purchasers knew that without these products they could save some number of dollars, that now often amounts to a sizeable percentage of the computer package purchase price, they could apply pressure to the vendor to provide alternative (likely less expensive) products. Microsoft has stated concerns that selling computers without operating systems equates to software piracy. This assertion is absurd, and has become irrelevant with Microsoft's newest release of Windows XP, which requires license activation.

Having consumers and end-users with more information is clearly in the public interest. All of what is suggested here concerns supplying information that enables computer users to make informed decisions, and to access their own work on their own computer.

In summary, I believe the proposed settlement is seriously lacking, and will, if implemented as proposed, aid Microsoft in its efforts to hinder its most viable competitors. Any successful settlement must protect the rights of computer users to choose the products they desire to access their data.

Sincerely,

Carl Michal

Department of Physics & Astronomy

University of British ColumbiaTel: (604) 822–2432

411–6224 Agricultural RdLab: (604) 822–3898

Vancouver, BCFax: (604) 822–5324

Canada V6T 1Z1Email: michal@physics.ubc.ca

MTC–00004367

From: Joseph Henry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 5:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to congratulate the DOJ's stellar work in bringing Microsoft to justice. By forcing the company to donate $1 billion dollars (in cash, equipment and software) you really hurt them. Oh wait, now that I think about it you actually just increased Microsofts market share dominance and hurt it's only viable competitor Apple Computer. It just goes to show you that if your a big corporation with unlimited resources, you can buy anything in this country including justice (and DOJ personel). Lets hear it for the good ol US of A!

Joseph Henry
604 Riverside Ave. Apt. 2
Park Rapids, MN 56470
218–732–7664

MTC–00004368

From: Joseph Henry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 5:53pm
Subject: Dear Department of Justice,

Dear Department of Justice,

I would like to express my feelings on the proposed Microsoft settlement. I am vehemently opposed to it as it is written for a number of reasons. First, as it is written the settlement won't be able to stop Microsoft from illegally using its market power and isn't easily enforceable. Second, The $1 billion donation to schools will only strengthen Window's (Microsofts) position in education at the expense of Apple Computer. Although the schools will be able to spend the cash portion however they seem fit, what operating system do you think most will choose if they are given loads of referbished Windows machines (as well as a bunch of Windows only based software). Lastly, $1 billion isn't enough. For a guy like Bill Gates, who has built his personal net worth to over $87 Billion through Microsoft's monopolistic practices, $1 billion is pocket change to keep the Federal Government at bay. The way I see it this settlement does exactly the opposite of what antitrust laws are intended to do. It slaps the wrist of a monopolistic company, imposing no real sanctions and at the same time erodes the market share of it's only viable competitor (Apple Computer).

Please don't let Microsoft get off this easy.

Joseph Henry
604 Riverside Ave, Apt. 2
Park Rapids, MN 56470
218–732–7664

MTC–00004369

From: Linda Quick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support Microsoft. It is a company that employs thousands of people in an industry that was almost nonexistent 25 years ago. Microsoft has made technology easy for the average person to learn and to use. Why would we punish a company that has contributed so much to society? I for one am happy that there is essentially one operating system. I can't image the problems we would encounter if everyone used different operating systems to ''talk'' to each other. PLEASE SUPPORT MICROSOFT. Thank you.

L. Quick, Connecticut

MTC–00004370

From: John Kristjansson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 6:00pm
Subject: Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Historically, Microsoft has had little problem with deliberately changing their operating system source code in order to destroy a competitor's competing, and oftentimes superior, products—a la ''it ain't done 'til Lotus won't run''. These practices have led to a situation where the consumer has become convinced that the only safe product to buy is one manufactured or endorsed by Microsoft. They have employed underhanded tactics in their licensing schemes to prevent PC manufacturers from offering competing products alongside the Windows platform—the infamous boot time license. Further, they use federal certifications, specifically the Orange Book (DOD Trusted Computer Systems Evaluation Criteria), in order to convince the consumer that their products are more secure than they really are(Orange Book C2 certification applies to standalone machines rather than a networked o/s). I won't even touch the topic of software bundling at this point, only the illegal maintenance of a monopoly. I am not convinced that the settlement, which has aspects that appear to help reinforce their monopoly position, goes far enough in remediating the conditions which led the DOJ to prosecute an antitrust suit against Microsoft. I feel that the only possible resolution that will prevent further illegal maintenance of their monopoly is to place the source code of their current operating system and its immediate predecessor in public scrutiny under a license similar to the Artistic License, as well as a 15-month ban on any further operating system releases. This will have the effect of lowering the barrier to entry in the marketplace, allowing a certain amount of competition to redevelop in the marketplace, and ultimately improve the overall security of the architecture. While this may sound a bit extreme, the actions that Microsoft has taken in the past are no less extreme, and their current activities and plans appear to make their past misconduct a more desirable situation. They must be held liable for their actions, and suffer the consequenses.

MTC–00004371

From: Karen Messenger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 6:03pm
Subject: Don't allow Microsoft to determine what is a ''viable business''

Dear Sir/Madam,

Having seen the proposed settlement, I would like to register my strong objection to it. The agreement is full of loopholes, whereby Microsoft is allowed to determine, at its own discretion, whether to adhere to certain principles. For example, Microsoft is required to make available its APIs, but only to organizations which Microsoft deems to be ''viable businesses''. This is outrageous! What constitutes a viable business?

I am an independant software developer. I have spent 3 years developing ground-breaking Internet technology designed to facilitate free broadcasting of media (e.g. video) between communities of cooperating clients (see www.freebeam.com for a short explanation). I have applied for a patent. I have acquired no outside funding. My business development plan calls for giving away my software for free, for some years, in order to develop a user base. After that time, I expect to derive income from patent royalties paid by large-scale commercial users. I expect I may derive no income for several years, in other words. Eventually, it will be very lucrative for me, so that makes up for it.

Am I a ''viable business''? Will Microsoft be required to make their APIs available to me? If not, then I would be unable to compete on an equal basis with competitors which Microsoft deemed to be ''viable''. That would be self-fulfulling.

In the interest of fair play for small-scale developer/entrepreneurs, such as myself, I implore you to reject the proposed settlement. Such a settlement would very clearly tend to squelch small-scale developers—a powerfully innovative force. Microsoft should not be able to exercise its own judgement in deciding how to live up to the terms of the agreement. The terms should be interpreted and enforced from outside of Microsoft. To do any less would be to further entrench Microsoft's illegal monopoly.

Sincerely,

Chuck Messenger
CC:chuckm@rochester.rr.com@inetgw

MTC–00004372

From: John Jensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 6:08pm
Subject: Microsoft

Did someone sell out to Microsoft, that they effectively have no punishment to go with their conviction? They are still at their old tricks, so STOP THEM ALREADY!

John Jensen
520 Goshawk Court
Bakersfield, CA 93309
icq #: 18494316

MTC–00004373

From: Ellsworth, Jenny
To: 'Microsoft.atr (a)usdoj.gov', 'Microsoft Comments (a)d..
Date: 12/13/01 6:24pm
Subject: Please Reject the Proposed Microsoft Settlement

As a remedy for Microsoft's abuse of monopolistic power, it would be better to forbid them to give their products to schools than to require it. I am an IT professional for the City of Newport Beach, and an important part of my job is computer training. I know, from observing users in our Microsoft-dominated environment, that exposure and training are the determining factors for a user's choice of software. Allowing Microsoft to monopolize the schoolchildren and future computer professionals of this country will only serve to ensure that they continue to monopolize the software industry in years to come.

In addition to serving Microsoft's business needs of the future, such so-called ''charity'' would cost them pennies to provide software to schools, and offer Microsoft both tax benefits and good public relations. Microsoft has in the past regarded the DOJ as giving them a mandate to monopolize the software industry, and this would be no different. Were they to provide cash, rather than software, to be used as the schools need to use it, that would be a great aid.

Allowing PC makers to install non-Microsoft software is not sufficient to enable competition. Microsoft must be made to separate the operating system from their other applications. Many users I know are at least somewhat confused about the difference between Windows, Office, and the Internet. This is the result of Microsoft's deliberately ambiguous naming conventions and the interaction between Microsoft products that cannot be matched by any other software manufacturer. I realize that dissociating their OS and other software is a tall order, but without such a move, competitors will not succeed.

Microsoft clearly believes that the DOJ and the State Attorneys General will not act against them. This has made them arrogant. They feel safe to act in a non-competitive manner, bullying companies and extorting money from them. When Newport Beach's IT department invited their reprentative to help us be in complience with their license agreements, the person from Microsoft spent most of his time threatening to audit us, telling us why piracy was bad, and often insulting us. To quote their representative when we produced our evidence of legitimate purchases, ''That and a dollar will buy you a cup of coffee,'' and, ''You know, we audit cities like you, and we win. Ask your city attorney; he will tell you it isn't worth it to fight us.'' Remember, we invited them to visit us. We asked for their help. They acted like bullies. Coercion through legal action is distasteful in a major corporation, but is illegal in a clear monopoly.

Microsoft must be made to clarify their licensing. Although we had paid for every single copy of Microsoft software, we, as intelligent computer professionals, couldn't understand the requirements well enough to comply with them. The licensing requirements are deliberately confusing and hard to comply with, and Microsoft knows that most companies will simply pay for more licenses, rather than try to fight them on an audit.

Please, do not allow Microsoft to infiltrate schools to increase their monopolistic power. Please, demand that Microsoft separate their OS from their other software. Please, require that Microsoft establish clear licensing that doesn't lead to entrapping customers.

These opinions represent my observations as an IT professional in an organization of over 400 people. The views do not necessarily represent those of the City of Newport Beach.

Jenny Ellsworth
MIS Technical Services Specialist
City of Newport Beach
3300 Newport Blvd.
Newport Beach, CA 92663

MTC–00004374

From: Robert Neely
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 6:42pm
Subject: One citizen's view

I have been a DOS & Windows user since near day one and have NEVER been disappointed in Microsoft's updating of existing software or maintenance of adequate customer service. This entire litigation seems to be solely motivated by other software manufacturers who were able to attract the attention of some office-holders.

I have yet to hear of even one consumer who claims to have been damaged by Microsoft's products. This entire matter seems to have jealousy as a base. Will someone please breath some common sense into the case? Thank you.

Robert Neely,
3055–84 N. Red Mountain,
Mesa, Arizona 85207; 480–641–9578

MTC–00004375

From: Joan Amino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Can we get off Microsofts case and let them get on with their business. I cannot believe that we are holding them up to appease some of their competitors. Let's get off their backs. PLEASE!!!

MTC–00004376

From: Russell Yuma
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 7:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I do not believe that Microsoft has done anything against the law that harms consumers in anyway. The complaints against Microsoft were brought about mostly by competitors of Microsoft. The states that have not agreed with the settlement are wrong and no more punishment should be made against Microsoft.

Microsoft is a most successful company that Benefits Consumers. Competitors should not be able to use the Justice Department and courts to gain a competitive advantage.

Russell Yuma
PO Box 165
Oakland, OR 97462

MTC–00004377

From: John Gelston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 7:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

I am a retired Boeing Company computer research and technology manager with 31 years of computing industry experience. I have first hand knowledge of the industry and its evolution. Competitors of Microsoft have succeeded in misleading government lawyers. They have characterized Microsoft's success as the result of illegal activity. Microsoft became successful long before anyone could have called them a monopoly because they understood consumers' (both commercial and individual) desire for products that worked well together on the personal computer. With all due respect, lawyers are not competent to evaluate what software product designs are good or bad for consumers! The marketplace is!

In the existing federal/state government suit, claims of damage to consumers are speculative at best. If valid, one would expect the plaintiffs to have been a host of corporate users rather than government lawyers parroting claims of disgruntled competitors. Where were the damaged consumers in the case? It was some of Microsoft's competitors, with their ringleader Scott McNealy, not consumers, who contrived the idea that consumers were being harmed and initiated complaints against the software company. The plaintiffs have not shown damage to consumers. We are expected to take on faith that helping competitors by harming Microsoft will somehow help consumers. Hogwash!

Claims of anti-competitive practices by Microsoft focus on hard-nosed business practices. While some of their tactics are deemed unacceptable due to their now dominant position, they are common among competitors in the industry. It is a fact that there is no industry that is any more competitive. The rapid rate of change in the software industry has been brought on by competitive innovation. The barriers to entry are nil. Linux, a significant alternative to Windows, came out of a dorm room. Anyone

that can program can become a billionaire if they have the initiative. The fact that the marketplace freely gravitates to de facto standards of one vendor does not mean they are being harmed! There is no other example in human history of such rapid increase in the benefits, features and functionality of product offerings accompanied by plummeting prices. Consumer damage is laughable! Every business and individual user around the world has benefited from Microsoft in one way or another. Before their contribution, the personal computer relied on a chaotic mish-mash of incompatible software, appealing to only the techie world. Microsoft's great success is due to overwhelming marketplace desire for and acceptance of the benefits they provided, more than any heavy-handed competitive acts they are charged with. I include a direct quote from a piece on this subject by Bob Williams of the Evergreen Freedom Foundation, a non-partisan public policy research organization in Washington State.

[''Microsoft's actions have increased the rate of technological development, but the same cannot be said for the actions of the government. Thousands of hours of labor and millions of dollars have been diverted from technological research and development to respond to the government's lawsuit.

''The government's case falls short in several areas, most notably in the government's misuse of antitrust laws. The proliferation of new products on the market and falling prices make it difficult to defend the idea that Microsoft's alleged monopolistic activity has harmed consumers. Consumers do not have to buy Microsoft products if they don't want to. This was illustrated best by an attorney from Ralph Nader's organization who criticized the size of Microsoft's market share, then proceeded to undermine his own argument by proudly stating that his office used no Microsoft products.

''It is litigation-happy state AGs who are harming consumers, not Microsoft. Certainly the rapid increase in useful technology has created enormous challenges for our society and many issues must be addressed, but the response from government should not be to crush all innovation by over- regulation and litigation. If the federal government is going to look suspiciously at lower prices and improved quality as evidence of illegal activity, American consumers are in big trouble.

''State attorneys general need to let this lawsuit end and focus on true threats to America's citizens and consumers.]

Respectfully,

John H. Gelston

9811 Marine View Drive

Mukilteo, WA 98275

425–349–1628

johngelston@email.msn.com

CC:Senator Maria Cantwell, Senator Patty Murray, msfin@...

MTC–00004378

From: Chris Griffin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 7:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern,

I hope and pray that the DoJ has the common sence to realize the chance at hand to to make a stronger economy. By forcing microsoft to open up source code, especially that of their Office suite, it could be ported or atleast partially used to help other vendors compete.

If the unix environment had a compatable office suite it could be used on more desktops at offices. Companies would then have more money to spend in other areas, such as user training, pay raises, technology advancements by being able to afford bright new programers that wouldnt have as much of a chance in a proprietary world. The list go on and on.

If the Apple/MacOS environment had another option than microsoft office that would also open doors for new jobs, and the before mentioned benefits. MS claims that if they open the code they will not have any incentive to better the product? Then what drives the free software movement? The people that either don't get paid or get paid very little. What keeps them improving their product? It's because they love what they do, and want to help people.

It should be obvious to everyone by now, with the momentum the open source people have built up that MS is trying desperatly to keep themselfs in the #1 position and not let anyone else even close. While competition is healthy, and almost all companies see that, even if they dont like it, microsofts tactics are unreasonable and should not go unnoticed by the courts.

Making MS open their office code to the public is a good and fair judgement I believe. I don't think their InternetExplorer code is as much of a big deal because with their latest release it has dropped support for some of the most common internet plugin software making it not the best choice of internet browers.

But I ask you to also consider how when MS updated their newest version of msn.com the site refused service to non IE browsers. That should be noticed as a blatant DoS (Denial of service) which has been pursued by the FBI. I think MS should be treated as any ''hacker'' the uses a DoS attack because the outcome is no different, its a Denial Of Service.

Thank you for your time, and I hope you make the right choice in this matter.

Chris Griffin

MTC–00004379

From: lloyd olson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 7:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

My husband and I think that the last five {holdout} states are completely out of line in trying to inflict more penalties on Microsoft. The first solution, one with providing software to the under privileged is enough. Let Microsoft do their things and help the country out of recession. sincerely, Eileen and Lloyd Olson

MTC–00004380

From: Roland Hughes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I very much disagree with the settlement reached with Microsoft. They are a preditory company and will do anything to anything to crush oposition. The idea of letting them indoctrinate school children as a punishment is to idiotic to even comtemplate.

MTC–00004381

From: Monica Samec
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 8:38pm
Subject: Proposal Re: Microsoft anit-trust settlement

Dear Justice Department member,

I am writing with regards to the Microsoft antitrust settlement. The Linux company, RedHat has proposed that all the money that Microsoft was currently planning on giving in the form of software for the poorest schools in America be redirected towards hardware. Red Hat then promiss to provide software to the schools, free of charge, with several additions:

—Red Hat will provide software for ALL the schools in America.

—Red Hat will also provide training and technical support.

—Red Hat's offer does not expire, ever. The Microsoft one expires after 5 years.

This proposal has many large advantages over the original plan. Problems with the original proposal:

1) Don't punish a monopoloy by extending it and giving it a foothold in the nation's most vulnerable.

In giving so much Microsoft software to the schools, the original proposal would result in extending Microsoft's dominance over the education sector. This does not make sense since the reason why there is a settlement is that Microsoft was found guilty of illegal monopolistic practices.

2) After 5 years, the most vulnerable schools will be trapped.

Microsoft's software lisences would expire after 5 years. After that time, the schools would be under great pressure to start paying very large software fees to Microsoft which ultimatelly hurt their funds very severely. The alternative would be to move away from Microsoft products, but that would be very difficult because the curriculums would already be based around the Microsoft software.

3) Most of the money that Microsoft would be ''giving'' would be entirely fictional to them.

Microsoft's proposal also serves to avoid paying the penalty imposed on it. Independently of how much Microsoft charges for its software, it costs next to nothing to print another CD. Also, it doesn't cost Microsoft anything to give someone a lisence. A lisence is not a product that must be manufactured, it doesn't cost the provider anything.

Benefits of RedHat's proposal:

** Schools get a much greater assistance.

1) Over 5 times more computers for the schools. In redirecting the cost of software towards hardware the number of computers given would jump from 200,000 to over a million. The number of computers per school would grow from 14 to over 70.

2) More schools are benefited. Every single school in America gets Red Hat software, not just the poorest 14,000. It is clear that this new proposal brings a much greater benefit to the schools.

** More seccurity for the schools to build a curriculum.

2) Red Hat's offer does not expire.

The RedHat software, including all upgrades, will remain completely free to all the schools in America indefinitely.

3) Red Hat also offers free technical support and training.

Just as important as having access to software, is being trained in it and having someone responsible when you have difficulties. Red Hat offers technical support and training, also for an unlimited time. With this proposal, the schools rest secure in the knowledge that the software the enjoy will remain available to them at no cost. It is now possible to build a curriculum.

** Red Hat's software is better:

Red Hat's software consists of the Linux operating system and an very large selection of applications for it.

1) Linux easily the most reliable and flexible operating system in the world. Schools don't have to worry about downtimes.

2) Linux is fast and efficient. The schools can keep their hardware longer.

Windows has a tendency to grow larger and slower over time, forcing consumers to purchase newer hardware to be able to upgrade. Not so for Linux. Linux itself grows very little over time (in some areas it actually gets smaller and faster). This frees schools from the need of continuous expensive upgrades.

3) The Open Source software running on Linux is of excellent quality.

* Computer Science.

—Linux offers the best selection of computer languages of any platform, as well as more tools for programming than any other operating system. Several of these (Perl, Python, PHP, Tcl, etc) are accessible to young children, and others (C, C++, Java, etc) can be taught at a high school level.

—Linux offers more tools for programming (program debuggers, editors, etc) than any other operating system.

—The Linux compiler for C and C++ is probably the best in the world.

—Linux comes with the best web server in the world: Apache. Schools can use it to allow students to make their own websites.

—Linux comes with many excellent tools for website development which are certainly accessible to both a younger audence and profesionals alike.

* Science and Mathematics.

For the areas of mathematics, science, and engineering, there is simply no coparisson. The tools in Linux are many, they are the most powerful, the most efficent, and they are free. This is why, UNIX and Linux are the standard platform for the physical sciences and math. To learn more about Linux and children, please visit www.linuxforkids.com

* Imaging.

Red Hat provides the excellent program GIMP (GNU Image Manipulation Program)—GNU is an organization responsible for some of the best software in the world.

Children can use this tool to create astounding artwork which might then be used on a printing press or on a website. References: www.gimp.org, www.gnu.org

* Other.

Red Hat's software also contains several excellent office applications, vector graphics tools, multimeda, etc. Now that you have seen an overview of what Red Hat is offering to the schools (I left out much for space reasons), I would ask you to find out exactly what Microsfot is offering to the schools and make a comparison. It is my honest opinion that the software that Red Hat is offering free of charge far surpases what would be available to the schools through Microsoft software.

I would like to strongly encourage the Justice Department accept the offer from RedHat and greatly extend the help offered to the most needy schools in the nation.

If you wish to ask questions or clarifications about any of what I have written here, please do not hesitate to ask. I am a strong believer in the importance of education, and this is a great opportunity to help those who are least capable of affording one.

Sincerely,

Monica Samec

MTC–00004382

From: blburton@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 8:57pm
Subject: AtATgram: Over Before You Knew It (12/13/01)

Brian <blburton@mac.com> is sending you a scene from _As_the_Apple_Turns!_Scene 3451 follows:

Over Before You Knew It (12/13/01)

'Tis a sad day, indeed, for ''Redmond Justice'' has finally wound to a close. That news may come as a shock to those of you who have been following the antitrust action from the very beginning, because you probably thought that a federal judge still needs to approve the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department before the case can officially be considered over and done with. We thought that, too, but evidently we were wrong— at least, if Microsoft's latest actions are any indication.

See, faithful viewer CHOLLYHEAD noticed a CNET article which reports that Microsoft has already gone ahead and named two ''compliance officers'' responsible for ensuring that the company sticks to the behavioral changes outlined in the consent decree. That'd be the_new_consent decree, mind you, as opposed to that old one from '95 which Microsoft treated with as much respect as it would a used Kleenex facial tissue. But hey, this time will obviously be different— these two compliance officers will make sure of that! Especially since one of them is already on the Microsoft payroll in the company's ''Law and Corporate Affairs antitrust practice group.'' (Way to inspire confidence...)

Now, clearly Microsoft wouldn't jump the gun and appoint compliance officers before the settlement was even _approved,_ right? As Microsoft CEO Steve Ballmer himself stated, ''As a major employer and a leader in our industry, we take our legal obligations very seriously.'' Therefore, the company would _never_ try to influence a judge to approve a proposed settlement by enacting the restrictions in said settlement before it's been given the go-ahead. No sirree Bob. Apparently all that stuff we heard about a sixty-day period of public comment followed by another thirty days of Justice Department response before the judge even has the _option_ of approving the settlement was just a hoax.

Then again, if Microsoft _is_ enacting compliance months before the settlement is even approved, we can only hope that the judge isn't na?ve enough to fall for a blatantly transparent ''we'll be good little boys'' act. As faithful viewer JONATHAN FLETCHER pointed out, the Senate Judiciary Committee is pretty skeptical about the settlement proposal, at least according to the New York Times, so here's hoping that people in general aren't really as painfully stupid as Microsoft seems to think they are. As for those nine states still pushing for tougher (read: ''actual'') penalties, check out The Register's commentary on Microsoft's ranting attempt to get the judge to force them to accept the settlement as it's currently worded— it's worth a giggle. And here's hoping that Microsoft's voluntary early compliance with the as-yet-unapproved consent decree only shows the judge just how ineffectual those ''remedies'' will be before she actually accepts or rejects it...

To see this scene as it was meant to be seen, complete with links to articles and formatted as originally broadcast, visit: <http://www.appleturns.com/scene/?id=3451>

To see the complete, unadulterated episode in which this scene was originally broadcast, visit: <http://www.appleturns.com/episode/?date=12/13/2001>

As the Apple Turns: <http://www.appleturns.com/>

This Scene: <http://www.appleturns.com/scene/?id=3451>

This Episode: <http://www.appleturns.com/episode/?date=12/13/2001>

Copyright (c)1997–2001 J. Miller; please don't forward without this attribution and the URLs above. Other reproduction requires J. Miller's explicit consent; please contact him at the site. Thanks.

MTC–00004383

From: Rich Hurd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 8:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Hi

I am a student thinking of being a teacher. Information Technology can and will shape the teaching profession in the future. Please dont put Microsoft in charge of that future by allowing the current settlement terms to go forth. If they continue and extend there monopoly, I wont teach Math or Science. I will do something else.

Thanks for listening

Rich Hurd

MTC–00004384

From: Hurd, Richard P
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/13/01 9:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi

I am a student thinking of being a teacher. Information Technology can and will shape

the teaching profession in the future. Please dont put Microsoft in charge of that future by allowing the current settlement terms to go forth. If they continue and extend there monopoly, I WILL NOT teach Math or Science. I will do something else.

Thanks for listening

Rich Hurd

MTC–00004385

From: Patricia J Bennatts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 9:21pm
Subject: Leave Microsoft free to improve, invent and share their innovations PLEASE !!!!!!

Please stop this stupid case to prohibit excellence in designing better and more desirable ways .. Stopping competition ties the inventiveness of Microsoft because the others can't or don't have the expertise to do so.. Let us complement this company under seige and value the good opportunities it offers to so many to make a good living and keep the economy progressing ... PLEASE LET US BE FAIR TO THIS GOOD COMPANY AND STOP TRYING TO PUT THEM DOWN Also note they don't hoard their wealth but contribute to many educational and philanthropic organization ... They are for excellence and continue to keep the marketed products ever new and wondrous.

MTC–00004386

From: bpetit@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 9:26pm
Subject: Breakup

I support breaking up Microsoft and think the current agreement you have made with Microsoft is a plain giveaway to them. They are a ruthless monopoly!!!

Concerned citizen

MTC–00004387

From: Len Bloch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to offer feedback on the proposed Microsoft settlement. There are many aspects of the settlement which I feel could be improved, but I will focus on the requirement that Microsoft disclose some of their code to other companies.

I am fully in favor of disclosure, but I feel that the disclosures should be made to the public at large, and the all members of the public should then have the right to modify and use the code. Microsoft's most significant competition comes from the free software movement, and it is crucial that the disclosures become available to anybody who wants to compete with Microsoft, even if they are not a ''company''.

As for the proposal that Microsoft be required to port their office applications to at least three other operating systems. It should be specified which operating systems, with the understanding that it should be widely used systems, like Linux and Open BSD.

Remember, Microsoft has been found guilty of criminal activities, and the remedies need strengthen Microsoft's main competition or they will not work as remedies. Microsoft's biggest competition comes from free software. By making more and better free software available, everybody will benefit.

Aloha,

Len Bloch

MTC–00004388

From: James Brundege
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 10:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

I would like to comment on the proposed Microsoft antitrust settlement. It is my understanding that the settlement requires Microsoft to disclose information on their APIs, protocols, etc. to competing businesses, but that this requirement does not extend to non-profits and government agencies. This is a critical problem with the settlement as proposed! As a developer of bioinformatics software for the scientific community, I develop free and open source software that fills critical scientific niches. This work is paid for by government grants. This type of software is critical for the research community, and it, like most software, must interact with systems operating under the Windows OS. This has become increasing difficult as open standards have been ignored to generate a competitive advantage. If non-profits, universities, and other sources of free software are locked out of the settlement agreement it will impede our ability to produce these niche programs. This will ultimately harm major government directives in bioinformatics and other areas.

I thus request that you reject the Microsoft settlement as proposed. Please reconsider the settlement to include provisions to give non-profits and other organizations the same competitive rights and the same access to Microsoft APIs and protocols that businesses are guaranteed in the current settlement.

Thanks you,

James Brundege, Ph.D.
Division of Medical Informatics, BICC
Oregon Health & Science Univ.
3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd
Portland, OR 97201
Phone: 503–494–7906 Fax: 503–494–4551
E-mail: brundege@ohsu.edu

MTC–00004389

From: Rolf Paloheimo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 10:58pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to inform you of my discomfort wioth the settlement that the government has entered into with Microsoft.

The settlement:

*does not give Microsoft any incentive to stop deceiving its customers,

*does not punish microsoft for attempting to deceive the government and the public,

*institutionalizes microsofts monopoly.

I hope that the court will reconsidor this settlement.

Thank you,

Rolf Paloheimo
http://healthyhousesystem.com
Creative Communities Research Inc.

MTC–00004390

From: Gary Rost
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 11:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There is still plenty to complain about in the text of the proposed settlement, itself.

Those who followed the case closely will remember that one of Microsoft's chief claims during the trial was that times and the nature of business have changed, and that anti-trust enforcement ought to be different today than it was when the laws were first passed in the early part of the last century. This is a fast-moving industry based on intellectual, rather than industrial, capital, goes the argument. Sure, Microsoft is on top today (and every day since it got bigger than Lotus around 1986) but, hey, that could change in a Redmond minute. This argument evidently didn't resonate with the court, though, since Microsoft was found guilty. Keep repeating to yourself: ''Microsoft is guilty.''

Well, Microsoft now appears to be exacting its revenge, leaning this time on the same letter of the old law to not only get a better deal, but literally to disenfranchise many of the people and organizations who feel they have been damaged by Microsoft's actions. If this deal goes through as it is written, Microsoft will emerge from the case not just unscathed, but stronger than before.

Here is what I mean. The remedies in the Proposed Final Judgment specifically protect companies in commerce—organizations in business for profit. On the surface, that makes sense because Microsoft was found guilty of monopolistic activities against ''competing'' commercial software vendors like Netscape, and other commercial vendors—computer vendors like Compaq, for example. The Department of Justice is used to working in this kind of economic world, and has done a fair job of crafting a remedy that will rein in Microsoft without causing undue harm to the rest of the commercial portion of the industry. But Microsoft's greatest single threat on the operating system front comes from Linux—a non-commercial product—and it faces a growing threat on the applications front from Open Source and freeware applications.

The biggest competitor to Microsoft Internet Information Server is Apache, which comes from the Apache Foundation, a not-for-profit. Apache practically rules the Net, along with Sendmail, and Perl, both of which also come from non-profits. Yet not-for-profit organizations have no rights at all under the proposed settlement. It is as though they don't even exist. Section III(J)(2) contains some very strong language against not-for-profits. Specifically, the language says that it need not describe nor license API, Documentation, or Communications Protocols affecting authentication and authorization to companies that don't meet Microsoft's criteria as a business: ''...(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, ...''

So much for SAMBA and other Open Source projects that use Microsoft calls. The

settlement gives Microsoft the right to effectively kill these products. Section III(D) takes this disturbing trend even further. It deals with disclosure of information regarding the APIs for incorporating non-Microsoft ''middleware.'' In this section, Microsoft discloses to Independent Software Vendors (ISVs), Independent Hardware Vendors (IHVs), Internet Access Providers (IAPs), Internet Content Providers (ICPs), and Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) the information needed to inter-operate with Windows at this level. Yet, when we look in the footnotes at the legal definitions for these outfits, we find the definitions specify commercial concerns only. But wait, there's more! Under this deal, the government is shut out, too. NASA, the national laboratories, the military, the National Institute of Standards and Technology—even the Department of Justice itself—have no rights. It is a good thing Afghanistan is such a low-tech adversary and that B–52s don't run Windows.

I know, I know. The government buys commercial software and uses contractors who make profits. Open Source software is sold for profit by outfits like Red Hat. It is easy to argue that I am being a bit shrill here. But I know the way Microsoft thinks. They probably saw this one coming months ago and have been falling all over themselves hoping to get it through. If this language gets through, MICROSOFT WILL FIND A WAY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF IT. Is the Department of Justice really that stupid? Yes and no. They showed through the case little understanding of how the software business really functions. But they are also complying with the law which, as Microsoft argued, may not be quite in sync with the market realities of today. In the days of Roosevelt and Taft, when these laws were first being enforced, the idea that truly free products could become a major force in any industry—well, it just would have seemed insane.

MTC–00004391

From: karsten koepcke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/13/01 11:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I've been in the computer business for about 20 years. I think this settlement is a total capitulation by the DOJ. The government is supposed to protect and encourage competition. All this does is allow Microsoft to continue its monopolistic practices. Judge Jackson had the right idea. Breaking the company up, much like Roosevelt did with the oil, steel and railroad trusts, is the right thing to do. No large, and especially no monopoly, enterprise is interested in innovation much less competition. To the contrary it is in their best interest to stifle innovation. Is there anyone out there who cares about ''We the people''???? The government seems to have a phobia in regard to competition. You break up AT&T and then you allow the Bell Companies to merge! And now with Taunzin Dingle you want to stifle competition in the telecommunications arena. I just don't get it.

Sincerely,
Karsten Koepcke

MTC–00004392

From: Patrick Thurmond
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:15am
Subject: Your doing the right thing!

Your doing the right thing! The MS settlement is absolutely correct. I do not want to see MS busted up. Thank you for holding steady to your decisions.

Happy Holidays,
Patrick Thurmond

MTC–00004393

From: Philip Sandiford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:19am
Subject: One Public Comment on Microsoft Punishment

I'll be brief. Microsoft has been found guilty. They are not repentant, in fact, they defy the court's judgment. The company has so much leverage that points raised within the Bush administration include the negative impact on the economy if the punishment is too severe, as well as the costs in time and expense.

I am not a wise man and will not pretend to know the ''just'' answer but I hope ''the dollar'' doesn't sully the correct remedy. I will gladly pay my part if society must also share a price to correct the unlawful behavior of those found guilty. Better that then increasing the public cynicism towards the court and Government.

Please don't allow these giants to believe they have grown above the law.

Philip T. Sandiford
Spokane Washington

MTC–00004394

From: T Paluchniak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:27am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am opposed to the settlement the Justice Department has negotiated with Microsoft. The settlement proposed by the nine dissenting states makes more sense. The DOJ's settlement does not do enough to insure that Microsoft does not further abuse its monopoly power. For example, the settlement now claims Microsoft does not have to afford certain protections to small developers unless they have been in business for a year, and have given out more than a million copies of its software. Whoever negotiated this has little knowledge about how the software industry works. In a year Microsoft could have already stomped out the competition. Such as a deal does not encourage competition, it hinders it drastically.

Furthermore, the proposed deal does not even require Microsoft to admit guilt, which makes it harder for companies like Netscape to collect damages resulting from Microsoft's illegal activities that brought it into court in the first place.

For some one such as myself who chooses to use alternative products such as the operating system put out by Apple Computer I personally am injured by Microsoft's practices because Apple is continuously threatened by Microsoft, which uses its monopoly power to get Apple to do things its way. Apple is afraid Microsoft will stop making Microsoft Office for it (which is is profitable for Microsoft) because Microsoft claims that it will stop making it. Apple then is forced to stop competing with Microsoft in certain areas, as no Microsoft Office would mean the death of Apple. Again this hurts competition. Worse it hurts me the consumer who likes to have a choice in the computer operating system market.

Microsoft shows no sign of letting up either, just look at its proposed settlement in being heard in Boston. Microsoft wants to punish itself by expanding its own market share at Apple's expense. How does this help competition? It does not.

I plead that the court will truly come up with a solution that sends a clear message to Microsoft that illegal competition is not tolerable.

MTC–00004395

From: mikey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:46am
Subject: MS Settlement

Call this justice NO I call it a mockery. You have told Microsoft that because it has money it can buy its way out of breaking the laws. this is it too you have sent the signal that because they have money they can force there way on Us the many citizens of this great country

MTC–00004396

From: Josh Wurzel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

As a user of an alternative platform, as an investor, as an educated student, and as a republican, I can not agree with Microsoft's settlement. This concession by the world's largest software company is clear an attempt to 1) look generous to the public 2) solve a major problem for the company and 3) continue to do business as usual. The fact of the matter is that Microsoft's presence and tactics hurt the economy far more than to help it, and this will not change if this settlement goes through. In fact, Microsoft will become even more bold than it did after the trial a few years ago. Nothing will stop them from using their market share to dominate every conceivable market. People do not buy windows because they want to. People buy windows (and other microsoft products) because ''everyone else uses them''. And people do not use these products for their quality, they use them because Microsoft forces vendors to cater to their demands, bundling their products and threatening retribution if strict rules are not followed. It takes no psychic to see where Microsoft is going with its current technologies. Do you really think Microsoft would launch subscription-based software if it did not have a monopoly? Now, it can FORCE people to use its operating system, and to repeatedly pay for the privilege of doing so. This is WRONG, in the very truest sense of the word.

With .net in the near future, Microsoft is going to be in a position to virtually control the internet. How much more grabs for power will it take before something is done to stop

them? How long before Bill Gates can threaten to take down the entire world wide web if billions in ransom are not paid? The idea seems far-fetched now, but it didn't take much threatening from Microsoft to get a small city in Virginia to cough up nearly a million dollars. And even if it is un-realistic to assume that Bill Gates is involved in some world-domination scheme, the fact is that his company puts him in a position to go through with it, if he should ever want to. We can't allow companies to have this much control over the population.

Please see Microsoft's offer for what it is: a pathetic attempt to ingratiate itself to the world while offering no real solution for its behavior.

Thank you,

Josh Wurzel

Bring MATLAB to OS X for Macintosh! Sign the petition!

http://www.PetitionOnline.com/matlabx/petition.html

MTC–00004397

From: suzerain.studios
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:18am
Subject: Settlement Proposal Comments

To whom it may concern:

As an American citizen who relies on computers for his everyday life, and for putting bread on my table, I'm extremely concerned about the proposed settlement proposal in the Microsoft antitrust case. It doesn't even begin to address the ethical breaches of repeatedly building from antitrust status to promote future product exposure. Microsoft is in a dangerous position where they could become more powerful than any single company, individual or country in history. Why? They are the leaders in an industry that is rapidly controlling more and more of everyday human life. Computers store DNA records, medical records, salary information, credit card data, and so on. Further, the network between computers is rapidly becoming the most important communications infrastructure between people. Communications lies at the heart of what makes a society able to function.

If any one entity gains control of the communications infrastructure, it will mean bad things for ordinary citizens. Any Microsoft settlement must do a few things:

(1) Prevent them from repeating the same ethical misgivings in future universes (i.e., networking protocols, networking software)

(2) Punish them for moving to keep people from technologies they wanted (Netscape's browser, QuickTime, etc.), for stifling the development of open protocols which would ease development of online product.

Therefore, I am disheartened, and would like to see the following:

(1) Any future networking protocols that Microsoft develops must be governed by truly open, multinational and multicorporate standards bodies which can keep the specifics of communication open for developers.

(2) A ''fine'' of enough to affect the company (i.e., in the billions). I think the money should be paid back to an entity that helps the very consumers they have adversely affected with their anticompetitive behavior (perhaps to fight hunger, or help people, or assist schools with getting the technology they wish to purchase).

Cheers,

Marc Antony Vose

Suzerain Studios

MTC–00004398

From: Speedy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:42am
Subject: Microsoft must be punished.

Briefly, the views expressed are similar to those in this article: http://www.linuxplanet.com/linuxplanet/opinions/3952/1/. This is where I saw the need to contact you regarding this issue. To Whom it may concern.

I wish to express my concern at the unjust ''penalties'' that Microsoft has been offered. The anti-trust case has proven the company to be trading in a way to retain a monopoly, and this is now where the penalties are to be given. Instead, they have been offered compromise after compromise, without having to compromise themselves.

I am not a resident of the US, but rather of Australia. Thus, I offer this email as an opinion of a resident of the internet. As a part of the Linux community. As a person with enough technical insight to understand what needs to be done in the industry to benefit both sides. I am disgusted at the way the US DoJ has handled this case, after it was already proven but yet to be settled. I am disgusted even more at the backflip done by the Bush administration to not punish a criminal, as was found in the courts of the Clinton administration. I won't even go into the evidence that Microsoft had pumped a lot of money into Bush's campaign. This is not about politics, but about justice and the IT industry.

I am not a lawyer, and I am not a Microsoft user. How many messages supporting Microsoft will be from normal users? Not many, I would assume. But why would Microsoft need users to write in with bad spelling and grammar, when they can pay lawyers to write full dissertations which are littered with Latin?

Microsoft has it's place in this world, and a decent agreement would benefit them, as well. It would force them to write more secure and stable systems, while allowing others (Linux, FreeBSD, and all the other free and proprietry Operating Systems) to be a choice for the end user. When I buy a computer, I hate the fact that I often have little to no choice about software. I can buy pieces and build my own, but if a large chain was offering a system for a budget price, why am I then forced to buy Window's with it? I could save another hundred dollars and have it loaded with Linux. Or with nothing at all, leaving it up to me to choose (there's that word again). But only if Microsoft is forced to comply with the law.

We need at least three items dealt with:

1) Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

2) The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

3) Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de-facto control of the Internet. As to the point about Microsoft needing to remain as it is for ''National Security''? HA! Ask the NSA what operating system they recommend. Better still, here is the address you may find the information: http://freshmeat.net/redir/selinux/7258/url—homepage/ (NSA Security-enhanced Linux is a set of patches to the Linux kernel and some utilities to incorporate a strong, flexible mandatory access control architecture into the major subsystems of the kernel. It provides a mechanism to enforce the separation of information based on confidentiality and integrity requirements, which allows threats of tampering and bypassing of application security mechanisms to be addressed and enables the confinement of damage that can be caused by malicious or flawed applications. It includes a set of sample security policy configuration files designed to meet common, general-purpose security goals.)

Why would a company, who have hijacked an entire industry and created their own ''standards'' without allowing others to use those standards (case in point: Word documents), be more secure than one whose standards are open? Any attempt by Microsoft to say otherwise should be regarded as fraud, or at least contempt. After all, what would happen if the ''security'' was, at some point, compromised? Would Microsoft take responsibility? I doubt it.

Thank you for letting me participate in this decision.

Shane Phillip Ravenn
219 Duffield Rd
Clontarf QLD 4019
Australia

MTC–00004399

From: Conrad Gempf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:47am
Subject: Microsoft Penalty Phase

As an American citizen living abroad, I have great hope that the United States courts will accomplish something that I see for myself no other body can: restore competition and fair play to the computer industry. My ''day job'' is not directly in computers, but in theological education.

However, I have been involved with writing for computer journals both in print and online for some time. I think most people in the industry are under no illusion about Microsoft's claims to want ''to innovate''. They have systematically moved into every lucrative field that they could by copying or buying out the competition and then leveraging the new product with their vast operating system monopoly. We have seen this happen with their buying of a web-browser and renaming it Explorer to compete with Navigator, we've seen it with their copying of the Palm handhelds, and nowadays we're seeing it with the launch of yet another games platform, with promises of integration to Windows and their new vision of a corporately-controlled internet and with their efforts in media players in Windows.

They maintain their monopoly in a way which quite evidently has strangled the competition. The numbers speak volumes. Even people who think that the Microsoft Windows operating system is superior to the Mac operating (and those people are not that easy to find) do not think that, on merits alone, it would deserve 95% of the market. It's not *that* much better. Consumers simply don't have a choice.

Even people who think that Microsoft Word is a better word processor than the pre-Windows 95 market leader Corel Word Perfect do not believe that it is 98% better.

Microsoft has and keeps the monopolistic market share that it has not because consumers choose them, but because manufacturers and consumers are made to choose them.

Microsoft have, we all know, broken agreements in the past. In the face of having been found guilty and having had that conviction upheld unanimously, they are still quite publicly maintaining that they have not done anything wrong. They cannot, therefore, be relied upon to conform willingly with the spirit of a voluntary penalty —they do not, apparently, understand what the courts are saying to them about their past behaviour.

A just and effective penalty would have to restore the possibility of competition. One of the best tests of a penalty would be the possible effects in the marketplace in terms of restoring competition and allowing the alternatives of the Microsoft Windows operating system to regain marketshare that reflects how consumers regard them on their merits.

In many ways, the structural remedy seemed to me ideal, both in terms of what it would accomplish and in terms of how little continual monitoring would have to be done by other people. I recognise that, for some reason, this has been withdrawn from consideration. But something needs to be done that is more drastic than the proposals that some of the States have accepted.

Saying ''You must behave lawfully from now on'' is not a penalty, it doesn't go beyond what any ordinary company would have to do. A repeat offender like Microsoft needs to be penalised in such a way as to artificially restore the balance it has wrongfully tipped in its favour, and preferably in ways that quickly give a boost to those competitors, like Apple, who have been directly harmed by their practices.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Conrad Gempf, PhD
US citizen,
Lecturer in Theology in London, UK

MTC–00004400

From: Tuukk4 (124)(091):)(060)–(060)(124) p4s4n3n
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft

hi,

I agree completly with there arguments

* Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars).

Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

* The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

* Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

These arguments can be found on http://www.linuxplanet.com/linuxplanet/opinions/3952/2/ Also I like see Microsoft be more polite to open source community/free software foundation. Everyone have right to exist without rasism. GPL is about freedom (I think you americanz admire that:).

All the bugs should be let out to public as soon as possible. All the bug data and securitys holes should be informed. Microsoft should collect any information from it's customers without asking it directly with email (Ok button isn't enough).

Money giving schools is fine but schools should have right to choose what they want to use. these are the main things.

Tuukka
Wallankumous alkaa ajatuksesta

MTC–00004401

From: Campagna, Tim
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 4:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please explain how giving more market share to the behemoth Microsoft is a punishment for it's action's. Is it not in plain site that Microsoft wants to push this through as fast as possible because they know they're getting off with nothing less than an advance in the education market. This is absolutely ridiculous!

Microsoft has a strangle hold on the business market and couldn't push companies like Apple out of the education market with it's system alone, so now they must use their monopolistic ways to attempt a take over. What's amazing about this is that the govt. wants to hand it to them with this settlement. Do not let Microsoft bully you! Please!

We need fare competition, let them compete for their money back, make them cough up the cash and let the schools decide.

Sincerely,
Tim Campagna
Newport Beach, CA

MTC–00004402

From: tc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:43am
Subject: Drop the Case Against Microsoft

I believe the government's case against Microsoft is an absurd abuse of process whereby Microsoft's competitors have attempted to use the power of government to achieve what they could not do in the free marketplace. This case should absolutely be settled at as little cost to Microsoft as possible. I am not a MS stockholder, but I believe that MS should be praised for making computers accessible to the average person rather than being persecuted for its success.

Anthony R. Conte

MTC–00004403

From: r.baggarley@waldmann.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:50am
Subject: Comments on the proposed anti-trust settlement

I am an American citizen living abroad:
Richard Baggarley
Paul-Ehrlich-Weg 2
78549 Spaichingen
Germany

I fail to understand how the proposed settlement punishes Microsoft for its illegal activities. On the contrary, this ''remedy'' only serves to increase Microsoft's presence in the education computer market. The dollar value of the settlement is minute since it costs Microsoft very little to manufacture copies of software. I'm sure that a settlement more in line with the gravity of the illegal activities of which Microsoft has been found guilty can be developed. Do not ''punish'' lawbreakers by allowing them the means to continue their illegal behavior.

Respectfully,
Richard Baggarley

MTC–00004404

From: Michael Vander Sande
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:00am
Subject: Comments on

Renata,

It is good that the Federal government is reconsidering the proposed Microsoft settlement as it fundamentally wrong to provide Microsoft with a clear path to expand it's general monopoly. The education market is one of very few that Microsoft controls and allowing them to freely promote, evangelize and otherwise steal market share seems more like a gift than punishment. We should not be suggesting, or

polluting, the minds of educators and students to use Microsoft versus it's competitors by forcing Microsoft products and services upon them. Microsoft products have proven to be less than easy to use, prone to security risks and generally unreliable. Please don't force children and educators to use them, instead provide a choice to those who seek it.

I look forward to staying informed of your decisions and am hopeful they will result in all that is fair and right.

Best Regards,
Michael Vander Sande
the Project House
859.431.4157
859.250.1313—cell
prjcthouse@mac.com

MTC–00004406

From: Wlwelter@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:40am
Subject: Justice

Dear Renata Hesse,

Please consider my choice/voice to have Microsoft ''punished'' or held accountable for trying to elliminate its competition. If the company was found guilty and lost its appeal why would they not be punished. No one would give me that break.

Bill Welter
Orlando, FL

MTC–00004407

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Carlos Edwards'' <rcedwards@corcystems.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 10:49 AM
Subject: Microsoft

I am very disappointed with the out come of the Microsoft trail. I believe harsher penalties should be enforced. Please do not back down, do not settle.

Sincerely,
Ronald Edwards
270 South 5th Street
Brooklyn NY, 11211

MTC–00004409

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Brian Higgins'' <bghiggins@ucdavis.edu>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 11:00 AM
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General,

I am utterly appalled by the decision of the US Justice department to settle the Microsoft suit as described in the press. The DOJ settlement agreement is a joke and a total affront to the consumer. I trust that you and your staff will not buckle under to the Microsoft propaganda. The courts have ruled that Microsoft has acted as a monopoly and we as consumers need to see the law upheld, the events of Sept 11 notwithstanding.

Please prosecute this case with vigor. Support the consumer.

Thank you
Brian Higgins
3202 Grosbeak Court
Davis, CA 95616

MTC–00004411

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Rutherford, Ronald'' <ronaldrutherford@dwt.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 11:44 AM
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings. This is just a short note to say that I also believe that the proposed Microsoft settlement, as it currently stands, is unacceptable.

Please keep up the fight. Thanks.
Ron Rutherford
Seattle

MTC–00004415

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Tom Moore'' <tom.moore@landslidedesign.com>
To: <Recipient List Suppressed:;>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 1:13 PM
Subject: Stay the course!

To the Attorney General:

I cannot urge you in strong enough terms to continue on your path of seeking to punish Microsoft for its egregious antitrust violations.

What they have done—and what they still plan to do—to the computer industry, and, by extension, almost every industry in America, is outrageous.

I'm extraordinarily disappointed in the federal government's abdication of its duty in this matter. It is now up to you to protect businesses like mine, and families like mine, from Microsoft's relentless and lawless clutches.

Thank you.
Tom Moore
Tom Moore
President, Landslide Design
tom.moore@landslidedesign.com
11 Forest Ave., Rockville, MD 20850
phone: 301.762.0627 fax: 301.762.5156

MTC–00004417

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Jonathan Ness'' <jness@frontbase.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 1:46 PM
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello West Virgina AG,

I want you to know that I support your continued fight to pursue justice against the Microsoft monopoly and it's anti-competitive business tactics. They sure got off easy in that settlement. Please don't give up the fight to ensure that they change their ways. Thanks!

Jonathan Ness
10520 19th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

MTC–00004418

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Jack Tyler'' <jack@jtectn.com>
To: <uag@att.state.ut.us>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 2:22 PM
Subject: I support further prosecution of Microsoft

I am a resident of Memphis, TN. Unfortunately, my state has settled with Microsoft in the anti-trust battle. My Attorney-General does not represent me, and my only recourse is to ask that you continue to prosecute.

Microsoft's latest action, the 'donating' of $1 billion worth of microsoft windows, software and hardware to schools (while in theory a nice gesture) illustrates how they continue to use their power to and unlimited wealth to move more and more people onto their platform.

Please help.

Please continue the fight for equality.

Jack tyler
JTEC
http://www.jtectn.com
memphis, TN

MTC–00004419

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message
From: ''Ron LaPedis'' <Sales@realpens.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 10:38 AM
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Mr. Attorney General,

I would like to commend you for not accepting the proposed DOJ settlement with Microsoft. I believe that it has been shown time and time again, that Microsoft 'extends and extinguishes.' That is, while appearing to support a standard, such as Java or Kerberos, they then add extensions to it that will only run on the Microsoft operating system (OS) platform.

When threatened by Netscape, which sold a browser which allowed web pages to be displayed on any platform, they developed their own browser and tightly integrated it into the OS then bundled it free of charge. Coupled with web pages that used coding which would only work on the Microsoft browser, they took over the market, effectively eliminating Netscape as a viable company. And this was AFTER a consent decree with the DOJ in an earlier case!

With Windows XP, Microsoft is attempting to take over access to the Internet, forcing users to use their middleware and go to Microsoft approved sites when a URL (web

address) is mistyped. Microsoft MUST be reigned in as a convicted monopolist, or there will be no choice whatever left for consumers.

I sincerely hope that you and the other dissenting state attorneys general will work for a settlement with teeth in it which will prevent Microsoft from crushing the competition through illegal practices, of which it has already been convicted .

Ron LaPedis
2115 Sea Cliff Way
San Bruno, CA
650–359–9887
http://realpens.com

MTC–00004421

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message

From: ''TechSupport->CBC-Saint Louis'' <techsupp@cbc-stl.org>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 1:54 PM
Subject: Microsoft ''Settlement''

Dear Sirs:

I am very glad that you are resisting the effort of Microsoft to get off scott-free from their monopolistic behavior. Please, since the Federal Government has caved in to Microsoft, continue this battle until real remedies AND punishments have been levied against Microsoft.

I find it very difficult to understand how a company can be found guilty, egregiously guilty in fact, of crimes, and all the Federal Government wants to do is to get them to promise to maybe never do it again! An individual, or a company without limitless pockets, that were to be found guilty of such behavior as has Microsoft, would be facing strict punishment that would make them truly regret committing such crimes and would make them think twice before committing such crimes again. Remedies for the future are needed, as well as punishments for past misbehavior. This is the second time that Microsoft has been found guilty of essentially the same crime—does the Three Strikes and you're out rule apply here? Because they will be back in court for the same crimes again!

Thanks for your care for the consumer. Please don't give up!

Brother Ray Bonderer, FSC
CBC-Saint Louis
Christian Brothers College High School
Technology Coordinator
6501 Clayton Road
Saint Louis, MO 63117–1796
314–721–1200

MTC–00004422

From: Joe (038) Micki Wilder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:43am
Subject: Let go Microsoft!

It was fair what the Dept. of Justice and the 9 states & Microsoft agreed on . Let go of this great company and get on with National Security.

MTC–00004424

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message

From: ''Patrick McDonald'' <patrick. mcdonald@courrier. usherb. ca>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 2:26 PM
Subject: Keep them on their toes

To whom this may concern,

Congratulations on not selling out to Microshaft, an unrepentant monopolist, bully, and lawbreaker of unique proportions. Congatulations on being clever enough (or honest enough) to not fall for their ''compromise offer'' that conveniently lets them walk away from legal proceedings... while laughing loudly at the federal and state governments, law-abiding corporate entities, and consumers. Please don't give up; the importance of staying the course is as immense as Micro$oft's repeated and conscious violation of fair competition laws. Your perseverance and determination will have crucial repercussions, not only for your constituency, but also for people living as far away as snowy Canada, and even beyond.

Best regards,
Pat McDonald

MTC–00004425

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Original Message

From: ''Dave Coker'' <dcoker@panix.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 2:29 PM

To whom it may concern :

I am totally appalled by the current MicroSoft settlement.

For years they have without restraint of any kind practiced a predatory form of business. They have effectively increased costs and limited consumer choice, all in the course of their efforts to control and increse market share.

I plead with you to revisit this decision as soon as possible, before it is too late.

In closing, as a Computer Professional with over twenty years experience I am obliged to point out that many lay people don't really know what they are being deprived of because of Microsofts practices.

Please correct this wrong.

Dave Coker

MTC–00004431

From: Berl R. Oakley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:02am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly:

I am e-mailing with respect to the proposed Microsoft antitrust settlement. It is my firm belief that the proposed settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its pattern of abuse of its monopoly power. Indeed, judge Jackson1s remedy was probably inadequate. A more reasonable solution would have been to break the company into four or more companies. The currently proposed remedy is clearly and obviously inadequate. It is important to note that Microsoft has engaged in illegalities repeatedly and over a very long period of time. It has successfully thumbed its collective nose at previous rulings and has shown that it can not be trusted in any way.

In addition, the wide-spread use of Microsoft software (particularly in the networking area) is a threat to national security. Microsoft has been very weak on security issues and the wide-spread use of a single platform makes us particularly vulnerable. Given the damage caused by kids engaged in mischief, it is frightening to consider the damage that could be caused by a serious cyberterrorist.

In addition, antitrust enforcement has been much too permissive in recent years. For one example of many, we get our news from fewer and fewer sources because of mergers of news organizations. This is unhealthy for democracy. When companies become very large and the management makes serious mistakes, the entire country suffers. Japan certainly has experienced this in the past decade in the banking sector. There are only a small number of banking corporations in Japan and they all made bad real estate loans a decade or more ago.

This has stifled credit flow and hindered economic recovery. The Enron debacle in the US may have similar (although one hopes not as severe) consequences. It is time for antitrust enforcement to regain some teeth. A just penalty for Microsoft must include, at a very minimum, the following.

First, Microsoft products must be extra-cost options on computers. Now they are bundling products into an operating system that has become extremely expensive (half the cost of an entry level computer). This clearly stifles competition as one is unlikely to pay for a program from a Microsoft competitor if one has already paid for the Microsoft version as part of the operating system or as an add-on that comes with the operating system.

Second, Microsoft applications should be required to use open document formats (such as XML). These document formats must be approved by an independent body (as is the case with XML). Microsoft must not be allowed to modify these formats to make them Microsoft- or Windows specific. As long as Microsoft1s closed formats are a de facto standard, other companies will be at a significant competitive disadvantage. Requiring Microsoft to use open document standards will help level the playing field. The value of open document standards (e.g. HTML, PDF) is apparent from how remarkably they fostered the growth of the internet. If Microsoft is not required to use open document formats, the specifications of their current and future document formats must be made public so that other software development companies can design their software to open, read and save Microsoft format documents. This is a simple matter, but is hugely important.

Third, Microsoft must be forced to respect open standards such as JAVA. This will allow developers to create cross-platform applications which will give users more software choices. Microsoft has responded to the promise of JAVA by producing a modified version that is Windows-specific. This is clearly an effort to hinder the

development of cross-platform software and, thus, reduce the choices available.

Fourth, any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. It is apparent that Microsoft would like to control the internet (note their .NET strategy). It is of paramount importance that they be prevented from doing so.

Fifth, Microsoft must be required to produce (or in some cases continue to produce) versions of their most popular software such as Word, Powerpoint, Excel, etc. for platforms other than Windows (Macintosh, Linux). These applications must be cost-competitive and features competitive with the Windows versions. This would go some way toward allowing these platforms to compete with Windows. Please note that I have no financial interest in antitrust actions that might restrict Microsoft. I do not work for a Microsoft competitor and I suspect that I own more Microsoft stock through mutual funds than that of all of its competitors. My motivations are simply an interest in fairness and the well being of our country.

Yours sincerely,
Berl R. Oakley, Ph. D.
Professor of Molecular Genetics
The Ohio State University

MTC–00004433

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:06am
Subject: Miscrosoft Settlement

——Original Message——

From: ''Dennis & Diana Wright'' <wrightsdd@home.net>

To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2001 10:50 PM

Subject: Thanks!

Thanks to your state for having the credibility and will to not agree to the bogus Antitrust settlement agreed to by nine of the 18 states and the U. S. DOJ.

The settlement negotiated by USDOJ and Microsoft and the nine states is an absolute disgrace. It will have no effect on the crimes committed by Micro$oft. They will continue their predatory practices and thumb their nose at the courts as they have in the past. Microsoft has severely damaged the Computer Industry through their practices and continue to do so.

I and many Americans will view this bogus settlement as another example of political contributions to the Republican Party and this administration being rewarded generously through this lame settlement.

I encourage you to push for punishment that will change these predatory practices and level the playing field for smaller companies. I commend you for your courage and your attempt to squeeze justice out of this process.

Thanks,
Robert Wright

MTC–00004435

From: Piolino, Thierry
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 10:10 am
Subject: Miscorsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I have been following the proceedings for quite a while and I was struck by the 'penalty'. In simple words DoJ says: ''Microsoft, you are a bad boy. Promise that you will not do it again.''

Microsoft has been found guilty of its de facto monopoly and with its new operating system Windows XP it is 'cementing' its grip on that monopoly. Under the guise of ''this is what people want'' Windows XP locks out standards owned by competitors (Java from Sun Microsystems, QuickTime from Apple, audio and video formats from RealNetwork). This is why I have certain concerns about any effect that the opening of the Windows application program interface might have.

Some people argue, that it is a question of National Interest. Remember the USS Yorktown (CG–48, Ticonderoga-Class AEGIS cruiser, lying dead in the Atlantic water after a complete crash of Windows NT, forcing her to be towed back to Norfolk, VA). Remember all viruses running on Windows, Outlook or Office.

For me 'National Interest' means interest for the Nation, nor for Microsoft ALONE. If MS gets some benefits, that is OK, but if only MS gets benefits and the rest of the world gets harmed, it is not National Interest, but Microsoft interest.

Microsoft should be punished for practicing illegally (and not thanked and encouraged to do so).

Merry Christmas and rule wisely.
T. Piolino

MTC–00004436

From: Brian Densmore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

You really need to get some professional software and hardware engineers on your staff. This proposed settlement is ludicrous. You don't seem to even have a basic understanding of the computer industry. This settlement would be far more damaging to the computer industry than is the current situation. If you allow this settlement to happen, you will have cleared the way for Microsoft to systematically wipe out all serious competitors. Example:

Microsoft would be able to define its own standards and block and seek to destroy all opposition on the web server front. Apache is the leading webserver in use today, but since it is part of a not-for-profit company Microsoft could attack this company in much the same way as it destroyed Netscape. This is a seriously flawed document. Go back to the drawing board and start over.

Take it from a professional computer software engineer (go check it out I'm in the Who's Who for the IT industry [or whatever they called it], or at least I was at one time—I really don't keep track of that stuff, too busy writing code).

By the way, in case you forgot. The courts found Microsoft guilty, not non-compliant. These guys are criminals, you should treat them accordingly.

Best Regards,
Brian Densmore
<mailto:densmoreb@ctbsonline.com>
Associate
CompuTech Business Solutions, Inc.
http://www.ctbsonline.com/
(816) 880–0988 x215

MTC–00004437

From: Neal T Konneker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:13am
Subject: Opposed to settlement

I oppose the proposed settlement with Microsoft. It does nothing more than reiterate existing laws in more specific terms. Since Microsoft violated these laws before, simply restating them in more detail accomplishes nothing. It offers little if any protection to Microsofts future competitors and no redress for those companies harmed by Microsoft in the past.

Neal Konneker

MTC–00004438

From: John Lightsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi there,

My name is John Lightsey and I'm a computer programmer and systems administrator for a small web development company in Houston Texas. Though I don't have an opinion about the legal wording of the proposed Microsoft antitrust settlement, I do feel qualified to voice my own opinion about its spirit.

The question of wether or not Microsoft holds a monopoly position in the desktop OS marketplace is already resolved. They do hold a monopoly and have for some time now. The question of wether or not Microsoft misuses their monopoly has also been resolved. They have misused it on numerous occasions in very direct way and are continuing to do so today. The proposed settlement, while acknowledging these facts, does little to prevent or halt current and future abuses of Microsoft's monopoly position. For example, it is patently obvious that Microsoft illegaly tied Internet Explorer into the Windows OS in order to destroy the market for third party web browsers, why is Microsoft STILL being allowed to bundle it in Windows XP. Why is there so little discussion of compensating the parties who were directly damaged by that action (Netscape, Mozilla, Opera, etc)? And, as a consumer, why do I still not have the option of purchasing a retail version of Windows without Internet Explorer built into it with the cost of Explorer reduced from the price?

This same line of reasoning applies to a wide variety of programs being bundled with the latest release of Windows which in reality are not a part of the operating system itself. Media Player (Microsoft's latest anti-competitive move very obviously designed to kill off third party applications like Real Player, Winamp, Power-DVD, Win-DVD which had done so well on Windows 95/98), its integrated firewall (destroying the market for products by Norton, Black Ice, Zonelabs and others), CD-burning capabilities (Nero, EZCD-Creator, CDR–Win), .Net capabilities (Java). The list of all the markets for third party applications that Microsoft has already destroyed is quite voluminous. The list of what companies they are directly targeting

with their latest OS release is also quite lengthy. Microsoft's contention with Internet Explorer has always been that it is ''free''. So, are all of these applications similarly ''free''? If so, why doesn't Microsoft make versions of these ''free'' applications available for other Operating Systems? The answer is obvious...these programs simply aren't free. They have a cost associated with them, and that cost is being directly rolled into the cost of the OS. So, if I'm already a happy consumer of RealMedia's products, why am I being forced to purchase Media Player? If I'm already happy with Nero as my CD burner, why am I being forced to buy the bundled Microsoft CD Burner? Out of the $200 cost for a full version of the Home Edition of Windows XP how much of the money am I spending on Microsoft products that I'm perfectly content to purchase from third parties? Unfortunately, when you combine the Microsoft bundling practices with it's other practices designed to force upgrading in order to maintain compatability you get a very nasty combination that will most certainly destroy any consumer choice in these areas in a very short time span. In fact, the length of time it has taken just to decide wether or not Netscape was pushed out of the browser market illegaly has seen the birth and the first stages of the death of valuable markets in CD burning software, personal firewalls, and integrated media applications. As a consumer, the government's nod of approval towards Microsoft's actions in this regard are quite disheartening.

Personally, I stopped using ALL Microsoft products when I read the news that the government was throwing in the towel and giving microsoft the go ahead to do as it pleases. It's quite obvious Microsoft has no intentions of stopping it's practices which will ultimately destroy the markets for any and all profitable third part computer applications. It's also becoming quite obvious that the current administration is not interested in addresing the monopolistic practices of Microsoft. As a programer I worry that if I ever build a profitable business off an application designed to work in Windows, I would be in jeopardy of having the functionality of my product integrated into the OS and any future market for my product destroyed. As a consumer, I'm disturbed to find that the government has no intention of creating a level playing field on which products can compete on the basis of merit, rather than the financial clout of their creators or their forced purchase through bundling. As a result I've started using Linux and contributing to the development of a truely free desktop OS. Though I do beleive many Microsoft products stand on their own merits (the core of the Windows OS, Office, Visual Studio) the fact that neither the government or Microsoft intended to halt the continued unfair, and IMHO illegal, anti-competitive practices or Redmond is really making it an all-or-none decision. Everything is Microsoft's or nothing is Microsoft's... Things like the Frontpage 2002 End Users Licensing Agreement, and it's conditions that you can't use the product to design a website critical of Microsoft or its subsidiaries, make it obvious that the ''Everything is Microsoft'' route will eventually destroy the computer industry.

Wether or not you agree with anything I've had to say up until this point, before I close I'd just like to mention another concern I've had recently. Many industry insiders are claiming the Desktop computer will fall by the wayside in another decade. While I don't necessarily agree with this prediction, it appears that Microsoft does. The X-Box, Windows CE, and .Net seem to be the spearhead of their advance into these new markets. Backed by the financial clout their OS monopoly has produced and their complete control of the desktop and it's standards for communication with other devices, Microsft is pushing its way into these new markets with the intention of dominating them as well. It has been reported, for instance, that Microsoft LOSES $100 on each and every X-box sold. Given that fact, how long is it going to take Microsoft to turn it's OS monopoly into a game console monopoly, into an internet appliance monopoly, into a PDA OS monopoly. I hope that any changes to the current settlement will take considerations like these into account, and that these issues can be addresed prior to Microsoft using its current monopoly to become the defacto standard in these new markets as well.

Thank you fo your time.
John Lightsey
webmaster@wazzim.com
1526 Richeleiu ln
Houston Tx, 77018
(713)812–1389

MTC–00004439

From: klg@humerus.mae.cornell.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I maintain the computer systems for a computing facility in the biomechanical engineering field at a leading university. I am not content with the proposed settlement of the antitrust suit currently pursued against Microsoft. Microsoft has been found guilty of monopolistic behavior that negatively affects the consumer. The proposed settlement does not go far enough to prevent further illegal behavior. Microsoft has demonstrated in the past a willingness to skirt the letter and intent of former consent decrees. Several weaknesses in the proposed settlement allow for continued harmful behavior with little remedy. We need a better settlement that also addresses past injuries to the consumer and discourages ongoing illegal behavior. This settlement falls short of that.

Thank you for your consideration. I can offer further details and specific examples should you be interested.

Kirk Gunsallus
Biomedical Mechanics
232 Upson Hall
Cornell University 14853

MTC–00004440

From: Jelagin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:34am
Subject: Public comment—Microsoft antitrust remedies

Gentlemen,

Thank for the opportunity to express my opinion regarding this issue. I am aware that my message is only one of many that you are receiving, and I am especially appreciative if an actual human being is reading this (besides someone from the FBI or NSA). If I am wrong on this assumption, shame on you for not caring, and shame on me for believing in the system. Enough of that, lets get to the heart of the matter; I'll try to make it quick and painless:

1. Microsoft has an unfair, and illegal, monopoly (you know this already).

2. The remedy you propose does nothing to break up that monopoly, in fact, it assists them in establishing new monopolies (re: the education market).

3. The penalties you propose are not severe enough to prevent them from continuing their current business practices.

4. While this may not be the case, many perceive this as a politically influenced process, which leads people to speculate if the outcome of this issue would have been different, had a few hundred people in people in Florida were more adept at using a butterfly ballot.

Thank you for your time,
Andy
Andy Jelagin
Network Administrator
Kaleidoscope Imaging, Inc.
700 N. Sacramento, 2nd Floor North
Chicago, Il 60612
www.ksimage.com

MTC–00004441

From: Greg Granger
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 10:35am
Subject: Travesty

This toothless agreement with Microsoft is a travesty of justice. Mr. Charles A. James needs to be investigate to determine why he would broker an agreement so hurtful to the American People. This has given the impression to the citizens of the United States (and the rest of the world) that in American Justice is for sale. It is a very very sad day. Millions were spent to bring MS to court and they were found guilty of Anti-Competitive behavior in both the original trial and the appeal.

But I suppose that's unimportant, in the U. S. today, Mr. James is justice. I suppose we can in the next ten years expect another 6–8 fold increase in software prices, buggier software and a continued lack of support. No doubt this is ok with Mr. James as long as he keeps Bill Gates happy. I also found it very interesting that the wording on the agreement was changed from ''The United States Government'' and ''The People of the United States'' to ''The United States Department of Justice'', no doubt this insures that even the few points of this agreement that require any participation from MS will be ignored. Certainly, unpatriotic (isn't that the term for person who have no concern for their country or it's citizens) people like Mr. James won't trouble MS and the wording of the agreement insures that not other part of the government can/will either. Even if MS were force to following the largely vacuous wording of the agreement to the letter, it's

wouldn't effect their monopolistic stranglehold over the software industry.

I will be writing my representatives requesting that Mr. James and Mr. Ashcroft be investigated. We need people of unquestionable patriotism and integrity working and leading the Deparment of Justice. We cannot afford to have men who through appathy, incompetence or corruption make a mockery of our Justice system and by extension our Country.

Greg Granger

R4305 x15876

''Happiness is good health and a bad memory.'' Ingrid Bergman

MTC–00004442

From: Earl Helbig
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We think the time is overdue to resolve this ongoing dispute. Freedom to innovate is curtailed by dragging out this dispute. It is more important to get our country moving again.

In the national interest, find a suitable way to let Microsoft forge on with its proven track record of innovation.

Ruth and Earl Helbig

MTC–00004443

From: Mark Tennent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:40am
Subject: U.S. v. Microsoft

To: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney, Suite 1200, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 601 D Street NW, Washington, DC 20530 From: Mark Tennent, 71 Wish Road, Hove BN3 4LN, UK Re: U.S. v. Microsoft

I understand that public comment has been invited on the above case and hope that as a non-US resident my comment is valid. I have been involved in the computer industry since 1985, before Microsoft held a near world-monopoly position in software. Since 1985 I have observed that as Microsoft's influence has grown, they have actually kept users of their operating systems and software at a disadvantage. Their operating systems are prone to attack by computer virus writers—and subsequently have been responsible for an immense cost to the world in recovering from the effects. Often the reason for the easy access offered to virus writers is due to Microsoft's badly or incompetently written software. Because of their control of the operating system they are also able to prevent faster development of computers and software by deliberately not supporting existing standards, such as MP3, or by making other companies software incompatible with Microsoft's, such as Apple's Quicktime, or by refusing developers access to Microsoft's codes. Consequently they have held back their own customers and limited their choices.

Currently I choose not to use a Microsoft operating system and avoid Microsoft applications because I have learned from experience of both that they are seldom the best tools for the purpose in hand. If Microsoft is allowed to extend their monopoly position it will have a great effect in limiting my own choices in software and what I am able to do with it. Microsoft were guilty of taking a competitor's product, Sun's Java, and changing it to make it proprietary to Microsoft. I am still suffering from the effects of this.

For example: I use on-line banking services, accessing my accounts from my computer. However, I am often barred from doing so unless I use specifically Microsoft operating systems and software. The only reason for this is that access has been blocked deliberately for non-Microsoft users. My bank, my Visa card supplier and others, operate similar secure services but on open-source applications and operating systems instead of Microsoft programs. They are able to be accessed from any computer that can use the Internet.

Another example is where the UK Government used to run its on-line services on open-source operating systems, at that time I had full access to the services. Microsoft was contracted to improve the services and since then they are only available to computers running Microsoft operating systems and applications. This has prevented me from using the facilities I used to have, to pay taxes and such like over the Internet. Microsoft have been found guilty of maintaining a monopoly yet the proposed settlement does little to correct the situation. Microsoft will not suffer in any way for their guilt and will themselves supply the controllers to prevent future transgressions. Already their proposed settlement of other cases—by donating software and computers to schools—seems deliberately designed to extend their monopoly into an area where, so far, they have not gained an overwhelming control, by damaging their biggest rival, Apple Computer.

I respectfully suggest that Microsoft have no intention of following the instructions of the court unless it has a beneficial effect for Microsoft. The penalties imposed should curb their behaviour and punish them for their past mis-behaviour. At the very least the settlement should contain the following three elements.

1. Microsoft be prevented from insisting that computer manufacturers must sell computers with Microsoft operating systems or only Microsoft products. This will allow computer manufacturers to supply computers with or without Microsoft operating systems with no fear of losing their licence to sell Microsoft products. In addition they should be able to place whatever other applications on the computers and make any icons or links to those applications appear on the computer's desktop at start-up time and to open as the default application in preference to Microsoft's.

2. Microsoft's present and future document file formats be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, whether on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to publishing Microsoft's Windows application program interface so that other authors will be able to write applications for Microsoft operating systems.

3 All Microsoft networking protocols should be published in full to prevent Microsoft from extending their control of the Internet and that and programming instructions be removed that prevent other operating systems from accessing applications running on Microsoft servers and applications.

MARK TENNENT

MTC–00004444

From: John Zukowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 10:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I just wanted to send a note that I feel the proposed settlement will not prevent Microsoft from further monopolizing the desktop computer arena. The proposed alternatives from the holdout states (mine includes / Mass.) provides, in my opinion, better remedies.

John Zukowski

MTC–00004445

From: AMaiersugg@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:02am
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Sirs,

Between the Justice Department and Mr. Greenspan, those of us who are retirees are really having a difficult time.

Settle this suit, those states who are unwilling to settle are not helping me, the hunt and pick user, but those companies who have just not gotten the message. Use the KISS system, you know, keep it simple, stupid. There are plenty of systems for those companies that use this commercially, but for me I need the Windows and Word programs provided by Mircrosoft, so please, for my use and my pocket book. Put an end to this thing. I have felt from the beginning that the Justice Department was not interested in those who use the Mircosoft systems, but in those local companies who had been setting on their hands too long and the market had passed them by.

Thank you.

Anna C. Maier-Sugg

MTC–00004447

From: Duncan Holley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter as a response to the ''penalty'' that Microsoft Corporation is to receive in the proposed settlement of their anti-trust violation case. As a professional in the IT industry, I come into contact with Microsoft products, and those of their competitors, every day, and I feel that through this experience, I am qualified to comment on the issue at hand.

Microsoft has already been found quilty in this case, and therefore, I will not discuss here the issue of their market place dominance, or the practices which brought the courts to this decision. However, I look at the proposed settlement and find myself asking several questions:

1) Why a settlement. Traditionally, are not settlements reserved for out of court decisions, reached before a defendant is found guilty of a crime? Why should a defendant have any right to influence his or her own sentence, after he or she has been

found guilty? Seemingly, this is the duty of the judge or jury, and not of the defendant. In light of this, I propose that Microsoft have no further input into the outcome of this case, beyond that of this public forum, which they are as entitled as the rest of us to partake in.

2) If a settlement, why this one? While on the surface, the support for financially challenged children is a noble ideal, it simply does not address this issues that are brought up in this case, nor remotely punish Microsoft for their illegal activities. In a statement released earlier in the week, Microsoft reacted with venom to the idea that the nine states which still pursue the case against them were attempting to punish the company. Forgive me if I am incorrect here, but isn't that what we are supposed to do with those that break the law, punish them? Below are the flaws I see in the current settlement, please review them at your liesure.

* Microsoft's competitors are in no way compensated for the damage the Micorsoft's abuse of monopoly powers has caused. While I understand the reality that each of these competitors would benefit only mildly from a financial perspective, isn't it up to those bodies to decide how the money should be spent, not Micorsoft? Additionally, the sheer volume of parties damaged by Microsoft's illegal activity is what would make each individual settlement so small. It seems to me that this implies Microsoft has hurt too many parties too be punished so lightly.

* Microsoft stands to Gain More Marketshare from this action. They will provide their equipment to school children, therefore increasing their marketshare. Even if they pay a small fee here, they will recoup it in the future, as these children will become accustomed to working with Microsoft equipment, and be more likely to use it in the future. This means that the settlement is a tool for Microsoft to Further Enhance It's Monopoly.

* If my understanding is correct, Microsoft stands to MAKE MONEY on the settlement. The production costs on a Windows CD are likely no more than a dollar each. If they are allowed to treat this penalty as a charitable donation, they will actually return more money in tax benefits than they spend in production costs.

In short, I hardly see how a settlement in which the Guilty party is not responsable to those it has injured, is given a tool to further perpetuate it's crime in the future, and even makes the perpetrator a few dollars on the side, is in any way a penalty for the great disregard Microsoft has shown for the law, the government, and the American consumer. The administration has set as a goal that this issue be finished in a final way, that it not reoccur, and we do not see Microsoft back in court every five years. The way to do this is to actually penalize them. By rewarding them, we are incouraging these individuals to not only continue to break the law, but to get it brought back to court. It seems to help their business. Remember, the last time they were found guilty of an anti-trust violation, they ignored the penalties put against them. It seems this time a more serious punishment is in order.

And if you simply must make them give one billion to the schools, just make it in cash, and say that no one is allowed to buy Microsoft software or hardware with that money. Apple, Sun, and Linux systems are all viable alternatives, and, as a member of the IT community, it is my experience that learning UNIX skills will make an individual at least as employable as learning Windows (Windows is so dominant in the home market, that those of us with UNIX skills are rare) and this will benefit those kids as well.

Sincerely,
Duncan H. Holley
9451 Lee Hwy #304
Fairfax, VA. 22031

MTC–00004451

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——Original Message——
From: ''rj friedman'' <rjf@indoserv.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 9:56 PM
Subject: MS Settlement is Unacceptable

As a concerned US citizen living abroad, I wanted to write to let you know that I am extremely disturbed at the proposed terms of settlement that the US Dept. of Justice has agreed to with Microsoft.

Given Microsoft's past history of manuevering around their supposedly binding agreements; given the huge number of loopholes in the proposed agreement; given the overall weakness of the remedies in relation to the crime; it would make a mockery of all the time, effort, and money that went into the proceedings to date, to accept those terms.

I appreciate the stand that West Virginia has taken to this point, and would like to STRONGLY urge the Attorney General to continue holding out for a more just and more meaningful remedy.

RJ Friedman

MTC–00004452

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——Original Message——
From: ''George Wagner'' <gwagner@macconnect.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 9:23 AM
Subject: More on the Microsoft settlement

After reading more on the Microsoft settlement, I am even more concerned. While the point of this was to reduce or eliminate Microsoft's use of their monopoly to expand its markets, the settlement forces them to do just that. It has Microsoft providing hardware, software, and training for schools. While I am all for helping out schools, all this does is increase Microsoft's marketshare, and in the long run makes them more money than it costs through upgrades and replacements. Providing straight funding with no strings attached would allow the schools to use the funds for whatever the SCHOOL decides is needed.

Additionally, the settlement doesn't appear to address any of Microsoft's new markets such as Internet transactions, Microsoft could be paid a fee for every transaction made with the computer. This could be huge. In addition, their software license agreement borders on a protection racket, dealing with the software as more of a lease than a purchase.

Microsoft's foray into the game console's is another example where their sheer force has made them a contender in a market where they have had no reputation. Had it not been for their monopoly, there would have only been moderate interest until the product actually hit the market.

There are other examples, but I am sure that you get the idea, and I hope that you are able to do something about it.

George Wagner

MTC–00004453

From: rsobba
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department,

I believe Microsoft is running an illegal monopoly and believe the would will greatly benefit from a competitive market (which is currently not the case.) Please let me know if I can do any thing to help this cause, i.e. petition, e-mail, letters...etc.

Sincerely
Rick Sobba
7739 Fontana
Prairie Village, KS. 66208

MTC–00004454

From: jda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:45am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am writing to express my profound disagreement with the settlement of the Microsoft monopoly case proposed by the US government. The proposed remedy has little teeth, and the ''penalty'' is actually a prescription for extending the monopoly into the sphere of education. The proposal put forward by the dissenting States is better. In particular, Microsoft must be obliged to provide its de facto monopoly software (Office) on other (non-Windows) platforms, in particular the MacOS and Linux. Furthermore, if Microsoft is to donate resources to poor schools, it should be in the form of cash, not refurbished (obsolete) computers and their own software—these will inevitably have the paradoxical effect of furthering Microsoft's presence one of the few arenas in which it does not already enjoy a monopoly. If the reimbursemet was only in the form of money, Microsoft would have to compete on an equal footing with other platforms/vendors who provide technology for the classroom. That is, they will have to earn their way in (like the other vendors) with out an unfair advantage.

The proposal, as it stands, is an obvious and cynical maneuver by Microsoft to further its monopoly status at little actual cost to itself. It should be soundly rejected.

Jonathan Ashwell
8903 Seneca Lane
Bethesda, MD 20817

MTC–00004455

From: Chris nelson

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:52am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I am very disturbed at the prospect of the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust action going into effect. In my work as an aerospace engineer I am exposed to the negative effects of the Microsoft monopoly on a daily basis. The hassle caused by substandard software quality, incompatible interfaces, poor security, and undocumented formats is a present reality, not a theoretical abstraction, for me. I had hoped that, after all the time and money spent pursuing the case, after having convicted Microsoft of illegally maintaining their monopoly, and after the conviction had been sustained by the appeals court, that Microsoft would actually be facing punishment for its misdeeds. Instead, the current settlement would seem to set the fox in charge of guarding the coop, with the promise that he won't take any more chickens- unless he decides that he really needs to. How does this settlement even pretend to penalize Microsoft for the things they have been convicted of doing? In many ways, it would appear that this settlement actually improves Microsoft's position as a monopoly.

In my opinion, a just settlement (one designed to limit Microsoft's ability to repeat its misdeeds) should include:

1) Microsoft's operating system API should be released to the public. Not just some of it, but all of it- especially the parts dealing with security. How is one to write a secure program in a Windows environment if Microsoft is obfuscating the API? Further, this release should truly be made to the public, not just to the companies that Microsoft deems significant enough to warrant it.

2) Microsoft's document formats should be made public (as above, I mean by this ''released to anyone who is interested''). This would allow competitors to write products which can seamlessly access documents produced in Microsoft applications and restore much-needed competition in this area (which is one of the prime leverage points that Microsoft uses to preserve its monopoly).

3) Microsoft software should be prohibited from being bundled with hardware purchases. While one would not want to stop people from buying their products at the same time that they purchase a computer, they should be a separate line item with a price tag attached to it. In this fashion, the myth that Microsoft operating systems come ''free'' with a computer would be dispelled, and, if the price was not right, then people would be able to evaluate other alternatives. In addition, those who never wanted to buy a Microsoft product with their new system would not be forced to pay the so-called ''Microsoft Tax'' as they usually are now.

4) Microsoft should be required to make it's operating system available to hardware manufacturers and resellers according to an openly published price schedule with uniform terms and conditions and a common date of availability. This would prevent recurrence of the blackmail strategies in which Microsoft withheld an operating system from a vendor (or made it available at a significantly higher price than competitors were paying) until the vendor complied with Microsoft's demands regarding competing products.

A settlement with the above points would truly work toward the elimination of the stranglehold currently held by Microsoft in the arena of operating system and office productivity software. Accomplishing this would, in the end, benefit everyone in the nation as competition resulted in better products at lower prices. Indeed, virtually the entire world would benefit from it.

Sincerely,
Dr. Chris Nelson
Chris Nelson
nelsoncc@hap.arnold.af.mil
931–454–6696
Home address:
431 Campfire Dr
Murfreesboro TN 37129

MTC–00004456

From: Julie Rubenstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:01pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I wish to offer my comment on settlement of the Microsoft case and important lingering issues I believe will still haunt Windows users, a group which pretty much equates to the general public at this point in our technological development.

I am a trained attorney, with basic education in antitrust law and a 25 year career in the public policy arena, currently working in the field for a United States Senator. It's been my observation as an early (1993) user of the Internet and a lifelong devotee of the Macintosh operating system, that Microsoft has pulled out every stop, at every opportunity, to prey upon its own customers throughout the distribution network as well as upon the end user market. I applauded the government's pursuit of this case and the excellent work Joel Klein performed on its behalf. Settling out at this point is a capitulation of important principles that will reverberate for many years to come, to the shame of this Administration. Is this the legacy you want to leave?

Further, I have grave concerns about allowing this monopoly to continue its overwhelming market dominance in this new era of terrorist threats, dangerous computer hackers and the possibility of network communications breakdowns. Reliance on a single operating system makes each and every one of us that much more vulnerable to this type of attack, so all the more reason to foster, not dampen, competition in this industry.

Thank you for your attention.
Julie Rubenstein
CC:Kathleen.Foote@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC–00004457

From: Brian Kelly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Well, I must that I have a mixed reaction to the proposed ''settlement''. First off, just from a philosophical point of view, I can understand Micrsoft's contention that the added functionality provided was simply giving the end user more for their dollar.

And I must also say that much of this litigation has sounded like propped up ''sour grapes'' from Mr Barksdale and Netscape, however, there are other issues which this litigation didn't even attempt to address which is quite simply,

''How did Microsoft's behavior in obtaining exclusive contracts to access points, web server services, and by contracting with numerous supposedly independent Internet Service Providers affect the access market?''

Much of the debate has centered around whether Microsoft's integration of additional software functionality was a violation of the Law, however you folks don't see the true strategy behind Microsoft's latest initiative.

You seem to believe that they don't care how the people connect, they simply want to be able to control the market once they do. And since there are numerous access ''players'' in the market, everything must be honky dorey.

I think if you did a little more ''investigative'' work instead of spending your time juggling through mounds of paperwork, you'd understand the true ''intentions'' of this corporation. Anybody even tangentially involved in this industry sees it as plain as day, unless they've been too befuddled by their overreliance on a single application.

They, meaning Microsoft, don't mind the antitrust ruling at all, since it still allows them to be probably the largest player in the access business. And access in combination with the leasing of Ware products, not HOME INSTALLED SOFTWARE, is what it's going to be all about in the coming years folks.

Sure they'll sell their lion's share of standalone Office products, but office has competitors. With Microsoft's Cash reserves, and their ability to institute the forthcoming ''passport'' system, their jewel has slipped right under your eyes folks.

They will argue there are thousands of Independent Access Providers, however, Microsoft is now poised not only to dominate the desktop but to dominate the very market which we all foolishly thought would be a free, more open way of doing business, the Internet itself and how people connect with each other.

But if you want my opinion on the case before the court, this seems like a bunch of litigation over whether Netscape is better than IE. So since it's simply a squabble between two companies who both were given access to the Public Markets in the form of Stock Issues, warrants and the rest, there won't be much sympathy in the end user community for either player.

The question actually centers on this, ''Why shouldn't Microsoft be allowed to extend their product beyond the traditional sit at home and type on the computer realm?'' Why shouldn't Microsoft be able to compete for the very market that their desktop systems helped to create, almost by mistake.? I don't think even years ago the computer industry realized how big a market to the home user, independent internet ''access'' would be.

So not only will Microsoft control the method of displaying web pages, via ISS, and their rolling out versions of ASP and .NET, but they will also be able to track every single consumer in the form of either their passport system or through acquisitions such as Hotmail and other services. Microsoft is probably the least concerned with end user privacy of any company in the market. They print out nice little privacy policies and the rest but behind the scenes I think we all know what they're going after.

I don't know if it's exactly the ''freedom to innovate'' scenario Bill likes to describe, but I'd be more concerned with Microsoft's behavior in dealing with the actual access points including the telecommunications providers, backbone providers (UUNet), Qwest, etc etc, then I would be with Microsoft's dealings when it comes to simply producing standalone applications like Office and IE.

Because we all know, unless we're floating around in some sort of self induced trance, that the Bottleneck is where it's going , not the standalone ''blip blip blip'' of typing your self printed flyer for your local yard sale.

I applaud the DOJ's efforts, but I must say folks that in some respects, you missed the boat. Microsoft will go on, and they will be stronger than ever. Nice try though, who could expect a bureaucratic organization like the DOJ to actually have any clue about what's really going on besides typing complaints with footnotes on their Microsoft Word desktops provided by Michael Dell.'

MTC–00004458

From: Cadet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:11pm
Subject: justice

Dear DOJ,

Please do not let microsoft decide it's own punishment. They are a company with a total disregard for the law and the justice department. They have bullied and strong armed the industry to their advantage. They do not promote innovation, they ether aquire it or destroy it. They cannot compete evenly on the merit of their products, so they use anti competitive tactics to compensate. Punishment should be harsh and final!!

Thank you for you're attention,
Christian Manasse
971 E Monterey St.
Chandler, AZ. 85225

MTC–00004459

From: Quinn Perkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Settlement

I strongly urge the courts to reject the current settlement proposed by Microsoft. The only way to repair the damage Microsoft has done to the software industry over the past five years is to implement the following:

1) Require Microsoft to continue development of Office and Internet Explorer at an acceptably high level for the Macintosh operating system. Apple cannot fairly compete with Microsoft because they hold development on the Mac platform for these two key areas over Apple's head.

2) Prevent Microsoft from pressuring PC manufacturers to include their Windows operating system, Internet Explorer browser and Windows Media Player multimedia device. To allow for fair competition, buyers of PCs should have options available to them.

3) Prevent Microsoft from forcing their ISP partners (such as Qwest Communications) from restricting use of operating system, browser or media player. If one wants DSL in Denver, one has to be on a Windows PC, using Internet Explorer if they deal with Qwest.

There will not be a second opportunity to remedy this situation. The political courage needs to be found to reign in Microsoft and restore competition and consumer choice to the computer and software industries.

Quinn Perkins
10309 West Fair Ave #C
Littleton, CO 80127

MTC–00004460

From: Bruce Moore
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 12:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is a joke. It will allow Microsoft to keep its monopoly with HUGE barriers to entry into the software OS industry. This settlement has so many loopholes I'm suprised that the Department of Justice just asked for a Congressional bill that would grant a monopoly and give them all the power they want to continually break the anti-trust laws of the United States.

This settlement isn't even a slap on the wrist, more like a handshake and a pat on the back telling them ''hey don't worry the nations economy and the approval rating for the Bush administration is more important than law.

Bruce Moore
Web Programmer
Quickdinero Inc.

MTC–00004461

From: Tristan Ishtar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

I am upset that the government is apparently letting Microsoft off the hook in this antitrust case. While I'm glad that Microsoft is not being broken up (just look at what that did for the telephone industry!), I feel that there needs to be an actual punishment imposed and mechanisms put in place to prevent Microsoft from owning the internet and the software industry.

Competition is good for any industry. Please make sure that Microsoft gets spanked for past infractions and prevented from committing future ones.

Thank you,
Tristan Ishtar
Orlando, FL

MTC–00004462

From: Wenger, John R
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata Hesse,

As someone familiar with computing and the computer industry, and the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolies in these areas, I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. The company has, I remind the judge, already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. A just penalty, I continue, would at barest minimum include three additional features:

Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

Also, the Center for Strategic and International Studies has pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jack Wenger, IS Mid-Tier Administrator
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

''Black holes are where God divided by zero.''
Albert Einstein

MTC–00004463

From: tkj
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:22pm
Subject: Please dont let MS off the hook!

Dear Members of US Government, the Litigation Team, and those of the various States of these United States of America.

It would represent a serious travesty of justice and would represent terrible policy were Microsoft Corp. be allowed such a meaningless and insulting end to this matter.

Microsoft's greed, furthered by its proved arrogance and disregard for any concept of fairness in the American business world, must not be rewarded. Many millions of our citizens have been harmed by Microsoft. Products famous for promulgating insecurity and all sorts of vulnerabilities to our institutions have been forced down the throat of the buying public which, in its innocence, carries the MS banner aloft, unwittingly betraying basic tenents of fairness that have helped make our country great.

Of all possible influences for good that can befall a nation, it is the IDEA of 'fair play' that is at the heart of our freedoms, our willingness to defend our way of life with our lives, and our confidence that we're doing the right thing for our children.

Do not let the harm done by this company go rewarded by such weak and unenforceable terms of the proposed agreement.

jon anderson, md
32 school st
northampton, ma. 01060

MTC–00004464

From: Thomas W. Carr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:28pm
Subject: Bad settlement

To the lay person it was clear that Microsoft was a monopoly. The findings of fact determined that Microsoft was a monopoly. The trial demonstrated Microsoft's propensity to deceive, manipulate and otherwise try to unfairly use the judicial and legislative system in their favor. The proposed settlement does not do nearly enough to protect the consumer and Microsoft competitors from their unlawful acts. It does not adequately punish Microsoft for their previous and continuing bad behavior.

The present settlement should be rejected. We need stronger remedies.

Tom Carr
Professor of Mathematics
Dallas, TX

MTC–00004465

From: George Chamales
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:32pm
Subject: A humorous look at the world ahead.

I'm sending you this e-mail from 2021—40 years after IBM released its first personal computer—in a last attempt to prevent the mistakes in computer development that put civilization in jeopardy... Not everything is awful. Some things are just, well, weird. For instance, Apple Computer continues to do well, but not for its stockholders. The company gained tax-exempt status as a religion in 2015. Authorities were convinced the designation was appropriate after many users took to flagellating themselves in public when Steve Jobs failed to make any significant new-product announcements at Macworld in Boston. Apple evangelists have become common in shopping malls and airports. The cult tends to attract very nice people, and they've managed to integrate into society quite well. The rest of us simply avoid talking about technology around them lest we get flooded with irate e-mail.

Bill Gates has been barricaded for the last two years in a vast subterranean bunker, along with a core group of true believers from the old Microsoft Corp.

Gates and his minions literally went underground in 2019 after the Supreme Court ruled against the company for the 1,249th time in the antitrust case that began in 1997. Authorities gave up trying to extract them after concluding that cracking open the bunker might hurt the people inside, who technically weren't criminals because they'd never actually been charged. Various philanthropic groups tried to ''deprogram'' followers of the man who once headed Microsoft and entice them out of the bunker. But the would-be rescuers were usually met with derisive laughter. The Microserfs said they'd only emerge from their shelter if the humanitarians correctly answered three riddles.

One group, having craftily recruited a team of Linux programmers, was able to pass the test. But those inside insisted that the Linux folks must have cheated and thereafter refused to respond to any more entreaties from the outside.

The only reason we know they're still alive down there is the frequent issuing of news releases, such as the one yesterday declaring that Microsoft takes security very seriously. In recent weeks, the releases have sometimes taken on a more plaintive tone, offering bug fixes for Windows Uber Grande users in exchange for a case of Malomars.

