to run your own instance or pay a host.

**Oh FFS (Score:4, Insightful)**

by [ilsaloving \( 1534307 \)](#) on Wednesday May 24, 2017 @01:09PM ([#54478169](#))


I remember when XML was the big thing and everyone was all, "Oooh oooh! Our solution will be so much better if we USE XML!!!!1!eleventy"

I also remember then, how stupid this idea was, because there was nothing intrinsic about XML that would improve anything. Sure, XML is a human-readable file format that could be validated against a schema file if you so chose, and that was pretty good, but claiming a file/data format will improve how something functions, is like saying a car will perform better if you put the gas tank on the right side instead of the left.

And here we go, full circle again. except now everyone is ejaculating all over JSON, whose only benefit to XML is that it's slightly less verbose. It has none of the rigour that XML has, but everyone thinks it's great cause it's new and cool, and XML sucks because it's "old".

At least with XML, you can say enforceably say whether the piece of data is malformed or not. With JSON, the best you can do is basic syntax checking. There is no way to enforce the data itself is what it should be.... you have to trust that the other party didn't screw up the contents. The only way to add enforceability is reinvent the wheel in the worst way, by writing your own reference function to validate the data and hope other people use it.

[Reply to This](#)   [Share](#)

[twitter facebook linkedin](#) 

[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

**Re: (Score:2)**

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

How would you validate XML? If using XML Schema, then is it always possible to describe all interrelationships among elements and attributes in a schema? Or are you using XSLT to do whatever validation XML Schema cannot express? If so, that is likewise "your own reference function to validate the data".

**Re: (Score:3)**

by [ilsaloving \( 1534307 \)](#)

XSLT is a presentation layer component, for translating XML into something else. If you're using it for validation, you're REALLY doing it wrong.

I won't go into details about what you can and cannot do with schemas because there are countless resources that can give far more detailed information than what I can do in a single slashdot post. Suffice it to say, Schemas may not be 100%, but for comparison, JSON has no equivalent to schemas at all.

An AC in another post pointed to a project that is attempting



- Re: (Score:3)

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

[JSON Schema](#) [json-schema.org] is a vocabulary that allows you to annotate and validate JSON documents.

Re: (Score:2)

by [HornWumpus \( 783565 \)](#)

XML was never really new...It was intended to be the last time anybody had to implement flat file hierarchical data stores.  
We see how well that worked. If it had worked, JSON would have never been invented. But they neglected coders need to piss all over standards before using them. JSON is XML, with all the deck chairs rearranged.

Re: (Score:2)

by [zifn4b \( 1040588 \)](#)

At least with XML, you can say enforceably say whether the piece of data is malformed or not. With JSON, the best you can do is basic syntax checking. There is no way to enforce the data itself is what it should be  
Oh? Then what's [this](#) [json-schema.org] then? Eagerly awaiting your informed and educated response.

Re: (Score:2)

by [squiggleslash \( 241428 \)](#)

There never has been a time when *everyone* was all "Oooh oooh! Our solution will be so much better if we USE XML!!!!1!eleventy". XML has always been exceptionally unpopular with actual developers, it's always been PHBs and the computing community's equivalent of Very Serious People that has forced that god-awful standard on everyone.  
Developers have always been trying to come up with better alternatives ever since XML was foisted upon us. It's taken a while, JSON took off because every implementation of Ja

Re: (Score:2)

by [ilsaloving \( 1534307 \)](#)

Ever heard of Json Schema ?  
Nope. Good to know! It would have been infinitely better to have something that was actually part of the JSON spec, but this is a second best option.  
<http://json-schema.org/> [json-schema.org]

Re: (Score:2)

by [zifn4b \( 1040588 \)](#)

Ever heard of Json Schema ?  
Nope. Good to know! It would have been infinitely better to have something that was actually part of the JSON spec, but this is a second best option.  
<http://json-schema.org/> [json-schema.org]  
Translation: I don't really know what the fuck I'm talking about and I want to back-pedal gracefully soas not to get my ego bruised too much resulting in butt hurt. Next time, before you open your mouth, do a Google search.

Re: (Score:2)

by [zifn4b \( 1040588 \)](#)

It would have been infinitely better to have something that was actually part of the JSON spec, but this is a second best option.  
And also, I understand this to me that if XSD was not part of the XML specification that XML Validators wouldn't work nearly as good then eh? You better quit while you're ahead.

Re: (Score:2)

by [dgaller \( 849242 \)](#)

RSS worked fine, the problem is it was too open. Publishers want you logged in and monetized, with a reader that will display ads, and subscribing through a smart phone app.


Re: RSS was too open (Score:2)

by [thewolffkin \( 2790519 \)](#)

RSS worked fine, the problem is it was too open. Publishers want you logged in and monetized, with a reader that will display ads, and subscribing through a smart phone app.  
Man I remember the good old Google Reader days RSS feeds were so well populated that I didn't bother going to websites anymore. RSS feeds had everything I wanted. But yeah those glory days feel like they're gone now. I haven't made the switch to feedly yet and this point I'm not sure I'm going to bother with it.