But the problem relating to the licensing system Microsoft established remains. Some years ago, the company stopped selling software outright and instead set up a subscription-based system. Users paid a fee, just like the cable bill and got to use a Microsoft operating system or Microsoft software, like the Office suite.

As a result, when Microsoft decided to issue an upgrade, we all upgraded pretty much simultaneously because the company eventually would cut off access to the older software. It wasn't too long before everybody, everywhere, was running exactly the same thing.

This had some great advantages. Computers got a lot simpler and more reliable because they didn't have to be quite as flexible. Things such as technical support and interoperability issues largely disappeared. All our appliances pretty much run on a stripped-down version of the Microsoft operating system, everything from the microwave oven to the thermostat. The problem is, because everything runs the same operating system—even my electric shaver—once somebody discovers a security flaw, it can bring down our computers. All the computers. All over the world. In some places, the power is on for only a couple of hours a day now. It's not safe to drive because the traffic lights can't be trusted. Torch-bearing mobs occasionally break into the homes of known technologists and . . . well, let's just say we're starting to run low on people who can fix things. We're on the brink of disaster, akin to the great corn blight of 2012. Then, all commercially planted corn had been made genetically identical, which produced spectacular yields. But when a new disease infected a crop in a small field in Iowa, it ripped through all the corn around the world because none of the plants had any resistance to the blight. God, what I wouldn't give to taste Frosted Flakes again. This story can be found at: http://www.dickypimpkins.com/article.php'sid=34

Thanks for your time,
George Chamales
College Student majoring in Electrical Engineering.

MTC–00004466

From: Stephen Putman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I wish to take advantage of the Tunney Act public comment period to express my sincere disappointment with the settlement reached between the Department of Justice and Microsoft Corporation in the antitrust matter currently being litigated.

I am a Senior Consultant with a major software company, frequently implementing solutions using Microsoft software. I also possess a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics with a concentration in Antitrust Policy. With this combination of experience, I have been following the progress of this case with great interest.

Microsoft has shown all of the classic behavior traits of an abusive monopolist throughout its corporate history. They have routinely intimidated competitors, kept prices artificially high in relation to other portions of the computer industry, and restricted innovation in the overall computer industry. They also do not have the incentive to correct major design flaws in their products because of lack of competition brought on by their monopoly position. This results in a computer industry that frustrates most people who use the machines I spend a good portion of my days explaining problems inherent in their systems and often times having no good answers.

During the course of the current litigation, the behavior of Microsoft was proven to be anti-competitive. Even though the original remedy for their transgressions was overturned on appeal, the fundamental finding of monopoly power was not. The settlement that you have reached does not address this basic fact, based on antitrust precedent. In my mind, the best examples of proper remedies in a case like this are the Standard Oil case in the early 1900s and the ATT case of 1984. In both cases, the abusive monopolist was split into multiple entities, and the result was more competition, better products, and lower prices for consumers. This settlement does not achieve anything close to this, which means the status quo is maintained, to the detriment of everyone concerned save one party Microsoft.

Microsoft has made the argument that any remedy in addition to your settlement would be inefficient economically. In this, I agree additional items of remedy would make my occupation more difficult in the short run because integration of disparate software products is inherently difficult in the current evolutionary state of the computer software industry. However, the currently proposed settlement does not adequately address the proven behavior of the company, nor ensure that this behavior would not reoccur. One can only hope that Judge Kollar-Kotelly will see this and rule appropriately, which would include harsher penalties than you have proposed.

I cannot help but think that the current political environment has contributed to the Departments desire to settle this matter in the way it has chosen to do so. It is quite unfortunate that the Department of Justice cannot rise above political expedience and pursue this matter to its logical conclusion,

protecting the interests of the public at large instead of the interests of a major corporation. But, based on the actions of the Department in other areas recently, I cannot say I am surprised. I fully expect this criticism to be sent to the electronic trash bin, after my name is added to the Departments Treason list for speaking out against your performance in this matter.

Sincerely,
Stephen J. Putman
Antelope, CA

MTC–00004467

From: Steve Rudeseal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Requiring that Microsoft donate software to schools does nothing to remedy their illegal business practices. What it does in fact, is allow Microsoft an unfair advantage in a market in where Apple is competing successfully. The proposed final judgement does nothing to address the fact that Microsoft is guilty of attempting to maintain its monopoly. Microsoft has become a de facto standard through both legal and illegal means. Therefor, they bear the burden of ensuring interoperability with other systems. Microsoft's competitors consist of both businesses and communities of individuals. Companies like Apple, Sun, Netscape and Red Hat compete directly with Microsoft in the business arena. But, there is also the Open Source and free software communities which are not related directly to any given company. Open source projects like the Apache web server and Samba file server have been very successful in competing with Microsoft. The proposed remedy does nothing to ensure that these Open Source competitors will be able to compete in the future.

To ensure that both companies and open source communities are able to compete fairly with Microsoft, two measures must be taken. First off, Microsoft must not be allowed to pre-install and bundle its software onto new systems. The consumer should be allowed to choose what software they want on their system. Microsoft would still be able to offer volume pricing to vendors, but would not be allowed to attach restrictions on how the software is used by the vendor.

Secondly, to ensure that there is other software available, Microsoft should be compelled to release the documentation on their protocols, APIs and file formats. Doing so would allow other competitors, both companies and communities, to compete on a level playing field. This solution would not require Microsoft to open up its source code, but it would ensure interoperability with competitors products.

Steve L. Rudeseal
System Administrator
TraceAnalysis, Inc.
email: srudeseal@traceanalysis.com

MTC–00004468

From: Kevin Colussi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:41pm
Subject: U.S. v. Microsoft

To Whom it may concern:

I'm writing on behalf of the proposed settlement of the U.S. v. Microsoft case. I do not agree with the decision and would only agree with the decision if the following were included in the settlement.

—Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.
—The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.
—Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

If the national interest is at issue, as I believe it is and as the judge has suggested it is, it is crucial that Microsoft's operating system monopoly not be extended, I quote the study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, which pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk.

In closing, All are surely in agreement that the resolution of this case is of great importance, not just now but for many years to come. This suggests a careful and deliberate penalty is far more important to the health of the nation than is a hasty one.

Sincerely,
Kevin Colussi
3711 Rock Haven Dr.
Greensboro, NC 27410

MTC–00004469

From: dave@bfnet.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:45pm
Subject: Argument against the Consent Decree

As a member of the computer industry, I am very familiar with the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopoly. Contrary to the statements of the US Department of Justice in its impact statement discussing the Consent Decree, the remedies settlement embodied in the Consent Decree fails to achieve the ends mandated by the Court for the following reasons:

—it fails to deny Microsoft the fruits of its statuatory violations,
—it fails to ensure that competition is likely to result,
—it was an agreement reached for the purpose of expediency, not for ensuring an adequate remedy and,
—it establishes an untenable precedent for future antitrust cases.

The Federal Government has already found Microsoft in violation, but this settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. A just penalty would at barest minimum include three additional features:

—Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.
—The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.
—Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

If the national interest is at issue, as the judge has suggested, we must stop the growth of Microsoft's operating system monopoly. The Center for Strategic and International Studies has pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk.

This case is of great importance not only to national security, but to the US economy and future competitiveness of US industry. We must take the time to craft a careful and deliberate remedy for the sake of our nation's health.

Sincerely,
David Michael Wuertele
Palo Alto, CA

MTC–00004470

From: Joseph Blough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please reconsider this settlement in the Microsoft (MS) antitrust case. The settlement (http://www.microsoft.com/presspass/trial/nov01/11–02settlement.asp) in no way prohibits MS from using predatory practices against competitors or consumers since there are huge loop holes that MS can (and will) use. A good analysis of one such hole can be found here http://linuxtoday.com/news_story.php3?1tsn=2001–11–06–005–20–OP–MS.

The Christain Science Monitor went so far as to call Windows XP a ''tourist trap'' where they suck you into using nothing but their software with their proprietary file formats. This is surely not the behavior of a company that plans to make amends and compete fairly with its competitors. As a linux user, I have seen how many options a user can have as far as computer operating systems (OS), software, and file formats. Microsoft seeks to remove these options through OEM agreements/arm-twisting hidden behind a ''trade secrets'' tag. The internet is a OS non-specific and browser non-specific medium, but MS is even taking that away. Windows XP heavily pushes you toward MSN in an attempt to overtake their latest competitor AOL. Personally, I use a local Internet Service Provider (ISP), but soon I'm sure MS will make it unprofitable to be a small time local ISP.

Consider this recession and how so many smaller computer software companies have had to close their doors. The main reason that many of these software companies remain small is that most of the money in the computing industry ends up in Redmond. Other companies only hope is to be bought by MS. MS monopoly eats into the revenue of practically every aspect of the computing industry (OS, ISP, office productivity, hardware, and now even console video games). These smaller companies can grow and hire more employees if only they have the assurance that MS is not able to use it's monopoly to destroy the smaller company.

Please, in the interests of protecting the consumer, do NOT accept that settlement. It will lead to unprecedented abuses by MS resulting in the loss of choices for many computer users. Many users do not even realize that they have a choice thanks to MS's past (and ongoing) strategies.

Thank you for your time.

MTC–00004471

From: Wpnelson@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Following are my comments for the public record regarding the Microsoft settlement.

Microsoft code should be made public to such an extent that programmers can write topnotch programs that are fully compatible with Windows. They should also be required to release such code that allows other programs to interface with their operating system so as to allow easy file translation between different programs such as word processing, spread sheets.

Their internet activities and code should be sufficiently open so that they cannot gain control of the net via their operating system through required registrations etc. Programs to make their browser Java compatible should be provided in the operating system as readily available and visible option to allow consumers to install the necessary code for cross compatibility. Kid's programs should remain compatible with Windows and Macintosh. Microsoft should be required to continue making Macintosh specific Microsoft Office programs available on a regular basis.

Microsoft should not be allowed to extend the reach of their operating system via ''giveaways'' in the public school system. If there is such a program it should be in cash with no strings attached as to where the money is spent on computers and software and the amount should be larger than currently indicated.

They should be prohibited from engaging in tactics that intimidate or enter into deals that require/allow programmers/companies from publishing competing software.

MTC–00004472

From: Brian Kelly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:53pm
Subject: P.P.S

Oh and by the way, I use Microsoft products because I simply think they are in every way shape and form superior to competitors products offered currently, so don't think I'm just a mindless Microsoft basher with an Interior decorator who thinks Linux is just the COOLEST. . . Not.

Microsoft kicks butt, that's why people buy their stuff, so let's move along now folks and get on to the 21st century.

I'm just concerned over how little the general public actually understands about how these companies actually operate, but who am I but another senseless user behind a keyboard with a satellite dish.

God Bless the USA!

MTC–00004473

From: Fidel Davila
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement Comments

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed Microsoft anti-trust settlement. In general, the proposed settlement does little to change the underlying monopolistic practices of Microsoft Corporation. First, history has shown that monopolies must be broken up into several entities OR become regulated if they are to stay as single units. Standard Oil and AT&T are just two situations that prove that break-up of monopolies lead to future increased competition and better services for the US public. And, investors in these companies ended up in better economic positions. Barring break-up, strict regulatory control like AT&T before its break-up is required to control the monopoly. The proposed Microsoft settlement does not break-up the company to increase competition nor provide sufficient regulation to prevent continued monopolistic practices.

Second, controlling Microsoft in current monopolistic areas will not prevent Microsoft from using their monopoly to control other areas of the digital realm. Microsoft wants to monoplize the PDA arena with its Pocket Windows system, television recording with its Ultimate TV, digital game boxes with their X-boxes, and regular television through set top box software being developed. They will use the same tactics used in gaining monopolies in web browsers and multi-media players to dominate these other areas. So, limiting Microsoft's monopolistic practices in some desktop operating systems and extensions areas will do nothing to control them from acquiring monopolies in these other areas noted.

Microsoft's distain for the US anti-monopoly laws and unrepentant attitude revealed itself in Microsoft's initial proposed settlement with the nine states that opted out of the Federal settlement. Their proposed settlement actually would have increased their monopoly into the educational area—one of the few areas they do not monopolize. Their arrogance at using a anti-monopoly settlement to extend their monopoly is incredible. The current proposed settlement does nothing to change this arrogance.

In summary, Microsoft's problem is one of attitude and processes. The current settlement does limit these marginally in the areas where Microsoft currently has monopolies but does nothing to prevent Microsoft from gaining monopolies in other areas of the digital realm. So, Microsoft keeps their current monopolies and is allowed to gain monopolies in other areas. Where do we—the general public—win? Given the current distaste for regulatory control of businesses, the only credible action is the break-up of MicroSoft into multiple entities. These would be at a minimum: a) an operating/server systems unit, b) applicants unit and c) multi-media unit. Then and only then will Microsoft units be in positions to cooperate with others to compete. With competition, the public will win!

Fidel Davila
5909 Edinburgh Drive
Plano, Texas 75092
972–378–9996

MTC–00004474

From: Ernie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 12:55pm
Subject: microsoft anti trust trial

Hello,

I was recently informed by a news web site I frequently visit that public comments were now being taken about the Microsoft trial, and the punishments, if any, they will face. Although I realize one voice may be lost in the shouts of millions of others, I felt that I had to respond, to at least show my support for some sort of major punishment for Microsoft. I am a user of Free Software. I run Linux, and OpenBSD, both of which are Freely available, and Open, operating systems. Many people around the world use software like this, and I won't bore you with the reasons. With Microsoft in control, free programs and operating systems such as the ones I use, and the many others in use around the world, will have a harder and harder time communicating with those who choose (or had chosen for them) Microsoft's Windows Operating Systems.

Microsoft has continually done things to promote anti-competitive behavior. They have changed their networking protocols, their .DOC word file format, and even the format of their file system from release to release. Although there may be technical reasons behind their changes, you would never be able to get that information from them. All of this is showed in mystery, as is their right as a private company, and yet Windows and MS Office are the most widely used pieces of software around. Yet only Windows can read and write the doc format with 100% compatibility, forcing you to use

Office, and a Windows based machine. If you want to network with Windows, you are forced to use their ever changing network protocols, and so on. It is with much doubt and trepidation I look forward to the coming months, and with it, Microsoft's ultimate fate. I feel that punishments need to be put in place, punishments that will foster competition in the technical market, and allow Microsoft to no longer maintain the stranglehold they have now.

At a minimum, I feel:

Microsoft should have to publish the format of its Microsoft Office suite. This will allow open communications between users of differing operating systems, regardless of the program they use.

OEM computer vendors should be allowed to change and modify the Windows desktop as they see fit, and Microsoft should no longer be allowed to ''strong-arm'' those vendors into installing, and only installing, its Windows operating system. Windows XP does not need to be any better or different than its predecessors for it to become to standard. New computers will simply come with it pre-installed, and the consumer will not have a choice.

Microsoft's networking protocols must be published IN FULL, and approved by an independent body, such as the IETF. I have no problem with Microsoft also donating large sums of money to the poorer school system around the world, education is very important; But, to allow them to simply further their dominance by letting them flood the school systems with their own software is insane. That will simply increase their dominance, and the cost to them will be minimal. In fact, its really more of a benefit for them, than anything. They should simply donate cash, and let the schools have the choice that a consumer walking into his local computer store does not have (the choice of not getting a computer with Windows).

I hope my comments will be taken seriously. Microsoft, which started as small as any company, has grown exponentially since. They seem to not represent the ideals that founded this country: Openness, fairness, and a willingness to cooperate.
Ernie Cline

MTC–00004475

From: Eric Ries
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata Hesse,
Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division,
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the recent proposed settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. As a member of the computer software industry, I am concerned about the precedent created by this proposed settlement. If it is the court's ruling that Microsoft is in violation of relevant antitrust laws, then it is imperative that the penalty imposed be adequate to address those violations. The proposed settlement does nothing to reduce Microsoft's monopoly power in any way. Furthermore, it sends the signal that Microsoft's methods are acceptable—even necessary—for success in the software industry.

Like many others, I am myself uncomfortable with excess government intervention in my industry. However, if government is to have a role, it should be a constructive one. I therefore would like to add my support to several other remedies being proposed by various scholars and industry experts. I feel that these remedies would be more effective at reducing Microsoft's monopoly power, and be easier and simpler to implement, leaving less room for ambiguity. They are:

1) De-coupling Microsoft software products from OEM computer hardware products. This would allow other companies to compete with Microsoft for the OEM markets in operating systems and office productivity software.

2) Requiring that Microsoft allow other operating systems to have access to the hardware ''boot loader'' which controls which operating systems a computer may run. Microsoft has used both technical and legal means to shut out various competitors from access to this vital system component, most notably Be, Inc.

3) Require Microsoft to publicize full details of all of their APIs, file formats, and network protocols. This would require Microsoft to go back to competing on the technical merits of its products.

In any event, I urge the Department of Justice to reconsider its proposed settlement with Microsoft and replace it with something that is both less ambiguous, more appropriate as a remedy, and more comprehensive in its scope.

Thank you for your time,
Eric Ries
950 Crane St #1
Menlo Park, CA 94025

MTC–00004476

From: John Beidelman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:16pm
Subject: U.S. v. Microsoft—Public Comment in opposing settlement

I oppose the proposed settlement of the case U.S. v. Microsoft on these grounds:

1. Under the proposed settlement, Microsoft maintains its dominant monopoly in operating systems and office applications software, contrary to sound public policy. This is the root of the problem. If you control the operating system, you control the desktop, the applications, the application programming interfaces (APIs), the network, and everything else that runs atop or in conjunction with the operating system. We're talking about the crown jewels of the information age. I can't believe that this nation could bust up the anti-competitive and illegal monopolies of Rockefeller and Morgan, but can't come to grips with the challenge presented by Gates and Ballmer.

2. The proposed penalty for Microsoft's offenses pales in comparison to the additional market capitalization they achieved by their illegal and harmful conduct. (They got away with it!) Indeed, if they are allowed to pay this proposed paltry penalty with software (in lieu of cash) to needy schools, their marginal expense is negligible—and Microsoft succeeds in capturing a new market presently held by Apple Computer. This part of the proposed penalty is preposterous! I remind you that the purpose of a penalty is to penalize, not do further harm.

3. By allowing Microsoft to ''embrace and extend'' internet standards and circumvent open APIs on the public internet, there is a real chance that the internet will become more and more inaccessible to those unable or unwilling to adopt Microsoft products and standards. This would be tyranny.

For these reasons and others, I oppose the proposed settlement and urge the Department of Justice to remove it from the table. Any settlement should be a cash only settlement and should provide no clauses to enable Microsoft to strengthen its negotiating position in the marketplace.

Respectfully yours,
John D. Beidelman

MTC–00004477

From: Jerrysafediver@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement proposed by Microsoft appears to be reasonable, fair, and just. Let's quit punishing success and put this ill-concieved action against Microsoft to rest. Significant harm has already occurred to consumers as a result of this action through the curtailment of innovation and increase in cost. Enough is enough!

Regards,
Jerry Effenberger
17511 32nd. Ave. N. E.
Seattle, Wa. 98155

MTC–00004478

From: Steve Brewer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:23pm
Subject: Proposed settlement unacceptable

The proposed settlement with Microsoft is unacceptable. The nature of the settlement itself is unacceptable because Microsoft has already shown that it does not believe its past behavior was a violation of law and it has consistently flouted consent decrees and rulings of the course in the past. There should be some remedy which actually reduces Microsoft's potential to illegally extend their monopoly into other businesses. A consent decree seems unlikely to accomplish that.

Furthermore, the language used provides loopholes for Microsoft to not release information to programmers working on open source and free software alternatives to microsoft software, especially with respect to file formats. Even if the consent decree were followed, it would give Microsoft new tools to fights its only serious competitors.

Please reject this settlement and impose a remedy on Microsoft that will have the effect of actually limiting their ability to extend their monopoly into other businesses. Without such a remedy, it seems certain that we will be back in this same situation again soon.

Steven D. Brewer <limako@mediaone.net>

http://revo.ne.mediaone.net/~sbrewer/
Ne lauxdu la tagon antaux vespero.

MTC–00004479

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft
ATR,antitrust @ftc.gov @inetgw,
Ralph@essen...
Date: 12/14/01 1:26pm
Subject: ''How Much Do We Need To Pay You To Screw Netscape?''
CC: letters@latimes. com@inetgw,letters@sjmercury.com@i...
Re: Bin Laden Tape Sparks Debate
''This is your lucky day...according to profit Ronnie Reagan, peace be with him.''

MTC–00004480

From: Brad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The settlement currently proposed by Microsoft does little to penalize them and potentially does a lot of harm by allowing them to extend their monopoly into education.
Brad Brooks
West Hills, Ca

MTC–00004481

From: Kevin Gryczan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:36pm
Subject: Public comment on MS v. DOJ Antitrust case
I have been a user of Microsoft products since MS–DOS 6.2 I know Microsoft has published quality software and should be allowed to continue doing so. What I disagree on is the marketing tactics that Microsoft has used to expand its business at the expense of third-party competition keeping a level playing field, particularly in the area of office applications and suites. I feel that an appropriate punishment for Microsoft for its violation of anttrust law is the following:
1: The proposed donation of computer equipment and software to poor school districts should be computer equipment purchased by Microsoft, with no software installed, and software being made available through grant money provided by Microsoft for the school districts to spend on software as they wish. School districts can then decide, with the help of IT professionals such as myself and others, which software packages and operating systems they can purchase and utilized on these donated computers.
2: Any Microsoft proprietary document file formats should be made open, and developers should be allowed to have unrestricted access to software development kits to develop programs that can read from, write to, and modify these documents. With this clause as part of a final judgment, better quality software products, such as a version of Microsoft Outlook that contains very few security holes which can be exploited through the spread of e-mail ''worm'' viruses can be developed.
3: Any standards and protocols that Microsoft has establshed while it was operating as a monopoly must be made open, with unrestricted access to developer kits and documentation for software and hardware developers wishing to utilize these standards and protocols. Again, this will level the playing field, with better quality products being developed by many manufacturers and developers.
The real issue at hand here is how fair is it to the consumer to allow Microsoft to continue operating under their current business practices.
Kevin Gryczan
Software Technician
InfoRad, Inc.
kevin.gryczan@inforad.com

MTC–00004482

From: Sean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:36pm
Subject: Bad settlement Idea
Hello,
Having spent much of my career as an Information Systems professional dealing with Microsoft and it products, I have to add my voice to the multitudes that think your proposed settlement is a bad idea. I have seen many good products go out of existence because of their inability to maintain their user base after Microsoft has decided to compete. The worst part of it is this; the competing Microsoft product is not as good, is more expensive, and generally doesn't play well with the other applications. It is impossible to get rid of, as it is ''part of the operating system'' or ''is required to work with the Microsoft Server software'' or some other tie in. Please do not take the offer settlement, it is to my detriment, and the detriment of all of those who make a living in the internet community.
Thank you,
Sean Flynn
Partner
STModdell.com Security Consulting

MTC–00004483

From: David Freeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust settlement.
To whom it may concern. I want to know why a corporation that has been found to be engaging in an illegal monopoly is now going to be given the opportunity to legally continue said monopoly. If I were convicted of a crime, would I be given the settlement that allows me to legally commit the same crime over and over again? I think not. Microsoft is the great stifler of innovation. Look at Java. Java is an awesome programming language whose greatest attribute is platform-independence (that means the same code can run on Macintosh, Unix, or Windows without being re-written), yet Microsoft goes MILES out of its way to ensure that Java is not implemented properly in there operating system. It sickens me to no end. Please, do the right thing and deny the settlement that Microsoft has been pushing for.
Regards,
David Freeman
14500 Cottingham Dr.
Austin, TX 78725
dfreeman@austin.rr.com

MTC–00004484

From: Dan Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:50pm
Subject: Why microsoft software should not be in public schools.
To whom it may concern,
I am a computer programmer who has worked as a system administrator and a technical support provider for unix, windows, and macintosh machines. I'm currently working on an electrical engineering degree from the University of Utah. I've been very concerned about the Microsoft Settlement currently proposed by the Department of Justice. The Microsoft Windows Operating System is uniquely unsuited to the public education sector. I believe this to be true for a number of reasons:
1) There are several very good Operating Systems available free of cost (all of the distributions of both Linux and BSD can be obtained for free, the GNU Hurd will soon be freely available). My wife teaches seventh grade english and I believe it's evident that there are many ways in which the funds allocated for public education could be better spent than on complicated and cripplingly expensive licenses.
2) Microsoft software makes an effort to hide from the user many of the fundamental processes that a computer routinely performs in day to day operation. The objective of hiding these preocesses is to make a computer easier to use and probably accounts, in large part, for Microsoft's success in the market, but does not seem suited to educating young people about how computers work. If a person can use a unix clone operating system (such as Linux, BSD, or Hurd) that person can easily adapt to Microsoft software and is often more competent than life long Microsoft users. As the goal is education it seems apparent that unix clones are the better alternative.
3) Most operating systems in use today (including the MS Dos Operating system upon which the windows operating systems are based) are based on Unix. This makes it a very easy jump from Unix to any other Operating System.
4) The freely available software is most often willing to furnishthe source code for the Operating Systems and all applications. The educational value of this for Computer Programming students cannot be overstated. For students to be able to examine the source code of professionals will help produce a generation of skilled, creative programmers with very professional coding styles.
5) Microsoft is a for-profit corporation. Adam Smith warned of the dangers of Government Sponsored Monopolies. To place Microsoft Software in schools is a government endorsement of their product. This could certainly viewed as a sanction. There are many distributions of opereating systems furnished entirely by not-for-profit volunteer organizations. (Look at www.debian.org and www.gnu.org for starters). The use of these non-corporate operating systems would help to protect capitalist ideals of a free market and of no government endorsements of corporations.
Taking into account the considerations that makes Microsoft software unsuitable for public education, I feel strongly that the anti-

trust settlement ought to be altered such that Microsoft makes their contribution to public education entirely in computer hardware, and that software better suited to public education be selected by schools to be put on those machines.

Dan

MTC–00004485

From: Michael Haisley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:50pm
Subject: Public comment

As someone familiar with computing and the computer industry, and the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolies in these areas, I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. The company has, already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. A just penalty, I continue, would at barest minimum include three additional features: *Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

*The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

*Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet. If the national interest is at issue, as I believe it is and as the judge has suggested it is, it is crucial that Microsoft's operating system monopoly not be extended, and in this I quote the study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, which pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk. In closing, I say that all are surely in agreement that the resolution of this case is of great importance, not just now but for many years to come. This suggests a careful and deliberate penalty is far more important to the health of the nation than is a hasty one.

Michael A. Haisley Jr.

Chief Executive Officer, Phenotek Corp.

MTC–00004486

From: Brian McHugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 1:59pm
Subject: Please accept settlement

December 14, 2001
Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530
Subject:Microsoft Settlement
VIA EMAIL

Dear Attorney Hesse:

I am aware that the Department of Justice is accepting public comment on the Microsoft settlement and write to support the proposal. Our country is in a recession. President Bush and Republican leaders in Washington are working to pass legislation that would stimulate the economy. People are out of work, businesses are cutting costs and laying off workers and families are tightening their budgets.

The absolute last thing we need right now is for the federal government to continue to spend taxpayer dollars in pursuit of this private company. Microsoft employees thousands of people and makes a major contribution to our economic vitality. The federal government should follow the lead of taxpayers and families and limit its spending. This will not only help the economy, it will allow Microsoft to prosper and continue to have a positive impact in our country.

Thank you for your commitment to public service.

Sincerely,
Brian McHugh
McHugh Funeral Home
283 Hanover Street
Manchester, NH 03104

MTC–00004487

From: Victoria Welch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:01pm
Subject: Comments on microsoft anti-trust case.

Dear Sir or Madam,

My comments for the Microsoft Anti-Trust Case. Microsoft has been determined guilty of violating anti-trust laws and the penalty phase just seems to miss the mark, I am hearing comments on the street that the U.S. Government is now a wholly owned subsidiary of Microsoft. I will admit that I find the ''penalties'' somewhat perplexing in that they certainly seem to miss the mark rather completely.

I personally think that is probably a little radical, but then I see demo copies of Microsoft's XP operating system on all the workbenches of my local post offices and I do wonder what is going on here. I do not see any other vendors product demos available there. This seems to indicate implicit approval of Microsoft products and no other by a government entity?

The following are the flaws that I see in the ''penalties'' that essentially seem to leave Microsoft better off than they were before the trial.

I do not see that Microsoft is penalized in any way in that there is no separation of integrated software that harms and stifles competition to the microsoft operating system. Further I see no provisions for computer manufacturers to be able to offer other and more viable operating systems in a fair and price competitive atmosphere—essentially nothing has changed.

I do not see that the proprietary protocols for the operating system, networking and other elements are to be made public in order that others may have equal opportunity to develop applications in a spirit of healthy competition and to encourage innovation. Microsoft appears to be allowed to maintain the closed, proprietary and monopolistic systems that started this process. Again it appears that nothing has changed and it will be business as usual for Microsoft.

In Washington State, Microsoft continues with its obnoxious and heavy handed practices only now in a new area. Their handling of their Internet Service Provider (ISP) business seems to be following the same basic marketing strategy that they used with their operating systems. This has even been noted in the Seattle Times Newspaper in a city where normally Microsoft can do no wrong:

Again, it appears to be business as usual for Microsoft. Thus I am perplexed at the current ''penalties'' being ''imposed'' on Microsoft. They seem to be more of an encouragement for Microsoft to continue in the same ways it has been and those are the very same ones that brought this issue to the DOJ in the first place. If these are implemented as currently stated then fair business practices, innovation and competition are DEAD in the computer field.

I do use Microsoft products, a very few are reasonably decent but I am forced to use others because the only option I have for them is other Microsoft products. Because of this my time is considerably less efficiently used in repairing and working to keep the systems going rather than accomplishing work that I need to do. If one does not expect much from the computers running Microsoft products then they are not the absolute worst products on the planet. If you expect much from them and/or use them heavily then you are going to rather constantly going to have them fail to the loss of time, effort and money. On days when I am working hard it is common to have to reboot my machine to recover my working ability at least several times. As time goes on from the initial (or subsequent complete re-install of the operating system) the situation grows steadily worse. The overall cost of running Microsoft products is incredibly high and far higher than it ever should be were Microsoft concerned with more than creating a market for the next version of its products. Bluntly quality is not job one.

In order that Microsoft be brought into line and with any hope of curbing their horrid business practices, it will take REAL penalties and serious oversight. With the obscene amounts of money that Microsoft has managed to accumulate through its less than fair business practices (to be kind) there is some doubt as to whether that can actually be accomplished. It has become quite obvious to anyone working in the field that there is no honor or integrity in Microsoft, only the search for more money in complete disregard for the good of the industry, the users and at this point in time it becomes

rather blatantly obvious that national security is at risk due to the poor quality and serious lack of attention to security that is epidemic in their products. That alternatives are few is a direct result of the issues that DOJ is supposed to be addressing in this matter.

I've been told that I am wasting my time here in that Microsoft can pay people to submit positive comments for this business enhancing solution that has been proposed as a ''punishment''. They have done the same things in the past, that is pretty much common knowledge. I can only hope that DOJ will prove wise, not be bought out by Microsoft and free the industry for the good of the consumer and the country. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,
Christine V. Welch
4337 8th Avenue NE, Apartment #C–107
Seattle, Washington 98105
(206) 634–0984
vikki@oz.net
Victoria Welch, WV9K, DoD#–13, SysAdmin SeaStar.org, vikki.oz.net

''Walking on water and developing software to specification are easy as long as both are frozen''—Edward V. Berard.

Do not unto others, that which you would not have others do unto you.

''Micro$oft Windows. I'll bet you can't install it just once!''

MTC–00004488

From: Richard Hecker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:05pm
Subject: Settlement comments
Richard A. Hecker—Senior Software Engineer
42906 47th Street West
Quartz Hill, California 93536
Renata Hesse—Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division, Dept. of Justice
601 D Street NW,
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Renata;

I thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns about the proposed settlement. This case has been difficult from the start and I have followed the progress of it diligently. As a Senior Software Engineer, my understanding of the claims has motivated me to give serious consideration to the proposed settlement. I hope the invitation to use this email account was sincere and that my views will be given equal weight as the comments that are submitted via other means.

Perhaps my biggest concern involves the attitude Microsoft displayed throughout the process. The litigation phase is over and the facts are clearly established. As a monopolist, Microsoft must follow the law. It will encourage them to break the law if you minimize the penalty. Their view of the law was expressed by some of the evidence they tried to submit and I was shocked from a professional standpoint.

I am also concerned that this settlement does little to eliminate the gain Microsoft accrued from killing their competition. If Microsoft keeps the gains from their previous illegal action, how can we expect the new competition to fair against them? I would like to see a settlement that provides assurances for such fair competition.

I see this settlement as having national significance in my own specific way. Microsoft is a large company with many shareholders and they contribute a significant amount to our economy. I see them as collecting monopoly benefits from the desktop section of this computer revolution. I expect that this desktop section will continue to drive productivity gains. Healthy competition based upon open standards is important. Full disclosure of all file specifications and application programming interfaces should be a minimum requirement. I would also like to see complete documentation of their network protocols as they expand their .NET services. Basically, I want to eliminate any aces they might try to conceal up their sleeve. In summary, the proposed settlement does not suffice. I know it will require more effort but the health of our desktop industry warrants it.

Richard

MTC–00004489

From: Mike Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:03pm
Subject: Public comments: Penalty phase of Microsoft Case

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly:

Having heard and read stories about the proposed settlement and what it contains (or lacks) I am pressed into sharing my comments and ask that you give them your consideration. I think they are directed to the heart of the matter.

From my perspective, Microsoft has been found guilty of hoarding thus the penalty, to be just, must require them to share.

All of the proposed settlement points do not address this issue so I ask that you include the following remedy.

The specifications of Microsoft's current and future file formats must be made public, so that files created by Microsoft applications can be read by programs from other makers, on any operating systems.

Sincerely Yours,
Michael Lee Smith
3355 Claire Ln #903
Jacksonville, FL 32223–6661

MTC–00004490

From: mike stephen
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 12/14/01 2:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney,
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division,
Department of Justice,
601 D Street NW,
Washington, DC 20530;

Please I beg of you..... If you let Microsoft get away like the current proposal suggests, We (the computer professionals) may never be able to dig ourselves out from the pit Microsoft has cast us all into.

Microsoft products by virtue of being a monopoly, have been designed without concern for security or reliability. I can prove that the design of Microsoft products leads to the spread of countless virii in the computer industry. They (Microsoft products) are the perfect products to use to send damaging virus from many groups like the terrorists from Afghanistan, Israel, Palestine, Egypt.... And do not imagine that these places have not already done damage.

And it is not only because Microsoft products are in such wide use, but the real problem is that the products have been very poorly designed. It seems Microsoft has enough money to do the job right, so the remaining reasons why the products are so poorly written is that there is currently no need to be ''Best of breed''. when you are the only option.

It will not be long till they (the terrorists) discover that they can inflict hundreds of billions of dollars in damage. All this because Microsoft has a virtual monopoly, and instead of actually writing well designed programs, they spend all the energy they have to simply maintain that monopoly.

Often I give speeches to information technology groups that state.... ''Without Microsoft in the industry, we would be at least 10 years ahead of where we are today''. But because of the constrictive designs and monopolizing practises of Microsoft, no possible competitive products have been able to get a start.

As just one example: IBM wrote a fine operating system called OS/2 in 1992. Only today some 9 years later is Windows XP beginning to catch up to the technical capability of OS/2. In fact it still has a long way to go to catch up to OS/2 in security and reliability. What happened? IBM could not get any hardware vendors to carry the software because Microsoft had tied up all manufacturers of computers to include with each and every computer, a copy of Windows. This in spite of the fact that many wanted to use OS/2 instead of Windows. What happened to anyone who decided to use OS/2 was they also paid and received a copy of Windows that they did not desire.

The only way to get the marketplace back in order is to separate the computer hardware from the operating system. When you go to a store to buy a computer, you should be able to buy any computer available without having to also purchase an operating system. That choice should be made at the time of purchase rather than included in the cost of the computer.

Please suggest that all operating systems should be available as separate products. The purchase of a computer should not also be the purchase of products from Microsoft.

It is much akin to buying a car, and with that car purchase, it also comes with a coupon for gasoline from the Microsoft gasoline company. We agree that the car uses gasoline, and we all buy gasoline, but what if we prefer to buy gasoline from Shell rather than prepay for gasoline from the Microsoft gasoline company? Should we not have the option of not prepaying for fuel from the Microsoft gas company?

Please at least bring this option up. It solves all the problems inflicted upon us by Microsoft and some of their abuses of the Sherman act. It also requires little supervision, and levels the playing field for others to play.

I suggest this (above) in addition to any penalty that might be given Microsoft

because of the illegal activities regarding the Sherman act. It's just that without the above mentioned separation of operating system from the hardware, we will not see any competition in the operating system industry. And when I imagine where we (the users of computers) could be were it not for Microsoft, I am almost brought to tears over the condition Microsoft has left the computer industry in.

We are a multi Trillion dollar industry, and to be controlled by illegal means, by one company that has already shown distain for the law and ethical business practises, means unless someone like you makes a move to change it, you will be remembered as part of the problem rather than as part of the solution.

Mike Stephen
Computer consultant
MCSE, IBM BesTeam, CNE.

MTC–00004491

From: Kenny, Eric
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:14pm
Subject: Settlement

I am a software developer living in Cincinnati, Oh (who works with Microsoft products), and I would like to register my total dissatisfaction with the DOJ's settlement with Microsoft. It amounts to nothing more than a slap on the wrist, and does almost nothing to rectify the situation. Consumers will be in no better situation that they were before this case.

Sincerely,
Eric Kenny

MTC–00004492

From: Andy Freed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Comments
To: Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Suite 1200,
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

The proposed Microsoft Settlement is a sham. We should expect this from them by now, but we shouldn't accept it. If Microsoft is allowed to choose the terms of their own punishment, they will choose to advance their own software. The current wording of the settlement is very different from the original ruling by Judge Michael Penfield, and lacks any true punishment for maintaining a monopoly.

There are plenty of arguments for breaking the company up. This is what was originally ordered by Judge Penfield, but was overturned in later rulings. This would be the best solution and punishment for Microsoft. As a Mac User, I avoid their operating system whenever I can. However, their Office software suite is excellent on the Macintosh platform, and only continues to get better. This software was created by a separate group, one that operates outside the realm of Microsoft and its operating systems. This shows that Microsoft doesn't require co-development of its software and operating system. However, by tying the two, they can successfully prevent the use of their software on other platforms.

The current settlement, as proposed by Microsoft, should be thrown away. I think a situation that truly punishes the corporation for violating anti-trust laws, which they have been convicted of, is needed. This could range from splitting the company into separate entities, or forcing Microsoft to share their source with developers, so other companies can have equal access to information that is pertinent to developing good software.

Microsoft has not been reprimanded for their monopolistic behavior, which they have not changed as of yet. They have also used their powers as a monopoly to extend other software, services, and protocols which will continue to advance their position as a monopoly. This case affects everyone who uses computers, in some way or another. The correct response to this case has nothing to do with the settlement that Microsoft has proposed. It should be thrown away, and a new settlement, something closer to Judge Penfield's ruling should be used.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Andy Freed
1415 SW Custer Dr. #A6
Portland, OR 97219
503–246–4836

MTC–00004493

From: Rock.Roskam@wachovia.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:22pm
Subject: comment on the settlement

Microsoft has, I remind the judge, already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. As a consumer I have repeatedly forced to pay extra and recieve inferior customer service because there is no recourse. A just penalty, I continue, would at barest minimum include three additional features:

Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

Sincerely,
Rock Roskam
P.O. Box 14466
RTP, NC 27709

MTC–00004494

From: Jed Haile
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:23pm
Subject: Objection to Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice Official and Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I have spent a large amount of time studying the proposed settlement for the Microsoft antitrust trial and I must express my extreme displeasure with the settlement.

Both the initial trial verdict and the appeals verdict upheld the fact that Microsoft is a monopoly that has illegally used it's monopoly power to deny other companies a chance to compete, and to control the flow of technology. Microsoft official were evasive and borderline to committing perjury in their testimony during the antitrust trial. Microsoft willfully disregarded the terms of their 1995 consent decree. What reason does any of us have to believe that Microsoft will honor the letter or the spirit of the proposed settlement? There are no strong enforcement clauses in the settlement, and there are enough exemptions and loopholes to make it entirely unclear what the settlement even restricts or enforces.

When the 18 states and the Department of Justice began this antitrust action against Microsoft the goal was to establish that Microsoft had illegally exercised monopoly power and to obtain punishment for that crime and to insure that Microsoft would no longer be able to commit further crimes of this nature. The proposed settlement does none of these things. Nowhere is there any punishment for Microsoft's breach of law, and the settlement contains enough exemptions and exclusions to leave Microsoft a broad lattitude to operate how it pleases. The settlement effectively makes it legal for Microsoft to continue their illegal practices.

The settlement is hopelessly biased in Microsoft's favor and I believe that Microsoft's past behavior warrants extreme reason to believe that Microsoft has no intention of honoring this settlement. Microsoft has never acknowledged their guilt, Microsoft has never accepted responsibility for their crimes, and Microsoft will certainly never agree to sign a settlement that limits their ability to continue to operate as they accustomed. The only option is to have punishment and corrective measures IMPOSED on Microsoft. I would ask that the court consider the new settlement terms being proposed by the states that have not yet agreed to the settlement. The simple fact that not all the states are satisfied with the settlement should be ample warning that there are serious reasons to object to this proposed settlement. I urge the Department of Justice, the State Attorney Generals, and the Judge officiating over this trial to reject this proposed settlement. A great amount of time, money and effort have gone into establishing that Microsoft did indeed violate

the law, and this settlement does nothing to justify that great effort.

With all respect,
Jed Haile
290 E 13th St
Idaho Falls, Id. 83404
Phone:
(208) 522–4518

MTC–00004495

From: Tony Kocurko
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:08pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement of Microsoft Antitrust Case

14 December 2001
Renata Hesse, Trail Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC
U.S.A. 20530
Anthony J. Kocurko
23 Burling Crescent
St. John's, Newfoundland
Canada A1E 5H3
Office Phone: 709–737–8898
Office FAX : 709–737–2589
E-mail: akocurko@mun.ca

Dear Ms. Hesse:

As a U.S. citizen living in Newfoundland and employed as a systems manager in a research department of a university, I have a keen interest in the Microsoft antitrust case. To be succinct, I believe that the complete details of the formats, including syntax and lexical interpretation, of both the data files and the network communications protocols of Microsoft products should be made public. That is the short of it.

Here is the long of it, although not very long. It is not uncommon for me to be asked by researchers, who do not happen to be using Microsoft operating systems, to help in deciphering e-mail attachments sent to them from colleagues or institutions using Microsoft products. (In fact, amazingly, there have been instances of researchers, who do use Microsoft operating systems, receiving e-mail text attachments and being unable to read them because they do not have the same Microsoft program that produced them.) Most often, we end up asking the sender to recreate the attachment in an open format, such as Rich Text Format, for example, for which there are available readers for non-Microsoft computer systems. On the networking side, if it were not for the existence of the Samba software (http://www.samba.org), we would have a very hard time sharing our research data among our Microsoft and non-Microsoft systems. My fear, as a systems manager of a heterogeneous facility, is that Microsoft will use the proposed terms of the settlement to make it impossible for third parties to produce open source software that will allow the fluent interchange of data between Microsoft and non-Microsoft products.

In thinking about this issue, I usually return to several situations to which almost anyone could relate. At the moment, I can pick up my phone and talk to a person anywhere in the world, regardless of the manufacturers of the phones and regardless of any fancy extensions that either phone may have. Similarly,I will be able to FAX this note to you without wondering whether the company that made your facsimile machine has so arranged things that only a FAX machine by the same company can send to yours. Again, I can make a recording on my VHS VCR and not have to concern myself with the VHS system on which it is re-played. Now, one may argue that no company would be so foolish as to create a phone that only phones of the same manufacturer can call, but, if that phone manufacturer controlled 90% of the phone market, it could well be tempted to do just such a thing.

It is my opinion that what goes on within the strict confines of a computer is up to that computer's operating system, but when the produce of that software leaves the computer, either as e-mail or a data file or a network transmission, then it has entered the public airways, so to speak, and its format should be readable by anyone on that airway. To put it in an almost ridiculously simple form, it is one thing to write a program that adds two numbers, but it is quite another to write such a program with an interface that requires that the two numbers be supplied to the program in some secret, proprietary language.

Sincerely Yours,
Anthony J. Kocurko

P.S. Please note that a FAX version of this note is being sent to one of 202–616–9937 and 202–307–1545.

MTC–00004496

From: tigre@roo.ybos.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:40pm
Subject: Regarding the Microsoft settlement proposal

My name is Titiimaea Ala'ilima and I am a computer professional in Cambridge, MA. I have read of the proposal for a settlement and I must say I feel very strongly that this is an entirely unsatisfactory remedy to the antitrust violations of Microsoft. It entirely sidesteps the issues at hand of abuse of monopoly power, giving no restitution to those who have actually been harmed by their anti-competitive practices. It is a work of pure public relations. Their so-called penalty involves giving away a certain dollar value of software, with the valuation of that software self-determined as a result of their monopolistic manipulation of the market. And it only serves to entrench their monopoly even further by training more children on their proprietary software. There is scarecely any sense of the word in which I would consider this a penalty, much less a reasonable remedy proportional to Microsoft's culpability.

Why not take the proposal offered by Red Hat, a distributor of the popular Linux operating system? If Microsoft wants to channel their punishment towards the benefit of needy children, why not do it in a cost-effective manner. They could provide hardware, the prices of which they have not themselves artificially inflated, and a more cost-effective operating system could be provided for these machines from another source, Red Hat themselves, for example, who have offered to provide the operating system software completely free of charge. This would impose a real, measurable financial cost to Microsoft, and a real benefit to society, without furthering the monopoly that Microsoft is in trouble for abusing.

It may seem like expediency would serve the interests of all involved, but I think this nation and its economy will suffer if we let Microsoft continue to dictate its own terms. The government will have wasted all of its time and money in prosecuting this case successfully if this settlement is accepted. This decision demands careful deliberation. The public may be tired of seeing this case in the news, but we must not let that dictate the merits of pursuing it further. The future of computing is at stake.

Sincerely,
Titiimaea Ala'ilima
180 Third Street
Cambridge, MA 02141

MTC–00004497

From: John Walker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:43pm
Subject: Giving away intellectual property

Some of the states have suggested that Microsoft be forced to share its source code for Office and Internet Explorer, among other remedies, in punishment for its recent ''conviction'' for anti-trust violations. My opinion: BAD!!

Microsoft should NOT be forced to disclose the ''secret formula'' which it has spent BILLIONS of dollars and MILLIONS of man-years to develop. The purpose of any remedies should NOT be to ''punish'' Microsoft for the alleged offenses (I still don't believe their conviction is valid, but. . .) but to set guidelines to control any future ''abuses''.

The ''reveal your source code'' solution is the equivalent of disemboweling someone for running a red light: effective (in that the person is unlikely to run any more red lights) but excessive (obviously).

MTC–00004498

From: Adolf von W(00FC)rttemberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:47pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Microsoft is a creative company. Leave these guys alone.

Adolf V. Shastri von Worttemberg, Ph.D, MCP
Computer Lab Manager/Sanskrit Professor
Emory University, Atlanta, GA
Office Ph.: 404–727–7619
Cell Phone: 404–314–3056
Home: 770–963–2699

People often find it easier to be a result of the past than a cause of the future.
Idam satyam: . denn so redet m i r die Gerechtigkeit: die Menschen sind nicht gleich. Und sie sollen es auch nicht werden.

MTC–00004499

From: Tony Kocurko
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 2:18pm
Subject: A Thousand Pardons, Ms. Hesse!

Dear Ms. Hesse:

After FAXing a copy of my previous e-mail regarding the proposed settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case, I discovered that my

(non-Microsoft) spell checker happily let me give you the title ''Trail Attorney''. Of course, if you're originally from Wyoming, this may well be the case. However, since we don't know each other, I beg your pardon.

Regards,

Tony Kocurko

Seismological Systems Manager (Phone: 709–737–8898 or –8142)

Department of Earth Sciences

Memorial University of Newfoundland

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1B 3X5

MTC–00004500

From: David L. Craig
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand from Robert Cringley's article, ''He's Not in It for the Profit—Steve Satchell for Microsoft Anti-Trust Compliance Committee!'' (http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20011206.html), _this_ email address/Subject combination is the online place to register my comments on the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. If this is not so, please let me know.

I have been very troubled by the turn in this case since Judge Jackson's ruling was overturned. I do not believe the best interests of the public, indeed, the entire planet, are being served any longer. Microsoft was proven to be guilty of very serious anticompetive behavior, yet the government appears to have backed off any serious response to that guilt. I regret the actions of Judge Jackson that have muddied the waters of the appropriate response—break up the monopoly! I see no other guarantee that will restore proper market forces and the ultimate good of competition fostering better products enhancing the quality of life. As long as Microsoft remains unchanged in its determination to use every possible means of abusing its monopoly position for its own gain at the expense of everybody else, and this seems to be the case still and into the foreseeable future, then it is the duty of the government to intervene and mete out the proper remediation. To not do so dooms us all to more abuses and their costs.

Judge Jackson had the right idea. Please deliver us from the monster in Redmond.

May the LORD God bless you abundantly!

Dave Craig

MTC–00004501

From: Roger Ayers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:04pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am an interested technology consumer and citizen of Washington State. I have followed this case from Day 1, including the original consent degree and the history leading up to the original District Court Filings. I have read, as suggested, the documents related to the proposed settlement, as well as all current District Court Filings and Appeal Court Filings. I find the proposed settlement preposterous and insulting to previous DOJ antitrust administrations, the informed public, and myself. It fails all forms of reasonableness in light of the District Court Finding of Facts and the Conclusions of Law, and the unanimous Appeals Court Ruling. It also ignores the basic evidence established throughout the history of the case, including Microsoft's current willingness to continue past transgressions into new areas as they attempt to extend their monopoly into new markets. I propose that the Court throw out the proposed settlement and instill the two simple remedies as best explained by the author of the attached article. Please allow me to include my suggestion of proper remedies as contained in the attached article. If this is not acceptable, please reply so I may remove the link and author my remedy within my text.

Thank you.

MTC–00004502

From: Pete Parks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:06pm
Subject: Voodoo Economics

To whom it my concern:

If Coke was given the same opportunity as Microsoft is being given. Non-Coke drinkers would have limited choice, which means the consumer suffers. It's sad to see that justice makes the victims suffer to the same crimes that monopolist tries to create in the first place which is ''limited choice''.

While getting my college degree my economics professors each stated the best economy is the economy where the consumer has multiple sources from which to make a choice. In addition the freedom to make the choice is what America is suppose to be about.

Please side on the consumers side by making Microsoft payout money to the schools so they can decide what's the best choice for them (note it might not even be a computer). Otherwise, it just like the joke the average American is hearing right now ''first hit is free kid!'' states the school drug dealer. Once the first hit has taken effect these school become an annuity based cash cow for Microsoft.

Pete Parks

MTC–00004503

From: Logan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:29pm
Subject: Anti-Trust

To Whom It May Concern,

Years spanned into decades as I formulated my own personal view of morality in this world. Years of experience and learning have come together to form the three basic principles by which I live. These principles may be best described as ''truisms'' because of their base nature, yet they remain effective in day to day use. They are:

''If it ain't yours, don't touch it''

''Lead by example and others will follow''

''That which does not kill us, makes us stronger'' (her Friedrich Nietzsche)

In respect to the anti-trust case against Microsoft all of these truisms can be applied, and in all cases to less than satisfactory implications. First, a word about my true interest in this case.

Nearly seven years ago I had my first experiences with the internet. One of those experiences was with a burgeoning new technology known as Java. I downloaded an application that allowed one to create Java Applets for implementation on the web. This software was known as ''Liquid Motion Pro.'' I was thrilled with the product as it allowed me as a creative designer to make things happen that were never before available to a ''non-programmer.'' Three weeks after this initial download, a message was posted on the manufacturers site stating that they had been purchased by Microsoft and that further development would be implemented by that company. A new web address was given to view the progress of the product. Two weeks after that, the product was discontinued and trash-canned by Microsoft.

Since that time I have watched as dozens of innovative applications simply go away due to the influence of this all-devouring monster known as Microsoft. They have trashed, beaten on and devoured more innovation and and innovative spirits than anything I've seen in my lifetime.

This breaches the first of my base tennets of living. If it ain't yours, don't touch it. Microsoft seems to understand this ideal, but from a strange sense of perspective. If they can't touch it, they find a way to make it their own, then they break it. If they can't break it, they make it so no one else can touch it. Example: Bungie Software at one time was the only major manufacturer of games for the Macintosh platform. They were to have released a ground breaking game called ''Halo'' for simultaneous release on Mac and WinTel. After having been purchased by Microsoft, they are only writing software for the proprietary Microsoft gaming system known as Xbox.

Lead by example and others will follow is supposed to be an inspirational slogan designed to motivate people to ''do the right thing.'' Lead by example for Microsoft has led to the capture of the major share of processor market by Intel. A company which produces inferior products for the non-professional market(check the benchmark tests of Pentium-IV vs the DEC Alpha EV67 or the Athlon XP). A company which has forced everyone to conform to their standard of chip architechture. Not surprising is this company's close working relationship with Microsoft. (A secondary truism that may be used effectively here is ''birds of a feather...'')

That which does not kill us. Well, this only applies if we do not die in the trial. Many companies who have fought against this Goliath have died. Many more will continue to die by their hand. Some who see their comrades fall by their side decide simply not to fight. How many of these corpses on the field of battle does there need to be in order to see this company for what it is?

I am not a legal expert. I am a layman. And as a layman I have to gather information and make decisions to the best of my ability based on a few simple principles. I used to have faith in this country. I served in it's armed forces. Now I see the winds of change beginning to blow.

As I see it, in my own small way, the anti-trust laws were established to promote fairness in business practices—to create an environment of competition—in a free and open market. They were also designed to

increase the technological innovations available to the public, thereby increasing the standard and quality of living for every citizen (not to mention the advancement of military capabilities).

What seems to be advancing is the idea that money makes might and might makes right. Through legal wrangling about the comments that a judge made about their company during the trial they wiggle their way into a legal impass. Their defense was not ''We're not guilty'' their defense was ''You didn't follow proceedure.'' After a costly stalemate the monopolists simply turn around and say ''we'll give you some money so you can fight your war and you make this all go away''

What appears to be huge amounts of money are about to be sloshed in the direction of the government. That is what the settlement is about. This is not about what is right or wrong, but about the size of the payoff. If it was about right or wrong, this case would have been taken to the Supreme Court and Microsoft would have been confirmed as guilty. I begin to realize that soon I will be at my desk forced to stare at the incredibly inane flag of the conqueror as I start up my computer for the third time that day and repeat the mantra to myself ''Resistance is futile, you will be assimilated'', then wonder if I'll have enough money to pay to vote for president on the next election day.

Thank You,
Logan
Creative Director,
USinns.com

MTC–00004504

From: George McCullen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:11pm
Subject: COMMENT ON MICROSOFT AND DOJ SETTLEMENT

As part of the public comment on the Microsoft settlement, I would like you to know that I believe your settlement with Microsoft is fair and just. While we waste our time with Microsoft, we are not paying attention to other companies that are anti-competitive. For example, the cable TV industry. I have a choice whether I wish to use Linux or Windows on my PC, and I can choose what media player or browser I would like to use by either buying it, or downloading it for free. I do not have a choice with my cable TV access. I cannot choose the channels I wish to see (I pay for all or none). What about cable broadband internet access? It seems that a lot of consumers are stuck without a choice there. Do we punish one company because they out-smarted their competitors? What about AOL? Netscape, Sun and Oracle? Should they US Govt help them compete? I think that has no bearing on consumer choice. I support your settlement with Microsoft. After this is settled, maybe cable TV operators or AOL should be next.

George McCullen

MTC–00004505

From: Matt Williamson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:12pm

As a linux user since 1995 I can proudly say the MS is not the only horse in town, please remember this.

And consider the following:

*Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

*The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

*Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

Matt Williamson
< mattw_unix@yahoo.com >

MTC–00004506

From: Greg Baker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:24pm
Subject: Please reconsider you settlement before its final.

This is not meant to be a bash, only my personal opinion that soon I will have no choice to but to use Microsoft products for everything I do on my computer. While this isn't such a horrible thing in and of itself, the fact that I won't have a choice makes me feel extremely exposed. I will be paying more because they will have me right where they want me and in that day there will be no turning back.

I am completely happy with my copy of Windows 2000 professional BUT I know that soon if I want to log on to my banks website I will have to use an array of Microsoft products. This means I will have to upgrade to Windows XP, because Microsoft won't release the necessary components for Windows 2000 NOT because they are technically unable, but because they have a monopoly and can force me too. Force me to pay for the another copy of windows (keep in mind I'm completely happy with W2K), use Microsoft Internet Explorer etc etc.

Please DO NOT settle with the current agreement. It does not help consumers to essentially let MS walk away with no fines, no punishment and most importantly no real way for new products to come into the market.

Thank you
Greg Baker

MTC–00004507

From: Annalisa—SecureStore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:23pm
Subject: Auguri!

Scalda il tuo inverno e quello dei tuoi cari.

Approfitta di questa occasione anche per Natale!

Tutto questo all'indirizzo: http://ghirosonno.monrif.net

oppure http://scaldaletto.xoasis.com—http://spazioweb.inwind.it/scaldasonno

DIRETTAMENTE DALLA FABBRICA A CASA TUA!!!

***L'OFFERTA E' VALIDA FINO AD ESAURIMENTO ***

Tutti i dati sono trattati in conformita' con la Legge 675/96.

MTC–00004508

From: Paul Burkeland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:30pm
Subject: Harsher Penalties for Microsoft

Please, please, please impose harsher penalties upon the software giant Microsoft.

Their maintaining of a monopoly is hurting us computer users. They make proprietary formats, and people accept them because of the huge hold they have on the market. They can charge whatever they want for their software (which is the only way to access these formats), essentially forcing people to pay outrageous prices to get work accomplished. If there were more competitors in this area, prices would be cheaper, and we wouldn't have to conform to Microsoft's way of doing things.

Microsoft keeps making their own standards on the internet. They make others conform to what THEY want. That isn't how the internet is supposed to be. One company isn't supposed to dictate how things are viewed and interacted with. One company isn't supposed to have a stranglehold on the future of computing.

Please?
Paul Burkeland

MTC–00004509

From: Shawn E Matthews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 3:40pm
Subject: Microsoft DOJ Settlement

Shawn E MatthewsWhile it's not perfect (what is these days), it is better than nothing. It's time to move on ... the States, while thinking that they're taking the best interests of the people in hand, are only making this worse by dragging it out.

Technology changes at lightning speed, what was wrong two years ago is no longer relevant today. I wonder, will the same level of scrutiny be applied when other monopolies like AOL Time Warner are investigated? Let's hope so.

Thank you,
Shawn E Matthews.

MTC–00004510

From: Warren Downs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:02pm
Subject: Comments on settlement

Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney Suite 1200 Antitrust Division, Department of Justice 601 D Street NW, Washington, DC 20530

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing to express my concerns with the proposed Microsoft-DOJ settlement. As a user of the Linux operating system, who has used multiple computer operating systems, including Microsoft Windows (in various incarnations) and IBM OS/2, I have found Linux to be the most flexible and useful basis for my computing. However, it is my concern that the proposed settlement will, far from opening up competion in the marketplace, actually assist Microsoft in removing my choice to use an alternative operating system.

Here are some of my specific concerns, which I hope will be addressed by the final settlement (and are not addressed by the currently proposed one):

1. When friends, family, and business associates send me Microsoft documents (e.g. Excel spreadsheets, Word documents, Powerpoint presentations), I need to be able to view those documents without being forced to use Microsoft products. Or, at the bare minimum, by using Microsoft applications on top of Linux, should that be an option. At present, there are a number of non-Microsoft products which attempt to read Microsoft file formats. However, they are hindered by Microsoft's frequent undocumented file format changes. At a bare minimum, I would request that Microsoft applications (e.g. MS Word, Excel, Powerpoint, Microsoft Money, Internet Explorer, Outlook/Outlook Express, including Windows Address book file formats such as .wab and .pab) should be available to run on Linux. It seems unfair to require Microsoft to port them to Linux, because there may be other operating systems which should also be supported. Rather, I feel it would be better if Microsoft be required to license the porting to third party companies. For programs which Microsoft charges for, such as MS office, the licensing wouldn't be free, but the price of the end product should be no more expensive than it's counterpart on Windows. Thus, Internet Explorer for Linux should be free, just like it is in Windows.

Microsoft will claim that Internet Explorer is part of the OS, as it is integrated into Windows. Regardless whether that is the case or not, users consider it to be an application, and as long as Microsoft continues to encourage Internet Explorer specific enhancements to the web pages on the internet, Microsoft should be required to make Internet Explorer available to other operating systems. Otherwise, we'll all be forced to use Windows in order to view web pages.

However, the best solution to the file format problem, would be to require Microsoft to make these file formats public documents. Microsoft could then keep their intellectual property, but third-party programmers would be able to produce compatible programs, so end-users such as myself would be able to access their data on alternative operating systems such as Linux.

2. Similarly, I need to be able to share information between my Linux computer and computers running Windows. At present, I am able to use the Samba (http://usl.samba.org/samba/samba.html) file sharing system on Linux to retrieve my files from the office computers. However, should Microsoft continue to make undocumented (and even patent-restricted!) changes to their network protocols, this option may not remain available to me.

Microsoft will claim that it is necessary to restrict details of their file formats and network protocols for security reasons. It is true that, in many cases, their file formats and network protocols attempt to be secure through obscurity, rather than through provably-secure algorithms. See http://www.softlab.ntua.gr/-taver/security/secur3.html for a definition of ''security through obscurity''.

However, the notable insecurity of Windows even without its file formats and network protocols being publicly documented should be testament enough that obscurity isn't helping security in this case. Instead, were Microsoft required to document their protocols and file formats, they would be more inclined to fix any security problems that came to light, and users of alternate operating systems such as Linux would be able to interoperate with their Windows-using co-workers, friends and family.

Therefore, a useful remedy would be one that requires Microsoft to publicly and non-discriminately document any changes to their network protocols, to be approved by an independent network protocol body.

3. In point #1, I mentioned the option of running Microsoft applications on Windows. At present, there is an effort, known as the Wine project (http://www.codeweavers.com/), which is attempting to make it possible to run Windows applications on Linux. It has been largely successful with applications which are written to use only the publicly-documented Windows Application Programming Interface (API) which Microsoft already provides.

However, it is well known that Microsoft applications (and perhaps those of a few other companies in close association with them) make use of undisclosed interfaces between Windows and the application. This makes it impossible to run those applications using an interface (such as Wine) created from only the public documentation. Therefore, it is unsurprising that Microsoft applications have been the least successful at running on Linux using Wine.

A useful remedy should require Microsoft to document all Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) which are used by any applications which it sells separately from Windows, bundled with Windows, or downloadable from Microsoft's website. This would at least make it possible to interoperate with Windows users by using the native Windows applications on Linux. However, it is Microsoft's trend to actually work against this option, in spite of being under anti-trust investigation. Microsoft licensing agreements for many of their applications currently state that you may only use the application in conjunction with Microsoft Windows. Thus, even if it were technically possible to run the Microsoft application on Linux, those licensing agreements would make it illegal! This is unconsionable, and should be addressed by requiring that Microsoft licensing agreements allow usage of their applications in conjunction with alternate operating systems, if the user so desires.

Of course, Microsoft doesn't wish to allow or encourage piracy of their software, and rightly so. However, as long as they maintain a monopoly, restricting interoperability with users of alternate operating systems, they should also allow their applications to be used in conjunction with alternate operating systems, as long as the application is legally owned by the user. Applications which are freely downloadable for Windows users, should also be freely downloadable for Linux and other operating system users.

4. When I purchase my next computer, I should be able to purchase the computer without Windows, or with Windows but without any bundled Microsoft applications, if I so desire, at a reduced cost. It is unfair of Microsoft to require bundling their products, or allow unbundling but only if the purchaser pays a penalty.

In order to be effective, a remedy must insure that, as a monopolist, Microsoft should be required to allow sales of Windows with or without bundled applications, with no penalty in the latter case. And Microsoft should not be able to penalize a computer vendor for selling some of their computers without Windows, either. This means that the software should also be available separately from the vendor, priced the same as the difference between the cost of the computer with and without the software. Only then will competition be able to flourish.

In closing, though my comments are written from the point of view of a Linux operating system user, I believe that it will be to the benefit of all computer users, including those using Windows, and yes, even Microsoft itself, for effective remedies to be taken in this case. I believe that the remedies I have proposed are reasonable, and I hope that the court will agree with me. I am not writing on behalf of a large competitor of Microsoft, and I strongly object to Microsoft's claim that this whole case is about it's competitors. It is of unmost concern to me, that I be allowed choice in what operating system and programs I use on my computer, and I believe there are many other users who feel the same. At present, we feel that we are held hostage to the infrastructure provided by Microsoft.

I am not antagonistic to Microsoft, and if I could be assured that I would have freedom of choice regarding the operating system I use, I would be happy to use and pay for Microsoft applications. However, my experience has been to the contrary, and I feel that only government intervention and continued supervision of Microsoft will be able to ensure that freedom of choice.

Sincerely,
Warren E. Downs
525 S. Williwaw
Palmer, AK 99645
(907) 745–6811

MTC–00004511

From: Herbst, Mike M.D.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I oppose the proposed Microsoft anti-trust case settlement. I believe that it neither

punishes Microsoft for past abuses nor effectively prevents future abuses.

I support measures to require Microsoft to reveal and license its source code for Windows operating systems. I believe that the Microsoft dual monopolies in the operating system business and the application business should be strictly separated.

Michael Herbst, MD

Chair, Santa Monica—UCLA Medical Informatics Committee

MTC–00004512

From: Jake Burns
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement View.

I view the settlement of the US Department of Justice's v. Microsoft to be inadequate. I urge you to reconsider the ramifications of the agreement the Microsoft is so heartily agreeing to.

I belive that all current Microsoft Software should be relicensed underthe GNU gpl scheme. All future Microsoft releases should be required to have no extra software bundled with it. For example, an operating system would be sold as an operating system with no extra applications. Internet Explorer would come as a separate product, so would Wordpad, Notepad, and any other applications that are not necessary or inherent in the operation of the system. This means, no bundled e-mail clients or games either.

Essentially an operating system sold by Microsoft would be the kernel,memory debug tools for kernel crashes and a Window manager or Shell.There are two reasons for this, it forces Microsoft to compete in several arenas legitimately. Instead of relying on the fact that they've made it hard for people to go out and use/install other softare. It also provides people the ability to show who they truly support as a business.it is fair to Microsoft in that they can charge for the software products that they currently bundle and make even more money (if their''aftermarket'' product is truly that marketable or saleable).These ''aftermarket'' products should be bundled in packages of no more than two prodcts. In otherwords, a Word Processor/Spreadsheet package could be made available, or any other combination of two products bundled could be made available.

On another level Microsoft's hardware, software, and services/internetdivisions should be split up. As we can see from past this did not hurt AT&T or any of the spinoffs. As a matter of fact, AT&T has had a few major spinoffs since the creation of the baby bells (eg Lucent). On top of these measures, Microsoft should pay back the rest of the industry that it has helped to stifle by, creating endowments for open source development. Essentially, they should create seed funds for full time open source development teams. The teams would work on software that doesn't compete with Microsoft's kernel products, eg. Linux open source software.

I personally think that this settlement gives Microsoft the ability to make money in three well defined separate arenas. I also believe that it levels out the playing field a little bit. With Microsoft's new .net strategy, they should be more than happy to open up the source code of their prior products. They should realize the profit potential of selling software as separate packages, rather than bundling with an OS to stifle competition. They should realize they have a well established internet presence that nearly stifles competion on its own.

I hardly think my proposal is harsh. The reason being, is that it stillallows Microsoft to make enough money to satisfy any greedy executive. Of course the lynchpin to it all is 3 oversight groups. One to monitor their sales of bundled software, one to monitor their funding of open source development and making sure that the open source development is adequately used. The third group would monitor internet services/ hardware sales (making sure drivers for their products are available to otherOS'es, and making sure that their internet services are truly compatible,(the most recent incident of them blocking other browsers to their content is outrageous)).

Bill Gates is a driven man, he should be up to the challenge of making three separate enterprises run well without each other.

Jake Burns

MTC–00004513

From: TOM HAVILAND
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:23pm
Subject: I am against the current settlement

I am against the current Microsoft anti-trust settlement. I do not believe it provides any remedy to their past and current practices. In fact I believe that it was developed with an eye more toward sexpediency than justice. Any settlement should contain the following restriction: Microsoft must publish all internal file formats and APIs to an independent 3rd party standards body. Additionally, Microsoft must submit any network protocols that it develops to an independent 3rd party standards body. Microsoft may not develop or deploy any products based on these file formats, APIs andnetwork protocols until the standards body approves and publishes same. No protocol, API, or file format may be encumbered by patent restrictions.

Thank you
Thomas Haviland
100 Duxbury Road
Bolton, Vermont 05676
CC:senator_leahy@leahy.
senate.gov@inetgw

MTC–00004514

From: Triodes12AX7@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:37pm
Subject: Submittance of comments regarding the DOJ/Microsoft Settlement

The Department of Justice is doing the world no favor by settling with the conditions they have set. Microsoft has been devising ways to bend the conditions to their advantage ever since their creation. Microsoft does not create programs, but rather is a business machine. Microsoft has not sold software since the mid to late 80s, rather they have sold infleunce. By IBM making a fatal mistake and selling off DOS (they thought no money could be made by selling software at the time, they thought the bucks were in the hardware) Microsoft gained a foot hold in the standards of the PC. Through this, they've decided who suceeds and who fails by using their image. Talk to anyone in america, it's very doubtful you will find many who do not know who Microsoft is, and how powerful they are. Through design they try to make the market theirs. By implementing their own ''bastardized'' standards (ala Java, the Kerbos networking protocol, microsoft proxy server etc.) they make it so you can only use their products or products approved by them. Back in the day, there was an authentication protocol called CHAP (an open standard was used called CHAP 80) Microsoft in an attempt to sieze control of the market implemented a version called ''CHAP 81'' which was basicly the same thing except it involved ''handshaking'' that would refuse connections to non CHAP 81 servers. In doing so they tried to push their OSes and networking products, but it failed miserably. Microsoft is like the mythical Hydra Hercules fought, this punishment will be like cutting off the heads, and there will merely be more in the places of the ones you cut off. Aim your attack for the heart of Microsoft instead. Some people say release the source code to Microsoft programs, but that's a punishment that would ultimately lead to their total destruction. Microsoft serves a place in socciety that is very important, as does windows. If you want to hurt microsoft without killing them, force them to release the source code to the version of software that was formerly released or after 3 years of the software being sold in retail (eg Windows ME whereas Windows XP is the current home edition, NT version 4.0 whereas Windows 2000 (NT 5) is the current version, and so on under the GNU Public liscense. Also allow versions of their software over 8 years old to become part of the public domain. There should also be a strict forbiddance for Microsoft to bundle more then the basic software (e.g. the updated versions of the Windows 95 install, as well as drivers such as DirectX) and they should be forced to put the rest on seperate CD(s.) If you have any issues that you desire to regard in this commentary, please email me at the address above. I will be happy to take any of your questions or comments to the best of my ability.

Regards,
Alan H Draconic

MTC–00004515

From: Terence E. Shelton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft

You should be ashamed of your proposed settlement with Microsoft! They are an abusive illegal monopoly and we the taxpayers pay your salary to protect us from them.

Microsoft does not invent. I have challenged several news groups to name a single software invention from Microsoft, so far there are two, BOB and DLL hell. Everything else was invented by others, mostly individuals and small companies,

only to have Microsoft copy their ideas and bake them into their product lines. This usurping of others ideas is the greatest hindrance to advancement for the software industry today. Nobody wants to put down the time and effort to write neat and useful programs because they know they will never be able to capitalize on it, Microsoft will copy it and get all the money. What will your proposed settlement do to hinder this in the future? As far as I can see nothing! At least the 'hold out states' proposed solution provides a glimmer of hope for breaking the monopoly. They appear to be doing your job. When I was an officer in the Navy we were restricted in our purchases from IBM because they were quasi-monopoly. Does that restriction still apply? Hopefully so! That would put the entire US government including the DOD out of Microsoft's pocket. That would break the monopoly and rekindle the innovation in the software industry.

Terence E. Shelton, MCSE
Systems Administrator
Nathan D. Maier Consulting Engineers Inc.
8080 Park Lane #600
Dallas, Texas 75231
Phone 214.739.4741

MTC–00004516

From: Juan Rivero
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

To whom it may concern:

As a computer user, developer, and educator, I wish to express my concern about the Microsoft Antitrust Settlement. My understanding of the matter is that Microsoft has been found guilty of Sherman Act violations, and that the public has been asked to comment on the penalty phase of the case. It is my opinion that the settlement, as currently stated, does nothing to remove the Microsoft monopoly and in fact enhances it.

As far as I can determine, Microsoft is not required to take any significant steps to relinquish its monopoly of the Software Systems market. At a bare minimum, the settlement should additionally:

(1) Require full publication of all file formats, especially those of Word Processors and Spreadsheets, so that competitors can produce equivalents of e.g. MS Word without being unduly handicapped by proprietary formats.

(2) Require that any network protocols invented by Microsoft be approved by an independent organization, in the same way that other protocols are.

(3) Require that retailers be permitted to sell computers with any operating system at all (including none) preinstalled, and adjust the price of their machines accordingly.

The issue of open file formats is extremely important, as MSWord files exchanged over networks have become a *de facto* standard for both business and governments; these organizations are reluctant to consider any alternatives to Microsoft operating systems because of the unavailability of MSWord-compatible products on the alternative platforms.

If a national security issue is at stake here, as the judge apparently has suggested, then all the more reason not to extend the Microsoft monopoly. The National Security Agency, who is surely qualified to judge, has stated for example that Windows NT is not auditable. In this case, it becomes desirable to allow alternative platforms an opportunity to enter the market without undue hindrance. This opinion is my own, and in no way do I pretend to represent the University of Alaska or any other institution.

Yours,
Juan Rivero
Dr. Juan Rivero, University of Alaska Southeast
http://www2.jun.alaska.edu/~jfjr
email:juan.rivero@uas.alaska.edu

MTC–00004517

From: Perrault, Brian
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
December 14th, 2001
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Ms. Hesse,

I am writing to voice my concerns over Microsoft's monopoly of the software and specifically, operating systems, industry.

First of all, let me thank you for taking the time to consider my comments. It is much appreciated that this opportunity has been granted to the public, I am most appreciative that I live in a society where I am able to participate in such dialogue.

I feel that the suite of operating systems which Microsoft has delivered to the public for the past 10 years have been poor in quality, at best. Furthermore, Microsoft's brute-force mass distribution of their product, has brought our society to a point where consumers and businesses cannot function without their product. This is a serious issue which must be dealt with immediately. Microsoft cannot continue to operate with the business practices they have employed in past years.

An appropriate alternative would be to break up Microsoft into several pieces. One piece would control development of their operating system, one would control their suite of office products, and a final one would control their suite of web software. Furthermore, Microsoft should be forced to sell a stripped-down version of their Windows operating system, which would allow users to customize their software options. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I encourage you to use the full force of the law to save our society from this plague which is Microsoft.

Sincerest thanks,
Brian J Perrault
Group 99
Advanced Space Systems and Concepts
MIT Lincoln Laboratory
Lexington, Massachusetts 02420

MTC–00004518

From: Jon Sellers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:12pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

My name is Jon Sellers. My address is 5541 Oak Hollow Drive, Titusville, FL 32780. I would like to make public comment on the proposed settlement for the Microsoft case.

I have over 15 years of experience in the systems management and software development fields and I am currently an Information Systems Manager with the Brevard County Board of County Commissioners. The opinions stated here are strictly my own and do not necessarily represent the opinions of my employer.

The current proposed settlement will have no affect on the maintenance of Microsoft's monopoly in desktop operating systems. The basis of this monopoly is simple:

1. Control of the Application Programming Interface (API) to the Windows operating system. By maintaining this control, Microsoft can modify the API to its advantage and to the disadvantage of its competitors.

2. Control of the file formats associated with its products. A commercial competitor cannot be assured its products will work with these formats which again, can be modified to Microsofts advantage.

3. Control of the network protocols associated with its network protocols. The argument is exactly the same as above.

Because the settlement proposed by Microsoft and the Department of Justice will not rectify any of these fundamental problems, it will not have any effect on Microsoft's maintenance of its monopoly.

It is my stated opinion that a better settlement would be to simply require that the above are made into public standards, alterable only by the consensus of an organization whose members represent both Microsoft and its competitors.

Jon Sellers

MTC–00004519

From: Mike Dewey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:11pm
Subject: Comment on Microsoft's antitrust case
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

I would like to express my concerns about the penalty phase of the U.S. v. Microsoft antitrust case. My qualifications for commenting on this case are that I am a computer programmer and I have been working in the computer industry for nine years. I do not have any ties to the parties involved in this case other than I am a user of their products.

Microsoft has been found guilty of violating U.S. antitrust laws, and therefore a just penalty must not encourage the continuation of this monopoly. The proposed settlement, however, would not punish Microsoft at all, and would actually help them hold onto their unfair advantage. I feel that the major reason that Microsoft has been able to hold onto their monopoly is that they do not make their file formats and other protocols public. In order for competing products to move into a space that is controlled by Microsoft, they must be able to interact with Microsoft products. However,

this competition cannot spend their resources creating new features because they are constantly playing catch-up with Microsoft's changing proprietary protocols. I think that it is very important for any penalty to include opening file formats, as well as having all of their protocols approved by an independent body of computer professionals and academics.

Another concern that I have is that Microsoft's settlement proposal involves distributing their software to our public schools. This is not a punishment at all, but rather a way for the company to guarantee that our next generation of computer users were raised on Microsoft products. I fully endorse the idea that any capitol exchanged as part of the punishment should go toward the public good, but it should not be done in a way that just makes the problem worse.

In closing, I would like to address the issue of how this settlement will affect our national interest. Computer systems most definitely play a role in our overall national security, and as things stand today they are our Achilles heel because they are controlled by a proprietary monopoly. When network protocols are open and public they can be reviewed by hundreds of people around the world, and this makes them more secure. I realize that this may be contrary to what one might think, but in the computer world secrecy always leads in insecure products. As an example, the web server made by the open source Apache group is the most widely used server in the world, yet it has been more than three years since a known remote root exploit has occurred through Apache. Microsoft's IIS server, on the other hand, is closed source and proprietary. IIS has had several major exploits in the past several months (the code red worm for instance).

I appreciate that you took the time to read my comments, and I hope that you take them into consideration when you make your decision.

Sincerely,
Michael Dewey
307 MacArthur Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94610
(510) 839–1892

MTC–00004520

From: Sugars, Kirk
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 5:25pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I would like to express my deep reservations and concerns about the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case.

First of all, Microsoft was indeed found guilty of violating the Sherman Anti-Trust act. Having worked with their products in a corporate setting for nearly two decades, I can personally attest to the damage their unfair tactics have caused the marketplace. The most notable would be the destruction of competition by buying out competing products, killing innovation by promising the same function in some future release of their operating system, or the maintenance of a monopoly (through onerous licensing practices) that is based on products that fail to meet necessary standards for security and stability. Having looked at the proposed settlement, I cannot see how the settlement addresses any of the CAUSES of the problem, or incents Microsoft in any way to change their behavior in the future. Quite the contrary, the settlement is almost a kiss and an apology to Microsoft for ''all their trouble with this annoying lawsuit.'' This does not appear to me to be in the public interest.

Secondly, I would like to suggest that this case and its consequences are of historic proportions. In my job I have spent many hours trouble-shooting instabilities in Microsoft's operating systems, fighting viruses that were virtually ''invited'' into the systems by their poor design decisions, and developing work-around's to the systems' limitations. All the while my choices have been limited by the unethical tactics of Microsoft. The future of our nation may well depend upon our ability to establish public control of, or at least influence over, the technological foundations of our economy. We cannot afford to ''hand over the keys'' to a company that has shown that it can't be trusted. I see no sign of remorse or any intention to behave differently in the future on the part of the defendant. Therefore, they should not be ''set free.''

Respectfully Submitted,
Kirk Sugars
VP-Systems Liaison Manager
Technical Services Group
Bank of Albuquerque
3900 Vassar Dr. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87107
505–855–0802
ksugars@bokf.com

MTC–00004521

From: Robert Ridgard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:22pm
Subject: MS court decision

Please consider that MS's 'reluctance' to accept the 'punishment' of placing PC's and software in schools sounds too much like Brer 'Rabbit pleading' please don't throw me in that brier patch'. It gives MS a segue into a market they had little presence in previously. Then there's the 'refurbished' PC option. Sure, an old PC is better than none, but a new one would be more useful to students AND would represent a more convincing decision. Plus, without adequate tech support and training, the computers are just boat anchors in Arizona! I urge, at the very least, that proper (not just 'adequate') training personnel be provided.

Thank you
Robert L. Ridgard
32779
Your focus determines your reality.

MTC–00004522

From: Bransky, Alex
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 5:22pm
Subject: suggestion

You should have Microsoft supply schools with computers that run Linux or Macintosh.

Alex Bransky
Anagram International
Eden Prairie, MN
952–949–5727

MTC–00004523

From: Clewley,Daniel T
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 5:24pm
Subject: Reject the DOJ Settlement
C C: 'thurrott(a)win2000mag. com'

I urge the Honorable Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly to reject the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the US Department of Justice (DOJ) . I strongly support that the proposed remedy from the remaining states and ask that it be accepted. Adopting the DOJ settlement will reward Microsoft for its past criminal actions, encourage future misconduct, damage the few remaining viable competitors, and force consumers to continue to pay inflated prices for inferior software. The attached analysis and opinion from the Editor of Win 2000 Magazine accurately conveys my beliefs regarding how and why the convicted monopolistic Microsoft corporation should be punished. ''Unlike the previously announced settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft, these remedies create a real prospect of achieving what the DOJ said it intended to accomplish: 'Stop Microsoft from engaging in unlawful conduct, prevent any recurrence of that conduct in the future, and restore competition in the software market.'' '

Daniel T. Clewley
700 North Alameda Street,
Los Angeles, CA, 90012–2944
(213) 217–7576—phone (213) 830–4574—fax
dclewley@mwdH20.com
..... Original Message .....
From: WinInfo Daily UPDATE
[mailto:WinInfo_UPDATE@lists.win 2000mag.net] Sent:
Monday, December 10, 2001 1:11 PM
To: dclewley@mwdh2o.com
Subject: WinInfo Daily UPDATE, December 10, 2001

1. NEWS AND VIEWS (contributed by Paul Thurrott, News Editor, thurrott@win2000mag.com)* AN ANALYSIS AND OPINION OF THE STATES' PROPOSED MICROSOFT REMEDY As expected, on Friday the District of Columbia and the nine remaining US states allied against Microsoft presented their proposed remedy for Microsoft's antitrust case. After the watered-down and ineffectual proposed settlement between Microsoft and the US Department of Justice (DOJ) and nine other US states last month, I didn't expect much from this proposed remedy. But this proposal is far more realistic and pragmatic than the earlier proposed settlement, and I strongly urge Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly to wholeheartedly reject the DOJ agreement and adopt this proposed remedy instead. In this analysis and opinion, I'll examine the remedial proposals the states have presented and explain why they represent a more suitable punishment for Microsoft's repeated violations of US antitrust law.

But first, a quick review. The US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously agreed with the earlier ruling that Microsoft had illegally maintained its desktop OS monopoly by ''suppressing emerging technologies that threatened to undermine its monopoly control.'' Microsoft prevented these technologies, which included Sun's Java and Netscape's Web browser, among others, from succeeding by

maintaining what the Court of Appeals called the ''applications barrier to entry,'' in which a dominant platform such as Windows stays in power by keeping consumers locked in. As noted in the proposed remedy, ''the applications barrier to entry, coupled with Microsoft's 90 percent plus market share, gave Microsoft the power to protect its 'dominant operating system irrespective of quality' and to 'stave off even superior new rivals.'' ' To specifically combat Java and Netscape, Microsoft ''aggressively and unlawfully prevented these rivals from achieving the widespread distribution they needed to attract software development and ultimately make other platforms meaningful competitors with Microsoft's Windows operating system.'' The proposed remedy also notes that the US Court of Appeals ''cataloged an extensive list of anticompetitive [and] exclusionary acts by which Microsoft artificially bolstered the applications barrier to entry, including commingling the software code for its own middleware with that of its monopoly operating system, thereby eliminating distribution opportunities for competing middleware; threatening to withhold and withholding critical technical information from competing middleware providers, thereby allowing Microsoft middleware to obtain significant advantages over its rivals; threatening to withhold porting of critical Microsoft software applications and financial benefits from those who even considered aiding its rivals; contractually precluding [PC makers] and ultimately end users from the opportunity to choose competitive software; and even deceiving software developers to conceal the fact that the software they were writing would be compatible only with Microsoft's platform.'' The list is long and, sadly, only a subset of the strategies that Microsoft has employed over the years to stifle competition and innovation.

After losing its appeal, Microsoft entered a new phase of its antitrust trial. Kollar-Kotelly recommended that the company attempt to settle the case, and the court eventually provided a mediator. Then on October 31, the last day of mediation, Microsoft and the DOJ shocked the world by announcing a settlement. However, Microsoft critics immediately denounced the settlement as being too lenient on the company. Even I referred to the settlement as ''a travesty of justice that leaves an illegal monopoly in a position of power, enabling Microsoft to continue harming competitors, partners, and even customers'' (see the URL at the end of this article for my take on the DOJ and Microsoft settlement).

As a result, the District of Columbia and nine of the 18 states allied against Microsoft refused to sign the agreement, calling on antitrust precedent and noting that ''the suit has been a futile exercise if the Government proves a violation but fails to secure a remedy adequate to redress it,'' and ''a remedies decree in an antitrust case must seek to 'unfetter a market from anticompetitive conduct' to 'terminate the illegal monopoly, deny to the defendant the fruits of its statutory violation, and ensure that there remain no practices likely to result in monopolization in the future.'' ' So the states' proposed remedy, delivered Friday as required, addresses these issues and punishes Microsoft for its illegal behavior. And the proposal elegantly explains why Microsoft should be punished in a manner more appropriate than that in the DOJ settlement. ''A meaningful remedy must do more, however, than merely prohibit a recurrence of Microsoft's past misdeeds,'' the proposed remedy reads. ''[First,] it must also seek to restore the competitive balance so that competing middleware developers and those who write applications based on that middleware are not unfairly handicapped in that competition by Microsoft's past exclusionary acts, and [secondly,] it must be forward-looking with respect to technological and marketplace developments, so that today's emerging competitive threats are protected from the very anticompetitive conduct that Microsoft has so consistently and effectively employed in the past. Only then can the applications barrier to entry be reduced and much-needed competition be given a fair chance to emerge.''

The states even specifically take a jab at the proposed DOJ and Microsoft settlement. ''Unlike the previously announced settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft, these remedies create a real prospect of achieving what the DOJ said it intended to accomplish: 'Stop Microsoft from engaging in unlawful conduct, prevent any recurrence of that conduct in the future, and restore competition in the software market.'' '

Here are the states' proposed remedies. I've ordered them by magnitude, with the proposed remedies I consider the most important listed first.

1. Microsoft should be required to license its Office source code so that competitors can sell Office on rival platforms. ''To begin to erode the applications barrier to entry that was enhanced by Microsoft's unlawful behavior, and thereby begin to 'pry open to competition a market that has been closed by defendants' illegal restraints,' Microsoft should be required to auction to a third party the right to port Microsoft Office to competing operating systems,'' the proposal reads. Also, Microsoft should be forced to continue offering its Macintosh Office product, with the stipulation that each revision of that product ship within 60 days of each Windows version of the suite and include similar functionality. And Microsoft should be forced to auction off Office licenses so that at least three companies can port the suite to the platforms of their choice; Microsoft will receive a royalty for each auction but no further payments. And Microsoft will be required to give the third parties all the technical information needed to make the ports successful.

This controversial remedy hits Microsoft right in the gut because it hands over some of the company's crown jewels—the source code to its dominant Office products—to competitors and opens up the Office productivity market once again. Critics have long maintained that Microsoft's OS monopoly is unfairly bolstered by users' reliance on Office, and this proposal seeks to answer that complaint. Indeed, given that many of Office's features have found their way into Windows over time and that the Office team has had unfair and early access to internal Windows technologies for years, it's only fair that competitors get the same benefits.

2. Microsoft should be forced to open-source Internet Explorer (IE). Much of the original trial focused on Microsoft's illegal bundling of IE in Windows solely to harm its competitor Netscape; the Appellate Court finally ruled that Microsoft designed IE not to make browsing more attractive to users, but to discourage PC makers from distributing rival products. In other words, the company ''integrated'' IE into windows solely to harm Netscape, not to help its customers. ''Eliminating Netscape and establishing [IE] as the dominant browser was a critical component of Microsoft's monopoly maintenance strategy,'' the proposed remedy notes. ''Given that Microsoft's browser dominance was achieved to bolster the operating system monopoly, the remedial prescription must involve undoing that dominance to the extent it is still possible to do so. Accordingly, the appropriate solution is to mandate open-source licensing for [IE], thereby ensuring at a minimum that others have full access to this critical platform and that Microsoft cannot benefit unduly from the browser dominance that it gained as part of its unlawful monopolization of the operating system market.''

If the court enacts this proposal, Microsoft will have to disclose and license the source code for all current and future versions of IE and any related Web-browsing functionality found in various versions of Windows. This action will give competitors and other developers a perpetual, royalty-free license to create any derived products they want, without fear of retaliation from Microsoft. As with the Office porting proposal, this proposal hits right at the heart of the matter and is an appropriate remedy for a company that abused competitors, partners, and users through its anticompetitive bundling of IE and Windows.

3. Microsoft's bundled software should be unbundled from Windows. As with the previous proposal, this requirement relates to Microsoft's illegal commingling of IE and other middleware with Windows, which deterred PC makers and users from installing competing products. The states give Microsoft two options: Either cease bundling middleware such as IE, Windows Media Player (WMP), and Windows Messenger in all current and future versions of Windows, or start selling Windows versions that don't include those bundled applications. If the court chooses the latter option, those unbundled Windows versions should cost significantly less than the versions that include bundled software and should function properly. This requirement applies to Windows XP, Windows 2000, Windows Me, and Windows NT 4.0, but not to Windows 98 or Win98 SE, for some reason.

Again, I endorse any remedy that addresses a specific area in which the court found Microsoft guilty of breaking the law. Indeed, the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously upheld the earlier District Court ruling that Microsoft bundled middleware such as IE solely to ''deter

computer manufacturers from installing a rival browser such as Netscape Navigator. Microsoft offered no specific or substantiated evidence to justify such commingling, and such commingling had an anticompetitive effect.'' Users and PC makers should be able to choose whether to install Microsoft or third-party middleware, and this proposal makes the choice possible. Contrast this solution to Windows XP, where users can't uninstall components such as WMP, Windows Movie Maker (WMM), and Windows Messenger, let alone replace them with other software.

4. If Microsoft knowingly violates the terms of this remedy, the company should be forced to license the source code of the product in question. Given Microsoft's repeated violation of previous agreements, this proposed remedy is key. If the court finds in the future that Microsoft illegally commingled software code into Windows, for example, the company will have to freely license the Windows source code to the appropriate parties. ''If the Court determines that Microsoft has knowingly committed an act of Material Non-Compliance, the Court may, in addition to any other action, convene a hearing to consider an order requiring Microsoft to license its source code for the Microsoft software that is implicated by the act of Material Non-Compliance to anyone requesting such a license for the purpose of facilitating interoperability between the relevant Microsoft product and any non-Microsoft product,'' the ruling reads. If the court finds that Microsoft knowingly engaged in a pattern of noncompliance, the company will have to pay fines and suffer further appropriate remedies. This remedy is crucial because it openly warns Microsoft about the consequences of its future behavior, giving the company no wiggle room to ''reinterpret'' its legally binding conduct remedies as it has so often in the past.

5. Microsoft should be forced to adhere to industry standards. Microsoft frequently ''embraces'' open standards only to ''extend'' them with proprietary additions that make interoperability with non-Windows platforms difficult or impossible. The states refer to this practice as the ''co-opting and/or undermining of industry standards,'' and they point to Microsoft's specific behavior regarding Java: The company ''purposely deceived software developers into believing that the Microsoft Java programming tools had cross-platform capability with Sun-based Java'' when they didn't. Under terms of this proposal, Microsoft would again have two options: The company could adopt and implement industry standards into its products and not modify them at all. Or it could modify these technologies and supply the changes to any party that requests them. Furthermore, Microsoft couldn't require third parties to use standards-based technologies it had modified.

This is another compelling request, because it addresses a specific behavior Microsoft has long been guilty of. If enacted, Microsoft's embrace-and-extend strategy will be open to competitors and thus rendered moot.

6. Microsoft should be forced to distribute Java with Windows and IE. According to the states, ''Microsoft's destruction of the cross-platform threat posed by Sun's Java technology was a critical element of the unlawful monopoly maintenance violation affirmed by the Court of Appeals. Microsoft continues to enjoy the benefits of its unlawful conduct, as Sun's Java technology does not provide the competitive threat today that it posed prior to Microsoft's campaign of anticompetitive conduct. Because an appropriate antitrust remedy decree should, among other things, attempt 'to deny to the defendant the fruits of its statutory violation,' Microsoft must be required to distribute Java with its platform software (i.e., its operating systems and [IE] browser), thereby ensuring that Java receives the widespread distribution that it could have had absent Microsoft's unlawful behavior, and increasing the likelihood that Java can serve as a platform to reduce the applications barrier to entry.'' Under the proposal's terms, this bundling would continue for 10 years and would require Microsoft to continue developing modern versions of Java that conform to Sun's latest Java specifications. This is the only part of the proposal I disagree with, largely because Sun has never opened up Java to an internationally recognized standards body (I likewise reject any argument that Java is a de facto standard). During the company's original trial, the court asked Bill Gates about Microsoft bundling Netscape Navigator in Windows. Gates replied that that would be like requiring Coca-Cola to include one Pepsi in each of its six-packs of Coke. I agree that such a requirement is ludicrous, as is requiring Microsoft to bundle Java with Windows.

The remaining proposed remedies are less exciting and more closely mimic the remedies in the DOJ's proposed settlement. Thus, I'll cover them more succinctly.

7. Microsoft should be required to reveal all interoperability technologies so that ''Microsoft middleware developers [don't] receive preferential disclosure of technical information over rival middleware developers.''

8. Microsoft should have to license its intellectual rights when necessary to meet the requirements of this remedy. Some of the aforementioned proposals will require Microsoft to license its intellectual property to third parties. The company will have to do so when appropriate.

9. Microsoft should have to provide uniform and nondiscriminatory licensing to PC makers, regardless of their relationships with Microsoft and Microsoft competitors.

10. Microsoft should be prohibited from entering into agreements that would harm competition. Furthermore, ''Microsoft must also be prohibited from taking certain actions that could unfairly disadvantage its would-be competitors, whether by knowingly interfering with the performance of their software with no advance warning or entering into certain types of contracts that could unreasonably foreclose competing middleware providers.''

11. Microsoft should be banned from retaliating against companies or users that choose non-Microsoft technologies.

12. Microsoft should be prevented from forcing PC makers and users to choose Microsoft-only solutions. No Microsoft middleware can be included in Windows unless it can also be removed and replaced by PC makers and end users.

13. Microsoft should be prohibited from requiring partners to sign noncompete agreements, such as the agreement it allegedly tried to enter into with Netscape.

14. Microsoft should be required to undergo regular compliance certification to ensure that it meets the requirements of the ruling against it. This certification will include an internal compliance officer, annual compliance certifications, a compliance committee consisting of at least three members of Microsoft's Board of Directors, and extensive internal-document retention.

15. A Special Master should be empowered to promptly investigate any future complaints against Microsoft.

16. Microsoft should be required to report any potential technology or corporate acquisitions to the plaintiffs for review because the company has used such acquisitions in the past to extend its monopoly power.

Folks, this proposal represents your tax dollars at work. I salute the states of California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Utah, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia for erecting a logical and workable remedy that addresses, rather than rewards, Microsoft's illegal, anticompetitive behavior. Just weeks ago, it seemed that Microsoft would escape punishment, but these proposed remedies give new hope that justice will be served. If Judge Kollar-Kotelly can at least find a happy middle ground between the DOJ's proposed settlement and this more reasonable set of remedies, we might see competition and innovation return to the computer industry. If I'm not mistaken, that was the original point of this legal nightmare.

MTC–00004524

From: Timothy Taebel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:28pm
Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern:

As a end user, I am grateful to the people at the Microsoft organization. I am 60 years old and never have had any formal training in the usage of computers. All I know, is that the cost of computers continues to fall and they are easier to use which is most beneficial to me and my family. It seems to me that the folks at Microsoft got up earlier, worked later and smarter than their competition and made the best mousetrap. The only mistake that Microsoft made is they weren't politically savvy. While Microsoft was tending to their knitting, the out witted competition cried foul and hired a bunch of lawyers and lobbyist. Then unfortunately the states got involved as their politically motivated Attorney Generals decided that suing Microsoft was good for the advancement of their careers. It seems to me that nobody is speaking up for the consumer, who has benefited immensely from the products from Microsoft. The lawsuit is nothing but a waste of tax payers money and should be resolved as quickly as possible. I

suggest the competition should just try to make a better product at a cheaper price and the public will buy it.

Thank You
Timothy C. Taebel
2020 Goldengate Dr.
Michigan City, In. 46360

MTC–00004525

From: David Morrissey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:42pm
Subject: Public comment

Hello...my name is David Morrissey.

I am not in favour of this settlement. I am an individual who understands many of the aspects of the computer industry. Within that sphere, I feel that the need for a hasty resolve is not as important as a proper resolve.

This is the aspect of the trial where Microsoft's punishment for breaking the law is being created and myself I would wish to see the following also included as they have all been raised my many voices from many corners of the issues.

1. Microsoft to offer the windows operating system's without additional software included or embedded to OEM's with both:

A) a price difference which reflects the cost of products such as MS Office instead of say 5–20$ dollars. Example-if MS office costs 100 dollars...I would like to see the price of the Office free windows OS 100 dollars cheaper.

B) A uniformed contract set up which would prevent MS from favouring or punishing OEM's who choose one variety or ''flavour'' over another. My feelings for this are that MS will be limited in it's ability to abuse it's monopoly in the OS market if it is unable to retaliate against manufacturers who wish to either not support Microsoft's other products and or choose to support a competitor's instead.

2. Microsoft must be made to release information required by competitors in a public and universal form in a timely manner. As they are a monopoly they must not be able to choose who may and may not and in what order and when software developers gain access to required Microsoft product information or ''hooks'' as their called.

3. Details of document file formats of Microsoft programs (Office) must also be made public and universal in a timely manner. If not then fear of another monopoly may prove warranted but unheeded.

4. Microsoft must not be allowed to create proprietary networking protocols which may take away from the internet as a free and open place devoid of the requirement for one company over another. Any new networking protocols Have to be FULLY documented and reviewed by an established Independent body such as tcp/ip is today. This could in effect remove the Open Source movement and competitors such at Linux, the fastest growing operating system avalible, from being a viable solution to an Internet virually inclosed behind a Microsoft yoke.

5. The moniting will last only a few years. What will happen after that is over? I feel that as long as there is a monopoly, then Microsoft should be held in check to prevent it from abusing it's monopoly. Hence the two items should be linked together in some manner where reports of abuse may be investagated where the monopoly abuse issue is called into question.

6. In the punishment stage I do no believe that Microsoft should have a hand in selecting who will be chosen to see that the punishment will be observerd... Or to have say in when and where these 3 purposed wardens can go and see within that area. More to the matter, here while the purposed agreemenet is being reviewed and this request of comments from the general public is being asked for, Microsoft has selected 2 of the people that MS says will oversee that it conforms to the agreement which MS also say through these actions will be agreed to by the DOJ. http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,5100682,00.html This leaves myself feeling that my time in responding to this request for public responce carries little to no weight. Big time buisnees and big time goverment?

7. There is NO penalty being required of Microsoft. They will pay no fines, they will have nothing laid agaisnt them. This illegal abuse of it's monopoly has streagthened and benifited Microsoft greatly at the cost of others. And those others will not recover from it or see any of their loses returned to them. Indeed this is more than worth it to MS to continue to break the law in order to break competitors.

8. The ability to embed software which directly compeates with competors such as Internet Explorer, must be removed to prevent effective bundeling. MS has the ablitiy to merge into the operating system a number of programs and software which will be paid for via higher OS prices and or licences fee's as the case may become.

Microsoft in this matter is not being properly addressed by the purposed agreement. I feel that the public would be better represented by a new sentence which would address the above concerns.

This company has been mentioned by the Center for Strategic and International Studies as a possible threat to national security. I would like to see it removed from gaining that sort of position. I fail to see how without addressing the above issues this agreement intends to effectively do this.

This company has also repeatedly made statements and remarks reflecting a goal to the only operating system available including comparisons to items such as the Open Source moment's Linux to Cancer. It may be well pointed out at this time that Microsoft is itself funning FreeBSD, a free open source OS, for it's hotmail service as I write this letter.

Thank you for your time and I hope that my time in this letter as well as others writing in will have some voice in this matter. Computers can be very complicated devices, and many people do not carry the level of understanding some of the more technical aspects of the issues dealt with in this case. I hope only the letters you recieve from those who do understand some or much of this case aid in adding weight against this agreement (or as the public opinion may go), and is not just an exercise in public relations.

Sincerly
David Morrissey.

MTC–00004526

From: Ted Kim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 5:50pm
Subject: Public Comment RE: US vs. Microsoft

As a longtime computer user, I find that the proposed settlement regarding the Microsoft Anti-Trust case to be inequitable and not in the best public interest. The proposed settlement does nothing to punish or curtail Microsoft's monopolistic business practices. In my humble opinion, the proposed settlement allows Microsoft to further its monopolistic business practices with no competition and with the Court's blessing. Gladly I observe that the Court has not gone blindly down that primrose path and is hearing other players in the industry to gather their opinions before acceptance of the proposal.

The Court is now determining the penalty to Microsoft for violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Microsoft has been found to be illegally maintaining a monopoly of the operating systems market. Any penalties handed down to Microsoft should include, but not be limited to the following in my opinion.

1. Microsoft operating system software should be billed, listed as, and invoiced to the consumer as a separate option on any computer purchases. This allows for the consumer the choice of not buying Microsoft's operating system and using another competing product. This also negates the argument from retailers that ''the computer will not run without Windows!'' There are alternatives to Microsoft's operating system. This allows those consumers, that choose not to use Microsoft product, not be punished for taking advantage of choices that are in the marketplace.

2. Specifications for past, present and future file formats must be publicly published by Microsoft. This is to ensure that third party vendors and programmers may design and make software to work with Microsoft product, not only on Windows, but on other operating systems.

3. Although already proposed, there should be more firm standard to be adhered to in regards to the public publishing of Application Programming Interfaces or API's. They should be fully disclosed and not partially disclosed and key important pieces not published as has happened in the past. A neutral panel or a neutral third party should be placed in charge of oversight.

4. Specifications for past, present and future network protocols should also be published and approved by a neutral third party. This is to ensure that Microsoft does not extend its monopoly to the Internet and become the de-facto standard.

I thank the Court for hearing my opinion, and hopefully my opinions and the opinions of others will help you in this monumental decision.

Respectfully,
Ted Kim
crazyk@powdersoft.com
crazyk@mac.com
3736 Colonial Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90066

''Difficulties exist to be surmounted.''—Ralph Waldo Emerson

MTC–00004528

From: Paul Van Noord
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust Settlement
12/14/2001 5:22 PM
Microsoft Anti-trust Settlement

To whom this concerns;

I am a computer consultant who focuses on small businesses, churches, missions and families. I build systems, write custom applications and train users. I have been in business since 1989. This needed to be said to lend credibility to what I have to say.

First, this is an anti-trust suit. Why? Because Microsoft cannot be trusted. If this were a different time in history Bill Gates' name would be Al Capone. The primary difference between these two men is their choice of weapons and the playing field. Both are/were driven by greed and an insatiable desire to control people.

Any settlement that increases the distribution of Microsoft products is totally contrary to what is needed to send a message to the up and coming ''wannabes'' that the type of Microsoft crime does not pay. AOL got where they are by giving away their software. Now you are proposing to do the same for Microsoft? Please do not do it.

Make Microsoft refund to any purchaser who asks, a substantial portion of the Windows purchase price as just compensation for manipulating them. Also, require their operating systems to be made open source and available to anyone. They can keep their proprietary applications but the operating systems should be open source because they are the weapons used to bludgeon purchasers into using their software. No Microsoft software should be part of any settlement. Only cash should be involved.

Sincerely,
Paul Van Noord
Common Sen$e Consulting
6480 Thoman Drive
Spring Grove PA 17362
717–633–6392 Fax 717–633–9886

MTC–00004529

From: Raul X. Garcia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Dear Department of Justice:

I feel the present settlement agreement regarding the Microsoft Anti-Trust suit is contrary to the purpose of the suit and it's legal proceedings. The fact that Netscape as a browser company is no longer, and that Microsoft gave away it's competiting product, under the disguise of being part of the operating system, speaks for it's self. Being a computer professional, I find it puzzling that Microsoft has captured 90% of the PC operating systems, office suites. It as if there are no other alternatives out there. Based on the wording of the agreement (which I feel has been written by Microsoft) there are loop holes which Microsoft will take advantage of. There have been and will continue to be companies victimized by Microsoft. Which will only result in a benefit for Microsoft, and detriment for the consumer.

I also believe, that appointing Steve Satchell to the Microsoft Compliance Committee, will bring it a certain degree of creditability and dignity.

Thanks,
Raul X. Garcia
Wk. 626–287–8520
Hm. 626–442–6521
Em. 626–278–4479

MTC–00004530

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,antitrust@ ftc.gov@inetgw, Ralph@essen...
Date: 12/14/01 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Hegemony' The IBM Monopoly Torch
CC:letters@latimes.com@ inetgw,letters@ sjmercury.com@i...

''What do you expect!!? What do you expect!?? Uncle Sam PASSED the IBM monopoly torch to Microsoft in 1982... you think we should hand it off to Joe Q. Public? Jesus Christ, Uncle Sam, you made the decision to screw Joe Q. Public then, so live with it!''

''All I say to Uncle Sam is Ka Ching, Ka Ching...ha ha, speak their language, they listen...''

MTC–00004531

From: Eric Swanson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Proposed Final Judgement
VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL
TO: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
FROM: Eric Swanson
2934 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
415–377–6531
swanson@mooselessness.com
REGARDING: Microsoft Antitrust Proposed Final Judgement

Dear Renata Hesse and All Those It May Concern:

I am writing as a concerned citizen to register my comments on the PFJ now being considered in the Microsoft antitrust case currently before Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly of the US District Court in the District of Columbia.

As a technology consultant, an expert implementor of both Microsoft's and other technology platforms, and a 20-year veteran in information technology, I believe the proposed settlement would be completely ineffective in correcting the harm Microsoft has done and continues to do to the computer industry overall. I won't belabor the point of how Microsoft's practices have limited my choices as a technology consumer—after all, their misdeeds have already been proved—but I will comment briefly on what I believe is wrong with the propsal.

First, the requirement that Microsoft disclose necessary software interfaces for the purpose of allowing competitors to develop network products and middleware that work with Microsoft systems may be well intentioned, but appears entirely toothless. This appears to require only that Microsoft disclose these interfaces upon release of the operating system that uses them. This still leaves a period of months or years when Microsoft internal developers will be aware of planned interfaces and can develop for them without competition. By the time external competitors catch up—perhaps six to eighteen months later—Microsoft could be nearly ready with another new OS release, complete with another window of advantage. To be effective, I believe this measure must require that Microsoft release such interface information even as it is being developed, so that outside developers can begin developing with accurate specifications at the same time it becomes practical for Microsoft developers to begin.

Second, the idea that Microsoft should be allowed any role in selecting the Technical Committee that will oversee its compliance (much less the very substantial role proposed) seems patently ridiculous. Any body that oversees compliance should be appointed by the Court, and selected based on technical skill, legal acumen, and a real understanding of how Microsoft's previous actions have caused harm. I endorse appointing a single special master to oversee this process, but at the very least any committee should be appointed by the presiding judge—or at least somebody other than a proven antitrust violator.

Third, the proposal does not define to my satisfaction how one finds whether Microsoft is ''retaliating'' against a competitor. As written, it seems to require that a court proceeding determine Microsoft's intent in order that they be held responsible. To me, this seems like a recipe for more years-long bouts of legal wrangling. Instead, I believe that biased treatment plus an identified motive for Microsoft should automatically be construed as retaliation unless Microsoft can prove otherwise. For example, if Microsoft changes some licensing terms for a competitor that recently started shipping systems with Linux instead of Windows, that change in terms would be automatically taken as ''retaliation''—the burden shifts to Microsoft to prove conclusively that the change was not retaliatory.

I have quite a few other disagreements with the proposed judgement, but there are people far more qualified than I to expand upon them.

I echo most of the sentiments of Attorneys General Bill Lockyer and Tom Miller, and many of the non-Microsoft industry leaders who have spoken about this issue. In short, I recommend taking a much harder line against a company that has shown not only violation of, but complete contempt for, the antitrust laws of our nation. If we fail to contain this threat, Microsoft and other large companies will be sent a terribly permissive message. Please don't let this happen.

Sincerely,
Eric Swanson (via email: swanson@mooselessness.com)

MTC–00004532

From: Wizard

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

To whom it may concern:

As a software developer for nearly 20 years, I find myself concerned with the details of the proposed settlement in Microsoft's antitrust case. As stated, I have been developing software for Microsoft's operating systems (OSs) as well as OSs from Sun, DEC, HP, and Linux. Since the inception of Windows 95 however, I have shied-away from any sort of development on Microsoft's OSs. I have done so because I believe that by developing software for Microsoft OSs, I am condoning the behavior that Microsoft has in the past, and continues to, exhibit in regards to it's competition.

I believe that any settlement with Microsoft that fails to directly and strongly address the central issue of the case by forbidding any similar practice in the future is irresponsible on the part of the DoJ. To this end, I believe that the DoJ must enforce a policy that does the following:

—The DoJ must ensure that any computer system sold that can be a target for a Microsoft OS, must declare the separate price of that OS and sell it separately for that price. It can include additional Microsoft products as a ''package'' with the installed OS for no additional cost, but the base OS must be a separate cost.

—Microsoft must make it's storage format for files of any and all of it's products that have benefited from it's monopoly. This would include all of the applications associated with it's Office suite, as well as Outlook Express, NetMeeting, and many others. This will help to level the playing field back to something that resembles fair. As it stands presently, the companies cannot compete as long as Microsoft is so far ahead.

—Microsoft cannot be allowed to create proprietary network protocols. All protocols that are intended to communicate beyond the physical boundaries of the machine must become a matter of public record, without restrictions on it's use. Any and all network protocols should be approved by some governing body providing oversight in such a manner as to ensure interoperability with other OSs. Microsoft should not be allowed to extend existing protocols without first seeking public comment on such extensions, and then publishing all of the details of the proposed extension. It can however, add functionality to existing systems provided that such added functionality does not interfere in any way with the proper implementation of the existing systems, and provided that the specification of the existing systems allow for such added functionality.

I feel most strongly about the last item. Microsoft has already extended the Kerberos standard to meet it's own desires (see http://www.usenix.org/publications/login/1997–11/embraces.html). This extension is not only proprietary, but it's not compatible with the existing Kerberos V5 standard. This has the interesting effect that the NT domain controller must be a Microsoft product, and that, I believe, is intentional.

The end result with what Microsoft is doing, is that it is intentionally developing it's OS in such a way as to make it extremely difficult to integrate other OSs into a Microsoft environment. With their existing monopoly, I believe that this is the HEART of why the antitrust settlement must take these items into account. As long as Microsoft is allowed to continue to benefit from it's monopoly status, there will never be any real competition in the marketplace, and that is just un-American.

Thank you for your time,
Grant Mongardi
Software Developer
Scituate, MA.
wizard@bostonhot.com

MTC–00004533

From: Alan J. Ecklof
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:28pm
Subject: Why now?

The fact that Microsoft is being punished now for behavior everybody knew was occurring since at least 1994, is like closing the barn door after the horse is out. Those who turned to IBM's OS/2 for a far superior OS in the early to mid-nineties are well aware of how MS manipulated the independent vendors. By making intentionely premature promises of a new OS(Windows 95) delivery, MS forced them to allocate resources to Windows development and ignore an OS that was better(by Gates' own admission) and already existed. The infamous MS software delays came to be known as vaporware. This led to a dearth of applications for OS/2 and no new OS for Windows machines. When it finally arrived, it was more hype than substance. I, personally, stopped using OS/2 when MS made a minor change to the Win32 service and forced IBM to pay 'again' for the right to be compatible, which according to sources was the last straw and led to a niche OS.

As far as forcing computer mfrs. into expensive licensing deals, that is only another example of how a monopoly can extend its reach and force people to by their software, when that may not be the buyer's first choice. Now the problem has become trying to punish the company after it ''finally'' has gotten it right and made a product that is worthy of praise (WindowsXP). This would only serve to make life difficult for all that use Microsoft products and possibly regress to the bad old days. This would have been a perfect scenario 4–7 years ago when Microsoft products were still, basically, expensive garbage and their far superior competitors still had some semblence of market share to further develop. Now it's nothing more than window dressing and does nothing to repair the software companies ruined by these illegal practices. In addition, some of the plaintiffs, AOL in particular, are no better than the defendant.

I wish I had a dime for every hour I spent trying to keep an MS Operating System alive and working or just reinstalling it again.

Please don't do anything that would bring back those days.

MTC–00004534

From: Jim O'Dell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

As a Operating Systems Analyst I have a serious interest in computers, and their operating systems(OS). Please do not let Microsoft get away with unfairly, and illegally, cornering the computing market.

Microsoft has effectivly a strangle hold on OS's, and the applications that run on them.

By controlling the OS's Application Program Interface (API), and the release dates of applications that must use the API, they keep anyone else from competing.

The only hope of leveling the playing field, and increasing the quality of programs that the world depends on, is to force Microsoft to adhere to Open Standards. Open Standards by their nature allow the world of computing to interface, interact, and grow.

BTW, the Internet is a prime example of how Open Standards can allow may diverse systems to work together.

Jim O'Dell
24429 Tyann Ct.
Moreno Valley, Ca. 92551

MTC–00004535

From: John Hilker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

I am one who feels that the proposed settlement between my government and Microsoft who was found guilty of violating portions of the Sherman Act is far from being in the best interest of me and is clearly not in the nation's interest. Microsoft may be a formidable component of our nation's economy but it's dominance is transitory. The decision on a penalty for Microsoft's behavior will have a long standing, precedent setting effect. Might makes right may be nature's example but our country was founded on a premise that the people must be shielded from oppressors.

I find it offensive that Microsoft is being allowed to thumb its nose at the People who have proven the guilt of the company in its behavior towards its customers and competitors.

Thank you for the opportunity register my opposition to the proposed settlement.

John Hilker
256 Genthner Road
Waldoboro, ME 04572

MTC–00004536

From: hersh@ri.cmu.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 6:57pm
Subject: comments on the Microsoft settlement

The breakup of the Bell Telephone monopoly spawned many new technologies and services which would never have happened otherwise.

There is now a thriving industry of local and long-distance phone carriers, DSL services, etc. Similarly, a real end to Microsoft's monopoly on computer software would spur huge growth and competition in operating systems and application software. The global internet holds fantastic promise

for new applications, new ways of connecting people, and incredible innovation. Building these new things and offering them at reasonable prices is not in Microsoft's interest when they have a monopoly, and is not possible for other companies. Break up the monopoly, and I believe we'll see enormous economic growth, as new companies spring up to compete.

To effectively allow competition, the settlement must enforce the publishing of standards. There are many standards we take for granted in everyday life without which whole industries would be impossible. Light bulbs all have the same type of socket. No one company has secret control over a socket standard, so no one company has a lock on selling the fixtures *and* the lights.

So Microsoft must be forced to expose their interfaces. Interfaces include APIs of course, but they importantly include document formats. A document saved in Microsoft Word *must* be openable (correctly) in a competing word processor program, and other programs must be able to correctly write files which MS Word reads. Sending and receiving documents is a fundamentally important communication, and if Microsoft is the only company which can sell software to read documents published by others, Microsoft's monopoly will continue unaffected, and new companies and new economic growth will not appear. In essence, *every* interface between one piece of software and another must be made public. This should be true not only for Microsoft, but for every software company. Interfaces include:

—network protocols
—Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)
—document formats

and possibly others. There must be no ''secret handshakes'' exchanged by Microsoft software which keeps others from competing.

As a Ph.D. student in Robotics with Masters and Bachelors degrees in Computer Science and several years in the programming industry, I have a good deal of experience with different software systems. It is my firm belief that Microsoft's software is as unreliable as it is and as expensive as it is because of Microsoft's monopoly. It is also my firm belief that other companies have been prevented from offering competetive software products because of Microsoft's monopoly. The court has found Microsoft guilty of maintaining a monopoly. The penalty given to Microsoft is a critical opportunity to enliven the whole nation's economy, but it must be done carefully, and include the publication of all interfaces.

Thank you,
David Hershberger
1235 Bellerock St.
Pittsburgh PA 15217

MTC–00004537

From: srd@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Sirs and Madams:

Microsoft's proposal to distribute their software to needy schools to atone for their monopolistic behaviour is ludicrous. Addicting yet another generation to their software exacerbates rather than mitigates the problem. While young and flexible, students should learn that alternative computing environments, such as Linux, BSD, UNIX, MacOSX and BeOS exist and have considerable virtues. In particular, students should be exposed to the open source movement, because of its low cost, intellectual freedom, and technical excellence. Education in the comparative merits of these systems is vastly preferable to indoctrination in the Microsoft way... Microsoft's proposed remedy is blatantly self-serving and an insult to intelligence.

A sensible way to reduce Microsoft's stranglehold on the software market is to *compel* them to open their proprietary Office file formats to the software world. I believe the sole reason Microsoft's OSes are so widely utilized is the public's addiction to their proprietary Office applications. Only by opening/documenting Microsoft's proprietary Office file formats, can competing office products, such as Sun's StarOffice, gain a competitive foothold. Without the capability to convert documents to and from Microsoft Office format, alternative office application software will *never* break through Microsoft's entrenched user base.

Microsoft's strategy of usurping and perverting open standards in their exclusive interest is well documented (http://www.opensource.org/halloween/) and must be curtailed. It is time to reverse this parasitic process, and make their proprietary ''standards'' open to the public. All ''standards'' should be public.

While compelling Microsoft to make its Office software available for Linux or MacOSX would benefit those OSes in the short-term, it would increaser Microsoft's dominance in the Office applications arena in the long run. I believe that opening/documenting the Office file formats would be a far more effective means of simulating software innovation and development.

While the courts have found Microsoft to be a monopoly, the DoJ's recent actions suggest that there will be no meaningful penalty. By putting Microsoft above the law, Microsoft's predatory behavior will become more egregious. Although Microsoft's malicious actions toward Netscape and Sun were serious, they pale in comparison to their apparently little-known, yet long-standing licensing practice that forbids or penalizes computer resellers from setting up dual-boot systems capable of running other operating systems. Microsoft must be compelled to cease and desist in this particular anti-competitive practice!

Microsoft has recently waged a libelous war against the the open source software movement. Their officials have called the movement ''un-American'', ''communist'', and ''a cancer''. There can be no doubt that Microsoft will stop at nothing to erradicate the open source movement. The DoJ's ultimate goal *should* be to insure that this kind of predatory Microsoft behaviour is banished from the face of the earth. Any settlement wording that requires Microsoft to share its APIs and file formats with other software businesses MUST BE WORDED TO EXPLICITLY INCLUDE THE MEMBERS OF THE FREE SOFTWARE MOVEMENT!

Anyone who doubts the value of a diverse ''gene pool'' in the software field should pay closer attention to the litany of virii that plague Microsoft, but not other, OSes. A huge amount of time, money and productivity have been wasted as a result of Microsoft's inability or lack of motivation to secure its OSes. Further, the never-ending cycle of pointless ''upgrades'' that Microsoft has used to sustain it's revenue stream should offend rational people everywhere.

Respectfully,
Dr. Stuart R. DeGraaf
Advisor Engineer / Systems Architect
Northrop Grumman ESSS
Baltimore, MD
410–531–0061 (home)
srd@erols.com (home)
410–765–4560 (work)
Stuart_R_DeGraaf@mail.northgrum.com (work)
CC:DeGraaf, David,Thyberg, Robert

MTC–00004538

From: Mike Muldoon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:05pm
Subject: Public response to Microsoft settlement action

Renata Hesse,

As someone familiar with computing and the computer industry, and the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolies in these areas, I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. The company has already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. A just penalty would at barest minimum include three additional features:

1. Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

2. The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

3. Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

If the national interest is at issue, as I believe it is and as the judge has suggested it is, it is crucial that Microsoft's operating

system monopoly not be extended, and in this I quote the study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, which pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk.

In closing, all are surely in agreement that the resolution of this case is of great importance, not just now but for many years to come. This suggests a careful and deliberate penalty is far more important to the health of the nation than is a hasty one.

Thank You,
Mike Muldoon
Senior Architect
Digital Age Media

MTC–00004539

From: Cage, Russell
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 7:08pm
Subject: Comment on settlement proposal
Russell Cage
1615 Morton
Ann Arbor MI 48104
14 December 2001
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
202–616–9937 FAX
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

It is my understanding that the Department of Justice has reached a proposed settlement with Microsoft in the matter of the recent anti-trust suit. Despite the established guilt of Microsoft, this settlement calls for only a token cash outlay, no fines, few conduct penalties and great freedom on the part of Microsoft to continue doing business as it wishes.

In my humble opinion, such a settlement is unconscionable. Not only does it fail to remedy the effects of past monopolistic behavior or prevent the same or worse in the future, it leaves the victims of the monopoly without a remedy. Worst of all, it may present a threat to national security.

Certain terms of the proposed settlement, such as the provision of $900 million in Microsoft software to schools, do nothing to ameliorate the damage done by previous monopolistic behavior. It has been argued that this would only extend the monopoly into an area where Microsoft is currently weak. This should not be allowed. By all means allow Microsoft to make up some of the damage the company has done to schools with its marketing practices, but make them do it in cash. The disposition of the cash should be overseen by people charged with getting the most benefit to the schools; benefit to Microsoft should not be a consideration. For this reason stock is inferior to cash; the value of the stock can be affected by the purchasing decisions of the schools, and Microsoft's welfare should not be a factor in the decision.

Other terms leave much to be desired. Microsoft has been proven to ignore conduct restrictions imposed on it by consent agreements. What is to prevent Microsoft from doing what it pleases regardless of the terms of this settlement? For this reason, I believe that the court was premature in ruling out a structural remedy.

But the most important issue may be national security. Microsoft's dominance in desktop operating systems means that most businesses run it on most or all of their computers. The vulnerability of Windows and other utilities such as the Outlook mail agent to viruses, worms and Trojan horse software has made both the global Internet and company intranets subject to being swamped with traffic and even crashed. Even crude viruses such as the Love Bug required eradication efforts amounting to billions of dollars world-wide.

This vulnerability is almost entirely due to Microsoft's ''integration'' of unwanted functionality into Windows and its related utilities. Once such functionality is ''integrated'', users and companies alike have few ways to remove or disable it if it becomes a liability. If an intelligent and determined enemy were to exploit many such liabilities, the cost to the USA could be far greater than the September 11 disaster.

For this reason, any settlement must stop Microsoft from ''integrating'' utilities and ''middleware'' with the operating system. Microsoft should be required to package, sell, install and remove software functionality in distinct, related units. If functionality such as an insecure web browser can be removed and replaced, the damage from an attack on that utility's vulnerability is limited. The effect on competitors to Microsoft may be one of the smaller issues; if such functionality cannot be removed and replaced because it is ''integrated'' by Microsoft, the entire Internet can potentially be shut down by a single security flaw.

Thank you for your attention to this pressing matter.

MTC–00004540

From: Graham, J. Christopher
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 7:16pm
Subject: My opinion on the MS case

I think that Microsoft should be SEVERELY punished for its monopolistic, heavy-handed practices. Industries and innovation elevate when there is competition in the marketplace. The technology industry—and as a result the business and home users—have suffered due to Microsoft running its competitors out of business. The initial judgment that was passed down is a joke—they need to be hit hard—financially or otherwise. As an independent technology consultant, whose organization is a Microsoft Consulting Partner—I am disappointed in the number of vendors or solutions that my clients have to choose from.

J. Christopher Graham
Baker Robbins & Company
Knowledge, Solutions, Partnership
Ph: 312.425.4458
http://www.brco.com

This transmission and all attachments are the copyrighted materials of Baker Robbins & Company

MTC–00004541

From: Kengo Hashimoto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:31pm
Subject: Comment from a non-MS user

To all whom it may concern:

I, as do millions of other citizens across the world, have an interest in sterner remedies, be it conduct or structural, in the United States vs. Microsoft Corporation case.

As the largest publisher of operating software and business applications software in the world, Microsoft is at a unique position to create an illegal monopoly in more ways than one. Some of these have been shown in court, and Microsoft has been found to be guilty of illegal monopolistic practices.

What concerns me about the current conduct of Microsoft is as follows: First, there is virtually no way for a consumer or a business to purchase a PC from a large vendor, such as Dell, without having some version of a Microsoft operating software pre-loaded on it. Second, Microsoft is notorious for creating non-documented application programming interfaces for use by Microsoft programmers, but not by their competitors in the applications field. Finally, as the largest producer of operating environments and Internet software, they alone can create non-standard extensions upon the languages spoken between computers, called protocol, potentially locking out competitors.

It is vitally important for a consumer or a business to be able to purchase a computer from a large OEM without Windows preloaded on it. Despite what Microsoft may claim, computers without Windows is not a hotbed of piracy. In fact, Microsoft themselves have taken steps with their newest operating environment, Windows XP, to prevent such casual copying. Therefore, in order to level the competitive playing field for different operating environments—such as BeOS, a potential PC version of MacOS X, Linux, Sun Solaris, to name a few—these machines should be made available without any operating environments, with separate prices for machines. For businesses, the situation is slightly different. Most large businesses purchase a business-wide license for operating environments from Microsoft. If these machines are not made available without an included Windows license, then these businesses will in effect end up paying twice for the same product. Of course, having two price lists, one for computers with, and the other for computers without, will have secondary beneficial effect of exposing what the various OEM prices for Windows are, and will prevent Microsoft from ''punishing'' OEM's who sell other operating environments (as happened with IBM's PC division in the early 1990's, when they chose to offer the IBM OS/2 operating environment as well as that of Microsoft's).

Of course, changes in the way Microsoft handles their Windows applications programming interface (API) needs to change as well. It is often rumoured, and once proven, that Microsoft maintains a list of API methods that are not available outside of Microsoft. What this allows Microsoft to do is to create two methods for receiving operating environment support for such common tasks as opening a file, differing in execution speed but otherwise identical in function. As virtually everything a program or an application can do, it must do so via calling the API methods, a Microsoft application, with the faster of the two

method calls available to it, will have a distinct and unfair advantage over the non-Microsoft competition. Obviously, these method calls are not limited to opening files, and can include, but not be limited to: launching new programs, opening a new network (including Internet) connection and reading in and writing out to it, opening a file and reading from and writing to it, displaying a graphics, and playing a sound.

As for Internet standards of protocols, there already exists several independant bodies for creation and maintenance of protocols. These include, but are not limited to, the World Wide Web Consortium, the Internet Engineering Task Force, ANSI, and ISO. Unfortunately, with Microsoft's track record of building their own, proprietary protocols that compete with the open protocols created by these independant committees, Microsoft has often closed the doors on competing operating environments on different platforms. For example, in the translation of human-readable domain names (such as www.sun.com) to machine-readable numeric representation (such as 192.168.1.2), performed by nameservers, Microsoft has already created a non-standard extention to their own system, such that a non-Windows nameserver takes a performance hit against a Windows-based nameserver when the client is also running Windows.

Similarly, Microsoft has created their own then-proprietary and closed extention to the Kerberos network authentication protocol with the introduction of Windows 2000. Because of their immense size, allowing this conduct can and will stifle innovation by their competitors, which is exactly what Microsoft has been found guilty of.

I would like to believe that Microsoft will not continue these behaviours, now that the courts have deemed them illegal. However, in the case of criminal behaviour by an individual, we as a society do not, after finding such a person guilty of the deed, tell them merely to stop doing that deed, and let them go. Instead, oftentimes, we incarcerate that individual. Similarly, we must place strict penalties upon Microsoft, as they have broken a law, and must be punished.

Sincerely,

Kengo Hashimoto

I request that my contact information be kept private, but for the purposes of full discloser it is as follows:

Contact Information:

email: hashik@cs.rpi.edu

phone: 314–878–4610

address: 1265 Whispering Pines Dr., Saint Louis, MO 63146

MTC–00004542

From: Logan Harper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:30pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Anti-trust Settlement

From my understanding of the proposed settlement, Microsoft is hardly being penalized for their previously uncompetitive maneuvers and even gaining the legal right to maintain its monopoly of the operating systems market. Any penalty that is assessed should not be payable in Microsoft Software any more than printed ''Microsoft Dollars'' would be a reasonable currency. For mere pennies on the dollar, Microsoft can reduce the fine from millions to a few thousand dollars. For the penalty phase, I would recommend at least several hundred million dollars in levied fines for their cavalier disregard of anti-trust law, payable directly to the US government, with absolutely no PR value for Microsoft, and no forced further integration of Microsoft products in school systems.

The key to breaking the monopoly on Operating Systems is first to allow buyers their choice of operating systems. Previously this choice was heavily discouraged by Microsoft. A remedy to this problem would be to make the choice of an operating system entirely distinct from the hardware—each buyer purchases a computer at a ''base price'', and any operating system, setup costs, etc. are added to this base price afterwards. In other words, no more package deals. Also, all computer resellers should pay the exact same price for the Microsoft software, regardless of how many other operating systems they offer to consumers.

Another consideration is the proprietary formats that Microsoft has established for programs running solely on its operating system. This can do little but maintain the necessity of their own operating system, and force users to purchase ''compatible Microsoft operating systems and programs''. A fitting solution to this concern would be to force Microsoft to release the details of the proprietary file formats so closely integrated into their operating system—word, excel, etc. Then, should someone wish to produce an application for another operating system that was compatible with the Microsoft standard files, they would be able to. This would help to make the choice of operating system just that—a choice.

In short, I feel the proposed settlement is little more than a mockery of the anti-trust law that it supposedly upholds. I would like to see a real settlement that would force Microsoft to end their stranglehold on the operating system market, and punish them for maintaining that stranglehold for way too long.

Sincerely,

Logan Harper

5500 Wabash Ave.

Terre Haute, IN

MTC–00004543

From: Donovan Bernauer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:35pm
Subject: Settle!!! Settle!!! Settle!!!!

Sincerely,

Donovan Bernauer

MTC–00004544

From: Andrew Gillean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:47pm

I do wish you people would get off Microsoft's case and do what you are supposed to be doing. Without Microsoft's Internet Explorer being given away way back when we would still be paying someone like Netscape money to have the technology to access the 'Web'.

Would you please remember that.

The other 'free' browsers would not even exist if it were not for Microsoft's efforts.

A Satisfied Microsoft Customer,

Andrew Gillean (agillean@rogers.com)

CC:support@msn.com@inetgw

MTC–00004545

From: Ed Reames
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:48pm
Subject: COMMENT ON MICROSOFT AND DOJ SETTLEMENT

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Dear M. Hesse,

I believe that you have erroneously settled with Microsoft. You should have required much more in settlement terms. Microsoft can really do whatever they want under the terms of your settlement.

I have been in the computing and telecommunications business for about thirty years. I do not think that you have done anything that will cause Microsoft to change their opertions.

Respectfully,

Calvin E. Reames, Jr.

14504 Ascot Square Court

Boyds, MD 20841–9036

301/353–9027

CC:Paul Sarbanes,Connie Morella,Barbara Mikulski

MTC–00004546

From: Aaron R. Kulkis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 7:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Considering the GREAT amount of harm which Microsoft has caused to it other businesses through it's anti-competitite practices... I notice that the currently proposed remedy consists of

A) PROMISES from Microsoft not to do it again.

(Just like Germany promised to not invade any neighbors in the 1940's)

B) Microsoft giving away CD–ROMs of their software....thereby FURTHER extending the monopoly by eliminating sales opportunities by competitors.

C) No TANGIBLE punishment in the form of fines of the corporation and/or jail time for officers of the corporation who made these criminal decisions.

(B) and (C) need to be changed.

Microsoft must NOT be allowed to further destroy competitor's opportunities to even gain customers, and Microsoft MUST suffer SIGNIFICANT punishment in the form of LARGE fines (large enough to have a REAL DETERRENT EFFECT... that is, on the order of $1 Billion or more). If Microsoft's investors get hurt...well, that's the price of choosing to become part of, and benefit from the behavior of, a criminal organization.

Aaron R. Kulkis

Computer Systems Engineer

General Motors Corporation

MTC–00004547

From: Anthony Hologounis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:03pm
Subject: Please stop the Microsoft monopoly

Hello

Please make note that I do not agree with the DOJ decision with respect to Microsoft. They are a monopoly and they have harmed the consumer.

Cheers

Anthony

MTC–00004548

From: Phillip Hofmeister
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:18pm
Subject: United States v. Microsoft Settlement
To: Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

To whom it may concern:

I am a concerned citizen of the State of Michigan who sees the proposed DOJ and Microsoft settlement to be inadequate for true justice and the national interest.

As can be seen throughout the course of the past 20 years, Microsoft's market share in the computer industry has steadily risen. Along with this rise has also come a rise in prices of Microsoft's operating systems and software (a rise in price that is faster than the rate of inflation). One can only assume this rise will continue as Microsoft's hold on the market becomes stronger. This is the exact reason that unregulated monopolies are NOT in the favor of national interest. As Microsoft continues to drive competition out of the market its prices will only continue to rise (I would be highly surprised if anything contrary to this happens). The proposed settlement does not adequately protect consumers and competition from this horrible, grim future.

A few of the many problems I see with the proposed judgement are mentioned below:

III.C.1 ...provided that the restrictions are non-discriminatory with respect it non-Microsoft and Microsoft products.

This portion of the judgement is open to manipulation and interpretation. What exactly qualifies as ''non-discriminatory''? It is not specified in the definitions. This leaves the door open to a year or more debate down the road as to what is discriminatory and what is not, which equates to loss of several thousands of dollars in taxpayers' money in legal expenses. This is definitely not in the public's best interest.

II.C.2 ...so long as such shortcuts do not impair the functionality of the user interface

One again, this statement is opened to much interpretation and the same problems as section III.C.1 (mentioned above).

IV.A.2 To determine and enforce compliance with this Final Judgment, duly authorized representatives of the United States and the plaintiff States, on reasonable notice to Microsoft and subject to any lawful privilege, shall be permitted the following:

Not that I do not trust Microsoft, but what would prevent them from ''loosing'' such documents when they receive this notice? Who could prove if this ''loss'' was accidental or intentional? The plaintiff's should have the right to inspect documents and source code without notice.

IV.A.4 The Plaintiffs shall have the authority to seek such orders as are necessary from the Court to enforce this Final Judgment, provided, however, that the Plaintiffs shall afford Microsoft a reasonable opportunity to cure alleged violations of Sections III.C, III.D, III.E and III.H, provided further that any action by Microsoft to cure any such violation shall not be a defense to enforcement with respect to any knowing, willful or systematic violations.

There is no limit place on what is a ''reasonable time''. Is it a year? A week? During this time it takes Microsoft to ''cure'' the problem it is still there. Microsoft should be required to pay damages for the time the problem was not ''cured''. This provision would encourage them to ''cure'' the problem quicker. In addition, there is no provision that says what will happen if the problem reappears after it is ''cured''. Does the process start over again with the same problem as the first time?

V.A Unless this Court grants an extension, this Final Judgment will expire on the fifth anniversary of the date it is entered by the Court. Why does Justice and a settlement that is supposedly in favor of the nation's interests expire? Are we only concerned with the nation's interest for 5 years? This clause effectively allows the whole battle to begin once more in 5 years. I do not believe anyone wants to endure this battle again. I would urge the reconsideration of this proposed settlement.

Respectfully submitted,

Phillip Hofmeister
6080 Academy Drive
Saginaw MI 48604
plhofmei@svsu.edu

MTC–00004549

From: Blake Buzzini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:25pm
Subject: Fully Support Proposed Settlement

I fully support the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ. It strikes the right balance between addressing the issues found by the court and ensuring that technology companies can continue to improve their products.

Many who support stricter sanctions prefer to ignore the facts of the case in favor of pushing their own technological agendas (Linux users, the Free Software Foundation). Still others are simply jealous of Microsoft's success (Sun, Oracle, AOL, Novell). I urge the Court to ignore these zealots and sore losers and approve the proposed settlement.

Sincerely,

Blake Buzzini

MTC–00004551

From: Preston A. Elder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust case.

Hi,

As a member of the wider internet community, I would like to voice my opinion of the proposed settlement by the US Dept. of Justice in regards to the Microsoft Anti-Trust case. Microsoft has been proven (and upheld) to be a monopoly, a corporation that stifles competition—however it seems the proposed settlement is little more than a slap on the wrists saying 'bad boy', but does not really address stopping Microsoft from BEING a monopoly.

Microsoft was proven to attain its monopoly status by such things as bundling software items with their operating systems (even if the user did not want to install the extra software on their machine), and worse, making it difficult for any user of these operating systems to chose to use a compeatitors product, and KEEP using it.

For example, if someone installs one of Microsoft's operating systems, Windows Media Player is installed, weather the user wanted it or not. The user must then take extra steps to NOT use Windows Media Player. To add insult to injury, after the user gets their system fully setup to use an alternate product, and then must do something as innocent as upgrade Microsoft Internet Explorer, Windows Media Player is installed aswell and set as the default player again. Even though the user did not want a newer version of Windows Media Playe, it was upgraded for them, and its dominance re-established. This is obviously monopolistic behavior, and the settlement proposed by the Dept. of Justice does not really restrict such behavior.

In addition, Microsoft has taken active roles to try and lock out anyone who chooses to use another operating system, by deliberately making Microsoft operating systems use slightly modified internet protocol standards, that are just different enough to make them not work with any non-Microsoft product, however, Microsoft still calls them a 'standard' implementation of the protocol in question. A recent example of this was Microsoft's using the Kerberos standard for their Windows 2000 network authentication schemes. Only after much pressure from the technically aware did Microsoft releace the source code to their proprietary extensions (to a public standard), and even then forced people who viewed these extensions to agree to a click-through license that essentially ment no-one could implement them for compatability.

Microsoft should be subjected to two destinct restrictions. Given their market possition, any protocols Microsoft invents instantly become a kind of de-facto standard, however most are not published, and must be reverse engineered to allow other operating systems and applications to communicate effectively with Microsoft products. This essentially gives Microsoft a 'stifling' possition in the market, especially as more laws such as the DMCA start to restrict the right to engage in activities such as reverse engineering. Therefore, Microsoft should be compelled to release full documentation on any new protocols and standards they employ. I also believe that some kind of third-party review committee should continually be involved in the process of creating these new standards, to ensure that Microsoft does not try and create a new protocol or standard that, by its very nature, precludes any competing product (such as another operating system like the Linux or Solaris operating systems) from implementing these protocols or standards, and effectively ensures that people must use

Microsoft only systems to be able to use whatever has implemented this standard.

Even if Microsoft is not broken in to two or more companies (it really is so large, and stifling, it should be broken into three destinct companies)—a better solution to their monopolistic behavior would be to force them to be more honest with the public, and open up their development process a little. Microsoft is such a widely used product, and a critical part of most desktop computers, that the amount of secrecy in-built into Microsoft's systems is more harmful than good. This in itself has been proven by the recent spate of virii that has attacked Microsoft systems, servers and desktops alike. Most of the time, by the time a hole in a Microsoft product is exploited, the problem is already known by Microsoft, but they cover it up, and hope nobody notices. If Microsoft had more open standards, such as opening up Microsoft's programmatical interfaces (API's, etc), and their file formats, these kinds of problems would be known alot earlier, and more importantly, fixes, patches, and even prevention by things such as virus scanners would be achieved much easier.

This would also have the added side-effect of helping end Microsoft's monopoly. It is well known that many applications Microsoft releases, such as Microsoft Office, use 'back-door' hooks into the various Microsoft operating systems. This means that products like Microsoft Office have more intergration, and can be alot faster than any compeating product could ever achieve because the developers of Microsoft Office have much more knowledge of and access to the program interfaces that the various Microsoft Windows operating systems use, which means they can stifle the competition by ensuring their product is always better because of the various tricks it can employ.

Microsoft recently sent a memo out to all the major PC vendors stating that they should NOT allow any consumers who purchase a PC from them to purchase it without a Windows operating system. The reasoning behind this was 'Since they are going to buy it anyway, this will help cease the increasing trend of software piracy'. This is clearly monopolistic behavior. There is an increasing number of users, businesses, and even governments that are NOT using Windows on their desktop and server machines, instead they are using alternatives such as Linux, Solaris, and other unix variants. However increasingly, every time a new PC is sold, the user is forced to purchase the Windows operating system with it, even if they have no intention of using it.

This behavior is increasing Microsoft's monopoly in two ways. Firstly, they get more and more 'sold' copies of their Windows operating system even from users who did not want it in the first place, and secondly, most of these systems come with Windows pre-installed, which means that users arent getting a choice of which operating system they wish to use, and Microsoft once again (as with their software bundling) is forcing the user to go through extra effort to NOT use a Microsoft product. In addition, most PC vendors have to pay Microsoft weather they put the Windows operating system on a new PC they sell or not, which effectively means there is 'no cost difference' between a PC with or without the Windows operating system—which means even if a user DOES manage to purchase a PC without the Windows operating system, they still end up paying for it anyway, as its already been added into the cost of their new PC by the vendor.

Microsoft products have been proven by multipal studies to be the biggest security risks on the internet. Microsoft's attitude and assumptions mean that more and more security flaws are being released in each successive product, and having farther and farther reaching concequences. With Microsoft introducing their new .NET initiative, this prospect is even scarier, as Microsoft will be forcing EVERYONE who wants to use their .NET systems to give Microsoft personally identifying information, which, as part of their licensing agreement, they may share with anyone they wish to. Microsoft's closed archetecture, and monopoly in the marketplace means that everyone will be forced to start giving up any information Microsoft wants—a scary prospect when you think about all the recent virii, and vulnerabilities found in Microsoft products (especially when compared to their compeatitors).

Finally, the Dept. of Justice settlement, apart from being too minimalistic in its conditions placed on future Microsoft business practices, also only gives Microsoft a slap on the wrist financially. Microsoft will be spending $1.1 billion dollars getting new computers to needy schools, a worthy and noble thing to do. However looking deeper, they will only be spending $200M on actual computer equipment, and the rest on software, their own software. They will be working out this $900M cost based on retail, or slightly discounted costs of their products. However this costs relatively little to Microsoft itself. The software is already created, and actually burning it to CD, and issuing site licenses for it is an extremely cheap process. Microsoft may say its worth $900M, and it would indeed be that much to buy if a business wished to purchase the same amount, however it costs them much less. Thus it ends up being only a small financial hit to the company, especially when you think about their profits from just one year.

There have been several offers from other companies, such as RedHat Inc. to make this a more equitable deal—by forcing Microsoft to pay the entire amount in hardware costs—something they cant just make cheaply and assign any price to it. RedHat even offered to supply all the software free, and give indefinate support and upgrade, as opposed to Microsoft's limited support and upgrade offer. I believe these kinds of offers by third party companies should seriously be considered as part of any Dept. of Justice settlement.

In summary, Microsoft's monoply has far-reaching effects, both now and especially in the near future. Microsoft stifles competition by changing or inventing standards that block compeating products from communicating to Microsoft products. Microsoft uses special code within its products to ensure that any product they make will always be faster or better intergrated than any compeatitor could be—infact, they've been caught in the past writing specific code to hinder compeating products! Microsoft ensures that a user will have to go through more effort to try and use (or keep using) a compeating product, than they would to use a Microsoft product. All of this behavior requires a stiffer repremand than the current Dept. of Justice settlement gives. Microsoft will push any settlement to its absolute limit, and find any loophole that is left in it—however with Microsoft's current dominance in the PC market, looking forward, we cannot allow Microsoft to maintain to its current practices, especially when Microsoft could soon be the gate keeper of thousands, even millions of peoples personal infromation.

Thank you for your time,

PreZ

Owner, Shadow Realm (http://www.srealm.net.au)

Systems Administrator, GOTH.NET (http://www.goth.net) Development Head, Magick IRC

Services (http://www.magick.tm) Maintainer, CoreWars (http://www.corewars.net)

Founder, DARKER.NET (http://www.darker.net)

CEO, RelicNet IRC Network (http://www.relic.net)

Death is life's way of telling you you've been fired.

— R. Geis

MTC–00004552

From: ANTHONYNAT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 8:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Name: Anthony J. Natoli
Organization: CEREBRAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE

DISCLAIMER: I am not and have not been an employee, shareholder, or business partner of Microsoft, and I, as an attorney, do not and have not had Microsoft or any of its business partners as a client.

Statement: I strongly support the proposed settlement in U.S. v. Microsoft I find the proposed settlement of the antitrust case of U.S. vs. Microsoft to be a fair and balanced resolution of the issues, protecting and helping consumers while also acknowledging the legitimate rights of Microsoft to practice its business.

I submit the following comments on the proposed settlement as a concerned consumer, a technophile, an intellectual property attorney, and a U.S. citizen:

1. As a consumer:

a. I have determined, from over two decades of using technology, that there has been significant price stability and/or reduction in prices of software and other components used in consumer devices and applications, generally referred to as ''computers'' and ''the Internet'', based on the business activities and products of Microsoft;

b. I have determined that there is and has been significant and valuable competition and choices available to me, as a consumer, to obtain more and better computers and uses of the Internet based on the business activities and products of Microsoft; and

c. I have determined that the proposed settlement is far more beneficial to consumers such as myself instead of the more harsh or draconian remedies proposed by other parties, with such suggested remedies including divestiture and/or breaking up of Microsoft, or stripping Microsoft of its intellectual property and/or its ability to innovate in consumer-related computing, including the Internet and browsers for use with the Internet.

2. As a technophile:

a. I have seen and benefited greatly from the advances in computing brought on by the business activities and products of Microsoft, especially market-driven standardization over two decades, of systems and components for use on or with Microsoft products and related products, including operating systems, graphic user interfaces, productivity suites, and Internet browsers;

b. I have seen and benefited greatly from the advances in computing brought on by the entry by Microsoft into different and diverse markets involving many areas of computing, including personal computers, wordprocessing and other productivity applications, and the Internet; and

c. I am wary of any government action which may decrease interoperability and standardization of computing technologies, such as the situation presented twenty years ago with far too many competitors pushing and selling disparate and incompatible computing platforms and software, with such chaotic conditions being potentially revisited and brought on by any government's imposing and implementing the more harsh or draconian remedies proposed by other parties, with such suggested remedies including divestiture and/or breaking up of Microsoft, or stripping Microsoft of its intellectual property and/or its ability to innovate in consumer-related computing, including the Internet and browsers for use with the Internet.

3. As an intellectual property attorney, experienced in patents, copyrights, software, and licensing and business agreements:

a. I favor the ownership and enforcement of intellectual property rights as an incentive for Microsoft, as with all other entitled entities, to innovate with the promise of reward via legitimate and enforceable government granted or recognized limited monopolies, for a limited time, as per Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution;

b. I believe that the compulsory licensing of intellectual property rights by Microsoft to other parties including competitors, as found in the proposed settlement, is an appropriate remedy and balancing of interests for permitting the government to apply and enforce antitrust laws under the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution in view of the intellectual property rights granted by law under the U.S. Constitution, with such compulsory licensing of intellectual property being well known and applied in other countries but generally unheard of in the U.S. and so being extraordinary but reasonable for enforcing the U.S. antitrust laws; and

c. I deplore the statements and attitudes of certain critics who blithely pooh-pooh, dismiss, or otherwise put no value in the intellectual property rights entitled to Microsoft, in its software and/or business licensing practices, so that such critics may pirate or otherwise obtain the intellectual property of companies for little or no payment of justifiable royalties and/or recoupment of research and development costs (and allegedly justified by such critics pompously in crying ''information wants to be free!''), with such royalties and recoupments owed to Microsoft or other software creators.

4. As a U.S. citizen:

a. I favor the present market system in the U.S. to permit Microsoft to utilize any and all business practices which are well-established and commonly used throughout multiple industries, including the computing industry, such as the free distribution of software such as Internet browsers to increase market share, a practice conducted extensively by Netscape (but unfortunately only in the past in order for Netscape to establish over 90 % market share in the browser market) with its freely downloadable browser available years before Microsoft even had an Internet browser to itself freely distribute;

b. I deplore the unequal application of the antitrust laws by the U.S. government in pursuing Microsoft, which has clearly benefited consumers, when there are many other businesses, including competitors of Microsoft, with more egregious practices and/or more monopolistic market power of certain other companies, such as the over 90 % market share of the Netscape browser at one time, via the aforementioned free distribution of software, as well as Cisco Systems which, for a number of years in nationally broadcast advertisements in television and other media, touted that over 90 % of the Internet systems used Cisco servers, without any investigation of Netscape or Cisco by the Federal Trade Commission and/or the Department of Justice of such pervasive and (according to some of Microsoft's critics) presumptively monopolistic market power; and

c. I seek a final resolution of this antitrust case against Microsoft in order to permit Microsoft to continue to further advance computing and Internet applications, for example, via WINDOWS XP and OFFICE XP, and to spur the recovery of the U.S. economy from the current recession for the betterment of all citizens of the United States.

CC:natoli@cerebralproperty.com@inetgw

MTC–00004553

From: Lee Bane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:03pm
Subject: MS Settlement—My Comments

Please!!

Set down and ask yourself, is this settlement the right way to protect the public? For now and the future.. or is this the right way to protect the big money people so they can buy more favors and forget the public interest. I am 76 years old and would like to just have a nice ''bread & butter'' operating system that I could add things to it that I want not what some big ole bully wants to put on it . Please, again what is right and what is wrong?

Thank you for your good service to ALL of us voters.

Lee Bane
lebane@cox-internet.com
www.banefamily.com

MTC–00004554

From: John Maxwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:13pm
Subject: Microsoft case

I have never had to deal with such an aggravating, arrogant, and despicable organization as Microsoft.

Whether I want their products or not, I have to pay a premium on each computer I buy because of their licensing practices. The government's total failure to treat them as the monopoly they are cost me money every time I buy a Personal Computer, forcing me to support them whether I want to or not.

Since they own the market, Microsoft seems to care little if the products they sell are substandard—in fact their poor practices have been adopted by competitors since there appears to be no recourse for consumers. A case in point is the proliferation of virus attacks launched through the same errors and poor practices that have existed for the last five years in their software. We would not allow this incompetence bordering on fraud in other industries to continue indefintely, but the government ignores Microsoft's repeated failures to provide their customers a reliable product.

I actually feel the blame belongs to the US government. This cut-throat operation has been unchecked for years, and the excuse is the consumer can always pay again for another operating system, pay again for non-Microsoft products to replace the ones they have already bought bundled into the machine, and the customer can always pay yet again for add on products such as anti-virus programs to make the Microsoft products almost safe to use. I submit if these were cars that consumers had to buy replacement brakes, replacement seatbelts, and functioning doors because those supplied at the factory were known to be defective, the Justice Department would have stepped in almost immediately.

And now that Microsoft has managed to drive most of its competitors out of business, the government is suggesting consumers let this organization automatically update users' software, forcing them onto th Internet whether they want to go or not. WHAT does Microsoft have to do to show the government that it has no ethics, no morals, and cannot be trusted to keep its word—yet again?

The Department of Justice should be ashamed.

MTC–00004555

From: Eric Crone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:25pm
Subject: Microsoft comments to webmaster's inbox

The two attached emails came into the Antitrust Webmaster inbox.

Best Regards,
Eric Crone
202–307–2782
CC: ATRMAILD:ATRMAILD.
ATRISG01:ATRMAILD. ATRISG01(HESSR...
Date: 12/14/2001 03:33 pm (Friday)

From: Stoney, Ericka
o: Atr, Webmaster
Subject: FW: Microsoft Antitrust case
Original Message ——-
From: Wojtyniak, Tim [mailto:twojtyniak@gentex.com] Sent: Friday, November 02, 2001 10:30 AM
To: ASKDOJ; 'senator(a)stabenow.senate.gov'; 'senator(a)stabenow.senate.gov'
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust case

I hope that what I am hearing is not correct about the wholly inadequate ''settlement'' in the Microsoft-DoJ anti-trust suit. If it is, I must protest that the DoJ is failing to protect me and all consumers from a monopolist convicted in Federal court of anti-competitive behavior. This settlement not only has no teeth—and Microsoft has shown a propensity toward failing to comply with the letter of agreements, not only the intent—but misses the point entirely that some proactive sanctions are necessary to keep Microsoft from illegally defining the future of ALL electronic technologies to it's tastes—and the detriment of all others. Despite their protestations, Microsoft's tactics do NOT benefit consumers in the long run. They benefit Microsoft alone. Consumers benefit from a legitimately open, competitive marketplace where companies are not allowed to use monopoly power in illegal ways to extend their market dominance.

To the DoJ:

As a US citizen, I am counting on you to vigorously enforce the laws of this country and not defer the opportunities of all Americans and all American companies to earn their success in the modem marketplace.

If I am misunderstanding the position of the DoJ, I apologize and would appreciate some further information about how the DoJ intends to proceed on the case.

To my esteemed representatives in the 107th Congress:

As my elected representatives, I am counting on you to look after my interests in this matter. Note that these are the interests of a citizen, first-most, and, secondarily that of a consumer. I trust that, while you hold elected office and thus have additional considerations and responsibilities, you still share the concerns of all citizens for just laws and enforcement of laws to protect the true American ideals, not the false ideals of greed and dishonesty so prominently displayed by the Microsoft Corporation.

Best,
Timothy A. Wojtyniak
twojtyniak@earthlink.net
twojtyniak@gentex.com
2614 S 9th Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49009
Date: 12/14/2001 03:32pm (Friday)
From: Stoney, Ericka
To: Atr, Webmaster
Subject: FW: USDOJ Comments—Microsoft settlement
——- Original Message ——-
From: WOLF [mailto:admin@wolfdenftp.com] Sent: Friday, November 02, 2001 5:04 PM
To: ASKDOJ; attorney.general@po.state.ct.us
Subject: USDOJ Comments—Microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ and Connect State Attorney General Blumenthal; As a personal computer user I am dismayed at the happenings with the DOJ's lawsuit with Microsoft. Microsoft has shown total disregard for the government (re issue in 1995 where microsoft violated an agreement with you, and the recent XP operating system) and for computer manufacturers and finally final users. Their products are ridden with hidden functions that spy on users, and are not reliable in terms of operating smoothly, and the easy of hackers to gain access to personal/corporate computers.

I agree with the following:

The Washington-based Computer and Communications Industry Association charged the administration wasn't pushing for tough enough penalties such as requiring Microsoft to disclose its source code blueprints for its flagship Windows operating system. ''The Justice Department isn't settling this case, it is selling out consumers, competition, and all those who want a vibrant, innovative high tech industry contributing strength to our economy,'' the group's president, Ed Black, said in a statement.

I am very disappointed that the government that we the people have elected has decided to go soft on microsoft. Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's decision to breakup microsoft and impose strict regulations of microsoft and their behavior was the most appropriate action to be taken for this monopolistic company whose only desire it seems is to continue it's domination by whatever means it chooses. And it seems the government has no objections to it. Does the LAW apply only to one group, and not others? What happened to the other monopolies in our past? Railroad and telephone and oil companies were all broken up, and became separate companies, not owned by the original monopolistic company. Why is that not happening here?

About the recent terms of settlement: What is the government thinking? The source code of microsoft contains many secrets that if discovered would show just what they are up to. There are many sites on the internet that show a great deal of hidden activities that microsoft has embedded in the operating system. What are they hiding? Microsoft needs to be broken up. Period. Their source code needs to be made public, and only then will we know just what they are up to. And only then will computers be made secure, applications will be made by others (and that will stimulate job growth) that actually work without crashing and then the people will have more faith in their elected officials. Unbundling of certain parts of the operating system should not just include them, or hide them. They need to be removed from all source code, and only installed at the users discretion, not hidden in the background.

Remember that the government is made up of those elected by the PEOPLE, NOT monopolistic corporations. YOU are our protection against them, as they strive to impose their shoddy products upon us while stifling competition. Please reconsider your agreement. This case has dragged on for a long time. Do not let the events of September 1lth be an excuse to roll belly up to a rich monopoly (how did they get so rich?!). If it goes longer, that's ok, just do the right thing for a change: represent the people, follow the LAW, and enforce it strictly.

I thank you for your time and attention.
Regards,
Phil Rizzuto, JR.
361 West Main Street
Cheshire, CT. 06410–2414
203.605.5696

MTC–00004556

From: Tom Kiatchuck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

It is my belief that the proposed antitrust settlement with Microsoft Corporation is not in the best interests of the American people. It does not protect against future abuses and in fact encourages the spread of the Microsoft software monopoly by training a vast army of young people to use their operating system and attendant application programs to the exclusion of very viable software alternatives. America is based on freedom of choice; but students in Americas' public schools can only learn to use computers, an essential skill for the coming generation of employees, on the products provided to them. Today, the Dept. of Justice has an opportunity to broaden the scope of that choice and thus empower generations yet unborn. It also has the opportunity to cave in to Bill Gates and thus must choose between greatness and ignominy.

The Northern Territories school district in Australia, with apopulation of just over 200,000, finds that it saved $1,000,000 in the first year alone by using Linux alongside Microsoft products to provide computer education at all grade levels. This was enough to allow the school district to purchase an additional 1,000 computers for distribution in the schools and as loaner units for students (and their parents) to use at home. In a few short years their children will be competing, very effectively, on the worldwide intellectual marketplace against American children whose access to hardware was hampered by the prohibitive cost imposed by the practice of using Microsoft products all but exclusively in the public schools. The Australian experience could have been dramatically more productive had they used Linux as the operating system on all their computers but it was a good initial step. The present savings represent its use in their servers only.

http://opensourceschools.org/article.php'story=200 11207001012102 [opensourceschools.org]

I support the notion that Microsoft should pay its fine in hardware donations only. It has been brought to my attention that Red Hat Software of Research Triangle Park, NC, (near Durham, NC) has offered to provide pro-bono copies of the Linux operating system corresponding to a Microsoft donation of hardware. It is my desire that any donation of software that Microsoft might choose to make would not be included in the proposed settlement but must also be a pro-bono gesture corresponding to the Red Hat Software offer. Moreover, any copies of software Microsoft might donate should require no payment of any sort by the schools at any forward point in time. It must be a true

donation of indefinite duration, just as the Red Hat offer is. Otherwise, if required to pay, the schools would eventually have to abandon their training programs for lack of funds to re-license / upgrade their software.

http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/011120/202744—1.html [yahoo.com]

While Microsoft Corporation should not be excluded from expressing generosity, such generosity, expressed as software gifts, only furthers their ability to monopolize the marketplace and should not be permitted as a part of the penalty for having followed illegal practices in the establishment of their dominance in the software market.

Microsoft has painted itself the champion of choice and freewill while villifying open-source software as being un-American. I think it is time for their actions, public and private, to match their very public words.

Software donations should be no part of the proposed settlement.

MTC–00004557

From: James Z. Coleman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:48pm
Subject: Microsoft, Owns what they MAKE, not the Goverment!

Hey,

What's the deal... Microsoft has its right to what they make... Why should our Government care... Microsoft made Windows, Microsoft can decide if they want Internet Explorer or any thing else in there... That's their Business, not Sun Micro, or you name it! If I made Windows, I'd be up there like Microsoft. I'd protest to the ending day... You have NO Control over what people put in their software, they made it, they decide on it! Unless something is copyrighted.

What I think... I think everyone is being a BIG BABY. If AOL and SUN Are upset and everyone else... Why doesn't Sun go with Linux, and AOL make an AOL O.S of their own, and not of Microsoft!

Second, Microsoft holds the right to their source... I don't think ANY STATES, should be trying to force Microsoft for open source... I'd leave any State over that reason. I'd hate them to NO END. I think its bad enough for this to go on.

There are other companies and people that need to be in court besides Microsoft!

James

James Z. Coleman—Owner

Digital Advance—Computer & Internet Specialists

jzcole@digitaladvance.net

Phone: 731.402–3444

<http://www.digitaladvance.net/> http://www.digitaladvance.net

MTC–00004558

From: PSHSR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 9:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ever since the antitrust case began I have felt that Microsoft was being prosecuted for being good at their business. I disagreed with Judge Jackson's ruling then and I still disagree. I would prefer to see all charges against Microsoft dropped.

Peter S Hanson

MTC–00004559

From: Silva
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:19pm
Subject: Disappointing

www.slashdot.com and other technical/software web news spots have begged readers like myself to send in our 2cents worth of comments towards the outcome of this trial. Therefore, please read below. Reading through the technical/software news, it appears that this trial is taking a disappointing turn for the worse since the outcome appears that Microsoft will be allowed to be a monopoly, but will have the additional legal backing to keep doing even more of it. The first trial was correct in attempting to split Microsoft into 2 separate groups. The reason for that is that the operating system group would be {forced} to lay an even and fair playing field for anyone and everyone wanting to create programs to run on the Windows operating system, while the application software group would be equally on a level competition field by {only} using the known application interfaces provided to everyone by the operating system group.

Please....To keep Microsoft the way it is now behaving with only a task force of 3 people to keep Microsoft honest by looking at millions and millions of lines of source code would be a disappointing result of the trial. Microsoft is based on all major continents last time I checked. 3 people is simply not enough to look at all that information and deal with all the extra issues that will be thrown at them on top of all that. It is too many tasks for too few people and things will be easily obfuscated past such a small group. If you decide to go this way, please add more people.

Microsoft strongly relies on the fact that customers do not go beyond loading the initial CDrom or bootdisks. Therefore if your 3 people find problems {after} the CDroms are sent out in public, you have just lost what you wanted to achieve. Few people actually update their machines with the fixes presented afterwards and the only way to be sure that the majority of users use the updated version is to physically send customers updated CDroms which Microsoft will not want to do at all. Despite all the patches and software updates and fixes presented on the Microsoft website, it prefers to know that the majority of users has non-updated.... Windows98 CDrom—it is difficult to remove Internet Explorer Windows2000 CDrom—it is difficult to load a competing operating system.

WindowsXP CDrom—it is impossible to remove Internet Explorer and it is taking a big hit against a company called SUN by leaving out Java. Please.... Separate Microsoft Applications from the Microsoft Operating System in some form or manner so that it is a level playing field for everybody. Right now Microsoft has the inside scoop on Microsoft while everybody else is on the outside looking in and only able to use the published/known operating system interfaces. If a person, group, or business is to create a program using only the known application Program Interfaces (APIs), Microsoft has the homegrown advantage to be able to create a quicker, fancier version competing against that product. We all watched NETSCAPE die to a former shadow of what it could have become because it was starved for income against Microsoft's free Internet Explorer plus all the twists and turns put into the operating system to keep Netscape Out.

If you do not separate applications from operating system in some form so that everybody has a fair chance, you will be seeing history repeat itself. BORLAND (a competing programming language company) and several other companies used to create very good compiler programs for Microsoft DOS and early Windows but they are mere shadows of themselves since they do not have insider information like the Microsoft compiler language programmers have access to. Right now, I won't be surprised if Adobe ACROBAT and other great programs become part of the Microsoft stable in a few years. The reason for saying that is that they have incorporated Microsoft's Visual Basic into their program(s) and since they have no competing product to replace it, Adobe Acrobat is either going to be a mere shadow of itself in the future or it will have to be sold to Microsoft itself when it eventually gets cornered with no alternatives to Visual Basic and the information Microsoft decides to present or break. Please have all application program interfaces (APIs) for the operating system brought out for everybody to use so that others can bring out competitive products.

Being a monopoly isn't wrong if you are the biggest fish in the pond, especially if all things are considered equal, fair and played on a level playing field, but doing actions to hinder fair competition and maintain that monopoly should be considered illegal.

Sincerely,
Jose Da Silva,
11280 Westminster Hwy,
Richmond, BC, V6X–1B3,
Canada

MTC–00004560

From: Alex Zarenin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

I would like to express my overall satisfaction with the wording of the proposed settlement. I think it properly addresses rights and obligations of all the parties and provides environment in which innovations from all sides may thrive.

I also think that provisions of this settlement will be beneficiary to consumers community by providing them with stable and rich operating environment without unduly limiting the choices and preferences.

It is true that Microsoft presently has a dominant role on the desktops; however this role was obtained as a result of fast and innovative development and, as a result, sufficiently good offering. Windows OS obtained its present position in competition with other OSes, such as OS/2, Macintosh, X/Windows etc. Moreover, even today its dominance is challenged daily with new offering (supported by pretty large companies, such as IBM, Sun, etc)—Linux,

System 7 just to name a few. As such I don't think that Microsoft has a true monopoly, which would imply that they may stop development and just reap the benefits of previous work for times to come—it has to improve its offering every day just to maintain this leading position.

In my opinion the states that continue pressing additional charges against Microsoft and do not agree to the proposed settlement are just blinded by the Microsoft-bashing mentality—their proposals would skew the marketplace towards Microsoft competitors and would let mediocre companies, such as Netscape, to make huge profits of the consumers and corporations by selling to them products that otherwise comes from Microsoft for free (like browser or Media player).

Netscape Navigator version 2 was much better then Internet Explorer 2— and it was dominating the market! However since then IE was greatly improving with each new release (and still was free!), while Netscape Navigator was lagging behind, which made it lose the market share. Similarly other companies should compete with Microsoft by providing better products, which in these years of instant communications will immediately attract consumers' attention!

In conclusion I would like to suggest some minor additions to proposed settlement:

For section ''C'' I would suggest to allow Microsoft to imbed in OS tools and features that would allow end users (and only end users!) to revert to Microsoft-provided versions of middleware and other tools, which were replaced by the OEM, if user feels that these replacements are detrimental to the stability or usability of the system. For example a user should be given an option to revert customized versions of the browser (installed, for example, by Comcast or AOL) to the vanilla version of this product.

For sections ''D'' and ''E'' I would suggest that Microsoft should not only made appropriate APIs and interfaces available to broad developers community (through MSDN or similar ways), but also take effort to submit them for non-binding review to corresponding committees (such as WWW consortium etc). The non-binding nature of these submission should not preclude Microsoft from implementing solutions that receive negative reviews; however negative reviews of appropriate APIs or interfaces will open the doors for competitors to provide alternative products, add-on tools etc.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide my comments to this settlement!

Alex Zarenin, Ph. D. in CS

MTC–00004561

From: Bol, Chris
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/14/01 11:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrus Case

To whom this may concern,

Microsoft has proposed to donate products to failing schools to help educate the children in Microsoft Products, this only further their holds in the market place. I manage the the web and networking divisions at a small West Michigan computing firm. There are many solutions that Linux can provide to us, but we can't find people with appropiate training. Use Microsoft money to purchase Linux products to truly give our children a diverse education, filling huge gaps for network managers and programers world wide.

Thankyou,
Chris Bol
chrisb@issol.com
www.issol.com
616–785–0745 x 113

MTC–00004562

From: Josh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 12:24am
Subject: Microsoft have an illegal monoply

Microsoft have an illegal monoply, they leave consumers no choice but to use MS software for general use, eg games, movies, web sites. This is wrong and should be stopped.

MTC–00004563

From: Dennis Jugan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 1:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

An apologue of the proposed Microsoft settlement A man intending to rob a bank parks his car and walks away without feeding the parking meter. While 'busy' at the bank, a parking enforcement person places a ticket on his car. His criminal act completed, he walks briskly back to his car with $20,000 tucked in a bag. Noticing the ticket, he rips it off the windshield, throws it aside, and escapes.

The ticket prompts the police to investigate him as a suspect in the robbery. Evidence is abundant. He's arrested and goes to trial in what everyone presumes to be an open-and-shut case.

Having failed to pay his parking ticket, he's served with papers to appear in traffic court as well, where he's found guilty and fined $100. The district attorney strikes an outrageous plea bargain: Pay the $100 parking fine and we'll drop the bank robbery charges.

This is no stupid man. He walks out of the courthouse minus $100, but enjoys the freedom to return to a locker at the bus station where he retrieves $20,000 in ill-gotten gains and begins to case the next bank. Bank robber takes all.....Microsoft takes all !!

Any reasonable person would recognize this hypothetical plea bargain as an unconscionable travesty of justice. Yet parallels can easily be drawn to the Microsoft settlement.

In the case of Microsoft, there is an undeniable maintenance of monopoly at the expense of competitors and the consumer. The remedy must ensure a reasonable opportunity for the market to return to a level playing field. Microsoft's behavior must also be closely scrutinized by a special master that fully understands the nuances of information technology as they relate to Microsoft's incorrigible conduct of the past as well as the company's announced designs for the present and the future in this market and in other unrelated markets.

The nine dissenting states have put forth a comprehensive remedy that promises a fair redress on the part of Microsoft and allows for the necessary requirements and scrutiny that Microsoft has proven necessary by its record of flaunting past legal agreements with the courts and its persistent misdeeds in the marketplace.

I encourage the court to dismiss the Department of Justice's ''plea bargain'' settlement with Microsoft and to pursue the recommendations thoughtfully set forth by the Attorneys General of the nine dissenting states.

Dennis Jugan
393 Devon Drive
Johnstown, PA 15904
djugan@devonbrook.com

MTC–00004564

From: Curtis(u)E(u)Combs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 4:07am
Subject: antitrust case

dear sir

i work at a campus in south georgia where, like most campuses, computers are a part of everyday use. my system administrator is constantly having problems with the lack of security installed with windows operating systems and it is a constant headache for him, i am forced by an unknoledgeable manager to use microsoft windows, and on a daily basis i'm made well aware of its uselessness. i'm a linux user. i am very competant and very aware of the needs of others who are not technically minded, i work with them everyday. i only wish that i had a suitable alternative not only the the constant failings of the operating system but to its shortcoming and its inablities to efficiantly provide constant stable, reliable performance. please, please, for the future of our children do not let microsoft continue to influence our market and continue providing us with less than workable environments for computing and yet continue to profit from it i would not expect to have to pay for a haircut in which the barber only cut a single hair and said that he has done his job, i would not expect to be arrested because i didnt pay, because the barber had brought the local police with his money.

thank you
curtis e combs jr
cecombs@valdosta.edu

MTC–00004565

From: James Saunders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 5:30am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The consumer has not been harmed, quite the contrary. Is this the price of success in this country? If you really want to go after a monopolist that is gouging all of us, try Frito Lay. Sincerely, Pat Saunders

MTC–00004566

From: Roland Seuhs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 8:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The best settlement would be if Microsoft is forced to charge the same price for Windows and have to treat PC-makers the same way.

This way, PC-makers could preinstall non-Microsoft operating systems without being afraid of facing higher price for Winodws-

licenses. Of course Microsoft should be allowed to give volume-discounts, but for 100,000 licenses, they would have to charge the same, no matter if the PC-maker installs competing operating systems or not.

For example Vobis, a big PC-maker and former market leader in Germany was nearly driven out of business because Vobis decided to preinstall OS/2 on some computers and Microsoft responded in shipping delays and higher license-prices. A fair license price which is the same for all PC-makers would solve that problem.

This settlement would also help competitors in the application market, because PC-makers could preinstall non-Microsoft applications without fear. For example Microsoft threatened several PC-makers not to preinstall Netscape. Since this solution is very fair (Microsoft still can set the prices, still can give volume discounts, they just have to treat every customer the same) I think Microsoft will have a very hard time arguing against it.

Thanks for listening and regards,

Roland Seuhs

MTC–00004567

From: Dr. Martin Senftleben
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 9:00am
Subject: Request for justice

Dear Sir,

I have noticed the ongoing attempts to reach a settlement between the DOJ and possibly the mightiest software company in the world, Microsoft. Microsoft has not become the mightiest because of the quality of their products, but because of their marketing methods, which forced me more than once to buy a computer with their operating system already pre-installed. I never ran this OS, but yet was forced to pay for it—no vender would give me any discount when removing Windows, actually, they refused to do that or offered to do it only at a high price.

Further, Microsoft did everything possible to avoid compatability with other products, once their operating system was established. The history is well known and has been on trial. I have knowingly been a victim—others never knew they were—of this misuse of monopoly power.

If you want to reach a settlement rather than breaking Microsoft's monopoly, then I request that a fair chance is given to every other software manufacturer. This can be reached only if Microsoft is forced to do the following:

1—The Microsoft Windows OS must be an option for every consumer, i.e. computers which have Windows pre-installed must be more expensive than computers without this OS, and computers with the same hardware configuration, but another OS must not cost more than a computer with Windows pre-installed.

2—Microsoft products besides the pure OS must be an option which needs to be paid, and must not be combined with Windows as has been with Internet Explorer and appears to be with the .NET technology in Windows XP, for example.

3—Since Microsoft's Windows has become kind of a standard, it's programming interfaces must be completely public. This is necessary for other software manufacturers to be able to exploit Windows functions to its fullest, since Microsoft has this advantage for its own products.

4—The document format of Microsoft applications must be fully public, so that migration from Microsoft products to other products becomes simple. The strongest reason for not migrating to another, competetive product for most people is the fear that they cannot handle their documents which have been created in Microsoft products any longer.

5—Microsoft must never be able to seize control of the Internet. Hence, any new networking protocol which might be incorporated into a Microsoft product has to be public, in order to enable others to use this protocol. Best would be to have an independent body keep control over the protocols used in the Internet.

6—Focusing on Microsoft products poses a high security risk, as has been proven hundreds of times every year. Yet, more and more companies feel forced to use such products, thus risking the security of their own confidential data (and eventually presenting it unknowingly to Microsoft on a silver tablet?). This fact should be reason enough to make sure that Microsoft must not be enabled to control any section of the market, as it shoudn't be the case with any company in this highly vulnerable area.

Please consider all facts very carefully. Do not give up our independence as consumers, and do not risk the national security by leaving an area uncovered which can be used by Microsoft to unfold it's power even further.

Thank you very much,

Dr. Martin Senftleben, Ph.D.

using Red Hat Linux 7.2

my webpages:

MTC–00004568

From: sbskinner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 9:41am
Subject: Microsoft AntiTrust Settlement

Dear Ms. Hesse:

Below describes just one of the problems I have with the administration's settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case. Although the below experience I had this morning is trivial, I thought you might like to view it from a very basic consumer standpoint. I am sending this also to the AGs of Massachusetts, California, West Virginia, Minnesota and to the District of Columbia (I haven't at this time located the remaining AGs rejecting the settlement),as well to you at the Department.

Suzanne B. Skinner

To: Microsoft Customer Service

Dated December 15, 2001

''For the last week or more, every time Ia fter I signed into hotmail, whether via Netscape Communicator 4.78 or from IE 6, the home page either didn't load at all, OR I had to keep refreshing the page to make it load. Then, next, while trying to access my inbox/junk mail boxes, the same thing occurred. Finally, this very morning and as I speak, when I logged on via IE, half the home page appeared on the screen AND the other half of the screen had that disgusting white page that said to ''Detect network settings,'' etc, because my browser could not support nahda nahda nahda... Also my IE often a/or continually rebuffs my ability to access even the most innocent of sites: e.g. last night to get to Google I had to perform the most herculean efforts and even then, most of the links (e.g. such real horrors as perhaps symantec, ancestry.com, also came up with the white ''network ... page and I was unable to get through. Fully exasperated, I then disabled cookies entirely (usually I keep them to return to sender), and the same tragic story was repeated. Netscape, while giving me the very same Hotmail issues, does allow me, even with cookies returned to sender, access to these above-mentioned wild sites without problem.

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

Suzanne B. Skinner

P.S. Speaking of bugs, at least three or four times over the each of the last five or six weeks, that ''do you wish to debug now'' error pops up. I would be glad to debug, if only the process didn't seem to occupy a vast amount of time, thereby leaving me too exhausted to finish up the rest of what I have to do online.

sbs

P.P. S. NOW: I am unable to send this email to you because, even though THERE IS NOT TOPIC TO BE SELECTED IN THE TOPIC AREA DROP-DOWN MENU, I CANNOT SEND THIS TO YOU BECAUSE I HAVE NOT SELECTED A TOPIC! THIS IS REALLY BAD, GUYS. I have to cut and paste this complaint into a word document to save it so I can send it via some other route. What a disaster.

P.P.S.S. NEXT NEXT: I have tried to follow your rotten process to get to tech support, and low nothing I can do can get me there. I am only trying to report a problem with Hotmail; I have been sent all you?re your 900 sites and get stuck back where I started. This is a really asinine ?computer lack of support? program. I could get Bill Gates or the Pentagon more easily than getting through to you?no wonder every one I know is hoping that Linux is us and running lots of stuff in the near future. Just now, immediately before I was retuned to the ?get help from a Microsoft support (the operative word) professional, I was given a full screen announcement that LO there was a run time error. Are you guys talking with each other? Where the heck is the ability to reach customer service? I am planning to send a copy of this notice to the justice departments anti-monopoly unit, as well as to the attorneys general of every state and ? if I have to ? every European Community nation that refuses to settle the anti-trust suit against you.

Now I have to find another way to reach Customer Disservice, without going through this painful and futile process.''

MTC–00004569

From: Mike Goodman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 10:17am
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Agreement

I would like to speak my mind on the impending anti-trust agreement with

Microsoft. The original judgement should have been left in place, as a computer/technology professional I have long been plagued by Microsoft's attitude towards business and the public in general. Bust'em up, nothing less will do.

MTC–00004570

From: Jeff and Shauna
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 10:17am
Subject: What Happened?

I would like to add my two cents to the whole mess. The best thing for the world is to break up Microsoft. One it punishes them. But more importantly it would be the best thing that could happen for the industry. It would force Microsoft to either create a stable and open operating system or they would go out of buisiness. It would force Microsoft to create software that works equally well on Linux or Mac as it does on Windows. In the end Microsoft would become a great competitor in the industry, not an overbarring monopoly.

Jeff Swenson
Driggs, ID

ps. I use Linux exclusivly at home. I use Windows at work. I am not anti-Microsoft. I am strongly in vavor of more real options.

MTC–00004571

From: mummum@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 10:34am
Subject: Microsoft Trial Comment

To whomever it may concern,

I believe that the decision made by the Department of Justice and the nice settling states was a fair and adequate one. It will impose certain restrictions to allow competitors to be able to get their products out to consumers and also give them an equal chance where one was not present before. Although, what I don't agree with at all is the fact that the remaining nine states are choosing to pursue this further. There should be no way that the restrictions they have suggested should go through or even be considered. Allowing other companies access to protected source code violates patent laws and making it so that Microsoft will not be able to add anything to their OS is unspeakable. It is afterall their piece of software and any company should be able to create something and add to it what they please. Offering two versions, being a light version and a regular version makes perfect sense, but not just a stripped down version. We see now that competitors such as Sun Microsystems, AOL-Time Warner, Oracle and Apple have continually intervened with the trial proceedings and now they are coming out with techonologies and products that will damage Microsoft. While consumers should be protected, the United States and its parties are not and should not be out to destroy companies that contribute so much revenue to the overall economy. Another retrcition asked by the states is that Microsoft include the Java VM by Sun Microsystems in their OS. This is absurd, as in 1997, Sun sued Microsoft for using it and modifying it, making it clear that they didn't want them to use it. Why would it be forced on them now? Furthermore, how can anyone even fathom the idea of forcing competing software on another company. It makes sense when Bill Gates made the comparison of saying that we can't force Pepsi to bundle a can of Coke with every six pack. Just like you can't get a Mercedes Benz dealership to make and sell Toyota cars for them. It just doesn't make sense any way that you put it. Consumers should have a choice, yes, but this choice is up to them to create for themselves. It was deemed that Microsoft should not decide what consumers should be able to use, but equally the Federal Government and governments of the individual states should not credit themselves with the authority to be able to do this either. I hope my comment has been taken to heart, because Microsoft is one of the greatest innovators in the history of US enterprises and hurting them more than necessary is a huge and terrible mistake. They make excellent products and I have benefited from them for many years. As a consumer I don't see where the harm came in in the first place, but these other restrictions are ludacris in their very nature. If it goes through, we would be destroying the very principles on which the concept of Free Market enterprises was created, it is an attack on her soul.

This should be considered as well as many other points, I have not been able to mention.

Your truly,
Stephen Ristich

MTC–00004572

From: Dr. Volodymyr Kruglov
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 12/15/01 10:34am
Subject: On MS cases—a view from abroad

Dear Sir,

I have wrote you, because I am worrying on the result of the Microsoft-DOJ and Microsoft-19 states cases. Let me discribe my own position that has shared with many friends of mine.

1. From our own experience we know very well that MS is using predatory practice—it is just impossible to buy PC without some Windows installed, even in Russia and Ukraine. Moreover, nobody never returned money, if I need not in their Windows.

2. Quality of MS Windows (all versions) is low: you can observe this, even via watching TV or reading the newspapers—permanent noise on 'compromised Web sites', 'new viruses' and similar. But, if you choose an alternative OS—Mac OS, Linux, OS/2—you will immediately be faced with troubles—some sites will reject to service you; there is not broad support from vendors and so on. Instead, everybody will propose you plenty of mediocre Windows-XYZ programs.

3. Few years ago, when the historical case against Microsoft has started, we have obtained some hope to see punished predator. All this process was, unfortunately, very long, but it showed to all (unblind) persons, what kind of tactics was used by MS: for killing OS/2, for struggle with Netscape, with attempts to remove or reduce Java etc. It was, sometimes, even funny to see, how 'great' Bill Gates impudently lying, how MS witnesses had permanent troubles with truth. The result was: guilty, should be splitted and it was just great! You can tell that Judge Jackson did mistake—he gave interviews to the newpapers—yes, it was tactical mistake, but I can understand this: what should you feel on MS, when you were forced to hear their lying for almost 3 years? And, also, the Appeal Court has never changing the main case result: they were agree that MS is guilty!

4. When we started to hear talks on 'settlement', I couldn't even think that such a variant is possible. After this, we started to hear on attempts to mediate states' cases. It was especially intresting to read on MS proposal to settle—via introducing themself in the one of the last sectors of market, where they weren't presented yet. It was strange, it was horrible ... We heard a lot on 'fair game', 'competition', holy 'American Justice', 'innovations of MS' (may be, MS Mouse?), of course. But please tell me, in what country the person, who was already announced guilty, has (with the help of government) opportunity to escape from real charges and to enter to a new beautiful marketing sector—schools? Sorry, but we can not see any justice in the lastest news—we could see only new victories for MS (and the absense even the 'commom sense' in American Justice).

If MS escapes their punishment, we will know very well, what is the meaning of 'Justice' in the USA, but, in this case, please avoid using of words aforementioned in the future—now we will know, how much these words cost!

Sincerely yours,
Volodymyr
PS
Microsoft should be destroyed!

MTC–00004573

From: Joey Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 12:08pm
Subject: Settling the case with Microsoft

To whom it may concern,

I am a computer programmer and Systems Administrator with more than 8 years of experience with varying Operating Systems, and feel it my moral and civic duty to speak out against the proposed deal with Microsoft to settle the antitrust case.

Like the majority of the other programmers that I personally know, I have watched most of the recent legal developments concerning the so-called ''Tech Sector'' with fear and trepidation. I am not a lawyer, but I have tried to understand how the Justice Department thinks that the proposed settlement will solve anything.

It has been found that Microsoft holds a monopoly in Operating Systems Software, and that Microsoft has acted to maintain that monopoly, in clear violation of the laws of the United states. It has also been found that this monopoly has allowed Microsoft to create a ''Barrier to Entry'' for Application developers (see ''Competitive Impact Statement'', III.B.2).

I am not a lawyer, but it seems fairly clear to me that any action taken should strive to remove from Microsoft the power to maintain this monopoly. I cannot understand how the proposed settlement addresses this issue. In fact, the language of the proposed settlement in several areas gives Microsoft a government enforced monopoly, by hiding it behind such concepts as ''security'' and ''anti-piracy''. By

using these words that are so emotionally bound, they have manipulated their way into a proposed settlement that does nothing to stop them from continuing their anti-competitive practices.

I would like to propose some additional actions that, from a computer programmer's point of view, are the barest minimum action that would remove this Microsoft from this position of power.

(I) In addition to the proposed requirement that Microsoft make available their ''API's and other Documentation'', there needs to be some provision made to allow the public to obtain the file formats for both existing and future Microsoft products.

(II) Microsoft should not be allowed to set the terms and price of distribution for such API's, Documentation, of file formats. I can understand if Microsoft feels they need to be fairly compensated for this information, but allowing Microsoft to set the price would give them the power to put this documentation out of the reach of those who best stand the chance to break this monopoly, and those most hurt by it.

(III) In the ''Revised Proposed Final Judgement'', I propose that the following sections should be stricken: III.J.2(b), III.J.2(c), III.J.2(d)

These conditions make it possible for Microsoft to exclude from these reparations the group that Microsoft's CEO himself has declared to be the single biggest threat to their businees. I'm speaking of an international community of programmers who volunteer their time to give to the world software that is technically superior, freely avialable to everyone (including the background logic, or ''source code''), and not legally encumbered by crippling or binding licenses. I speak of the people collectively referred to as the ''Open Source Community''. I am a member of the Open Source Community, and have repeatedly attempted to legally obtain from Microsoft documenation that would allow me to release a product that either competes with, or cooperates with, Microsoft products, and had these attempts blocked simply due to my involvement in Open Source. In the past, there was nothing I could do except attempt to legally reverse engineer this information. But if we are to truly achieve a result which will allow a competitive marketplace, we must remove this ''Applications Barrier to Entry'', as discussed in ''Competitive Impact Statement'', III.B.2. III.J.2(b), III.J.2(c), and III.J.2(d) give Microsoft all the ammunition they require to maintain this barrier.

(IV) If it is determined that Microsoft should make some sort of financial reparations, it should be declared that this may NOT be in the form of Microsoft Software, as this would simply allow Microsoft to spread their monopoly even further under the guise of compliance to the settlement.

These opinions are likely quite naive from a legal viewpoint, but from the viewpoint of a computer programmer, this is the minimum that will give us empower us to overcome the barriers Microsoft has thrown in our way.

In closing, I would like to draw your attention to the comments made by Matthew Szulik, CEO of Red Hat, Inc., generally regarded as the most successful company selling and supporting open source software. ''...contrary to the statements of the US Department of Justice in its impact statement discussing the Consent Decree, the remedies settlement embodied in the Consent Decree fails to achieve the ends mandated by the Court for the following reasons:

it fails to deny Microsoft the fruits of its statuatory violations,
it fails to ensure that competition is likely to result,
it was an agreement reached for the purpose of expediency, not for ensuring an adequate remedy and,
it establishes an untenable precedent for future antitrust cases.''

MTC–00004574

From: promo@f1trading.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 12:44pm
Subject: REMOVE SUCCESS

This is to confirm your removal from our database. You will receive no further emails from F1Trading.com

MTC–00004575

From: Marc (038) Denise Bryant
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 12/15/01 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I would just like to comment on the Microsoft anti-trust case. I know quite a bit about computers. I feel Microsoft has taken over the computer industry. I have seen many good companies that made a better product, but were bought out by or put out of business. I've seen good programs that are coded well but no longer are available because of Microsoft. One can argue ''It's a free country, they can do what they want''. The truth of the matter is we have many freedoms in this country however we have no freedom of choice when it comes to Microsoft. There are other operating systems available, but who can go up against Microsoft. You may have the best product, but you're never going to sell it because Microsoft won't let you. Does that sound like freedom to you?

very truly yours
Marc C. Bryant

MTC–00004576

From: Joseph Boschert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft case

As a student at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, I see first hand the harm that is done when mixing Microsoft and education. I wont go into great detail, because I believe the CEO of Red Hat Inc. already discussed it, but I do feel that by donating software and hardware to poor education disctricts is a suitable punishment for Microsoft. I do favor the proposal that has been making the rounds about Microsoft donating $1 billion in hardware, and having Red Hat, Inc. donate all the software to run on the Microsoft donated hardware. I see this a perfect opportunity to introduce competition into the marketplace, and have Microsoft do the ''right thing'' by giving poor educational school districts the appropriate means of computing technology. I do not see any solutions brought to the public as suitable. As you look to your constituents for answers to this complex monopolistic situation, I hope you continue to read and listen to suggestions. Thank you for your time.

Joseph Boschert
UW-Whitewater Student

MTC–00004577

From: Steve Black
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 1:42pm
Subject: Comments on Settlement—United States vs. Microsoft

Comments on proposed settlement for civil action No. 98–1232: Without doubt, I cannot agree more with the proposed settlement. Primarily for the following reasons:

1. In the civil action, numerous allegations are presented that are no more than unproven statements of marketing hype and propaganda. It's no surprise that the statements are one-sided and ignore Netscape's public comments regarding the demise of Microsoft's commercial viability which are equally meaningless. Attorney's are highly skilled at avoiding lies, but extremely skilled at presenting misleading information.

2. There is a monopoly in PC operating systems, however it, has been created by competitor incompetence, sloth and greed. PC OEM's are only interested in what earns them the most profit and America's millions of large and small businesses cannot afford the expense of maintaining, training, installing and resolving compatibility issues of multiple PC operating systems . As it is, having to maintain separate server and PC systems is more than enough headache and there are strong financial forces to compel the fusion of these systems.

3. Microsoft failed at the outset to enhance Windows Explorer to have the capabilities of Internet Explorer. The internet is simply one large array of hard drives. Every computer should be able to connect to these shared drivers. There is no need for separate ''Explorers'' or ''Navigators''. However, there is nothing to prevent a competent product from being commercially successful if consumers and businesses identify ownership value. Unfortunately, there has never been a market for a separate ''browser''. Netscape's theft of the browser concept and attempt to create a marketable product is something they have every right to attempt, but this product concept is doomed from the beginning.

4. Alternative operating systems have been soundly rejected by the marketplace for reasons of commonality, cost of training and lack of return of investment for businesses. The Apple monopoly could have been wildly commercially successful, except they chose to maintain high prices. The high cost of operating system entry is hard work, investment and technical competence. Allegations that a Microsoft operating system monopoly makes it more difficult to market a competing operating system are correct, however, there are no barriers to marketing any other software product as thousands of large and small companies have done,

provided there is a viable marketing concept and perceived value to the product.

5. There is no browser threat to an operating system. This is a totally ludicrous statement and is not just my opinion, but the opinion of hundreds of PC experts that have published over and over again how totally void of technical knowledge such a statement is. Quoting Microsoft statements to the contrary is simply mis-use of marketing propaganda, proves nothing and has no basis in fact.