I announce new formats... (Score:3)

by [grumpy-cowboy \( 4342983 \)](#) on Wednesday May 24, 2017 @01:22PM (#54478309)

YAML Feed  
INI Feed  
CSV Feed  
PROTOBUF Feed  
THRIFT Feed  
TSV Feed  
TXT Feed  
{NEW TRENDY FORMAT} Feed  
[Reply to This](#) [Share](#)  
[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linked in](#)   
[Flag as Inappropriate](#)

Podcasts would be the adoption moment I think. (Score:2)

by [thewolffkin \( 2790519 \)](#)

Since the death of Google Reader my most used case of RSS is podcasts. I get the occasional feed notification from IFTTT but most of the websites I used to get RSS from just have direct channels that are a little better and a little easier.  
But podcasts however I listen to a fair number of podcasts and I have about 30-40 of them in my reader ([Podcast Addict](#) [google.com]). I'd like a readable JSON format for syndication but if it's going to mess with my podcasts I won't bother.

RSS is dead and replaced by... (Score:2)

by [Parker Lewis \( 999165 \)](#)

RSS is dead and replaced by Twitter. Of course, I use RSS, but RSS is too nerd for the average user.

In a society based only on acquisition of wealth.. (Score:2)

by [zifn4b \( 1040588 \)](#)

It's no surprise that anyone would consider re-inventing the wheel or fixing what isn't broken because you can exchange the unnecessary labor for money. Brilliant!

Only adding confusion (Score:2)

by [mpol \( 719243 \)](#)

This new standard will only cause confusion.  
The big parties like Google are already trying to rid the world of RSS, or relegate it to a niche, since there is no advertising money in it.  
There is all kinds of things wrong with XML, but not in the context or RSS Feeds. The format is simple, easy to create and easy to read. Adding a new standard will not make RSS Feeds suddenly popular, quite the opposite.  
Let's unite behind RSS and the XML format.

XML is not the problem (Score:2)

by [OrangeTide \( 124937 \)](#)

The data format isn't the problem. It's that the current web industry does not promote decentralized content distribution when it cannot be used to distribute advertisements and collect consumer metrics.  
iCalendar is a custom property list format (SOMETHING:VALUE) and there is no real need to replace it either. As the problems aren't the format, but in how applications choose to use, distribute, and interoperate.  
The problem lies way way above the software. It's with people, the businesses and users.

ASN.1 feeds announced as alternative to RSS (Score:2)

by [WaffleMonster \( 969671 \)](#)

On second thought... we need a version that uses protocol buffers.. this would make RSS even better. You'll never know it or care but it'll be better...trust the Internet... more fragmentation for semantic bullshits sake is good for everyone.

Re: (Score:2)

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

I've read over the years that JSON data size is smaller? Also read that gzip negates this transparently.  
XML will still compress smaller than JSON because gzip still has to emit back-references for the end tags. It's similar to how minified JS compresses smaller than unminified JS.

CORRECTION (Score:2)

by [tepples \( 727027 \)](#)

Change "XML will still compress smaller than JSON" to "XML will still compress *slightly larger* than JSON".
- Related Links

Top of the: [day](#), [week](#), [month](#).

813 comments

[Outsourced IT Workers Ask Sen Feinstein For Help, Get Form Letter in Return](#)

704 comments

[DNC Hacker' Unmasked: He Really Works for Russia, Researchers Say](#)

566 comments

[After Healthcare Defeat, Can The Trump Administration Fix America's H-1B Visa Program?](#)

563 comments

[The Working Dead: Which IT Jobs Are Bound For Extinction?](#)

555 comments

[20,000 Worldclass University Lectures Made Illegal. So We Irrevocably Mirrored Them](#)

[next](#)
- ## Microsoft
- [Microsoft To Launch Its Netflix-Style Game Pass On June 1; Live Gold Subscribers Get Early Access](#)
- 27 comments
- [previous](#)
- 
- [US International Tourism Market Share Is Falling Under Trump](#)
- 261 comments
- Teen Vanishes In Aruba: But 10 Years Later, Police Uncover Truth (LifeDaily.com)

24 Celebs With IQs Too Bizarre To Believe (ZestVIP)

The Most Beautiful Woodstock 1969 Photos Ever Captured (NinjaJournalist)

5 Gründe Gold zu traden (Kewase)

Rare War Photos Not Suitable For History Books (HistoryNut.com)
- Slashdot
- Post

Get 34 More Comments

100 of 133 loaded

Submit Story

"Our reruns are better than theirs." -- Nick at Nite

FAQ

Story Archive

Hall of Fame

Advertising

Terms

Privacy

Cookie Preferences

Opt Out Choices

About

Feedback

Mobile View

Blog
- Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2017 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved.
- [Close](#)
- [Slashdot](#)
- Working...