6. Software that runs on multiple operating systems is no threat to Microsoft. JAVA, which is not a competitor to the Microsoft operating system, is being avoided more and more by many PC users because it is the language of choice of many hackers and PC terrorists. The demise of JAVA is dependent on it's authors making it a safe and viable product. Their technical competence and business acumen is on trial in the eyes of the market place. I know of no reason to run JAVA on my computer and simply avoid all web sites that try to load it on my machine. Microsoft does not force any PC user to install their operating system. But like junk mail, numerous web sites offer it daily. Linux, Unix, Beos and several operating systems are available, but do not provide the features and benefits of Windows and will not even be cosidered by businesses.

7. This action has never been in the interest of consumers. Netscape and Sun have used their political influence to leverage anti-trust concepts to a new level of distortion. Ambitious politicians like Bill Lockyer have been financially induced to support egregious legal actions by companies that have lost billions of hardware dollars to windows PCs. That is, thousands of small companies that could not afford $60,000 work stations with proprietary UNIX software, can now use $3,000 PCs to engineer products that consumers demand. Increased productivity due to Microsoft innovation is the real benefit of a free market. This is why Netscape and Sun are losing billions due to the demise of their empires and why they are in such a panic to get revenge by destroying Microsoft. They are using the legal system to compensate for their business failings. Did the largest makers of the buggy whip sue Henry Ford for anti-trust behavior?

Steven Black
1916 Camas Court SE
Renton, WA 98055

MTC–00004578

From: Dave Muse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

to: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney, Suite 1200, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 601 D Street NW, Washington, DC 20530 Greetings,

As a long-time computer hobbyist (since about 1979) I have long lamented the slow but steady demise of choices in the computer operating system and computer applications market, brought about by Microsoft's increasing dominance.

Many users of computers are relatively new to computing, and cannot appreciate what can or should be different about this marketplace. But I had to watch, over the years, many excellent software products vanish by being forced out of business or bought up by Microsoft—and in most cases I did not feel that the competing Microsoft products were as good (in any way but marketing) as what was no longer there.

I am very disappointed at the proposed settlement supported by Microsoft and the DOJ. I believe it is full of the very sort of loopholes that Microsoft can enjoy exploiting to its advantage. Where is the punishment for what Microsoft has been found guilty of? Do not make the issue into one of national security, or the strength of our economy; this is the time to fix the problem and get it behind us. The task will not become easier, indeed, much longer-term damage to our competitive marketplace could eventually result.

In my opinion, what consumers need, at a minimum, to be able to truly choose alternatives to Microsoft are:

—Both the Windows API and Microsoft document formats (MS Word, MS Excel, etc) must be made freely available. This will enable competitive products to view and edit documents created by Microsoft products., and to create programs that can run on Windows as well as Microsoft's applications do. Open standards benefit everyone except a monopolist.

—Microsoft networking protocols must be standardized by a standards body. This will prevent Microsoft from using their private, proprietary protocols to seize control of new applications used on the Internet. Again, open standards are in everyone's interest except Microsoft.

—Microsoft products should be provided only as extra-cost options on personal computers. I should always have the choice of whether or not I'm going to buy a Microsoft product.

Sincerely,
Dave Muse
200 Burt Ave
Jackson MI 49201
mrvideo@softhome.net

MTC–00004579

From: mitchell@deckard1.mcmurdo.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 2:21pm
Subject: Break the application lock

Microsoft's lock on the computer industry stems from its proprietary file formats. In short, everyone runs Word because the only way to share a document is by using the same application to read/write it. Other programs —try— to read/write .doc files, but invariably they fail in some way or another. As a result, to be fully compatible, you must use Word as well, because that is what everyone else using. And this isn't just Word, but all the file types; spreadsheets, presentations (powerpoint), etc.

IF the format of these files were openly published, then any software company could write programs that read and wrote to those specifications. Any company then has the chance to write the next ''killer word processor/spreadsheet/etc'' based on the functionality and user-interface of their program. They are not locked out because it isn't compatible with whatever program currently has the greatest user-base.

As an example of this in other technologies; anyone can make a tv because the broadcast format is well documented and it will work with everyone else's. We aren't tied to choosing a CBS tv because we want to watch a few CBS shows.

Likewise, we are not tied to using MCI (in the telephone industry) because that is what our friends/work/etc uses. We are free to choose our own telephone company and can talk with anyone else regardless of what telephone company they use. In the same goal as standards in other communication areas, file formats should also be standardized. That would allow people to choose what company/program they want to use based on their own preferences, not because they have to conform to what everyone else uses.

Any company selling a ''communications'' program (that is what documents, spreadsheets, presentations, etc, programs are, they communicate ideas to other people) must conform to a standardized way of exchanging that information. As changes are needed to the standards, those changes must be at the very least, well publicized, and ideally would be reviewed and incorporated into the standards such that everyone has equal access to the new extensions.

With this solution adopted, it allows Microsoft to succeed or fail based on the quality of their own products and allows other companies to enter the market and compete equally. Further more, Microsoft is then not being ''penalized'' by the government for being successful, as the very staunch Microsoft supporters view it.

Sincerely,
Richard
Richard Mitchell—Airborne Oceanographic Lidar
mitchell@aol.wff.nasa.gov—Laboratory
mitchell@osb.wff.nasa.gov—(shining a little light on the world)

MTC–00004580

From: Steve Cohen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 2:33pm
Subject: My comments re: US vs Microsoft

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed settlement in the case. I am a software developer with over ten years in the industry. I have worked with Microsoft products and others for most of those ten years. I have seen the harm that the Microsoft monopoly does to the industry.

THE SETTLEMENT IN MANY WAYS MAKES THINGS WORSE

The settling of this suit on the terms proposed would be a travesty. Although convicted of many violations of antitrust law, the settlement does not require Microsoft to admit any wrongdoing and they have not done so. Worse yet, the settlement resolves many of the ambiguous portions of earlier decisions upon which most of the case was argued— in Microsoft's favor! Microsoft's ability to destroy competition by incorporating new features into the Windows operating system has been explicitly allowed. How is that a reasonable outcome of a case where the defendant was convicted?

MICROSOFT'S PREDATORY DESTRUCTION OF THE INDEPENDENT SOFTWARE INDUSTRY

I remember in the early 1990's when Microsoft was eager to get Independent Software Vendors to write to the Windows platform; I remember a few years later seeing Microsoft enter the market with competing applications to those which had been written for the Windows platform. Software Vendors who may have envisioned years of profitable activity as a ''partner'' of Microsoft now found that their partner was directly competing with them—enabled by the unfair monopoly Microsoft enjoyed over Operating System distribution through new computer sales. Today, the Independent Software industry is a shambles. In the late nineties, venture capital for competitors to Microsoft dried up. The filing of US vs. Microsoft in 1997 temporarily reversed this trend as Microsoft temporarily was forced to stop some of its most egregious predatory practices. This settlement, if adopted, will revert this industry to this unhealthy state.

POOR SECURITY PRACTICES BY MICROSOFT PROTECTED BY ITS MONOPOLY

Microsoft products are notorious for the poor security they provide. Much of today's problems with viruses and other malicious junk distributed on the Internet would be lessened if this security were improved. A marketplace in which only Microsoft products were readily available would remove whatever incentives Microsoft has to improve this aspect of their products. And recent comments prove that they still don't get it.

Recently, Scott Culp, Manager of the Microsoft Security Response Center issued a broadside to the industry calling for there to be less talk about known security weaknesses in Microsoft products. Rather than fixing problems, they want to be free to hide problems and be shielded from bad publicity.

The less ''monocultural'' the general computing environment is within society, the more security there will be against these threats. Thus diversity in computing environments is in and of itself a benefit to the general health of our networked computing environment. And this is all the more true when the dominant player is the weakest link in terms of security.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ''OPEN SOURCE'' SOFTWARE

There are other problems with the settlement, even with some of the sections that would seem to be improvements. Certain sections of the settlement protect Microsoft's competitors ''in commerce'' against actions which Microsoft has committed before. Netowrk protocols, file formats and similar technical information must be freely shared with these competitors.

But the ''in commerce'' clause protects Microsoft from disclosing this information to what have become its most important competitors—Open Source software, which has emerged as a viable alternative in many areas, particularly the Internet. Because Open Source is not distributed on a for-profit basis, it is not protected as are commercial software companies. Worse yet, Microsoft is permitted to set the criteria designating to what businesses it is required to release this information.

And yet many Open Source applications have been adopted for use by for-profit companies, as well as the Unites States Armed Forces and other branches of government. They find it to be not only cost-effective but also find the ability to fix bugs themselves an advantage that cannot be duplicated in the world of commercial software, where bugs can take months if not years to be fixed, if they are fixed at all. Also, Open Source programs such as SAMBA allow Windows computers and non-Windows computers to coexist and communicate well on the same local-area networks, a big advantage. If Microsoft is not required to release its network protocols to the Samba project, this facility will be killed, thus forcing many customers who might otherwise not wish to buy only Windows computers to do so, thus FURTHERING THE MONOPOLY EVEN MORE.

The restriction on providing protocols only to organizations ''in commerce'' must be lifted. There is no reason why these specifications should not be freely available to anyone. Some might object that this would release information compromising security—this is refuted by the mess that already exists with unreleased information, as well as by the fact that other organizations which DO release this information have far fewer security problems than Microsoft systems. At a minimum the decision of who to release to should NOT be made by the convicted defendant in this case, Microsoft.

LACK OF CONSUMER CHOICE IN NEW COMPUTER PURCHASES Another problem is the whole problem of customers forced to take operating systems they may not want when purchasing a new computer. If a consumer wishes to run a different operating system on a new consumer, that consumer should not be forced to pay for an OS he or she will not use. This practice should be forbidden since it is at the core of so many of the abuses on which Microsoft was convicted.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is my belief that this settlement is a total cave-in to the convicted defendant in this case, and would effectively remove this industry from antitrust protections of the law. While the original remedy of breakup ordered by Judge Jackson is not a necessity (and many sincere people have questioned its effectiveness), the terms of this settlement need to be tightened to prevent Microsoft from the abusing the great wiggle-room this ill-advised settlement gives them.

Sincerely,
Steven M. Cohen
335 Darrow Avenue
Evanston, IL 60202

MTC–00004581

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,antitrust@ftc.gov@ inetgw,Ralph@essen...
Date: 12/15/01 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Hegemony: Proud American, Please Be Happy
CC: letters@latimes.com@ inetgw,letters@sjmercury. com@i...

''Instead of crash-proof unix, consumers get pure unadulterated koran.''

''Instead of exciting software enterpreneurship, young graduates can worship at my mosque.''

''Instead of implement paradigm shifting ideas, all nerds grow beards or wear burqas.''

''This I choose for you, proud American, please be happy. Okie dokie? Ha ha ha ha...''

MTC–00004582

From: Lonnie Rolland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 2:46pm
Subject: doj settlement

Sir:

I honestly think (and there is plenty of proof to back it up) that Microsoft is 'killing' off many, many nitch markets in the computer industry. You could see it 5 years ago. You can see it even better today. Is justice blind ? (or corrupted ?) There is a whole army of extremely un-happy programmer wanting to do something about this. Fix the problem now. Do we really need 'democrats' back in the public office in order to fix the glaring wrongs. Prove me wrong !

Disgusted,
Lonnie Rolland
CC:letters@latimes.com@inetgw

MTC–00004583

From: George Beekman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 3:04pm
Subject: antitrust settlement

DOJ,

I'm writing to express my shock and dismay concerning the settlement proposed by the Bush administration in the Microsoft antitrust case. The proposed settlement has several serious shortcomings:

1. It does not punish the company for its illegal activities
2. It does little to prevent future illegal activities
3. It essentially rewards the company for its abuse of power
4. It effectively increases the company's market share, strengthening its monopoly position.

For a settlement to be fair, it must:

* make it easier for competitors (AOL, Apple, Sun, Oracle, and others) to penetrate markets that Microsoft dominates
* make it harder for Microsoft to abuse its monopoly status.
* discourage other companies for engaging in illegal monopolistic practices.

The current settlement proposal isn't justice. Our government must do more to bring Microsoft to justice.

Sincerely,
George Beekman
3825 NW Hayes
Corvallis, OR 97330

MTC–00004584

From: lifedata@vol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 3:11pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft Anti Trust Case
To: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney.

People knowledgable in computer technology and unbiased by connections with Microsoft know and declare the

obvious. Microsoft has used its enormous financial power to crush smaller competitors. In the process it has stifled the innovation typical of those lean operators whose bottom line depended on truly ''doing it better,'' rather than on massive advertising campaigns.

The findings that Microsoft is in violation supports the voices thus speaking out. It does not intimate the damage to private enterprise when they disappeared, one after the other nor the enormous loss of the technology these innovators had been contributing. Security is but one example. The loss of billions of industry dollars when hackers attack through the myriad, continuing, security leaks in Windows software is unnecessary. Far better security is available in other systems. Microsoft callously ignores this.

Remedies should be commensurate with the massive culpability of Microsoft. Serious penalties and corrective measures are in order. As should be expected, current proposals, written by Microsoft itself, actually enhance their monopoly, and deepen the technological loss to the American people. The posturing of Microsoft's legal cadre notwithstanding, breaking up Microsoft, therefore their monopoly, is step in the right direction. Such breakups in the past have proven to give birth to many new technologies.

Further, because of their immense power:

1. Microsoft should be prevented from forcing their system to be installed on any new machine whether by old or new schemes. Schemes designed to bypass this intent by ''creative'' pricing or clever wording should be flatly prohibited.

2. Microsoft should be ordered to make their system APIs available in full to all software developers equally. That is, they should not charge more or license less to a competitor than to a partner.

3. Microsoft should be ordered to make all their networking standards public, therefore prevented from secretly making competing browsers disfunctional.

Sincerely,
James P. Lalone
9835 Standifer Gap Rd
Ooltewah, TN 37363

MTC–00004585

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft ATR,rremington @webtv.net@inetgw,mcarona@...
Date: 12/15/01 4:26pm
Subject: Financial News 12/15/2001

Business & Financial News from 11/1/2001 to 12/15/2001

Houston based Enron Corporation lays out the plan for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. The failed Azurix water unit and wind energy assets may be sold for $4-$6 billion dollars. Other assets as the energy trading unit may be sold to one of three financial bidders including JP Morgan Chase, Citicorp, two of the largest Enron creditors, or UBS Warburg. Enron employee 401K pension funds were vested in Enron stock, now virtually worthless! Enron's total bank debt, including bonds and derivatives is about $15 billion. Accounting firm Arthur Andersen's CEO has been quoted as saying that Enron did not disclose subsidiary company information to Andersen, a felony violation of SEC regulations. Enron hid negative balance sheet information through affiliated companies.Total value of failed Enron Corporation is over $60 billion dollars, including stock and preferred shareholders values.

The Microsoft Anti-Trust Deal is under bipartisan fire in Congess. The Senate Judiciary committee has been overseeing the Justice Department's proposed deal, with nine states still pressing for tougher terms. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. has received an antitrust lawsuit from 29 states. The attorneys general alleged that the Company illegally kept generic versions of its BuSpar anxiety medication off the market, cheating consumers out of millions of of dollars.

Prudential Financial launched the largest IPO ever in the insurance business, selling $3 billion dollars of stock to investors.

AOL Time Warner CEO Gerald Levin announces his retirement from the Company, effective May 2002, the earliest date his employment contract offered.

Vivendi-Universal executive Edgar Bronfman, from the Seagrams family, resigns the number two position at the media conglomerate. French based Vivendi retains Jean-Marie Messier as CEO.

Barry Diller, of USA Networks and the Home Shopping Channel has been named chief executive of Universal Studios, overseeing all theme parks, television, and motion picture operations. The huge music & publishing division of Universal will remain under separate management. Vivendi-Universal has announced a financial partnership with Echostar /DirecTV in the range of $1.5 billion dollars. The strategic partnership is designed to provide content for HDTV and traditional satellite subscription broadcasts.

The Federal Reserve Bank reduces the prime rate for the 11th time this year.

Hollywood studios and directors agreed this week on a new three year contract six months earlier than the deadline in May 2002. Run away productions to foreign countries has been one of the major issues in resolving conflicts early.

Major League Baseball places contraction on hold until 2003. Speculation from many general managers is based on elimination of collective bargaining and other labor/salary issues wrapped up in a smokescreen of talks regarding team elimination.

''Anaheim Angels' Done Deal Disintegrates''. Headlines from the Orange County Register detail Disney executives nixing a negotiated trade with the Chicago White Sox involving Angel Darin Erstad and the Sox' Garland, Singleton, & two minor league players.

ABC & AOL Sports purchase 6 year rights to broadcast the NBA, winning the bid from NBC.

NBC announces the elimination of broadcast advertising bans on hard liquor commercials, allowing Smirnoff vodka and other Diageo brand to advertise on the peacock network from 9–11 PM and on the Tonight Show with Jay Leno & Saturday Night Live. ABC, CBS, & FOX networks will allow only beer and wine advertisements at this time.

MTC–00004586

From: Lou Owens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 4:34pm
Subject: microsoft

Quit wasting tax dollars trying to punish Microsoft for exercising free enterprise. This country is a capitalistic society and free enterprise is one of the core principles.

I run a small business and no one is wasting tax dollars to limit my competition. The market decides if I am providing products and services at the right price and quality.

Lou Owens

MTC–00004587

From: Ray Ashmun
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 5:09pm
Subject: settle

You need to keep asking yourself, where is the consumer outcry about Microsoft. There isn't much, because most people are very happy with the current situation. I'm an old-time pc user and remember how things were before Windows. It cost us a fortune in money and work to get the necessary utilities up and running in our computers. Now we save time and money with almost everything in Windows. I don't want to go back to the old days and I will continue to purchase Microsoft products for as long as they are available. It is disgusting to me that you have allowed competitors who are unable to develop decent products to convince you that everything will be better as soon as you cripple Microsoft. The entire PC revolution would be much farther behind where it is today if it hadn't been for Microsoft. Most if us chose Microsoft when given the chance, and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

Leave things alone and settle this court case now.

Ray Ashmun

MTC–00004588

From: lmuntz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft attitude toward intellectual property

I am a doctoral candidate in English at the University of Iowa and serve as a teaching assistant at UI and at Mt. Mercy College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The temptation that essay-for-sale-or-trade websites offer to undergrads is quite strong and offers a constant battle for those of us who wish to prevent plagiarism and teach our students how to perform rigorous, honest intellectual work. The publication of the following article on Microsoft's website Slate undermines such attempts. For a corporation that portrays itself as concerned about intellectual property rights and about making the Internet a learning tool for students, the promulgation of such an article on-line by MSN indicates at the least a faulty editorial policy and at most an arrogance about or negligence in enacting the corporation's policies and missions, in my opinion.

I appreciate having this venue by which to comment.

Lori Muntz

Original Message From <lori-muntz@uiowa.edu> shopping

Adventures in Cheating

A guide to buying term papers online.

By Seth Stevenson

Posted Tuesday, December 11, 2001, at 11:04 AM PT

Illustration by Nina Frenkel Students, your semester is almost over. This fall, did you find yourself pulling many bong hits but few all-nighters? Absorbing much Schlitz but little Nietzsche? Attending Arizona State University? If the answer is yes to any or (especially) all these questions, you will no doubt be plagiarizing your term papers. Good for you—we're all short on time these days. Yes, it's ethically blah blah blah to cheat on a term paper blah. The question is: How do you do it right? For example, the chump move is to find some library book and copy big hunks out of it. No good: You still have to walk to the library, find a decent book, and link the hunks together with your own awful prose. Instead, why not just click on a term paper Web site and buy the whole damn paper already written by some smart dude? Que bella! Ah, but which site?

I shopped at several online term paper stores to determine where best to spend your cheating dollar. After selecting papers on topics in history, psychology, and biology, I had each paper graded by one of my judges. These were: Slate writer David Greenberg, who teaches history at Columbia; my dad, who teaches psychology at the University of Rhode Island (sometimes smeared as the ASU of the East); and my girlfriend, who was a teaching assistant in biology at Duke (where she says cheating was quite common). So, which site wins for the best combination of price and paper quality? I compared free sites, sites that sell ''pre-written papers,'' and a site that writes custom papers to your specifications.

Free Sites

A quick Web search turns up dozens of sites filled with free term papers. Some ask you to donate one of your own papers in exchange, but most don't. I chose one from each of our fields for comparison and soon found that when it comes to free papers, you get just about what you pay for.

EssaysFree.com: From this site I chose a history paper titled ''The Infamous Watergate Scandal.'' Bad choice. This paper had no thesis, no argument, random capitalization, and bizarre spell-checking errors-including ''taking the whiteness stand'' (witness) and ''the registration of Nixon'' (resignation). My judge said if they gave F's at Columbia, well Instead, it gots a good old ''Please come see me.''

BigNerds.com: Of the free bio paper I chose from this site, my judge said, ''Disturbing. I am still disturbed.'' It indeed read less like a term paper than a deranged manifesto. Rambling for 11 single-spaced pages and ostensibly on evolutionary theory, it somehow made reference to Lamarck, Sol Invictus, and ''the blanket of a superficial American Dream.'' Meanwhile, it garbled its basic explanation of population genetics. Grade: ''I would not give this a grade so much as suggest tutoring, a change in majors, some sort of counseling .''

OPPapers.com: This site fared much better. A paper titled ''Critically Evaluate Erikson's Psychosocial Theory'' spelled Erikson's name wrong in the first sentence, yet still won a C+/B− from my dad. It hit most of the important points-the problem was no analysis. And the citations all came from textbooks, not real sources. Oddly, this paper also used British spellings (''behaviour'') for no apparent reason. But all in all not terrible, considering it was free. OPPapers.com, purely on style points, was my favorite site. The name comes from an old hip-hop song (''You down with O–P–P?'' meaning other people's ... genitalia), the site has pictures of coed babes, and one paper in the psych section was simply the phrase ''I wanna bang Angelina Jolie'' typed over and over again for several pages. Hey, whaddaya want for free?

Sites Selling Pre-Written Papers

There are dozens of these—I narrowed it down to three sites that seemed fairly reputable and were stocked with a wide selection. (In general, the selection offered on pay sites was 10 times bigger than at the free ones.) Each pay site posted clear disclaimers that you're not to pass off these papers as your own work. Sure you're not.

AcademicTermPapers.com: This site charged $7 per page, and I ordered ''The Paranoia Behind Watergate'' for $35. Well worth it. My history judge gave it the highest grade of all the papers he saw—a B or maybe even a B+. Why? It boasted an actual argument. A few passages, however, might set off his plagiarism radar (or ''pladar''). They show almost too thorough a command of the literature.

My other purchase here was a $49 bio paper titled ''The Species Concept.'' Despite appearing in the bio section of the site, this paper seemed to be for a philosophy class. Of course, no way to know that until after you've bought it (the pay sites give you just the title and a very brief synopsis of each paper). My judge would grade this a C− in an intro bio class, as its conclusion was ''utterly meaningless,'' and it tossed around ''airy'' philosophies without actually understanding the species concept at all.

Illustration by Nina Frenkel

PaperStore.net: For about $10 per page, I ordered two papers from the Paper Store, which is also BuyPapers.com and AllPapers.com. For $50.23, I bought ''Personality Theory: Freud and Erikson,'' by one Dr. P. McCabe (the only credited author on any of these papers. As best I can tell, the global stock of papers for sale is mostly actual undergrad stuff with a few items by hired guns thrown in). The writing style here was oddly mixed, with bad paraphrasing of textbooks—which is normal for a freshman—side by side with surprisingly clever and polished observations. Grade: a solid B.

My other Paper Store paper was ''Typical Assumptions of Kin Selection,'' bought for $40.38. Again, a pretty good buy. It was well-written, accurate, and occasionally even thoughtful. My bio judge would give it a B in a freshman class. Possible pladar ping: The writer seemed to imply that some of his ideas stemmed from a personal chat with a noted biologist. But overall, the Paper Store earned its pay.

A1Termpaper.com (aka 1–800–Termpaper.com): In some ways this is the strangest site, as most of the papers for sale were written between 1978 and '83. I would guess this is an old term paper source, which has recently made the jump to the Web. From its history section, I bought a book report on Garry Wills' Nixon Agonistes for $44.75, plus a $7.45 fee for scanning all the pages—the paper was written in 1981, no doubt on a typewriter. Quality? It understood the book but made no critique—a high-school paper. My judge would give it a D.

I next bought ''Personality as Seen by Erikson, Mead, and Freud'' from A1 Termpaper for $62.65 plus a $10.43 scanning fee. Also written in 1981, this one had the most stylish prose of any psych paper and the most sophisticated thesis, but it was riddled with factual errors. For instance, it got Freud's psychosexual stages completely mixed up and even added some that don't exist (the correct progression is oral-anal-phallic-latency-genital, as if you didn't know). Showing its age, it cited a textbook from 1968 and nothing from after '69 (and no, that's not another Freudian stage, gutter-mind). Grade: Dad gave it a C+. In the end, A1 Termpaper.com was pricey, outdated, and not a good buy.

With all these pre-written papers, though, it occurred to me that a smart but horribly lazy student could choose to put his effort into editing instead of researching and writing: Buy a mediocre paper that's done the legwork, then whip it into shape by improving the writing and adding some carefully chosen details. Not a bad strategy.

Papers Made To Order

PaperMasters.com: My final buy was a custom-made paper written to my specifications. Lots of sites do this, for between $17 and $20 per page. PaperMasters.com claims all its writers have ''at least one Master's Degree'' and charges $17.95 per page. I typed this request (posing as a professor's assignment, copied verbatim) into its Web order form: ''A 4-page term paper on David Foster Wallace's Infinite Jest. Investigate the semiotics of the 'addicted gaze' as represented by the mysterious film of the book's title. Possible topics to address include nihilism, figurative transgendering, the culture of entertainment, and the concept of 'infinite gestation.' '' This assignment was total hooey. It made no sense whatsoever. Yet it differed little from papers I was assigned as an undergrad English major at Brown.

After a few tries (one woman at the 800 number told me they were extremely busy), my assignment was accepted by Paper Masters, with a deadline for one week later. Keep in mind, Infinite Jest is an 1,100-page novel (including byzantine footnotes), and it took me almost a month to read even though I was completely engrossed by it. In short, there's no way anyone could 1) finish the book in time; and 2) write anything coherent that addressed the assignment. I began to feel guilty. Some poor writer somewhere was plowing through this tome, then concocting a meaningless mishmash of words simply to fill four pages and satisfy the bizarre whims of a solitary, heartless taskmaster (me). But then I realized this is exactly what I did for all four years of college—and I paid them for the privilege!

When the custom paper came back, it was all I'd dreamed. Representative sentence:

''The novel's diverse characters demonstrate both individually and collectively the fixations and obsessions that bind humanity to the pitfalls of reality and provide a fertile groundwork for the semiotic explanation of addictive behavior.'' Tripe. The paper had no thesis and in fact had no body—not one sentence actually advanced a cogent idea. I'm guessing it would have gotten a C+ at Brown-maybe even a B−. (Click here to read the rest of the paper.) If I were a just slightly lesser person, I might be tempted by this service. One custom paper off the Web: $71.80. Not having to dredge up pointless poppycock for some po-mo obsessed, overrated lit-crit professor: priceless.

sidebar

Return to article

Infinite Jest

Introduction

Wallace's fictional narrative Infinite Jest is an epic approach to the solicitous and addictive nature of humanity. The novel's diverse characters demonstrate both individually and collectively the fixations and obsessions that bind humanity to the pitfalls of reality and provide a fertile groundwork for the semiotic explanation of addictive behavior. Although Wallace may have actualized the concept of the ''addicted gaze'' to the literal or physical response to the viewing of Incandenza's coveted film the Entertainment [Infinite Jest], it is manifested symbolically throughout the novel in the distractions of its characters.

Nihilism

It would appear that Wallace has chosen society's most frequently rejected and denounced individuals as the vehicle for the narrative search for and preservation of the ultimate fix, which is illustrated by the obsession for Incandenza's film. At the same time and despite their diversity and distinctions, these individuals will ultimately represent the inextricable and covert characteristics of nihilistic behavior.

School-aged malcontents, drug addicts and the physically challenged all attempt to get a hold of a copy of the film and experience its pleasures at any cost. Ironically, it was the film maker James Incadenza's habit to regularly observe the depravation of Boston's crowded street milieus, where ''everyone goes nuts and mills, either switching or watching'' (620). It is not surprising therefore that he should develop a film that would be perceived as the panacea to the entertainment addictions of the masses.

Figurative Transgendering

Wallace devotes a substantial amount of space to the illustration of the contradictions of gender, where the adoption of gender behavior or symbols contrary to the character's true gender can be analyzed. The occasion of Hugh Steeply in drag as he met with Marathe to discuss the emergence of the Entertainment's cartridge may have served the literal purpose of the agent arriving incognito however his devotion to applying feminine mannerisms appear to go above and beyond the call of duty (90). In spite of his practice, Marathe nevertheless describes Steely's appearance as ''less like a women than a twisted parody of womanhood'' (93).

Wallace also presents the steroid-driven objectives of a number of the female tennis player's like Ann Kittenplan. ''who at twelve-and-a-have looks like a Belorussian shot putter'' (330). It may be fair to assume that their desire to acquire a manly physique is not entirely confined to the advantages it offers on the tennis court. In his notes, Wallace suggests that the ''gratification of pretty much every physical need is either taken care of or prohibited'' by the tennis academy (984). Clearly, the administration of steroids or any other drug of choice is prohibited by the ETA considering the wide scale purchase of ''clean'' urine for the academy's drug testing.

An Endless Jest

Perhaps the most significant example of the addicted gaze is demonstrated not so much in the stationary and fixated attention to satisfying one's obsession but in the demand for the continuous pursuit of it. The halfway house/rehab center, Ennet House, represents the often ineffectual and delusional pursuit of ridding oneself of addiction. A clear example of the deceptive environment of rehab is demonstrated by Lenz's use of cocaine while at the facility. For many of the residents like Lenz, the limitations at Ennet House are often so unbearable that its residents are driven to the use of drugs in order to preserve their sanity. Ironically, Lenz's stash of cocaine works as a contrived temptation that undermines any true potential for ridding himself of his addiction.

Conclusion

Wallace's Infinite Jest is a chaotic amalgam of humanity and the similarly depraved behaviors that they demonstrate in the pursuit of amusement and satisfaction. Although the restrictions to their attainment are clearly represented by the physical entities of the Academy, the Ennet House and the wheelchair, they are also fostered by them.

If Incandenza's ''Accomplice'' is any indication of the content of the Entertainment, it only reinforces the contention that human nature includes the inherent desire to not only view the depravity and debauchery of human behavior but even more, to participate in it. There is little to ponder why so many of Wallace's characters must depend on their mind and body altering drugs of choice, if not to influence how they are viewed by others then at the very least to make more palatable their own perceptions of self.

John L.'s monologue delivered at one of the AA meetings illustrates the destructive implications of either reasoning: ''all the masks come off and you all of a sudden see the Disease as it really is??and see what owns you, what's become what you are—'' (347).

References

Nihilism. The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. [online] Available: http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/n/nihilism.htm.

Wallace, David Foster. Infinite Jest. New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1996. for future reference

MTC–00004589

From: Todd Chilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly

Hi,

In regards to the attached email, my thoughts are as follows. I think Microsoft winning (winning in my definition meaning slaps on the hand being irrelevant...) is very disheartening. The reason it is disheartening is because it sends the message that our own government is not really in control, nor has the actual ability and/or care to note and control such behavior. If you will notice that Microsoft is using the ''loss'' to market there own products yet again. And once again, our judges and government officials just aren't bright or competent enough to see through these things.

On another note, I make a living supporting NT and Unix networks and I am currently using MS products to send you this message. I would like to see sensible cases and sensible reprimands. Companies like Novell and Sun that do not really ''compete'' with MS and then sue is a little ridiculous as well. Novell just sat there and watched the giant come without really trying to compete. Sun has never targeted the home user or even the low end server market, yet the complain about MS? We need research, relevant facts, and accurate penalties. I actually don't hate MS. I hate a system that allows companies like MS to do whatever they want with nothing more than a inconvenience or the ability to turn their ''punishments'' into ''advantages.''

Thank you,

Todd Chilson

P.S. In all sympathy to government officials, I know they have a very hard job and they are doing the best they can with enlightening counter-arguments to my position. I believe in them equally, but this is my opinion as it stands today.

MTC–00004590

From: Ron
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 8:18pm
Subject: Microsoft case

I personally don't see how consumers have been harmed by any of the so-called actions of Microsoft. In fact, consumers have benefited. Microsoft has bundled other products into the operating system so the consumer doesn't have to buy them separately. This is a win for the consumer. There is no consumer or consumer group that can say this is not a benefit to them. Where can you get an operating system which comes with audio and video editing capabilities, CD writing capabilities, and built-in networking, for $100 (or less). You can't. Check the price of Novel's operating system, or Sun's operating system. They cost much more.

It is obvious that this case has been spearheaded by Netscape. Netscape originally gave their browser away for free to flood the market. Microsoft has been accused of this too, but Netscape did it first. Unfortunately for Netscape they did not have the capital to hold them over while they gave away a free product. Microsoft came along with their own browser, and late in the game I might add. After several revisions, Microsoft's browser became superior to Netscape's browser. Netscape buried themselves, Microsoft didn't bury them.

Ronald Listo

11006 Old Cheshire Lane
Chester, VA 23831

MTC–00004591

From: Karl Vogel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attn: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Greetings:

The proposed Microsoft settlement language lets the company off far too easily. If the deal goes through without modification, I believe Microsoft will actually become stronger and better able to act as an industry monopoly.

As I understand the proposed final judgment, remedies specifically protect organizations in business for profit. This is fine as far as it goes, but Microsoft's greatest current threats come from the non-commercial arena: Linux-based systems on the operating system front, the Apache webserver on the IIS-alternative front, and the Gnome and KDE GUI packages on the desktop front. These three competitors are all not-for-profit in nature, and not-for-profit organizations seem to have no rights at all under the proposed settlement.

Section III(J)(2) says that it need not describe nor license API, Documentation, or Communications Protocols affecting authentication and authorization to companies that don't meet Microsoft's criteria as a business:

''...(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, ...'' In other words, Microsoft can now effectively kill any not-for-profit product which makes use of Microsoft protocols, which doesn't amount to much in the way of punishment for precisely that sort of past behavior. The biggest loser in this settlement would seem to be the U.S. government, as it also doesn't qualify as a for-profit organization. This includes your office, the military, and anyone else working for the government who might benefit from some real competition. Finally, nothing in this proposal would prevent a future Microsoft monopoly based on .NET and HailStorm.

Recommendations:

* People should be able to create independent implementations of Microsoft APIs without fear of legal retaliation. This is the only way that other organizations can hope to make their products work and play nicely together with MS products on an MS desktop.

* Instead of auctioning the right to port Office to specific systems, or forcing them to give up code for IIS, simply require that MS Office work properly when installed and run under the ''Wine'' emulator for Intel-based systems. This prevents MS from making a product dependent on undocumented Windows features, without hobbling them or making them give up their corporate crown jewels.

http://www.kegel.com/remedy.html holds more specific language changes for the proposed final judgment.

Please rethink this. You can get a very clear picture of a company just by watching what they're willing to do to get the last 5% of a market. If Microsoft had been willing to settle for 85% of the desktop, do you think this trial would have happened in the first place? Winning is one thing, but winning by any means necessary is another. Thank you for your time.

Karl Vogel
Wright-Patterson AFB
Beavercreek, OH

MTC–00004592

From: Dave Gant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 9:48pm
Subject: MS Settlement

I think it's utterly ridiculous to reward a monopolist entity that has proven time and again to have no respect for morality, fair play, or even the law. If the DOJ cannot see that the placement of one's product in an institution for education is a huge benefit, I have honest concerns about the competence of the government to deal with these matters in today's world. If this settlement goes through, it will send the message to businesses that fair competition and business ethics are an optional hindrance.

Dave Gant

MTC–00004593

From: morrownr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/15/01 10:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti Trust Case

After having read the agreement between the USDoJ and Microsoft concerning the settlement of the ongoing case I must say that I feel justice will not be served by this agreement. I have followed the small computer software industry for many years and I identifed what I thought to be illegal activity by Microsoft as early as 1986. I then watched as the years passed and the increasingly obvious illegal activities increased. I watched as the DoJ made a couple of attempts to curb this illegal activity in the early '90's but Microsoft totally ignored both the letter and the intent of the agreements they signed with the DoJ. Microsoft has not and nor do I expect them to show any regard for the laws of the United States of America until far more reaching corrective action is taken. Microsoft has made billions by disregarding the law. The current settlement allows them to keep it all. This is simply not right. It is also not right that the company be left with the same structure that it has today. This company must be broken up to stop the illegal activity. A strong message needs to be send to the business community...that the laws of the United States will be enforced.

Regards,
Nick Morrow

MTC–00004594

From: Louis Vonderscheer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 12:09am
Subject: Comment

As an end user of computers and software I feel I must protest the proposed settlement of the Microsoft Case. To me it seems a small slap on the wrist for a company that has a virtual monopoly on both operating system and applications.

Most executives that choose the software for companies will pick Microsoft much as they used to pick IBM. They are afraid of incompatibilities when using 3rd parth software.

Microsoft has bought their compitition, or dried up their sales by announcing a competing product to be released ''real soon now''. Much software that I have used over the years is now gone, replaced by some ''kitchen sink'' variety, bundled into the current Windows version. Now we are stuck with Access, Word and Excel, while old industry standars like Paradox, Lotus and WordPerfect are fading into obscurity. It would be nice to have a choice in software at least if not the OS. I like General Motors but I want more then Chevrolet available. We need the competition.

Thank you for your consideration
Louis A. Vonderscheer
Redding, California.

MTC–00004595

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft
ATR,rremington@webtv.net@inetgw
Date: 12/16/01 2:31am
Subject: USPS Mail Tampering

During the past weeks I have been receiving encoded messages as to the origins of the shenanigans, hijinx, assaults, and felonies against me while living at 62 Trofello Lane, Aliso Viejo, CA. This supposed secure gated community at the edge of Soka University, has operations funded by a Mission Viejo based company, Benchmark Funding. The tip, provided by the local USPS carrier is only one of the many discoveries of subversion & deception here.

Additional stalling and funding by Canadian based companies as well as the entry of a ''planning'' neighbor from St. Louis via Laguna Niguel reeks of another's idea of how I should live my life. Tonight's mail featured a card addressed to this woman's (Laura) three year old daughter (Brianne) with our 62 Trofello address. Last week, my only income, the California unemployment check arrived after 10 business days from the date it was mailed from Sacramento, normally a one to two day trip even with the 9/11 security and holiday mail demands. Someone, I believe one of the residents living on my block, intercepted my unemployment check for over a week, and then placed it in a US Postal mailbox for a second routing through the US Postal Service. I have timed the prior receipt of this biweekly check and have received it directly in two days from the US Postal carrier when I wait for my mail at home. I shouldn't have to do this!

Apparently someone's thinking I would stay at home for weeks while my check was lost, as my bank account is close to zero. Wrong! I will continue to sell personal items in order to live normally by searching for employment in an area of my choice. The Merino community in Aliso Viejo is not even

close to an area that I desire to reside in. I want my money rightfully returned to me without delay in order to continue living without others dictating business for me.

This is the United States, folks. For over 35 years I have been enslaved while my money and royalties were intentionally withheld in order to clone a replacement musician for the Chicago Blackhawks Hockey Team, and later, as a ''Project'' for Canadian funded television shows and other nonsense. Additional royalties and revenue have been illegally used by others without my consent, resulting in a multi-decade fight for my rights to live in a safe, secure community of my choice, not another's decision.

A strategically placed December 17, 2001 People Magazine with George Harrison on the cover features an article by Susan Forward titled ''Ties That Bind'' ''Outraged By Your In-Laws? Author and self-help guru Susan Forward has some tips for easing the strain''. Referring to the intense abdominal strains from the multiple poisoning by my sister, Bonnie, her husband, Al Rex, as well as my parents during the past year, the People feature descries the various varieties of poisonous in-laws with her new book, ''Toxic In-Laws: Loving Strategies for Protecting Your Marriage''. Reciprocal communications or assistance from the Orange County Sheriff's Department and the United States Department Of Justice are less than direct to me. An occasional feature article by someone unknown to me may be left in my view at the 24 Hour Sporting Club in Irvine. Big deal, all it confirms is that someone deliberately poisoned me, I already knew that, as well as some of the motives for the assaults.

Official replies or settlements after decades of investigations and over three years of my direct communications have yet to occur. COX Cable, one of the media & communications conglomerates bidding for the $60 billion dollar assets of AT&T's cable communications division has been active plotting behind the scenes. Cox Cable provides the telephone communication at the Merino community as well, forcing me to choose yet another cellular provider, Verizon, in order to obtain return calls from employers.

Friday's edition of the LA Times Living section features two cartoons in the comics pages relevant to my complaint. The first is Real Life Adventures on page E21. The authors, Wise & Alderich, choose to show a couple behind a hedge with the words, ''NUDIS COLON''. The author could have chosen the exact wording, Nudist Colony, however the encoding is for New Disney Colon, referring to the continued attacks and subsequent ''creative juices'' prepared in Tropicana Pure Premium Orange juice with a special ''White Cap'', the company my father retired from.

I now believe that my brother's ''spastic colon'' and colon surgery for Crohn's disease several years ago was actually caused by my family's intentional poisoning against him, without his knowledge of the origins of the attacks. Barry is intelligent and has clued me into my mother's subversive personality in his jewelry business years ago. It has taken me longer, unfortunately, to believe that parents could be so cruel! The discoveries of the chronic Muenchausens Proxy and ''Toxic In-Laws'' Syndromes proven frequently with attacks from my parents, sister, and her in-laws. I belive my mother's brother, Allan, an insurance agent, has interfered with my money. Allan's mysterious disappearance overseas on cruise ships coincides with ''Disney done deals that disintegrate'' and other fizzled plots.

Above the Real Life Adventure is the Over The Hedge comic. This comic has been mentioned in several of my previous US Justice communications. This entire week has been devoted to the theft of $30 million dollars by the ''mastermind'' critter against the ''turtle'' character through credit card fraud. The settlement occurs in Saturday's edition when an African credit card is used to pay off the debts incurred. This cartoon is close to the truth, folks!

I am requesting your immediate attention to my complaints! This situation is degrading daily and will result in EXTREMELY UNPREDICTABLE BEHAVIOR if my money is not returned to me immediately. I have waited for over 15 years and have informed the US Department of Justice regarding the truth in the deceptive business and theft of my money and assets. I deserve the opportunity to live my life in security and peace, away from my family's continued attacks and interference! There is adequate comfortable safe housing available in other areas! You know it, and so do I.

DO IT NOW !!

DO NOT DELAY THIS ANY MORE !!

Robert Remington

MTC–00004596

From: Ryan Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 3:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice,

I am concerned about the anti-trust settlement with Microsoft. It is clear that Microsoft is guilty of antitrust violations. Although I am not an expert, I have been keeping up with the case and would like to express my concern with the way that the agreement addresses open source software and other access to the API's associated with Windows. It seems clear to me that the power Windows holds over the market is much more than a coupled browser, but the way that Microsoft can leverage that monopoly to increase the barriers to entry of other software makers into producing software for Windows.

Section III(J)(2) and Section III(D) both contain language that could damage free software and other enterprises that Microsoft does not consider a business. Since programs like Apache and Linux make a huge difference in the server market, and consequently the internet, this language essentially gives Microsoft the keys to the gate regulating the connection of PC's with internet servers. Additionally, since these programs are maintained by large communities of people not formed into a legal entity, they have little way to legally fight Microsoft if Microsoft decides they are not worthy of the API's necessary to interface with Windows.

This language would also hurt the government, NASA and any other non-profit scientific or other organization that would like to interface with Windows. Please look at this area further and do not give the company a chance to strengthen it's position in the market. Additionally, it does not seem like the agreement provides enough penalities to the company for it's monopolisitic actions. Microsoft should not be stopped from competing fairly in the marketplace, but they should be given a new way to strengthen their position either. It is not enough just to make it available to remove coupled programs or to change certain features. The benchmark should be whether or not the average computer user is able to make that choice when they buy their computer. As one last point, I would like to advocate the selection of Steve Satchell as a member of the three member watchdog committee over Microsoft. Robert X. Cringley has recommended him highly and I have learned to trust Mr. Cringley's opinion after having read his column for a long time.

Sincerely,

Ryan C. Johnson

Los Gatos, CA

MTC–00004597

From: Alex Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 3:48am
Subject: DOJ v. Microsoft comments

Below are my comments regarding the conclusion of the US v. Microsoft trial, in accordance with the public comment period. I hope they are considered in the resolution of this case:

I have followed the trial very closely, and am most disappointed with the resolution proposed. I do not feel as though Microsoft has respected the court at any stage of it's trial, and has acted with distain toward our entire system. Furthermore, I feel as though the Attorney General after the change in the administration has pursued this issue with less vigor than is appropriate for a case with such far-reaching implications. I hope that the Court again finds against Microsoft, a company that does not respect it's customers, competitors, or the legal system. Please punish Microsoft in a way that will make it take notice, and that will help competition. I'm very concerned that favorite technologies such as Quicktime and Java will be knocked out using the same unfair Microsoft practices that already cost consumers innovative products like Netscape, and has hurt the adoption of the Macintosh OS.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alex Johnson

3438 Vista Ave

Cincinnati, OH 45208

MTC–00004598

From: Dan Cannon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 8:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Other than some vague language about ''harming consumers'', I could find no specific statements in the complaint that clearly defines what the damage has been to consumers. The complaint itself clearly focuses on competing products and

Microsoft's competitors. While not specifically mentioned in the complaint, anyone familiar with computer industry knows who these competitors are. It is clear this complaint was fostered by these competitors and not by consumers.

From a consumer's (and industry participant's) viewpoint, the complaint seems like a contradiction in that producing affordable software requires a ubiquitous platform and re-useable infrastructure, but a ubiquitous platform and re-useable infrastructure(according to the complaint) somehow equates to a monopoly. In addition, moving functionality down into the platform has always been a way of achieving re-usability and thus reducing software development cost. Microsoft's competitors understand these basic tenets and are coming up with alternatives to achieve ubiquity; they just don't do it as well and efficiently as Microsoft—yet.

I had a vision of what our world would look like when I started out in the computer industry some 30 years ago. Microsoft has done more to advance that vision by making it possible for the masses to afford computing devices. We are still in the vision's infancy. The evolutionary process will continue to weave exciting new capabilities into the consumer's daily processes. Microsoft understands this and is aggressively bringing these new capabilities to the masses. They are also empowering many whole industries and individuals to take advantage of exciting new opportunities.

I would suggest our government send a loud message that reaching any vision is not accomplished by filing complaints, but instead by innovation and hard work. From a consumer's viewpoint we are punishing success; exactly the wrong message we should be sending. Tell the computing industry (and all other sectors) to focus less on fostering legal action and more on building competing platforms, providing re-useable infrastructure, achieving ubiquity, and ultimately providing markets with cost-effectiveness solutions to process improvement.

Dan Cannon
xiggi@hotmail.com

MTC–00004599

From: Steven Zaveloff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 9:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ms.Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am writing regarding the proposed settlement of the Microsoft antitrust litigation.

I believe that the proposed settlement is a travesty of justice. Its effect will be to make it even easier for Microsoft to make its operating systems even more pervasive and its monopoly position more secure—with a tax write-off to boot.

Yours truly,

Steven H. Zaveloff zaveloff@earthlink.net
P.O. Box 200203 Tel: (512)219–7142
Austin, Texas 78720–0203 Fax: (707)988–8694
http://www.foreignword.com/cv/document_353.htm

MTC–00004600

From: Zach Arnold, JMaD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern:

I am of the opinion that the proposed Microsoft antitrust settlement is a sham. It would not promote competition in any way. Microsoft, which has been found to be guilty on numerous occasions, does not deserve such a blatant concession by the federal government.

Zach Arnold
zacharnold@excite.com

''If you're not going to be better tomorrow than you were today, what need have you for tomorrow?''

Rabbi Nachman of Bratslav

MTC–00004601

From: Robert Constant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 12:42pm
Subject: AntiTrust Settlement

The case should be settled. Microsoft wants to settle the case and now the States are are holding up the process with more demands. The States that are holding out are of course the States that have Competitors to Microsoft. Hopefully this is not a case of Competitors basically trying to get want they want from Microsoft by USING the Goverment. I believe that what the goverment has put forth. It is not up to the goverment to try and make a competive arena. Punish the Micorsoft for its behavior, not make its competitors get a free ride or even to playing field for them.

MTC–00004602

From: Ryan, Randy
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/16/01 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

I work in public education and experience Microsoft everyday. While I feel that they are somewhat over-zealous in grabbing every penny they can from all users of their software, it still is the only way to fly.

There are other solutions we could use, but truthfully, Microsoft has a very good and stable product. I think that this is because of the resources they have and if they don't protect their position in the marketplace, then all computer users will suffer.

Don't tear apart the best thing for computers, but don't let them just run roughshod over us either. I trust that the DOJ will make the correct decision as long as the justices in question keep an open mind and take in both sides of the case....the consumer and the company.

Thanks for the opportunity to air my position.

Randy Ryan
Marble Falls, Texas

MTC–00004603

From: Mike Westkamper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly disagree with the settlement that has been publicly touted in this case. From my perspective as a business person in this industry, Microsoft has destroyed competition, stifled creativity and has exposed this country to irreparable harm. The arrogance shown by this monopoly and defiance of the law coupled with products which expose us to significant harm are a direct result of their apparent invulnerability.

The settlement is a coup for Microsoft. It provides junk computers and Microsoft software to kids. A marketing win for them. Nowhere do those who were harmed see compensation or recognition.

I hold that Microsoft should be made accountable to those who claim harm from their manipulation of the market as a monopoly. Further, Microsoft should be made to compensate those who have been harmed by the poor software allowing hackers to infect their sites.

I would gladly offer additional comments if you would like another voice in the chorus.

Mike Westkamper
President, WEI Inc.

CC: Connecticut Attorney General,Mike Westkamper

MTC–00004604

From: Starr81
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I found on the Internet that citizens may comment on the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case. Therefore, I offer these thoughts: The proposed settlement is a travesty. It is the desired product of a clever defendant who has found a prosecutor eager to throw Br'er Rabbit back in the briar patch.

The settlement fails to honor the verdict of the trial court and the unanimous conclusion of appellate judges. It even defies common sense, because it leaves a monopolist in undisturbed control of the market. PC shoppers will continue to find no choice but machines in which Microsoft's operating system has already been installed. (Apple doesn't count, because it has a miniscule and declining percentage of the market.)

Pre-installation of the operating system means the consumer cannot know what is being paid for Windows, and what the price would be if the computer came with no operating system or an alternative system. Worse, it effectively defines other software options, leveraging Microsoft's power. The only answer is a remedy that prevents Microsoft from preventing consumers from making an informed choice. The consumer must be offered a true choice. This requires two things. First, that Windows be ''un-bundled,'' so that computers be offered and priced on the basis of all of these options: with no operating system included, with a sysem such as Linux, and with the buyer's choice of Windows ME, 98SE, 2000 or XP. (The latter choice is necessary to prevent Microsoft from forcing consumers to accept Windows XP's special ''hooks'' that will lead to control of software application markets Microsoft doesn't already dominate.)

Second, Microsoft must be forced to allow the natural development of alternative

operating systems. Its 90% control of the word processing/spreadsheet/etc. office software package market is part and parcel of its monopolist power; Office strengthens Windows, and Windows strengthens Office. Accordingly, Microsoft must be compelled to develop or license versions of Office for Linux (and any other competitive system that may arrive), much as it currently does for Apple's machines. This must continue to be required as long as either Windows' or Office's share of the ''IBM-compatible'' market is greater than fifty percent. Only when Microsoft voluntarily chooses to market application software on a non-discriminatory basis can one conclude its monopolist personality has changed. In sum, the acid test of a settlement should be this: if the defendant is happy to enter into it, then the prosecution has been duped and justice will be denied.

Gerald Starr,
Norman, Oklahoma

MTC–00004605

From: Edward Styles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Now I agree that Microsoft should face penalties that will slow the grow of this monopolistic practice.

Now we are all aware of monoploies. The utilities and cable companies are examples of monoploies. I feel that if Microsoft became a monopoly because it was just the best product for the job I would say let them be, but I cannot say that. Microsoft is a product that I am forced to use. I also have to pirate the software because there is no way to learn about the software for IT jobs. Two wrongs don't make a right but how can I learn about it if I can't afford to use it. What does Microsoft have to say to that.

Also I feel that Linux should be pushed into schools. The money saved could be used on teachers and better classrooms. Open source technology would be great for that. Also there is a place for Windows and Office. I do feel the companies should be split so that it can promote competition and through this competition better products. I do not wish for Microsoft to fail, we need Microsoft, but we also need choice as well. No penalities, just the company split.

MTC–00004606

From: hyperkat44@netscape.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 1:16pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

As a senior programmer analyst with long industry involvement, I strongly agree with the counter-proposal for settlement of the United States vs Microsoft offered by the 9 states and am vehemently opposed to the proposed final judgement of Nov. 6th.

In my opinion, the proposal of November 6th would not restore competition and sends the wrong signal to an organization that rationalizes criminal behavior as ''innovation''. I feel that even the stronger counter-proposal by the dissenting states does not go far enought in punishing Microsoft corporation for ill gotten gains.

Sincerely,
Richard T. Van Cura
14256 Jennifer Road
Omaha, Ne 68138

MTC–00004607

From: John Bekas Jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 2:40pm
Subject: DoJ vs Microsoft settlement

Dear DoJ

I am writing to you in response to the settlement terms of the antitrust case against Microsoft. I am extremely disappointed with the outcome, as Microsoft is receiving little or no punishment for their actions. As a software developer in Chicago, Illinois, I am sorely disappointed that the federal goverment and my own state government have given up the fight and have decided to settle on terms favorable to Microsoft. The courts have ruled that Microsoft is indeed a monopolist. Not only that, they ruled that Microsoft abused this monopoly. Therefore, I believe Microsoft should be treated accordingly.

I understand that ongoing court cases take time and cost a lot of money. Plenty of both have been invested over the past few years of litigation. However, coming to a settlement favorable to Microsoft, such as this one is, is equivalent to throwing away all of the time and money invested in the case.

One example of abuse I experienced came about a few years ago when I was purchasing a new computer from Dell. At the time, IBM's OS/2 Warp was an alternative operating system which I was interested in running on my new system. When asked if I could receive my computer with OS/2 Warp installed instead of Windows 95, the sales person said no. When asked if I could receive my system with no operating system installed, the sales person again said no. When I persisted, the sales person changed his attitude and said that I could get the system without an operating system installed; however, the system cost remained the same. I was unable to purchase a new system without paying Microsoft for software that I had no intention of using.

I have no idea whether this situation has changed in the past few years. Instead, I have discovered that if I assemble a system on my own, no software is included. Unfortunately, a typical computer generally does not have this option.

As for software and bundling, I believe Microsoft abuses this power greatly. Although the common person probably does benefit from the inclusion of Web Browsers, Media Players, Image Manipulation Tools, etc., many power users uninstall these ''freebies,'' and instead opt to purchase more fully functional software. Unfortunately, these users are forced to pay for the included software in order to upgrade their operating system. If Microsoft was truly interested in including software that was of use to a majority of users, why do they not include Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel with their operating system? I would imagine that more people probably use a word processor or spreadsheet than Media Players or Image Manipulation Tools. My guess is that Microsoft no longer has any competition in these markets and has no incentive for forcing their use. When is the last time someone sent you a document in Word Perfect format?

I also want to touch on the proposed settlement of the Class Action lawsuits currently being proposed by Microsoft. Please do not let them extend their monopoly further by allowing them to install $1 billion of their software in needy schools. Instead, let Microsoft donate their money and let the schools decide which solutions they are interested in buying. Apple Computer has focused on software designed for children and they should be given a fair opportunity to compete for installation rights in these schools. RedHat Software is willing to donate free software (with no time limit) to these schools if the settlement money is given in the form of hardware and not software. Any of these alternative options will increase competition and will not just help Microsoft extend their grasp to new areas.

In closing, I think that the proposed solution from the remaining states in the antitrust case is much better suited to the crimes committed. In particular, I'm referring to the stricter punishments for non-compliance that the states are requesting—namely, the opening of source code to the Windows OS if Microsoft is found to be continuing its anticompetitive behavior during the next few years.

Thanks,
John Bekas, Jr.
Software Developer
Chicago, Illinois

MTC–00004608

From: Roger O'Brien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 3:07pm
Subject: You have NBC, you have a part of Apple, please don't take the Education

You have NBC, you have a part of Apple, please don't take the Education market!

MTC–00004609

From: Bill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 6:19pm
Subject: RE: Microsoft and your DOJ Action—STOP your actions against this Fine American Company!

Gentlemen:

This email is to let you have one more American citizens opinion about YOUR actions ...the actions of our elected government officials and how you spend MY tax dollars. Microsoft has been shown to be a monopoly. This is not illegal. The lawsuits propagated against this fine company were brought during the liberal administration of the past 8 years and the era of ''competitive lawsuits'' as a method of competing in a market where the companies supporting the lawsuit were unable to produce a product that was competitive. Said another way: STOP your actions against Microsoft and live with the current settlement that has been proposed. This company has been damaged enough even though they do NOT deserve these actions!

They make a wonderful product...one that consumers WANT to buy. They make it better than OTHER competitors can make it and they market it ''CHEAPLY''...well within

the product development and production costs. They do not make a huge profit for what they charge. In fact the profit they make is THEIR business...not the consumer or government's business. Let them alone to continue to produce a better mousetrap! STOP being ''bought'' by other competitors! MY TAX vote says leave them alone!

I am not a Microsoft employee or have anything to do with their company. I simply use their products. I believe that THIS company should be PROTECTED by your DOJ from these frivolous lawsuits brought by competition that cannot simply come up with a competitive mousetrap! By the way...I am extremely computer fluent and KNOW much about computers and all software involved! Personally I PREFER Microsoft software to all of the rest...and I have bought and used the rest!

The point is I am an American Taxpayer, a businessman and a VOTER. Please respect my vote and bring back some decency to our government at the DOJ levels by CUTTING your DOJ actions and departments. LAYOFF many of your unneeded lawyers and put our TAX dollars back into the consumer's hands and OUT of the government BUREAUCRACY!

Thank you,
Bill Martin
2850 Country Club Blvd
Orange Park, Fl 32073
wem@pobox.com

MTC–00004610

From: Steven B. Ronsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 7:16pm
Subject: United States v. Microsoft Settlement

I am an IT professional who specializes in creating applications for the Microsoft Windows environment.

I am extremely disappointed in the proposed remedy which holds no hope for forcing Microsoft's compliance to non-predatory practices. I am appalled to think that, after five years of litigation, the DOJ feels this is a satisfactory conclusion. It really begs the question of where Microsoft is investing its political contributions and reflects very poorly on the entire administration.

A fitting solution would be much closer to remedy originally proposed by the trial judge.

Steven B. Ronsen
72 Norwood Ave.
Buffalo, NY 14222
(716) 881–4809
Steven B, Ronsen
sronsen@buffnet.net
(716) 881–4809

MTC–00004611

From: alan malnak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 9:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please be advised that I have read most of the legal documents concerning the Microsoft settlement and am of the opinion that the settlement is fair and just.

It seems to me, that as indicated in the Microsoft brief, much of the opposition to the settlement comes from companies that have selfish motives.

Having Microsoft reveal as much as the opponents request would be similar to the government ordering Coco Cola to reveal its recipe to all of the competitors on the street.

We even see our elected official taking the part of companies that are located in their political district.

Despite what may be claimed, can anyone really say that telephone service is better or cheaper for the consumer since the inception of all of the smaller companies since the court ordered breakup ?

In addition, and one only has to look at the Market history to come to an obvious conclusion, as Microsoft goes so goes the market. Many company pension plans are suffering severe loss in value as a result of the drop in Microsoft stock and the effect it has on other investments That may not be of great importance to some, but it is to me since I am retired and cannot vote myself a larger pension and increased health benefits as our elected officials do.

Again, I am in total support of the settlement agreed to by the Government and Microsoft.

MTC–00004612

From: Frederik Eaton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 10:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft must be required to provide documentation about APIs, ABIs, and communications protocols to individuals and developers of free software, not just to commercial vendors. A large part of Microsoft's competition comes from free software community, and to deny its members the same rights as commercial interests under the new antitrust settlement would be absurd.

If there will be any kind of committee appointed to oversee Microsoft, Steve Satchell should be on it.

MTC–00004613

From: Patrick J-Whitty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 10:43pm
Subject: Microsoft: Enough is Enough

I am writing this email as a concerned American citizen. Ever since the beginning of the anti-trust case against Microsoft, I have learned more and more about how they connived and manipulated their way to success. I've learned how they tried to muscle other companies out of business because they didn't want to have any competition. This is wrong. Microsoft is a monopoly, and monopolies do nothing but harm this country. They stifle innovation and they place power into the hands of the wealthy.

Just because Judge Jackson's ruling was overturned does not make these facts untrue. Microsoft does nothing but harm others. I am appalled that Judge Kollar-Kotelly would use the disasters of September 11 to try to shield these crooks from the justice they deserve. This is downright tasteless.

Microsoft must be brought to justice. Their programs should all be open sourced, people should be given the opportunity to choose whether or not they want Windows, and Microsoft should not be allowed to dominate the Internet.

I hope other Americans see what I have seen. What is decided with Microsoft will affect the rest of the world for years to come. They must be stopped and brought to justice.

Sincerely,
Patrick Johnson-Whitty

MTC–00004614

From: Yev Bronshteyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 10:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

As it stands, I believe the proposed settlement is insufficient. While giving certian limited freedoms to the manufacturers, I believe all parties involved have lost track of those for whom the settlement is necessitated—the consumers.

As a consumer, I am entitled to demanding free choice in buying a product, and to government protection of my choice. In regards to Microsoft settlement, this applies as folows:

* The consumers must be given inalienable right to select any and all of the software he/she purchases with a new computer. This includes both middleware and operating systems.

* The consumer must not pay for any software he/she does not receive as a result of making the decision described above.

* No OEM or retailer should suffer any financial loss for granting a consumer the afore-mentioned fundamental freedoms, and no party should (yes, even Microsoft) should gain from denying these rights to the consumer. Specifically, this translates into:

—No exclusivity contracts with OEMs. Microsoft must not be allowed to enter into contracts that bind the OEM to providing any Operating System and/or middleware on all or any specific fraction of systems sold but that OEM.

—No discounts to OEMs based on their choice of operating system or middleware.

Any settlement that fails to provide for the above rights are included in ironclad, incontravertible language with no ''exceptions'', falls short of satisfactory to the needs of the consumers.

As a consumer, I thank you for your concern for our interests.

Yev Bronshteyn.

MTC–00004615

From: Yev Bronshteyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 11:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

As it stands, I believe the proposed settlement is insufficient. While giving certian limited freedoms to the manufacturers, I believe all parties involved have lost track of those for whom the settlement is necessitated—the consumers.

As a consumer, I am entitled to demanding free choice in buying a product, and to government protection of my choice. In regards to Microsoft settlement, this applies as folows:

* The consumers must be given inalienable right to select any and all of the software he/

she purchases with a new computer. This includes both middleware and operating systems.

* The consumer must not pay for any software he/she does not receive as a result of making the decision described above.

* No OEM or retailer should suffer any financial loss for granting a consumer the afore-mentioned fundamental freedoms, and no party should (yes, even Microsoft) should gain from denying these rights to the consumer. Specifically, this translates into:

—No exclusivity contracts with OEMs.
Microsoft must not be allowed to enter into contracts that bind the OEM to providing any Operating System and/or middleware on all or any specific fraction of systems sold but that OEM.

—No discounts to OEMs based on their choice of operating system or middleware.

Any settlement that fails to provide for the above rights are included in ironclad, incontravertible language with no ''exceptions'', falls short of satisfactory to the needs of the consumers.

As a consumer, I thank you for your concern for our interests.

Yev Bronshteyn.

MTC–00004616

From: Bill Fox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 11:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate.

Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a miniscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so. Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.

Respectfully,
William W. Fox, Jr.
9805 Fox Rest Lane
Vienna, VA 22181
703–281–3126

MTC–00004617

From: Benjamin Everson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 11:19pm
Subject: the settlement is flawed

I will keep this brief—the settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case is severely flawed. MS has been found guilty, yet the DOJ has found it more appealing to just make the case go away rather than really trying to solve the problem that has been determined to exist. Please don't allow this mistake to happen. If you do, I promise it will come back to bite us all. The Internet is supposed to be an open community, not owned by any one entity. This will cease to be true if Microsoft is not reigned in, and the day that happens will truly be a sad one.

Ben Everson

MTC–00004618

From: Michael Longfield
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/16/01 11:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am one of many people upset by the potential ramifications of the Settlement. Although I do not live in your jurisdiction (I am Canadian), I am nonetheless concerned. I use Microsoft products. Yet I do not think they should be given the opportunity to strengthen their market position in schools as punishment for their other monopolistic practices. The suggestion of Steve Jobs, requiring Microsoft to provide money not software and hardware, is worth greater consideration.

Sincerely,
Michael Longfield

MTC–00004619

From: C. R. Brade
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't see how this settlement changes anything. Microsoft (MS) already has a foundation (started after the suit, I think) that donates money that K-12 schools can apply to, how does expanding the visibility of such PR do anything to change MS. Microsoft used to have a lower market share than Borland for the then popular C++ Programming Language software; MS didn't have a better product and couldn't get Borland (Enprise(sp.?)) to sell their company to MS, so they took over half of Borland's top programming staff (wages that no one else could match). Borland never did get anywhere near their marketshare in programming language software back. Sure MS might of had to pay Borland (briefly changed its name) a fine, but I am sure MS has more than made of the difference. Why should MS ever deal ethically with anyone? If they get caught they may pay a fine, but the fine won't be enough to make them suffer any long term loss in any area.

Everyone knows that the Apple Computer Company's strategy that helped them get a foothold in the K-12 schools was its heavy rebate program for schools to buy one of their computers. What this settlement would do is basically give MS the same strategy to slowly remove Apple's presence. Why not require that the computer's not run MS software? Money not used can grow interest deferred and be used for improving technical training in non-Microsoft equipment. The Red Hat people said they would provide free Red Hat Linux OS's with technical support for the schools MS gives equipment to. There is a glut of MS certified people, why not train some disadvantaged children in high school/jr. high in Linux administration. There are probably many inner city or Appalachian Mountain children who would jump at the chance. Companies in economically disadvantaged areas would then have someone to hire who knows how to run a server with very low site license fees and has

a lower number of security issues requiring patches with each new release. This could help a new company compete and grow—helping a company grow and employ more tech. savvy employees which could help the area no longer be an economically disadvantaged area. Note Linux has in some cases been put on computers and have them run compatible applications that choke on MS OS & software. If not why not require MS if it takes more than 10% (when agreed upon market share rate) of Apple's K-12 OS share in K-12 schools during and 2 years after of this billion dollar K-12 assistance phase; require that MS pay an additional one billion (at one year anniversary date of first payment) plus whatever percent of share loss over 10% times 100 billion until either MS for over a year doesn't exceed its when agreed upon market share rate or holds less than 65% of the market share in all of the following: PC OS's, word-processing packages [note the large share they took from with bundling (WordPerfect/ Lotus 1–2–3)], programming language software, and internet browsers.

Maybe it is true that money talks and big corporations never have to apologize as long as they have the money. I hope I am wrong, but the case of the intermittent windshield wiper patent comes to mind.

C.R. Brade
twiggy139@home.com
aj7301@wayne.edu

MTC–00004620

From: Wes Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:56am
Subject: Microsoft's Monopoly

I have been using both Microsoft operating systems and the Macintosh for as long as they have existed. I could write a long letter, but I won't. It is very clear to me that on many occasions Microsoft has used their dominance of the operating system marked to further their monopoly. You might not realize that they have done it in the word processing market in Japan.

Today let me just say that I am seriously concerned about two things. First, by putting their media player into Windows and making it the first choice media player, they have taken a big step towards squeezing out Apple Quicktime and RealNetworks RealPlayer.

Secondly, there is Microsoft Passport, which is collecting a lot of data about subscribers and forcing all who are using Microsoft Hotmail, Microsoft Network, and Microsoft Developers' Network to subscribe if they want to continue to receive those services. I think it is a very unhealthy thing for this service to be under Microsoft's control at all, and it will be very unfortunate if they dominate this field as well as the operating system market.

Very Sincerely Yours,
W. Wesley Peterson
Professor of Information and Computer Sciences
University of Hawaii
wes@hawaii.edu

MTC–00004621

From: js aal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:15am
Subject: Proposed settlement is an embaressment to the US/DOJ

Ladies/Gentlemen;

As I reviewed the proposed settlement offered Microsoft in its recent anti-trust suit, I am struck by the lack of any real penalty to Microsoft. The original trial judge found MS guilty of being a monopolist and ordered a series of remedies. The appeals court did not agree with the remedies, but they did uphold the finding of monopolistic actions. This confirms the need for some sort of penalty or sanction that forces MS to end their monopolistic actions.

The DOJ proposals to settle this case clearly have an odor of a payoff of some sort. MS has hired the right type of Washington, DC attorneys, it has sponsored the right lobbyists, BUT it has yet to admit the monopolistic practices and show some sort of remorse. The company has continued in the same course it has prior to the trial.

DOJ should ask for two things:

1. Disallow the OEM relationship MS has with the makers of personal computers that allows them to ship a unit with MS installed along with along with the placement of unique icons that tie the machine back to other MS products.

2. Force MS to publish the full interface specifications to its Windows operating systems packages. This should be a standard that all other vendors (including other divisions within Microsoft) would use in developing their applications.

There is a precedent for the second penalty, because that is the condition forced upon IBM when it settled with DOJ in one of its several anti-trust cases. IBM continued to prosper as did many of the smaller ancillary companies.

That is anti-trust justice displayed in the past. I hope DOJ and the US Court system has the same courage to do this today.

Have a great Day!
Alex Lukshin

MTC–00004622

From: gwintle@csc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is clear to me that the Consent Decree was reached for the purpose of expediency rather than a sustainable result. When the result of the antitrust litigation has been upheld by the highest court in the nation, why is a lower court and, more specifically, the Justice Department willing to accept a less favorable settlement to consumer than the Microsoft proposed settlement when the finding of guilt was still at issue. I find it inconceivable that a firm with 96% marketshare, which has routinely annihilated competitors in its path, be offered improved terms after guilt has been established. I find that it is with deep regret, that contrary to the statements of the US Department of Justice in its impact statement discussing the Consent Decree, the remedies settlement embodied in the Consent Decree fails to achieve the ends mandated by the Court for the following reasons:

* it fails to deny Microsoft the fruits of its statuatory violations,

* it fails to ensure that competition is likely to result,

* it was an agreement reached for the purpose of expediency, not for ensuring an adequate remedy and,

* it establishes an untenable precedent for future antitrust cases.

I feal that as someone familiar with computing and the computer industry, and the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolies in these areas, I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. The company has already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly. A just penalty would at barest minimum include three additional features:

* Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

* The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

* Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

There is considerable national interest in this issue, it is crucial that Microsoft's operating system monopoly not be extended. This is a case is of great importance, not just now but for many years to come. This suggests a careful and deliberate penalty is far more important to the health of the nation than is a hasty one.

I would like to finish by quoting the nine State Attorneys Generals who are opposing the settlement ''Nothing in the text of this agreement forces Microsoft to change its business practices and technical implementations in the least.''

MTC–00004623

From: Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:36am
Subject: Microsoft settlement must be amended.

To the U.S. DOJ et al:

Good morning. My name in Michael Mohr. I am writing to you today to share my opinion regarding the Microsoft antitrust

settlement. Having used PCs for almost a decade now, I am familiar with most Microsoft operating systems, including DOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 9X, and NT. After reading about the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the USDOJ, I am outraged that such nonsense could come about. Please read first my experiences as a Windows 98 user, and then my recommendations on what should be done.

After many years experimenting with various operating systems, including all of Microsoft's and quite a few unices, I have come to the conclusion that Windows 98 is the operating system that I must keep installed on my laptop. Note that I said must, not wish to. Go into any Staples, Office Depot, Circuit City, or Office Max and take a look at the software on the shelves. Look closely and you will see that all the software available runs solely under Microsoft's Windows operating system. You will not find software for Solaris, UNIX, BSD, Linux, QNX, or any other operating system. This also poses a problem in the arena of device drivers, which are often solely distributed for the Windows OS. This is a result of Microsoft's OS being bundled with almost all new computers sold today. Why is this so? Because Microsoft has more money and power than the other developers. It lets them freely violate the Sherman Antitrust Act without fear of reprecussion from the government, as shown by your settlement. It also lets them crush competetion before it has its legs under it, as shown by AOL's buyout of Netscape.

In addition to this, I have recently begun to notice strange things happening when I run Internet Explorer. It crashes 2 to 3 minutes after execution, without fail, every time. Now this wouldn't be so much of a problem for me, except that the browser is actually the operating system. Hence, when the browser crashes, the operating system crashes, often leading to a complete system freeze or a blue screen. This requires the computer to be shut down, power removed, and booted again.

Every 2 to 3 minutes. Imagine if your computer frize every 2 minutes at work and you lost all data you had input in that time. You would be pretty angry, wouldn't you? Moreover, you would be unable to get any work done at all. I have been forced to use Netscape Communicator to browse the web. At least when Netscape crashes (and it happens a lot less than Internet Explorer does), it doesn't crash the entire operating system.

Now take all of this and compare it to Linux. If an application fails, it can be easily terminated from a command prompt. If the graphical interface crashes (which happens QUITE infrequently), it can also be shut down and restarted from a command prompt. This is the result of a very smart group of people who designed the OS to be modular. If one part fails, all of the other parts are completely independant, and therefore a crashing browser will not take down the entire system. Try to find any Windows server with a continuous uptime of 6 years and you will be looking for the rest of your life. Anyhow, that ends my complaints against Microsoft (for now). Here are some suggestions that you may wish to consider when finalizing the settlement with MS.

(1) Anything that MS does which is intended to expand its monopoly MUST be offered as options which cost more money. In this way, a computer buyer who does not wish to purchase these options is not forced to do so.

(2) All distributors or vendors should be required to offer their new computers with a choice of non-Microsoft operating systems such as Linux, QNX, or nothing at all. In addition, these vendors must ship their computers with hardware which is compatible with all operating systems offered. For example, the notorious Lucent Winmodem should not be shipped with Compaq laptops because it was designed for use ONLY under Windows.

(3) Microsoft's present and future document formats should be made public so that other applications running on other operating systems are able to read and save into these formats.

(4) All Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet. Microsoft must not be allowed to extend its OS monopoly and other choices must be available to consumers, right there, on the front page. 100 percent compatibility for Linux should be offered in all desktops and notebooks.

Thank you for your time. I hope that you take my words into account when finalizing your judgements.

Michael Mohr

MTC–00004624

From: Jonathan Kingaby
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 4:56am
Subject: Public Feedback

I have been using Microsoft Products for over 10years and generally I think they are great.

However, a genius it does not take to realise that they have been up to some very suspect shenanigans since about 1990. I would not want to see them shutdown, split up or otherwise reduced since in many ways they are the engine room of the good ship IT economy. I would like to see a tougher stance taken though and a more punitive slap delivered.

Regards
Jonathan Kingaby
Development Manager
Elan Computing
Elan House
5–11 Fetter Lane
London
EC4A 1QX

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Elan. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients, any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing client engagement letter or contract. If you have received this email in error please notify the Elan Helpdesk by telephone on +44 (0) 20 7830 1542

MTC–00004625

From: Gerald S. Abreu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 7:23am
Subject: The Microsoft Case

As I see it competition would force Microsoft to improve the quality of its products in areas including but not limited to reliability and security. The settlement before the judge would benefit only Microsoft; a sterner settlement would benefit everybody. I think now is the time to move the world in the direction of open markets and opportunity in the field of personal computing.

Thank you and sincerely
Gerald S. Abreu
104 Linden Lane
Culloden, WV 25510

MTC–00004626

From: david javid
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 7:48am
Subject: COMMENT ON MICROSOFT AND DOJ SETTLEMENT

Hello,

I think it is a shame that Microsoft has to be punished for the good it has done to the public across the World. The World owes B.Gates for making computer technology available to all men and women, old and young, white and black, rich and poor, even in the remotest part of the World and in any language at an affordable price. More importantly, I admire Bill Gates for providing an environment in which every interested person or body can learn, educate and flourish in the field of computers and computing. This is in contrast to the behaviour of some other corporate operating in the high technology market and for some reason CISCO comes to my mind!!

Regards
David Javid

MTC–00004627

From: Aaron Katz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 8:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's

illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in any way compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate.

Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so.

Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.

Sincerely,
Aaron M. Katz
Beverly, MA 01915

MTC–00004628

From: Jeremey Wise
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 8:52am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

I am a Technical Computer Consultant for one of the world's largest computer resellers in the world. I have both an MCSE, CNE, and other certifications (tried for RHCE but failed on first try). I only say these things as examples that I understand the industry.

I have been following the MS antitrust case closely from the aspect of its direct impact on my wellbeing. I do believe that MS did and does still participate in very anti-competitive activities to the extent of falling under the auspices of antitrust. Yet, I do not believe it is the job of the government to break them up. I believe that free market will solve this issue in the long run. My concern, and why I am writing this letter, is that the proposed solution of having MS purchase hardware and provide the software for schools makes no sense. In all my years of consultation I have strived to help companies understand Total Cost of Ownership is the real gauge of a successful deployment. In the proposed settlement MS would not be helping the school systems in any way by adding there software to the settlement. Hardware is less than 1% of the total deployment and maintenance cost. Not to say this would not help out schools. If that is how the government wishes to punish MS, and MS is ok with that, then ok. But please asses the total cost long-term before letting them tack on the software pieces.

MS software like any software is a license that is essentially 'leased'. The end user must eventual upgrade to retain any level of support. MS also, to there credit, has built a structure that provides disincentive to its customers to retain older software via support, or integration of new software being contingent on upgrade of the old software infrastructures.

Synopsis: I believe that the hardware purchase aspect of the settlement, if agreed to by both sides (MS & DOJ) to be a viable one. The adding of software to the mix will, in the long run, cost the US Governement far more and to a large extent further expand the hold that MS will hold over the market sector, a market sector which is particularly sensitive to monetary constraints that would be enforced vi upgrade incentive build into MS marketing strategies (the upgrade concerns of the government are reflected in there maintaining a high amount of Macintosh systems in schools which have a very different software marketing strategy than MS). I am not objecting to MS holding a large sector of the market. Just that if the stated goal of MS is to demonstrate, via this act of donation, there intent to follow non anti-competitive strategies. Then they should be open to alternative solutions of software where the later upgrade fees are not a concern.

Jeremey Wise (MCSE,CNE,CSE)

MTC–00004629

From: SSchwartz@MICROS.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 8:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Renata B. Hesse Antitrust Division U.S. Department of Justice 601 D Street NW Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20530–0001 Under the Tunney Act, I wish to comment on the Microsoft settlement's inadequacy in improving the competitive environment in the software industry. Some serious shortcomings relate to: 1) Middleware: The current language in Section H.3 states ''Microsoft Middleware Product would be invoked solely for use in interoperating with a server maintained by Microsoft (outside the context of general Web browsing)'' does nothing to limit the company's ability to tie customers and restrict competition in non Web-based networked services under .NET, as they fall ''outside the context of general Web browsing''. Microsoft has already begun abusing its desktop monopoly to tie customers into .NET revenue streams and set up a new monopoly over the network.

Part 2 of the same section states ''that designated Non-Microsoft Middleware Product fails to implement a reasonable technical requirement...'' essentially gives Microsoft a veto over any competitor's product. They can simply claim it doesn't meet their ''technical requirements.''

2) Interoperability Under the definition of terms, '' 'Communications Protocol' means the set of rules for information exchange to accomplish predefined tasks between a Windows Operating System Product on a client computer and Windows 2000 Server or products marketed as its successors running on a server computer and connected via a local area network or a wide area network.'' This definition explicitly excludes the SMB/CIFS (Samba) protocol and all of the Microsoft RPC calls needed by any SMB/CIFS server to adequately interoperate with Windows 2000. Microsoft could claim these protocols are used by Windows 2000 server for remote administration and as such would not be required to be disclosed. The Samba team have written this up explicitly here: http://linuxtoday.com/news_story.php3?ltsn=2001–11–06–005–20-OP-MS

3) General veto on interoperability In section J., the document specifically protects Microsoft from having to ''document, disclose or license to third parties: (a) portions of APIs or Documentation or portions or layers of Communications Protocols the disclosure of which would compromise the security of anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption or authentication systems, including without limitation, keys, authorization tokens or enforcement criteria'' Since the .NET architecture being bundled into Windows essentially builds ''anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, and authentication systems'' into all levels of the operating system, ANY API, documentation, or communication layer can fall into this category. This means that Microsoft never has to disclose any API by

claiming it's part of a security or authorization system, giving them a complete veto over ALL disclosure.

4) Veto against Open Source Substantial amounts of the software that runs the Internet is ''Open Source'', which means it's developed on a non-commercial basis by nonprofit groups and volunteers. Examples include Apache, GNU/Linux, Samba, etc. Under section J.2.c., Microsoft does not need to make ANY API available to groups that fail to meet ''reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business.'' This explicitly gives them a veto over sharing any information with open source development projects as they are usually undertaken on a not-for-profit basis (and therefore would not be considered authentic, or viable businesses).

These concerns can be met in the following ways:

1) Middleware: Extend middleware interoperability with a Microsoft server to ALL contexts (both within general Web browsing as well as other networked services such as are those being included under .NET).

2) Interoperability: Require full disclosure of ALL protocols between client and Microsoft server (including remote administration calls)

3) General veto on interoperability: Require Microsoft to disclose APIs relating to ''anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption, or authentication systems'' to all.

4) Veto against Open Source: Forbid Microsoft from discriminating between for-profit and nonprofit groups in API disclosure.

Additionally,

5) Keep Microsoft out of the classroom. It is bad enough having to use their desolate software at work, don't force it onto children who are so malleable and may still have a chance to become creative and improve the world. Giving away antiquated software and hardware, which is what the $1,000,000,000.00 would be, becomes a tax write off. Make them purchase $1,000,000,000.00 worth of NEW, state of the art goods in the open market. What an economic stimulus that would be!!! And, make them provide services to set up and maintain the equipment, in addition to the $1,000,000,000.00 worth of goods.

Sincerely,

Stephen Schwartz

MTC–00004630

From: Schultz, Michael S
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 9:02am
Subject: Thoughts

Greetings,

My name is Michael Schultz, and I am an IT Professional working for Pfizer. After reading about the settlement, I was disappointed in the results. Microsoft has been using their heavy handed practices for years to gain an edge on the competition. However, they have also been an incredible boon to the digital community by bringing the computer to households much as TVs in the past. Their bad practices need to be curtailed, so other companies can compete, but you don't want to cut the legs out from under a company that has done so much in this field.

The settlement as I would have it:

1. MS must stop their heavy-handed practices against competitors. (If you can't beat em, buy em attitude, and forcing PC manufacturers to do ANYTHING other than install the OS)

2. MS can continue to offer their ''all-in-one'' package for their OS, but they must also offer a ''Lite'' version for those who want the OS, but not be forced to use anything else.

3. The losers from MS actions are the people. Because of this, I recommend that all fines against Microsoft go towards a commission to provide learning materials and computers to public schools.

I know it seems like a very simple solution, but it's all that we have been asking for. Stop MS from forcing things down our throat. Allow the competition room to enter the market...as competition makes BOTH parties better. And finally, fine MS enough for them to take notice, but not enough to injure the companies growth...putting this money toward something benificial to the people.

Heck, I'd have this whole thing over in a day!

Michael S. Schultz
SMS Consultant
(860) 441–1022
LEGAL NOTICE

Unless expressly stated otherwise, this message is confidential and may be privileged. It is intended for the addressee(s) only. Access to this E-mail by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not an addressee, any disclosure or copying of the contents of this E-mail or any action taken (or not taken) in reliance on it is unauthorized and may be unlawful. If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately.

MTC–00004631

From: Harry Hochheiser
To: Microsoft ATR,hsh@cs.umd.edu@inetgw
Date: 12/17/01 9:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust agreement is does not go far enough. By leaving the basic components of Microsoft's dominance in the PC operating system and office application markets untouched, this proposal does little, if anything at all, to enhance meaningful competition. This proposal should be replaced by a stronger settlement that opens the way for realistic opportunities for competition in desktop operating system and productivity software.

Microsoft's dominance in the OS market has led to a situation that is fraught with dangers for the computer-using public. The susceptibility of Windows machines to viruses points out the costs of a closed, vendor-driven operating system: substantial economic inconveniences caused by Code Red and related viruses are directly attributable to Microsoft design and marketing practices, and could easily have been avoided. Furthermore, operating costs due to reliability and usability problems of Microsoft software place a burden on businesses, schools, and government agencies that make substantial use of computers.

Microsoft's monopoly on the operating system and office applications has also led to a slowing in innovation: without meaningful competition, advances in application tools, interfaces, and reliability have slowed. New releases of Microsoft products appear to be driven by a desire to sell additional software licenses, rather than by any meaningful innovation. Microsoft products that are shipped bundled with new computers should be priced separately, to provide consumers with information necessary to make informed decisions about the costs of Microsoft products.

Any settlement should include provisions that would create the realistic possibility of a completely compatible alternative to Windows and the Office Suite. Specifically:

Operating systems API interfaces, file formats, network protocols, and other details should be published and freely available to any interested software developers. Provision of this information post-fact to commercial developers on a fee basis is insufficient. Substantial fees for access to this information would essentially close off the vital open-source community ,and delays in dissemination would significantly reduce the value of this information.

New versions of software should maintain compatibility with older Microsoft products and existing competitive products. In particular, Microsoft should be required to use file formats that are baked on community-supported consensus and widespread publication.

Microsoft products must respect ongoing standards efforts and refrain from using extensions that place competitors at significant disadvantages. Microsoft-specific extensions HTML tags that go beyond accepted standards of the World Wide Web Consortium have made use of Netscape Navigator increasingly difficult. Where standards such as HTML exist, Microsoft should be required to adhere to standards as published.

Microsoft and its supporters can be expected to argue that these measures would raise the cost of innovation and stifle advances in the state of the art. The recent history of the computer industry does not support this view. Efforts such as SMTP and POP3 protocols for Internet mail, the World wide web, and Linux have proven the ability of open standards and common shared platforms to foster development of software that innovates and provides value to end users. The Microsoft settlement must be strengthened to achieve these goals.

Harry Hochheiserhsh@cs.umd.edu

Human-Computer Interaction Lab, University of Maryland

Director-at-Large, Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility

http://www.cs.umd.edu/~hsh http:/www.cpsr.org

(Affiliations provided for identification purposes only. I do not speak for either U. Md. or CPSR)

MTC–00004633

From: Daniel Mann—Centreville KW164
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 12/17/01 9:26am
Subject: The Proposed Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am 21 years old. I'm about to graduate from college, and I have grown up with computers. In school, I have used mostly Macs, and in work, I use windows machines exclusively. That is to say I have extensive experience on both platforms. I think that the proposed settlement is a joke. Not only does it excuse the findings of fact and the verdict of the court, but also the settlement offers a public relations coup by allowing Microsoft to ''donate'' 500 million dollars of their own products. This costs them very much less than they propose. The duplication of software is very inexpensive. In a year, nobody will remember that it was due to an antitrust conviction that the software was even donated. I feel that the punishment necessary is far greater than what is being offered. If Microsoft cannot be split, then I urge you to open the windows source code, offer unbundled versions of software, require full java support as a standard feature, and require development and production of office and internet explorer software for all competing platforms. Additionally, strict fines should be imposed. Perhaps half of the damages, or roughly 6 Billion dollars could be a more equitable compromise. Thank you for your time.

Daniel Mann
MCA
Keller Williams Realty
Centreville, VA
P: (703) 815.5700 F:(703) 815.5707

MTC–00004635

From: IAMDMANN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:27am
Subject: settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am 21 years old. I'm about to graduate from college, and I have grown up with computers. In school, I have used mostly Macs, and in work, I use windows machines exclusively. That is to say I have extensive experience on both platforms. I think that the proposed settlement is a joke. Not only does it excuse the findings of fact and the verdict of the court, but also the settlement offers a public relations coup by allowing Microsoft to ''donate'' 500 million dollars of their own products. This costs them very much less than they propose. The duplication of software is very inexpensive. In a year, nobody will remember that it was due to an antitrust conviction that the software was even donated. I feel that the punishment necessary is far greater than what is being offered. If Microsoft cannot be split, then I urge you to open the windows source code, offer unbundled versions of software, require full java support as a standard feature, and require development and production of office and internet explorer software for all competing platforms. Additionally, strict fines should be imposed. Perhaps half of the damages, or roughly 6 Billion dollars could be a more equitable compromise. Thank you for your time.

Daniel Mann

MTC–00004636

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——Original Message——
From: ''Herb Himmelfarb'' <himby@open.org>
To: ''Himmelfarb, Cyn & Herb'' <himby@open.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 3:15 PM
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi, The proposed settlement in the anti-trust case against the Microsoft Corporation appears to me to be too lenient. In my opinion, this corporation has engaged in restraint of trade to an alarming degree. Rather than bore you with information you already have, I request that more severe penalties be imposed upon Microsoft.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Herbert S. Himmelfarb
615 19 Street NE
Salem, OR 97301–2713
503.375.2934
himby@open.org

MTC–00004639

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——Original Message——
From: ''Blaize Clement'' <blaizec@home.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:54 PM
Subject: Microsoft

Just one example of how Microsoft has an unfair advantage is that as a freelance writer, I am not able to submit work to many publications or internet sites because I use a Mac. I should not be forced to use a Windows-based program to sell my work when I prefer the more efficient Apple system. Please don't let Microsoft control my personal choice and that of a lot of other writers.

Thank you,
Blaize Clement

MTC–00004641

From: DArmour@weatrust.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:35am
Subject: Opposed to the Settlement

To Whom It May Concern

As a computer profesional and avid user of computers I oppose the proposed Microsoft settlement. Microsoft's efforts have damaged the creativity and vitality of the American software industry. A broad industry with multiple players will produce higher quality software that will more directly benefit the consumer and American businesses. There is no evidence to suggest that Microsoft's practices of bundling software have offered consumers any advantage. The quality of their software has cost consumers and business large sums of money. The constant upgrade cycles have promoted their bottom end, but have not drastically improved or changed the computing experience. Since 1995 there have been at least 6 Microsoft OS upgrades. Four of them have been of equal quality and problems which have been sited as reasons for upgrading namely stability and usability. The user interface of OS have not changed substantially since 1984 when Apple introduced the Macintosh.

If the government does not take an extremely active role in the the punishment of Microsoft they will cause the software industry to irreparably damaged. In the long run this will hurt America and American interests. Without competition there is no true progress. In this case, there is already insufficient competition, to promote true advantages and benefit to the consumer. Please re-think this settlement and attempt a more comprehensive and restricive solution.

Sincerely
David Armour

MTC–00004643

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:37am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——Original Message ——
From: ''Gordon Krum'' <gkrum@appletserve.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2001 12:48 PM
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Greetings,

As a programmer who specializes in educational projects I can tell you from personal experience that the way Microsoft conducts business has held back the usefulness of computers to education at all levels. Schools just can't cope with the additional expenses generated by Microsoft's attempts to own the world. The losers here are our kids and therefore our society. Allowing Microsoft to buy their way out by giving schools hardware and software will only increase the problem by further limiting competition. Instead, and at least, make them give the thing the value most COLD HARD CASH and let the schools decide how to spend it without restrictions of any kind.

Some excuse Microsoft by saying that they are just good technology manipulators. So were the robber barons of almost a century ago. Through new technology they then and Microsoft now manipulated, circumvented, squashed and laid waste the honest well intentioned efforts of many people all in the name of filling their own wallets. If what the robber barons did was criminal then what Microsoft is doing is criminal.

Having lived and worked in the silicon valley I know that there are thousands of Gates want to be's. How this settlement goes down sends a message to the entire industry about what behaviors will or will not be tolerated.

Please make it a RESOUNDING message!
Gordon Krum, programmer
gkrum@appletserve.com
4151 Olive Hill Rd.
Fallbrook, Ca 92028

MTC–00004644

From: DArmour@weatrust.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern

As a computer profesional and avid user of computers I oppose the proposed Microsoft settlement. Microsoft's efforts have damaged

the creativity and vitality of the American software industry. A broad industry with multiple players will produce higher quality software that will more directly benefit the consumer and American businesses. There is no evidence to suggest that Microsoft's practices of bundling software have offered consumers any advantage. The quality of their software has cost consumers and business large sums of money. The constant upgrade cycles have promoted their bottom end, but have not drastically improved or changed the computing experience. Since 1995 there have been at least 6 Microsoft OS upgrades. Four of them have been of equal quality and problems which have been sited as reasons for upgrading namely stability and usability. The user interface of OS have not changed substantially since 1984 when Apple introduced the Macintosh.

If the government does not take an extremely active role in the the punishment of Microsoft they will cause the software industry to irreparably damaged. In the long run this will hurt America and American interests. Without competition there is no true progress. In this case, there is already insufficient competition, to promote true advantages and benefit to the consumer. Please re-think this settlement and attempt a more comprehensive and restricive solution.

Sincerely
David Armour

MTC–00004645

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Original Message
From: ''Wilner, Richard A.'' <WILNERI@mail.northgrum.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 10:22 AM
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I am very disappointed with the Feds settlement.

Microsoft has been getting away with activities like this for years. From stealing the operating system from the Macintosh to pulling the rug out from under developers that were developing applications for OS/2, to taking control of the internet with their browser. With money brings power and they have much to much power. They wiped out Netscape by offering their browser for free and putting it on every PC that was sold

Richard Wilner
Command Media
AEW & EW Systems
Phone (516) 575–0997
Fax (516) 346–2577
email:
richard_wilner@mail.northgrum.com

MTC–00004646

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Original Message
From: ''JLilly'' <john@corpgraphics.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 10:34 AM
Subject: Microsoft settlement offer perpetuates the monopoly

Dear Sir,

The proposed settlement by Microsoft to supply schools with computers and software does nothing but further entrench their monopoly. In fact, it leverages their share into one of the last markets where there is still real choice; education.

Instead of letting Microsoft dump their software into the nations schools, I suggest having Microsoft pay that same amount in cash, perhaps for a ''technology'' earmarked fund, and let the schools choose what they want to do with it. If they choose Microsoft, more power to them. If they continue to use Macs, that's fine too. At least they will have a choice, and they won't have the monopoly hoisted onto them under the false pretense of a ''gift.''

John Lilly

MTC–00004647

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Original Message
From: ''Marcus Nelson'' <Marcus.Nelson@Dobson.net>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 10:37 AM
Subject: Microsoft

Please do not let Microsoft get away with this. When I first got into computing fifteen years ago, there were several multi-media and office solutions. Prices were competitive and acceptable (around $150 or so), now it's almost $600 for the professional version. The fact is, it is in my best interest to have to use their proprietary solutions to work with their other products. How much longer will it be before this will be a requirement?

When a company gets as big as MS, it is very easy for them to either steal another smaller companies intellectual property, knowing their own lawyers are stronger and can drag it out until the smaller company has to cave in. Or they can just buy the company out and bury it. This is not innovation. It's tyrant bully-ism at it's finest. No company can compete against this.

Please consider cafefully the judgements placed upon MS. They do not deserve to get off easily. If they do, we'll be right back here again in a couple of years.

Regards,
Marcus Nelson
CELLULARONE
Regional IS Coordinator
Wisconsin/Michigan 1
5000 Stewart Avenue
Wausau, WI 54401
Cellular (715) 571–0051
Fax (715) 551–2300
Office (715) 551–2554
marcus.nelson@dobson.net

MTC–00004648

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Original Message
From: ''Tony Palumbo'' <tpalumbo@netcsi.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 1:44 PM
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern...

I have just finished reading an article about the proposed Microsoft settlement and can only shake my head in disbelief. While I agree that severe penalties are in order, the form of this settlement will only further establish the monopolistic behavior that MS already enjoys.

YES ... forcing them to spend $1 billion on the poorest school districts is a wonderful idea and I applaud the effort. Unfortunately, this also helps the Microsoft WinTel cartel into a more dominant position. Wasn't this entire case about CHOICE

A better idea would be to force Microsoft to outfit these schools with software/hardware solutions from its competitors (Apple, Linux, Sun)

This settlement is neither in the interest of consumers who will further have their ability of choice eroded, nor those business and their employees who will be forced out of business as MS is allowed to play the same games it has since its inception.

Thank you for your consideration
Anthony J. Palumbo
80 Ridge Road
Hackettstown, NJ 07840

MTC–00004649

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
——- Original Message ——-
From: ''Ken'' <macessen@accountmaster.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 12:26 PM
Subject: Anti-Trust Settlement

The proposed settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft is weak, will not stop future abuses, and does not protect consumers. This settlement favors Microsoft to such a degree that it would appear that Microsofts donations to the Republican party and the Bush presidential campaign were a quid pro quo, and this directly affected the course of the Justice Department in settling the case. As a consumer, I find it incredible that the defendant in this case has gotten so much influence regarding the nature of the punishment. This is not justice and its not a remedy for proven anti-trust violations.

The settlement does not address unfair advantages Microsoft has gained using illegal behavior. Companies have been destroyed, not though fair competition, but rather by Microsofts monopoly tactics to maintain and increase their market share. For all practical purposes, there is no longer any competition in the browser market. Microsofts competitors have been harmed and many companies completely destroyed.

The proposed restrictions will not prevent further abuses. Just look at the features that Microsoft has bundled, or in some cases excluded, in its new Windows XP just

released in October of 2001. It was proven in the anti-trust trial that Microsoft attempted to coerce, bully, and illegally obtain and maintain a monopoly with multimedia application technology to the detriment of Real Media, Apple Computer, and others. They include their own multimedia player and exclude other similar products from other companies. By removing support and making it difficult for consumers to add competing products that are often superior to Microsofts bundled products, consumers have been harmed.

They have removed support for Java from Windows XP which will disrupt e-commerce and Java based applications delivered over the Internet. This has harmed Sun and other companies that have invested heavily in Java based technology that Microsoft considers a threat to their monopoly. Microsoft has modified their version of another technology, JavaScript, the programming language for Web browsers. These changes to Microsofts implementation of JavaScript are intended to hijack the previous JavaScript standard and make it their own. As a result, only Microsoft Web browsers will handle this new standard properly. The examples go on and on. Consumers have been and continue to be harmed.

The proposed 3 member panel that will oversee Microsoft will likely be biased in favor of Microsoft, or at the very least, not fair in protecting consumers. With one member chosen by Microsoft, one chosen by the Justice Department, and the third chosen by these two members, the judgment of the panel will be questionable. With their oversight activities done in secret and their salaries paid by Microsoft, it looks like the fix was in and Microsoft won.

Ken Goff
422 5th Street SE
Watertown, SD 57201
(605) 882–1917

MTC–00004653

From: Chris Lee
To: Microsoft ATR,antitrust@usdoj.gov@inetgw
Date: 12/17/01 9:50am
Subject: MS is found GUILTY and gets away w/''MURDER''!

BAD SETTLEMENTS WILL LEAD TO FURTHER COURT ACTIONS, WHICH MEANS MORE RESOURCES AND MONEY WILL BE EXPENDED IN THE FUTURE TO CORRECT THE CURRENT MISTAKE!!!! HOW CAN MS WIN WHEN IT LOST THE TRIAL AND THE APPEAL??????

December 17, 2001

For Microsoft, a Season of Triumph

By STEVE LOHR

or most technology companies, the fall of 2001 was a season to forget, with its deepening sales slump, losses and layoffs. But for Microsoft (news/quote), it was a time of triumph, even some vindication. In the federal antitrust case that Microsoft fought so long, with so little success, things turned in the company's favor when the Bush administration decided to settle in November.

Within weeks, Microsoft announced a settlement with plaintiffs in more than 100 private class-action antitrust suits. To be sure, protests remain. Some states that sued Microsoft are urging a federal judge to toughen provisions of the settlement with the Justice Department, and there are objections to the class-action deal. A European investigation also continues, although Microsoft says it wants to settle that case as well. In all, however, Microsoft has made rapid, dramatic strides toward finally putting its antitrust troubles behind it.

The proposed settlement in the crucial federal case is widely seen as a Microsoft victory. It would not restrict the company's product designs, allowing Microsoft to fold software into its Windows operating system for potentially huge new markets, including online shopping, personal identification and downloading music and movies over the Internet. Those features are found in the recently released Windows XP.

And the drastic sanction of splitting Microsoft up the remedy championed by the Clinton administration, and approved by a lower court judge, but regarded quite skeptically in a federal appeals court ruling in June was rejected by the Bush administration.

But the settlement terms do require Microsoft to share technical information with competitors and industry partners more openly. In addition, Microsoft would be prohibited from bullying other companies with anticompetitive contracts.

Some Microsoft rivals and industry commentators argue that the case could do a lot to encourage competition, by forcing Microsoft to change its corporate behavior.

Microsoft's legal team is certainly echoing the behavioral theme. ''The client has learned a lot through all this,'' said William H. Neukom, the tall, silver-haired general counsel and legal field general in Microsoft's antitrust battles.

Mr. Neukom, 60, is stepping down next year, and his designated successor, Bradley P. Smith, suggested that priorities for Microsoft would be to establish a ''strong track record of compliance'' with the settlement order and to ''strengthen our ties with the rest of the industry.''

But legal pressure is not the only thing forcing Microsoft to change. Technology trends notably the spread of Internet technology are equally responsible.

Over all, investment in technology may have slowed, but Bill Gates, the Microsoft chairman, believes that some cooling off may be healthy. With the get-rich-instantly mentality of the dot-com bubble gone, Mr. Gates said, chatting with journalists in October, ''I think the environment for doing major research and development real innovation is better now than it was before.'' Certainly it is for Microsoft, which is sitting on $36 billion in cash.

Microsoft is putting some of its capital to work by investing heavily in the development of ''Web services,'' mainly clever software sent over the Internet to automate all kinds of business and personal tasks. A company's data will be linked with a supplier's to replenish needed parts automatically, for example. Or a person's scheduling data, stored on a PC or hand-held computer, will interact with the dentist's data to set up an appointment or with an airline to arrange travel.

To realize these goals will require open communications in software, which raises privacy and security issues that must be resolved. The move will also require businesses to form partnerships and trusted relationships with other companies. This will mean a change of many corporate cultures, including Microsoft's.

Consequently, over the next several years, it will be very difficult to determine the legacy of Microsoft's antitrust conflicts, because so many other forces will also be shaping the company and the industry.

MTC–00004654

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01–9:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——- Original Message ——-
From: ''Stephanie Santmyers'' <ssantmyers@triad.rr.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2001 6:49 PM
Subject: microsoft settlement—No

If Microsoft wants to give schools a billion it must be in cash. Poor schools need books, supplies, and breakfast programs for students not computers. Microsoft wants to make good little consumer Microsurfs.

Stephanie Santmyers

MTC–00004658

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01–9:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——- Original Message ——-
From: ''Don Adams'' <dadams@vallnet.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu> Sent: Thursday, November 22, 2001 10:07 AM
Subject: MS antitrust

I can't believe Microsoft is getting off so easy. After reading an superior article in Wired magazine I believe MS should be severely punished or it will continue it's anti competitive behaviors. Only the government can protect consumers from a giant like MS.

Don Adams

MTC–00004659

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01–10:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

——- Original Message ——-
From: ''Doug Walker'' <dwal@mac.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu> Sent: Friday, November 23, 2001 6:48 PM
Subject: Unhappy with federal settlement

I am very unhappy with the Federal government's settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. Microsoft broke the law! The punishment is far too mild. Furthermore something needs to be do to prevent Microsoft from continuing these violations. It appears our government has failed to do its job.

I am very happy the West Virginia Attorney General did not join the Federal government's settlement. Keep up the good work. I am in support of your decision.

Doug Walker
2743 Blackburn Drive
Davis, CA 95616

MTC–00004660

From: JOHN BONANNO
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 10:04am
Subject: Microsoft again!!!

''I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

''I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate. ''Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

''Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so. ''Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.''

Ditto JOHN BONANNO
J.S. Bonanno Inc.

MTC–00004667

From: Peter Ekstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 10:19am
Subject: anti-trust penalties

''I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

''I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate.

''Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

''Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so.

''Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.''

Peter Ekstein
Miami, Florida

MTC–00004668

From: Matt Brittenham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 10:21am
Subject: Don't let Microsoft off so easy

I'm sure you're aware of the facts and Microsoft's history with regard to the previous consent decree in 1995. I'm also sure you will have plenty of other correspondence to sift through on this subject. so I won't bore you by trying to support or argue my opinion, but merely offer the opinion that the proposed settlement is a terrible idea. If it is to be a penalty make it hurt, if it is to be a protection, at least make it something that protects other software companies in some way. The proposed settlement neither

punishes nor protects, and at worst it could further embed Microsoft's monopoly into the Education market.

Sincerely,
Matt Brittenham

MTC–00004673

From: Alex
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 10:37am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

These are not my own words but I am in full agreement.

Alex Castillo
214 Lynnhurst Dr.
Ormond, Fl 32176

''I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows T 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

''I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate.

''Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement. ''Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so.

''Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.''

Thank you

MTC–00004674

From: james stanley
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 10:43am
Subject: My Feedback

Stop wasting tax dollars and leave Microsoft alone. Give them the $1B education settlement and move on.

James T. Stanley
Technical Product Manager
Powerway, Inc.
(317) 915–6140

MTC–00004675

From: Steve Watkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 11:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to express my opposition to the proposed settlement in the Microsoft aantitrust case. I have served as a Director of Information Technology for over 10 years and am also an attorney. This settlement does not address the fundamental issue of Microsoft's illegal monopoly. Through the years, Microsoft has stifled superior products, such as Corel WordPerfect Office, the Macintosh OS, and Novell NetWare, to name a few. Microsoft has stifled these products and sought to force consumers to use its own inferior versions of these products through heavy-handed tactics and leverage of its illegal monopoly. The only way to prevent expansion of Microsoft's monopoly and hopefully reverse it is to break the company up into smaller companies and I urge the Court to reject the current settlement proposal.

Steve Watkins
590 Kirkwood Dr.
London, KY 40744

MTC–00004676

From: Patton, Simeon
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 11:29am
Subject: Settlement

it would not serve the children of poor neighbor hoods to be subjected to the microsoft control. It is a great jester for them to provide computers to all these schools but that cost absolutely nothing it's a tax write off(big penalty there). Further more at the end of this school computer deal, will we the tax payer before to pay MS more for new license fees on each of the computer(I don't think so) what a deal give computer and software away get tax break then charge them back for licenses and hardware upgrade and not only do we make money but we further our dominance in the computer business. WOW that was will thought out. on top of that we'll be getting all of the youngest minds drugged into the MS cartel, forever a junkie to a bad drug. This is not a punishment the selling of the American youths to corporate America.

Please do not make the children suffer just to bring a end to this.

MTC–00004677

From: caezar5
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 11:50am
Subject: comments

I am a student at Mechanicville High School, in New York. For my 12th grade English term paper, I will be writing about why Microsoft is a monopoly. I would like to ask you one question. Why do you think Microsoft is a monopoly?

MTC–00004678

From: Tim Breaux
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:05pm
Subject: Comments on the Microsoft penalty

Gentlemen—

I was more than shocked to note that the penalty phase of the Microsoft anti-trust trial did not actually apply any penalties after the court confirmed that the anti trust infraction had occurred in fact. Microsoft has always manufactured inferior products (with only one historical exception) and bludgeoned their competitors through intimidation and through extending their operating system monopoly to other services. Microsoft (according to the court) maintained their operating system monopoly. I certainly agree with this finding. Their ensuing success with Microsoft Office and Internet explorer was based ONLY on the pre-existing power of their operating system monopoly and not on the strength of the products. Microsoft's tactics has generally been to release inferior products, give them away as part of a ''deal'' with the operating system, get them entrenched, and then slowly upgrade quality. This give Microsoft years to complete development of a product, where competitors need to create a great one out of the gate, and then maintain superior function in perpetuity.

The only product that Microsoft ever introduced that was a credible competitor to its peers (at introduction) was Excel. Excel was introduced in the late 1980s and was superior to the entrenched competitor (Lotus 1–2–3) but (humorously) did not run on Windows because Windows was not yet capable enough. Excel was introduced on the Macintosh. Hmmm. I wonder where Microsoft got the display ideas to make Excel function on Windows? Microsoft deserves to incur a real penalty. The penalty should include:

1) Pricing of the MS operating systems must be separate from the purchase of a PC. That would let competitors actually compete. Even on price. Imagine that.

2) Microsoft must publish of file standards for all Microsoft application products, particularly Microsoft Office products. That way, competitors with better products could displace them

3) Microsoft should be precluded from using any API (application programming interface) to Windows that they have not published. That way, others could use their monopoly as well as they do. Microsoft would still have a timing advantage, as they would always help themselves first (that is they would release their APIs internally before they would externally) but Microsoft actually is not that strong at development, so they would still lose some market share over this.

4) Any network protocol that Microsoft releases should be approved by an independent protocol committee, to preclude Microsoft from using its existing monopoly base to supplant the heterogeneity of the internet.

I am happy to discuss this further.

TSB

Tim Breaux

Chief Executive Officer

Full Market Value, Inc.

''The Multiple Listing Service of Excess Computer Equipment''?

Phone 503.221.7800

Fax 503.221.7820

tim.breaux@fullmarketvalue.com

FullMarketValue.com

MTC–00004679

From: RasselArt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am deeply disappointed by the current settlement proposals. Microsoft is a twice convicted monopolist and is getting away with a slap on the wrists. I am a graphic artist that has been using computers for 16 plus years. Being a graphic artist, most of my computer use has been based on Apple's Macintosh platform, but I have used others, including Microsoft Windows. As a consumer, over the years I have witnessed Microsoft Corporations very aggressive behavior. I am no lawyer, but I consider some of the following to be anticompetitive, monopolistic behavior.

Years ago I used a software program that was first marketed by the former Aldus Corporation—Aldus Persuasion. Persuasion became an Adobe product after Aldus was purchased by Adobe. Persuasion was a presentation graphics program. Persuasion was considered by myself and others to be a much superior program to Microsoft's PowerPoint. Adobe, for whatever reason, decided to stop marketing Persuasion not long after Microsoft starting bundling PowerPoint for free with their Office suite of products. Coincidence?

Perhaps, but how could Adobe compete in a marketspace where the competition gives their product away to gain market share? Now, I and everyone I work with uses PowerPoint. It has become the defacto standard for electronic presentations because it was bundled with Microsoft Office.

I have also witnessed two occasions, where in my opinion, Microsoft has made financial investments in their competitors to keep them in business: My first example is Apple Computer, the only company with an operating system that can even be considered competition for Microsoft's Windows. Apple computer was in grave financial health and Microsoft made a $150 million dollar investment and a five year software commitment. I think most people in the industry would agree that Microsoft's commitments saved Apple Computer from going out of business.

My second example is Corel Corporation. Corel is the maker of a suite of office products that are the only software programs that can be considered competition to Microsoft's Office software. Microsoft made another huge financial investment to keep Corel from going out of business. This time though, the investment raised so many eyebrows that Microsoft had to withdraw their name and the strings attached to the investment, yet leaving Corel with the financial investment to keep the company viable.

In my opinion, Microsoft's own monopolistic behavior has forced them to invest in their competitors to keep them from going out of business. The investments sustain Microsoft's only viable competitors. If that isn't evidence of total and complete control of a marketspace, I don't know what is.

Sincerely,

Steve Rassel

338 Edgewater Road

Sheboygan, WI 53081

Rasselart@aol.com

V 920.459.8375

F 920.459.9655

MTC–00004680

From: Robert Burcham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is foolhardy to believe that a monopoly such as Microsoft will ever play fair. They will not. They are a bigger monopolistic force in their industries than Bell ever was, and yet there seems to be a magic new standard applied to this case.

The company should be broken up. It is a crime against the future if they are not.

And for God's sake, why would you ever want to ''punish'' a monopoly by giving them NEW CUSTOMERS? If MS is allowed to ''donate'' software to America's schools, what boat will those schools be in 5 years from now? We will be able to simply chalk them up as the latest group of consumers stripped of choice and indentured to MS unchecked illegal business practices.

MTC–00004681

From: Smith Eric D Contr ASC/YSXI
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Please insist on another look at the Microsoft case. Microsoft has consistently used illegal (much of their technology was openly stolen) and unfair tactics (antitrust prctices) to propagate mediocre software. They consistently ignore international software standards so that their software forces users to use MS software for something which should have been done using existing international standards. Worse yet, they force users to upgrade to newer versions of existing MS software (for example, they force the latest version of their browser just to display help pages in a nonstandard HTML format). Perhaps more importantly for the governement, the software they produce is riddled with huge, undocumented security holes. Their web server (IIS) alone has been known to have almost daily security fixes released. Almost all the viruses have beeen aimed at known security vulnerabilities in MS products such as OutLook, Exchange, IIS, etc.

1. The proposed settlement should be tossed.

2. Various agencies of the US government should be ENCOURAGED to use standard ''Open Source'' software where possible.

—Occurance of viruses would be reduced to near nonexistant.

—Using the Apache web server (most popular in the world) would save billions by providing for a more stable and secure web server environment. Almost all web server targeted viruses would be eliminated.

—Using Open Office, www.openoffice.org (or the slightly enhanced Star Office), instead of MS Office would save hundreds of billions of dollars just in the DoD and would eliminate most of the viruses aimed at MS Office.

—Using the more stable Linux operating system accross the DoD would save hundreds of billions of dollars in software purchases and licensing. It would also eliminate virtually all major viruses.

3. Please encourage the Justic Dept to enforce antitrust laws.

Thank you for your continued hard work,

Eric Damon Smith

MTC–00004682

From: McCay, Joseph
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 12:43pm
Subject: The Microsoft Case.

I believe the current proposed solution does nothing to stop Microsoft's behavior. Even during the court case, Microsoft has continued the practices of pushing there monopoly. They have been slapping the court in the face. Recent examples of this would be Windows XP. Windows XP includes the MSN (Microsoft's equivalent to AOL) built into the operating system. They

are trying to force AOL, Prodigy, et. al. out of business with the same tactics that have been ruled a violation of the Antitrust clause. They continually show complete disregard for the courts of the United State of America and the people prosecuting them. If you take a closer look at Windows XP, I am sure you will find many problems. Please reconsider you stance against Microsoft and move forward with harsher penalties that will actually force Microsoft to change their ways.

Microsoft is stifling innovation. They have never really been innovative. They only ''borrow'' open source code that doesn't require changes that are made to be open source too (BSD style licenses), and they ''embrace and extend'' open standards to prevent a standard from gaining any momentum. The embrace the standard, and then they add proprietary technology that only they can use. I am sure you will find more if you start looking.

Thank you for your time.

Joseph L. McCay

MTC–00004683

From: Lawrence D.W. Graves
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:30pm
Subject: comments on US v. Microsoft settlement

This e-mail is to communicate my strong opposition to the terms of the proposed settlement.

Let me state at the outset that I support government intervention in commercial spheres only within the exercise of its constitutionally-granted powers, and then only when market forces will not remedy the perceived problem. Further, I generally believe that not all monopolistic competition is bad, as there are many industries in which the traditional economic model with its ''dead weight loss'' is simplistic and ignores the benefits of reinvestment of the monopolistic prices in a manner that shifts the supply curve downward (the Schumpeter analysis). In short, please accept that I am a very reluctant advocate of government action in the anti-trust arena. Nevertheless, the Microsoft case is one where I feel that government intervention is not only appropriate now, but actually is long overdue.

Microsoft is a company that has achieved and perpetuated its market dominance by various unfair means, only a few of which were brought into issue and proven in the present case. Moreover, Microsoft shows absolutely no sign of changing its ways. If ever there were a case where structural relief was warranted, this is it.

I was dismayed at the judgment of Judge Jackson when he prescribed structural relief, but not in the way that Microsoft was: breaking the company into only two pieces (without soliciting the input of experts on this point) is clearly inadequate. The Microsoft juggernaut was able to succeed largely as a result of improperly exerting its control over one part of the software market (operating systems) and leveraging this into others (e.g., internet browsers, office suites). On the facts known to the industry, I would suggest a break-up into at least the following: (1) consumer operating systems, (2) corporate/server operating systems, (3) consumer applications, (4) corporate applications, (5) internet-related applications and services. With a prohibition against preferential treatment by and for any other companies spun out in the break-up, this would allow each of the new companies to act in an independently-rational way, rather than as now (where, for example, the MS Office suite is not ported to run on Linux, despite the clear market for it).

The proposed settlement does little to address the company's past misbehavior, and puts all of its past conduct out of the reach of future enforcement. Failing to pursue, now and to the utmost, the government's remedies will effectively immunize Microsoft against governmental sanction for any misbehavior for the next decade. I cannot imagine a worse result to consumers in the computer industry.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding any of the foregoing comments.

LDWG
Lawrence D.W. Graves
Graves@Ent-Atty.com
Fierst & Pucci LLP
(413) 584–8067
64 Gothic Street
(413) 585–0787 (FAX)
Northampton, MA 01060
PGP key at pgp.com

MTC–00004684

From: Caveman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust Case

As a long time computer user, and now, a software quality engineer at the Checkfree Corp, I would like to give a few thoughts on what judgements should be given to Microsoft in the Anti-trust settlement and the technical elements of such a settlement.

First, I believe it is important for Microsoft to remain intact, as one company. Microsoft has been an industry leader, and it would not benefit the computer industry, or Microsoft's ability to deliver its product, by breaking up the company.

Next, it is very important that Microsoft be reigned in with regards to its licensing and fees policies that currently are in place. Because of its sheer size and familiarity in the marketplace, Microsoft has been able to provide computer makers with deep discount prices on their software, but then they turn around and make end-users pay very high fees for access to the software. This creates a problem, because for the computer makers who do not have much of an interest in how their customers actually use the computer, so in almost all cases they will pick the cheapest operating software to package with their computer so that the customer can use the hardware that they make. Because Microsoft's software is therefore so well distributed, the end user is forced into a relationship where the middleman (the computer manufacturers) get what they want, Microsoft gets what they want (high licencing fees), but the end user doesn't get what they want (effective product support and low costs). Because their are really two products involved, software and hardware, a lack of accountability is also introduced since Microsoft can blame the hardware companies, and the harware companies can blame Microsoft when something is defective for the end user. And the end user has no recourse to determine the exact party at fault, because they need to pay ridiculously high licensing costs to Microsoft to determine how the software code is using the hardware. Think of the Firestone/Ford Explorer tire blame game that is still going on, which hasn't benefitted the consumer at all.

Lastly, I believe that an Operating System, such as Microsoft's recently release WindowsXP need only to provide the necessary protocols and low level functions to run the computer hardware. All other software that Microsoft packages with their current operating systems software is superfalous. OfficeXP, Outlook, Internet Explorer, etc. all have been woven so closely with the Operating System software so as to close out other software companies attempting to build equivalent alternatives. This is not needed. I have no problem with Microsoft developing protocols to run extra software packages such as these more efficiently than their competitors software, but to exclude access to these operating system protocols so that a competitor is intentionally hindered in making the most efficient use of the Operating System is wrong. This is an attempt to increase market share—only—using monopolistic tactics, and does not allow creativity or competition in the marketplace.

MTC–00004685

From: Chris KeepsSecrets
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to voice my opinion in the matter of United States v. Microsoft. I believe that it will be inherently impossible for Microsoft to remain in it's current state and not be considered a monopoly. As long as Microsoft is allowed to coordinate their operating systems Division and Software departments in coordination, the consumer will lose out. Microsoft has shown in OS's such as Windows XP that they are willing to sacrifice user security in order to advance initiatives such as Microsoft Passport and .NET. I believe the only remedy to the current situation is to create 2 separate entities to handle software and operating systems. I must strongly object to the regulations in this settlement and ask for a new set of guidelines Thank you for your time.

Chris Bradshaw
Columbia Missouri

MTC–00004686

From: andrew.cook@mail.sprint.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to add my voice to the dissenting states who desire to tie Microsoft compliance to source-code publishing. Microsoft has a track record of finding loopholes in consent decrees, and the less that is left to interpretation the better. Please give this decree teeth, but also keep the

constraints within reason so Microsoft will stop trying to win via courts and marketing and go back to software development.

Regards,

Andrew Cook—Senior Network Engineer
Sprint LTD—Advanced Network Services
Tallahassee, Florida
PH: (850)847–0457
FX: (850)656–6133
E-Mail: andrew.cook@mail.sprint.com

MTC–00004687

From: Jason A. Bubenicek
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 1:07pm
Subject: A Simple Solution the Microsoft Fine

Hi,

Microsoft should have to pay the $1,000,000 in cash. The money should go a special school technology committee. This committee will take requests for technology from all IT departments at the nations ''poorest schools''.

All the requests should be tallied, the best ideas win. Emphasis should be placed on shared/networked technology. A community should be created that schools can connect to and share information. That should be one of the biggest points.

The system should only use technology that is standards based (XML, HTTP, HTML, SOAP, SMTP, SQL Databases, etc.) Once this system is developed, the money should be evenly divided between the schools to purchase whatever hardware and software they choose. The only stipulation is that whatever they purchase will have to connect to this standards based network system that has been created.

Each school's IT manager would then petition all the major hardware/software vendors for bids on the system they want to setup.

All the above should foster competition, reliance on standards based systems, a connected/shared environment, use of the private market to get the best price and above all a rich set of tools for the education of our students.

Jason Bubenicek

MTC–00004688

From: Scott Purl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

1. When I worked at a university, we were covered by the site license negotiated with Microsoft, which allowed us to not budget or buy the operating system on new PCs. However, the vendors were not allowed to sell the computer without the operating system, thus allowing Microsoft to double-bill the University.

2. These new PCs fequently had Microsoft Office ''bundled'' with it. We were again covered by a site license, and the vendor was not allowed to un-bundle the Office sofware. Double-billing again by Microsoft.

3. Seperating Microsoft into two companies would probably not remedy the situation. However, requiring Microsoft to not bundle software with the operating system, and to not require bundling by hardware sellers, would probably be a good start. I would suggest 3 required operating system offerings: (1) No Microsoft Operating system, (2) Basic, (3) Deluxe with previously bundled applications (image processing, windows media player, internet explorer, outlook express, solitaire/freecell/pinball).

4. I fear that the seperation of Microsoft into two or more companies would result in more monopolies.

Cheers,

Scott

MTC–00004689

From: jonathan hirschman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I firmly believe that the proposed DOJ settlement for Microsoft does not serve either the best interests of the consumer or the business community at large. I'd like to recount several experiences that underscore that conviction.

I've been involved in the IT and Interactive Media industries since the '80s, and I've seen how Microsoft has stifled competition, progress and made the technological workplace less efficient as a result. Additionally, Microsoft has made my life as a consumer more difficult, removing choices that I'd like to see in the marketplace.

Examples:

* While overseeing a switch-over from a DOS environment to a Windows environment in the early '90s, my company (Newkirk Products, Inc. in Albany, NY) was forced to remove DR-DOS from all machines, and move instead to MS-DOS. Why? Because Windows 3.0/3.1 was purposely made to not function on DR-DOS. Newkirk was actually paying extra to use DR-DOS (most PC's came with MS-DOS at the time, bundled in) since it was far superior. Newkirk was compelled to move to Windows due to the business community's wholesale move to Office. Companies were moving to Office not because it was the best software at the time, but because Microsoft's bundling practices at the time made it the cheapest. Newkirk had been using Borland and other office productivity products up to that time. Newkirk did not want to move to Windows, had their been versions of Office for other GUI products of the time (for example, GEM, from DRI, which was more functional and more advanced than Windows at the same time).

The move to Windows ended up increasing costs, overall, as Windows did not work on existing PCs as well as competing GUI products. It was, however, a case of either being able to trade documents with other companies, or not being able to.

Moving to MS-DOS, in turn, made it more difficult for Newkirk to continue using Novell's Netware product. Again, Newkirk felt compelled to move to Windows NT. Microsoft's predatory pricing at the time also helped fuel management's decision; NT was given away nearly for free at the time, even if the official pricing didn't reflect that.

When I left Newkirk after 6 years, it had gone from a multi-product environment to one that was exclusively Microsoft products. Microsoft's lock on both the operating system market, and the applications market, effectively forced Newkirk off of a technology path that was essentially non-Microsoft.

* As an Executive Producer at Time Inc. New Media's Pathfinder, Microsoft's grip on the industry became even more accute. Pathfinder was one of the first commercial Internet sites, and was the first ''portal'' as well. Microsoft effectively forced many technological choices upon us due to bundling Internet Explorer with Windows. Despite the fact that Netscape's browser was far superior, Pathfinder was forced to ''dumb down'' its Web site so that Internet Explorer users wouldn't be left out.

It was clear to me that users only used Internet Explorer since it was shipped with their computers, not because it was a good product. During my exposure to users of the Internet, it became clear to me that if no browser had shipped with Windows, users would have picked Netscape almost all of the time.

* Two other events from my days with Pathfinder bear recounting: In 1995, we were visited by a representative from Microsoft that told us that Microsoft was going to dominate the Internet, and that if we didn't fall in line with their techological vision, we'd be ''swept aside''. It made more than a few senior executives nervous.

It is my understanding that, later, Microsoft even took the step of proposing a ''quid pro quo'' arrangement with Pathfinder: that if Pathfinder changed its site to ''favor'' Internet Explorer, Pathfinder would enjoy both the latest inside track technology from Microsoft as well as lucrative ''banner'' advertising. This was rejected due to concerns of journalistic integrity and general ethics.

* As an end-user, I enjoy the benefits of Linux and other ''free'' operating systems and related technologies. However, Microsoft's industry dominance has strangled efforts for innovation on non-Microsoft platforms.

One example is computer games. Microsoft, again, due to their platform ubiquity, was able to compel game publishers to change the APIs that they used for creating the games. In the '90's, many, if not most, game publishers were using OpenGL as their graphical API. OpenGL is cross platform, which means that it is relatively easy for game publishers to port their software to Macintosh or Linux should they wish to do so. However, Microsoft, again using bundling tactics, forced the industry to move to DirectX—a Microsoft only API. As a result, most games realistically cannot be ported to other platforms—it is too expensive an endeavor to re-write them from the ground up.

As a result, at least partially, there are very few games for the Macintosh and Linux. If Microsoft were forced to move their gaming technology (as well as their other software) to ther platforms, consumers would greatly benefit from increased choice. Although there are efforts to clone Microsoft's API on other platforms, my understanding is that such efforts have no standing in the current settlement. They should.

Microsoft's dominance of network operating systems have also spawned work-alikes, such as Samba. Samba allows anyone to run Microsoft file and print sharing

protocols, but for free. It is an excellent product that large companies such as HP have based for-pay products on. However... Microsoft keeps on changing their proprietary APIs, seemingly to ''break'' compatibility. This is a well known fact in the Samba community.

Since Samba is the only real competitor to Microsoft's networking operating systems, it deserves standing in any settlement.

Lastly:

I believe that the only way to effectively stop Microsoft from their stifling effect on the technology world at large is to split the company into two or entities. One such entity, Applications, should be mandated to provide equal version of their software on at least three non-Windows operating systems., preferably those with the largest user-bases. I believe that Microsoft's source code should be open to examination by competitors, including those that represent ''free'' products like Samba. I believe that Microsoft's source code should be released to the public domain within a year of commercial release, to ensure that there are no hidden functions or agendas within their products.

Hopefully letters such of this one will have an effect on the outcome of this case. I sincerely believe that the current settlement will do very little to rein in Microsoft's continuing abuse.

jonathan hirschman

MTC–00004690

From: yonder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:42pm
Subject: Re: U.S. v. Microsoft: Settlement Information

By definition, a monopoly must be detrimental to or restrict competition. Many people will remember a little feature in early versions of Internet Explorer for Windows 3.1 that disallowed the downloading of Netscape citing that the file was too large. Yet somehow I was still able to download larger files than Netscape from other sites. I was even able to download the same Netscape executable that IE felt was too large from alternate sites. While this example was from many years ago, I believe that Microsoft's aggressive corporate philosophy has remained unchanged. More recently you may note that Microsoft has included in its end user agreement for Frontpage 2002 the following clause:

''You may not use the Software in connection with any site that disparages Microsoft, MSN, MSNBC, Expedia, or their products or services, infringe any intellectual property or other rights of these parties, violate any state, federal or international law, or promote racism, hatred or pornography.''

While the legality of this clause is questionable at best, what remains clear is Microsoft's commitment to eliminating criticism and competition. It has been their argument that federal intervention and restriction on their business practices stifles innovation. I think you must ask yourself what kind of corporation refers to preventing the downloading of competitive products and making critical speech a violation of an end user agreement innovation. You will also remember Kodak's suit against Microsoft over desktop photo software. Why would it be so difficult for a user who has installed Kodak software to use it as a default with Kodak digital cameras? This may be a long shot but I think it has something to do with the percentage Microsoft makes off of every photo processed with the default XP software. They have done much worse things that tying Internet Explorer to Windows and have to wonder why the DOJ was so quick to attempt dropping the case. The coming of Windows XP, Microsoft .NET, and Passport tracking only signals worse things are to come, especially if the settlement proposed by Microsoft is accepted. I do not feel that training millions of children on Microsoft products from an early age is an appropriate remedy for an existing monopoly. If they truly cared about providing kids with computers, why have they violently rejected to proposal to provide schools with alternate operating system based systems (Mac OSX, Linux, etc...)?

As a computer software professional and a security advocate, I implore you to look closer at the consequences of allowing current trends to continue. I would like to believe that any software company I create has a fighting chance of competing with Microsoft supported companies.

Jaymin Benjamin Kessler
yonder@nyc2600.org
1.201.967.1601
378 Harrison St
Paramus, NJ 07652

MTC–00004691

From: Vince Pratt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has been found guilty. It is my opinion that the Proposed Final Judgment will do little or nothing to stop the anti-competitive practices from Microsoft. It is my belief that Microsoft should also be held accountable for the security and reliability of it's products. Here are a few examples of actual issues I take with Microsoft.

In Windows 2000 operating system software of course comes with the Internet Explorer web browser software and Outlook Express email software. On a recent occasion I wanted to remove Outlook Express from the computer as I did not want to use it and because of security (virus) concerns. I would like to point out the Microsoft has a Control Panel to Add/Remove programs to/from the computer. The end user has no option during install or by using Add/Remove Programs to remove Internet Explorer or Outlook Express. One might think well since I don't want Outlook Express I'll just manually throw the program into the trash. Well that will not work. The operating System will not allow the end user to remove Outlook Express. Below is a link to the Microsoft document that describes the steps necessary to remove Outlook Express. I would like to point out that 80% of computer users would not be able to complete the steps described.

http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx'scid=kb;EN-US;q263837

I link to a Slashdot article from 12/12/2001:

http://slashdot.org/articles/01/12/12/1357232.shtml

Which links to the original article here :

http://www.eetimes.com/story/OEG20011211S0054

These articles speak about Microsoft now entering into a new market. DVD players. It seems Microsoft now wants to have it's own proprietary CODEC (Compressor/Decompressor) installed into every DVD player that exists. My question is why is Microsoft able to 'set standards' when we have committees of experts and academics that develop and set 'industry standards'. This shows how Microsoft operate. There are perfectly viable standards out there right now that work on all computing platforms. This will harm anyone who does not want to run on the Microsoft platform.

I would just like to have my opinion known. I believe that the Proposed Final Judgment will do nothing to help protect consumers or other technology companies. I believe that the states proposal does a great deal more to punish Microsoft. After all they were found guilty and are supposed to be punished for their behavior.

Sincerely,
Vince Pratt
Network Administrator
LeMoyne-Owen College
Memphis, TN 38126
901–942–6252 Voice
901–775–7600 FAX

MTC–00004692

From: Josh York
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft.

Greetings,

I am Josh York an Information Technology professional and I have followed this case from the beginning.

The Monopoly that Microsoft maintains over the Personal Computer Desktop Operating System market must be stopped. Allowing them to extend their monopoly to our children is downright absurd! Giving Microsoft a foot in the door of our education systems is appalling do not want my children to grow up and know nothing but Microsoft...allowing them to pump our schools full of their Monopoly-ware will provide them with an Army of young adults who only use Microsoft products.

Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

Microsoft must not be allowed to offer benefits to companies for selling their software preinstalled. This FORCES customers to pay high prices for Microsoft's monopoly-ware, ensuring the nourishment of the software giant. Computer companies have paid Microsoft large sums of money for every computer sold for far too long,*this is because computer companies have no real alternative.* This MUST stop. And this is the only way it will happen, Microsoft enforces this policy with monopolist aggression.

Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing control of the Internet. Microsoft is notorious for using a VERY monopolistic and unfair business practice to drive competition our of markets: Protocol switching. Open standards drive the internet and all Technology. Microsoft wishes to use their own trademarked protocols to monopolize markets they cannot dominate using Fair . For inbusiness practices stance: Microsoft Windows 3-windows XP use the SMB protocol for file and printer sharing, This protocol is being utilized by Red Hat Linux, Novells' NetWare, Sun Microsystems' Solaris, and other Operating systems to interface with Microsoft software. Studies show that Red Hat Linux, Using the SMB protocol, can OUTPERFORM Microsoft's OWN servers, using SMB to provide files and printers to Microsoft's clients. Microsoft sees a threat in these companies ability to provide services to their clients so they try to are seeking to disable their ability to do so by rejecting the standards.

I also propose that Microsoft's Operating System and Applications divisions be Seperated,not into two, but into MANY companies.

Here is a list of proposed split results:

Microsoft Windows OS. (Win 95,98,Me,XP,Windows 2000 Pro,NT Workstation.)

Microsoft Office/Visual Studio/Internet Explorer/Other Development.

MSN /MSN messenger/Hotmail

Windows Embedded/MS compact edition

Microsoft Entertainment/ MS-Media player/MS-Xbox/MS gaming Zone.

Microsoft Server OS.(Exchange-Server,Microsoft Data Center,Internet Security and Acceleration Server, .Net server,2000 Server,Win NT server,SQL server,IIS server,Back office,Sharepoint server,Biztalk,) Having separate Desktop and Server OSes would force Microsoft to adhere to Open standards.

Splitting Office and Development suites from the main distribution could lead to the Development of Office for Unixes (Linux,Sun Microsystems' solaris ect..),as well as lead to better development tools for other platforms.

Splitting the Embedded division would help enforce the use of open standards, many companies believe that PDAs and Pocket-PC's are to play a big role in Microsofts' future, and aid in their monopoly of Software. Creating a Microsoft Entertainment company will help keep Microsoft from using things like Hotmail and Passport to force their customers to use their Email or Internet service providers (ISP). The separation of the ISP and messenger would keep Microsoft from using their OS monopoly to put companies like AOL out of business.Currently Windows XP only ships with Microsofts ISP connectivity and Messenger software,this is a very blatant monopolistic practice.

That is all,

Thanks

Josh York.

My Opinions do not reflect the opinions of anyone but myself,that includes my Company.

This Document is free to distrubute, copy, quote, Plagarize and spray paint on a wall if you want...Just give credit where credit is due.

Special thanks to: dennispowell@earthlink.net For Content provided by he.

MTC–00004693

From: Sam Steingold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 1:48pm
Subject: MS settlement—break-up is necessary!

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

Given the Microsoft's history of ignoring anti-trust settlements with the government, I see no reason to believe that they will behave any better now.

A monopoly will never change it's behavior as long as it is a monopoly. No agreements, no oversight, no committees—nothing will change that. In my opinion, the only way to contain Microsoft's monopolistic anti-competitive behavior is to split the company.

Sam Steingold (http://www.podval.org/sds)

MTC–00004694

From: John Monahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft ''punishment''

Dear Sir(s),

Microsoft should not be allowed to escape with such a ''punishment'' as giving away a boatload of their own software that costs them very little to reproduce.

Besides, it will give them stronger hold on the education market, which is one of the very few markets that MS does not already have a stranglehold on. As Steve Jobs of Apple Computer, Inc. has said, if MS wants to give the $1 Billion dollars to the schools, then let the schools decide how they want to spend the money. This would be fair to MS's competitors and giving $1 Billion in ACTUAL MONEY (not their own software) may be a true and just punishment.

Thank you,

John C. Monahan

Webmaster of www.bright.net

In-House Network Administrator, Com Net, Inc.

MTC–00004695

From: Justin Mahn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust case

I think Microsoft should be broken up into operating system and other components as a company. Look what happened to the Microsoft Office 'firewall' that Microsoft was supposed to have from the last decade.

Justin Mahn

439–67–2244

MTC–00004696

From: William Affleck-Asch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

William C.S. Affleck-Asch
3648 Francis Ave N, #B
Seattle WA 98103–9323
Phone 206–632–3010

In regards to the proposed final settlement of the US v Microsoft case, I believe that I may have some relevent points to make, both as a long-time investor and as someone who has worked with (and for) Microsoft.

Please note that I live in the Seattle area and through investments in Microsoft owe the establishment and ownership of my first house. I worked for one of the direct contractors of Microsoft, and have been a Microsoft Certified Professional and many of my friends and neighbors work for or have worked for them.

In my opinion, the current final settlement is unworkable. Microsoft is unlikely to abide by the constraints in terms of business practices, as in the tech industry it is easier to use legal loopholes or gray areas to attack one's opponents and crush them at the early stages of marketing, than to play totally by the book. Historically, this has been one of Microsoft's chief tactics, and it is unlikely that their behavior would be changed under this final solution.

The main problem that I see is that the tech oversight committee is toothless. Without the ability to delay or force immeadiate (90 day or less) remedies, they would be a reactive committee that could only admonish Microsoft, and by the time anything would occur, Microsoft would have succeeded in demolishing their opponent in a tech sphere.

The second, and perhaps most egregious, problem is that the offer to provide Microsoft software and hardware to public schools would have the unintended effect of increasing Microsoft's profitability and ability to dominate the software market, particularly in terms of education. This could be easily remedied by requiring Microsoft to donate the $1 billion with no strings tied as to the hardware or software chosen.

In fact, it would be preferable for Microsoft to basically write a blank check, by having a form where one chose between PCs and Operating Systems—where one could choose to receive a Microsoft software bundle at the educational discount rate (e.g. WinXP plus OfficeXP for $100) or a similar solution from a Linux provider (since they admit this is their competition—and since I have read that Red Hat will provide a similar solution for free). It also should be vendor neutral in terms of what networking solutions are required—for many schools it is the server software and hubs, routers, and gateways that cost the most.

Beyond this, however, my only point is that Microsoft maintains its dominance in PC OS market primarily through the use of continual changes to standards and protocols—a requirement to fully and quickly publish any such documents and specifications and do so at no or minimal charges would be the easiest way to bring back competition in this sphere.

Sincerely,

Will Affleck-Asch

current member of the B.F. Day school PTSA in Seattle

current member of the 43rd District Democrats—currently serving as their Secretary, but not speaking for them past member of the 36th District Democrats—King County Democratic Central Committee alt(m)

MTC–00004697

From: DYMOND Christopher S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Reneta B. Hesse,

I'm writing to express my shock and dismay concerning the settlement proposed by the Bush administration in the Microsoft antitrust case. For the settlement to be fair Microsoft it should make it easier for competitors to penetrate markets that Microsoft dominates. The proposed settlement does very little to accomplish this, in fact it would appear to give Microsoft a win by helping them to move into the markets (such as schools) where they are not dominate.

Sincerely
Christopher Dymomd
Salem Oregon
(503) 378–8325

MTC–00004698

From: wellner@weida.dyndns.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:16pm
Subject: Proposed Final Judgment

As I understand it you are required by law to make yourselves available to public comment, but I thank you for the chance to put in my concerns regardless of why you read them. I also am quite sure that in a high profile case you are getting much in terms of input, so I'll keep this short and to my primary concern. In that past Microsoft has shown great contempt for both the free market and the court in it's business practices. This was proved in the case.

I don't agree with the settlement that has been proposed. It seems to me that it is a terribly light slap on the wrist for a company that, by it's own admission, is central to the computing economy to suffer so little for such egregious crimes.

However, there is little I can do except to state that I hope stronger punishment can be given in place of the current PFJ.

Assuming that the PFJ is put into action *please* make sure that the supervisory functions are actively executed and that all future violations (at this point I think we must assume there *will* be future violations since Microsoft has shown no remorse for it's past illegal behavior and, in fact, have built the largest software company in the world using said practices) be quickly dealt with.

The problem with the software industry is that it moves so much more quickly than the court system. In the current context Netscape is a great example of a company that Microsoft put out of business using illegal practices, but there are dozens of others. I have worked with several databases, GUI tools and general utilities made by companies that no longer exist because Microsoft colluded to put them out of business using illegal practices.

As I say earlier I think the PFJ is a startlingly punishment free proposal for such egregious crimes. My preference would have been a fine of $17B (the amount of free cash that Microsoft has in the bank right now) as it seems the only thing they respect is the dollar. If it cannot be, then please make certain that future violations are dealt with swiftly. It's the only way that competition if going to be reintroduced to the competitive market.

rw2
Rich Wellner
531 Canyon Trail
Carol Stream, IL 60188

MTC–00004699

From: Michael Peele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My suggestions, as a voting, taxpaying US citizen:

Do not allow Microsoft to spread its software as a ''cost'' to Microsoft. If Microsoft wants to donate software to schools, let it, but remember that the incremental cost of producing software is zero. Do not allow Microsoft to spread its software to anyone for any reason as part of this settlement. Make Microsoft pay the fees in CASH. US Currency only. Not stock, not software, not hardware, CASH.

I like Red Hat software's suggestion from Matthew Szulik.

I would really like to see Microsoft split up.

I would like to see Microsoft compete fairly in all markets.

Michael Peele
Georgetown University

MTC–00004700

From: Anthony K. Galanis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 2:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to submit my opinion on the Microsoft antitrust case during the 60-Day public feedback phase.

This case in no way represents the best interests of the consumer. This case is all about Microsoft's competition. You cannot compare the computer software industry to anything else that has existed before. It does not work the same way. Things that used to take years in other markets can take days in this market. Innovation and improvements are based on an iterative standard. The consumer has chosen their standard and it is Windows. Millions and millions of people appreciate and choose Microsoft's software and they want to be able to reap the benefits of having a standard. There is much more software available to solve almost any problem. Have you tried to find a program for the Amiga, Linux or even Macintosh. It is difficult because not many developers make programs for them because they can't make money. From an economic standpoint, there are more benefits from having one dominant OS. As a consumer I have many, many more choices because I do have Windows. For my other OS's my choices are very, very limited.

When a new technology come around, the best of breed is usually purchased by Microsoft (the original development company wins) and then that product is integrated into Windows (which then benefits millions upon millions of other users who otherwise would never have been exposed to that technology). If a better solution exists that is not Microsoft's, people can still go out and buy that if they choose. Microsoft's not stopping that.

Here is a good example. Take the backup utility and the disk defragmentor. Both would be considered middleware. Both serve the purpose for millions of users. Those users don't have to go out and purchase a $49.99 backup program and a $49.99 disk defragmentor program, which of course would not benefit them at all. Yet other backup programs and disk defragmentor programs are flourishing in today's market. They add additional abilities that Microsoft's 'middleware' does not, so they succeed. You don't see any plain backup or defragmentor programs out there because everyone with Windows already has one. This drives innovation because it forces manufactures to improve upon the 'standard' to succeed. It has worked very well in the past. Look at all of the amazing things that a consumer can get for less that $200.

The hot issues are of course IE and Media Player. If these products we not the best, they would not succeed. If Microsoft was not constantly improving them or not following standards, they would end up like the backup or defragmentor programs, still included for out of the box functionality.

But if the States have there way, all middleware would be striped from Windows, forcing consumers to once again purchase every little thing. It is very obvious what the benefit is to Microsoft's competition but what exactly is the benefit to consumers?

I do not think it is any coincidence that all of the states remaining in the antitrust case represent Microsoft's biggest competitors. Where are the consumers that are supposed to be complaining that the states so vehemently claim to be protecting?

Do I think Microsoft is perfect? No. Did it pull some shady deals with PC manufactures? Probably. So fine them for that and make it illegal for deals like that to be made again. But wait, isn't that what AOL is trying to do right now? If Microsoft can't make exclusive deals, then nobody else should be able to either.

The World and humanity itself benefits from having a 'standard' operating system. The Internet is where it is today in no small part to the integration of IE with Windows. The digital music and video will experience similar benefits from Media Player. All consumers will win. Only the competition that does not have a compelling product will lose.

One last note on Java. Sun refuses to submit Java to a standards body leaving it as a proprietary programming language. This is very much unlike Microsoft's C#, .Net, XML and DHTML initiatives. Microsoft should in no way be required to integrate Sun's Java virtual machine (VM) into Windows. I used to program in Java and very much appreciated Microsoft's extensions to the language. It made programming for the Windows environment much, much easier. But Sun did not own those extensions so the sued Microsoft. Now the want their VM included. Give me a break. They had it made and they bit their own leg off. Too bad for them.

Please don't take away my benefits because a lot of very rich, jealous competitors did not succeed.

Thanks you for your time,
Anthony K. Galanis
CTO
qBill, Inc.

MTC–00004701

From: Steve Russo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:16pm
Subject: Nail them to the cross.

As a valid MCSE, I would like to say that I am dissapointed about the outcome of this court case. I think that you are letting them off to easily. I would like to see something done about how they have repeatedly broken the law. I don't care if Mr. Bush is president, and I don't care if the sales of their products bring us out of a recession. What I care about is JUSTICE. Don't let them put their junk in schools! If ATT&T had tried to put more phone systems in libraries as the settlement for their case, they would have been laughed out of court. The same should be done for Micro$oft. I feel that it is wrong that everytime I buy a new PC, I need to pay for a windows os to come with it. I DONT USE THEIR OS's! I shouldn't need to pay for it. This is a monopoly and I am not happy about vendor lock-in. I want to see you people get off of your asses. Do something about them instead of taking bribes from them. Let justice prevail!

Thanks,
Steve

PS Also, if you do do something about them, please sleep better at night knowing that you did the right thing. We can't get back the companies that we lost, but we can do something about the companies that we WILL lose. PSS If you would like more information about me or my MCSE information, please email me back. I will gladly give you my Microsoft Certificate numbers.

MTC–00004702

From: Lord Sith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Department of Justice;

The events and findings of the second MS anti-trust trial were more or less brought about by Microsoft's willful failure to follow either the letter or the intent of the first consent decree.

Given the numerous exemptions and limitations placed on items set forth in section III (Prohibited Conduct) of the ''Revised Proposed Final Judgment'' I fear that this settlement is doomed to suffer similar fate. Too many loopholes are available for Microsoft to skirt around the intent of this judgment.

It is my opinion that this proposed settlement is not strong enough to control or curtail Microsoft's monopolistic behavior.

Thank you for your time,
Jonathan Call
Springville, UT

MTC–00004703

From: Smith, Wayne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:16pm
Subject: Proposed Remedy

To Whom It Should Concern:

The schools of America do NOT need a bunch of out-dated PC machines running Microsoft software—as proposed. Software—free to schools, and also nearly free to Microsoft.

There are countless numbers of software producers who work hard to sell there wares to the education market. Government-sponsored ''give-away'' programs as proposed in the Microsoft remedy simply shuts out all other competition...and you call that punishing a monopolist company for past transgressions?

A fair solution would be to have Microsoft PAY cold, hard, CASH to the schools to use on needs educators identify. The cash amount should be significant and on-going for a period of at least 12 years, so that each of the 12 grades could benefit over time by the purchase of NEW technology OR reduction in class size, or other enhancements that educators know will make a real impact in learning improvement. My government should not be assisting a law-breaking monopolist in finding new ways to shut out its competitors in the education market.

Show me you understand what is at stake in this case by rejecting this ''free software-hardware'' bait.

Microsoft did not get to be so big by being the best or by being dumb. They got caught violating laws designed to protect us. Punish them, do not reward them!

Wayne Smith
3043 Shannon Lakes North
Tallahassee, FL 32309

MTC–00004704

From: Jason LaVoie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

As a member of the software industry whom is intimately familiar with Microsoft's Windows NT based operating systems, I find the settlement agreement with Microsoft Corporation unsatisfactory. The three member oversight committee is laughable. First and foremost it is open for corruption (e.g. payoffs.) Secondly, it is far too subjective. Thirdly, I possess severe doubts this committee is going to have any real bearing on Microsoft's practices.

More needs to be done to open up the marketplace for competition. I do not feel the current settlement is going to change the landscape of the desktop operating system market. Microsoft ships unstable and often junky operating systems to people who can barely use a computer. The end user suffers while Microsoft takes its time shipping service packs. Most end users do not even know what a service pack is, let alone know how to install it. In any other market this practice would be unacceptable. Perhaps service packs to prematurely shipped cars that fell apart while driving would be appropriate? Microsoft gets away with this behavior because it CAN. Capitalism works because of competition, and Microsoft has none. Linux is not and may not ever be a viable competitor in the Desktop Operating System market.

I believe more can and should be done to curb the anti-competitive behavior of Microsoft and to open up the marketplace for competition. The current settlement does not effectively accomplish either of these goals.

Thank you for your time.
Jason LaVoie
34 Maple Ln
Mahopac, NY 10541

MTC–00004705

From: Charles Duffy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good day. As a free software developer and an employee of a company which deals primarily in software developed through non-commercial means, I'm concerned about the current settlement's implication that only for-profit, commercial entities should have access to Microsoft's APIs. Much software developed not-for-profit has commercial impact or usage; developers of such software should be recognized without the need for a commercial entity to represent their interests.

As an example, the WINE project is a development effort which seeks to build an application programming interface permitting software written for Windows platforms to function on UNIX-based operating systems such as Linux. While WINE presently has commercial backers and has been used in some commercial products (such as CorelDRAW for Linux), for much of its development life its development was run by a loosely affiliated group of developers.

If providing commercial interests with access to interoperability information is in the public good, providing similar access to non-commercial interests is no less so; such open access benefits both personal users and commercial interests which make use of the fruits of such development efforts. For these reasons, I urge that the language recognizing only commercial interests in the proposed settlement be striken.

Thank you kindly for your consideration.

MTC–00004706

From: Matthew Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Regarding the proposed settlement of the case Microsoft vs USA—this settlement proposes to solve the problem of Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior, and change the fact that competing in the markets (principly those of operating systems and office software) that Microsoft control is currently very difficult. A large part of that difficulty are problems with the interoperability with those Microsoft systems—if I write some wordprocessing software, for example, which is better than Microsoft Word, I cannot hope to get any market penetration, due to the fact that my software will not be able to be compatible with data generated by Microsoft's version—which is the current industry standard. This is obviously bad for competition. The same is true of operating system protocols, notably the SMB protocol that Microsoft use for networking file sharing and authentication—they have frequently updated this so that other Operating Systems (for example Linux) will not work correctly.

I think (and I know that I am not alone in this) that any attempt to make that market

more competative would have to begin my requiring MicMicrosoft Settlement.rosoft to release details of these formats, and restrain from making undocumented changes that break compatibility with other systems. If this was the case, the software would have a greater chance of competing purely on merit, which is, of course, the ideal.

Given that the proposed settlement has a Technical Oversight Committee to ensure compliance with the judgement, I hope you will consider this as a condition they should enforce, either that specifications for these are released so that other software can be compatible with Microsoft products, or that they should look closely at that issue with regards to deliberate changes that they make to file formats and protocols, that are primarily designed to break functionality, rather than implement new features, or if new features are added, that this be done in such a way as to leave existing functionality in place.

Yours Sincerely,

Matthew Johnson.

<techieguy@breathemail.net>

Why the EU-CD is bad—don't let this become law!

http://eurorights.org/eudmca/WhyTheEUCDIsBad.html

''They that would give up essential liberty for temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.''

Benjamin Franklin

''Those who desire to give up Freedom, in order to gain Security, will not have, nor do they deserve, either one.''

Thomas Jefferson

MTC–00004707

From: Dan.Nolan@ni.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I have been following the Microsoft antitrust case since its early beginnings. I would like to humbly suggest a possible remedy. Years ago, IBM released the IBM PC. Although the PC is now the computer hardware platform of choice (as opposed to Apple's Macintosh or the now defunct DEC Alpha), very few of the PCs sold today are actually made by IBM. The creation of the IBM-compatible computer allowed third party companies to sell computers on which PC software would run, without having to pay residuals to IBM. This allowed the explosion of diversity of software that we have enjoyed over the last decade. As hardware competition brought computer prices down, consumers benefited from the broad variety of offerings and software vendors flourished on platform that allowed them to sell to a wider audience than ever before. What I propose is simple: we need to encourage the creation of Windows-compatible operating systems. If there were other companies besides Microsoft who could sell an operating system that could run the same programs as Windows, at no additional expense to the consumer or software vendor, then Microsoft's monopoly would be broken without directly penalizing them. In fact, if there were an industry of Windows-compatible OS vendors, each one would try to distinguish itself by bundling useful software or partnering with other software companies to provide value-added packages. While Microsoft remains a monopoly, these practices make competition nearly impossible, but in a free market with fair competition these same tactics become acceptable and even encouraged.

Consider the case of Netscape Navigator vs. Internet Explorer. When Microsoft decided to bundle IE with Windows, there wouldn't have been any problem is Netscape could have made a deal with a competing OS vendor to bundle its software. But since there were no competing vendors, Netscape's demise was guaranteed.

So how do we encourage and empower companies to create Windows-compatible operating systems? By exposing the internals of Windows to the public. If the source code for each version of Windows that was obsolete (no longer on store shelves) was released to the public under an open source license like the GPL, it would allow third party companies to create compatible operating systems. Microsoft could still compete and even dominate the industry by producing high quality software and bundling them with the latest version. However, since many software products require it in order to run, tightly bundled software like DirectX which provides additional graphics capabilities to Windows programs would also have to be made open source (except for the latest version, of course). If this remedy is applied, it would benefit all parties involved: consumers benefit from lower prices on software and operating system upgrades, software vendors could sell their products to a larger market, computer science researchers benefit from the years of technical innovation that made Windows possible, and Microsoft can still remain the leading operating system vendor in the market (at least for the next five years).

Dan Nolan

Software Engineer,

National Instruments.

MTC–00004708

From: Micah Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My correspondance with you today is in response to a call for public comment on the proposed Microsoft Settlement.

I am the president of a small software development company in Houston, Texas. We develop web-based applications that employ open-source tools including the Linux OS, the Apache web server, and the PERL scripting language. I write to you today because I believe my perspective as a technical professional in the computer industry and my experience with my customers over the past four years may help to support the position that an expeditious, rather than a settlement that addresses the monopolist abuse perpetrated by Microsoft will do further damage to an industry that has already seen abusive use of a monopolist position. The proposed relief settlement may have been appropriate in reducing monopolist abuse six or seven years ago when competitive products such as office suites and web browsers existed, but today it would serve as a ''20–20 hindsight'' commentary on monopolist abuse.

One example of the direct damages incurred on consumers and my customers is the inability to deploy alternative desktop solutions to a purely Microsoft based environment. The solution is not infeasable because of any technical deficiency in alternatives or lack of functionality, but rather becase of a monopolist abuse of proprietary file formats. The Microsoft Office suite changes file formats routinely to prevent competitive office suites from succesfully implementing import filters for those formats. The proposed settlement includes a remedy for this situation, but does so a Microsoft's discression. This power to decide what information and to what extent it is made available is exactly the abuse that has damaged the free and open software marketplace. By routinely changing published standards and advertised intentions to keep their competitors one step behind.

In a truly free and openly competitive marketplace, a company would /* never*/ change their file formats so radically, but rather work to support third-party filters and products to allow consumers to more easily manipulate their data. The remedy does nothing to insure that Microsoft will not continue their abuse of these notorious strongholds. My customers routinely ask me for alternatives to the high cost of proposed Microsoft solutions and for the time being we are able to offer such solutions in limited cases. However, these limited cases too are falling into peril as Microsoft continues to abuse industry standards. One of my customers was recently quoted an e-mail system costing in excess of $45,000 US to support roughly a 400 user community. Because we were able to convince our customer to not restrict themselves by using Microsoft Outlook clients, we were able to implement an competitive solution for $2500 US.

The entire project, however, was predecated on the customer not using Microsoft Outlook's group calendaring features. Had they insisted on that their business need for group calendaring be based on Microsoft Outlook, then the ONLY usable solution would be Microsoft's Microsoft Exchange server. The protocols and formats used by the Exchange mail server are routinely changed, not well documented for third-party developers, and are not developed as an industry standard. Forcing Microsoft to devulge it's proprietary data formats means more than monitoring their license agreements with third-party companies at this point. To fix years of abuse, the information must be made, free of charge, to a wider group of software developers, thus helping to restore competitiveness to these areas of the industry. Making the information available free of charge will allow Microsoft's competitors to offer solutions that can co-exist with todays Microsoft domainated landscape.

If time and effort is not taken to thoroughly evaluate the reprecussions of a hastily made settlement, the software industry will

continue to wither in the hands of a monopoly company. Strength in our economy and society has been achieved through radical diversity. The software industry in years past has seen tremendous strides from it's diversity. Any entity that threatens that diversity by strangling competitors and prohibitively raising the barrier for the entry of new products must be seen as a threat and as destructive to our economy.

If Microsoft is not firmly held at bay until a monopoly no longer exists, competitive products and corporations such as mine will simply fail to survive. Not because they don't offer superior products or services, but because they cannot find entry into an industry that uses /*exactly one */ vendor for all of it's core software needs.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Micah T. Quinn

Quinn Team Incorporated

Micah T. Quinn

President

MTC–00004709

From: Tony Kimball
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 3:44pm
Subject: Comments on Proposed Settlement

Lectori Salutem:

Pursuant to the announced proposed settlement conditions which purport to provide remedy to the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable, I write to provide for the record my specific objections, as a computing professional of 12 years experience in the field:

Firstly, the proposed settlement fails to provide effective remedy in that restrictions on interface disclosure are left to the judgement and discrimination of the culpable party, and explicit conditions are placed on disclosure requirements, which prevent public-interest organizations from obtaining essential information enabling the development of interoperable components.

Secondly, the proposed settlement fails to provide effective remedy for the damaging monopolistic practice of hiding the cost of Microsoft products in the cost of purchasing a computer or other device. Unless consumers are able to purchases devices at lower cost in the absence of a Microsoft product, all consumers are in effect being taxed to subsidize Microsoft's monopoly.

Thirdly, the proposed settlement fails to provide effective remedy because it does not require Microsoft to provide adequate disclosure of file formats, type library formats, document formats, network protocols, and other crucial related interfaces to the public, or even to purchasers of Microsoft products. As a result, public-interest development organizations and commercial competitors alike are prevented from providing product offerings which are competetive with Microsoft products in performance and capability.

Fourthly, the proposed settlement allows Microsoft to avoid compensating the public for its criminal practices, places the burden of paying for the costs of obtaining remedy on the goverment and the people, rather than upon the culpable party, and in fact assists Microsoft in extending its monopoly into the educational systems of the various states.

Fifthly, the proposed settlement does nothing to protect the public from the evident intention of Microsoft to subvert the global Internet as a tool of monopoly extention, and to the detriment of the privacy of all persons, by insinuating proprietary protocols into the conduct of commerce, and enforcing the disclosure of detailed personal and financial information to entities controlled by Microsoft. Sixthly, the historic and continuing failure of Microsoft to provide secure information systems constitutes a dire threat to the national interest and security, which can only be prevented by placing Microsoft installations on equal competetive footing with installed computer systems which use more robust and secure software systems. Microsoft has placed backdoors in its operating systems which allow surreptitious access to private information by unauthorized parties. Until and unless the source code for all of Microsoft's software components are available for public inspection, continued security lapses and abuses must be expected. The only effective means of resolving these problems, both the competetive disadvantage of non-Microsoft systems, and the instability and insecurity of the predominant Microsoft systems, is to require that all of the source code for Microsoft's system software as distributed with OEM computers and appliances must be made available to all persons constructing interoperable or competing software. The proposed settlement, to the detriment of the security, stability, and viability of nations economic, military, and emergency systems infrastructure fails to provide any such requirement or stipulation.

In summary, the proposed settlement provides no effective remedy to the illegal practices of Microsoft, and imposes a substantial penalty on the wronged parties (the goverment and public of the United States) by failing to exact compensation for court costs or for damages done.

Sincerely,

Anthony Lee Kimball

1822 N Park St

Fergus Falls, MN

56537

alk@pobox.com

MTC–00004710

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,antitrust@ftc.gov @inetgw,Ralph@essen...
Date: 12/17/01 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Hegemony' Wall Street Journal's Double Standard
CC: letters@latimes.com @inetgw,letters @sjmercury.com@i...

Re: Haitian Connections—How Clinton's cronies cashed in on foreign policy.

We are not suggesting that Fusion's business in Haiti is illegal.

...We are saying that Fusion's Haiti deal is sleazy.

Sleazy like Bill Gates's modus operandi or different than that of Wall Street's poster boy?

''My friends at Dow Jones, they know who to criticize and who not, ha ha ha...''

MTC–00004711

From: Steven Bach
To: microsoft.atr
Date: 12/17/01 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I am writing to protest the proposed DOJ settlement with MicroSoft. The net result of this settlement is in no way punitive, nor does it help to resolve past damages, or do enough to prevent future predatory monopolistic behavior by Microsoft.

Specifically, currently many of MS's most serious competitors are Open Source software projects headed by non-profit foundations. Section III(J)(2) makes it clear that these groups would not be entitled to API documentation. While it is outrageous that only for-profit corporate entities would be considered worth of documentation, the fact that no for-profit corporate entities appear to be able to compete with MS, while projects run by various non-profit foundations are in many cases more successful than MS (Apache, BIND, sendmail) makes it ludicrous. This must be addressed.

Section III(D) makes it outlines that MS will disclose to Independent Software Vendors (ISVs), Independent Hardware Vendors (IHVs), Internet Access Providers (IAPs), Internet Content Providers (ICPs), and Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) the information needed to inter-operate with Windows at this level. Yet, when we look in the footnotes at the legal definitions for these outfits, we find the definitions specify commercial concerns only(!). The most important competition is running on a non-commercial level. Consider that even our Gov't, for instance NASA, the national laboratories, the military, the National Institute of Standards and Technology—even the Department of Justice itself—have no rights. In some cases nat'l labs and other groups produce free software, and it makes no sense for the gov't to exclude itself from the right to access MS's APIs. This too must be addressed.

Even with these aspects rectified I do not think that the settlement is adequate. A split of the company into four groups (HW, Developer Tools, Applications, Server Software), along with a substantial fine would be the only proper way to dispense justice to the guilty party.

Thanks for your time,

Steven Bach

MTC–00004712

From: Byron York
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to see an investigation started that looked in to George Bush and John Ashcroft's dealings with Microsoft. As the Proposed Final Judgment was obviously written by an attorney for Microsoft, and not the DOJ, I feel it would be prudent to look in to the back room deals that made the settlement possible.

I believe there are major abuses of power, fraud, conflicts of interest, and other high crimes and misdemeanors that were committed in Microsoft's name. The real

culprits, Bush and Ashcroft, should pay for their crimes. There is no way a reasonable person can look at how Ashcroft has handled this case since he took over and not see the glaring capitulation that the DOJ has handed Bill Gates.

Why surrender when you have won? Nine federal judges agree: Microsoft is an abusive monopoly and needs to be punished. Why, other than fraud or an abuse of power, would the DOJ give up like this?

''The best thing that happened to Microsoft in years was George Bush being elected president.'' THAT is not how JUSTICE is supposed to work in this country. The law, and the enforcement of the law, should be blind to who is sitting in the White House. The DOJ's actions in this matter have left a bad taste in my mouth and have brought into question the entire system of justice in this country.

Hoping that the real criminals behind this fiasco are brought to justice,

Byron York

713.416.4487

MTC–00004713

From: Lysinger, Sam (ISS Atlanta)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/17/01 4:12pm
Subject: Microsft anti-trust case

Hello,

After reviewing the documents regarding the charges against Microsoft and spending many years using and supporting their products (I write this email using Microsoft Outlook), I feel that the US Courts should throw the book at Microsoft.

Most of the argument regards Web Browsers. Why is it that Microsoft Outlook, an email program, requires Internet Explorer in order for it to function? Web browsing and email are completely unrelated things. This alone tells me that I am being forced to use Internet Explorer on some level or other.

Most people don't take the time to download Netscape if another web browser is already on their computer. This is laziness, and not Microsoft's fault but they are exploiting the basic human desire of taking the path of least resistance in doing a task. To make it more interesting, HTML is a computer langauge that is platform independant. Why is it that Microsoft added specific HTML tags that only work in Internet Explorer. Most people don't think about it, but there are web pages I cannot browse without their html browser. I don't particularly like their browser, it functions fine, but I prefer the layout of Netscape. If you were to surf Microsoft's web page with a competitors web browser, you will find it difficult at best. This is clearly forcing me to use another piece of web browsing software, theirs, when I need to download a patch or security update for the windows operating system.

I like choice, I like Windows NT and 2000, I totally hate win95 and win98. I like unix and I like Mac OS also. I like Excel and I hate Microsoft Word with a passion (I use Word Perfect for DOS and I think much could also be said about Microsoft forcing application competitors out of the market but I don't want to take up too much of your time).

I do not like being forced into using something and I feel that I am. This is why the 13 colonies kicked out the English and this is why we broke up Standard Oil and IBM.

I'd like to see justice done.

Thanks for your time,

Sam Lysinger

IT Infrastructure

slysinge@iss.net

404–236–4063

Television is so educational, every time I turn it on I want to go to the library and get a book.

MTC–00004714

From: Jerry Seeger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:21pm
Subject: thoughts on the antitrust settlement

I am rather perplexed and amazed by the proposed settlement of the antitrust violations of Microsoft. Perplexed because the settlement is so weak that it is not a punishment at all and amazed that anyone thinks it would change Microsoft's behavior after the brazen way the company rolled over the last consent decree.

Microsoft broke the law. Microsoft is continuing with the exact same illegal behavior in Windows XP by bundling CD-burning software, instant messaging, and a host of other features. As an example, the CD-Burning features in Windows XP are vastly inferior to other commercial (non-free) products, but despite the higher quality the independent vendors cannot compete with free. Yet, if the features listed above are intrinsic features of an operating system which should be available at no charge, why do you have to pay an extra $200 to connect securely to Microsoft's own servers? Which one of those sounds more like a necessary operating system feature that should not cost extra? The extra cost for a secure connection to a Microsoft server is an example of what happens when Microsoft has no competition in a market. This so-called settlement merely legitimizes Microsoft's continued predatory behavior. More competitors will vanish each year, until there is only one software company. Any software maker who makes a useful product for the windows platform will eventually be replaced by second-rate, but free, software from Microsoft.

Jerry Seeger

Vice President of Software Engineering

BinaryLabs, Inc.

MTC–00004715

From: Andrew W. Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strenuously object to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust trial. I am a student, programmer and computer technician. I do technical support on both Windows and Macintosh computers, and it has been my experience that Windows is a far inferior operating system. It crashes more frequently, is harder to use and users are far less time-efficient on the Windows machines. Despite this, Windows runs on 90% or more of the computers in America.

Microsoft was convicted of engaging in illegal activities that enabled it to create and maintain a monopoly. There is no penalty suggested for such illegal activities in the settlement, merely clarifications that hope to prevent further illegal continuation of the monopoly. I do not believe these will prevent such a continuation, and a penalty should be required in response to the illegal actions performed so far.

I am also skeptical about the availability of unbiased persons to sit on the technical committee. Microsoft's effect on the computing industry is such that there would be very few people with such technical knowledge that would not have any predisposition towards Microsoft.

In addition, the matter of illegally tying applications to the operating system has not been adequately addressed. Microsoft was initially convicted of illegally tying, but was overturned on appeal. Since then, it has been remanded to the District Court for consideration. This settlement prematurely closes the issue of illegal tying before it can be considered properly. This settlement is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons, especially the lack of a penalty. There is no incentive for Microsoft to comply with future requirements, as they have not been penalized for their actions, merely to cease such actions. What is to stop them from engaging in further activities knowing that there will be no drawbacks beyond stopping them? It would be akin to debating whether to take a miracle drug with the long term effects of water. No, there is no incentive here to prevent further abuse of the legal system, or of the market through the use of illegal monopolies.

Sincerely,

Andrew W. Hill

MTC–00004716

From: Matthew Toczek
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice,

It is my opinion that Microsoft has already proven it does not respect and will not abide by antitrust laws in this country. I appreciate your work and time spent in attempting reasonable compromise with Microsoft; however, it is not your fault a legal, lasting and appropriate solution cannot be made—it is Microsoft's. As such, I feel the only way to get the point across to this gigantic corporation is through extensive legal and economic means.

Sincerely,

Matthew Toczek

public key: www.wpi.edu/toxic/public—key/public—key.html

CC:Matthew Toczek

MTC–00004717

From: mpl22@cornell.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter presents my response to the revised proposed Final Judgement to resolve the United States' civil antitrust case against Microsoft, which is currently up for public review. I am a citizen of the united states, and a resident of Ithaca, NY.

I. Critique of Proposed Final Judgement

The proposed Final Judgement that the US and Microsoft agreed to on November 6th appears to have the best intentions, and addresses many of the major issues raised by the case. Unfortunately, I feel that it falls short of being an effective remedy.

I agree with many of the points in the following critique of the proposed final judgement, and it is more complete than my own statement will be. Please review the statement on the antitrustinstitute.org website at: http://www.antitrustinstitute.org/recent/149.cfm

There is much to consider in that document, the points in the proposed final remedy that I consider most important to review are that:

(1) it makes no attempt to address ''ill-gotten gains'' garnered by microsoft through its anticompetitive practices. This is a serious shortcoming because the company's illegal tactics have placed it in a very advantageous position in the industry. In order to make anticompetitive behavior unprofitable, there must be substantive punishment that reduces those gains.

(2) the anti-retaliatory clause is insufficient. Section 3.A.1 specifies that Microsoft shall not retaliate against and OEM for ''developing, distributing, promoting, using, selling, or licensing any software that competes with Microsoft Platform Software or any product or service that distributes or promotes any Non-Microsoft Middleware;''. Section 6.L defines Microsoft Platform Software as ''(i) a Windows Operating System Product and/or (ii) a Microsoft Middleware Product.'' As I read this clause, it still allows retaliation against OEM's for developing, distributing, promoting, using, selling, or licensing, software that competes with other Non-Platform Microsoft Products, such as Office, .Net, and other applications. This opens an important window for Microsoft to continue its anticompetitive practices.

(3) the api disclosure provision in section 3.D is impossible to enforce. The only way to ensure that microsoft isn't hiding undocumented API's is to audit the source code. No body with sufficient manpower has been appointed to do this. A more appropriate solution would be to require disclosure to API's AND source to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs. They could then audit suspect code themselves, and present an informed complaint to the Technical Committee, which could verify and investigate.

(4) The only punitive measure specified to discourage Microsoft from non-compliance is a 2 year extension of the terms of the judgement. If Microsoft is not complying with the judgement anyway, this is an extraordinarily ineffective punishment.

II. Support for Plaintiff Litigating States' Remedial Proposals (December 7, 2001)

The proposal filed by the state on December 7th, 2001 is a much more complete remedy. The proposal is available on the web at: http://www.naag.org/features/microsoft/ms-remedy—filing.pdf

(1) It addresses the Microsoft's ill-gotten gains in section H by Open Sourcing the code to Internet Explorer. The Court's Findings of Fact, issued on 11/5/99, state that Microsoft successfully used its monopoly power to increase the market share of Internet Explorer. These findings of fact can be found on the US Department of Justice webpage at: http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f3800/msjudgex.htm#vh By Open Sourcing the code to Internet Explorer, Microsoft is deprived of the gains associated with their anti-competitive behavior. Additionally, consumers and the entire computing industry benefit by augmenting the publically available software infrastructure of the internet.

(2) Section E offers a stronger anti-retaliatory clause which covers all microsoft products, and not just Platform Products.

(3) Section C offers an API Disclosure provision that is enforceable. ISV's, OEM's, etc are provided access to source as well as API documentation. This will allow them to inspect suspicious code and present well informed complaints to the Technical Committee.

(4) Section O offers excellent punitive measures in the event that Microsoft does not comply with the Judgement. Additionally, section L of this document provides excellent protection against Microsoft co-opting and breaking standards compatibility, as the findings of fact show it did with the JAVA standard. This topic is not addressed in the Proposed Final Judgement.

III. General suggestions

Unbundling microsoft middleware/products/services is a superior solution than requiring alternatives be bundled as well. The latter has the effect of favoring a small number of well established middleware/products/services by creating large barriers of entry to new middleware/products/services that are not included in the OS distribution.

Mandating that Microsoft offer licenses to third-party companies to port its applications to alternative Operating Systems is a superior solution than requiring that Microsoft maintain ports of particular products to particular OS's. Determining whether a port of a given application to a given platform can be profitable is difficult and should be decided by the market. Microsoft should not be allowed to lock-out existing markets by not porting applications and not allowing others to do so. However, is it not feasible to expect Microsoft to port every application to every platform. There is not always a demand.

There should be a reward in the event that microsoft makes every effort in good faith to comply with the judgement. Perhaps make the judgement applicable for 10 years, with an option to terminate the measures in 5 if microsoft makes efforts in good faith to comply.

IV. Relevant Links

(1) The Proposed Final Judgement (11/6/2001) http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm

(2) The commentary on the Proposed Final Judgement at antitrustinstitute.org http://www.antitrustinstitute.org/recent/149.cfm

(3) Plaintiff Litigating States' Remedial Proposals (12/7/2001) http://www.naag.org/features/microsoft/ms-remedy—filing.pdf

V. Closing

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope an appropriate set of remedial measures can be decided upon soon.

Mike Lococo
Coordinator Computer Facilities
221 Tjaden Hall
College of AA&P
Cornell University
14853
CC:mpl22@cornell.edu@inetgw

MTC–00004718

From: Frank Carreiro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just a quick note regarding the settlement with Microsoft Corp.

I am rather disappointed with the DOJ. Despite the facts behind the case and a higher court supporting the facts, I was hoping Microsoft would be penalized for exercising regularly their monopoly powers. How many people do you know running Microsoft products? How many run alternative operating systems. Now we have Windows XP. At $300 a copy I'm outraged. Over time products usually get better and cheaper for the home user. Not in this case. I believe this is the most Microsoft has charged for an operating system to date.

Fortunately there are a large number of people walking away from Microsoft. I am now running RedHat Linux 7.x for over 90% of my computer usage these days. At every opportunity I push Linux as a solution simply because it's high quality software without the Microsoft bugs. Someday we all should have the joy of working on a computer that is reasonably priced and very productive.

Speaking of which. I do run a couple of SAMBA servers (www.samba.org) which permit me to connect my friends computers and communicate with them. If I am reading this deal correctly SAMBA and every other product in Linux which can communicate with Windows will be killed. Some deal. Giving Microsoft MORE power to monopolize the world? I don't believe this has been well thought through. I would strongly suggest everyone pay closer attention to what is going on here. Also the not for profit organizations such as Apache would be in great jeopardy.

Section III(J)(2) concerns me a great deal. You may wish to re-read it as it seems to allow Microsoft to define what is a business (well.. just about). Right now the biggest threat to Microsoft is open source software. I think we all understand just how well Microsoft's security by obscurity has worked in the last few years. Pathetic would be kind in my estimation. Certainly the other OS's have their share of problems however it IS easier to troubleshoot and fix problems with 10,000 people looking at the code over 100 people doing the same work. Over time it becomes harder and harder for bugs to creep in as more people get involved. In closing I don't believe splitting the company into two entities will solve the problem at hand however the other end of the spectrum also does not resolve our concerns with Microsoft. Some middle ground must be reached. Microsoft must not be allowed to continue operating as they have in the past. Ma Bell and the oil companies from the early 1900's were not allowed to continue their

monopolistic practices after the courts ruled against them. Why should Microsoft be allowed?

There are better alternatives to Microsoft which are just as difficult to learn and use. Give them a chance to prove themselves. I believe the economy will turn around as they contribute in their own way. Other countries have learned what open source can give them. Let us be leaders and not followers in technology. Else we will be eating their dust in the years to come.

Frank Carreiro

MTC–00004719

From: C HOFFNER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 5:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Renata B. Hesse,

(A Problem—Partial Standards)

Standards are rules system components must embody to interact correctly with other components. Without standards it is impossible to build a new component to extend or upgrade the original system. Components of the DOS and Windows operating systems are at three levels. The drivers at the bottom level include the hardware interface. The applications at the top level include the user interface. There are three areas where the software industry depends on standards to ensure aftermarket products are compatible. These three areas are file formats, application interfaces, and communication protocols. The de jure standards defined by the CCITT and similar bodies inherently promote competition. On the other hand, the de facto standards defined by the Microsoft monopoly effectively stifle competition.

In the telecommunications industry, de jure standards have become a part of the culture. In fact, de facto standards are not viewed as standards at all since they change at the dictates of a single company. The de facto standards from Microsoft stand in stark contrast to those from AT&T and IBM. Entire books have been written on undocumented DOS and Windows. Missing information is only found by reverse engineering. It is not that Microsoft fails to provide details of the standards it defines. It is rather that they are all too often incomplete and inaccurate. Something must be done to level the playing field.

(A Solution—Improved Disclosure)

Before computer programmers write any code, systems engineers write a set of specifications. Among other things, these spell out the standards, both de facto and de jure, the software must implement. Because communications protocols found in Microsoft products are those drafted by standards bodies in the telecommunications industry, complete and accurate documentation is available to competitors. This is not the case with the documentation for file formats and application interfaces. In fact, it is sometimes necessary to find what works by trial and error. The result is unexplained failures.

Standards documents are of use to developers rather than end-users. They should be tracked and updated in a manner consistent with industry practice. The consumer benefit is higher quality products. Changes to file formats and application interfaces may be made late in the development cycle. A product group that is ISO-9001 certified will have procedures for updating the specifications accordingly. To ensure responsible use of its de facto standards:

(1) Order Microsoft to seek ISO-9001 certification.

(2) Order Microsoft to provide missing information.

(3) Impose harsh fines for repeated non-compliance. Improving disclosure of de facto standards is not all that is needed. It is a problem by itself, but only a part of the broader problem. But here, the example of AT&T and IBM can help in fashioning a solution.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Hoffner

MTC–00004720

From: JMHynes@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the US DOJ:

For what it's worth, it is time for you to hear from the backbone of the US economic system—The small business owner. Below is a copy of an email that I sent to Microsoft. It was written from the culmination of many years of my frustration with attempting to use Microsoft's products. This direct lack of respect for customer service sent me over the edge. And so, I send this to you to read and understand that the economy will never realize the true efficiency gains from Microsoft software because we spend twice as much time as we save with it on the phone with poor customer service issues. Bottom line = If there was a competing operating system out there to which I could easily switch, I would be gone from Microsoft in an instant. Please negotiate a settlement that encourages better service and/or competition. If I receive a response from Microsoft, I will submit it for your review as well.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Hynes

Partner

Excidian, LLC

To whom it may concern (Manufacturing/Engineering/whoever):

I own a small business. I purchased a computer from Gateway with your Millenium product on it and a FREE upgrade to Windows XP. Gateway tells me that I will have to wait for my upgrade until next spring even though they are shipping new computers with their OEM version of XP on it now. Microsoft customer support had a great deal of difficulty explaining this to me (I cannot believe you leave your customer service people hanging out to dry without the info to explain these problems), but from what I can understand, Microsoft tweaks each OEM version so that it runs correctly with each manufacturer's BIOS. I cannot believe that you cannot burn enough upgrade disks so that your OEM customer, Gateway, does not have to tell their customers that they will have to wait until the spring of 2002! Or, did you release the XP version before the bios designs were ready and now software engineering cannot keep up? Or, did Gateway run a promotion to keep selling computers and screw their customers that were stupid enough to buy a device with Millenium (and I write that branded product name with disdain)? Can someone at Microsoft explain why I will have to wait until the spring of 2002 for my upgrade from Millenium to Windows XP? I'm thinking right now that if there were competition for operating systems, this type of ''glitch'' would not happen. If I could easily switch to a competing operating system right now, I would do it. I certainly would not run my small business like this. Show me your entrepreneurial spirit. Show me that you want to under promise and over deliver. Show me that you want to keep your customers happy enough so that no other competing operating system would be able to take customers from you. Show me that you care enough by letting Bill Gates read and answer this email. Better yet, send me my Gateway customized upgrade from Millenium to Windows XP!

John Hynes
Excidian, LLC
(724) 728–8477
CC:Excidian@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00004721

From: Patrick McCloskey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 7:52pm
Subject: Microsoft antitrust settlement

I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons.

First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly.

Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate. THEY ARE OBVIOUSLY STILL UP TO THEIR SAME OLD TRICKS AND THINK YOU AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE FOOLS.

Patrick McCloskey

MTC–00004722

From: Pam Takada
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement, I am opposed to the settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to register my OPPOSITION TO THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT, which is too lenient. I am an ordinary citizen with no connection to the case. I feel that Microsoft is a monopoly and that the settlement is a slap on the wrist for Microsoft. Clearly, the evidence shows the monopolistic and predatory behavior of Microsoft.

The settlement only serves Microsoft's interest in further propagating its monopoly. A suitable settlement would include the breakup of Microsoft into 2 or more companies.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Takada
916 San Ramon Ave.
Huntsville, AL 35802
Pam.Takada@mindspring.com
256–881–7750

MTC–00004723

From: jackie lightfield

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 8:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed terms of the settlement, in particular ''that Microsoft does not have to disclose portions of the APIs that might ''compromise the security of anti-piracy, antivirus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption or authentication systems'' is problematic. Under such vague definitions, Microsoft would be able to avoid other provisions of the settlement by invoking this clause. I don't think it was the intent of the courts to create a case law that is unspecified and therefor unenforceable.

Much like there are Government regulations separating the consolidation of power amongst owners of broadcast and newspaper media companies in the same markets, there too should be regulations against the consolidation of of power amongst a single company in the technology market.

It is imperative that the industry adopt standards in order to assure interoperability. This is the area that I hope the Department of Justice review and determine that an enforcement of published standards, long before the release of software, would provide competition an equal opportunity to develop for the operating system in question, and as a by product, create better software. Under the proposed settlement there are no time provisions, that would define clearly the period in which new APIs can be introduced and disseminated. Further, there should be a classification of where, within the operating system code, such portions of the API as it related to security of anti-piracy, antivirus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption or authentication systems, are utilized, and what alternatives the Operating System will provide for third-party software to utilize such API calls. For example, a chat service that requires authentication, should not require that the chat service ''recreate: authentication, encryption or other such code, in order to perform correctly on the operating system.

regards
jaqueline lightfield
president
http://www.blowtorch.com
interactive publishing technologies
tel 203/497–8832 fax 203/497–8836
* http://www.yourct.com *

MTC–00004724

From: Ken Worthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:17pm
Subject: Software monopolies and Microsoft

Hello.

The government's solution to its case against Microsoft, and its strategy in pursuing the case, are completely misguided and ineffective. In short, MICROSOFT'S MONOPOLOY MUST BE ELIMINATED, NOT MITIGATED, AT ITS SOURCE, BY FORCING THE CREATION OF OPEN STANDARDS, PARTICULARLY THE STANDARDIZATION OF THE INTERFACE BETWEEN THE OPERATING SYSTEM AND APPLICATIONS AND THE STANDARDIZATION OF FILE FORMATS, SUCH AS WORD PROCESSING DOCUMENT FORMATS.

The government has managed to get this case completely wrong. There is a fact about software development which is essential to Microsoft's position which has been obscured by the whole conversation. That's because the correct distinctions between more traditional technologies and software have not yet been discerned. This case is not, at its essence, about ''unfair'' practices, but rather aobut the very existence of a harmful and unnecessary monopoly control over what should be in the public domain—operating system and file format interface specifications. The fact is that monopoly proprietorship of operating system and file format interfaces is NOT essential to interoperability. A standard IS essential, and that standard will either be intentionally created/maintained, or it will be spontaneously generated by whichever company has an early market lead. In the case of the operating system / application interface, Microsoft was lucky enough to have an early lead, and its momentum in the control of the operating system interface has lead to a huge market advantage which has only grown and will continue to do so. In addition, they have been able to parlay their position as controller of that standard into the monopoly control of yet more standards, particularly the file format standards for word processing and spreadsheets.

The very fact that the solutions arrived at involve simply penalizing Microsoft for unfair business practices and reforming those practices reveals that there is a real lack of understanding that it is not simply Microsoft's use of their defacto monopoly position that is harmful, but rather the very existence of that monopoloy position, which, contrary to much of what they and others say is NOT essential for the health of the industry and innovation, but rather extremely DETRIMENTAL to those things. Evidence of the latter is the fact that Microsoft continues to produce defective, inefficient operating systems (which are continually purchased due to their monopoly position, NOT their quality), that are quite inferior to readily available alternatives which do not enjoy a monopoly hold on the operating system to application interface.

Microsoft's astounding success and wealth has been gained primarily due to their monopoly control over these interfaces. Because of that, they now should be forced to fund the creation of an independent industry consortium or standards board responsible for creating and developing the open interface standards, and they must be forced to conform to those standards in all of their products. At that point, the market will be truly open and free and other competitors will be able to actually compete with Microsoft. Microsoft knows full well that when this happens, their market hold will dissolve because other companies are more streamlined and efficient and will be able to produce these products at a fraction of the price. The result will be the release of the vast human resources now occupied by Microsoft, into more efficient and productive companies. This would be the most positive development in the software industry, perhaps ever.

These thoughts come from about 15 years' experience as a software developer and observer of the software industry. Now that I am in graduate school, I see firsthand many more of the negative effects of Microsoft's monopolies. In academia, as in much of the rest of society, word processing documents cannot usually be accessed by other people unless they are in Microsoft's proprietary ''Word'' .doc format. That is simply because it has become the defacto standard format. There is no reason why one company must control the defacto standard format; it could as well be controlled by an open standards board who are responsible for its maintenance and technical development. Also, we are effectively required by the defacto operating system standard to have Microsoft Office as our operating system for computers; this is because many of our scholars require certain programs which only work on that operating system. If Microsoft did not own the defacto standard operating system interface, ANY vendor would be able to produce operating systems which would run all of those applications that we need. The interface itself would be developed in such a way as to benefit consumers and the industry as a whole rather than being developed primarily at the discretion and for the benefit of a single company.

The fact that it is the operating system / application interface which Microsoft controls (and is the defacto standard) is obscured in most of the discussions that I have seen in this case. Government lawyers have ASSUMED that it is the operating system itself, rather than the interface to it which is central to the monopoly, but this is false. The following analogy should illustrate the point: In the world of transportation, imagine that one single company owned all of the information (and patents) needed to construct a road or highway (other companies might be able to make railroads, for which the exact design specifications are public knowledge). This company basically owns the interface between roads and cars. Other companies can produce cars to drive on their roads (because they publish that side of their interface), but other companies cannot produce roads on which those same cars can drive, because patent law prohibits them from building roads to those secret, proprietary specifications—the road/car interface specification. You would think it is absurd, but this is exactly the situation we are in with software. One company got an early lead in producing desktop operating systems, gained momentum from the market's deep need for a standard interface, and has reaped the rewards ever since, to the detriment of industry and consumers. Please make Microsoft give up its proprietary control of operating system and file format interface specifications, and create an open standards board to administer industry-wide standards for these things.

Thank you very much,
Kenneth Worthy
University of California, Berkeley

MTC–00004725

From: Taran Rampersad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 9:29pm
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Microsoft Inc.'s Case

To Whom It May Concern:

For the record, I am a Software Developer who has worked in the industry for almost 10 years. I have used many Microsoft products, and have enjoyed the increasing abilities of software systems developed by Microsoft. I also enjoy using other operating systems, but as a software developer, I have to follow market trends to keep myself fed—regardless of the market trends.

However, it is apparent that Microsoft has attempted to maintain a monopoly on the Internet Web Browser market to any casual software user. It is more apparent to a software developer who work within Microsoft operating systems. The technical aspects involved in the operating system itself, specifically, development with the Microsoft Foundation Classes and use of ''.Net'' technology marries the software developer (happily or unhappily so) to Internet Explorer, and the operating system. Furthermore, specific training programs such as MCSE (Microsoft Certified Software Engineer) and MCSD (Microsoft Certified Solution Developer) are geared towards maintaining the Internet Browser market by way of gearing Microsoft Certified individuals (who pay for courses and tests!) to use only Microsoft Products. Operating Systems. Software. Software Development. In an internet enabled world, these are the tools for maintaining a monopoly on the Internet Browser Market.

One could argue that nobody else has attempted these things on the level that Microsoft Inc. has. Yet that is my point. Nobody should. Freedom of Choice.

The newer versions of Windows have the internet technologies wrapped in them. This IS an obvious attempt to maintain a monopoly on the Internet Browser market. They may be able to prove that they did not do it 'on purpose', but they have done it. If I run over a man with my car, and I broke a traffic law while doing so, the offense is manslaughter. It I planned to do it (premeditated), it's Murder 1.

The fact remains that a man would be dead. The fact remains that Microsoft has leveled the playing field. Odds are that when this is read, it will be read on a Windows NT 4.0 machine. Why? Because the U.S. Government has certified Windows NT 4.0 as a secure operating system. Furthermore, this mail message will probably be read through another one of Microsoft's applications.

The U.S. Government, for lack of any other 'secure' operating system, has gone with the highest bidder. Neil Armstrong quipped about going to the moon on everything built by the lowest bidder, and here the United States states that we'll go with the ONLY software manufacturer that creates an operating system.

This seems counterintuitive. Freedom of Choice. If you need more proof than the software that the reader of this document is using, and my ability to predict that, I'm at a loss.

These two points highlight the fact that the average American consumer is paying more than once for the same software—first as consumers, then as taxpayers. When banks charge twice for ATM withdrawals, we cringe and say that it may be legal, but it is obviously immoral. Given, the hardware manufacturer is hiding the price of the operating system on new computer systems, the fact remains the same. This is a sticky situation, but legal recourse in the interest of the people of the United States (and the rest of the world!) should contain the following items:

(1) Microsoft products—or products of any software manufacturer—must be sold as separate items by computer vendors. Users can then make a CONSCIOUS choice. Other software manufacturers then also have a chance to compete. Installation of the USER SELECTED software can remain free.

(2) Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

(3) The specifications of Microsoft's past, present and future document and network formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's AND other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows Application Program Interface ('Windows API', the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

(4) The level Microsoft is certified by the Software Engineering Institute must be made public to the consumer, as well as insight into their development process for Operating Systems. SEI level 3 is required by the United States Government for software companies that supply software to it (or that was coming in 1999). This certification was created to protect the government from software manufacturers that had no software development process. This same certification should protect the average consumer, AND insight into the Software Development Process for creation of their operating systems would give software manufacturer's a chance to keep up with Microsoft.

(5) Device Driver information for new operating systems MUST be made public prior to the release of the operating system by a minimum of 6 months. This is VERY important when dealing with future web enabled embedded devices. This is also very important to the average consumer—they get a better product!

This judgement is not only of import to the United States, where it is a national issue. It is in fact an INTERNATIONAL issue, since the monopoly itself extends to all corners of the world. Judgement in this case MUST be fair to the consumer, because future cases along these lines will look toward this precedent. And, in future, it may not be as domestic an issue.

Furthermore, if Microsoft Inc. were a foreign company, this would be seen as a security issue. It should be seen this way despite the fact that Microsoft is a domestic software manufacturer for the SAME reasons.

Please realize that the implications in an internet based society reach further than the next few years.

They affect society ad infinitum.

Thank you,

Taran Rampersad

2546 Oak Trail West, #203

Clearwater, FL 33764.

MTC–00004726

From: Derek Chen-Becker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

My name is Derek Chen-Becker and I am currently a Graduate student at Washington University in Saint Louis, Missouri. I am writing to voice my concern with the proposed remedy for the Microsoft Anti-trust settlement. Specifically, I feel that the proposed remedy does not in any way recognize the significance of non-commercial works and the importance of maintaining open standards to the process of innovation in the computer industry. The Internet, originally DarpaNet, was conceived on the basis of open standards to ensure interoperability between disparate systems. The proposed remedies would allow Microsoft to leverage its monopoly in the personal computer market to impose de facto standards without requiring that these standards are open for interoperability purposes. Without this requirement, Microsoft can effectively stifle competition in any one area by changing its standards enough to break competing products.

As a graduate student, I am aware of many projects written for non-Microsoft operating systems which are used to allow compatibility between systems. For instance, the Samba project (http://www.samba.org) provides network filesystem compatibility between Microsoft and non-Microsoft operating systems. This project is non-commercial and is effectively in the public domain. Section I.1 specifies that all terms be reasonable and non-discriminatory (RAND), but what is RAND for a commercial entity is hardly RAND for a non-profit project composed of volunteers.

I feel that without modifications to the settlement that provide for requirements of open standards, Microsoft will have little incentive to change its current practice of breaking interoperability with non-Microsoft systems.

Thank You,

Derek Chen-Becker

Derek Chen-Becker
dwb2@cec.wustl.edu
http://cec.wustl.edu/dwb2

MTC–00004727

From: Craig Ogle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/17/01 11:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an Australian Computer user for the last 15 years I have seen the rise of personal computers. This has been an amazing journey. The darkest part of computing has been the rise of the Microsoft Corporation as it has constricted competition and forced IT'S standards upon the computing world. I think the settlement that Microsoft wants to reach is a slap in the face for justice (world not just American). This corporation who has destroyed countless companies, has to be held accountable for its actions.

Please as a concerned world citizen do not let Microsoft railroad the justice system at it has done the computer world.

Craig Ogle
4 Sylvia Crt Eatons Hill
Queensland Australia 4037

MTC–00004728

From: skoric@EUnet.yu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 12:17am
Subject: MICROSOFT ANTITRUST

''Red Hat'' <RedHat@redhat.rgc2.net> wrote:

November was a busy month for Microsoft and the US judicial system. It began when the Department of Justice announced it had reached a settlement of the antitrust suit against the company. The DOJ had previously found Microsoft to be a monopolist, but the settlement included no punishment for past actions and left doubt as to its protections against future monopolistic practices.

The DOJ is collecting your letters about the settlement via email. We encourage you to share your opinions.

send your letters to:
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

That's my opinion. The global position of Microsoft's Windows has made it the world's leader in operating systems. That is ok as long as it is considered as a market competition. But, when such a leader position is used to remove competitive products in areas that are not so close to (or just not needed to be used by) an operating system—then it is the monopol.

It makes me wonder why the DOJ (or any other US official) doesn't include any punishment for past actions, because that might motivate other similar cases. In the same time, looks that such ''justice'' is very ''gentle'' to the monopolyst that is an US company. Would it be the same when a non-US company behaved like Mocrosoft? It won't be good if such ''justice'' works for only those players who might belong to the US ''national interests'', but does not for others.

Regards,
Misko

MTC–00004729

From: David C. Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 12:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

''I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

''I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate.

''Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

''Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so.

''Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.''

You can't be serious about letting Microsoft off the hook !

Sincerely,
David C. Hill
Arvada, Colorado

''Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.''

John Fitzgerald Kennedy
1/20/61
Dave Hill <dchill1@qwest.net> :-)

MTC–00004730

From: Ted McFadden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 12:55am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Suit

To whom it may concern:

I was made aware of this e-mail address by an online forum, and wish to contribute my opinion to the trial, for whatever it may be worth. Microsoft makes itself to appear harmless, but in fact they are a gigantic international monster, crushing any and all competition in its path to maintain its own kingdom. While this in itself may not be a bad thing, consider that the ideal Microsoft world basically consists of us ''low-life'' consumers feeding them money on their own terms. Microsoft does not care whether the customers are happy; they simply want money, and they will do anything in their power to get it. Recently, Microsoft has been issuing progressively worse software (starting with the release of their Windows 95 operating system, and continuing today in the form of their Windows XP operating system), but a lack of a real choice has subjected many (including myself) to Microsoft's whim.

As an American who believes in the freedom to choose, I object to Microsoft's continued abuse of their monopoly power, especially after having been disciplined once. Microsoft was given a second chance by the 1995 Consent Decree, issued by the highest law of the land (our own Supreme Court). They not only disobeyed the Decree, they insulted the very heart of our judicial system by doing so. The punishment for doing so should *NOT* give them the chance to extend their monopoly power further, as the current proposed settlement would allow. I, personally, am all in favor of Microsoft donating money instead of software and hardware, to let the said schools choose their own preferred route. Not only that, Microsoft should make information about competition available to the said schools, so the schools can make an informed choice. If the schools choose to go with Microsoft's software, then so be it.... at least they had the ability to choose.

Sincerely,
Edward Ridout ''Ted'' McFadden

MTC–00004731

From: John McBride
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 1:38am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Ms. Hesse,

As stated on the subject line, I am writing you this letter in regard to the proposed settlement between the United States Justice Department and the Microsoft Corporation. I must tell you up front that I am not a lawyer or economic specialist. My only real interest in the case stems from my profession as a computer programmer, a means with which I have earned my living (to some extent) since the mid 1980s.

As outlined at the DOJ website, I have reviewed the various sections of the document found at :

http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm

As I am a simple person, I am partioning this message into three parts. The first part will address the shortcomings I perceive in the proposal, the second part will address what I believe to be positive areas of the proposal, and the final section will be a declaration of my personal concerns about the overall proposal.

I will quote the portions of the document that concern me, then follow the quote with some type of comment.

Part One: Shortcomings of the Proposal:

''Section III. Prohibited Conduct''

''A. Microsoft shall not retaliate against an OEM...''

''B. Microsoft's provision of Windows Operating System Products to Covered OEMs...''

''C. Microsoft shall not restrict by agreement any OEM...''

Microsoft's upcoming strategy is to replace hardware OEMs (Dell,HP,Compaq) with their own hardware platform, and derivitives of the same, known as ''The Xbox''. These prohibitions are meaningless in such a scenario.

''Section III. Prohibited Conduct''

''E. Starting nine months after the submission of this proposed...''

''D. Starting at the earlier of the release of...''

Part of the text includes the wording ''..for the sole purpose of interoperating with a Windows Operating System Product...'' Does this mean that any code written must, at the time of execution, be connected on at least one end to a Microsoft product? In other words, Microsoft is guaranteed 50% market share during a transaction instance? If this interpretation can be made, it is hardly a penalty—it is guaranteed market share.

''Section III. Prohibited Conduct''

''F.2. Microsoft shall not enter into any agreement relating...'' The wording is so complex that it will be, in practice, easily circumvented.

''Section III. Prohibited Conduct''

''J.1; J.2 ...'' IP, Piracy, Hackers...this is an enormous loophole; an open hoop that Microsoft will jump through in an instant. These two sections, in many ways, invalidate the entire proposal.

Part Two: Positive Areas of the Proposal:

Anything exposing the inner workings of the Windows System, both the protocols and APIs, so that programmers, researchers and scientists can make their products work efficiently and competitively with the Microsoft Platform are beneficial. I hope that Section III.E,D can be interpreted in such a way that no Microsoft product need be present in the transaction using such exposed protocols and APIs.

Part Three: Declaration of Personal Concerns:

My primary personal concern is that, at nearly every technical conference I attend, there is an increased Microsoft presence at a rate that far exceeds the market saturation of General Motors (1950's) and IBM (1970's)—both of which had dealings with the US Government regarding antitrust issues—in the American marketplace Given the extreme market penetration, the continuing patterns of abuse, and a marketing department that (quite frankly) lies at every opportunity, all I can say about Microsoft (with regards to this proposal) is the following statement:

''As a result of this proposal, Microsoft will have an increased presence on computers and computing devices in the near and long term. Consumers will continue to have less choice in the computing environments they use, as such, the proposed settlement will not have accomplished its goal—to end the Microsoft monopoly on computing devices''.

If the DOJ and Federal Government were serious about increasing consumer choice, you would have found a way to mandate Operating Environments (in general) on a percentage basis, in much the way broadcasting and monetary environments are regulated. Indeed, the political arm would have insured that no platform ever control more than, say, thirty percent of the user or server environment. Until the Federal Government and the DOJ acknowlege this reality, my choice in computing environments is, quite simply, Microsoft. The proposal has not, and will not, change this reality.

Thank you for your fine service, and I strongly appreciate this opportunity to express my opinions.

Sincerely,
John McBride,
North Edwards, CA

MTC–00004732

From: Scott Walters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 2:07am
Subject: Settlement Comments

Dear Renata Hesse;

I wish to go on record as I feel I have been materially harmed, as have all businesses and software developers in America. Microsoft sets a standard for compatability for nearly all computer systems in the United States. Competing systems by other vendors, such as Compaq, IBM, RedHat, SGI are frequently and genereally rejected for applications for which they are technically superior and more cost effective because they do not meet this standard of compatability set by Microsoft Corporation. The standard that Microsoft sets shifts to suit Microsofts needs. When competing products are able to interoperate with their file formats, programming conventions, or network protocols, Microsoft quickly changes the standards. As a result, people and companies genereally fear to use anything not endorced by Microsoft, as they know it will soon be incompatable. This afflicts even vendors who wish to support Microsoft, by building their software exclusively on this platform. Any company that makes good or useful software for Microsoft quickly finds that Microsoft has a version of their own software that is tightly integrated with Windows that is difficult to remove or replace. This has happended to Lotus, to dBase, to Netscape, to Harvard Graphics, to WinAmp—and hundreds of other companies and products.

A previous computer software and hardware monopoly, before being broken up, held the market from any outside innovation, and provided standard software programming processes and computer systems. These systems are the heart of many large companies, including my current employer, Qwest. These systems became deeply entrenched, after 15 years of monopoly. It has proven impossible to replace these computers or move the software off of them, due to their proprietary nature. The backbones of thousands of companies like Qwest/USWest are these ailing, proprietary, hulking beasts. They cannot be upgraded any longer to deal with the new demands increased capacity and business models have placed on them. Modern software design processes and methods don't apply to them. Even today, as each year goes by, it becomes harder and harder to replace them.

Closed, secret systems owned by a single vendor are creating time-bombs for the future. While businesses know they will never be able to run software for Windows on any other system, they are failing to consider the fact that the face of computing will have completely changed in 10 years. Unless Microsoft's protocols, file formats, and ''API'' (software's specification for interfacing to the operating system) are not intentionally minipulated to maintain incompatability and secrecy, we will face this same legacy, and this same disaster, again. Billions of dollars will be spent maintaining systems from a previous generation, while businesses information backbones could easily be taking on new shapes and dimentions. Every business bullied into using Microsoft products today for fear of being subjected to incompatability will find the future holds much greater threats.

This monopoly will essentially be leagized if Microsoft's offer is accepted. The corporations, software developers, computer manufacturers, and consumers deserve better then this. Microsoft can maintain a viable product and business without this. The quality of Microsoft's product will not noticibly deteriate, and will likely improve, if they are not held in a status where they can refuse to interoperate with other vendor's products. Data and resources being shared between computers will produce a more diverse, competitive market. Businesses will be able to elect to use software, hardware, and other technology that best suits their needs, including new, untested, experimental and futuristic ideas. Businesses will be at liberty to plan and build for a future, and to take this future in their own hands.

Thank you sincerely for your time and attention on this grave matter.

Scott David Walters
16231 E Balsam Dr
Fountain Hills, AZ 85268

MTC–00004733

From: Christopher Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 2:42am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Apparently it is quite impossible for non-technologically enhanced people to look at the situation logically-especially US Justices. Trust in that if Microsoft is penalized to the letter and spirit of the law-that the sky won't fall. There are alternatives to Microsoft. It is incredulous to my mind that Microsoft has been allowed to thrive. Apparently Mr. Gates can buy ANYthing-even justice. I wish you all a lifetime of windows for your actions to date, may you live with unstable operating systems. thousands of computer viruses, and a stagnant tech sector due to your laissez-faire policies. Not to mention a megalomaniac named Gates. Usually I am sympathetic to people of Mr. Gates nature, for he is truly a unique individual. A real shame that due to his business practices and unrepentant behavior he is no better than a criminal, and since he is super-wealthy can buy what he wants. For myself I will not purchase Microsoft software, nor will I use it unless it is free, and superior. Fortunately Microsoft Macintosh products are superior in this area where Microsoft has had to compete with other Macintosh products. Microsoft CAN do a good job of software if they have to. Why do they have to under the settlement you propose?

I would rather not service Microsoft OS based computers in my work, and since I an a Macintosh specialist I don't have to. Even the new Windows XP will crash if a real load is put into the OS-not to mention the back orifices that report the contents of your hard drive to Redmond every time you connect to the internet. I realize that Microsoft has a piracy of software problem-but I am not prepared to live in a world where some engineer can look at the contents of my hard disk whenever I use the net. No thanks America, I'll stick with my Mac.

MTC–00004734

From: Karl Fusaris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 6:37am
Subject: Rewarding Crime

Dear Sir or Madam,

Rewarding criminals in exchange for their crimes sends the wrong message to everyone.

Yours truly,
Karl Fusaris

MTC–00004735

From: tidwell@tekelec.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 7:34am
Subject: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

Just upgraded to windows XP and wanted to share some concerns I have as a consumer.

During the upgrade process from Windows 98 MS informed me that Java would no longer work with my new system and must be removed for the upgrade. It also informed me that my Adaptec CD software would have to be removed as well.

While the Java issue makes me laugh the Adaptec issue IS SERIOUS. The reason being the software WILL WORK ON WINDOWS 2000 BUT NOT XP. XP uses the EXACT same 'kernal' as Windows 2000. So to use the analogy of a car I should be able to use the same gas but now I have to visit a different gas pump for CDs!

On further examination I find that MS is making it difficult for me to work with MP3 but PUSHING their own WMA format for CD data. I COULD NOT EVEN READ my Quicken data from a CD-RW disk because XP changed the driver.

Now for the cleancher ...

MS HAS LOCKED DOWN ACCESS TO DRIVERS. IF YOU WRITE A DRIVER FOR MS THEY HAVE TO APPROVE IT NOW. So now unless I do a deal with MS my driver would NOT GET USED by the average consumer. MS will use this to force upon consumers hardware and media that the consumers will have NO CHOICE on.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE stop this. The American software market will go to Japan or Europe if the bright minds in this country are not given access to the OS.

MS was born on 3rd base and wants everyone to think they got there by hard work. Well if MS is TRULY a competitive company then shouldn't their application divisions have to play by the same rules as everyone else?

MS only has to hit it out of the infield for THEM to get a homerun. For everyone else writing software you have to swing blind folded and HOPE you hit it.

I see no way for a software company to make money writing software that run on Windows. MS continues to dump on the market and sit on their cash. If an oil company was in the car buinsess would you let them give away CARS?

Then how can an OS company give away applications while still making money selling them? Why can't everyone see that if Ford and Exxon where the same company and DESTROYED ALL THE OTHER ONES that it would be a BAD THING. Operating sytems and application software SHOULD BE considered seperate markets. IF REVENUE IS GAINED. MAKE MS GIVE AWAY EITHER THE APPLICATIONS OR THE OS. MAKE THEM PICK.

No other software company can give away free code without someway to make a profit.

Sincerely,
Ed Tidwell
Raleigh, NC

MTC–00004736

From: Andrew Kuenzi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 8:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is absolute joke that you would allow this company to settle when you have mountains of evidence and countless witnesses to the fact that this company has demonstarted, and continous to demonstrate monopolistic behaviors. It really makes me wonder what kind of justice we have when you have solid evidence to a crime, and from my last review of the laws of the United States, monopolistic behavior is a crime, and you choose to settle instead of procecute to the fullest extent. It would not surprise me to read that the justice department will also settle with Bin Laden for 2 years probation or a settlement of $100,000. You always take the easy way out. There are reasons laws are created. Either you enforce the laws or you change them.

MTC–00004737

From: PRAXIS Institute
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 8:37am
Subject: MS Settlement

Greetings and good day.

We are requesting information on how to provide services to over 20,000 low income, at-risk, under-served, under-represented minority and ethnic youth. The Microsoft settlement with the DOJ is an answer to our prayers. We currently operate computer repair classes for our youth and families, but we need software and computers for their homes and their schools. Lots of schools. Could you please give us the relevant contact information from both the U.S. and Microsoft?

Thank you. We can be reached at 215.769.2441, 215.514.7680, 781.239.0115, and through this e-mail address.

Horace Arthur Trent III
President and CEO
PRAXIS Institute
CC:pdwhite@juno.com@inetgw

MTC–00004738

From: Immanuel.Babu@
industrialrisk.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 9:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to register my strong reservations regarding the settlement reached with Microsoft. A company which limits consumers access to competitors software should not receive such a liberal settlement. The source code for the Windows platform should be open source so that all vendors would have an equal footing. There should be strict restrictions on the aggressive marketing policies of this company.

Best Regards
Immanuel Babu
860/ 543 6246

MTC–00004739

From: Marc Schafer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 9:14am
Subject: comments

Attached, please find my comments regarding the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust lawsuit.

Marc Schafer

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this letter to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed settlement against the Microsoft monopoly. I have worked in the software industry for 10 years now. Great strides have been taken in that time and Microsoft has made many contributions; however, they have used their power and control in the market to limit consumer choice.

They have taken advantage of their operating system monopoly to take over

every area of application software seen as profitable. They do this by providing their own internal developers with the Applications Programming Interface (API) for the Windows operating system well before the public has access to it. Some parts of the API are never published at all. Microsoft has also used bundling to great advantage. The anti-trust action started as a result of their unfair competitive practices used against Netscape and the results can already be seen. Microsoft has used it monopoly in web browsers to begin modifying existing web standards into proprietary, undocumented extensions that render some web pages unviewable in Netscape. Many content creators using Microsoft tools are not even aware that are using these extensions resulting in numerous pages on the web that simply don't work with anything but Microsoft tools. Microsoft enjoys unrivaled market power and uses its wealth to maintain this dominance. Licensing agreements with computer vendors ensure that the discount for ordering a machine with Windows installed is almost nothing while the retail purchase price of the operating system is large. As a frequent linux user, I have also seen companies producing software for both operating systems get purchased by Microsoft and forsake their linux products within months afterwards.

Despite their numerous abuses, the current proposed settlement does nothing to improve the comptetive situation. In fact, donations to schools will only cement Microsoft's position by training a new generation of computer users in a Microsoft only environment. The remedies against the monopoly must include the following:

1. Microsoft products must be listed as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

2. The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

3. Applications in markets where Microsoft enjoys a monopoly due to past anti-competitive behavior must be made available on non-Windows operating systems. For example, Internet Explorer should be ported to Linux/Unix along with the Microsoft Office Suite. Selling these products on other operating systems would generate revenue for the company yet they refuse to do it because it weakens their stranglehold on the market.

4. All Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet as they are trying to do right now by subverting Java and introducing extensions in their web server which are undocumented and work only with Internet Explorer.

5. Microsoft must make available for sale a ''bare-bones'' version of its operating system to prevent bundling. Although great arguments have gone on about what constitutes a ''bare-bones'' operating system, there are examples to work from. Linux, for example, still fits entirely on a single 1.4MB floppy disk.

6. Microsoft must be prevented from entering the hardware market. The introduction of the XBox clearly paves the way for a future for where Microsoft software will be the only choice and it will only work well on their own hardware. Without these remedies there will be no other operating systems, web browsers, or office productivity suites. The United States is a world leader in technology for the digital age. It is time for Microsoft's control over the future of the entire industry to be broken so that other innovators may have their chance to shape the future.

Sincerely, Marc Schafer

MTC–00004740

From: Brendan Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 9:28am
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Settlement

Just wanting to convey my disbelief at the proposed settlement for the Microsoft anti-trust case. Allowing Microsoft to provide software to schools will have the effect of strengthening their position, not punishing them for past vioalations and preventing new ones. Any settlement MUST punish Microsoft for their past abuse of their monopoly position, prevent future abuses, compensate victims of the abuse, and allow current and future competitors a level 'playing field'. Nothing else is good enough; nothing else will send out a clear message that huge corporations such as this will not be allowed to abuse their extremely priveleged position.

Regards,
Brendan J Moore
23 Buller Road
Brighton
BN2 4BH
United Kingdom

MTC–00004741

From: Thomas Diehl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 9:40am
Subject: Public Comment

I usually do not comment on issues such as this trial, but I am baffled by how much leeway Microsoft has had in determining its own punishment for abusing monopoly power.

If a person commits and is convicted of murder, there is very little disagreement on whether jail time is appropriate punishment. The defendant doesn't decide the nature of the punishment. While I understand that there is little well defined precedent for this case, that does not justify repeated rebuttals of punishment until they fit within the control of Microsoft.

I would like to add my own suggestion for part of the punishment appropriate to the crime. One of the reasons Microsoft maintains a monopoly is control of the Office software sales. I would think removing proprietary rights to any file formats of current and future (5+ years) mocrosoft products would be appropriate. I believe that if this is done, it would allow competitors access to the market since purchasing microsft software would not be required for compatibility. This could have addressed issues with Java compatibility, preventing the continous upgrade path Microsoft forced on the office software consumers, and several other area where Microsoft is trying to gain control, such as video and audio formats, graphics drivers and others.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. as I have watched this case through several phases, the arrogance and poor morality of Microsoft has made itself readily apparent. I believe something must be done that will actually changed how business is done at Microsoft. The current settlement does not appear to offer any repercussions that could prevent microsoft from maintaining a monopoly through abuse of that monopoly.

Sincerely yours,
Thomas Diehl

MTC–00004742

From: Jason Glazer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 10:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe the proposed settlement will prevent Microsoft from abusing its monopoly position in the software market in the future. I call for structural remedies. Innovation is the cornerstone of the software industry yet innovation throughout the industry has slowed to a trickle. Microsoft provides innovative new features slowly in a measured approach so that they can ensure continued upgrades to software in future years. Office and Internet Explorer have seen very few real innovations since competition has ceased. No real competition or innovation is possible unless the competitive threat that exists today as Microsoft is removed from the industry. Microsoft prevents new companies from starting based simply on the fear that if they become successful they will face Microsoft.

Instead of the current settlement, please recommend that Microsoft be broken into many small companies (about 20). Each ''sub-Microsoft'' would be provided the entire set of source code and 1/20th of the employees chosen by lottery. These companies not be allowed to rejoin in any form for at least 15 years nor allow any of the companies to hire any programmer from any of the competing companies for the same 15 years. Any collaboration between the companies would be prohibited unless done in a open forum that anyone could attend for the cost of attendance. If Microsoft has been shown to have abused its monopoly position than only structural remedies can have any lasting effect.

Jason Glazer

MTC–00004744

From: Mark Carrara
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 12:57pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement

As a user of Microsoft products, specifically the Windows Operating system I do not feel that the proposed settlement is a fair remedy for the illegal activities that Microsoft was found guilty of committing. Contrary to Microsoft's current spin on the matter, they were found guilty and the verdict was upheld by the appellate court. The only question open is that of a fair remedy. I feel that the remedy proposed by the current DOJ is based on political considerations and not what is fair for users and the country as a whole.

One argument put forth by the supporters of Microsoft is that it is in the 'national interest' that they not have harsh remedies applied. With the rapid reduction in the cost of computer components the operating system is becoming one of the most expensive 'part' of a modern computer. If Microsoft was not allowed to maintain the monopoly it has on operating systems, costs to consumers, including businesses, would be reduced, increasing profits throughout the economy.

Any remedy needs to address the ability of purchasers of computers be allowed to reduce their costs by not buying Windows when they purchase a new computer. Also sanctions must be put in place to prevent Microsoft from extending their operating system monopoly to other areas, such as the Internet.

Mark Carrara Technology Coordinator
School District of Gilman 325 N. 5th St
Gilman, WI 54433

MTC–00004745

From: David J. Liszewski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I suggest that this remedy be implemented and enforced as soon as possible. Today it is impossible to buy an Intel-based personal computer without paying for Microsoft software. I hope that the penalties are a sufficient deterrent: any amount less than hundreds of millions or billions is immaterial to them.

Sincerely,
David J. Liszewski

MTC–00004746

From: Chris Compton
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/18/01 2:12pm
Subject: Commentary on Microsoft settlement

While the DOJ settlement does seem a little light to me, it is the best offer on the table for the United States. The other states want to destroy Microsoft, you cannot let this happen. Despite the personal interest of the people at Oracle, Sun, et. al., Microsoft has propelled the microcomputer industry foreword to a standard. This benefits everyone (including people that don't own computers). I have been a professional programmer since 1989, and while I still prefer the Mac OS, I believe that especially with the current economy we need to SETTLE THIS CASE BASED ON THE DOJ RECOMMENDATION IMMEDIATELY.

Thanks,
Chris C.

P.S. In my personal opinion Larry Ellison is even less relevant than Steve Jobs.

MTC–00004748

From: Alexander Hutton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 3:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Remedy

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to you to express my extreme displeasure with the proposed anti-trust settlement.

The reasons for my displeasure are simple. If, in fact, Microsoft is a monopoly and has abused its position as found by the court system, then the settlement only serves to strengthen that monopoly, NOT remedy the situation.

It will not seriously punish Microsoft for the following reasons:

1.) The cost of goods provided do not equate to a ''cost detriment'' for the amount stated. Software, aside from the time to develop, the $1.00 or so it would cost to produce the CD and paper goods, only has value to the consumer. So even a billion dollars worth of software ''donated'' to schools might only actually cost Microsoft a hundred thousand dollars worth of $.02 compact discs.

2.) Microsoft has an enormous cash position. Even if they were to somehow be forced to pay 1/10 of their liquid assets, they'd still have more money than 99.999% of the businesses in the world, and certainly a grossly large amount when compared to various competitors. So much cash that, it would not put them or their business practices at risk, nor would it serve to curtail their monopolistic practices at all. Furthermore, the remedy will actually HELP Microsoft. If, for example, you were a rich Arab speaking nation that desired to influence the western world into increasing trade with your homeland. One way you could naturally affect that outcome would be if all children attending American schools were to learn Arabic. What better way to make sure that happens than to donate what seems like a huge sum of goods and services to the ''impoverished'' school systems of America? How much better for you if your donation actually didn't tangibly cost you any real considerable cash flow? Soon, these schools, whose foreign language programs have been languishing without proper funding, would almost automatically be producing young citizens to be fluent in Arabic—thus increasing the probability that when they entered the job pool they would use these skills to betterment of themselves and said Arab nation. In the same way, planting Microsoft products in schools (one of the few niche markets that Microsoft does not own 95% market share) will only encourage future use of their products and services, and wide spread adoption of their technologies. This remedy actually hurts competition, and increases their market share even more. Please consider other options, I would recommend options that actually increase the adoption of open standards authored and steered by multi-vendor bodies.

Thank You
Alex Hutton
Principal
Alexander Hutton, L.L.C.
http://www.alexhutton.com
614.596.0967

MTC–00004749

From: ross
To: Microsoft
ATR,rdestaf@home.com@inetgw
Date: 12/18/01 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement IMHO

Microsoft is a monoply.

1) OS dominance leveraged to maintain/create Application dominance

2) Application platform exclusivity to maintain/expand OS dominance Remedy/Solutions:

1) Seperate the OS from the Apps.: seperate the development/marketing decisions of MS–OS from MS–APPS, this may require seperation of money/ownership.

2) If MS provides an application free/below market value, then they should have to garantee it remains free for lets say 10years, that way we ensure it is not leveraging its OS profits for APPlication development. (Maybe allow pay-for distribution if app is pulled from market for 2yrs prior to return to the market place)

3) MS should offer OS-build-in-apps(free) as a second source-cd distribution seperate from their OS. Also these free apps should be installed in the same manor as other third party vendors. Should not be placed on start-bar as intrinsic to the OS.

4) If a MS-App gains a certain percentage of OS saturation or profit margin, then it should be required to port that app to other OS's Overview/Background/Discussion: MS (Microsoft) dominance as an OS (Operating System) provider gives them leverage as an Application provider. MS has manipulated it's OS to gain Application market share. This has occured by devalualing the actual cost of Application development from the App to the OS. In a Second method MS has modified its OS to give it's Applications prominance: by use of default settings and uninstallable Apps: DirectX, Internet explorer are not uninstallable (I believe MS's latest audio/visual player behaves the same). Thirdly, MS has limited OEM's ability to ''bundle'' third party apps with new machine sales. MS has used pricing leverage to limit third party inclusion.

MS does not provide it's excellent Application to other OS's (except in the MS-office/MAC case). The is small sales benefit of porting MS-Word to Linux/Solaris definitely out ways the possible loss of Desktop OS share. (IF MS-word was available to Unix, there would be very little push to move from Unix to MS–OS.) But, because of the MS-word reliance on MS-OS there is a trend to move from Unix to MS–OS. In my employment case, most users have two machines, one to run engineering apps and another computer to run MS–OS/MS-Office. I believe MS does not port it's Apps to Unix because it would negatively effect MS–OS market share. Overall MS does a wonderful job on its user interfaces and with interoperablity of its applications, but I believe the ability of microsoft to leverage it's

OS dominance to benifit it application market and it's ability to limit its apps to a particular platform restrict industry growth and increase reliance on MS instead of providing a better market.

I think the proper solution is to seperate the development/marketing decisions of MS–OS from MS–APPS, this may require seperation of money/ownership.

BTW: Having MS pay for computers and OS's for schools and local governments is not a solution, it has nothing to do with the problem. It is just greedy politicians looing for handouts from greedy corporations.

Ross M. DeStafeno

MTC–00004750

From: CCDHankA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:11pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I agree with many that a rush to settle this case can only aid Microsoft in achieving its continuing malpractice. I will leave it it position to expand its dominance of the software industry.

Henry G. Adams

MTC–00004751

From: slewis@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft

I find it hard to believe what is going on with Microsoft. As a shareholder of Apple stock, I must add that the settlement is extremely mild and will likely jeopardize Apple's share of the education market. I am against the settlement and the new proposed settlement from Microsoft. ''Microsoft's proposed settlement compels schools to adopt Microsoft technology. Most educators, along with Apple, think this is simply wrong. Any settlement must guarantee that schools have the freedom to choose, and this requires that Microsoft pay their penalty in cash, not donated Microsoft software which will cost them only pennies on the dollar. A $1 billion cash penalty represents less than 3 percent of Microsoft's $36 billion cash hoard,'' said Jobs.—taken from http://www.maccentral.com

Thank you,
Steven Lewis
1010 Lee St
Barboursville, WV
25504

MTC–00004752

From: rshiller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am very disappointed that the government has caved in to the Microsoft Corporation. First, $1 billion is a drop in the bucket compared to what they have cheated its customers and suppliers out of. Second, the $half billion in software devoted to operating systems(OS) costs Microsoft practically nothing and gives their monopoly in operating systems a boost, giving them new markets(some punishment!). Third, there is no protection from or punishment of Microsoft continuing its monopolistic practices. Red Hat has offered to give these schools free operating systems if the amount Microsoft was to use for OSes is given to the schools in cash instead of software. This seems like a good deal too good to refuse! Please put me on any mailing list you have that would keep me informed about what you are discussing or doing on the Microsoft matter.

Thank you,
Robert N. Shiller

MTC–00004753

From: Scott M. Fulton, III
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlepersons:

Attached to this e-mail are my comments with regard to the Proposed Final Judgment in the Microsoft antitrust matter. I am a published author, editor, and developer of software, currently in partnership with Ingenus. My credentials are explained in the attached comments. I thank you for directing this document to the proper authority, and wish you the best of holidays.

Yours sincerely,
Scott M. Fulton, III
Senior Partner, Ingenus
5664 Fen Court
Indianapolis, IN 46220 USA
voice: (317) 475–0212
Ingenus
5664 FEN COURT
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46220 USA
(317) 475–0212
smfulton3@apexmail.com
Scott M. Fulton, III
Jennifer Fulton
PROFESSIONAL I.T. SERVICES
Editorial Consulting
Engineering Training
Research
18 December 2001
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
United States Dept. of Justice
601 D. Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001
Ingenus

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am submitting to you this document in accordance with the U.S. District Court's request for public commentary in the matter of the proposed settlement in U.S. v. Microsoft, Civil Action No. 98–1232, and New York v. Microsoft, Civil Action No. 98–1233.

I am currently a computer book author and private computing consultant, and until very recently, was employed with CMP Media, Inc. as a Senior Editor for the Planet IT Web site—one of the recent victims of the ''dot-com fallout.'' I have been a published author, editor, and correspondent in the field of computing for over 17 years, several of those years having been spent as one of Computer Shopper magazine's original contributors. Under the pseudonym ''D. F. Scott,'' I am the author of 13 books, nine of which are on the subject of Microsoft Visual Basic, one of that company's most prominent programming languages. I am currently working on my fourteenth title, on the subject of the Microsoft Access 2002 database. As an author, programmer, and private consultant, I am intimately familiar with Microsoft's products, applications architecture, and corporate history. I have developed software using Microsoft products for 23 years.

I know Microsoft, and I know my industry. I thoroughly comprehend how Microsoft's products, agendas, and conduct have shaped and defined computing as we know it today. I have friends and colleagues who work at Microsoft, and I have others who work with its current partners, its former partners, and its direct competitors. Having read Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's Findings of Fact in the civil matter as rendered 5 November 1999, and having shared my opinions at length with others directly affected by those Findings since that time, I can state without hesitation that there is nothing in those Findings to which I take exception, or about which I personally can find any reason to disagree. I call your attention to the fact that these Findings of Fact were given deference by the Court of Appeals, despite that certain elements were called into question, and despite the disqualification of the judge. The Appeals Court's thorough study of the Findings of Fact, as well as the other evidence in the case before the District Court, uphold a quintessential truth whose importance transcends any scrutiny of judicial misconduct: Microsoft's conduct as a corporation and a manufacturer of computing products, is predicated upon an internal policy of deception, which includes deceiving customers, deceiving competitors, deceiving partners, deceiving its own vendors, and at some level, deceiving its own staff.

Although the Appeals Court—with reluctance—deferred to Judge Jackson's Findings of Fact, it appears to me that the settlement currently proposed by Microsoft and the Justice Dept. has ignored the basic tenets of those Findings. This proposed settlement does not specify the actions of a company that has violated the Sherman Antitrust Act—a fact which has been upheld by the Appeals Court. Instead, it is a document with ample evidence of being scripted by a company entangled in its own self-importance and intoxicated by a fundamental belief in its own immunity, and having been agreed to by a plaintiff that no longer represents the cause of fairness in free enterprise originally championed by Joel Klein and Janet Reno.

That Microsoft Corp. has monopoly power in key markets is not in dispute. To hold monopoly power in this country is not illegal, and in certain conceivable circumstances, it may even be justified. Microsoft achieved its monopoly power through means which stand the test of legitimacy under the closest scrutiny. Throughout its history, the company has shrewdly and wisely taken advantage of imminent and remarkable opportunities. Its initial agreement in 1981 with IBM, allowing it to produce compatible operating systems for non-IBM computers, actually created an industry where there had not been one before, and which actually might never have been. That competitors, including IBM, have been unable to produce viable alternatives to MS–DOS or Microsoft Windows, can indeed

be attributed to failures in foresight, design, and marketing solely on the part of those competitors. Generally, the prominence of Microsoft Corp. can be credited to its own legitimate successes, and to its competitors' legitimate shortcomings, wild notions, and simply wrong ideas.

But once Microsoft attained its lofty position, the measures it took to fortify, protect, and defend that position were clearly immoral, unethical, and as the Court of Appeals has upheld, illegal. The antitrust case against Microsoft has been mainly about deception as a means not of attaining prominence, but of ensuring it. Any remedy imposed upon Microsoft, or settled upon by Microsoft and the Justice Dept., must acknowledge this deception, must take steps to completely disable and render defunct Microsoft's means of deception in the future, and must in some measure compensate those who were harmed—if not monetarily, then through good faith measures that go beyond the requirements of an ordinary company to do respectable and competitive business in its chosen industry. As it stands now, the proposed settlement may actually be used as a tool to extend and sustain the sheath of deception Microsoft has sewn, to further its own interests, and to continue the basic falsehood that the state of the computing industry now is as it should be.

ENTER THE DUNGEON

Once it became a monopoly as early as 1988, Microsoft's executives almost immediately adopted a Watergate-style cloak-and-dagger approach to its internal corporate and even personal conduct, to the extent that some executives were privately relishing in the opportunity for them to emulate Nixon's ''plumbers,'' or characters from ''The Godfather,'' or anti-heroes from comic books, or even leaders of the Third Reich. The company's chief executives not only tolerated but helped foster this new approach, like ''dungeon masters'' in a role-playing game encouraging nastier self-characterizations by players who deemed themselves ''evil.'' Before the company had actually violated the law, Microsoft's executives were adopting other-worldly roles, imagining themselves as saviors of the world but rebels against the establishment, immunized from the laws that apply to mere mortals. It was this immersion in this surrealistic fantasy vision that empowered Microsoft not only to commit its undisputed violations of antitrust law, but also to defend its conduct to this very day as somehow fair, honest, innovative, and pro-competitive.

In 1994, Newsweek correspondent Michael Meyer sat in on a meeting of Microsoft's key executives, including then-CEO Bill Gates, and product managers who were discussing—while fully aware of Meyer's presence—the lackluster performance of their personal accounting software, called Microsoft Money, against a competitor, Intuit's Quicken. (Later, Microsoft and Intuit announced a merger, which even later fell apart.) In his 11 July 1994 article entitled, ''Culture Club,'' Meyer recounted his experiences in the boardroom:

Then comes a strange moment, the sort of thing that happens often at Microsoft, which seemingly within moments turns disaster into salvation. Talk has turned to broader trends in banking. Where's it going, what's in it for us. Banks are dinosaurs, says Gates. We can ''bypass'' them. [The Money product manager] is unhappy with an alliance involving a big bank-card company. ''Too slow.'' Instead he proposes a deal with a small—and more easily controllable—check-clearing outfit. ''Why don't we buy them?'' Gates asks, thinking bigger. It occurs to him that people banking from home will cut checks using Microsoft's software. Microsoft can then push all those transactions through its new affiliate, taking a fee on every one. Abruptly, Gates sheds his disappointment with Money. He's caught up in a vision of ''the transformation of the world financial system.'' It's a ''pot of gold,'' he declares, pounding the conference table with his fists, triumphant and hungry and wired. ''Get me into that and goddam, we'll make so much money!''

Here is Microsoft in action. In just three hours, it laid plans to buy at least two companies, ditched an alliance with a major financial institution, opted for another and made major moves into ''two incredible new worlds,'' as Gates put it—home banking and sports entertainment. Another company might take months to accomplish as much. It is important to note here that, seven years later, none of this ''of gold'' thinking actually led anywhere—not for Microsoft Money, not for Microsoft Corp., and not for the world financial system. Nothing took place that day, or any day since, on this particular subject that offended anyone's rights or broke any laws. Nor was Microsoft Money as a software product the least bit improved. Meyer was astonished by Microsoft's ''accomplishment,'' but today, little evidence of it remains outside of this article.

What did happen that day in 1994 is an example of how Microsoft approaches its everyday business: not by applying itself to the truths and principles and operating parameters of its chosen industry, and not by solving the arguably solvable problems put before it, but instead by concocting a fantasy world where Microsoft is the world's great benefactor, the great multitude is the recipient of its mercy and grace, and all other entities in the computing industry are either—to borrow a recently reborn phrase—''with us or against us.'' This is a world where media entities such as Newsweek, and professional observers such as myself, should stand in awe of that company's ''accomplishments,'' as if its role-playing conquests held tangible value in any currency in which common people trade.

How MICROSOFT LOST THE MORAL HIGH GROUND

In another civil matter separate from the suit brought forth by the Justice Dept., the Canadian software producer Caldera took action against Microsoft in U.S. District Court in Utah, on behalf of a product it had acquired from Novell Corp.—a competitive operating system called DR–DOS. (This civil action was later settled, and the specific terms of that settlement were undisclosed.) As revealed by evidence subpoenaed by Caldera and presented in its Consolidated Statement of Facts, Microsoft's executives openly conspired to develop MS–DOS in such a way that compliance with its principles would mean, by definition, incompatibility with DR–DOS. Later, these same executives came up with the idea of tying MS–DOS together with Windows—the first instance of ''tying'' in the company's history—in such a way that DR–DOS users would be artificially prohibited from running Windows 3.1. In fact, as the evidence in Caldera v. Microsoft indicates, Microsoft's idea of tying MS–DOS to Windows derived from its efforts to thwart the development of DR–DOS, and may have been created for that specific purpose alone and no other.

The Consolidated Statement in the Caldera case uses subpoenaed internal documents and e-mails from Microsoft executives to draw a picture of a company whose central, overriding, and only interest from 1990 to 1995 was not to produce a viable operating system for consumers, but to prevent Digital Research, and then Novell, and then Caldera from doing so. (Granted, IBM's OS/2 was also a Windows competitor during this time, although the Caldera Statement makes little mention of that system.) According to the Statement, in the summer of 1990, Microsoft's OEM sales force was directed to only use per-processor terms in licensing agreements with both small and large PC manufacturers, in order to prevent, as one account manager put it, ''losing them to DR.'' Per-processor licensing practices was the subject of one of the Justice Dept.'s first civil actions against Microsoft, and was a matter of contention throughout the current civil case. Such exclusionary licenses made it cost-prohibitive for manufacturers to offer DR-DOS, or any other alternative operating system, to their customers while at the same time maintaining their critical link to Microsoft. As Microsoft's company memoranda—excerpted in the Caldera Statement—indicate, the company was fully aware of that fact. For instance, there is this note of congratulations:

Congratulations are in order for John ''DRI Killer'' McLaughlan (No, he isn't having another baby) who signed a $2.5M agreement with Acbel (Sun Moon Star). The agreement licenses DOS 5 per processor on a worldwide basis for 3 years (they will be replacing DRI DOS which they currently ship outside the US).

In July 1991, Novell announced its merger with DR–DOS producer Digital Research, in order to build a stronger, more complete operating system product line that could compete on the same level as Microsoft, and that could be licensed to IBM, which had already identified itself as an interested party.

In a memorandum to fellow executives dated March 1992, Microsoft Vice President (now Senior Vice President) Jim Allchin spelled out his perception of the threat imposed by Novell: I still don't think we take them as serious as is required of us to win. This isn't IBM. These guys are really good; they have an installed base; they have a channel; they have marketing power; they have good products. AND they want our position. They want to control the APIs, middleware, and as many desktops as they can in addition to the server market they already own. We need to start thinking about

Novell as THE competitor to fight against—not in one area of our business, but all of them.

If you want to get serious about stopping Novell, we need to start understanding this is war— nothing less. That's how Novell views it. We better wake up and get serious about them or they will eventually find a way to hurt us badly. Allchin's concept of ''war'' sparked then-Windows Product Manager Brad Silverberg to advocate developing Windows 3.1 intentionally so that it gave DR–DOS users the impression that it could not run on that platform. The Caldera Statement provides this e-mail exchange between

Silverberg and his deputy (now Senior Vice President), David Cole: Cole: A kind-gentle message in setup would probably not offend anyone and probably won't get the press up in arms, but I don't think it serves much of a warning [* * *] What is the guy supposed to do? Silverberg: what the guy is supposed to do is feel uncomfortable, and when he has bugs, suspect that the problem is dr-dos and then go out to buy ms-dos, or decide to not take the risk for the other machines he has to buy for in the office. With company policy having been determined that the Windows user should be made to feel uncomfortable with the notion of using a non-Microsoft product, work began on how to intentionally develop the beta code of Windows 3.1 so that parts of it fail to execute on a DR–DOS platform. In an e-mail discussion excerpted in the Caldera statement, a developer of Windows 3.1 told his development manager, Phil Barrett, of an incompatibility he discovered between a disk cache utility for 3.1, code-named ''Bambi,'' and DR–DOS. The developer reports that he has created a build of the utility that solves this problem. Nevertheless, Barrett suggests in his response that this fix never see the light of day:

heh, heh, heh * * * my proposal is to have bambi refuse to run on this alien OS. comments? The approach we will take is to detect dr 6 and refuse to load. The error message should be something like 'Invalid device driver interface.' The actual error message in Windows 3.1 Setup would read, ''The XMS driver you have installed is not compatible with Windows. You must remove it before SETUP can successfully install Windows.''

Whether on direct instruction to do so or working on his own initiative, a Microsoft programmer made contact with Andrew Dyson, a technical support analyst at DRI, and in so doing identified himself as ''Roger Sour, Director of Windows Development, Microsoft.'' Explaining that he was trying to solve an incompatibility problem with the ''memory control blocks,'' this Microsoft developer requested information from Dyson on whether DRI has written Windows code to detect whether a program is running under a DR–DOS or MS–DOS platform. In the interest of fair play, Dyson submitted this information; but later, a DRI official wrote ''Roger Sour'' (whether or not he knew Sour existed is beside the point) to tell him that DRI was aware of Microsoft's plan to make Windows 3.1 fail on DR–DOS. The letter stated, ''Usually, when a software manufacturer feels that something in our operating system is preventing their application from running well, that company works with us to resolve the actual, perceived, or potential conflicts.''

In a letter dated 1 November 1991, Phil Barrett responded to the DRI official that there no ''Roger Sour'' at Microsoft, and added, ''Perhaps you may have been the victim of a prank.'' This ''prank'' was reported to the Federal Trade Commission, which contacted Microsoft later that week. News of the FTC contact prompted David Cole to write the following in an executive memo:

The bothersome part is where the hell is DRI getting their information. Are they just speculating? Seems like a pretty risky thing to do with the FTC? Did they interpret ''Roger Sour'' thing broadly and conclude we are doing it for Windows?

What bothered Microsoft more than the possible appearance of impropriety was the possibility of a mole within the company. For the next year and a half, Microsoft would deal with DRI, Novell (which acquired DRI), and the FTC as a single monkey on its back—the collective entity preventing Microsoft from smoothly integrating itself into the corporate computer network. Beginning in 1992, Microsoft would develop the entire Windows platform into ''Chicago''—a confusing amalgamation of possible development scenarios which only Microsoft would be able to decipher, leaving confused independent developers and consumers to sort them out for themselves. In a 16 June 1992 strategy document circulated by Microsoft's then-Vice President Brad Silverberg, the company outlined its concept of Chicago as a product that could be packaged three ways—as Windows for Workgroups, as plain Windows, and as MS–DOS. Thus, the answer to the question, ''Are you merging MS–DOS with Windows?'' could be ''Yes,'' and the answer to the question, ''Are you maintaining the two product lines separately?'' could also be ''Yes.'' This obfuscation, according to documents, was crafted deliberately for the sole reason of throwing off the competition and keeping consumers guessing, thus fulfilling the following directive Brad Silverberg had made in late 1991:

This is a very important point. We need to create the reputation for problems and incompatibilities to undermine confidence to drdos6; so people will make judgments against it without knowing details or fats [sic].

In 1993, following its acquisition of DRI, Novell re-engineered DR–DOS to become Novell DOS 7—a product which it promised would not only serve as a cohesive network and desktop platform, but which would also run Windows 3.1 without problems. At long last, the monkey on Microsoft's back became too much for Chairman Bill Gates, who on 21 July wrote the following memo to his subordinates:

Who at Microsoft gets up every morning thinking about how to compete with these guys in the short term—specifically cut their revenue. Perhaps we need more focus on this. After their behavior in this FTC investigation, I am very keen on this. Once again, Gates infuses his fellow executives and product managers with a lofty vision of Microsoft as having carte blanche, on account of its size, to set the rules for the industry, even if it means teetering on the edge of implying that it's above the law. With Gates, there is never a smoking gun. The job of providing the smoke is left to others, such as Jim Allchin who, in an 18 September 1993 memo, advised the following:

Sentiment is against us. We can and MUST turn this around. As we become more aggressive against Novell product and marketing-wise, we must get our mouth in order. The press, etc. is very sketical of us so one slip up and we get set back quite a ways. This really isn't that hard. If you're going to kill someone there isn't much reason to get all worked up about it and angry—you just pull the trigger. Any discussions beforehand are a waste of time. We need to smile at Novell while we pull the trigger.

The strategy that Microsoft concocted is for the company to represent Chicago as the successor to MS–DOS 6.3, and as perhaps Windows bundled with DOS and perhaps Windows merged with DOS. Consumers and businesses considering their upgrade options would have to consider the extent to which they considered Windows an asset. Not knowing whether the two products would bundle or merge, consumers were forced to evaluate MS–DOS as though it were Windows, and not for its own merits—which, against Novell DOS, were admittedly lacking. As long as Windows continued to support Novell NetWare—and it did, quite completely—consumers would conclude they had nothing to lose from their current NetWare investment, if they were to choose an all-Microsoft upgrade path for the future, which included DOS as well. The decision to actually merge DOS with Windows was withheld until the last possible minute—in 1994, well after what was supposed to have been Chicago's initial release date. This decision was the coup de grace to Novell DOS, indicating to buyers that there would be no need for a DOS once Windows 95 was installed.

Consumer confusion about Microsoft's course of action led to the desired result: Buyers turned away from Novell, believing what Microsoft itself calls its own ''FUD messages'' (fear, uncertainty, and doubt) about the future reliability of Novell DOS in tandem with Windows. The term ''FUD'' is said to derive from a similar term used by Pres. Nixon's famous ''plumbers''—the people hired to spread rumors and false information about possible presidential opponents. It is a term which shows up in Microsoft internal memos and documents as though it were its own brand name.

MIRACLE INGREDIENTS

The DR–DOS story is important because the behavior of Microsoft during the early 1990s established a prototype for its behavior during the ''browser wars''—one of the current antitrust action's two key periods of interest. It is in some ways humorous to note that Microsoft held little or no regard for the Internet as a global information resource, until such time as it perceived that resource as a threat to its business. Bill Gates actually wrote an entire book, ''The Road Ahead,''

that was a national bestseller, and that afterwards was amended as a ''Special Edition'' after its author had received too many inquiries about its omission of the Internet as a topic. Microsoft is not a company that believes in creating opportunities, or even in finding fair and open opportunities outside of its own corporate walls. This is a company whose key success during the 1990s was stifling the opportunities of others in order to protect its own products and intellectual assets.

After Novell had been thoroughly decimated by Microsoft FUD, the company turned its attention in late 1994 to Netscape, as the threat-on-the-horizon it needed to continue to function the way it had trained itself to do. Microsoft, as we all know now, perceived Netscape Navigator as a platform that could potentially be leveraged to distribute a future form of Sun Microsystems' Java as a substitute operating system. The cross-platform capabilities of Java awakened developers to the potential of crafting applications that did not need to rely on the resources of any one operating system exclusively—especially Windows.

As Judge Jackson's Findings of Fact show, Microsoft's internal policy was to develop its own Java programming language and applications resources—called J++—to appear to be compliant with Sun's Java, while actually presenting Java developers using Windows with non-portable libraries. Jackson writes:

In a further effort intended to increase the incompatibility between Java applications written for its Windows JVM and other Windows JVMs, and to increase the difficulty of porting Java applications from the Windows environment to other platforms, Microsoft designed its Java developer tools to encourage developers to write their Java applications using certain ''keywords'' and ''compiler directives'' that could only be executed properly by Microsoft's version of the Java runtime environment for Windows. Microsoft encouraged developers to use these extensions by shipping its developer tools with the extensions enabled by default and by failing to warn developers that their use would result in applications that might not run properly with any runtime environment other than Microsoft's and that would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to port to JVMs running on other platforms. This action comported with the suggestion that Microsoft's Thomas Reardon made to his colleagues in November 1996: ''[W]e should just quietly grow j++ [Microsoft's developer tools] share and assume that people will take more advantage of our classes without ever realizing they are building win 32-only java apps.'' Microsoft refused to alter its developer tools until November 1998, when a court ordered it to disable its keywords and compiler directives by default and to warn developers that using Microsoft's Java extensions would likely cause incompatibilities with non-Microsoft runtime environments.

The part of this story that Judge Jackson didn't touch on, and that was not introduced as evidence, concerns Microsoft's efforts during 1996–1999 to promote a cloudy but potentially promising future system called ActiveX as an alternative to Java for developers, and an alternative to Netscape for Windows users. Just exactly what ActiveX was, is, or was supposed to be, isn't entirely clear. I understand this fact better than most people alive. In 1996 and '97, I wrote a book on ActiveX technology for developers, with the full cooperation of a major worldwide publisher. For the better part of two years, I wrote seven complete drafts of this book, overhauling the content each time in order to keep up with Microsoft's mind-boggling changes in its definition of the product/concept/marketing scheme.

In an early document for developers such as myself, dated 18 June 1996, Microsoft defined ActiveX in this way:

ActiveX is a set of open technologies that bring the power of the personal computer to the ubiquitous connectivity of the Internet. ActiveX takes the Internet beyond static text and picture documents to provide users with a new generation of more active, exciting, and useful experiences. For intranet developers (intranets are private Web sites published on internal, corporate networks), ActiveX provides core functionality for building robust enterprise-wide applications that offer enhanced functionality and productivity beyond basic HTML document sharing.

So in June, at least, ActiveX was a multimedia standard for Web sites. The very next month, Microsoft announced it was turning over stewardship of ActiveX to an independent body. In its press release, Microsoft quoted an independent industry analyst as stating the following:

COM and DCOM—the foundation for ActiveX—constitute the most widely used object framework, but as technologies owned and controlled exclusively by Microsoft, they were not vendor-independent solutions. In the hands of a neutral standards body, ActiveX can become a vendor-independent solution, enabling interoperability while allowing both developers and customers to take full advantage of their existing investments in OLE and DCOM technologies. ''COM and DCOM'' are, respectively, the Component Object Model and the Distributed Component Object Model. These are legitimate architectures which, in my view, represent some of the best ideas Microsoft has ever put forward. COM enabled source code from diverse and varied applications and program components to address one another dynamically, using a common framework and an amendable object language. This way, old programs could conceivably determine the capabilities of newer programs when they shared the same system, under a multitasking framework such as Windows 95. DCOM extended these principles to program components over a network, so server-based components could communicate with client-based components and provide them with requested resources. These were delicately intricate systems, but they were constructed with the best of intentions, and their creators deserve respect.

But it was apparently never the intention of Microsoft's executives to exploit the full potential of COM and DCOM. Instead, they deployed ActiveX as a marketing tool to befuddle the market as to Microsoft's intentions, and to repeat the company's successful strategy against DRI and Novell, this time to kick Netscape and Sun Microsystems into the death spiral.

Developers such as myself were given a myriad of mixed and often self-contradictory messages. In the summer of 1996, we were told that ActiveX was a system that would be deployed on Microsoft's Internet Explorer Web browser, to enable online applications from Windows servers to utilize controls—buttons, menus, lists, and common ''user interface'' elements—whose programs were deployed on the client side, thus freeing bandwidth and relieving much of the burden on the server. This was—and still is—a good idea. We were told that ActiveX controls would make use of a Windows feature called Object Linking and Embedding (OLE, pronounced ''olay'') to enable their code to be called up on the server side by container programs on the client side—again, a good idea. This utilization of resources would free the controls programs from the constraints of the client-side architecture called Microsoft Foundation Classes (MFC)—the architecture upon which Microsoft's Office applications are based. (Microsoft's developers are indeed capable of creating good ideas, and executing good plans based on them.)

In the fall of 1996, the FUD began. Microsoft offered developers a free, limited edition of its Visual Basic development environment, geared exclusively toward the creation of ActiveX controls. These controls, we were told, leveraged the power of MFC to make them more fully integrated with Windows. This went against the company's original design strategy, for reasons we couldn't yet fathom.

While the newly-formed ''ActiveX Working Group,'' assigned stewardship of the ActiveX standard, did establish a Web site for a brief period, the group only held a few token meetings, and even then with a subset of its membership. Many members listed on the Web site were surprised to find they were members at all. As soon as January of 1997, the Working Group had become a non-entity.

Later that same month, Microsoft announced its intention to deploy a network communications system then called Microsoft Transaction Server (MTS), and to market that system under the ActiveX collective umbrella. MTS would be the hub of a system that processed DCOM transactions over networks and over the Internet, between Microsoft servers and client systems that were running ActiveX controls. What confused us at first was the fact that DCOM was not OLE, so the ActiveX controls we had now appeared not to be the ActiveX controls we were supposed to build for later. Furthermore, the new controls—to be created using that free edition of Visual Basic—could only operate within the confines of a single, designated container program—which, not coincidentally, was part of Internet Explorer 3.0. So it appeared that the capability of Netscape Navigator to be adaptable, through a third-party product, to display and use ActiveX controls, was due for extinction.

By the spring of 1997, Microsoft had announced the replacement of its core database transaction protocol with something

called ActiveX Data Objects (ADO). This protocol would be used by Microsoft Office applications, and would be licensed for free to developers making their own programs for data transactions. For ADO to be deployed in a network environment, it appeared, the server would need to run MTS. So if everyday applications wanted to take advantage of Web deployment capabilities, Netscape was appearing to be less and less of an option. ADO objects were not controls—what's more, they weren't COM objects or DCOM objects either. So the umbrella seemed to be reaching further. Almost every Windows protocol had something to do with ActiveX—and thus, by association, something to do with future deployment over the Internet.

In the summer of 1997, Microsoft sprung the trap. MTS as a product was integrated with Internet Information Server, and very soon thereafter, IIS was incorporated as a native part of Windows NT 4.0. If your server had NT4, it had IIS, so it had MTS. On the client side, Internet Explorer would be ''sewn'' onto the front end of Windows 98, not as an integral part or even an inseparable one from Windows 98, but a part which the common user could not easily detach from it. Suddenly, the whole world of Windows closed in on itself, excluding Netscape and Sun technologies and immediately rendering them obsolete. Users abandoned Netscape in droves, and within only a matter of months. Sun's efforts to develop Java further, gradually slowed to a trickle. The death spiral still worked.

The code of conduct which the Appeals Court upheld as illegal use of Microsoft's monopoly power, stems directly from the code of conduct Microsoft taught itself in fending off the DR–DOS threat. It is not the behavior of an established, experienced company whose leadership position is bestowed upon it by its customers and partners. It is the behavior of an adolescent, catapulted quickly to prominence in a young industry, without ever having found the time or the inclination to learn how success may be achieved fairly and with honor. It is a spoiled brat kid that never listened to its elders, and has never come to appreciate the world outside of itself. It has erected its own psychological ''barrier to entry'' that prohibits it from absorbing anything of positive benefit—any new ideas, any good alliances, any substantive partnerships—from the outside world, out there, where the enemy lives. Paranoid, over-sensitive, and withdrawn, it hides out in its room, nails a ''Keep Out'' sign to its door, locks the door shut, loses itself in a video game, and drowns itself out with loud music laced with messages of pessimism and disdain. It is the unloved child. It is built in the image of its maker. It will not listen to reason.

Within the locked, sacrosanct confines of corporate headquarters or boardrooms, no fantasy world is illegal. Corporate fiefdom or chivalry may assume any degree of distortion, and black may very easily be declared white without objection. It is when these bizarre practices lead directly to tactics of deception, sabotage, and bad faith against not only a company's competitors but also its purported partners, and to a calculated campaign of consumer choice control, that they impede upon the rights of individuals, of companies and corporations, and of an entire industry. Microsoft's private fantasy world has evolved into a dangerous corporate subculture whose principles and motives threaten the very way business is done in America, in Canada, in Asia, in Europe, and anywhere there is a microprocessor.

When faced with a situation where the only rational option is for Microsoft to solve its own problems, Microsoft chooses instead to go on the attack against some outside enemy that could potentially expose or spotlight those problems. As a result, those problems may never be solved, but the enemy du jour becomes so damaged that the continued existence of those problems in the context of the industry as a whole, becomes inconsequential. To this day, serious bugs and deficiencies in Microsoft's operating systems and applications, discovered by myself and others and duly reported to Microsoft, remain uncorrected, quite possibly for fear of the political cost of exposing the problem by making the world aware of its solution.

Microsoft's distorted perception of the computing industry, and of the world as a whole, is important because of a fact which Judge Jackson came to realize but, all too soon, commented on: Any conduct remedy which relies solely upon Microsoft's own ability to scrutinize, admonish, and improve itself through its own means, will be treated by Microsoft's executives with disrespect and contempt. It's like a parent ordering his wayward son to shape up. The executives of Microsoft are as unwilling to consider such an order as an adolescent boy, bottled up in his room, is willing to remove his headphones and listen to his dad for five seconds. They are likely to ignore such an order altogether. I say this with the utmost respect: They don't give a damn what you think.

FIRST NOVELL, THEN NETSCAPE, NOW THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Microsoft is a company which views all events and actions relevant to the computing industry, taken outside of its corporate headquarters, as attacks against it. These include not only new product announcements from Oracle or marketing agreements from Sony, but legal maneuvers, motions, and actions from the Justice Dept., and judgments and decisions from the courts. Microsoft's executives are charged with the mission to manipulate circumstances to its own advantage, so that the enemy's actions end up reinforcing the company's prominence. Bill Gates calls this mission ''kicking them into the death spiral.'' Here's how the death spiral works, paraphrased from Microsoft's own internal documents:

1. Make agreements with the enemy that build an interdependence between the enemy and us.

2. Generate uncertainty about our future course of action, to throw the enemy off-track.

3. Propose a clear solution to the uncertainty that depends upon a certain set of rules, and make it impossible for the enemy to turn you down.

4. Change the rules so that the enemy is forced to live with its own decisions, while we move to an entirely new world where the rules are different and we own the territory.

The proposed final judgment before you now, presented by Microsoft and the Justice Dept., is yet another clear example of the death spiral methodology, this time applied to the American justice system. Just as Novell was compelled to commit itself to a category of products that appeared to have been rendered obsolete, and Netscape was compelled to commit itself to offering for free a product that once generated revenue and that had been rendered in most consumers' minds unnecessary, the Justice Dept. and the District Court are being compelled to accept a vision of Microsoft's conduct for the future that is incompatible with Microsoft's own vision of the future. Microsoft plans to change the rules, to pull the rug out from under you, and move on to a new territory where it gets to make new rules.

Last 12 December, Microsoft counsel Charles F. Rule presented a statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee, defending its Proposed Final Judgment (PFJ) as taking corrective measures that are far broader than may even be necessary, given that ''four-fifths'' of Judge Jackson's findings were invalidated, by his estimate, by the Appeals Court. As with most prepared statements before a Senate committee, the latter part that no one has time to read aloud, is ''read into the record'' without objection. The body of this statement explains the three-part provisions of the PFJ. The following excerpt explains the Judgment's provisions with regard to the category of software called middleware:

The case that the plaintiffs tried and the narrowed liability that survived appellate review all hinged on claims that Microsoft took certain actions to exclude Netscape's Navigator browser and Sun's Java technology from the market in order to protect the Windows operating system monopoly. The plaintiffs successfully argued that Microsoft feared that Navigator and Java, either alone or together, might eventually include and expose a broad set of general purpose APIs to which software developers could write as an alternative to the Windows APIs. Since Navigator and Java can run on multiple operating systems, if they developed into general purpose platforms, Navigator and Java would provide a means of overcoming the ''applications barrier'' to entry and threaten the position of the Windows operating system as platform software.

A person might expect that a decree designed to address such a monopoly maintenance claim would provide relief with respect to Web-browsing software and Java or, at most, to other general purpose platform software that exposes a broad set of APIs and is ported to run on multiple operating systems. The PFJ goes much further. The Department insisted that obligations imposed on Microsoft by the decree extend to a range of software that has little in common with Navigator and Java. The decree applies to ''middleware'' broadly defined to include, in addition to Web-browsing software and Java, instant messaging software, media players, and even email clients—software that, Microsoft believes, has virtually no chance of developing into broad, general purpose

platforms that might threaten to displace the Windows platform. In addition, there is a broad catch-all definition of middleware that in the future is likely to sweep other similar software into the decree.

To summarize: It is conceded that Microsoft acted unlawfully to thwart any action that Netscape and Sun may have taken to use Navigator and Java as leverage for the distribution of an operating platform that substitutes for Windows. Microsoft is to be praised, says Rule, for its broad definition of middleware as more than just Web browsers, but many categories of software with functionality that currently isn't part of an operating system—software that could not displace Windows in and of itself, because it isn't really an operating platform like Java anyway. ''A broad catch-all definition of middleware,'' Rule calls it—essentially, any software that isn't Windows. Defined so broadly, anything that isn't on the Windows Setup CD-ROM could potentially be defined as middleware. The settlement's provisions would, conceivably, apply to Microsoft's treatment of the producers and manufacturers of any non-Microsoft package on a store shelf or Internet download site. Which sounds perfectly wonderful if we allow ourselves to forget recent history: Microsoft has a reputation for incorporating features from non-Microsoft software packages—or features which at least appear to incorporate their functionality—in new versions of Windows. The new digital photo management features of Windows XP are a clear and present example. What is to prevent Microsoft from adopting any new feature into Windows, thus narrowing the feature set of ''middleware'' at will? Certainly not the proposed judgment, which includes specific provisions enabling Microsoft to share resources with a third party for the development of products that compete with that party. From the top of page 5:

Nothing in this section shall prohibit Microsoft from entering into (a) any bona fide joint venture or (b) any joint development or joint services arrangement with any ISV, IHV, IAP, ICP, or OEM for a new product, technology or service, or any material value-add to an existing product, technology or service, in which both Microsoft and the ISV, IHV, IAP, ICP, or OEM contribute significant developer or other resources, that prohibits such entity from competing with the object of the joint venture or other arrangement for a reasonable period of time.

So conceivably, if we accept Mr. Rule's explanation, a category of software that was middleware in the past, could at Microsoft's discretion no longer be middleware today or tomorrow. But if you read the Definitions section of the PFJ, you discover Mr. Rule's explanation isn't entirely accurate. In this section, there are two main categories: Microsoft Middleware, and non-Microsoft middleware. The definition of middleware as ''Internet browsers, email client software, networked audio/video client software, instant messaging software'' applies only to the Microsoft category. In other words, the broad definition applies only if Microsoft is the producer of the broadly defined products. Non-Microsoft middleware is defined later in the same section in this way:

''Non-Microsoft Middleware'' means a non-Microsoft software product running on a Windows Operating System Product that exposes a range of functionality to ISVs through published APIs, and that could, if ported to or made interoperable with, a non-Microsoft Operating System, thereby make it easier for applications that rely in whole or in part on the functionality supplied by that software product to be ported to or run on that non-Microsoft Operating System. In other words, any product that exposes its own functionality to outside developers in the same way for Windows as for other operating systems, enabling them to conceivably write code that supports that functionality, for instance, for Macintosh, Linux, and Windows simultaneously. This isn't exactly Rule's ''broad catch-all definition'' that applies to instant messaging. Essentially, what this truly refers to is any software that establishes dependencies with other software, apart from the native dependence that all Windows software has with the Windows operating system.

Speaking as a developer, I can speak with experience: This definition may sound quite broad, but it isn't. Excluded from this definition are the drivers that software requires to be able to, for instance, print an image on the printer or display something on-screen—drivers are always considered part of Windows, even though Microsoft may not have written them. Excluded from this definition are the kinds of products whose mutual benefit, from the perspective of the user, is derived from their being bundled together rather than from their communication with one another—for example, Netscape Instant Messenger's bundling with Netscape Navigator. Excluded from this definition are programs that establish dependencies on categories of data (as opposed to programs or source code) that rely on the native operating system independence of the system that uses them—as, for example, MP3 music files are non-specific to Windows or Macintosh or Linux.

It is not broadness that distinguishes Microsoft's legal definition of middleware, but fuzziness. Depending on how you look at it, and where you look for it, it can be anything at any time. The conduct restrictions in the PFJ prohibit Microsoft from entering into agreements with manufacturers that, in turn, would prohibit them from choosing their own middleware for their own systems. Such restrictions would be important if we could be certain what it is that Microsoft is prohibited from prohibiting.

This fuzziness extends to the present moment. As I write, the entire ActiveX marketing scenario is in the final stages of being disbanded, in favor of a program architecture that replaces it entirely: the .NET (pronounced ''dot-net'') architecture. The basic principle of .NET is that Windows may be enhanced to include a just-in-time compiler (JIT) whose job is to execute programs in the Windows environment. The role of the JIT is analogous to that of the Java Virtual Machine (JVM), although Microsoft's implementation will have no cross-platform capabilities. Conceivably, as developers are compelled to switch their program architectures from the now-obsolete COM to the new .NET, the architectural model of the Windows application may be redrawn in such a way that ''apps'' become satellites of a sort—small, shared components designed to interoperate and, in so doing, produce a collective, de facto application on behalf of the user. In such an architectural model, middleware by one definition would not exist. The reason is because the functionality of a collective .NET application would not have to be ''exposed'' like the opening of a telephone directory—and as the PFJ expects—but is instead derived as a result of an independent assessment by Windows of the collective capabilities of the .NET component programs. Imagine telephones that could publicize their own phone numbers, and you get a glimpse of the idea.

The architectural concepts underlying Microsoft's .NET architecture are among the best ideas the company's developers have ever conceived. Nonetheless, the mechanism is being put in place today for Microsoft to change the rules yet again. Microsoft itself has stated in press conferences throughout the antitrust proceedings, that the rules of the computing industry change so fast that, by the time a judgment or settlement is finally reached, its terms will have been rendered obsolete by the very evolution of the industry. Microsoft is actively working to demonstrate this principle, and we must see .NET not only as a good idea, but a warning. As long as we consider Microsoft the de facto keeper of the computing dictionary, we will render that company of changing its terms—and to some extent, our lives as a result—on a whim.

Microsoft has a history of making its enemies follow a set of rules, which it then changes. Provisions in the PFJ would prohibit Microsoft from excluding from any party the right to include icons and menu selections on its systems that point to any software it chooses. As both a developer and an editor, I have heard news—whether it be controlled leaks or the usual FUD—that Microsoft is considering eliminating the ''Desktop'' as a feature of Windows, replacing it with a more resplendent, multimedia-oriented, Web-based system that's possibly tied into its MSN network. The Windows Desktop is where all the icons and menu selections are. If Microsoft changes the rules, these provisions would immediately be rendered archaic.

The provisions of the Proposed Final Judgment as they stand today would restrict Microsoft to behaving as we would expect any large, successful company to behave with regard to its partners, competitors, supporters, and customers, had that company attained its position of prominence by legitimate means. What the PFJ would have us forget is that Microsoft has a duty, at this point in its history, to make reparations to those parties whom it knowingly and willfully deceived. It must behave not as an ordinary large company, but as one with unordinary obligations to the market in which it does business: to provide its partners, competitors, supporters, and customers with more than is expected of the company that has operated in good faith, competed on the quality of its products and

services, and has not broken federal and state laws.

MICROSOFT'S WORLD, AND OTHERS

Unlike any single corporation in any other industry in the world, Microsoft has attained the freedom to dictate not only the terms of the course of action for others in that industry, but also the very terminology, principles, and rules of existence by which that industry operates. In 1984, an operating system was a ''bootstrap'' program whose basic function was to engage the computer, take keyboard commands from the user, and give the user some rudimentary access to stored files. In 2001, the operating system has become something which removes red-eye from photographs, bounces instant messages to digital cell phones, and handles copyright infringement management on behalf of music publishers—and all of these things, not particularly very well. This transfiguration of the concept of the operating system is referred to by Microsoft as ''innovation.'' No similar concept of innovation can be applied to any other industry in the world. In our own fantasy world, we can imagine an automobile industry whose leader endows its products with microwave ovens, paper shredders, and Spanish teachers. We can imagine the manufacturer calling these developments ''innovation.'' And we can argue that such developments would not be illegal in and of themselves. But even in that fantasy world, we cannot concoct a situation where the inclusion of these features in automobiles would in any way impede, hinder, or prohibit a consumer's means of nuking a hot dog, shredding a letter, or counting to diez by any other method.

Microsoft's incorporation of often arbitrarily-chosen new features in its operating system, by design, impedes the channel of delivery for any company whose business is specifically to provide those features. Knowing that, Microsoft has created its own little market where partners and potential partners bargain for prominence. The price of a partner striking this bargain is often the termination of its own native distribution channel for its product—without Microsoft's backing, neither the product nor the company can exist. And yet Microsoft itself has shown it had no intention for its partnerships to continue for any longer than it could conjure its own, self-branded alternative. Microsoft used its partnerships to develop new markets in voice recognition, storage security, file backup and restoration, messaging, imaging, multimedia, database organization and translation—markets whose main channel of distribution were controlled by Microsoft. Once that market exists, Microsoft rescinds its partnership and offers its own ''innovation'' as a substitute.

The Definitions section of documents in the current antitrust case, including the overturned District Court's Final Judgment, paints an outline for a newcomer to planet Earth of an industry constructed in general accordance with Microsoft's current vision. What an operating system is, what a ''browser'' is, what an application is, what a database is, are definitions that could have been supplied by a Microsoft manual. That a company should have such a defining vision should never be made illegal—any American company should be free to dream of redefining its industry. But the very definitions of these things as we have come to understand them, derive from Microsoft actions taken to defend its own prominence and thwart enemy attacks. Had these actions never been taken, our very understanding of the parts of a personal computer may be almost unrecognizable to the inhabitants of this world. Taking that into account, any remedial measure which accepts the present state of computing at face value, without taking into account not only what computing is becoming, but also what it might have been today had Microsoft never acted with such aggression and deception, is of no benefit to the companies outside of Microsoft who each should have the right to challenge Microsoft's prominence in a fair and competitive manner.

We use personal computers today whose processing power and data address capability supersede that which the Dept. of Defense categorized as ''supercomputing'' only eight years ago. Knowledge of their technology falling into the hands of enemies of the U.S., was considered a threat to national security. The processors on our desktops are capable of calculations which, as late as 1989, were deemed impossible given the laws of physics. Yet what can we truly do with these computers? Can we calculate the trajectories of celestial bodies? Can we give them voice commands and ask them to perform sophisticated analyses of financial transactions, bodily functions, or legal maneuvers? Can a computer tell me what I'm eating that jeopardizes my cholesterol rate? Can we make heads or tails of Enron's bookkeeping strategy?

These are jobs, the basic functions of which supercomputers of the 1980s could perform with ease. Yet the modern, everyday personal computer, whose processing ability supersedes that of those machines by orders of magnitude, just barely delivers enough power for you to type a letter, or keep a list of your colleagues' phone numbers, or even play a decent game of chess with you. Crashing has become one of the fundamental functions of a computer. Entire careers are spent by system administrators whose principal jobs are helping their users recover from system crashes. We speak often of how the computers on-board Apollo 11 had one-fourth the processing power of a T.I. pocket calculator. Today, an everyday personal computer, capable of literally millions of times the processing power of Apollo 11, has difficulty running a real-time simulation of the Apollo 11 on-board computer, without being bogged down by the colossal overhead incurred by the operating system. Most of us computer users and developers are just barely eking out our everyday jobs.

Had there been a true state of competition between Microsoft and other producers of operating systems over the last 15 years, this pitiful state of existence would never have come about. Microsoft yesterday and today has employed brilliant programmers, with the capability to endow computers with extraordinary functionality and richness of experience. These programmers—not just those outside the company—have been handicapped by the crippling weight of the monstrosity that has become Microsoft Windows, a platform that transforms the definition of ''moving target'' into an unfathomable, four-dimensional puzzle from which rational minds can barely escape.

It is bewilderment in the apparently minuscule importance of the law within Microsoft's own little world, that Judge Jackson attempted to express—and which, sadly, he did at the wrong time and with improper motivation. Judge Jackson's judgment was indeed clouded, as was Joel Klein's, and those of the other parties in this case who have attempted to craft an appropriate remedy for Microsoft's offenses. To date, no solution on the table—including the breakup of the company—has taken into account this obvious fact: Any remedy that fails to render the future executive conduct of Microsoft or its successor companies innocuous to those whom its prior conduct knowingly deceived, is no remedy at all.

NEW CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE FINAL JUDGMENT

Tough love, for a misbehaving adolescent child, often mandates that the parent be willing to cut that child off—not to kick him into the death spiral, but to make him live with his own choices. Microsoft would have itself continue to live in a world defined by the agreements it makes with others—how free and open they are, how restricted and narrow they may be, but in any event, how many agreements there are! It is my suggestion to you that, in the interest of tough love, Microsoft should be cut off. We must take steps to force Microsoft to live with the decisions that it has already made for itself. We must allow Microsoft to live in the world it has constructed for itself. But we must not allow circumstances to continue which force, or compel, or rely upon any other company doing business in the computing industry—software, hardware, services, networking, or elsewhere—to have to make any agreements with Microsoft whatsoever just to stay alive.

What if we're sick of Microsoft? Why must developers, manufacturers, vendors, and retailers be forced to endure even the fairest and most legally honorable of relationships with a corporation that has proven its inherent incapability to see value in the ideas, works, and products of others outside its own doors? Why must the rest of the computing industry be bunched together under the category of ''third party'' by legal definition?

In the early 1980s, the computing industry at large made a collective decision to support a single, pre-eminent operating system, and to trust Microsoft with the stewardship of that system. This decision was not reached by having been kicked into the death spiral. This was a rational decision made by honest, persevering corporations whose mutual interest was to build an industry together so that each could prosper.

Microsoft Windows did not, as Microsoft's self-authored history proclaims, compete head-to-head with other operating systems on equal turf, and achieve a position of prominence through overwhelming customer acclamation. MS–DOS—and by succession, Windows—were handed this position of prominence on a silver plate, under the

auspices of a bond of trust between Microsoft and the rest of the computing industry. This trust was the collective property of the computing industry. Microsoft violated, ruined, and destroyed that trust. Entire corporations were destroyed as a result, and others today struggle simply to break even.

To presume that Microsoft can make reparations for this violation by way of an agreement stating that it promises this will never, ever happen again, is to ignore the extent of the damage that was done. For Netscape, Sun, and Novell, the death spiral was indeed devastating, but their survival is foreseeable. They may each yet rise from the ashes, with or without Microsoft's aid—and they may be better off without it anyway. These are companies that may never benefit from any settlement on the content of future agreements with Microsoft. These companies don't want future agreements with Microsoft.

The offended parties in the Microsoft antitrust matter are Microsoft's many software development partners, the computer manufacturers who depend on Windows, the retailers who have the right to sell the products they want to sell, and most importantly, the consumers and businesses who rely on Windows every day. The state of Windows today—and as a result, the state of the way their businesses work every day—was designed, planned, built, and executed in bad faith.

In the interest of crafting a proper redress, I make the following suggested replacements for the terms of the District Court's Final Judgment:

1. Microsoft should cede stewardship of all components of its operating system directly related to the function of maintaining the readiness and usability of the computer, to an independent Licensing Bureau. This Bureau may be comprised of representatives of software manufacturers (including Microsoft); hardware manufacturers; leaders in services, support, and education. Any element of Windows whose basic function does not directly relate to the operability of the computer and its peripherals, may be retained exclusively by Microsoft. This definition may include Media Player, Outlook Express, and such elements that Microsoft has called ''Microsoft Middleware.'' This central element of Windows is referred to here as the Windows core.

2. Representatives of lawmaking entities worldwide will be appointed as special liaison to the Licensing Bureau, for the purpose of overseeing all development, licensing, and educational operations. This includes representatives of the US Justice Dept., but may also include representatives from the various plaintiff states, from Canada, from the EU, and elsewhere.

3. The Licensing Bureau will make public all relevant information required by any independent developer to be able to create an application or program for any purpose that developer may conceive, in a timely manner such that a program constructed using this information may be guaranteed to run on the most premium version of Windows commercially available for a period of time 24 months following the developer's receipt of the information. Costs incurred for this publication will be assumed by the Bureau, and the Bureau will be free to make certain premium versions of its publications—such as ''courseware''—commercially available.

4. The Licensing Bureau will serve as the central authority for licensing of shared Windows components to independent developers, for inclusion in independent programs. This way, developers who use a compiler package will be able to incorporate elements of shared code necessary for the software to perform common functions, such as display buttons and present menus.

5. Members of the Bureau will grant themselves licenses to produce, develop, distribute, and sell operating systems with any package, design, or name they may choose, but which has guaranteed compatibility with the Windows core, and whose principles comply completely with the level of interoperability and communication required by the Windows core. Costs incurred for licenses will be paid to Microsoft Corp., and for the first two years, Microsoft will be credited in any non-Microsoft version of Windows as the creator of Windows. For example, ''IBM Windows'' may include this message: ''Based on Microsoft technology.'' (Use the ''Intel Inside'' logo for a prototype.)

6. Each member of the Bureau will retain the right to develop (or ''innovate'') its own exclusive packaging arrangement for its own version of Windows. Hypothetically, ''HP Windows'' could include HP's own choice of media player, e-mail client, or instant messenger; and HP may even choose to make a ''plain'' version of Windows available without these items. Meanwhile, Microsoft may continue to offer Windows Media Player, Outlook Express, and MSN Messenger. Fair market competition will determine which package is superior.

7. It will be the sole and exclusive responsibility of the Bureau to determine for the benefit of its own members, as well as the computing industry at large, the developmental strategy for the Windows core, to assign the tasks of development to Microsoft teams or to teams from other companies, to manage the development process, and to ensure compliance with the interoperability principles of the Windows core. Microsoft has a seat at the table, but it's a seat among equals. It can elect to play along, or go home and sulk.

At this time in the history of the computing industry, and of the country as a whole, it is incumbent upon us all to get smarter very quickly. We now live and work in a society dependent upon the free and expedient flow of information. The computing industry has helped the concept of information to evolve to include not just news and mail, but functionality—the type of work that can be performed by software and yet represented digitally.

Microsoft's most ardent supporters have argued that it should not be the business of the federal government to interfere with, place controls on, or make restrictions to the free flow of information, or to any company that facilitates this flow of information. They are right. Acceptance of the Proposed Final Judgment as it presently stands, is a tacit surrender and assignment of all rights to restrict the free flow of information, by the federal government, to a single company. The Proposed Final Judgment defines the future as a magnification of the present—in a state of existence that does not appear to have evolved much from where we stand now. And yet we know that the company to which the government would, in effect, render this authority is capable of using its own monopoly power in deceptive ways to manipulate the information industry in such a way that every single transaction comes closer and closer to flowing, at some point, through Microsoft.

''Get me into that,'' Bill Gates is quoted as saying, ''and goddam, we'll make so much money!'' The free flow of transportation was engineered by geniuses—Henry Ford, John A. Roebling, Norman Bel Geddes—and championed by presidents—Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Dwight Eisenhower. The free flow of ideas is one of the basic principles upheld by the United States Constitution. Up to now, all successful freedom has been constructed and established on solid principles. Are we truly prepared to draw up a statement that speaks for all of us as a people and a nation, that serves as a catalyst for the surrender of the free flow of information not to an institution defined by principles, but a corporation defined by deception? We are a smarter people than that. We know, for a fact, that all information, all knowledge, all wisdom is truly free, and that all people are entitled to fair and equal access. This principle will be demonstrated, clearly and unequivocally, either in the relative peace of today or in the turmoil of the future. You may spare the people a great ordeal now, against a powerful yet unprincipled force, by putting a stop to the death spiral. The way you do this is the way you deal with a wayward adolescent: Stop making deals. Take away its power. Spell out the law. And don't get kicked in yourself.

Yours sincerely,
Scott M. Fulton, III
Senior Partner, Ingenus

MTC–00004754

From: Jay Starkman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:34pm
Subject: Awful settlement proposal with Microsoft

Dear Sir or Madam:

Your proposed ''settlement'' with Microsoft still leaves me with an intrusive Windoz operating system that I can't avoid using because it's a monopoly. As a monopoly, other vendors' software is written to run only on Windoz. MS makes sure that the Windoz API calls cannot be emulated by another OS. A real settlement would require MS to publish all its APIs so that other OS's could write emulation code allowing Windoz-specific software to run on non-Windoz OS's like Linux and OS/2. It would allow me (not just computer manufacturers) to remove unwanted software like Outlook Express, NetMeeting, and Front Page. It would give me access to hidden directories and hidden registry entries. It would give me a choice of which OS I want to run given software and give me control over Windoz OS if I chose to use it.

I use both OS/2 and Linux, but it's becoming harder and harder as MS tightens the noose around those systems. Even surfing the Internet, there are sites written specifically for MS Internet Explorer and the Windoz user. The .NET and Passport initiates will seal Internet into the MS corral. Your ''settlement'' unchains a tyrant MS on the world. Innovation will suffer. So will my pocketbook. Just try to find a copy of Windoz XP for a non-fair traded price. Why did they even bother with a ''settlement''. It's a capitulation.

The second tragedy of September 11 is that it led to the unleashing of Microsoft.

Please fire every lawyer in the anti-trust division Justice Department.

They're all incompetent.

-Jay Starkman, CPA

Atlanta, GA

P.S. In 1973, I was employed by Price Waterhouse to assist with their anti-trust matters. I've got first-hand familiarity with the resources and connivance used to get the government to drop that case. The Justice Department is again being taken for fools. And you are!

Jay Starkman, CPA

Voice: 404—636–1400 Fax: 404–636–1130

2531 Briarcliff Road, Suite 116

e-mail: jay@starkman.com

Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Internet: http://www.starkman.com

MTC–00004755

From: Karl Zaske
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement of the antitrust action against Microsoft Corporation is most alarming. As I understand it, instead of punishing MS for violating the law, this settlement rewards their misdeeds by providing them an unfair competitive advantage in one of the few markets where they have not been able to bully their way to domination, K–12 education. How can this possibly make sense? As punishment for abuse of monopoly power the remedy is to increase the monopoly? It's my opinion that Microsoft is making a fool of the DOJ, and Lord help consumers if this settlement goes through.

Sincerely, Karl Zaske

MTC–00004756

From: Rich Murdock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice

I have worked in Education as a computer Technician for 3 years and I have seen over and over Microsoft pushing out the smaller companies. No one can compete with them because they have the money to push out the little guy who needs to make a profit on everything, where Microsoft can afford to loose money just to get their foot in the door. Like this new proposal, it's like convicting a child molester and then for a punishment make him the director of a daycare center. If you want to punish Microsoft don't give them the oppertunity to molest more kids, make them pay by breaking them up or give half of last years income in cash to needy schools. This helps everyone, the schools need money and Microsoft has unfairly earned the money so take it away and give it to the needy.

Rich Murdock

Freshwater Education District

Computer Technician

MTC–00004757

From: Jeremy Richter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 6:21pm
Subject: Very Upset Citizen

As a citizen of the United States who believes in the spirit of competition, I am deeply concerned about the steps being taken to settle the Microsoft Antitrust case. I am a Macintosh user and like the choices that are provided to me using Apple's operating system. But with Microsoft's recent suggestion that a fair settlement could be reached by donating software to underprivileged schools, I am outraged. This is such an obvious ploy to gain additional customers that I can't believe the government is not objecting to it. Didn't they break the law? How does donating software to schools remedy the monopoly stranglehold they have in the PC industry? Allowing Microsoft to donate a billion dollars worth of software completely wipes out any competition. How can Apple and other companies compete with Microsoft in the education market if Microsoft's software will be for free? This isn't a remedy; it's simply creating an even bigger beast that will further destroy competition.

Make Microsoft donate billions in cash for its previous violations and have an independent organization manage how the money is dispersed. Currently, Microsoft has over $36 billion dollars in cash, so I'm pretty sure a few billion would not hurt them in the long run. This would be the right thing to do. In addition, Microsoft should be required to provide its popular Office Suite to both the Macintosh and Linux platforms indefinitely (and they should be released at the same time as the Windows versions and have the same features).

I am confident that most consumers believe preserving competition is worth having to spend a little more time and money to implement the right remedy for Microsoft's wrongdoings.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Sincerely,

Jeremy Richter

MTC–00004758

From: Gregory J. Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm quite displeased that my government has decided to let Microsoft off the hook when they have been declared a monopoly. The terms of this settlement does little to prevent Microsoft from continuing their monopolistic practices and does nothing to punish them from their past regressions. Microsoft has proved itself as a fierce competitor and will stop at nothing to own what ever market it wishes to own. It will try and try again destroying it's competitors or at the last resort buying them out. At work I use a MS operating system, MS Office, we have MS servers and I use a MS web browser. Forget about using an ''alternative'' web browser, my IT department forbids it because it would be incompatible although technically possible. MS marketing at work!

Now they want to control my personal information with their .NET initiative. They say it's because that is what people what and they are just trying to give us what we want. The real reason is because MS wants to own a potential market and keep the rewards for themselves. They have shown that they have no interest in security or doing anything of interest to the user. They don't make changes until they are forced to and then they are often do a poor job or steal from other companies. I certainly do not trust Microsoft. From a Wired article: ''Microsoft chairman Bill Gates on Thursday defended the settlement as tough but one that ''we're really pleased to have.'' If Microsoft is glad to have it then it clearly does not go far enough. I hope that the judge will reject this settlement as inadequate. I also hope for a Department of Justice that is interested in protecting the interests of American citizens rather than the interests of large corporations.

Gregory J. Smith

1840 Peach Rd. NE

Rio Rancho, NM 87124

(505) 891–6160

gregjsmith@mac.com

MTC–00004759

From: AMERHOME@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 8:18pm
Subject: Microsoft antitrust case

December18, 2001

Renata Hesse

Trial Attorney

Antitrust Division

U.S. Department of Justice

601 D Street, NW # 1200

Washington, DC 20530

By fax and Email: <A HREF=''mailto:microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov ''>microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov</A>

Dear Ms. Hesse:

We are writing to comment onissues in the settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case. We also wish to commend the Department of Justice for negotiating a fair and reasonable Revised Proposed Final Judgment in the case, and to urge the Department to resistefforts of Microsoft competitors to undermine the proposed settlement of thecase.

The American HomeownersGrassroots Alliance is the national advocacy organization representing, alongwith its sister foundation, the nation???s 70 million homeowners since 1983. Ourinterest in this case comes from the fact that nearly 60% of homes have one ormore computers. Those tools are increasingly important to homeowners who dependon them as tools for personal and business communications, financial managementand planning, adult and children???s education, and also to manage the rapidlygrowing number of home-based businesses.

In the early history ofthe personal computer industry there were many choices for operating systems,much as there are in

cellular telephones in the U.S. today. The utility ofpersonal computers was undermined by the inability of software written for oneoperating system to work on a different operating system, just as theincompatibility of today???s cellular telephone operating systems is a limitingfactor in their value to consumers. Over time the development of many types ofsoftware for the Windows operating system lead more and more consumers toselect the Windows operating system. Consumer preference for a wide variety ofsoftware applications, convenience, and ease of use also lead to a consumerpreference for the integration of software applications into the Windowsoperating system.

The evolution of theWindows operating system into an industry standard through consumer choice isthe most valuable consumer benefit of Windows. Actions taken to addressMicrosoft behavior should, in no case, undermine the current right of consumersto select Microsoft operating systems and popular arrays of integrated softwareapplications.

We believe the revisedproposed final judgment strikes the right balance in effectively addressingMicrosoft???s unacceptable practices and also preserves consumer choice. Theagreement calls for uniform pricing and allows computer makers flexibility toconfigure Windows and promote non-Microsoft programs. Both interfaces andprotocols necessary for other software to work with Windows must disclosed, andboth retaliation and exclusive agreements are prohibited. An independentlyappointed permanent technical committee will monitor compliance and assist withdispute resolution. The U.S. or any of the states have a right to inspect allMicrosoft documents and all source code for any Microsoft program, interviewany Microsoft employee, and order Microsoft to prepare any report under oathregarding any issues relating to the final judgment. Any person may complainregarding noncompliance to the Justice Department, the states and/or thetechnical committee and the plaintiffs can immediately initiate proceedings tohold Microsoft in contempt. We see no loopholes in this remedy.

Our members have noturged us to support more stringent sanctions against Microsoft. In fact webelieve there is little or no consumer opposition to the revised proposed finaljudgment. We oppose many of the suggestions of Microsoft competitors, directlyor through their influence of federal legislators, state attorney generals, third party organizations, for settlement provisions designed to increase their market share. These companies do not represent consumers, and consumers havemade their preference for the Windows operating system known by their actionsin the marketplace.

We thank you for theopportunity to present our views on this case.

Sincerely,
Beth Hahn
President

MTC–00004761

From: Kent L. Shephard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 8:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I have followed the case carefully and seen the effects of Microsoft's violation of anti-trust statutes. Microsoft has shown that it can't be trusted to not engage in this type of behavior. They had been brought before the court previously and found guilty of similar behavior. This settlement does nothing to protect the consumer or competition from Microsoft's abusive monopoly.

Quite frankly, this settlement had no teeth. What happens if Microsoft finds itself again guilty of this behavior? What action will be taken and what is the penalty? I see nothing outlined. Do they just get to walk and be told ''don't do it again''? What happened to punishment for prior actions? Do they just get away with putting companies out of business? Blatantly ignore the law and walk away?

I say this with the utmost respect. This settlement stinks.

Sincerely,
Kent L. Shephard
Kent L. Shephard
B2C2, Inc.
ASIC Design Manager
(510)814–7373 x153
kshephard@b2c2inc.com
The opinions expressed are mine
and not those of B2C2, Inc.

If I expressed them, they would have to be mine wouldn't they?

MTC–00004762

From: Bill Martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 8:43pm
Subject: comments on proposed Microsoft settlement

As someone who has long believed that government anti-trust enforcement was unnecessarily heavy handed, I am nonetheless appalled and outraged by the Justice Department's handling of the Microsoft case.

I have studied what I can find about the terms of the agreement, and find myself wondering whether Mr. James had the wool pulled over his eyes due to his ignorance of (and/or bad advice on) the technical aspects involved, or whether ''the (political) fix was in.'' I am a retired Fortune 500 corporate financial executive, and as such, with in-house legal assistance, negotiated many eight figure financings and other agreements. I have never seen an agreement so full of loopholes. I honestly believe that the settlement agreement is worse than no settlement at all.

For the last four years, I have worked as the (volunteer) computer staff person for a local professional performing arts organization. I first built the network, including repairing and upgrading a hodge podge collection of donated PCs and building the server. I have then kept the network maintained since then, upgrading it when necessary. As such, I have greatly expanded my long time computer hobbyist's knowledge and am well aware of Microsoft's transgressions. I have watched them target and destroy many entrenched or potential competitors by improper use of their OS monopoly. I have seen them tell outrageous lies to the public, and later to the courts, to maintain and build their monopoly. I am a lifelong believer in free markets and capitalism; their behavior is an embarrassment to me and gives aid to those who would replace our economic system with socialism or state capitalism.

To refute just one faulty Microsoft technical argument that DOJ improperly accepted, secrecy is not a necessary, nor even a reliable, way to build a secure operating system. Microsoft used the secrecy = security argument to sell DOJ on allowing it to improperly keep parts of its OS inaccessable to firms writing competitive applications. Yet the most secure PC operating system in the world (Open BSD Unix) has made its code public. The ultimate security comes from having others review the code to find flaws. Microsoft's secrecy policy does not work; new security holes are found weekly. Secrecy merely delays the discovery of problems until the software is in wide use—maximizing the problem. The public would be better served by requiring them to publish their OS secrets—better served through improved detection of security holes, and also by facilitated competitors who are able to better program applications to run on Microsoft's operating systems.

I will not get into other technical issues here; they are well documented in the industry press and the Wall Street Journal. And their transgressions are well documented in the court record. Where is the punishment for their past misdeeds and perjuries? Where is the incentive for them not to continue the practices that the appeals court has properly found to be illegal? Where is there a single provision in the agreement that does not have at least one large loophole? They have clearly demonstrated that they will use (and extend aggressively) any opening that they can find (or create (or imagine).)

Microsoft has made fools of the DOJ. Please go back to the negotiating table or the courtroom. Further delay in justice is better than legitimizing Microsoft's illegalities and other misdeeds. The health of our economy demands it.

William R. Martin
2725 River Road
Virginia Beach, VA 23454–1210
bill_martin@usa.net

MTC–00004763

From: Mark Taggart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 9:06pm
Subject: An outsider's viewpoint

Make them give cash—$1 Billion—there's my opinion. If they don't like it, raise it to 1.5 billion, and keep going up because they are wasting your time and our tax dollars. I'm willing to be the tax payers have already paid a hefty sum for these hearings and with the $1 billion fine at hand we will at most break even. I'm not going to bother you with my reasoning any more than that.

Have a good day,
Mark Taggart

MTC–00004764

From: David Phillips

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 10:35pm
Subject: Comment on proposed Microsoft Settlement
2689 Elmwood Avenue Apt 2
Kenmore NY 14217
716–874–9407
davep@niagaracyber.com

Greetings.

I'm writing to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement. Microsoft's major penalty should be financial. They benefited enormously from direct and indirect effects of the intimidation tactics they employed. Also, they got caught lying bare-assed to Judge Penfield, which is a major disgrace. Under no circumstances should they be allowed to use a legal penalty to dump hardware and software onto a market segment, such as Education, which has seen a fair amount of competition over the years. For Microsoft to use your settlement as a 'free' way to kill Apple Computer, for instance, would be adding serious insult to real injury.

Alternatively, let Microsoft pay cash—not credit, not millions of copies of their inferior software with a marginal production costs of pennies per unit—to a completely independent foundation which can allocate funds to help EDUCATION. Not necessarily only for the most needy schools, but for the most needy geographical areas, such as rural or inner-city school districts. Some of those billions of dollars could—should the foundation so decide—go to local Headstart programs, for teacher professional development or to help school districts attract better-quality teachers. Math and Science teacher shortages, and the need to recruit girls into these fields, could be among the areas addressed by this foundation.

To recap: Microsoft should just pay money. Lots of it. And the recipient foundation must be COMPLETELY independent of Microsoft. And the funds should be able to be spent to alleviate ignorance.

Clearly, Microsoft's own executives could have used some civics lessons when growing up. How about we break that cycle of ignorance in this generation?

Thanks very much,
David Phillips, PhD.

MTC–00004765

From: Ole Sock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 11:23pm
Subject: Open letter to the confused Attorney Generals
Subject: Open letter to the confused Attorney Generals

The attorney generals in all 50 of our states should realize that the biggest monopoly of all is the ''Government (sic Public) Education System''. In order to curry favor with the influential education bureaucracy the two party politicians have allowed the fox into the hen house, fully disregarding the sound government procurement principle to never ''sole source''. In this respect the politicians have failed the taxpayer miserably. Even though we now have 5 year vesting the future looks grim for millions of baby boomers who have been bashed about with downsizings in the ''private sector''.

Competition and the supposedly global free market are the built in checks and balances to keep ''private'' sector goods and services reasonably priced. The ''public'' sector worker is largely immune from NAFTA and FAST TRACK. This is unfair and its further unfair to encumber an innovative company such as Microsoft which competes in the private sector. It's companies such as Microsoft that eventually produce a product to serve the public by taking over an entity that in its present state is cumbersome and an expensive burden on the backs of society. Our aging populace could better use these saved dollars for medical needs. Therefore I ask the AGs to stop encumbering our free market companies and direct their attention to areas that are bigger concerns to the taxpayer.

I challenge all states attorney generals to rid us of our biggest monopoly and stop violating the constitutional rights of America's children, which under the present situation does not provide an equal opportunity to education. Dangle that education dollar in front of our private sector technological companies and let the innovation of the free market bring a better and equal education to America's children at a cost that is determined by the free market.

If any of you 50 need further convincing in free markets for education try WWW.FRIEDMANFOUNDATION.ORG.

Ray Bastings
29 Hickory Lane
Malvern Pa 19355
FARKNARKLE@MSN.COM

MTC–00004766

From: laspencer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/18/01 11:35pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Microsoft should be split up into 3 companies.

1. An operating system company.
2. An application software company.
3. A web browser company.

Microsoft has clearly abrogated the traditional rules for monopoly control. They are unrepentant. It is time for the federal government to limit Microsoft's power.

Lee Spencer
3323 Seawind Circle
Anchorage, AK 99516
laspencer@gci.net
907–345–0772

MTC–00004767

From: Bill Defelice
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 7:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to express my concern to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am a computer support professional of more than 22 years with the past 16+ of those years spent in the area of education.

I have used a variety of personal computing operating systems in both the retail and educational channels, including those made by Microsoft (MS–DOS, Windows 3.11/95/98/ME/NT/2000/XP), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Unix, BeOS, Novell and Apple.

My opinion is that a variety of operating systems other than Microsoft's provide superior features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly in excess of 70% of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed. There have been numerous ways that this has been documented, including the PBS television special ''Triumph of the Nerds'', which covers every aspect from Microsoft's own Bill Gates taking advantage of the original author of the PC Dos operating system to stealing the look and feel of Apple Computer's operating system used in the Macintosh and Lisa personal computer systems.

I am quite opposed to the settlement for several reasons. The one I most strongly object to is the fact that is provides Microsoft with an unfair advantage through an increased market share. By the fact they are to provide a majority of their settlement award with their own hardware/software in lieu of cash only strengthens the foothold of Microsoft in the educational environment. Many school districts, including the one I work for, utilize multiple computing platforms from Unix, Macintosh as well as Microsoft.

Receiving product from Microsoft not only hinders progress within districts like ours, but provides further deterioration of the other platforms utilized—regardless of the merits of these other platforms. I would recommend that Microsoft be required to pay a mostly cash settlement instead of providing them with an avenue for furthering their stronghold.

Microsoft was also convicted of illegally integrating its products and/or its key technologies to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was previously overturned. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying key technologies to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to open competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of this act and this should be remedied. The settlement formally forecloses any future opportunity to do so * this simply can't be allowed.

There doesn't appear to be any further action to prevent them from furthering their monopoly. The nerve of CEO Steve Ballmer stating publicly that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. This should show that the Microsoft mentality is they believe we are all drones and will be bamboozled anything they say as gospel! How can the American public believe that Microsoft will change their ways and become law abiding? There is no apparent incentive to keep Microsoft's compliance. There must be safeguards provided in the settlement to insure compliance as well as monitoring them to prevent deviation from those guidelines set forth for a settlement.

Respectfully submitted,
Bill DeFelice, Sr. Technician
Norwalk Connecticut Public Schools
Bill DeFelice

Sr. Computer—A/V Technician
Norwalk Public Schools
Instructional Technology Center
125 East Avenue
Norwalk, CT 06852
Tel: 203–854–4104

MTC–00004768

From: Eleanor J Morgan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 9:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settment

I think it is time the Government put this subject to rest. I feel other company's feel they aren't getting as much money and are poor losers. Bill Gate's has done so much for others and people are taking advantage of him. Hope something is done soon to get this behind him.

MTC–00004769

From: Wendell Galbraith
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/19/01 9:36am

Please do not let Microsoft get away again without stiff penalties. They use the words ''innovate'' and ''consumer'' over and over to bamboozle the public and lawmakers and force us to use their software. It got no publicity but research the case of ''Blue Mountain Arts vs. Microsoft'' and you will get a crystal clear understanding of what they do.

Wendell Galbraith
Research Director
WJMK Television
Boca Raton, Fl.

MTC–00004770

From: Rebecca Matthews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 10:37am
Subject: How do you apply for a grant?

Please let me know how you apply for a Microsoft grant.

RM

MTC–00004771

From: Steven Randolph
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 10:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposed settlement with Microsoft in the anti-trust case. I heartily concur with the finding of the courts that Microsoft is an abusive monopolist that has acted illegally to limit competition. But the proposed settlement will not sufficiently restore competition. Microsoft should be divided into two independent companies as per the plan described by the original trial judge. Furthermore, strong measures should be taken to ensure that Microsoft does not ''bundle'' applications into its operating systems so as to prevent or discourage consumers from consideration of competing applications from non-Microsoft sources.

Sincerely,
Steven Randolph
6710 Taylor Road
Lakeland, FL 33811
863–255–8954
steven.randolph@starband.net

MTC–00004772

From: Bernard P Ducamp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 11:13am
Subject: Monopoly Maintenance

Please refer to the we site: http://www.byte.com/documents/s=1115/byt20010824s0001/. The article about the demise of BeOS points out the following: The reality is that Be's failure has made a point to the world, to whit: ''Don't bother trying to create a better commercial desktop OS—it doesn't matter how hard you try, how many engineers you throw at the problem, how much money you spend, how many years you put into it, or how wonderful the product is. Microsoft owns that (monopoly) space, and will VIGOROUSLY defend it.''

MTC–00004773

From: Mark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 11:17am
Subject: Comment about Microsoft antitrust settlement

Having worked in the computer industry for more than 20 years I have seen the bennefit TRUE competition as done for our industry. The current Microsoft settlement does nothing to promote competition and in fact further promotes Microsoft's monopoly into the education market. In the future, the underfunded schools will be forced to pay for upgrading Microsoft software. This is an expense our schools can't afford.

Additionally the true cost of the software Microsoft plans to donate is significantly less than the list price. A better solution would be to have Microsoft pay cash to the schools and allow the schools to spend to money on what ever they wish or non-Microsoft platforms. Redhat has offered to donate Linux for free. Let Microsoft buy the hardware. Or let the schools buy Apple computers.

I would prefer to see Microsoft broken up in to an operating system company and an application company.

Sincerly,
Mark Wisner
101 Farrell Ct.
Morrisville, NC 27560

MTC–00004774

From: holtf@redwood.rt.cs.boeing.com @inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Here's a snippet from an e-mail making the rounds today, 19 Dec 01—This is the sort of compliance you can expect from Microsoft:

''I understand that some people using Netscape's browsers had trouble reading my recent IETF trip report. Unfortunately, I had forgotten that Microsoft had changed their HTML conversion utility for Word2000 such that it creates great content for their IE browser but horrid content for Netscape browsers.

Because I used Word2000 to create this report, I have been getting emails reporting great frustration trying to read/access my report.

Fortunately, <name deleted> used a utility to strip out the Word2000-isms from an older version of my trip report. . . .''

The only innovative work we've ever seen from Microsoft has addressed avoiding standards and undermining competitors. The people impressed with Microsoft products are the turn-key users and those who benefit directly from the largesse. Everyone I know who works in information technology admires Microsoft's business strategy—a monopoly in an area the government doesn't understand. However, in these technical circles, I never hear Microsoft praised for its technical innovations or for its quality; quite the opposite.

(Technically, what has Microsoft *ever* innovated? A dancing paper clip? Seriously review this question of innovation with someone knowledgable in the history of information technology—every major Microsoft product is the result of purchase or imitation.)

Those in the industry know that antitrust action against Microsoft should have started in the late 1980s. The government has clearly been slow to understand the information technology sector of business. But finally the suit came, too late for Lotus and Caldera, but Microsoft's fundamental business practices had not changed. I can't believe that after winning the case, the U.S. Government is now going to capitulate.

Fred.

Fred B. Holt Phone: (425)865–4148
Math and Eng. Analysis FAX: (425)865–2966
The Boeing Company e-mail: fred.b.holt@boeing.com

The Boeing Company takes no responsibility for the content of this message.

CC:senator_leahy@leahy.senate.gov @inetgw,attorney.gen.

MTC–00004775

From: Richard D. Copeland, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 2:18pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530;
(facsimile) 202–616–9937

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a computer programmer and consider myself knowledgeable of the computer industry. I am writing concerning the proposed Microsoft settlement with the Department of Justice. Since Microsoft has already been found guilty, I consider the existing settlement to be severely lacking in several areas. As it is currently written, the settlement will not prevent Microsoft from continuing their anti-competitive behavior. Also, it provides no penalty for Microsoft's past behavior. A meaningful settlement needs, at a minimum, the following:

* Both the Windows API and Microsoft document formats (MS Word, MS Excel, etc) must be made freely available to anyone who wants them.

* Microsoft networking protocols must be standardized by a standards body. This will prevent Microsoft from using their private, proprietary protocols to seize control of new applications used on the Internet.

* Microsoft products should be provided only as extra-cost options on personal

computers. The software should also be available for the same price as the difference between a computer loaded with Microsoft products, and one without any Microsoft products. This will prevent Microsoft from ''bunding'' an entire kitchen sink of applications with Windows, increasing the price of Windows (either directly or indirectly), and preventing competition.

Sincerely,
Richard D. Copeland, Jr.
concerned, informed Citizen

MTC–00004777

From: Brian Uecker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 4:16pm
Subject: My support

I totally endorse the DOJ's settlement with Microsoft! Don't let those liberal, know-nothing states screw this up!!!

Brian Uecker

MTC–00004778

From: Russell Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern, I am Russell Parker and have been a Systems and Network engineer for over 17 years. And as a professional in this field I would like to say that I think that the US Gov. is doing a gross case of Injustice in regards to the harassment of Microsoft. Why is it that the US Gov thinks it has to punish a company once they are at a certain size? As for as the claims that Microsoft does not play fair. That is just the cry of companies that do not have a product that is as good as what Ms has and they are using this to get an unfair advantage over Ms. If the consumer does not like what any company does they have the ''right'' not to buy from a company that does not do bossiness in the manor that they like. That is what happened to WordPerfect, and for the government to tell a company what they can and can not do is not only bring us closer to socialism in the US.

Russell Parker CNE, MCSE
4400 S. Bell Apt 102C
Amarillo TX 79109

MTC–00004779

From: Wally Flint
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 5:02pm
Subject: antitrust issues

THE IDEA PROPOSED HEREIN IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARD SET OF OPERATING SYSTEM COMPONENTS. The specification of these components is not a specification for how the components should work. Instead, it is only a specification for the nature and scope of components (what module does what), together with the interfaces for the components (how to ''connect to'' a component, or how to access the functionality of each component). I call this operating system the ''Standard Operating System'' (SOP).

METHODOLOGIES

Many well-known software companies (BEA, IBM, Sun, ...) compete on a level playing field to produce J2EE application servers. This ''fair and competitive market'' did not emerge from the mist of random free market chaotic activity. Instead, it developed on the basis of the following methodologies:

1) Modularization of Software

Dell manufactures computers from video cards, mother boards, and other electronic modules and components. Contrast this with the old way of carrying out circuit design—wiring together a bunch of resistors and transistors. With the old methodology, every electronic product was essentially ''custom built''. Then, electronic hardware became modularized. The integrated circuit (IC) offered complex functionality (such as an amplifier) as a modular unit. Circuit boards (like a PC's mother board or video card) offered even more complex functionality as a modular unit. If a circuit board goes bad, just replace it with a new one (as opposed to replacing the entire computer). If a cheaper video card appears on the market, companies like Dell can lower costs by changing to the new cheaper video card.

This modularization could not have developed without standards. For example, circuit boards have standard connectors that plug into standard sockets in the PC. If every video card had its own custom connector, then each PC design could use one and only one type of video card.

Just as electronic products are built from standard modules, large complex software programs may be built from standard software modules. For this to happen, the interface for accessing the functionality of that component must be defined. Standardizing a software module interface is analogous to standardizing circuit board connectors. For example, if a software module draws lines on the screen, then the line drawing functionality may possibly be accessed by calling a ''drawLine'' function, a ''paintLine'' function, a ''renderLine'' function, and so on. A standard is developed by choosing one of these names, and asking all component developers to use the same name. This allows software modules to be mixed and matched for a variety of purposes (optimization of cost, speed, quality, ...), just as hardware components are mixed and matched in the design of a PC.

2) Community Process Sun has developed a community process, called the ''Java Community Process'', for allowing interested parties to influence the development of a standard. (www.jcp.org)

3) Proving Compliance with a Standard To prove compliance with a standard, a compatibility test suite is developed. A compatibility test suite is a software application that exercises the various functionalities of a software module, and verifies that the behavior that results is the same behavior as that required by the standard. The same compatibility test suite is used for all software module developers, producing a ''level playing field'' for competition in meeting the standard.

(http://developer.java.sun.com/developer/technicalArticles/JCPtools/)

IMPORTANT FEATURES OF THE METHODOLOGIES DESCRIBED ABOVE

A) These methodologies allow code to remain proprietary (unless a company elects to open source its code), yet still facilitate competition for all operating system components. They also facilitate mixing and matching components. You could run a Microsoft kernel with a windowing system from company XYZ, or visa versa. Allowing code to remain proprietary stimulates competition and investment, promotes quality, and is fair to investors.

B) Part of the difficulty in solving the anti-trust problem lies in defining where the operating system ends and software applications begin. Should an instant messenger be classified as an operating system component, or is it a software application? This issue is highly significant when trying to determine whether Microsoft is bundling its applications with its operating system, and thereby forcing consumers to purchase the applications in order to get the operating system. I call this bundling phenomenon ''operating system creep''. Operating system creep is the process of expanding the definition of word ''operating system'' for the purpose of legitimizing the practice of bundling applications with the operating system.

The above methodologies indirectly provide a solution to the problem of operating system creep. Assume the standard operating system is developed as a bunch of components, instead of as one giant blob. In this case, the standard for a given component may change frequently while the standard is maturing. However, the standard for that component will eventually stabilize, and thereafter the standard will probably not change very often. After a component standard has stabilized, companies that develop that component are not affected by operating system creep. That is, if company XYZ markets a component for rendering the desktop on the screen, then that component cannot be adversely affected if Microsoft bundles an instant messenger component with its version of SOP. Under the current situation (no standardized modularization), the entire operating system is pushed onto the consumer as a single giant ''blob'' (a single giant component), and in this case, no other company can compete to provide this giant component, because the component changes with each iteration. (For example, the giant component may include an instant messenger in one iteration, where it did not include an instant messenger in the previous iteration.) But with standardized componentization, the standard for a given operating system module eventually stabilizes, and all companies can then easily compete to implement that standard. The point is that the standard for a stabilized component cannot be affected by changing the scope of what is considered the ''operating system''.

C) In order to end up with a quality design, an industry consortium should develop the standardized interfaces, as well as the scope of those interfaces (should it be one big interface, or a component for screen rendering, a component for I/O, and so on? should screen rendering be one big component, or should it be broken into several sub-components?). The industry consortium could standardize components using a process similar to the java community process described above.

ONE ASPECT OF THE REMEDY

Suppose the Windows operating system is required to implement the SOP interfaces. In

this case, if Microsoft applications (such as Microsoft Word) communicate with Windows using proprietary (non-standard) interfaces, then this effectively creates an artificial shortage of applications for competing operating systems. Looked at another way, it forces competing operating systems to implement the proprietary interfaces to become ''Microsoft Word compatible'', and thereby destroys the standard. Perhaps one aspect of a remedy could be requiring Microsoft applications to use ONLY the standardized interfaces.

MTC–00004780

From: Tom Harwood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft Is An Unrepentant Criminal And Must Be Treated As Such: On November 29, we first noted that the 60-day comment period on the Microsoft antitrust settlement with the Justice Department and nine states had begun. Today, we filed our comments on the settlement. It is incredulous to us that anyone could think that the settlement is reasonable and effective. Here is the text of our submission to the Justice Department: ''I would like to express my opposition to the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. I am not a lawyer but a user of personal computers, a tool essential to my livelihood for approximately 20 years. I have used many personal computing operating systems over the years, including those made by Microsoft (MSDOS, Windows 3.11, Windows 95, Windows 98, Windows ME, Windows NT 4.0 and Windows XP Pro), Amiga, Commodore, IBM, Texas Instruments and Apple Computer. My opinion is that operating systems other than Microsoft's have been superior in features and performance at each stage of development of the personal computing platform. Yet Microsoft achieved a monopoly, i.e. in excess of 70 percent of the personal computer market. Microsoft's illegal behavior in maintaining and expanding that monopoly to in excess of 90 per cent of the market effectively destroyed all existing competitive personal computing operating systems in the process, save one, and perhaps prevented others from being developed.

''I am firmly opposed to the settlement for three principal reasons. First, the settlement does not in anyway compensate for the effects of Microsoft's illegal maintenance of a monopoly. Second, it forecloses further pursuit of illegal tying. Third, its attempt to prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior is inadequate. ''Microsoft stands convicted after appeal of conducting illegal acts to maintain its monopoly of personal computer operating systems. Microsoft's illegal acts certainly have cost consumers billions of dollars directly and possibly much more by preventing the development of alternatives. We will never know what we've lost as a result of illegally stifled competition. Yet the settlement does not provide even a minuscule penalty for the deleterious results of Microsoft's egregiously illegal behavior. It simply dismisses this and proceeds with a lame attempt to prevent a continuation of such illegal behavior. No corrective action of any type that simply attempts to put Microsoft on a legal course can be reasonably construed to be a penalty of any sort. A penalty is required and none is provided by the settlement.

''Microsoft was also convicted of illegally tying its products to its monopoly operating system but that conviction was overturned on appeal based on the standard used by the District Court judge to convict Microsoft. The issue was remanded to the District Court for further consideration. A decision to not pursue the illegal tying issue is formalized in the settlement even though the Justice Department announced that it would not pursue it before entering into the settlement. In my experience it is indeed Microsoft's tying of its products to its monopoly operating system that has been the most damaging to competition in the personal computing market. Microsoft was initially found guilty of illegal tying and the remanded issue should be pursued. The settlement formally forecloses the opportunity to do so.

''Finally, the settlement is inadequate to prevent Microsoft from continuing its practices of illegally maintaining its monopoly. Clearly, Microsoft is an unrepentant criminal. As an example, its CEO Steve Ballmer was quoted as stating that he does not even know what a monopoly is after Microsoft was convicted of being one. It is totally incredulous to believe that Microsoft will simply go forth and be a good corporate citizen. While the settlement contains provisions to enforce its restrictions through oversight, the burden is on the government to catch Microsoft in the act and, if so, then Microsoft is simply returned once again to proceedings such as these. Where is the incentive for Microsoft to comply? My mind boggles in that this is the second time that a settlement of this nature has been reached with the same convict. The second is no more satisfactory than the first. Any resolution of this case against Microsoft must provide appropriate incentives for the unrepentant criminal to comply with the law.''

MTC–00004781

From: Jen Huebert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my support for Steve Satchell to be a nominee for the three-member committee stationed at Microsoft for the Microsoft Anti-Trust Compliance Committee. I believe Mr. Satchell is well qualified for this postion, and would be a fair and knowledgeable member of the committee.

I would like to comment on the case for public record according to my rights under the Tunney Act:

One of Microsoft's chief claims during this trial was that times and the nature of business have changed, and that anti-trust enforcement ought to be different today than it was when the laws were first passed over a century ago. Microsoft now appears to be leaning on this to disenfranchise many of the people and organizations who feel they have been damaged by Microsoft's actions.

Here's the explanation:

The remedies in the Proposed Final Judgement specifically protect companies in commerce—organizations in business for profit. On the surface, that makes sense because Microsoft was found guilty of monopolistic activities against ''competing'' commercial software vendors like Netscape, and other commercial vendors.

Microsoft's greatest single threat on the operating system front comes from Linux—a non-commercial product—and it faces a growing threat on the applications front from Open Source and freeware applications. The biggest competitor to Microsoft Internet Information Server is Apache, which comes from the Apache Foundation, a not-for-profit. Apache practically rules the Net, along with Sendmail, and Perl, both of which also come from non-profits. Yet not-for-profit organizations have no rights at all under the proposed settlement. It is as though they don't even exist. Section III(J)(2) is a prime example, and Section III(D) is another. Under this deal, the government is shut out, too.

This is all cause of great concern, and should be to us all.

Regards,
Jen Huebert
jhuebert@postmark.net

MTC–00004782

From: frank xu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 6:43pm
Subject: the settle is fair and benefical to consumers

TO who it may concern,

I think the settle fair and benefical to consumers. Any opposition to this settle has seen to be only benefical Microsoft's competitors such as SUN and Oracle. The products from these MS competitor have much higher price, in the order of magnitude.

Tax payer's money should be used to help companies to make good and more products, not to put any limit on all the good stuff MS created and consumers have long been enjoying. MS competitors should spend more time on improving products intead of firing laws suits which are waste of Tax payer's money.

Thanks for asking public opinion.
Frank Xu

MTC–00004783

From: James Dixon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 9:35pm
Subject: Comments on the proposed settlement.

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to voice my opinion on the proposed settlement in the Microsoft antitrust trial. I have no legal training and am writing solely as an informed layman. I do have experience with computers, as I have worked as a computer technician for the past 6 years, and have been using computers since 1976.

Microsoft has been found guilty of establishing and maintaining a monopoly in the field of computer operating systems. It is my opinion that the proposed settlement does nothing to penalize them for past illegal actions taken in this regard, and does little

to prevent such actions in the future. Quite frankly, in both this trial and the previous one, Microsoft has shown a complete and total disregard for the law and legal agreements. Any penalty must take this into account, and be crafted accordingly. I believe there are three simple components to such an effective penalty.

First, Microsoft should pay a large fine for its past actions—large not just in layman's terms, but in relationship to the size of the company and it's current cash reserves. This money should be used by the court to compensate those injured by Microsoft's illegal activities. How best to do so is a matter best left to the judgement of the court. This serves two purposes. Hopefully it reminds Microsoft that there is a penalty to pay for breaking the law, and thereby dissuades them from doing so in the future. More importantly, it reinforces the standard (and reminds the public and other corporations) that the rule of law is absolute, and disregard of it will not be tolerated. Secondly, since Microsoft is an acting monoply, it should be regulated as one. Microsoft should no longer be allowed to negotiate individual license fees for Windows and Office. Instead, as with other regulated monoplies, they should publish a public tarriff which lists the quantities and prices at which their products may be purchased. This would prevent Microsoft from providing reduced prices in exchange for exclusive contracts, a popular tactic of Microsoft's in the past. This tarriff would be the only way in which Microsoft would be allowed to sell their products. Since this is a fairly harsh penalty, it should probably be subject to periodic review to determine if it is still required. Every 3–5 years would seem to be appropriate.

Thirdly, all API's to Microsoft's products should be made public. This should be enforced by a panel of outside experts with full access to Microsoft's source code, and their decisions should be binding. No API's, security or otherwise, should be excluded, and the disclosure should be fully public, not limited in any way. This will prevent another of Microsoft's popular tactics, reserving hidden API's and only partially documenting others.

Taken together, these three components will act as a significant check on future illegal activities on Microsoft's part, and will allow competing firms and Open Source developers to offer products which both compete and interoperate with Microsoft's. They do not, of course, address the full range of Microsoft's illegal and anti-comptetitive actions, but doing so is outside of my capabilites or time. These are the points on which I feel qualified to speak, and I believe my recommendations are both simple and relatively easy to implement, especially in comparison to the currently proposed settlement. I would like them to be considered in lieu of or in addition to the proposed settlement.

Finally, if Microsoft cannot agree to these types of regulations, or breaks the agreement in any way, final drastic action is required. Just as a convicted criminal can no longer be allowed to possess weapons, if Microsoft cannot act within the law their weapons should be taken from them. In this case, those weapons are Windows and Office. If Microsoft will not agree to these terms, or live by them, the copyright to Windows and Office should be removed from them and placed in the public domain. I realize this is an extreme and drastic action, but given Microsoft's well demonstrated and total disregard for the law and lawfully negotiated settlements, I can think of no other final penalty which meets the needs of the public.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Respectfully,

James E. Dixon
Route 3, Box 85-B
Mannington, WV 26582
jdixon@pobox.com

MTC–00004784

From: Mark Sealey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 11:54pm
Subject: Comment against the recent MicroSoft judgement settlement, payment to schools
Mark Sealey
24668–A Brighton Drive
VALENCIA
CA 91355–4374
(+1 661) 255 7044

As a long time educator and computer/IT specialist, i am extremely concerned at the recent settlement proposed for industry monopolist Microsoft.

The proposal to 'pay off' monies owed to the industry and public by making equipment and software available to educational establishments would, in fact, further that company's monopoly.

Such an arrangement would effectively tie in those schools and colleges unwise enough to receive such merchandise to depending on Microsoft products from the time they took delivery of the goods onwards. Microsoft has a proven record of releasing inferior software and operating systems necessitating that the buyer pay later on for upgrades and improvements.

Schools participating in this deception would sooner or later find themselves under strong pressure to abandon superior products for Microsoft upgrades and later versions.

This is not good for American school students, parents, tax payers or the spirit of competition which has put such otherwise excellent resources into our schools.

Please inform me of the Department's intention not to let this happen.

Thank you!

best

Mark Sealey
<www.markworks.com>

MTC–00004785

From: RedGhost
To: NEWCASE ATR,Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 1:24am
Subject: Microsoft use of Federal Facilities for Advertising

I am disturbed to find that Microsoft has been allowed to advertise in a Federal Facility. Today I was at the Main Post Office in Seattle and found that Microsoft has paid for placement in local Postal Facilities. This apalls me. I understood that the case Department of Justice had prosecuted ended up in a Conviction on the Charges. The appearance of the posters, CDs and other items promoting Microsoft, seems to imply that the Federal Goverment condones the actions, historical and future that this criminal endevour undertakes. Maybe I am mistaken in my understanding, but the left hand either does not know what the right does, or there is a new policy of selling access to government facilities to the highest bidder.

This sets a precedent that leads down a slippery slope in allowing anybody with a wad of cash to buy a their way into government facilities. If this is going to be policy, what is to restrict any enterprise from dispensing items of a questionable nature other buildings where the public has access? The assault on postal facilities with bacterial agents, though tragic, is not as insidious as allowing this activity to continue.

I have reviewed the contents of the ''free'' disk and have found that this item perpetuates the continued anticompetative activities the company was investigated for. This item forces the user to ''upgrade'' software on their computer, to the Proprietary microsoft item, instead of allowing the interested party to view this with a competitors browser or multimedia program. It also promotes gambling with a ''Contest'' for prizes, which forces the user to ''register'' with the microsoft Passport software, to allow the company to monitor the users online activities, and track actions.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Clay Monroe
5702 43rd ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105–2225

MTC–00004786

From: Aaron Peluso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 3:24am
Subject: Microsoft Feedback

Lets get this thing settled and get on with our lives. The DOJ settlement is more than fair.

Aaron Peluso

MTC–00004787

From: Jeremy.Duane@Metavante.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 8:11am
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

I'm 27yrs old, and need some explantion. How is it any different when companies like ''AOL'' & ''Time Warner'' merg, and take a commanding lead in their fields. Then now AT&T plan a merger & now are going to take control of the market more then what their competitors had. HOW is it then different then how ''MicroSoft'' conducts itself? I have no business/law degree, but to me....it just seems unfair. Punish ''MicroSoft'' for ''bullying'', but then when other huge companies are doing the same....say&do nothing to them? If your going to make this ''fair'', make it fair down both sides of the street. I work hard for a living, manage to stay afloat, I could care less what one company does to another.... my point is: Make it legally fair to everyone. Personally, the whole thing against ''Microsoft'', to me, just makes no sence at all. Why anger the richest man in the world? He now is reaching out into different

markets, soon his ''XBOX'' will eliminate competitors, are you then going to go after him for that? Then after that, then what? From a plain guy in WI., I say leave it be already.

Jeremy Duane
www.geocities.com/soul—seeking

MTC–00004788

From: mmcweeney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 8:19am
Subject: Comments on Antitrust for **Federal Register**

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to voice my concerns at the haste at which the Antitrust case against Microsoft is being reached. I believe there are superior alternatives to Microsoft products available, but believe the penalties proposed will not allow the companies and individuals who comprise the computer community to benefit from these.

Specifically, I have found it close to impossible to purchase a desktop or laptop computer for my own personal use, without having Microsoft Windows included in the price. In other words as a consumer, I was forced to buy a product I neither required nor wanted. This is an unacceptable situation. Those engaging in this practice include virtually all the major computer manufacturers, and almost all retail outlets. On enquiring why this is the case, most informed me that they were prevented from shipping the computer alone (without bundled Microsoft software) because of agreements with Microsoft. As such, these same companies would not quote me for a software-free machine.

Microsoft should not be allowed to yield profits from those who want to use their products. By imposing penalties which prevent these agreements, the Department of Justice has the opportunity to:

1:Prevent Microsoft from dubbing closed proprietary file formats and other technologies as ''Industry standards'', thereby improving interoperability.

2:Allow true competition which will benefit the entire computer community in terms of software quality and security.

3:Facilitate the public by allowing them to choose software on merit.

4:Eliminate the scourge of viruses which are almost non-existant outside the realms of Microsoft, but as Code Red and Nimda showed, could potentially grind the internet to a halt for everybody. It's everybody's internet.

Please protect it.

I sincerely hope that the Dept. of Justice will be mindful of this and impose meaningful penalties which will undo past damage, and improve future competition.

Yours faithfully
Mel McWeeney
Mr. Mel McWeeney,
I.T. Consultant,
136 Teffia Park,
Longford,
Rep. of Ireland.

MTC–00004790

From: Stacey Tarbell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 10:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
December 20, 2001
Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530
Subject: U.S. v. Microsoft
By Email

Dear Attorney Hesse:

The Department of Justice Antitrust Division is accepting public comment in the settlement between the United States government and the Microsoft Corporation until the end of January 2002. I write to offer my support of the settlement.

Although I do not work in the high technology industry, I can see the benefits it has had in our country, specifically those of Microsoft. In the span of a few short years, this company has totally transformed how Americans communicate in business and in their private lives. Microsoft has brought worker efficiency to a level that was never dreamed of when we were all using typewriters and calculators.

If any of Microsofts competitors could even come close to a product that could rival Excel, Word or PowerPoint, consumers would have a real choice. Since no other company can even come close, consumers chose Microsoft. As a result, its competitors have chosen to try and defeat them in the courtroom, rather than the marketplace. They are co-opting the governments resources because they really have no alternative to compete with other than their inferior products.

It is a shame that the government has fallen prey to the special interests of Microsofts competitors. Through this settlement, we have the opportunity to finally put an end to what has already been a case that has gone on too long. I urge you to settle this case once and for all. Consumers, families and the marketplace deserve nothing less.

Sincerely,
Stacey Tarbell
121 Pinewood Drive
Contoocook, New Hampshire 03229

MTC–00004791

From: Joseph J Wolff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 11:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

The Microsoft proposed settlement will only serve to make Microsoft a stronger monopolist.

1) 'Giving' software away to underprivileged schools benefits Microsoft far more than it benefits the schools—and in fact giving software away to schools is a proven marketing tacting used by Apple computer 20 years ago to put its business on the map—it is akin to 'planting the seeds' in young users of your operating system or platform—grabbing mindshare at the earliest point, and while the minds are still open and gullible, without the ability to filter propaganda and spin. It also plants the seeds for upgrades—sources put the IT budget of Microsoft-based schools at 30–40% of the total IT budget—hardly something that the underprivileged schools will be able to afford after their first five years of free ride is ended, with the next release after that of MSWindows or MSOffice being (intentionally) ''incompatible'' with the previous release—a proven tactic to force upgrades.

A better solution is proposed by RedHat Software, here: http://www.redhat.com/about/presscenter/2001/press—usschools.html This would preserve the future of the software for the schools, and would quintuple the number of systems and schools receiving a benefit.

2) An even more disturbing manipulation contained in the settlement is described here: http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20011206.html So once again, Microsoft is using the settlement to actually lock in its future—rather than actually be constrained by it.

These clauses will give Microsoft the leverage it needs to prevent distribution of it's API documentation to whomever it doesn't want to see them, perpetuating the problem, in precisely the same way it has done in the past—only this time with the force of law!

The clauses also attack the only real competition Microsoft now has—the open-source community, where the products are available for nothing—the only way it has proven possible to compete with Microsoft given its monopolistic practices.

In conclusion, I urge the DOJ to rethink the proposed settlement—I also respectfully submit that the selttlement, and the comments from the knowledgeable members of the media and industry experts, indicate clearly that there is a fundamental lack of understanding by the DOJ of the software business and the way Microsoft has competed unfairly and used monoipolistic practices to squash competition—and in fact the DOJ in the current settlement is simply another pawn being played by Microsoft to further its own interests.

Respectfully,
Joseph J Wolff
Founder and CEO,
eRacks Thin Systems
www.eracks.com
joe@eracks.com
CC:joe@eracks.com@inetgw

MTC–00004792

From: Michael W. Shelton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 12:07pm
Subject: Let Justice Prevail

As a long-time network administrator, I have long suffered from the abuses perpetrated by Microsoft's hegemony in the sphere of small-computer operating systems. Whereas my suffering is not sufficient for the law to require relief, Microsoft's actions have been determined to violate the law, and in this penalty phase of the case, penalties should be meted out appropriately. It is beginning to look like that may not happen, and that computer consumers and users will continue to suffer. Thus, I'm offering my opinion.

* Users should not be forced to buy Microsoft products as part of the purchase of

a new computer. The cost of those products should be added on, and their inclusion made optional. Thus, a computer without software could be configured with software products of the buyer's choice at prices that reflect true competition between those products, rather than settling for Microsoft's products because they are ''included'' or add ''only a few dollars'' to the price.

* Microsoft's file formats should be made public, so that other vendors' programs can read them, even on other operating systems. Also, the Windows application programming interface should be opened to allow other vendors to write programs for the Window operating system with the same advantages that Microsoft's internal programmers have.

* If Microsoft insists on developing its own networking protocols, those protocols should be made public, so that the company cannot leverage its hegemony into control over even more of the internet.

Whereas I am, like most Americans, appalled by the events of September 11, there is no excuse for sacrificing that which makes America great in a headlong rush to concentrate on the solution of a single problem at the expense of all others. This is not a time for us to be sacrificing civil rights or to knuckle under to corporate greed, however it may be clothed. Microsoft has been found, appropriately and finally, to be in violation of the law, and an appropriate remedy should be levied. We will all (including Microsoft, if you believe in that most capitalistic of values: free and open competition) benefit from a leveling of the field and from the business-as-usual continuity of the proper application of the rule of law.

Thank you for the opportunity to make my voice heard.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Shelton

If you think education is expensive, try ignorance.

Derek Bok

Michael W. Shelton

1537 North Lakeside Ridge Drive

Sand Springs, OK 74063

phone 918/245–0510

Mike@MikeRocosm.com

MTC–00004793

From: Sylvia Rapp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 12:19pm
Subject: objection

Dear Sir:

I want to voice my objection to the settlement our Government is plannig to give Microsoft. I feel it is unfair to consumers and will crush all competition in the market place. It is not in our best interest to live in a world dominated by Microsoft.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Rapp

MTC–00004794

From: Chet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 11:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please review carefully the proposed settlement in this case.

I, like millions of other tax paying citizens of this country feel that Microsoft is not being punished, but rewarded with this proposed settlement. Where is the justice for the thousands of businesses and individuals who have been hurt by Microsoft. They are not in the underprivileged schools of America. I agree that a settlement going to the schools would be wonderful. But not in the form of more Microsoft software and training. That would only diminish Apple's stronghold in the Educational Sector and further promote Microsoft's monopoly.

And where do all those who have been negatively effected by Microsoft's monopoly get there justice? Certainly not in this proposed settlement.

Please, let's get a grip on this situation and muster up the intestinal fortitude to devise an appropriate settlement that actually punishes Microsoft and rewards those who have been harmed by their monopolistic practices!

Regards,

Chet Poulton

Creative Director

ICS Inc.

cip@icsys.cc

MTC–00004795

From: E Floyd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 12:44pm
Subject: Comment on MS/DOJ Settlement

I can't beleave they were let off that easy. This is not more then a slap on the hand for a company like that. Not to mention they are still useing the same tactic as we speak. In my opinion, this does nothing but set up the world for a ''Microsoft Tax'' In this case, I don't think my tax dollars were put to good use. It seems as if it was a waste of time and money.

MTC–00004797

From: Chuck Scott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 1:29pm
Subject: Comment on Microsoft settlement

I have been using Microsoft Windows software for well over 20 years now for both business and personal use. I can not begin to fathom how it is that the government would say that improving your product is a detrimental to consumers. In order to improve your product you have to stay competitive. Microsoft did just that. If you look at the root cause of everything that has been laid at the feet of Microsoft I think you will find that personal greed and ego were as much to blame for what happened as anything Microsoft did in terms of business deals. If you really look at this objectively you will see that Microsoft is the leader of the this industry and certainly is not the detractor it is made out to be.

I am sure that their competitors would love to hamstring Microsoft so they can force you to pay bloated prices for their software which they do not test very thoroughly and the support for which is poor if it exists at all. I recently shifted to Windows 2000 at work and Windows XP at home. The quality is remarkable and if recent experience holds true the return on investment period will happen much earlier in the lifecycle than I ever imagined possible.

And lets talk about Netscape. I began using it when it first hit the market and used Navigator quite a while after MS Internet Explorer came out. I never cared what was pre-installed on the PC I went with the software that was best suited for my needs. What influenced me to change was to IE was when the level of quality and performance in IE surpassed Netscape. Netscape got sloppy and IE became a superior product which was incrementally improved and for which quality and stability and security were more important than ego, flashiness, and advertising opportunities. Netscape did themselves in, Microsoft's only real hand in this was building a better product and marketing properly.

And as a consumer of quit a large library of non-MS software that runs on Windows I would also like to make a point that Microsoft has enabled a huge and extremely productive industry around the world. Because of this the price of software for personal and business use is affordable by a great many people. If Microsoft's competitors were to have their way they would control the price and access. And limit it to running only on their hardware. The key point here is that Microsoft was successful in building a operating system that runs on wide range of hardware from many manufacturers at a price that is affordable to nearly every one. This sounds to me like something that is good for consumers and business.

So the agreement more than exceeds the necessary level of ''protection'' we need from this industry leader. Accept it as is and get on with more important things. Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : http://explorer.msn.com

MTC–00004798

From: Bill Parish
To: rickbe@microsoft.com@inetgw,steveb @microsoft.com@i. . .
Date: 12/20/01 2:35pm
Subject: 5 Brief Story Ideas—Request for SEC Action

CC: John Chambers,Larry Carter,radkem@sec.gov@inetgw,r. . .

Hell Steve, Here a few thoughts you might consider. I am confident that sooner or later you will see the significance of supporting these efforts and iron out a compromise. Also copied are john chambers and Larry Carter given the enron like public relations techniques they have used to suppress my research. Can you imagine, dedicating their entire monthly corporate pr plan (keep in mind the size of their staff) to discrediting my efforts toward working toward reform and clarifying unusual financial transactions at cisco? Most surprising was that this was not even news to leading publications, especially after they said I could not talk about the plan because it constituted a ''trade secret.'' To those leading reporters out there unable to report on Microsoft, Cisco or AOL, please do consider giving O'Reilly, Oprah and a few of the other talk show hosts a call on my behalf. Maybe we could arrange a show featuring ''little bill'' and ''big bill'' best regards,

Bill

cc: SEC Chief of Staff, Federal Reserve, FTC, John Chambers, Larry Carter

bcc: leading business reporters, regulators, legal experts, academics, federal reserve

1) Enron/Microsoft—CEO Key Lay's previous Quote to employees at Memorial Coliseum in Portland, Oregon.

''We'd like to look at ourselves as the Microsoft of the energy world.'' Lay saw that Microsoft was able to make massive off balance sheet speculations using derivaties on its own stock, manipulate earnings and use employee options to completely eliminate their corporate income tax. Like Enron, Microsoft also has a staggering mix of what could be direct conflicts of interest among insiders that make Enron's offenses look minor. Corruption that was tolerated at Enron was enabled by the Microsoft Corporation and their orchestration of a complete breakdown in corporate accounting practices.

This included Microsoft firing its own internal auditor who told them what they were doing constituted securities fraud, as documented on my website and reported by ABC News. It is also noteworthy that two previous CFO's at Microsoft boasted over their ability to impact accounting standards. One of these individuals was also Chairman of the Board of the Nasdaq stock exchange while CFO at Microsoft and also aggressively setting new accounting standards. The other CFO was so brazen as to do an op-ed piece in the NY Times after the Times did a key feature story titled Financial Engineering 1.0. The Op Ed piece is a shining example of misrepresenting the significance of financial activity at Microsoft and it is startling that he was not sanctioned by the SEC. Financial integrity was a joke to this CFO who is also on record as boasting of 10 reasons why Microsoft should have a market value of $1 trillion. Even more startling is how Microsoft is now triggering the collapse of the Internet itself as documented in the http://www.billparish.com/20011128msftupdate.html. Although poorly written, this report contains numerous excellent well documented story ideas and can be directly quoted.

2) Impact of Comcast/Microsoft purchase of AT&T Broadband. AOL now has more than $100 billion of what a prudent person might consider ''fake'' assets or inflated goodwill on its balance sheet.

Why hasn't AOL written this down similar to what JDS/Uniphase did. Parish & Company hereby specifically asks the SEC to conduct a review here given the significant impairment of these assets in many other companies.

Microsoft has almost no ''fake'' assets and more than $35 billion in cash. In addition, AOL also has bank debt of more than $20 billion and back taxes to the IRS resulting from the Time Warner merger of more than $13 billion. Most disturbing however is their championing of ''pro forma'' earnings and eliminating the cash expenses of interest and taxes from these pro forma earnings. In the summer of 1999 at an investor town forum I asked a question of Arthur Levitt that was reported in the Oregonian. The question was, when will the SEC go after the big offendors who are breaking down the rules rather than simply focusing on smaller cases. Please allow me to repeat that request today and suggest that the SEC focus on AOL and Microsoft. This seems especially prudent given Gerald Levin's announced departure next Spring. Clearly, Ted Turner is being set up as the fall guy.

In April of 2000 I issued a public warning on AOL's bonds and specifically asked both Moody's and Standard and Poors why their debt was not downgraded. The SEC could also look at the business relationships between S&P and Moody's and AOL to see if more disclosure of potential conflicts of interest should be required. Two useful reports regarding the impact of the Comcast/Microsoft purchase of AT&T broadband are:

http://www.billparish.com/20010430aolpart2.html This is more pure background on unique situations at AOL. http://www.billparish.com/20011128msftupdate.html Addressed AT&T more directly.

3) Citigroup and Spinoff of Asbestos Liability. Completely unreported regarding the spinoff of Traveller's Property Casualty unit is what could be the real reason for the spin-off, as noted in note 77 in the following report on Citigroup. This report also contains my letter to FTC trying to block Assoc First Capital merger that occurred last fall. Note 77 details Citigroup's asbestos exposure from purchasing Aetna's Property Casualty Business for $4 billion. This is a shining example of an activity banks should not be allowed to enter, that is, property casualty insurance. This was also one of the rationale presented to the Federal Reserve Board of why they should have denied the Associated First Capital merger, known in the industry as the icon of predatory lending. http://www.billparish.com/citigrouppyramid.html

4) Microsoft Hoodwinks Grover Norquist. Grover Norquist, along with Howard Jarvis, was responsible for the legendary property tax limitation #13 that was passed in CA in 1978. I heard Grover speak recently in Portland and, knowing that Microsoft is one of his biggest funders, as dicated on his website, I asked him afterward how he felt about Msft paying zero federal income tax. His reponse was ''how do they do that.'' Think about the implications, simply remarkable. Tax policy is important and clearly what drives many organizations to fail, most notably Enron, due to an attempt to justify economic illusions from a manipulation of the tax code. For example, you can be certain that 90 percent of Key Lay's wealth resulted from stock option wages were taken as a tax deduction by Enron but never charged to earnings. This greatly inflated their true earnings. Other financial engineering similarly modeled other techniques used at Microsoft, for example those used at Expedia.

5) Microsoft Speculations on Own Stock. Miraculously, Microsoft's SEC 10K for the year ending June 30, 2001 indicated that this obligation had been settled. Given that this loss was more than $8 billion a few months earlier, the question becomes, was the disclosure adequate. More important, were any of these options held by company insiders including Paul Allen. Parish & Company hereby formally requests that the SEC, given the recent collapse of Enron, make an inquiry to determine if any of these options were held by Paul Allen or any other significant Microsoft insiders. Although not a board member, given overlapping business dealings Allen is still an insider. This is critical to restore integrity to the market. 6) Overcoming Ruthless Legal and PR Intimidation: For example, as many of you know, Cisco Systems had an orchestrated company wide effort to try and discredit my efforts to disclose what was clearly unusual financial activity at Cisco. This campaign, which was a monumental failure, occurred in October 2000 just before Cisco's stock began a steep decline from $82 to $20 per share. When I was later anonymously sent a copy of this confidential plan, I would guess from some employee trying to clear their conscience, I was told that it represented a ''trade secret'' that could not be discussed. Sure sounds like Enron like PR to me?

Summary Comment: Any opportunity to be quoted regarding helping generate a dialogue on these issues is always most appreciated. I can understand that many of you have considered me somewhat opinionated on these matters. Let's not worry about that but rather how to get the economy back on track. The validity of my claims should only be magnified by the situation at Enron. Enron was able to climb to slot number 7 in Microsoft's pyramid scheme, 7th in the S&P 500, but they did not see how they were structured to fail, nor does AOL now. As an aside, it is amazing how the Janus family of funds seems to be insulated. They own almost $10 billion of AOL and you have to wonder who is doing the research.

I was able to help a lot of people locally avoid large losses on Enron but it is up to you to help maintain the integrity of the system.

I'll keep putting out hard hitting studies designed to help fix the system but I can't have much impact without you. You might scan my archive at www.billparish.com for various other ideas pertaining to these topics, all designed to help restore integrity to the financial reporting process. Again, if you are a reporter and can't do the story, please do try and contact another media outlet that might. I do produce quite a lot of most interesting research not put on the web site that might allow you to greatly advance your career. People tell me that I am much better via radio or television, in terms of media experiences. Probably because they are more interactive and allow for questions. My strategy is all about win/win and maybe one of these days I'll even convince Bill Gates of its merits.

Please do lend a hand.

Most sincerely, Bill Parish

Bill Parish
Parish & Company
10260 SW Greenburg Rd., Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97223
Tel: 503–643–6999
Website: www.billparish.com
Email: bill@billparish.com

MTC–00004799

From: Ole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 3:59pm
Subject: Antitrust settlement.

Dear USJ Folks,

One citizen's view: The Microsoft offer to settle the class action anti-trust suit should be accepted only with the modification

suggested by Red Hat. Otherwise, in it's original form, Microsoft offers nothing—except a further extention of it's (illegal) monopoly.

We are rather disappointed with the proposed settlement of the original case against Microsoft, considering the resolution something just short of a sellout. But DoJ has an opportunity for at least partial redemption by obtaining a resolution of the instant case in some fashion closer to the Red Hat proposal. And the schools of America would be the beneficiaries.

With sincere wishes for a more free and open market,

Duane L. Olson

(Retired system design engineer, with no current industry affiliation of any kind)

MTC–00004800

From: William Douglass
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/20/01 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

TO: The U.S. Department of Justice

This letter is written by officers of both Incremax Technologies Corporation of New York City, and the International Association of Microsoft Certified Partners (IAMCP), a group of independent organizations selling solutions based primarily upon Microsoft software.

We wish to express full agreement with the settlement that has been arrived at between Microsoft and the federal government and nine states. It is in the best interests of the consuming public, the industry, and the economy, which has been negatively affected by the uncertainty this lengthy litigation has generated.

Any future litigation against Microsoft will re-introduce uncertainty to the marketplace while threatening over-regulation of an industry that already functions quite well to the marketplace (and to the arm of the law) on its own.

We urge that the settlement be finally approved because it has harnessed Microsoft for over-stepping its bounds. It is now time for consumers to benefit from the unfettered workings of a free marketplace.

Sincerely,
Kerry P. Gerontianos
President, Incremax Technologies
Incremax Technologies
President, IAMCP
William H. Douglass
Director of Communications,
Board Member, IAMCP
CC:Kerry P. Gerontianos

MTC–00004802

From: West, Dennis
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/20/01 4:29pm
Subject: DOJ Proposed Microsoft Anti-trust (Monopoly) Settlement

DOJ Proposed Microsoft Anti-trust (Monopoly) Settlement The US judicial system found Microsoft was a monopoly but the DOJ and some states have proposed a settlement that doesn't fully solve the Microsoft anti-trust/monopoly issue and prevent Microsoft from continuing to expand the company's present monopoly.

Asking Microsoft to not do it again will not work.

In the 1990s, I personnel watched Cecil Dobbs from Microsoft in Foster City California give hundreds of copies of free software packages to Lockheed Martin in Sunnyvale California that resulted in Lockheed Martins standardizing on Microsoft software and other software venders that sold Word processor, Spreadsheet, Presentation, Project Management, Calendar/Scheduling and E-mail fade away since they depended on the sale of their software to survive.

What I saw was Microsoft using the sale of the Windows Operation System software to finance free gifts to a major company to standardize on other Microsoft software.

Without separating the Window Operating System cash cow from other types of software, competition will die and Microsoft end up being the consumers only choice.

Windows XP Operating System is a good example of Microsoft's effort to eliminate competition from 5 other software packages by bundling other Microsoft software with the Windows XP Operation System for consumers and companies.

Without software choices, Microsoft will be free to set software prices and their will be little or no motivation to improve software. Some REAL legal remedies are needed at the present time to reduce the existing Microsoft software monopoly that the courts agreed presently exist. Please stand firm that a lot more is needed than the present DOJ settlement proposes.

Personally, I would like to see some kind of a barrier between the Windows Operating Systems and general user Microsoft software that would foster competition.

Dennis L. West
10670 Cordova Road
Cupertino, CA 95014–3912
(408) 255–2077

MTC–00004803

From: Scott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Having been an unwilling Microsoft user for some time, I have quite a few comments in regards to how Microsoft should be dealt with. Microsoft should be required to port Win32 Emulators and Direct X to Linux and Macintosh computers. Microsoft has had a stranglehold on the gaming industry; requiring that they expand their proprietary software to other platforms will aide in giving gaming companies choice, and providing for consumer freedom.

Microsoft should also be required to release full source code within a two to three year period. This permits watchdog groups to analyze Microsoft's work in WindowsXP (and later OS'), so that it can be assured that Microsoft is, (a) not purposely placing barriers in its software, against competition; and (b) security flaws can be identified, when they arise, and independent groups have the ability to react.

Microsoft .NET should receive heavy government attention, and be both open source and restriction free, for other companies to improve upon Microsoft's foundation.

MTC–00004804

From: Robert Levy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Comments on the Microsoft Settlement

Here is the good news if the Microsoft settlement is approved: Although the company may face litigation from competitors, a few consumers, the European Union, and recalcitrant state attorneys general, at least the federal antitrust lawsuit won't be around to drain Microsoft's energies and undermine economic growth so essential to the post-September 11 recovery.

From a longer-term perspective, the Microsoft antitrust dispute, which has been festering in one form or another since the Federal Trade Commission opened its investigation in 1991, produced nothing but losers. There are no long-term winners. To settle the case, Microsoft will be making more concessions than is justified by the DC Circuit's opinion. In the meantime, consumers had to pick up the tab while high-tech executives wasted resources on politicking instead of developing the kinds of integrated products that customers demand. The settlement addresses and corrects, with minor exceptions, each objection raised by the DC Circuit in affirming Judge Jackson's holding of monopoly maintenance. Microsoft may not retaliate against other companies for supporting competing software; or enter into exclusive agreements with software developers, Internet content providers, or Internet access providers. Nor may Microsoft prevent PC makers and consumers from installing a rival operating system, or removing Microsoft's ?middleware? products and installing rival middleware. Further, Microsoft must disclose and license its applications programming interfaces (APIs) to software developers; and charge uniform, published prices (except for volume discounts) to its 20 top PC-maker clients.

The principal Microsoft ?transgression? not addressed in the settlement is the commingling of operating system and browser code. Of course, that problem is trivial as long as the consumer and PC maker are not forced to use, and can actually uninstall, Microsoft's browser. In two critical respects, the settlement goes beyond what the appellate court directed. First, the court found that Microsoft had suppressed competition in the middleware market as a means of maintaining its Windows monopoly. Middleware, according to the court, consists of products that expose APIs and thereby compete against traditional operating systems. But the settlement agreement defines middleware more broadly, to include not only browsers but also products like email, instant messaging, and media players. Those products do not expose

APIs; they do not compete against Windows; yet Microsoft will be compelled to treat rival ?middleware? products as if the court had found ? which it did not ? that bundling those products somehow constituted an illegal tying arrangement.

Second, the settlement dictates that Microsoft will have to disclose its server protocols so that non-Microsoft servers (like those produced by IBM, Oracle, Sun Microsystems, and Novell) will be able to interoperate with Windows. The allegation,

first leveled by Sun in a complaint filed with the European Union two years ago, is that Microsoft is attempting to extend its PC monopoly to the server market by making newer versions of Windows incompatible with servers other than Microsoft's. But the newest version of Windows (XP), just released on October 25, has a miniscule share of the operating system market. Quite simply, there is no monopoly to leverage. Older versions (Windows 95 and 98) are perfectly compatible with non-Microsoft servers, which by the way supply about 60 percent of the server market. Most important, the server issue was never part of the Justice Department's case. On that issue, there was no complaint, no trial, no evidence, and no verdict ? just a restriction on Microsoft's behavior.

There's a lesson in all of this. Two years ago, an attempted settlement mediated by appellate judge Richard Posner came to nothing, reportedly because of several intractable attorneys general. Judge Posner had little to say about his efforts until September 2000 when, in a speech, he lambasted the states? role in antitrust litigation, accused them of being captured by competitor interests, and suggested that they should limit themselves to price fixing cases involving goods sold to the state.

That's good advice. Ten years have lapsed since the Microsoft case first unfolded. Silicon Valley, supposed bastion of entrepreneurship, has become part of the problem. Multiple governmental entities, responsive to the parochial interests of rival businesses, initially combined to challenge Microsoft. Now, with that challenge resolved to the satisfaction of almost everyone, nine states might dawdle just long enough to foul the country's near-term economic recovery. It's time to shut down this lawsuit and let the software industry get back to serving customers.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert A. Levy
Senior Fellow in Constitutional Studies
Cato Institute
1000 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202–789–5253

These comments are extracted from a longer article by Robert A. Levy entitled ?Soft Settlement,? Los Angeles Daily Journal, Nov. 26, 2001.

MTC–00004805

From: Haven, Richard
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/20/01 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please add my objection to the proposed settlement, specifically regarding the definition of the beneficiaries of the remedies. Not-for-profit and governmental organization are part of this market and deserve the compensation and protection of any agreement.

Allowing the subject of penalties any discretion in who is to benefit does not remedy the market as a whole, or benefit those potential beneficiaries who Microsoft might try to exclude for the same reasons they were convicted in the first place.

Thank you for your attention

Richard C Haven

MTC–00004806

From: Jim Saxton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 8:47pm
Subject: Appropriate settlement

Microsoft has gained and maintained its monopoly in the PC desktop Operating System market by enforcing an anti-competitive boot loader license with its OEM customers. As you know, this license prohibited Microsoft OEM customers from installing non Microsoft Operating Systems on the same computer that includes Windows. This license leveraged the Microsoft Windows market share to prevent the computer manufacturers from differentiating their computers by including non-Microsoft products. This license effectively killed such products as BeOS and OS2.

The appropriate remedy is to modify this license to require Microsoft OEM customers to include a non Microsoft Operating system. This would put microsoft in a position of actively repairing the damage it has caused to the Computer Operating system market. Microsoft may indeed have to resurrect a competing OS to allow its customers to bundle Windows with their computers.

The personal computer industry would benefit by allowing the manufacturers to once again differentiate their products. This would benefit the consumer by allowing them to buy a computer with an alternate Operating System to Windows. This would also make the Internet more resilient as there would be a more diverse environment and consumers would be less vulnerable to virus attack.

Black Belt Jimmy

MTC–00004807

From: JShoe2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am simply a homemaker/family business person and I don't understand why big Government can't leave something alone that isn't broken—Just look at the mess the phone industry is in—this is your fault!

I like going to the store and buying a computer with all the programs I need already loaded and ready for my use. I don't know enough to want to pick and choose between various hardware and software programs.

Seems to me these states that won't settle are very jealous of all Microsoft has accomplished and the revenue that OUR state makes from their success. Bill Gates and Microsoft are very philantropic and give many things back to our state, schools, universities, as well as other charities. They even spread this largesse to other charities and other educational programs thru-out the US.

Seems to me that these other states should be embarrassed by their greed and have their hands slapped.

Thanks for listening to me.

Jean Shoemaker

MTC–00004808

From: Jud Meaders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/20/01 11:12pm
Subject: XP security hole

Still think MSFT can be trusted with mission-critical work? Want to let the security of the country depend on MSFT? Want to hire MSFT ''security experts'' to advise the federal government?

I am still outraged at your complicity in letting MSFT get off the legal, political and economic hook totally. I will do my everything I can to vote you guys out of office.

Here's the link: http://www.newsfactor.com/perl/story/15458.html

MTC–00004809

From: Mal Elliott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 12:18am
Subject: My lack of choice

I am tired of being shoved around by Microsoft. I have purchased software from many companies such as Digital Research, Novell, Corel, and many others only to have Microsoft use its muscle and money to push them aside with inferior products and operating systems. Microsoft was found guilty of monopoly in federal court but was not punished for it and it is obvious from what is going on now that it is doing things even worse than it did before the federal law suit. Microsoft should be broken up into a company that manufactures the operating system and all other software it produces should be under another entity. That is the only way to bring them back to the level of competition with the remainder of the software companies. Microsoft did not grow to its present size with superior products; it did it with money and market control, with inferior products. I am a retired writer now writing books. I want to use better products to produce my books but am forced to use Microsoft products because that is what the market dictates. I want choice.

Mal Elliott,
Wichita, Kansas.

MTC–00004810

From: Robert Wong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Plaintiff-Microsoft Revise Propose Final Judgment should be reject because the proposal is too HARSH on Microsoft. There is consumer harm if Microsoft agrees to abide by the terms of the agreements.

Microsoft is to provide information on server products, but server products is an area where there is healthy competition and which Microsoft does not have a monopoly. The server platforms were never mentioned in any of the Finding of Facts and Conclusion of Law or the Full Court of Appeals ruling. By providing such information, competitors can damage the Server platform products if that is there intent and this agreement will allow it to occur.

Microsoft agrees to provide technical information to all competitor's of middleware, it does not rule on inferior middle ware created by competitors in order to sabotage the Windows platform. Java is one form of middle ware, but the Finding of

Facts indicates that Java is not mature and was slower than native Windows applications.

The terms on the Technical Committee and three appointed members represent endless investigation which are a waste of Microsoft time and money. There is no lines of division on the technical committee between investigating Windows platform and X-Boxes. They have access to all Microsoft source code, contracts and internal documents. Will an investigation of X-Box be warrant if someone like Sony complains that X-Box is too rough on the game station market? With three technical members, each one of them can conduct the same investigation and come up with a different conclusion. There is nothing in the agreement which allows one investigation per committee member. Endless competitors can flood complains for each of the three technical committee members.

Please revise this proposal to eliminate the abuse by Microsoft competitors who have no interest in consumer interest before approving. This settlement is too HARSH on Microsoft.

Robert Wong
e-mail: robertwong@hotmail.com
CC:robertwong@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC–00004811

From: Lionel Berthomier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 1:39am
Subject: microsoft settlement

microsoft v. french justice
interesting links :
http://www.01net.com/rdn?oid=168836&rub=2796
http://www.vnunet.fr/mac/kios/sommaire.htm?revue=90
http://www.weblmi.com/daily/2001/1129/condamnation.htm
http://www.thestandard.ru/cw/1996/36/2.htm
http://www2.computerwoche.de/index.cfm?pageid=254&artid=30183&type=detail&category=84

MTC–00004812

From: larry a price
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 5:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement too weak.

There are several issues that the proposed settlement needs to address, in order that Microsoft not walk away unpunished for their CRIMINAL behaviour.

1. Protecting Open Source. The proposed final settlement offer contains language intended to let Microsoft itself determine who is qualified to have access to the technical information intended to allow other operating systems to interoperate with Microsoft software. In point of fact, the language specifically claims their right to require that those party to interoperability information be businesses. This is clearly intended to to discriminate against the MANY software projects that are run entirely as volunteer efforts. The court should require that any technical information that Microsoft is required to disclose must be available to the public, so that the public itself might act in redressing the harm created by Microsoft's illegal tactics.

2. Closed File Formats Are A tool of Monopoly. One of the most insidious tactics used by Microsoft in the construction of their monopoly in business productivity and personal computing software is the creation of incompatible, undocumented file formats.

In addition the tactic of making new versions of their software produce files that were incompatible with their old software led to their being in effect able to require users of their software to upgrade their systems on their schedule.

The fact that Microsoft's file formats were undocumented has meant that competitors were effectively locked out of providing equivalent services to consumers who had unwisely chosen to use Microsoft products and that those consumers were themselves harmed in that their property was held hostage to Microsoft's software and would need to be either abandoned or (at great expense) converted to some other format.

3. Security Needs Of Consumers and Appropriate Liability. A further issue that could be addressed by the court is Microsoft's liability for the millions of person-hours of time wasted in dealing with the inadequacies of their operating system and of their email products. A clear statement by the court that consumers had at a minimum an implied warranty of functionality, including an expectation of data privacy in the form of mechanisms to prevent both Microsoft itself and others from altering, destroying or illicitly copying data without it's owners permission; would set a clear precedent that software is the same as any other class of product and should not be allowed to exempt itself from product liability through specious End User License Agreements. In that a product sold in exchange for value should meet a reasonable buyers expectations for functionality and safety.

http://www.efn.org/laprice (Community, Cooperation, Consensus
http://www.opn.org (Openness to serendipity, make mistakes
http://www.efn.org/laprice/poems (but learn from them.(carpe fructus ludi)
http://allie.office.efn.org/phpwiki/index.php?OregonPublicNetworking

MTC–00004813

From: steven st catherine
To: Criminal Division,Microsoft ATR,Barrie.Thurlow@hom...
Date: 12/21/01 6:52am
Subject: Industrial Espionage is a serious crime

New Age Informations

Dear Barrie Thurlow

The list of crimes are as incomplete and as the following criminal investigation in part details, I was at a Ms Christine Hodder flat 29 Campden House, Harben Road NW3 where I was allowed to work and stay for over a year at her home, and where I am an intellectual property designer of a sort. On an argument over her involvement into the theft of my intellectual property and or thinking process methodology, and or any material gain via dishonest contact which she admitted at one point only to retracted it later. On leaving she insisted that I take the computer where I had found a memohasp-??device on the table when she was dismantling the computer to give to me. Which I now believe is a bug of some sort, as I had checked out the product on the internet and found out it was a multi-purpose electronic transmitting device. Returning three day later to a website which detailed the memohsap-1 differently from what I had first read its product details to be. On investigation I found that the company Aladdin was the said sole distributors of Hasp products and the only entry found on their website search facility for this product was solid.asp. Solid.asp is a webpage relating to Solidworks Corporation who when questioned via their public information access info@solidworks.com about there involvement in this product deceptive uses they refused to answer a product company relationship claimed by Aladdin to exist. Returning to Aladdin and using the website search facility the only entry for memohasp-1 was removed and marked 0. On further investigation many webpages at Aladdin Hasp were false and some completely blank and their relation to other companies they claim are also false. On contacting Progress Soft Corporation a claimed distributor by Aladdin for Hasp products in Jordan and other Arab countries does not have a word of the Arabic Language on their website www.progressoft.com, as fact. On writing an email to Progressoft their reply was towards that of denial and claimed that IS is the sole distributor for Aladdin Hasp products where Aladdin and other sources claim that they are. However IS does not yet exist to my knowledge and is a mystical company name given out of share panic. The electronic device is a form of bugging device which is given to their company related clients and or individual to use which their company product, and or claimed uses. And as Solidworks Corporation is in 3D design technology of a kind their clients may of been bugged by them so they refuse to answer any question relating to this product. On contacting a UK distributor and questioning them about the product they stated that they only put the device on the back of machines without knowing there internal description workings. However, this device was claimed to be a Cara Professional protection device by Ms Christine Hodder and this can be confirmed by the two officers who attended its return to her and which was refused by her but confirmed by her as a Cara Professional protection device. Webpages have been changed at the US patent office, and or distorted by electronic manipulation as else where also and where I am still trying to complete the formal addressing procedural action to be address to the US patent office. On contacting Aladdin Hasp claiming I was given the memohasp-1 by Ms Christine Hodder as is the case to have the device reinstalled lead me to the FTP.exe file. It is already on the computer she had given me and where I was instructed by Aladdin to download a ftp:/ extension file Hinstall.zip.

Ftp stands for File Transfer Program and the extension ftp is used in connection to the internet. This is in part the crime and if the British government now want to state that crimes involving intellectual property is not criminal and is civil I disagree completely.

As any act to obtain information and or property of any kind via dishonest means is a criminal offence. And as yourselves may be involved in this crime and or involved by way of none action I can now see why you try and play this issue down and alike matters. This is a clear claim by the British government to be involved in maintaining criminal activity for their own benefit. The computer was also witnessed by two officers to be communicating with an external source without a phone line being connected. My phone line was then connected days later as the cover-up continues where I had made phone call on a phone line which did not exist by my request. This is a worldwide espionage network and it uses Microsoft Corporation operating system the FTP.EXE file and or files similarly alike to communicate undetected and gain access control of computers, and or complete control undetected. Aladdin also claimed it had a concise National Software Testing Lab (NSTL) report and on contacting NSTL they reply that they have a report that is three year old or older. On requesting this report via paying for it from NSTL they have not replied because they may also possibly be a bogus website for selling illegal bugging devices. Microsoft are the claimed owner of NSTL logo and if this is correct and they own the logo of NSTL they then possibly own the company who is a advisor to US governmental institution. Industrial Espionage is a serious crime sir please take note.

Yours sincerely and respectfully
Steven St Catherine
Director

From: Thurlow Barrie
To: '''steven_st_catherine@hotmail.com''' CC: ''Public Enquiries (CD)''
Subject: Serious criminal activities
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 09:58:16 -0000

Dear Mr St Catherine,

Thank you for your message to report serious criminal activities. As you did not mention what these activities were I regret that the Home Office is unable to help.

Please report criminal activity to your local police, and please consult your legal adviser or Citizen's Advice Bureau in the first instance regarding any dispute over intellectual property.

Yours sincerely,
Barrie Thurlow
Home Office
Direct Communication Unit

MTC–00004814

From: Tanya L. Durni
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 7:45am
Subject: microsoft case

The sanctions ordered in the Microsoft case are not tough enough. Microsoft has a history of bending and breaking the laws to suit them, at the expense of their partners and competitors. The case has at least exposed some of these practices.

I think Microsoft's worse enemy in the long run is itself, however, in the meantime, the companies with new innovative ideas are at risk. I don't understand why our government, when it finally determines there is a problem, waits sooooo long to deliver the appropriate discipline. Unfortunately, by waiting they are rewarding the lawbreakers and penalizing the honest hard working American. By not doing enough to control the source of the problem early on, we only allow things to get way out of hand.

MTC–00004815

From: James Wall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 7:48 am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Please settle the case as is. Microsoft has done more for average users than any other company. One could have always bought Apple or IBM. Apple made biggest mistake in US business history in not unbundlely their OS. never understood the PC business. Microsoft was just more aggressive and smarter than others. The states case is stupid. Most of those opposed to settlement are angry billionaires who were out smarted by MS.

jjwall

MTC–00004816

From: Leon Schafer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 8:08am
Subject: Proposed settlement
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this letter to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed settlement against the Microsoft monopoly. I have worked in the software industry for 27 years now. Great strides have been taken in that time and Microsoft has made many contributions; however, they have used their power and control in the market to limit consumer choice.

They have taken advantage of their operating system monopoly to take over every area of application software seen as profitable. They do this by providing their own internal developers with the Applications Programming Interface (API) for the Windows operating system well before the public has access to it. Some parts of the API are never published at all.

Microsoft has also used bundling to great advantage. The anti-trust action started as a result of their unfair competitive practices used against Netscape and the results can already be seen. Microsoft has used it's monopoly in web browsers to begin modifying existing web standards into proprietary, undocumented extensions that render some web pages unviewable in Netscape. Many content creators using Microsoft tools are not even aware that are using these extensions resulting in numerous pages on the web that simply don't work with anything but Microsoft tools.

Microsoft enjoys unrivaled market power and uses its wealth to maintain this dominance. Licensing agreements with computer vendors ensure that the discount for ordering a machine with Windows installed is almost nothing while the retail purchase price of the operating system is large. As a consumer, I have also seen companies producing software for both operating systems get purchased by Microsoft and forsake their non-Windows products within months afterwards.

Despite their numerous abuses, the current proposed settlement does nothing to improve the comptetive situation. In fact, donations to schools will only cement Microsoft's position by training a new generation of computer users in a Microsoft only environment. The remedies against the monopoly must include the following:

Microsoft products must be listed as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

Applications in markets where Microsoft enjoys a monopoly due to past anti-competitive behavior must be made available on non-Windows operating systems. For example, Internet Explorer should be ported to Linux/Unix along with the Microsoft Office Suite. Selling these products on other operating systems would generate revenue for the company yet they refuse to do it because it weakens their stranglehold on the market.

All Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet as they are trying to do right now by subverting Java and introducing extensions in their web server which are undocumented and work only with Internet Explorer.

Microsoft must make available for sale a ''bare-bones'' version of its operating system to prevent bundling. Although great arguments have gone on about what constitutes a ''bare-bones'' operating system, there are examples to work from. Linux, for example, still fits entirely on a single 1.4MB floppy disk.

Microsoft must be prevented from entering the hardware market. The introduction of the XBox clearly paves the way for a future for where Microsoft software will be the only choice and it will only work well on their own hardware.

Without these remedies there will be no other operating systems, web browsers, or office productivity suites. The United States is a world leader in technology for the digital age. It is time for Microsoft's control over the future of the entire industry to be broken so

that other innovators may have their chance to shape the future.

Sincerely,
Leon Schafer
2116 Mark
Lansing, MI 48912

MTC–00004817

From: Johnny Barrett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 8:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I honestly hope the Justice Department sees through the facade MS is proposing. The deal offers very little value (pennies on the dollar) and gives MS an inroad to market they have been historically the underdog. This is just another market to conquer and the settlement is a great vehicle to begin the process.

Better to force them to give the actual dollars to the schools and inform the schools the funds are earmarked for computer education.

Johnny C. Barrett
CST-Supporting NMD XBR (256) 313–9879 FAX 319–757
Johnny.Barrett@nmd.army.mil

MTC–00004818

From: finortis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 8:18am
Subject: A few things about Microsoft, I do not like and think needs addressing
CC: finortis

These are newer issues then was brought up in the US vs. Microsoft trial .... but one's that absolutely show Microsoft's monopolist behaviour .... and too much control they have gained over the consumer. Certain things that should be addressed, and also show that Microsoft has not ''learned their lesson'', but remains bad as ever, and perhaps worse/more bold then in the past:

1. Windows Product Activation: This has been bundled into Windows XP (the successor to Windows 2000, and their current lattest operating system). With this system in place, the OS keeps track of peices of info about the hardware in the computer. Some of the things, an upgrade becomes necessary largely due to the bloat provided in software ..... of which Microsoft is a main culprit through the inclusion of useless features such as ''Mr. Clippy'' in Microsoft Office. Things such as RAM .... people need more RAM because the software comes to utilize more RAM, as each generation progresses. Disk space, need we look at the disk space requirements of win3.1 and Dos 6.22 vs win95, win95 vs. win98, winNT 4.0 vs win2k, etc? CPU, same thing .... it wasn't that long ago that a 400 MHz CPU was plenty fast .... not with many software products on the market .... that same CPU, the performance would tank.

Microsoft, with ever increasing amounts of bloatware has contributed to the need of consumers to upgrade their hardware, and despite this, they now restrict the users right to upgrade their own computers as they see fit. Under Windows Product Activation (or WPA), one is allowed to have 4 of those identifiers changed (a CPU upgrade changes too of them). After that, the operating system will cease to function, requiring reactivation. One is then at the mercy of Microsoft to allow them to reactivate, or have to re-purchase an operating system, they already payed for a liscence to use.

They will site software piracy as a reason for this .... but they won't mention the flip side. How many times has a user, upgrading their computer from an OEM, been required to buy a bundled copy of Windows (many times the SAME EXACT VERSION the customer is liscenced too), due to Microsoft's OEM contracts? Ask many a Linux user how feasable it is to buy a ''naked PC'' (one without an operating system) and see what they say? They're refered to it as the Windows tax. One should not have to get a new liscence when one is replacing a PC, and not adding to it. The liscence in the past has stated that the user has a right to do a clean transfer of their Microsoft software from one computer to another. However, OEM contracts that Microsoft holds, has effectively prevented the user the right to do this. This WPA could further force the user to have to purchase an OEM copy of winXP, even if they own the upgrade, simply because they bought a new PC .... even if they migrate their hard drive from the old to the new. This is bunk, Windows Product Activation has got to go.

2. I am extremely opposed to the ''Secure PC anitiative''. Gettng in bed with the RIAA, that has lobbied the DMCA through Congress, in which other elements of society were unwisely not listened too ..... fair use rights which have been enjoyed by US citizens for decades are rashly being discarded. There is no balance sought here anymore .... and take this entire mess, and throw in some people's ideas of brain fingerprinting, the cost to civilization could be quite negative ..... and the consequences to future generations quite bad. Brain fingerprinting, another one of these perposterious ideas that (in that case cropped up after Sept 11, supposedly to keep us safe, by allowing them to monitor brain responces, to figure out the inner workings of people's minds, and profile people's thoughts or what is in their brain) .... is nothing short of an Orwellian nightmere. The possible applications of this:

http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/archive/22020.html
http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/archive/22123.html

But in the case of the RIAA, which MS is getting in bed with, the DMCA (Digital Millenium Copyright Act), unwisely legislated under pressure from lobbyiest, without balancing this against other elements and interests of society, other then the recording industry, has even been used in case to stiffle scientific progress. And what is this about scientific confrences migrating accross seas out of fear to publish work that is against the interests of a given corporation?

http://www.eff.org/effector/HTML/effect14.37.html#I

'''This judge apparently believes that the fact that hundreds of scientists are currently afraid to publish their work and that scientific conferences are relocating overseas isn't a problem,'' noted Robin Gross, EFF Intellectual Property Attorney.''

Allowing copyright law (the DMCA specifically, which seems at the urging of the RIAA (Recording Industry Association of America) and others, to have largely thrown out fair use rights of previously legislated copyright law, to stiffle scientific progress is most unwise, and could serve to hinder innovation, more then help it. So much of the technological progress we have seen in recent times, so many innovations, owe their existence to scientific discoveries which have been made over the last couple hundred years. Without the contributions science has offered to society, we might still be farming the backlands, and going to the bathroom in out houses. Without the discoveries of modern medicine, cures to many formerly dreaded diseases and ailments would not have been found. Without the discoveries of scientists, much of the technology now being discussed would not have even existed.

A hinderance of science, and the ability of scientists to publish their discoveries .... because it is not in favor with a given corporation, could do more to hinder the progress of civilization, then any good that could ever come from it. Instead of welcoming discoveries of a flawed system, and learning from it, and learning how to make better systems (assuming the system imposed on customers is even a good idea, and that is quite an assumption), they have instead chosen to threaten legal action against researchers, if they should publish their work, which the motion picture industry does not like. Under conditions such as this, the objectivity in both findings and in the publication and sharing of findings, which the scientific method is very much dependent upon, is largely compromised. It little matters if it is corporate interest, or religious doctrine and persecution (Galileo anyone?) that stands as a hinderence to such objectivity being allowed in said findings and reporting of them.

This should come as no surprise in a court room type environment .... where the search for the truth in any given case, should be of utmost importance. When the objectivity in fact finding is compromised, because it might be in disfavor of a given corporation (as much as a given religious authority of old) .... the ability to arrive at the truth, and using such knowledge arive at a wise decision is itself compromised.

Taking all of this, the Secure PC Anitiative that Microsoft is behind, essentially amounts to nothing less then a decleration of war against the consumer ..... and in the name of preserving the power of the recording industry (which society is largely progressing to the point of their obsollesence) is further erroding the freedoms that US citizens have enjoyed under law for decades. For information on the Secure PC Initiative, one can begin looking here:

http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/4/23387.html

This, and other initiatives such as CPRM, their ''Digital Rights Manageament'' and other such proposals, are totally unacceptable. Further the DMCA, and certain applications of it, such as in the case above, should be up for Constitutional Review, and put to the test against both prior articles of legislation and the US Constitution. Making such a law, without considering and

balancing all the interists and parties of society is both unwise, and unwarrented. If endeavors such as this, and Micosoft's contribution to this aren't checked ..... the cost to civillization and the impact on society it makes, in years to come could be extremely negative.

3. Microsot's .NET proposals should be reviewed. Much of what I have read, and it all being under Microsoft's control, leaves me extremely concerned. I would tend to be extremely cautious before rushing right into acceptence of .NET.

4. MSN (the Microsoft Network) could very well be an anti-trust violation waiting to happen. I just recently recieved an email from Qwest.net (my current provider) concerning a merger Qwest made with MSN. We are being encouraged to migrate to ''MSN service powered by Qwest''. Some of this information can be viewed on the qwest.net Internet site until January 3rd, when the site will be updated, per their announcement http://www.qwest.net/nav4/public/bus/

crossroads.html

Specific info on this merger is here: http://www.qwest.net/nav4/msn/faq.html

Browsing around, I got info that states only Windows is supported. Umm.... I dual boot between Linux and Windows .... and as far as I'm concerned that is my right. When I signed up with qwest.net, I never agreed to run in a Windows only environment, and should not have to do so now. Such a provision is absolutely unacceptable, and I will not tollerate or agree too. I do not plan on migrating, but am looking into alternative services now .... since having further looked into MSN and gathered more information about this service from DSL Reports. I then got indication that not only is Linux not totally supported, but that MSN prohibits one from using non-Microsoft email software. It is none of their business, and they have no right to tell me what software I can and can not use ..... and to prohibit me from using an email program from a competitor to Microsoft. The suggested transition ..... I come to like even less. http://www.dslreports.com/forum/remark,1775836root=msnetworkmode=flat

''In addition, Microsoft also prohibits MSN users from using any third-party e-mail programs. Good Luck on Microsoft EVER supporting Sendmail :-D''

Further searching .... I find even less to like about the ISP Qwest wants to switch us all over too .... since certain corporate alliances were made between Qwest the phone company, and Microsoft (MSN specifically): http://www.dslreports.com/comments/1646

In fact, I have yet to find one positive feedback from any of MSN's customers. All indication is that they're holding people against their will ..... by holding them to the service and making it very difficult ot leave once transitioned. Doing a futher search around

http://www.dslreports.com

for info on MSN or this merger will find much of the same, from very disatisfied customers. This whole MSN proposal has the ear marks of possible anti-trust viloation associated with MSN (or anti-trust violations in the possible making) .... In any case, as for me, I have NO intention of transitioning .... but plan on changing my service before the current one runs out. The more I read about MSN ..... the less I like the service, and do NOT want to get ensnared in this ISP from the get go. That they are taking over from my current ISP .... I do NOT like, and very much loathe the prospects. I will even have my Qwest DSL service cancelled, and sign up with another provider such as Covad ..... before I will switch to them, given all I have read about their service, on top of my initial hesitation, which has only been confirmed and expanded upon, the more research I do on them. I just hope that neither MSN or AOL expands into the customer base of any new ISP I go with, through such mergers.

MTC–00004820

From: Lyon, David
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/21/01 12:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to comment on the revised proposed Final Judgment to resolve the United States' civil antitrust case against Microsoft. I am a professional programmer certified with both Sun Microsystems and Microsoft. As a United States citizen I believe that my tax dollars have been wasted on this case against Microsoft and I am glad to see it is finally being settled. I believe that this case was not brought against Microsoft to protect the interests of the United States citizens, but to protect the interests of government lawyers who need to justify their jobs and in the interest of various competitors of Microsoft. I believe that Microsoft's competitors are large enough and powerful enough to compete effectively with Microsoft without the help of the United States government. I also believe that the lawyers and judges involved in this case do not have an understanding of the technologies and products involved, and have made decisions based on assumptions many of which are aided by the Marketing teams from competing companies.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

David Lyon
Senior Programmer Analyst

MTC–00004821

From: JefRaskin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 1:02pm
Subject: (no subject)
Jef Raskin
8 Gypsy Hill
Pacifica CA 94044
650–359–8588 www.jefraskin.com
jefraskin@aol.com
MICROSOFT'S REAL SINS

The courts have determined that Microsoft has used its economic clout and technological hegemony to maintain and extend its market dominance unfairly. But this insult to the body corporate and intrusion into the body politic does not compare in severity to the injury Microsoft has done to our bodies, minds, and wallets as individual and corporate users of its products.

The problem I speak of is not one of market dominance, but of an inhumane disregard for our physical frailties and mental limitations.

The human-machine interface of Microsoft products is badly designed, as if interface designers did not know how to do better. The effects of this willful ignorance are manifold. One, for example, is to force us to make many more keystrokes and mouse motions than is necessary for a task. This excess can be total— as when there is no action you may take but must either use the mouse to point to and click on a certain on-screen button or tap the Return key before you are allowed to proceed. I estimate that overall, compared to good interface design practice, over 25% of the keyclicks and 50% of the mouse moves are unnecessary. Where is the reckoning for the human pain and loss of productivity from repetitive stress injuries? Who will dun the Redmond Monolith for the large negative impact on productivity that the wasted motions themselves have caused?

More subtle is the unnecessary taxation Microsoft software interfaces impose in terms of frustration and annoyance. Due to designs that ignore what is presently known about human cognition—the software often causes us to make errors, errors that would not have occurred had decent cognetic engineering been applied. In another time, riled revolutionaries might have tossed the software into Boston harbor (nowadays they'd be fined for polluting the harbor).

When I give talks on usability, I never find one computer user who is not fed up with the petty impediments we face. I ask, ''Who here has accidentally struck some key combination when using Microsoft Word and then spent minutes figuring how to turn off the undesired feature that resulted?''

Almost every person raises a hand. I can bring down the house by saying, ''It looks like you're writing a letter. You are an idiot. You need help?'' It is not that the problems of Microsoft's works are unrecognized, it is that they seem to be accepted as an inevitable part of using computers. Apple's Macintosh interface, our only almost-big-time alternative, suffers from the similar interface problems: it is only a little better. Besides, most of us are forced to use Microsoft products on it anyway. Outside of Gates's Domain, we note that the Internet and the World Wide Web could be made far easier to understand and use.

Most of the people who design the systems and the software, those who we think of as leaders and visionaries, are woefully behind the times when it comes to interfaces. They have not progressed much beyond where we were 20 years ago.

To compound these sins, Microsoft's products demand far more computer resources than necessary. For example, in one editor I use, a 22-word memo, with 118 characters, is stored in 456 bytes of memory. In Word, it takes up 19,742 bytes. A business plan that requires 98,482 bytes in the first editor is bloated into 225,280 bytes by Word. Depending on the average size of your documents, Word wastes from half to over 90 percent of your memory. That's memory you or your company pays for. Now add in the hundreds of megabytes of memory and gigabytes of hard drive space their latest operating system demands. With competent design, it could run a lot faster and fit in a lot less memory then it now does. Besides

stealing resources, large programs are harder to learn and understand, and are more prone to bugs than are smaller programs. They eat into your time and pocketbook relentlessly. Nobody is taking Microsoft to court over these brazen acts of theft.

Some defend Microsoft on the grounds that it has brought a measure of uniformity and standardization to the industry. They point out that because of Microsoft, skills are transferable from one machine to another. Even if true, and it is possible to argue that standards arise in ways other than by domination, that is no excuse for the awful quality of the products. Others believe that there is no other possible approach than Microsoft's, but this opinion comes purely from parochialism. Microsoft (and, to a lesser extent—only because they sell fewer units—other software makers) is injuring us physically by making us do unnecessary labor; waste our time and that of our enterprises; cause us avoidable mental stress, anxiety, frustration, and annoyance; and force us to buy more far more hardware than is necessary to do the job. Even if the department of Justice had applied the severest remedies open to it, these crimes would not have been touched.

Computer and software designs are not like the weather. We can do something about them. The technology is available. If the courts cannot, it is time that users, management, and shareholders demand better.

Jef Raskin, an independent interface designer and writer who lives in Pacifica, California, created Apple's Macintosh series of computers and is the author of the recent book ''The Humane Interface'' (Addison Wesley, 2000).

MTC–00004822

From: Brett Markham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 1:08 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a computer industry professional, well versed in both Microsoft products, and those of competitors.

I am not a pinko commie that wants Microsoft punished for being successful. I would describe myself as a distinctly pro-business guy. However, Microsoft has engaged in such rampant abuse of free enterprise that I believe the settlement is too light.

Microsoft makes everything in its operating systems dependent upon installation of their browser, rather than competing products. In fact, one of the steps needed to make NT Y2K compliant was downloading IE4. I recently needed to install an antivirus package on an NT server, and was forced to download their IE5 as a prerequisite of upgrading the OS, not as a prerequisite of the Virus package.

That is insane. Nobody can convince me this is necessary, since no other OS in existence has that dependency.

But why their insistence on IE? BEcause of Internet Information Server, and front page. You see, using those products, it is possible to create web sites that only work with their browser. In other words, Microsoft is creating a world where no competing clients OR servers can exist. On an ongoing basis, Microsoft deliberately introduces changes in its products that make it stop functioning with other companies' products. An example is Samba, an SMB server that operates on Unix platforms to make files on Unix servers available to Windows clients. Microsoft deliberately broke compatibility in SP3, and then again with the Win2K release.

Why? Because they are trying to force everybody in the world to abandon every other product, and install MS products instead.

And I'm sure you are aware of what goes on with laptop computers and most others. MS enters into agreements with manufacturers that essentially make MS the only choice. In and of itself, having an agreement between companies is not a problem. But margins are so narrow in the computer hardware market that the difference between a manufacturer paying $189 and $25 for a Windows license is the diference between a profitable company, and bankruptcy. By making these deals with manufacturers, it isn't long before others are forced to comply or go under. At best, that is an illegal contract of adhesion.

So what happens to the consumer is he ends up buying a computer, and having to pay for MS products, even if he intends to load another OS! This automatically makes competing products more expensive for the end user. And guess what? The agreements between MS and manufacturers often deprive the manufacturer of the ability to even sell computers with competing products!

I could go on and on; and doubtless many have. Microsoft's treatment of Blue Mountain greetings after a failed buyout bid are legendary and were the source of an injunction.

Microsoft lies, steals, enters into contracts which are adhesive, forces reliance on its browser, breaks competing software, etc. etc. etc.

Anything short of separating its OS company and its application company will not work for protecting the American public.

Very truly,
Brett Markham

MTC–00004823

From: Dorothy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

When will you wake up. Microsoft stiffles all competition. If some one has a better product, they either steal it or buy it and effectively puts the little guy out of business. Reliance on one leaky, leaky system is foolhardy!!

Dorothy Sucre (I use both Apple and Microsoft, but Apple doesn't leak like Windows does!!)

MTC–00004824

From: Glenn Murray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 1:40pm
Subject: Comment on proposed Microsoft settlement

Glenn Murray
Research Asst. Professor
Dept. of Chemical Engineering
Colorado School of Mines
Golden, CO 80401
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Washington, DC 20530

Dear Renata Hesse,

I am writing to object to the proposed settlement to the Microsoft antitrust case. As an educator and researcher in technical fields it has been my experience that Microsoft's dominance and way of doing business has hampered innovation and the free exchange of information. In particular I am concerned about the following points:

(1) Microsoft's attempt to control the internet via proprietary protocols. I believe these protocols should be open standards and that Microsoft should have to compete on a level playing field.

(2) Microsoft's proprietary document formats (e.g., for Word, Excel, and Power Point) and their acceptance as a closed standard strongly discourage any competition. It has come to the point that to communicate with others it is necessary to buy expensive Microsoft products—-there are no compatible competing products, expensive or otherwise. Having open formats could not but help this situation and, again, provide a level playing field for competitors.

It seems we have antitrust laws for a reason, but the proposed settlement does not address the harm Microsoft has done, continues to do, and evidently intends to do. I found it particulary ironic that the settlement encourages Microsoft to extend its dominance into the educational sector. In education we are continually introducing students to new technology. I think that marketplace competition is the best way to keep prices reasonable and introduce innovation for people trying to learn these technolgies. I would like to see an antitrust settlement which has a chance of achieving this.

Sincerely,
Glenn Murray
www.mines.edu/gmurray/public_html/Welcome.html

MTC–00004825

From: Stephanie (038) Ted Coopman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 2:03pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Ms. Hesse,

I am extremely concerned about the proposed settlement in the Microsoft Anti-trust case. I feel the settlement is wholly inadequate to curb Microsoft's illegal behavior and fails to adequately address several key issues that are critical to not only the future of computer and internet based business, but has broader societal implications. I discuss my specific concerns below:

Microsoft Is a Remorseless Repeat Offender

Microsoft has shown no willingness to accept responsibility for its actions. In fact, it still adheres to the concept that it is innocent of any wrongdoing. Earlier conditions placed on Microsoft for its anti-competitive behavior were completely ignored. To think that this company will simply be polite and follow the tepid

suggestions of the Department of Justice(DOJ) is sheer folly. If Microsoft believes it is doing no wrong and they have not be censured for their activity, it will, as it has in the past, continue to behave in the manner that has brought it so much wealth and power. Microsoft is the same as the repeat offender thief who feels that they are somehow above the rules and laws that apply to everyone else. Microsoft has violated its parole (so to speak) and should be hit with the maximum penalty.

Settlement Sets a Bad Example

This settlement will have so little impact on the computer and internet related markets and conditions as well as the ability of Microsoft to operate in preferred anti-competitive mode, that other companies will not see anti-competitive monopolistic behavior as anything other than a successful business model. If we, as a society, believe that harsh sentences are required to deter illegal behavior by others, how can we give Microsoft a pass in this case? Rather than an example of the harsh fate awaiting those who defraud the public, this settlement would be an example that the DOJ is a paper tiger who will not hold companies responsible for their actions.

Any Settlement Without Requirements for Interoperability is Useless What makes Microsoft so dangerous is not that its size, but its actions. Microsoft intentionally makes its software so it will not run well with other competing products or even industry standard code. This combined with their dominance in the market makes any real competition impossible. For example, Microsoft Internet Explorer will not accurately read standard HTML, the foundation of the internet. Nor will it read HTML generated by most other HTML composing software. It is designed to only accurately read code produced by another Microsoft product, Frontpage. As with Microsoft Java, this code has no real deviation or innovation related to the original code, other than elements designed to foil competing software or coding formats. This makes extra work for those trying to make alternative formats function with the ubiquitous MS operating systems and integrated applications.

Interoperability is a critical element for the development of the internet. To purposely sacrifice this on the alter of monopoly control and corporate greed is unacceptable. This intentional interference with attempts for consistent interoperability must be stopped.

The Microsoft Monopoly is a Threat to National Security With the focus on ''cybersecurity'' by the current administration, it is amazing that this issue has not come up in conjunction wit this case. Time after time, worms, virus's and other cyber-assaults have wreaked havoc on computer systems world wide costing billions of dollars. The main form for entering all these systems has been Microsoft Internet Explorer and the Outlook Email system. Weaknesses in this program are so easy to exploit and the connections between the program and the MS OS are so numerous that anyone with a few classes in programming can crash millions of computers. This is the computer equivalent of planting a forest with the same type of tree. One bug can wipe out the whole lot. Microsoft's monopolistic attitude of ''ship it now and fix it later'' leaves our computer networks open to attack. The resent glaring security fault in Windows XP is just the latest example. This is a clear example of how Microsoft's actions are a threat to the general public. The US Government has a specific interest in making sure that there is a diverse mixture of internet software to blunt the threat of attack. Microsoft's intentional interoperability thwarts many attempts to harden systems by using alternative software.

This Settlement Will Not Eliminate or Redress Harm Done to Businesses and Consumers

I have personally been harmed by Microsoft's actions. I have wasted hours of programming time trying to make code function on Microsoft Internet Explorer. Code that is technically correct and runs on every other interface. Because of the market dominance of Microsoft, I must make this code work. This is not caused by some superior aspect of this program, but by intentional meddling that ensures only code written in Microsoft Internet Explorer, Frontpage, or MS Office versions will look correct. This is to crush any competitors product. This Microsoft software is not superior in functionality or operation. In fact, it generates useless extraneous code that doubles or triples the size of coded pages which consumes more hard-drive space and makes website run slower. This also slows down the internet. Because Microsoft controls such a large market share, I am forced to use Microsoft software in order to move data other computers. I have little or no choices for programs because I would have to convert them to a MS program first or alter the files name so Microsoft products can read them. There is NO technical need for this. I own Apple computers and the Apple OS will read ANY document no matter what the title. If Microsoft decides it doesn't want to write compatable programs for another OS, that OS is doomed.

In conclusion, I urge the DOJ to reconsider this settlement. Microsoft will not comply with any remedy as long as they fail to admit wrong doing. Steps must be taken to ensure all software has the ability to operate with Microsoft's products. Microsoft must be forced to adhere to industry standards for HTML, Java and other code that allow functionality and interoperability. They must be severely punished and forced to adhere to all remedies by a oversight body that has the power to force compliance. Microsoft must be forced to support alternative OS such Linux and Apple. The penalties for Microsoft's actions must serve as a dire warning to any other company who dares to defraud the public and abuse United States Law.

Sincerely,
Ted M. Coopman
Rogue Commuication
2501 Friesland Court
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
831–477–7780

MTC–00004826

From: Chris Hedberg
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov''
Date: 12/21/01 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just wanted to send a quick comment regarding the recent Microsoft settlement. I think that the mechanism described whereby Judgement Compliance Officers on the Technical Committee help to resolve issues between Microsoft and customers or competitors is a very good one, assuming that you find the right people for the Compliance Officer positions and that the committee is free to act and backed up by the power to be heard. It's a much better idea that Judge Jackson's initial ruling, which I definitely feel could have led to a lot of confusion in the PC market and not much real advantage to consumers.

I would not have minded provisions requiring Microsoft to publish their APIs more completely and to release specifications for their internal formats to allow other companies easier access to the features internal MS developers take for granted in many cases, but this solution seems very flexible and powerful, both of which I think are required elements when dealing with a market that changes rapidly and a creative, strong-willed, dominant company. I am a former full-time employee of Microsoft, and while I feel that its employees and many of its products are among the best in the world, I have long disagreed with the company's aggressive and often short-sightedly self-serving approach to standards and competition. Microsoft is at its best when it's forced to compete against strong products. It products tend to weaken and fail when there's no clear competitor meeting an unmet need.

Thank you for reading my comments.
Chris Hedberg

MTC–00004828

From: blburton@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 5:00pm
Subject: AtATgram: One For The Record Books (12/20/01)

Brian <blburton@mac.com> is sending you a scene from —As—the—Apple—Turns!—

Scene 3467 follows:

One For The Record Books (12/20/01)

Hey, guess what? Something amazing happened today. Ready for this? They found a MICROSOFT SECURITY HOLE. Wait, don't leave! Yes, we know that Microsoft security flaws are about as rare as pennies with Lincoln's picture on them, but this one is different: it's bad. Really bad. So bad it makes most Microsoft security holes look like terrific new features they should be advertising in boldface caps on the box with lots of exclamation points. Yea verily, this is the great-granddaddy of all Windows vulnerabilities. (This is the part where you're supposed to gasp audibly and one or two of you actually faint for effect.)

Actually, technically the bug was discovered several weeks ago, but it was apparently kept pretty hush-hush until now. Faithful viewer DAVID MCCONNELL tipped us off to an Associated Press article which leads off with one of the greatest introductions we've ever seen: ''Microsoft's newest version of Windows, billed as the

most secure ever, contains several serious flaws that allow hackers to steal or destroy a victim's data files across the Internet or implant rogue computer software. —The company released a free fix Thursday.—'' Gosh, all they did is put the personal data of millions of customers at terrifying risk, and the fix is —free?— The newfound benevolence of Redmond never ceases to amaze us. Clearly that whole Justice Department brouhaha did some good after all.

And the amazement just keeps on coming, because Microsoft actually seems to be admitting the gravity of the situation, calling it a ''very serious vulnerability'' and acknowledging that ''the risk to consumers was unprecedented because the glitches allow hackers to seize control of all Windows XP operating system software without requiring a computer user to do anything except connect to the Internet.'' We are stunned— —stunned—, we tell you— that Microsoft hasn't therefore simply blamed the Internet for the problem. What's this world coming to?

By the way, no, there's no word on whether this was one of those ''trojans, trapdoors, and bugs'' that a captured terrorist insists Al Qaeda managed to stick into Windows XP, but feel free to incorporate that possibility into your own twisted world view sans evidence if you like. Meanwhile, word has it that Microsoft has ''forcefully urged'' all users to install the patch right away, although we noticed a distinct lack of any mention of the problem whatsoever when we visited the company's home page. Maybe things haven't changed that much after all. Those of you running Windows XP should probably hunt down and install that patch ASAP; those of you who are just itching to exploit that vulnerability can rest easy in the knowledge that even if Microsoft calls every single registered user of XP, there's still going to be a fair percentage of people who won't bother to apply the patch. So take your time.

In closing, Microsoft is clearly the company with whom you want to trust your sensitive personal and financial information. Oooooh yeah, .NET and Passport just sound better and better all the time ...

To see this scene as it was meant to be seen, complete with links to articles and formatted as originally broadcast, visit: <http://www.appleturns.com/scene/?id=3467>

To see the complete, unadulterated episode in which this scene was originally broadcast, visit: <http://www.appleturns.com/episode/?date=12/20/2001>

As the Apple Turns: <http://www.appleturns.com/>

This Scene: <http://www.appleturns.com/scene/?id=3467>

This Episode: <http://www.appleturns.com/episode/?date=12/20/2001>

Copyright (c)1997–2001 J. Miller; please don't forward without this attribution and the URLs above. Other reproduction requires J. Miller's explicit consent; please contact him at the site. Thanks.

MTC–00004829

From: Shneiderman, Ben
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/21/01 5:51pm
Subject: comment on behalf of consumers

Much of the discussion of settlement terms focuses on strategies that promote competition. This is fine, but some method of assessment of the benefit to consumers and computer users might be an appropriate addition.

The current level of user frustration is high—one survey of 6000 users reports that an average of 6.1 hours a week are wasted. This drain on productivity could amount to $100B annually in the US alone. Although there are few reliable statistics about the top ten sources of trouble and frustration, a good start has been made in collecting data about the most serious annoyance—a system crash. The web site www.bugtoaster.com presents data from its clever technology to capture data on crashes (I have no relationship with this company).

Other sources of frustration include:
—difficulties with installation and configuration
—inability to open email attachments
—incompatible file formats
—inability to complete e-commerce transactions
—incomprehensible instructions or dialog boxes
—insufficient information to isolate problems
—lack of feedback about system state
—hostile or incomprehensible error messages

I propose that Microsoft (or an outside independent agency, possibly NIST), be required to establish metrics for frequency and severity of user problems and report on these publicly on a monthly basis. This parallels what airlines do with respect to lost baggage and flight delay frequencies. Then as Microsoft and other software developers improve their software quality, measurable gains could be shown.

A basic approach would be to develop a frustration reporting mechanism that would automatically or by email enable users to register the problems they have. Such a database would help identify problem frequency and measure their severity.

I hope that this proposal generates competitive activity that benefits consumers.

Sincerely,
Ben Shneiderman
Dept of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
www.cs.umd.edu/ben
301–405–2680
301–405–6707 fax
www.cs.umd.edu/hcil
Founding Director (1983–2000), Human-Computer Interaction Lab
Professor, Computer Science
Member, Institute for Systems Research & Institute for Advanced Computer Studies
CC:Shneiderman Ben

MTC–00004831

From: Phillip C. Wolf
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov,senator (a)graham.senate....
Date: 12/21/01 6:07pm
Subject: Microsoft comment period

Sirs:

I am an avid computer user since learning about them in my high school in 1972.

I am also a member of the Armed Services of the United States of America, and have witnessed firsthand the tears of frustration at using an incompetent software suite foisted upon the country by Microsoft.

This is NOT a benevolent monopoly as ATT was. This is an evil, greedy, incompetent corporation which stops at NOTHING to extend and prevail it's dominance.

Witness: Bill Gates, Microsoft, et alia working dilgently behind the scenes to control and steer the COMCAST/ATT broadband merger, so as to completely stiffle any potential competition from AOL Time Warner.

My industry-standard, world-standard computer software is today increasing finding internet sites which do not function properly due to Microsoft's blatant highjacking of such standards with proprietory ''flavors'' which are known only by Microsoft, and which overtake the world internet by their monopoly stranglehold. (Java, C++, VisualBasic, FTP, html, and TCP/IP)

The self-imposed, self-proposed ''penalty'' offer (truly, THIS IS A PATHETIC ATTEMPT TO MAKE A COMPLETE MOCKERY OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM) to pay off foul deeds against the comsumers of America and the world, by ''donating'' used systems containing Microsoft products EXCLUSIVELY to public schools. Is there no one in government today who can see that this is a thinly disguised attempt to POISON the minds of schoolchildren and pull them into the Hell that is Windows(tm)?????? Unix, OS/2 (killed by Microsoft) even Linux, are far, far, far better operating systems than Microsoft Windows. ANYONE who uses a computer extensively and dares to compare will see this in a micro-second.

To close, I add the thoughts of a commentator I read at Linuxplanet.com, with which I am in COMPLETE agreement:

* Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

* The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

* Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

PLEASE: Stop this monster run amok. PLEASE: protect Americans and others from this criminal hegemony. PLEASE: decide in favor of the American Way of Life which has worked so well for hundreds of years—a fair, open, and LEVEL playing field for business. Do the right thing.

Please.

sincerely,

Phillip C. Wolf

Master Chief Petty Officer (USCG)

Consumer Patriot

MTC–00004832

From: Dave.Pickens@sun.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to register my disagreement with the Stipulation and Revised Proposed Final Judgment in re: United States of America v. Microsoft Corporation. I understand that under the Tunney Act, I as an American Citizen have the ability to comment and wish to do so.

I've been in the information technology field since the late 1970's... I had just started my career when Microsoft was founded and therefore have seen the world both pre-Microsoft and post-Microsoft. My main issues with the proposed settlement are:

1. Does not address non-commercial or open source usage of Microsoft technologies. Specifically it excludes anything that is does not have a viable ''commercial'' entity. How does one measure this? Who is to say what is or isn't viable? Under the proposed settlement, Microsoft would have the ability to exclude much of the development efforts at Universities, non-profit organizations, and small businesses simply by saying that these are not legitament or viable. At that point, these Universities or non-profit entities would need to file a complaint with the oversight group which would undoubtedly take considerable resources and efforts. Many of these organizations could not afford to undertake such efforts.

To limit the access to Microsoft's APIs, etc. in such a manner creates a divide that many would not or could not cross.

I urge you to eliminate this loophole that would allow Microsoft to exclude a significant portion of the information technology community.

Equal access needs to be assured, regardless of whether it's an individual person, a non-profit organization, a University or a for-profit organization.

2. Does not address harm caused by Microsoft's past abuse of monopolistic practices.

Their ability to fund economically unfeasible products or investments—some software related, others not related at all to software, is tremendous.

A prime example is their investment in the new gaming system X-Box... depending upon which analyst you read, estimation is that this product will not even begin to make money until late-2004, perhaps 2005. This is a loss-leader designed to further their business goals in a new market but utilizing capital obtained via monopoly power in other market segments.

Another example is their investment / ''partnership'' with customers with the ultimate outcome of locking in their products / technology use with these customers. This has been accomplished in several ways including the investment in target organization, outright purchase of target organization or significant product discounts beyond normal levels to similarly sized organizations. The only way that Microsoft has been able to do this is by using money (capital) obtained via their monopolist practices.

The proposed settlement continues to allow Microsoft to enjoy the fruits of their criminal activities, so far as to even allow Microsoft to be insulated against market forces due to their diversification. Had Microsoft not invested in nor used money obtained via monopolistic practices, their ability to maintain a monopoly may have been address by the market itself.

I urge you to either require Microsoft to divest holdings in customers, business partners, etc. or place them into a separately managed holding company that is the equivalent of a blind-trust. The ability of Microsoft to continue to utilize these tainted assets is great.

I further urge you to seek punitive damages by way of divestiture to address the harm caused my Microsoft's abuse of monopoly powers.

3. The duration of the settlement is too short a period of time. Based upon my reading of the documents, the settlement could expire in as little as 5 years, and at most 8 years.

My concern is that Microsoft will wait things out, then return to their usual tactics once oversight has been eliminated. The other part of my concern is that Microsoft reduces their aggressiveness to a point, and then frustrates the oversight group for 8 years, effectively distracting and tying up the oversight group with argument upon argument, issue upon issue— effectively outlasting them via appeals, taking things back to court, etc.

4. No specific penalties for non-performance or violation. Most contracts I read tend to have some form of penalties for non-performance or breach written into them. I don't see any of that in the proposed settlement. Based upon this, Microsoft could easily continue to violate the settlement and fight any attempts at punishment for many years to come.

I think certain minimum penalties need to be spelled out should Microsoft even appear (''appearance of impropriety'') to violate the settlement terms, not obey the oversight group, and any other US laws for that matter. These penalties could be as simple as the term of the settlement / oversight is extended to 10 years beyond the date of the infraction. It might also include monetary or other penalties such as breaking Microsoft into 3 or 4 separate companies is avoided initially but should Microsoft violate the terms of the settlement, then they consent to being broken apart into separate companies.

Without penalties, I am concerned that Microsoft will continue abuses, simply writing off the oversight and annoyances because there is no incentive to do otherwise.

Respectfully submitted,

David B. Pickens
Dave Pickens Sun
SunONE Enterprise Architect
Academic and Research Computing
Microsystems, Inc.
8900 Keystone Crossing
Suite 700
Indianapolis, IN 46240
ph: 317–574–5729
em: dave.pickens@sun.com

MTC–00004833

From: Nick Bogan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 7:34pm
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Settlement

Since before the original trial and consent decree, continuing through the U.S. vs Microsoft trial preceded over by Judge Jackson, to the present, Microsoft has had as its sole goal the elimination of consumer choice in the computing environment. Time and again, they have used all means both legal and illegal, indifferent to either the interest of consumers and the public at large or the law, to ensure that no other company or influence could tamper with their total control of the PC market. Whether it was crushing Netscape by means of illegal deals with OEMs, or in more recent times working to ensure that only Microsoft browsers on Microsoft OSes can use the Internet (witness their recent trial closure of msn.com to all browsers but IE and old, non-Web-standards-compliant versions of Netscape, shutting out newer, more-compliant-than-IE third-party browsers allegedly in the interest of Web standards compliance; I won't even speak of what Microsoft would like to do to the Internet with .NET), the company has made it clear that it will never change its ways unless the law is enforced.

If Microsoft is not stopped, computer users will continue to be forced to either use their products (Office and IE, and hence Windows) to permit compatibility with other computer users, or use third-party solutions that attempt to provide compatibility with undocumented Microsoft APIs and file formats (for example, the Office file formats) but are burdened with needing to reverse-engineer them. With the planned changes to Microsoft's software licensing, future purchasers of their software may simply be required to upgrade when Microsoft sees fit. As it is, installing Windows XP requires contacting Microsoft (this must be repeated if the computer's hardware is changed at any time) and is accompanied by several requests for the installer to sign up for Microsoft's Passport service.

The evidence that Microsoft has used its monopoly power illegally to protect and even to further its monopolies is indisputable; it is simply a given that the company is a monopolist and has been for years. What is not given is the response of the DOJ to this preponderance of evidence. As a computer user who currently enjoys the opportunity to choose third-party software such as Linux and Mozilla, I hope that a forceful settlement is enacted that prevents Microsoft from continuing to try to force such products out of the computing world. Such a settlement

should, at least, include a provision requiring Microsoft to provide accurate and freely available documentation of its APIs and file formats at the time of launch of any new product, whether it is free or charged for, that modifies these formats. If they do not do so, or release inaccurate or restricted documentation, they would not be allowed to ship (or continue to ship) the product.

I do not support any proposal that mandates Microsoft to produce versions of its software for other computing platforms. By providing free and accurate information about its currently proprietary APIs and file formats, it would be possible, albeit with much work, for Microsoft's competitors and other agents such as writers of Free Software to produce genuine alternatives to Microsoft software. The notion that the only hope for alternative computing platforms is for Microsoft Office or IE to be ported to them speaks volumes about the unhealthy and damaging control that Microsoft has obtained and retains, in large part through illegal actions.

In addition, while the option for OEMs to bundle third-party software and operating systems under the currently proposed settlement is a good start, it should be extended to prohibit the imposition of any future ''Windows taxes'' that use Microsoft's monopoly position to effectively force OEMs to preload Windows. If I don't want to buy Windows when buying a computer, I shouldn't have to, and I should save at least as much as the per-unit license cost to the OEM by excluding it.

I appreciate the efforts of those who are reviewing these comments. I hope that my voice, along with those of many others, will help strengthen the settlement, making it into an effective tool that will restrain Microsoft from illegal actions and help bring an end to its hurtfully excessive domination of the computing industry.

MTC–00004834

From: RobAnn Mateja
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 8:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a taxpayer and citizen of the United States, I strongly urge the DOJ to accept the settlement offer. Like many American citizens, I feel this case was always more about protecting the interests of Microsoft's competitors than the interests of the American public. Let's let the marketplace, not the competitors or the government, decide who shall prevail in the software computer industry. The settlement terms will put constraints upon Microsoft to mitigate any real, imagined, or trumped up anti competitive behavior by Microsoft.

On a tangential note, I would love to see the DOJ shift its attention from attacking successful American enterprises, such as Microsoft, and focus instead upon protecting this country from the very real threat of anti-American extremists. As sad as it is to say, perhaps if the priorities had been set correctly in the first place, we would not have had to bear the horrible tragedy of Sept. 11. Perhaps that sounds like a cheap shot, but that thought is certainly in my heart and in the hearts of many other American citizens.

MTC–00004835

From: Jack Belland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to get off Microsoft's back. Companies that compete with MS would dearly love to have the government diminish MS's ability to compete in future software & tech markets in order to improve their chances of making billionaires for themselves. This country needs mega successful businesses & the people with the talent to run and nurture these wealth creating entities which produce the muscle the USA must have to prosper in this world.

Jack in Tucson, AZ

MTC–00004836

From: Amit Jain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 11:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has been found guilty of abusing their monopoly. They should be broken up. Anything less is unacceptable.

Peace,
Amit Jain
1 Castle Pt. on the Hudson S–724
Hoboken, NJ 07030

MTC–00004837

From: Ryan Boder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/21/01 11:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached is an Adobe Acrobat file that includes my comments on the settlement. If you cannot view an Acrobat file please inform me and I will send you another format.

Thank You.
Ryan Boder
6635 Olivetree Court
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

To the United States Department of Justice:

I am writing in response to the proposed settlement which is currently under the 60 day public comment period. I consider myself to be a person whom the outcome of this case will have a very significant effect. Currently, as a senior at Carnegie Mellon University, majoring in Computer Engineering and minoring in Computer Science, I am naturally looking for a place in the computer industry in the very near future. As I compare companies and go from interview to interview I am realizing a very hard to face reality. There are almost no jobs available in my field that really interest me. My main interest is in operating system development and I would like to work on a desktop OS. I am a proponent of open source software and some day I hope to either work for or have started an open source software company. But the reason I am writing you today is because I don't understand why it is so difficult to find a job doing what I want do. I believe the answer to that question is the lack of an actual competitive operating systems market. Sure I could go to work for Microsoft, but then I don't like Redmond and more importantly, I don't like the company who illegally injured the industry I want to work in.

Then I begin to think to myself, what about my colleagues? What about my friends in the Computer Science department who aren't really interested in working on an operating system but would love to find a good job developing cutting edge office software or get a job developing some kind of networking application that people would actually use. What should they do? Should they go to work for Microsoft also?

The fact is that now, Microsoft has a monopoly on not only operating systems, but also to a lesser degree, office software and web browsers. They have blatantly and obviously abused this monopoly in many cases over the years and it has to stop. The DOJ has made that very clear. I have carefully read the ''Complaint'', ''Stipulated and Revised Proposed Final Judgment'' and the ''Competitive Impact Statement'' files from the case web site and while they do cover many of the needed changes that need to be made, I do not feel they properly punish the Microsoft Corporation for hurting such a large number of people and an entire industry as they have done. In fact, I do not feel they punish the Microsoft Corporation at all. They do a very good job at setting rules so that it will be more difficult for Microsoft to abuse it's monopoly in the future. This in itself is a good thing but the damage has already been done. While Microsoft was using it's operating system monopoly to keep competitors from competing, it was also illegally building an empire that it does not through legal business practices deserve to have. And who pays the price for their actions? I do. My friends do. Every other company in the the world who is completely and utterly dependent on Microsoft products does.

The DOJ claims that while we all realize that Microsoft is an illegal company, it would be in the best interest of the general public to settle now because it provides ''effective and certain relief''. I admit that it provides a certain action to be taken place, but I disagree that it provides certain relief. Let's say two warriors start out as equal competitive fighters. Then one, through an illegal means, grows 100 times as large as the other. Finally the king steps in and says to the the criminal warrior, ''Now you have to abide by the rules, but you will not be punished for you actions''. Is it going to be a fair fight now? You are effectively pitting David against Goliath except this is no religious fairy tail, this is the computer industry in the 21 st century.

My opinion of software

I have learned software is unlike any product that we have ever seen in history.

1. It takes a long time and a lot of work by smart people to make good software.

2. It can be developed at very little actual cost besides time.

3. Once a usable version is released, it can be ''manufactured'' at practically zero cost.

4. It is never actually done. There are always bugs and defects that can be improved. So from the inherent properties of

software, it seems as though this would be one of the easiest industries to get into. But for some reason even huge organizations like Netscape, Sun, Compaq and many other are struggling or have failed because they were unable to compete. Not to mention the many small software companies that have fallen before they even left a mark. The reason for this is that standards are not open to the public.

What constitutes a standard

A standard is a specification that a group of people have agreed upon so that they can work with each other and not against each other. A communications protocol that everyone on the internet uses is a standard. A programming API that programmers around the world have agreed upon is a standard. A file format that everyone in the business world uses every day to communicate is also a standard. In fact, it might even be considered a communications protocol since it is a method for the person who creates the file to communicate with those who read the file. Standards are a great idea but what happens if a single person or company owns a standard?

Why standards should be public domain

When a standard is public domain everyone can use it. When a standard is proprietary then only the people who satisfy a condition set by the owner can use it. The example I would like to mention here is the Microsoft Office binary file format. This is a perfect example of what happens when a standard is owned. Microsoft and only Microsoft has the ability to truly read and write to Office documents. Others can try and come very close to succeeding, but unless the standard is completely opened one cannot truly be compatible with it. The Office software that I am using to write this paper claims to be Microsoft Office 2000/XP compatible, and for all intents and purposes it is. I have been able to read and write every Microsoft Office file that has come my way with the OpenOffice.org software. Basically what has happened is a group of very talented programmers from Sun Microsystems and the general public have put a lot of time and effort into reverse engineering the Microsoft Office binary file format. The reason for this effort is so that when a person uses their product he or she is not constrained by the twenty Microsoft Office files sent to them every day that they are expected to open and read. Most of the people who send these files have never heard of and can't even fathom the idea of using something other than Microsoft Office to do daily office work. So if the OpenOffice.org people could do it, then there is nothing to worry about, right? Wrong. They were placed at an extreme disadvantage from the start and have still managed to develop a product that I guarantee you can compete with Microsoft Office from a technical standpoint. However, those hours spent tirelessly reverse engineering a binary format could have and should have been spent doing something else. They could have been working on other parts of the program to give it even more useful features than it already has. The Microsoft programmers did not have to worry about this dilemma because they exclusively had the standard. There is no intellectual property in the Microsoft Office file format. In fact it is agreed upon by most people in the software industry that a text based format (such as XML which is what OpenOffice.org uses for their native file format) works better for these types of files. So why does Microsoft continue to use a binary format and not share the specification? Because they know that if they did either of these things they would suddenly have to compete with other software developers and might lose the stranglehold they now have on office software and thus, on every business in America.

Let's assume I convince a non-computer person to try the OpenOffice.org software or Sun Star Office and one day they get a Microsoft Office file that doesn't look right when they open it. I guarantee you the first thing they will think is that their program is bad and Microsoft Office is better because Microsoft Office could open that file while OpenOffice.org could not. (I have never actually seen that happen because those OpenOffice developers did such a good job, but this is a hypothetical situation) Is it because the OpenOffice.org developers are not as good as the Microsoft developers? That question can't really be answered, but as a software expert I seriously doubt it. When a company owns a standard protocol it is inherently anticompetitive and everyone (except Microsoft) loses.

What must be done

These standards all need to be completely and absolutely open to the general public and anyone who wishes to compete. The settlement has the right idea in disclosing most communications protocols and API's but that doesn't cover it. All communications protocols, all API's and all standard file formats need to be opened up to the general public. There is no way to have a competitive market otherwise. I place a big emphasis on file formats because the DOJ has not mentioned them at all in the stipulations of the Final Judgment proposal. They are just as important as communications protocols and in my opinion should be treated exactly as communications protocols for the duration of this case.

The only argument the DOJ has given against opening all protocols is that the ones that are security related should be kept secret. I realize that in the ''Competitive Impact Statement'' it was explained that this exception was only for authorization tokens or keys, but it seems to me that the wording for the actual stipulation is weak and that it will allow Microsoft the ability to still close access to certain functionality under the ''It's for security purposes'' umbrella. What must happen is that all protocols, all API's and all file formats be completely opened to the general public.

Why the general public

The parties mentioned in the stipulations who are protected from anti-competitive acts are ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs. These people deserve to be protected, but what about open source software developers? Why are they excluded from this list? Do they not have as much a fight to this information as the independent software vendors? Where do you draw the line? Redhat is an independent software vendor, but they produce open source code, so how can they sign the non-disclosure agreement when they always ''disclose'' their software? What about the many other software companies who produce open source products? Are they not independent software vendors? Bill Gates argues that they are not and that they ruin the country because they don't pay taxes, but something tells me that if Redhat didn't pay their taxes they would be punished. Would opening these three standards: protocols, API's and file formats to the general public cause any harm? No way. If you are going to open them to competitors, open them to all competitors, not just the competitors Microsoft has beaten before (in many cases illegally) and already have a huge advantage over. Open them to the open source software developers who not only are some of the most eager people to see them, but also the last group in the world that Microsoft wants to compete with. This is the group that has Microsoft worried sick because they actually might be able to legitimately compete.

How it should be done

I do not want to see the DOJ settle on this case and believe me, I will be lobbying my home state to jump back in this fight. On the other hand, if it the DOJ is going to settle now I hope that they do it the right way. Yes, the Technical Committee is a good idea and I hope the people who get hired to do the job never let one mistake slip by. The TC has the fight to hire as many as it deems necessary to help carry out its task and I hope they do so without holding back. The TC should hire a team of as many programmers and technical writers as it needs and have them prepare and maintain the documentation that will be provided to competitors, Do not let Microsoft be responsible for this task. Let people who actually care about the cause and are passionate about getting these standards out there and helping their colleagues compete fairly handle this important job. Don't leave it up to Microsoft who has only to lose from this stipulation and has for so long kept it secret.

As I have stated before, I do not think that this final judgment will induce a competitive industry as it is supposed to. I believe that while on the fight track, this proposal has some weaknesses and some stipulations that are likely to not be enforced at all. Also it does not in any way punish Microsoft for the crimes they have been committing for the past decade. Here are the stipulations that I question, denoted by letter and number from section HI of the proposal, ''Prohibited Conduct''.

Section III: Prohibited Conduct

C)

1. The part about allowing them to restrict OEM's from installing software that provides a particular type of functionality as long as the restrictions are non-discriminatory between non MS products and MS products. Microsoft will be able to take advantage of that by claiming that a product that competes with their own product has a prohibited type of functionality. It is easy to take two programs that provide a similar function but in all other aspects provide different functions, and say they are two different types of products prohibiting the competitive product.

3. The restriction that non-MS middleware must either not display a user interface or should display a user interface similar to the corresponding MS product. This forces competing software vendors to follow Microsoft's lead in these type of products. Then to the user it seems that Microsoft is the only innovator and the other vendors are merely copying. I believe there should be no restrictions whatsoever on competing middleware products. With this exception, Microsoft is allowed to define the configuration of the desktop. That should be the job of the OEM.

D)

This is one of the most important rules to stop Microsoft from illegally abusing it's monopoly as it has done consistently and effectively in the past. The settlement is right on the concept here but you are leaving out the single most important group that wishes to have access to this API: the public. The general public includes people like myself and other software developers who use and maintain software products that compete with Microsoft products. Open source software developers and the general public want access to those API's just as badly as the commercial organizations mentioned. And we deserve access just as they do. Microsoft API's are not and cannot be considered intellectual property because of Microsoft's monopoly on the entire software industry. Those API's are a de facto standard and must be treated as such. My personal opinion as well as many other software experts like myself believe that no API should ever be closed to anyone for any reason. However, I am willing to not argue that debate in this paper because that is not what this settlement is about. I do believe that Microsoft will continue to abuse its monopoly if these API's are not released to the general public with all documentation. The reason is that I believe competitors to Microsoft are growing out of the hard work and effort of the Free Software Foundation and the GNU organization, the Linux Kernel, distribution providers such as RedHat, MandrakeSoft, Suse, 3T Solutions and many other equally important open source software developers. The open source movement has utilized a method of creating better software, that even a closed source giant like Microsoft itself will have to work very hard to keep up with. Unless these de facto standard API's are released to them and the public, there will not be competition in the software industry. As for the other closed source software vendors, they most likely will not be able to compete with Microsoft even with the API's simply because Microsoft will bury them in marketing and other tactics such as the infamous ''Embrace and Extend'' strategy that was used to retard the popularity of excellent ideas such as Java, Javascript and ANSI C++. Please do not allow Microsoft to harm the industry and the public more than it already has by allowing them to define the playing field even more. In conclusion to this section, the DOJ must force Microsoft to release any and all programming API's and communications protocols to the general public, so that competing open source software developers can make their products compatible with the de facto standard products of the Microsoft monopoly.

E)

This is a very good and necessary stipulation, but it does have a weakness. I tend to learn from experience and it has shown that the Microsoft Corporation will do anything and everything it can, stopping at nothing to not just help it's own products, but to also injure and even paralyze the products of all of it's competitors. We have seen Microsoft make illogical technical decisions for the sole purpose of killing excellent products like Netscape Communicator and Sun Java technologies. Therefore, I do not trust Microsoft to handle such an important task as making all communications protocols absolutely and completely open to all people. For example, Microsoft's biggest fear right now is the GNU/Linux Operating System becoming as easy for a computer user weaned on Windows as Microsoft's own OS. They have good reason to be afraid, since these systems have a history of being more stable and secure than Windows. However since Microsoft owns the vast majority of the desktop Operating Systems being used today, it is imperative for every single Microsoft communications protocol to be open and available for any (competing) open source developer. Otherwise an ignorant user will make the assumption that the competing system is broken, because it does not easily communicate with all the Windows systems they already have. I have suggested a possible solution to this problem above in the ''How should it be done'' section.

G)

1. This stipulation is contradictory. It claims that Microsoft may not enter into a contract that will force the other party to exclusively or favorably deal with Microsoft products as opposed to competing products. Then it says that they actually can do this as long as they can provide numbers that show it is reasonable to favor the Microsoft product. (In good faith? Who are we talking about here?) Since Microsoft has such a large percentage of the market they will always be able to produce numbers that show this. Besides, if you want to see how the Microsoft Corporation likes to fudge numbers, ask them how exactly they came up with the availability rate for their web servers. They are a monopoly and achieved that through marketing and questionable business practices. That is not what got them their enormous market percentage, rather it was abusing that monopoly that made it difficult and sometimes even impossible for their competitors to sell enough product to stay in business. (Even in the cases where the competing product was technically superior) The DOJ must never let them enter into an agreement that removes the other parties right to use a competing product.

H)

3. Along with this stipulation, there should be a message defined by the DOJ that is used every time windows tries to automatically change settings. Also, there should always be an option that the user can choose that will permanently disable each automatic configuration change. This must be clearly explained when asking for user confirmation so that, for example, my grandmother can read and understand exactly what choices she has. The reason for this is simple. Microsoft, if given the opportunity, will ask if the user wishes to change settings on a regular basis so that the user will become extremely annoyed. Then they will use phrases like ''Internet Explorer is currently not your default web browser. Would you like to make it your default? (Click yes to make this message stop appearing)''. There should always be an option such as ''No, keep SomeBrowserName as my default web browser and don't ask me again''. Also, the DOJ should define these messages to keep Microsoft from wording it like this, ''Keep SomeBrowserName as my default web browser (Some functionality may be lost)''. If I am the kind of person who gets nervous about things like using a different program than Word to write a paper, then that statement will be enough to scare me into using IE. Microsoft's Operating System monopoly gives them the power to make any program they want look bad. A perfect example of this is the Caldera vs. Microsoft case where Windows was generating false error messages when run on DR–DOS instead of MS–DOS. They have abused this power many times with their FUD attacks and messages like the one shown above. This must be stopped and only the DOJ has the power to stop it. In the freeway of the software industry, Microsoft has built the roads that most people drive on and history has shown us that only Microsoft brand cars are allowed a smooth drive. This must be changed.

H—Exceptions:

1. Assuming that all communications protocols and programming API's are open to the public, this should never be an issue because any decent non-Microsoft program will be able to handle the users requests.

2. If the user has installed a program that is unable to handle that request, then the user most likely had a very good reason for it and probably doesn't want Windows stepping in and changing that for them. Also, this stipulation gives Microsoft programs an inherent competitive advantage over other programs. When Windows decides a program failed (which will be up to Windows' own discretion?), it steps in and uses a Microsoft program to handle it. But when a Microsoft program fails to handle a request, will Windows step in and use a non-Microsoft product to handle it? No way. On top of all this, it gives Microsoft the ability to leverage the content of their web sites in the same manner that they leveraged the Windows OS to stamp out competitors. I know plenty of people who would not even consider using a non-IE web browser at all if they couldn't access the web sites maintained by Microsoft with it. I remind you of the day, a couple months ago, when they tried to block all non-IE web browsers from viewing msn.com. This attempt was met by an uproar from non-IE users and they removed the block in fear of looking bad in public. With Microsoft extending it's presence into basically all other industries that deal with information distribution and digital media (as they have been doing at a steady rate), this will only get worse. The DOJ must force Microsoft to not switch to a Microsoft program when accessing Microsoft's servers. They must let

any program access it and the communications protocol must be completely available so that all other developers can make their client software also work with Microsoft's servers. If the competing middleware doesn't work then let the user choose to stop using it.

J)

1. Why not? As has been shown in the past time and time again, reverse engineering or even random hacking can and will find those API's and find the security holes in them. Also it has been shown by software packages such as OpenSSH, a program is more secure when it is open for not just the hackers that sit around all day and reverse engineer hidden protocols to find exploits, but also to users who may find the exploits first and then tell the developer to fix them. I don't want to hear that my own government, the people who are supposed to protect me, are relying on a protocol or API hidden in Windows for security. No one is asking for authorization keys or tokens that are hidden in windows. Those should stay hidden and with good reason, but the protocol or API should be open and available. There is no way for a non-Microsoft product to compete with a Microsoft product when Microsoft can access parts of the OS that competing products can't with hidden protocols or API's.

2. This section specifically allows Microsoft the ability not to describe to or license their ''secure'' API's and protocols to their number one competitor, open source software. Do you think that they will disclose these protocols to open source programmers when they have the power to discriminate against a business that does not ''meet reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business'' when Microsoft publicly describes the GPL as a cancer? This stipulation is anti-competitive by nature and does not belong in this proposal. As noted by Robert X. Cringely, Microsoft can and will take advantage of this power. The people who have a desire to crack those protocols can and will crack them whether the DOJ and Microsoft wants them to or not. How long did it take before the eBook anti-piracy code was cracked? Or how about the DVD decryption algorithm? I can't think of any reason to allow them to keep hidden any communication protocol other then to allow them to use Windows as leverage to keep customers away from competing products. The first thing my operating systems professor said in his security lecture was, ''If the security of your system relies on others not knowing how it works, then you're in a lot of trouble''. The reason Microsoft wants it this way is to keep open source software projects from competing. The DOJ cannot allow this.

Conclusion

To conclude this paper I will reemphasize the most important points:

1. Microsoft monopolized, and through illegal abuse of that monopoly, retarded the growth of the entire software industry. These illegal actions have injured myself as a software developer along with my colleagues. They have also injured Microsoft's own customers through high prices, lack of choice in purchasing a product and lack of innovation. There is no reason to innovate when you aren't competing against anyone at all.

2. The most important change that must be made to stop this illegal abuse of power is to open all standards up to the public. The keys standards I mention in this paper are communications protocols, programming interfaces and file formats. The most important being file formats because the DOJ did not even mention them in its Final Judgment.

3. The Final Judgment only includes opening these standards to independent software developers with a non-disclosure agreement. The standard must be opened to the general public so that all can compete fairly, including Microsoft's most fierce competitor to date: open source software.

4. Even if all the changes I mentioned are made, Microsoft will still be the undisputed leader in the software industry and will remain that way for a long time unless they are actually punished for their crimes. This final judgment is what I consider a slap on the wrist, considering the amount of people they have harmed and the software industry that they have corrupted. I ask the DOJ to reconsider it's decision to settle and put Microsoft on trial. They are guilty and they will be found guilty if tried. If the trial takes two years, so be it. At least then they will be convicted and they will be punished. The Final Judgment does not offer any kind of certain results and it might not change anything. Microsoft has been building up an empire while they illegally shut down all competition and that empire will still be strong even if they do have to compete fairly from this point on. I urge the DOJ to put Microsoft on trial, and if (when) they are found guilty, punish them as they deserve to be punished.

If the DOJ decides to continue with the settlement, I urge that they strengthen some of the stipulations, add the general public to the list of those protected and completely open the three key standards mentioned in this paper. For all those who have been injured by the illegal activities of the Microsoft Corporation, they have my sympathy and hopefully the sympathy and support of the government of the United States of America.

Sincerely,
Ryan Boder
boder@cmu.edu

MTC–00004838

From: Alan Mark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:21am
Subject: Justice isn't doing the US justice

Regarding the Microsoft anti-trust case:

I worked for Novell in Asia from 1992–1993. All the PC manufacturers were afraid of Microsoft because of the licensing agreements they were forced to sign. No PC could ship without Windows installed.

They continue such practices today. It is a shame that you have let them continue to proceed in this fashion. Soon, they will try to corner the home game market. Just wait.

Alan Mark
Chief Security Strategist
Novell, Inc.

MTC–00004839

From: PapaHalland@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:28am
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Suit Settlement

I wish to protest in the strongest terms possible your proposed settlement of the antitrust suit against Microsoft. The proposals as reported in the newspapers and other media I read on a regular basis are wholly inadequate to correct the egregious violations of the antitrust laws by Microsoft over the years but rather give Microsoft license to keep on bullying its way through the computer software markets without fear of any consequences or effective control by the government.

I think that the only way to level the playing field in computer software is to force Gates and Co. to establish open Operating System interface standards so that anyone with a better piece of software can competitively interface with the Windows OS and compete with Microsoft produced appplication SW of all types (Productivity, internet browsers, et. al.). Additionally, Microsoft applications of all types should not be given unfair advantages. The best way to do this is to sever and establish a fireway between the OS and Application SW divisions of Microsoft. In addition, there should be a special master appointed by the court of jurisdiction to monitor and bring to the courts' attention any further efforts on Microsoft's part to subvert these approachs to free and open competition.

For years, consumers have paid outrageous sums for half baked upgrades of MS software and thereby lined Microsofts corporate treasury and Bill Gates' pockets. With the findings of their guilt alread in the bag, it is time for DOJ to step up to the plate and follow through with real remedies rather than the proposed puny ''settlement solutions'' that will solve nothing. Please don't let the country down. Please restore competition to the PC software market.

Sincerely,
Irving W Halland
Saratoga CA

MTC–00004840

From: Jerome Krough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:29am
Subject: ms—v—U.S. Settlement

The current settlement between the DOJ and microsoft is unsatisfactory in it's present state. I fail to see anywhere in the settlement where microsoft is being punished for their activities, in fact microsoft is being rewarded for conducting business that is at the very least detrimental to consumers and the tech industry as a whole. In short, I decide how I use MY computer and neither bill gates nor microsoft will dictate to me what software or hardware I use.

MTC–00004841

From: Mike Riley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:30am
Subject: a global tragedy

I wish someone in a position of power would stand up to Microsoft ''quit being such

winnies''! I am a computer engineer with over 15 years experience; I make a living fixing the so called innovative software that microsoft hacks together; I would much rather be out installing new systems and networks that all ways fixing billy's trash. I use Linux on all of our servers because it is better; I don't have to call anyone if it were ever to break I can just look completely under the hood and fix it; but Linux rarely brakes; I have servers that have been running non-stop for 3 years never a problem and never need to be shut down.

here are some facts that I have not heard brought up in the case against microsoft.

microsoft is to big even for you politicians; and he is just getting bigger! you better stop him now or it will be to late!

Microsoft needs to be split up in to 3 separate companies just like the just said; this would spur an enormous amount of new startup companies to produce better programs for Windows and Linux because for once in 10 years it would be an even playing field and millions of new faces would be in the race to compete in software development.

I have more I will send later gota run; so I can pay my taxes! LOL :)

MTC–00004842

From: sydneymat@netscape.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:43am
Subject: About the proposal

To the US Department of Justice,

In regards to the settlement by Microsoft, it would be a great idea to transfer the 'money' as was said into something tangible and of worth to the school's of the United States.

An example comes to mind in regards to Red Hat's proposal (http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/011120/202744_1.html) but I think it would be much more sensible to give the money to the nations #1 provider of eductation hardware and software, Apple Computers. The solution is simple, buy the required number of computers from Apple to reach that figure of money and then distribute them all. There are many good reasons to do this:

-Apple provide the best user experience
-Apple have been a leader in education for basically its known existance
-Apple provide a quality solution to any problem with OS and app's built in
-Office for Mac can be distributed at no real charge to the buyers of the new Mac's
-Microsoft does not solidify its position in anything but the office suite market

This is a truly reasonable response to the dilema and would be appreciated by all.

Regards,
Mat

MTC–00004843

From: Olie Echevarria
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 3:51am
Subject: Against DOJ-Microsoft agreement

To whom it may concern,

As an American, I am now executing my right to free speech and opinion. This opinion is in regards to agreement between Microsoft Corporation, the DOJ and 9 of the 18 states that are suing Microsoft. I regret to inform you that the current agreement that was reached does not go far enough in stopping Microsoft's current behavior. Me, myself, a web developer, and internet user can tell you that there are serious flaws that DOES allow Microsoft to keep its current behavior. Microsoft's proposal is by passing the whole issue why there was a litigation in the first place. They are proposing $1 Billion dollar donation to schools.

My second issue is, why hasn't Bill Gates and any of his associates who testified, under oath been charged with perjury and contempt of court and falsifying evidence(ie, Professor Felton's computer program that seperates the browser from the Operating System)? I urge the courts to please address these issues. Microsoft because of it's financial and corporate status in the United States of America should have no bearing or influence whatsoever!

For example, the agreement fails to address fully the browser issue, the whole reason why the case started. Users will still not be able to have a choice on what browser they will want to use. As a former PC user, I can tell you that there is no choice on what I can use for a browser, except ONE, Internet Explorer, of which I consider a inferior product compared to Netscape, Opera, Mozilla, etc. Try going to Circuit City or CompUSA and ask for a PC with Netscape or Opera preloaded, I can attest to you that you will not find ANY, only Internet Explorer! Yet Microsoft will tell you they are all for competition and choice, but only their choice and terms not yours, the consumer. If they are for choice and competition, then I urge you to force them to allow OEMs to include rival software that will compete based on technical merits and not marketing merits.

Secondly, my second argument comes from their behavior in the market place in terms of their End User License Agreement. According to their ''EULA,'' their software is deemed: ''As is'' meaning if their software blows up your machine, they are not liable to damages. I urge the courts to have Microsoft modify their EULA so that if a consumer who buys a PC and DOES NOT want or to use the Microsoft OS, that they be allowed to return the software to Microsoft and as a result, the consumer be allowed to obtain a full refund based on the full market retail price of the Microsoft software bundled/included.

Third, I would have them open up their source code to Internet Explorer, force Microsoft to license their Office suite to 5 platforms and not two(Windows and Macintosh). Lastly, have them modify the EULA so that includes a clause that holds Microsoft liable for ANY security related defects in their software that they tout as ''the most secure'' ever. As of right, their software is labled as, ''As is.'' Microsoft has a history of telling the public their software is secure and robust and when it comes to enterprise level computing, they fail in that arena.

I urge you, the courts to review their proposal and I urge the courts to find another solution since the current proposal does not go far enough to even come close to finding the correct remedy to impose on Microsoft. With the opinions states above, I urge the courts to look my remedy objectively and I hope that my proposal is good.

Thank you,
Your fellow countrymen,
Orlando Echevarria

MTC–00004844

From: Betty Whitaker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 8:25am
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

I would like to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement from my perspective as a U.S. citizen and a consumer. I am not a lawyer, so I have difficulty reading the legalese you asked that I read before submitting my comments, however I do know justice when I see it; and I do not see it in the proposed settlement. I do, however, know what I have seen happen over the last few years; and it is from this knowledge that I make my comments.

First, as a law abiding citizen I am outraged that although our court system has judged Microsoft to be a monoply, the Department of Justice is effectively negating that judgement by not requiring Microsoft to quit the behavior for which I understand it was judged to be a monopoly. I don't know who is in whose pocket; but our courts are being made a mockery of by this proposed settlement. There is a clear distinction between an operating system and the programs that run on it. By bundling programs with their operating system, Microsoft is gaining a clear advantage over competitors to their programs just by having Microsoft's programs already installed on consumers computers. Many people will look no farther for programs just because they already have one installed. This gives Microsoft a clear advantage over companies with competing browsers, music players, office suites, etc. This is monopolistic behavior; and must be stopped to be an effective remedy. The only possible just remedy is to split Microsoft into two companies, the operating system and the programs that run on the operating system, both of which must compete for market share. Second, as a consumer I am incensed that I will continue to be forced to pay for programs that I do not use just to purchase an operating system. Microsoft is not providing me with anything I want with their bundled programs. All they are doing is taking up space on my hard drive. I want to be able to determine for myself which programs I want to use for what; and I want to be sure that I get the best program for my money. That is becoming increasingly difficult for me to do. Remember the old adage ''Jack of all trades, master of none.''? That is what is happening to Microsoft today. Even their operating system is getting worse instead of better in some ways, bloated and a resource hog, with worse and worse security holes. Nobody can be all things to all people. I want the best buy for my money; and Microsoft's bundled programs are not the best that I can get. However, they will soon become all that I can get if Microsoft is not forced to compete for market share fairly. All I want from Microsoft is an operating system. Then if they make a better program to run on it I will buy their program, otherwise I will use a competitor's program. That is what I have been doing from the day I bought my

first computer; and that is what I want to continue to be allowed to do.

Thank you for reading my opinions on this matter.

Sincerely,
Betty Whitaker
whitak35@swbell.net

MTC–00004845

From: Ramsey G. Brenner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 10:18am
Subject: Recent security flaw (Public Comment)

The recent Windows XP security flaw demonstrates how destructive Microsft is to consumers. They knowingly witheld important information about a very destructive vunerability for 5 weeks while at the same time telling consumers that Windows XP was secure. They knew it was a lie but did not tell anyone because they did not want to negatively affect their sales. Additionally, MS has added new ''features'' that force consumers to upgrade their product every 3 years (or after every 3 installs (which ever is shorter)) after they have already paid MS hundreds of dollars to use their product. MS has also started to make all their older products unsupported, thereby forcing consumers to upgrade to Windows XP even if they have no need to.

Microsft has shown they do not care about the law; taking the attitude that it applies to everyone but them. They have shown that they do not care about thier customers. The only thing that it appears they care about is taking our money.

When a company cares more about money than the quality of their product and their customers, they deserve to be punished. Don't let Microsoft off the hook again; they will never learn.

MTC–00004846

From: Brad Schmitcke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 10:20am
Subject: Microsoft Case

As a comsumer, a citizen, and a registered voter, I am appalled at the settlement that has been proposed for Microsoft's anti-trust case. Bill Gates should spend time in prison like anyone else who would submit false evidence to a federal court. There are so many specific points that I cannot go into all of them here.

However, it is clear that MS is not getting the punishment is deserves. They are a law breaking monopoly. Their CEO is a cheater. Allowing MS to merely donate one billion dollars in software that it develops and valuates is like telling a thief he can pay one victim with the money he has raised from stealing from others. Actually, it would be more like telling a thief that he can pay on victim with the profits he has made on the sale of property he has stolen from other victims.

Microsoft would not have reached it's current financial level if it hadn't done some very illegal and unscrupulous things. Microsoft has been found guilty in a Federal Court. How much is Bill Gates worth now? How much was he worth before he broke the law. He should be reduced to his former shadow and even be taken down a notch from there. If I did some of the things that Bill Gates and MS had done, and if I were prosecuted and convicted, I would have nothing and I would be in prison. What is the difference between Bill Gates and me in this land of equality? Does the amount of money a person has determine their level of equality before the law? In theory, no. In practice, it seems to be YES!!

Well, just as a murderer cannot collect life insurance on someone he has killed, MS should not be allowed to keep money that was obtained through illegal practices. Furthermore, they should not be rewarded by being allowed to penetrate the educational market as a ''punishment''. Give Bill Gates what he deserves. He deserves to be punished, not rewarded with another avenue in which to unfairly dominate a market.

Regards,
Bradley D. Schmitcke
Bellingham, WA 98226

MTC–00004847

From: kevin lyda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 10:06am
Subject: public comment...

The anti-trust settlement as currently described will do nothing to curb Microsofts monopolistic behaviour. Even today i read about the Microsoft UPNP security flaw, I also note that UPNP itself is a tool Microsoft is using to extend its monopoly. Even correctly implemented, the design of UPNP looks suspect from a security viewpoint, but as time goes on firewalls and NAT routers are going to need to run UPNP in order to use certain Microsoft services.

In other words UPNP is being used to extend Microsoft's dominance on the desktop to the firewall arena.

The fact is that if the current situation continues, the hitech field will be held back and even Microsoft will eventually be hurt by its monopoly position. This settlement must do more to push Microsoft away from this path.

Microsoft should be forced to openly describe file formats and network protocols that it uses. It should also be forced to port its most popular desktop applications to other platforms (linux and solaris). In addition as part of its cash settlement to schools, it's offering software. This is cynical to the extreme. The offer made by RedHat to give away its software to schools and have Microsoft just donate computers would do much more for schools, and better address Microsoft's monopoly.

Thanks,
Kevin Lyda
US citizen
Ballinvoher
Caherlistrane
Co. Galway
Ireland
kevin@suberic.net gpg or pgp encrypted mail is preferred. my
fork()'ed on 37058400 public key is available at:
meatspace place: orbit http://suberic.net/kevin/gpg.roo.public.txt
http://suberic.net/kevin

MTC–00004848

From: Ian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 10:48am
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Proceedings

I am writing this to show my disheartenment at the United States Government over the 'slap on the wrist' that they gave the Microsoft Corporation in the latest anti-trust lawsuit. It is utterly fascinating that the you are looking into these flaws for the difficulty exploits could cause people, after basically letting M$ off the hook in the monopoly punishment phase. This is another reason why monopoly for a universally adopted and used O/S is bad. I use Microsoft's Products at home, work, and at school; however, I also use a free operating system, 'linux' at home, work, and school—I like knowing that my operating system is safe...I can look at the source code, and say, ''Hey, wait, that's not supposed to be in there,'' take it out, and then make another operating system. I feel that Microsoft should be punished as follows:

—They make the source code available (after an NDA) to any interested parties
—They drop the copyright on all older versions of their software (Software that hasn't been made in 5 years should be released under the public domain without support)
—They disallow the .NET fiasco that is currently going on now.

Thank you for your time, and for letting my participate in a part of these proceedings.

Ian Wilson
P.O. Box 304
Ada, Ohio 45810–0304

-From RFC 1925: ''(3) With sufficient thrust, pigs fly just fine. However, this is not necessarily a good idea. It is hard to be sure where they are going to land, and it could be dangerous sitting under them as they fly overhead.''

MTC–00004849

From: Mike Haji-Sheikh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 11:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

I would like to encourage you to rethink the settlement with MS. One disturbing section would allow Microsoft to withhold code to non-profit orginizations such as SAMBA.org. This would effectively allow MS to monopolize the business server business. as quoted from Kringly;

''Section III(J)(2) contains some very strong language against not-for-profits. Specifically, the language says that it need not describe nor license API, Documentation, or Communications Protocols affecting authentication and authorization to companies that don't meet Microsoft's criteria as a business: ''...(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, ...''

This is a ludicrous section—effectively using the DoJ to firm up it's monopoly since

Microsofts biggest competitor depends on non profits. This competitor is another non-profit called LINUX which has become very important in the world of advanced science and engineering. The LINUX operating system has given the scientific world a low cost way of building supercomputers using clustering. It is imperative that the LINUX operating system is not impacted negatively by the DoJ. The development of new medicines, semiconductors, aircraft and transportation will depend more and more on LINUX based systems. This effective gutting will make it difficult for the LINUX operating system to thrive in a Microsoft world.

Please include my comments as a non-computer professional and scientist

Dr. Michael James Haji-Sheikh, PhD

Sr. Principle Development Engineer, Honeywell's Embedded Systems

MTC–00004850

From: Paul Venezia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 11:10am
Subject: Microsoft = bad for the world

To put it simply, this trial and ''settlement'' is a farce. Microsoft is trying to do to the federal government what it's done to countless competitors over the years. This company is ruthless, powerful, wealthy and without conscience. You cannot let this continue, period. A world with a tame Microsoft would be the only way to ensure the growth, stability and security of the Internet, commerce, the economy, and the country. My terms are strong and true.

Do not let them get away with corporate rape and murder any longer. Do not let them run roughshod over hapless consumers. DO NOT LET THEM WIN.

Paul Venezia

US Citizen

MTC–00004851

From: Jezmo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am a little ashamed of the proposal set out for Microsoft. I don't care if I have to go back to living in the stone ages, a convicted entity CAN NOT be let off just because it will upset the economy. One analogy would be to say if I punish a killerm it will hurt that individual's loved ones. Justice MUST BE SERVED regardless of the consequences of those actions. Please rethink your your remedies! A very concerned CITIZEN.

P.S. I am a Microsoft user and certainly do not want see them put out of business, however there is better answer than the one proposed!

MTC–00004852

From: Ronald Large
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I am a Microsoft product user, a user of Quicken (Intuit), and use software by many other developers. I started using home computers in 1981 (that is eighty-one, 20 years ago).

Microsoft has not harmed the consumer. On the contrary, Microsoft has immeasurably helped the consumer. We now have an unlimited choice of software. And Microsoft isn't really a monopoly: if I wanted to run Mac OS10 I could buy a Mac and do so. Or if I want to use Linus I can get it free and run it on any of my computers! Actually I really don't care which operating system I use as long as it will run my current software and future software will be developed for it.

I once paid $4,000 for a DEC computer using a DEC operating system. In all of Southern California there were only 2 stores selling software for that operating system, and there was only 1 wordprocessor for it! At that time Egghead Computer and numerous other stores were selling software written for IBM/MS DOS. DOS eventually dominated the market and became the operating system of choice for software developers (larger market for their product). This simplified things and expanded our choices of software.

As a California resident I am troubled by our Attorney General's stance on this issue. I assure that if Microsoft were located in Silicon Valley instead of Washington he would not be pursuing this suit.

California's interest in this case is simply to help Sun Microsystems, Oracle and other California firms do what they cannot do themselves: outsell Microsoft in the marketplace.

Please settle the suit as agreed to by microsoft and most of the states.

Ronald J Large
400 Susana Avenue
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310.316.2075

MTC–00004854

From: Ronny Ong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree that the proposed settlement is an acceptable way to resolve the antitrust action against Microsoft Corporation. The settlement obtains timely and adequate protection for consumers, but does not grant unjustified advantage to Microsoft competitors. I believe that the existing antitrust laws are fully applicable in today's technological world. At the same time, the monopoly perceived to be held by Microsoft is clearly different than traditional abusive monopolies.

In a monopoly held by a utility, consumers are forced to purchase the product from the utility on an ongoing basis, month after month. The only choice is to do without the product. In the case of consumers who purchased Windows 95, they remain free to use that product today without ever having paid additional money to Microsoft. Even if we assume that the direct competition to Windows (e.g. BeOS, OS/2, Linux, Solaris, Unix, etc.) are irrelevant, consumers are not forced in any way to upgrade to newer versions of Windows unless they desire the additional benefits of the newer versions. To prevent Microsoft from being able to add features to its operating system in order to compete for those upgrades would be a misuse of regulatory and judicial power.

If we survey all manner of industries and product categories outside personal computer software, there are many manufacturers permitted to favor their own add-ons over those provided by aftermarket suppliers, even when those manufacturers have an overwhelming share of the market. Microsoft makes a tremendous amount of technical information available to Independent Software Vendors (ISVs) on a very timely basis, and the size of the Windows marketplace (which has been used to illustrate Microsoft's monopoly position) is truly a result of how open a platform Windows has been.

This nation is obligated to protect equal opportunity but not to impose equality where not deserved. An extraordinary volume of dissention is being generated by those who have failed to compete successfully with Microsoft in the free market, as well as a relatively small number of disgruntled and greedy consumers. Rational consideration, however, cannot conclude that ongoing litigation serves any purpose besides boosting the self-importance of a few parties and their attorneys. Prompt settlement with Microsoft is in the public good.

Regards,
Ronny Ong
5801 Hilton Head Dr
Garland, TX 75044–4964
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00004855

From: Greg Mumm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 3:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I write this email to express my displeasure over the absence of any meaningful punishment against Microsoft.

The recent ruling is a symbolic slap on the wrist that will harm competition and further degrade the economy.

As a software engineer I have had the advantage of observing the last decade and half with a depth and breadth of understanding most do not experience.

Two misconceptions exist about Microsoft. First is that they are innovative and second that they compete fairly. Microsoft is not innovative and never has been. Four examples follow.

First, since the 1970's UNIX-based computers have allowed file names of virtually any size. While other operating systems like Novell allowed long file names, Microsoft operating systems didn't until late in 1995. Even though Microsoft operating systems contained this glaring handicap, consumers continued to purchase them in favor of those systems with superior features.

Secondly, while many operating systems used more powerful 32-bit instructions in the 1980s and early 1990s, Microsoft continued to use the less powerful 16 and 8 bit instructions. Use of this less powerful instruction set wasn't completely abandoned until Windows NT was shipped, 6 to 8 years after other operating system began using them—an eternity in the high technology industry. If the market place was competitive, wouldn't customers consider purchasing the more powerful of two operating systems? They generally didn't. Sales of Windows 3.1 and Windows 95 soared.

Third, in the 1980s operating systems frequently included graphical interfaces. This

user-friendly feature was included with the operating systems in the Apple Macintosh, UNIX and the Commodore Amiga. Yet consumers waited many years until Microsoft released Windows rather than purchasing a competitor's operating system containing this desirable feature.

Fourth, an example about Microsoft inferior compiler products. Compiler technology is important because these utilities allow programmers to write applications for a particular operating system. During the late 1980's and early to mid 90's there were many different compilers available from several vendors. In particular, the company Borland produced a tool that was smaller, faster and more robust than Microsoft's tool. Once again consumers choose the Microsoft product overwhelmingly over the competitors product. A few programmers even created a compiler that was given away for free that couldn't compete with the Microsoft compiler. Why would consumers pick the Microsoft product over a more innovative product?

Finally, there is the issue of quality. While Linux and other UNIX systems frequently run for months or years without problems, it's often difficult to get a Microsoft operating system to run all day without crashing. Still, the consumers overwhelmingly choose Microsoft as the operating system of choice, despite it's legendary unreliability. In these cases, and others, the products offered by Microsoft are less innovative, less powerful, harder to use and more unreliable than the products offered by it's competitors.

Microsoft has been very abusive in it's desire to make money as the following four examples illustrate.

First, it's a matter of fact that Microsoft applications like Word and Excel used undocumented features of the Microsoft operating systems they ran under. It wasn't until this practice was widely publicized that Microsoft produced documentation for it's competitors to use. The operating system is like a socket, and applications like Access and Word are the technical equivalent of the light bulb. Microsoft owns both.

The second example concerns malicious code created by Microsoft. The code was placed into Microsoft programs and would display strange messages when running on a non-Microsoft operating system. The phony messages weren't a side-effect, they were the entire purpose of the code modules. In this example, Microsoft's competitor is now out of business.

Third, Microsoft tried to stop the acceptance of Java. Java is an OS-independent language created by Microsoft's rival, Sun Microsystems. Microsoft did not adopt the language and in fact developed a similar one which only runs on Microsoft operating systems. In fact upgrading your Microsoft browser will cause all traces of the Java language to disappear silently from your computer.

Finally, upgrading browser versions causes other problems. Updating a Microsoft browser disables the Netscape plug-in feature. This open-ended feature has been around as long as the Web, but a recent installation quietly removes it in place of a Microsoft-only solution. In conclusion, Microsoft is not, nor has ever been, innovative. What they have been is an overly aggressive monopoly. Monopolies are bad for everyone because they take a bigger piece of the economic pie than they are entitled to. It is a travesty of justice to let Microsoft's abusive, monopolistic behavior continue unabated for this long. The current ruling does nothing to solve the problem.

Sincerely,

Greg Mumm

MTC–00004856

From: Michael Ferguson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 7:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Since the U.S. government owns so many computers, it should be required to have a computer of another operating system for every computer it owns with the Microsoft operating system. So for each Microsoft type computer the government should be required to use one linux computer, one apple computer, one atari computer, one BeOs computer, one unix computer, etc. This way the government won't be contributing to and exacerbating Microsoft's dominance in the computer industry.

Michael Ferguson

Pelican, Alaska

MTC–00004857

From: JRWORRELL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 8:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Terms

Dear DOJ Pussycats:

The settlement with Microsoft for it's proven monopolistic practices is a sham. For several years after Microsoft gave me a free copy of one of their programs I was under the Microsoft spell. Then I began to wake up to the fact that some other very good software was beginning to dissapear from the market and that whether I liked the newer Microsoft offerings or not, which I often did not, I no longer had a choice. So, I was delighted when the DOJ took Microsoft to task for the way they were using their monopoly status to gobble up or destroy competitive internet access tools. I also hoped they would get whacked for the tactics they had used to wipe out other graphic user interfaces (including the software that ran on them) in order to establish the Windows monopoly.

I can tell you it was heartning when the court ruled against Microsoft...but, I can't tell you how sick it made me when you guys caved when it came time to access penalties and establish some rules with teeth to prevent more of the same from happening in the future. Why waste the taxpayers money on a fight, win it and then roll over an play dead? I am almost seventy and I don't have much to show for my working life but I still have my self respect for not caving in when the political winds called for something other than marshmallow gonads.

How about a second issue? For a few years there was hope for competitive, alternative software after Corel bought the Word Perfect and Quatro Pro products which Microsoft had almost killed. I was delighted because Corel had long been beating Microsoft's butt in the graphics area and I felt that this might provide some welcome competition. I began to use the Corel alternatives and was pleased with the results. Corel even began to make a position in Linux the alternative, open source operating system that dared to challenge Gates and company.

Then right in the midst of the antitrust proceedings guess who bought Corel? Now Microsoft has taken over the number one graphics product they could never come close to let alone equal and almost the last if not the last of the surviving office suites, not to mention the possibility of getting a foot in the door to muddy up the Unix/Linux products that Corel was into. Not a whimper from any DOJ pussycats? Talk about a slap in the face of justice and fair play.

Now about the settlement itself. What kind of a deal is it to punish someone by giving them the biggest marketing opportunity of the ages. Let them give free software to thousands of future buyers who know little or nothing about the software marketplace and who may never have a chance to see, use and compare a competive product? All it does is serve to create a bigger more dominating monopoly. Doesn't anyone at DOJ have the integrity and guts to stand up to the politicians who have inspired this sham? Probably not!

Well, at best I can hope that someone read enough of this to classify it as an uniquivocal and utterly damming condemnation of the settlement and those who have allowed it to happen after plainly whomping the crap out of Microsoft in court. You deserve more and we, the American public deserve more.

B.W.

MTC–00004858

From: Peter Leckie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/22/01 11:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the poing microsoft would have more competition if other operating systems were able to execute there cope The program ''Wine'' for linux is such a program But is only is alpha stage and needs a lote of work But mainly it needs help from Microsoft, documentation on all the api's so they can be reproduced to allow wine to run windows programs as well as windows does. But will Microsoft allow this there is plenty of documentation on how to use there api's so software developers can produce microsoft code so shouldn't microsoft release details on how to reproduce there api's.

If Wine could run 100% of windows programs it would give people the choice of either Windows or Linux, giving people a choice of what they use, which we don't have at the moment.

this is a very bad situation we are in now and someone should put a stop to it.

Yours truly Peter Leckie

MTC–00004859

From: svedvik@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 6:25am
Subject: this is the lightest 'punishment' I have ever seen

I can honestly understand how the DoJ would allow Microsoft to remain a single

company. What I can't understand is why anyone would believe that this is going far enough. I think that Microsoft should be required to release all of it's proprietary file formats to competitors, so there is a real competitor to Microsoft Office. Currently no one without MS Office can create a MS-Office Document. Since businesses all use MS Office, everyone had to use MS Office to create compatibility. That is wrong, and should be put to a stop immediately.

MTC–00004860

From: Jerry Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 9:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I have been in the Computer Industry for over 27 years. And I would like to say a few words about the Microsoft/DOJ Settlement. I believe that the Settlement does very little to curb Microsoft's maintenance of their illegal monopoly. Microsoft will basically be doing business as usual, and even though the DOJ did a reasonably good job of amassing the evidence leading up to the monopolist being found guilty. It just appears that during the penalty phase (this IS the penalty phase is it not?), everyone lost sight of the fact that Microsoft is guilty. Everyone apparently wants to get it over with rather than really restore competition to the software industry.

I urge you to go on to incorporate the other nine states proposal. It goes a lot further in trying to restore competition.

Jerry F. Davis

Sr. Computer Programmer.

Try Linux, the Operating System which values your freedom. Not the Outlaw Microsoft, which values their bottom line.

MTC–00004861

From: root@puma.awmach.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 9:30am
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

What a cop out.

Of my computers, I have one which runs Microsoft 98SE as its operating system. Yet I had to indirectly pay for Microsoft operating system licenses when I bought the others. That has been going on for years.

The courts found them to be a monoply. As punishment, you are giving them direct access to one of the few markets they don't dominate—schools. What a crock.

My biggest fear as a software developer is that they will decide to put their foot in the door of the market I sell products in. They are trying already, but the experience most of our customers have with their bug ridden security hole dominated O/Ss that you have to reboot every week has kept them from wanting to put Microsoft O/Ss in the remote computer end of it (although it is just about impossible to sell our host products anymore).

Whining that we can't compete? Partially. But our company doesn't have this lucrative arrangement with most of the free world's computer producers that if the free world buys a product from those companies (that we have nothing to do with producing ourselves), the free world has to give us money indirectly anyway—just on the chance that they might use our product someday. What a sweet deal! Now the DOJ is going to roll over and reward that! Any market that Microsoft wants to go after they can stomp on. Their first entry into the market may be crap, but since they have this unending stream of money coming in—completely unrelated to the product they are going after, they can throw tons of money at any problem, hire or buy up as many companies they need—and eventually after 5 years or so, have some product that isn't completely unreliable. Their programmers have better access to the O/S than any outsider ever will have (which you're also rolling over on) both to suggest features beneficial to their product and to get help in coding for the O/S.

Since they can bundle their crappy products with their buggy O/S products right from the version 1.0 level, it is an extreme disincentive for people to even try out anyone else's products. They spend enough time learning and trying to get the 1.0 level product working that they have a time and frequently a data investment in the product that comes essentially free with the O/S. By that time, they figure that version 2.0 will be available soon, so even if they aren't happy with the product, they aren't going to spend their own money to try out something else. So even if there is a better product out there, it doesn't get a chance 80% of the time (or higher). By bundling this information into suites (or bundling IE with the O/S as another example) it makes it harder for standalone products to compete.

From the programming standpoint—you have reasonably small companies trying to innovate even on Microsoft O/Ss, that can't keep up with their rapid progression of operating systems with multiple interfaces. To stay approved as being Microsoft logo careers, you have to stay associated with the latest O/S. Otherwise you can't play. Yet as a small company, you don't have the resources to learn everything that is on the DVD–ROM of new Microsoft avalanches every few months. So, that's another way they win. 3.1, 95, 98, 98SE, NT, ME, 2000, XP, ...—we're a big company with a lot of people working for us—let's change things every year—make sure we only sell the latest O/S on the new computers (pre-installed so people don't have much of a choice), change things enough every couple of years that older products don't work quite right on the new stuff—and make sure that our unending flow of money gets our suites updated to work with the latest so we always have a nice integrated moving target for everyone else to hit. Wherever possible, get our products to pop up first on the list of options—if possible, keep the competitors products from even coming up as an option, and if we get extremely lucky (which seems to happen a lot more often than it should) figure out how the competitors products are working and find out how to disable them (or worse—just make a part of them not work right which leads people to think that the other product is faulty) when we install our own products. Well, I've ranted enough. But letting Microsoft off is just plain wrong in the first place, and letting them into the schools (rewarding them for their monopolistic behaviour of the last decades) really stinks.

William Haller Webservant awmach.org alpha-omega mach

MTC–00004862

From: Don Jerman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 10:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Thank you for your consideration of these comments on the proposed settlement of United States v. Microsoft.

I am a database administrator with more than 12 years in professional service to the State of North Carolina. I have worked in many capacities within our IT organization and I have worked with Microsoft operating system products for the majority of my career. I find that the settlement is probably too lenient to be in the public interest, but with a little strengthening in specific areas, it may serve. Here are the points of weakness that I would like to see addressed, if this settlement is to be entered.

In abstract, the main problem is that the settlement does not protect the consumer, but protects only businesses that consume Microsoft products. Particularly, that an assumption is made that only viable businesses which publish software have a valid interest in API's and communication protocols.

While I recognize that the settlement is the product of a negotiation, it should be noted that Microsoft has been found guilty of violations of the law, and that any settlement must adequately limit their ability to continue to restrain their competitors in an unfair manner. I submit, further, that constraining the ability of private citizens to become competitors falls into this category. Below, I comment on individual sections and paragraphs, preceeding the comments with the reference to the relevant section and paragraph of the Proposed Final Judgment. I refer you especially to the comments regarding III,J, as in my opinion they form a critical weakness in the document, apparently founded on an incorrect appreciation of the nature of computer security. Here are my comments by section and paragraph:

III,A

Although the settlement requires two warnings before termination of an agreement, and allows instant termination of the agreement upon the third, it does not require that the three warnings be given in good faith, nor does it provide a mechanism for timely review of the claims, merely a 30-day period for remedy by the OEM. Microsoft can use this to stop any agreement it pleases simply by making spurious claims.

III,B,3

The limits on size and appearance of a middleware user interface are not consistent with III,B,1 and III,B,2, and do not serve an obvious purpose other than to allow Microsoft to limit the options of its competitors. The limitations permit Microsoft to minimize their competitors' ability to innovate in this area without regard to the functionality their competitors may be attempting to provide. These limits should be struck from the settlement, and replaced with language similar to III,B,2, which says that differences shall not impact the usability of the operating system.

III,I

For the purpose of licensing or publishing API's and Communications Protocols, ''Third Parties'' described in III,E and III,I should be construed to be anyone permitted by III,J,2(a), that is, anyone who ''has no history of software counterfeiting or piracy or willful violation of intellectual property rights'' Businesses are not the only providers of software and services, and with respect to these products, failure to license is failure to permit competition. This is one of the core weaknesses of this document, in my opinion, because as a State agency my organization is none of the entities named, yet we have used Microsoft APIs and communications protocols to build our software.

III,J,1

This is one of the main weaknesses in the document. III,J,1(a) should be limited to ''keys, authorization tokens and enforcement criteria'' only, but the API's and Communications Protocols should not be withholdable. Here is my analysis: Observe that ''secret'' bugs, APIs and protocols have been compromised regularly by virus-writers in recent years.

For instance Thai hackers have hacked the anti-piracy features of Windows XP, presumably without API documents:

http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/O,4586,5099511,00.html

There is no reasonable expectation that failure to provide documentation will prevent insecure use of these APIs by those who want to abuse them. If the code is published in machine-readable form (as it must be, to be used), then those who do not follow rules will be able to read it and use it, whether a formal API is published or not. Anything readable by a machine is readable by some people, and those people can write their findings in documented form for less-skilled people to use.

Keys, tokens and enforcement criteria are legitimate secrets that must be kept secret to be effective. However, documentation of methods, APIs and communications protocols are useful to those who wish to interact with the system. They are not required to abuse the system, as reverse-engineering will yeild the needed information. But they are required to make legitimate use of the system, as reverse engineering of these methods, APIs and protocols is prohibited by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, since they may be used to secure access to copyrighted materials. Since the abuse of these systems is likely to be an offense anyway, it its not necessary to restrict the information required for legitimate use.

Allowing Microsoft to keep these items a secret permits them to have an advantage over their legitimate competitors, without significantly retarding the development of attacks against Microsoft systems.

I refer the reader to these excellent discussion of whether secrecy about methods and flaws is desirable or not:

http://www.computerworld.com/storyba/0%2c4125%2cNAV47—STO65969%2c00.html

http://www.counterpane.com/crypto-gram-0111.html

Essentially, they take the position that the vulnerabilities in a system exist whether or not the documentation is published, and will be discovered and exploited whether or not documentation is forthcoming.

My conclusion is, therefore, that non-publication merely prevents competition, not abuse. Furthermore that publication can lead to informed decisions, error detection, and intelligent application of precautionary measures, rather than discovery-by-abuse as we've seen before. III,J,2

This is another of the main weaknesses of the document III,J,2(a) is perfectly reasonable, and should be left alone. III,J,2(b) prohibits entities from reviewing the documentation to discover if they have a need for it. As such, and given the arguments under III,J,1 above, III,J,2(b) should be struck from the document. Furthermore, the word Business offers a ''handle'' for III,J,2(c), to which I object below. The word should be struck if this paragraph is allowed to stand.

III,J,2(c) allows Microsoft to prohibit anyone who is not a Business, by whatever criteria they decide, from accessing these API's. I have argued under III,J,1 above that such prohibition is not requried, and I now argue that it is harmful to the consumer. If these API's and protocols are required to interact with Microsoft servers, then preventing the private consumer from doing so prevents their contribution to non-commercial entities, and their full use of the product. There is no justification offered why only businesses, and only viable businesses, should have this access. In any case, permitting Microsoft (and not, say, the TC or USDOJ) to provide the criteria at their sole discretion is absolutely ludicrous!

If anything, the settlement should be forcing more disclosure, and should include all end-users of Microsoft platforms as potential licensees. Furthermore for documentation licenses, the standard for reasonable charges should be related closely to the cost of any required redaction and distribution, as presumably Microsoft needs to produce the documentation for its own use. III,J,2(d) permits Microsoft to charge any price from anyone using one of these API's, for and unspecified testing procedure. Again, this permits Microsoft to restrain private citizens, nonprofits and businesses with relatively little capital from producing products that might compete with Microsoft products. In my analysis:

1. If the API or protocol is secure, then no product could possibly corrupt or violate the server systems by using it (after all it's perfectly reasonable for the server to refuse any request that would violate security).

2. This test permits Microsoft to analyze competing products prior to release—a directly anticompetetive act! It offers prior knowledge and time to act to Microsoft whenever a competitor wishes to release an innovative product.

3. Reliability and security testing now resides with the end-user. End users such as my employer have frequently found that Microsoft's testing of its own products leaves much to be desired. What assurance does Microsoft offer that their testing of these third party products will be more useful? This test will not reduce the burden on the end-user, but may reduce their perception of the potential risk (without really reducing the risk), resulting in a less secure world.

4. If, through some extraordinarily poor judgement on the part of the plaintiffs, this paragraph is allowed to stand, then Microsoft should be held liable for subsequent failures of security for any products surviving this test, and furthermore, the TC should be available for appeal should Microsoft fail to approve any competitor's product. Absence of that language makes this paragraph an invitation to restrain competition! In short, if Microsoft is to become a mandatory testing body, they should be unable to disclaim liability for damages caused by failure of their product and the products they test.

5. If the tests are to be performed, a third party should perform the tests, and all relevant Microsoft products should similarly endure the tests and be approved or rejected based on the same criteria that are applied to their competitors. Finally, the competitors must be able to appeal to the TC any discrepancies between the provided documentation and the test results. I strongly recommend that III,J,2(b,c,d) be struck entirely, or radically altered to provide a real opportunity to all consumers (including non-commercial consumers) to license these materials without providing anticompetetive advantages to Microsoft.

IV

With regard to section IV, my only comment is that the proceedings of the TC should be in the public record, including all documentation and communication between Microsoft, the Plaintiffs and the TC, except where the TC or the Court determines that specific data regarding authentication keys and tokens, trade secrets or future business plans should be redacted or released on a delayed schedule, to protect the viability of Microsoft's business and their business dealings. In such cases they should be redacted in a manner consistent with existing practise in disclosure of public records, so that the public can know the existence and extent of the redacted material, but not its content. It is my hope that these changes, or changes in this spirit, will be introduced to the Final Judgment. Thank you for your consideration.

MTC–00004863

From: r(u)hodg Hodgson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 10:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

I feel that the offer that Microsoft has made is a good one and that it should be excepted by all partys concerned.

Thank you; Robert Hodgson;

MTC–00004864

From: ksvm@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
RE: Reject Microsoft Settlement

Please include in the record of US v Microsoft

DATE: December 21, 2001

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to ask that you do not accept the Revised Proposed Final Judgement. It does nothing to remedy Microsoft's illegal behavior, and moreover appears to be completely written by Microsoft lawyers.

Charles James would have us believe that this is a good agreement for the United States of America. I disagree. It is worse than no agreement at all. Microsoft has adopted a corporate culture which has no respect for the law or the free society in which we live. Microsoft is unrepentant and believes itself above the law and beyond the reach of the court system. Now is the time to prove them wrong.

''AND WHEREAS, this Final Judgement does not constitute any admission by any party regarding any issue of fact or law.''

I'm not a lawyer, but this says to me that Microsoft does not, in the proposed settlement, admit any wrongdoing or illegal behavior. This seems unacceptable given that they have already been found to have a pattern of illegal behavior by both a Federal Judge and a Federal Court of Appeals. What possible justification can there be for such weak terms at this point? This is a remand only for remedy not, points of law or fact and yet Microsoft appears to be able to maintain it's legal position that it did no wrong in the Proposed Judgement. This is unacceptable. The only thing the public can surmise from these terms is that The United Sates of America is afraid of Microsoft. The United States of America is afraid to face the world's largest software maker in court, in a case they have already won, not once but twice. The United States has won both in Federal Court and on appeal by an overwhelming margin. What possible scenario of negotiations would lead to wording which allows Microsoft not only to go free without sanctions, but free without admission of an already proven pattern of illegal behavior? On it's face it appears ludicrous.

I have always had a great deal of faith in our system of government, particularly the judicial branch. This branch has not offered us perfect justice of course, it is merely one which attempts to rectify something which has gone wrong or at least to steer society in the right direction. At it's best that is all we can ask of our judicial branch.

Steer us in the right direction.

Prove to us and to Microsoft that we are equal under the law. The Revised Proposed Final Judgement is flawed. It is full of loopholes such as describing a ''Windows Operating System Product'' as ''The software code that comprises a Windows Operating System Product shall be determined by Microsoft in it's sole discretion.'' Clearly, as much of this case has revolved around whether or not browsers, media players and other similar software or middleware can be considered part of the Operating System. The few restrictions only apply to APIs, middleware and software that ''Microsoft in it's sole discretion'' doesn't consider a part of the ''Windows Operating System Product''. As they tried to prove in court that they could not separate their browser from the Windows Operating System Product, we know what Microsoft's view is on the subject even while we also know from court records that it is untrue. Given that Microsoft in this Revised Proposed Final Judgement need not heed previous court findings of fact or law they will most assuredly continue in their legal position that it is the nature of their ''Windows Operating System Product'' to add functionality ad infinitum, which expands and extends Microsoft's Windows Monopoly into any and all new markets as it pleases.

Or in section J.2.

''No provision of this Final Judgement shall: Prevent Microsoft from conditioning any license of any API, Documentation or Communications Protocol related to anti-piracy systems, anti-virus technologies, license enforcement mechanisms, authentication/authorization security, or third party intellectual property protection mechanisms of any Microsoft product to any person or entity on the requirement that the licensee: (a) has no history of software counterfeiting or piracy or willful violation of intellectual property rights, (b) has reasonable business need for the API, Documentation or Communications Protocol for a planned shipping product, (c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, (d) agrees to submit at its own expense, any computer program using such API, Documentation or Communications Protocols to third party verification, approved by Microsoft, to test for and ensure verification and compliance with Microsoft specifications for use of the API or interface, which specifications shall be related to proper operation and integrity of the systems and mechanisms identified in this paragraph.''

Microsoft, here is being given ''carte blanche'' to restrict access to protocols ostensibly being offered in other parts of the agreement. Specifically, ''reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft'', allows Microsoft, essentially in it's sole discretion the ability to be the gatekeeper of the APIs and protocols. This Judgement is worse than no Judgement at all because it is actually the building of Microsoft's next case, with the clear expectation that there will be a next case. We already know from past behavior, that Microsoft will push this language beyond the limits of crediblity in order to extend their monopoly.

In particular the wording of J.2. (c) seems directed at open-source software, the only credible long term competition to Microsoft in the Server market. If disallowed access to APIs and communications protocols used by Microsoft in PCs, Microsoft will be able to embrace and extend into the Server market. They will of course suggest that open-source is not a viable business model, in spite of the fact it is being sold by many of the largest server vendors, such as IBM, Dell, SGI and others.

The Revised Proposed Final Judgement does nothing to remedy or sanction Microsoft for past illegal behavior. Further, this agreement in effect leaves no recourse but further litigation to remedy any transgressions in the future of the few weak sanctions it contains. Microsoft is moving rapidly into financial services and banking with Passport, their hope at the least is to capture a transaction fee for every online transaction. It does not seem at all unlikely that ''Passport'' once established would then be made of plastic to replace VISA, MasterCard, Discover and American Express. What if any restrictions would the Proposed Final Judgement place on these types of behavior? None, in my estimation.

Microsoft has developed a copy protection scheme and is already deep in the process of entering the field of entertainment, media and access via MSN/ MSNBC. None of these endeavors are even approached by the wording of the Final Judgement. Microsoft clearly expects to extend it's Operating System Monopoly into media access and entertainment monopolies. XBox, for example, is tied to the MSN service. There is nothing to keep Microsoft from having the MSN service inextricably tied to Windows in future versions.

Given the nature of their Windows monopoly, Microsoft can easily integrate these services into the ''Windows Operating System Product'' and raise the price of that product even more dramatically than they already have, as well as charging businesses for access to customers. These practices will not only crush other software vendors they will rapidly crush vendors in all manner of digital commerce.

Microsoft has made no real concessions, nor have they admitted the flaws of their past behavior. They have not promised to improve their behavior in the future. If the Proposed Final Judgement stands, Microsoft will not be a better Corporate citizen. They will be worse.

Sincerely,
Michael Mirande
PO Box 441
Dufur OR 97021

MTC–00004865

From: Joel Landry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Speaking as a Canadian who has very little knowledge in interpreting law, I like what I am reading. This is the first step in breaking Microsoft's strangle hold on the computer industry. In the past, everywhere I turned, Microsoft was the ''required'' normal environment for computers. Now maybe other companies can start giving Microsoft some real competition and/or other software will hopefully work better in Windows. Although this settlement sounds nice, there is a side of this argument I have not seen though.... When you submit ''incidents'' to Microsoft for technical help for either MS Windows or Internet Explorer, they are attributed to the same Product Identifier. Now this creates a problem.... Are these 2 software programs not separate? If they are separate, why do they have the same Product Identifier when other Microsoft products are different? Internet Explorer 6 which was just released, still uses the same Product Identifier scheme.

When you purchase Windows, you get a specific number (2 or 3 I think) of ''FREE'' tech help incidents, which can be used up very easily and quickly. If you used these incident for Windows and then run into problems with Internet explorer, then you are out of luck because the PID is the same. The process to get help is a little irritating and complicated. There are only 4 ways I have found to get immediate help:

1- PAY for it. After the ''FREE'' incidents, you are supposed to pay. YA right. Pay for

Internet Explorer when it's supposed to be free.

2- Find what you are looking for in the Knowledge Base. If you are lucky, when you consider most people are not very computer tech literate.

3- Pray for one of those (Usually) irritating POPUP Window Surveys. Maybe they will reply.

4- There is an e-mail link at the bottom of the WEBRESPONSE area on the Microsoft web site. This link is ''hidden'' at the bottom of the page and is not evident. It doesn't even look like an e-mail link. All that being said.... I have been managing to get tech support from Microsoft for Internet Explorer without paying for it. The question now remains.....

Why do 2 apparently separate software packages have the same Product ID? Is this some way for Microsoft to keep everything together even when they say they are not?

MTC–00004866

From: rgr@rgristroph-austin.ath.cx@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 5:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
This is an emailed version of a letter also sent by the US Postal Service.
Robert G. Ristroph
11612 Hidden Quail
Austin, TX 78758
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Dear Ms. Hesse,

I am writing with regard to the Justice Department's proposed settlement with Microsoft. I believe that this settlement should be scrapped and completely rewritten. Most of the ''restrictions'' placed on Microsoft are already illegal; what few restrictions are left are impossible to enforce and seem designed to produce more legal disputes rather than resolve them; and the proposed enforcement mechanism is a ludicrous embarrassment. In addition to scrapping this proposed settlement, any payment or further employment of the authors should be re-evaluated in light of this idiocy.

I have read the original complaint of United States and the several States at http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f1700/1763.htm, the proposed settlement at http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm, the Competitive Impact Statement at http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm, as well as numerous other sources including the findings of fact and other documents.

My own injury by Microsoft's illegal actions comes from Microsoft's agreements with OEM's which forced my employer to pay for Windows when buying a new computer from Dell, which we had no plans to use Windows, intending it for Linux. This was supposedly addressed in a prior case to the present one, and yet to this day the same hardware without a Microsoft license has the same cost.

I wish to examine the elements of the proposed agreement item by item, and then propose an outline of an alternative settlement.

A. That Microsoft will not retaliate against OEMs for distributing non-Microsoft software. This is already prohibited by law, given Microsoft's monopoly. The proposed settlement can not consist of Microsoft agreeing to follow the law in the future; like other companies in the United States, it has to follow the law regardless of this settlement.

B. That Microsoft make public it's licensing agreements and offer the same terms to everyone. This is the only part of the proposed settlement makes sense, however, OEMs have shown in the past they were willing to collaborate in Microsoft's illegal activities. Should Microsoft offer an OEM a secrete payback or special deal, the cooperation of the OEM will make this section difficult to enforce.

C. That Microsoft cannot restrict certain OEM software through agreements. This is already illegal, like A.

D. Some meaningless nonsense not worthy of comment or the paper it is printed on.

E. That communications protocols in Microsoft software be publicly available. In light of Microsoft's previous behavior in exploiting secrete calls in it's software, all of it's source code should be available for public examination. The suggestion that only ''communications protocols'' be public is problematic because it leaves open to dispute what consists of a communications protocol. This is foolish given Microsoft's previous self-serving interpretations of court orders.

F. That Microsoft will not retaliate against software vendors for competing against them. This is already against the law given that Microsoft is a monopoly.

G. That fixed percentage distribution agreements be banned. This is already against the law. The exceptions listed in this paragraph are also against the law, creating the suggestion that the United States will enter into an agreement with Microsoft to allow it to break the law in some cases.

H. That OEMs and users are allowed to configure the Microsoft software they buy. This is vague and confusing because it is difficult to precisely describe what consists of configuring software, and thus impossible to reliably enforce. In a competitive market it would be the natural case, and the proposed settlement should focus on restoring competition.

I. That Microsoft offer licenses to ''intellectual property'' necessary to allow others to exercise ''alternatives provided under this final judgment.'' The reference to alternatives provided to others contradicts the final section of the proposed settlement, which explicitly denies that the final settlement gives any rights to third parties. Even aside from that, this section probably denies behavior already illegal, is riddled with exceptions, vague, and seems designed to produce legal action rather than remedy.

J. A section devoted wholly to exceptions for Microsoft, as if there where not enough already.

The Enforcement Authority:

A. Access to source code is probably one of the best remedies. The exceptions and limitation of this access to a committee are silly.

B. The Technical Committee. It has too few members, it should be composed of Officers of a United States Federal Court in order to make it's requests immediately enforceable through Contempt hearings, and the gag on public statements renders the whole committee useless. The further restriction that the testimony of this muzzled and hobbled committee not be admissible in court is a bit like shooting the deer after it's tied down with it's throat cut.

C. The Microsoft Compliance Officer. This section is nonsense. Other companies manage to obey the law without the use of a special office. If Microsoft needs one they can implement it without a judgment.

D. Voluntary Dispute Resolution. This section seems dedicated to stipulating that various parties send each other letters before seeking court hearings, common practice. 4(d) guts all enforcement power from the proposed judgment, and suggests that the Attorneys for the Justice Department don't believe in their own system of courts.

Third Party Rights:

This section is in contradiction with other references to the submission of complaints to the Technical Committee and the requirement that Microsoft offer ''intellectual property'' licenses to the third parties so that they can pursue the alternatives guaranteed them in this proposed final judgment.

In summary, this proposed final judgment is a poor sham for a capitulation by the Plaintiffs. It's not even a good surrender, because it's vagueness and self-contradictions guarantee more legal action; if we must capitulate, at least we should save on legal costs. It also completely fails to disguise the capitulation in any way. This is why whoever wrote it should be fired, even if the Justice Department unwisely chooses to fail to enforce the law as applies to Microsoft. A real final judgment, which might have the chance of remedying the situation, would have to be in some way ''self enforcing.'' By ''self enforcing'' I mean that the remedy by it's nature should preclude further legal wrangling and evasion efforts by Microsoft. Stipulations on Microsoft's future behavior inherently have to be enforced, and thus are not well suited to this case. Furthermore, when the proposed judgment stipulates that behavior already illegal be banned and then suggests exceptions, the Plaintiffs are acquiescing in further law breaking by Microsoft. An example of a ''self enforcing'' remedy would be denying Microsoft copyright protection. No Technical Committee is required; all that is needed is to reject out of hand cases of copyright enforcement that Microsoft brings. Thus, revoking copyright privileges for some portion of the works that Microsoft used to violate the law might be an appropriate remedy. Or perhaps Microsoft could post substantial bonds against it's future behavior.

Many of the major flaws in this proposed final settlement result from the needless use of vague and disputable terms, when simple and undisputable ones would do.

Replace all references to ''Microsoft Middleware'' ''Windows Operating System Product'' and such with the simple phrases ''products of Microsoft'' and ''products of third parties.'' Avoid even the use the term ''software products,'' as Microsoft would produce hardware required to run their

products and then violate the agreement. Be sure the phrase ''products'' is defined to mean anything Microsoft does, including services.

Replace all references to ''ISVs, IHVs, ICDs, OEMs'' and such with the phrase ''any third party.'' Quibbling over which member of the alphabet soup a particular entity fell under is thus eliminated. The final judgment should require no differentiation between the various consumers and companies interacting with Microsoft. This also remedies the fault that the current proposed judgment allows Microsoft to exempt any third party from the benefits of what legal behavior is required by claiming they do not have a viable business plan.

I hope you find these suggestions helpful in writing a real judgment.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Ristroph

From: ksvm@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MTC–00004867

From: Al Koscielny
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe the proposed settlement will alleviate the lack of competition in the software industry. In the monopoly days of IBM, a single company controlled the hardware and all the software than ran on it. Many years of investigation by the DOJ forced production of enough documentation that other vendors could compete. In the current monpoly days of Microsoft, a single company controls the operating system and all the software that runs on it. The vertical stack of tied products has simply moved up the complexity chain.

I should have a choice between at least 2 operating systems, which would preclude the barriers to entry described in the findings in this case. The proposed settlement would only prevent the abuses that Microsoft used in the past to keep its monopoly position. But those previous abuses are no longer important to preserving Microsoft's monopoly position. Currently it's claimed that there is not enough demand to preinstall any operating system other than Windows on a PC, although some vendors have offered Linux, mostly on servers. So Microsoft's hold on the desktop, 92% by some accounts, is not going to change without intervention. How will this settlement remedy Microsoft's ownership of the desktop market?

Recent years have seen a vast shift from single machine computing to a focus on inter-networked computers. The proposed settlement offers no mechanisms for keeping Microsoft in check that adapt to the rapid changes in technology. Over the past few years, I've come across a few sites that only work with Internet Explorer. If Microsoft can popularize IIS sufficiently, they can extend the vertical stack to include the server side of the Internet as well. Will Passport be popular enough that other vendors can be excluded from competition? Will Windows XP put RealPlayer out of business? Will false promises of interoperablity help .net triumph over Java? Where are these areas of potential abuse addressed in the proposed settlement?

Thanks for taking the time to listen to my concerns.

Al Koscielny
alko@nc.rr.com

MTC–00004868

From: Fisk, Kevin
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/23/01 6:14pm
Subject: Settlement

This is NOT in the public interest. I am a registered republican, but will NOT vote for any politician who supports this settlement. It is a joke.

Kevin Fisk
CC:'attorney.general(a)po.state.ct.us'

MTC–00004869

From: HarryBower@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/23/01 11:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly oppose the proposed settlement with Microsoft wherein they offer to provide a billion dollars worth of computers to schools. That is not a penalty at all. It is simply good advertising omn their part. It results in unfair competition against much smaller Apple Computer (a California Business) which has been able to compete well in the education market. A substantial increase in the Microsoft presence in schools will seriously impact Apple's position. Please find a way of punishing Microsoft instead of giving them an other opportunity to help drive a competitor out of business.

Thank you,

Harry M. Bowers

MTC–00004870

From: Jerry Clabaugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 1:17am
Subject: Public comment on US v. Microsoft

''None of the people who run divisions are going to change what they do or think or forecast. Nothing.''

-Bill Gates, interview in The Washington Post on the 1995 consent decree, August 1995 ''The practices Microsoft agreed to forgo had already served their purpose. Gates was right when he summed up the effect of the [1995] consent decree in one word: 'Nothing.'" -James Gleick, ''Making Microsoft Safe for Capitalism'' The present Consent Decree has many shortcomings which render it ineffective in ''unfettering the market from Microsoft's anticompetive conduct''. In particular, the Technical Committee, which has been characterized as a major concession by Microsoft, gives the proposed Decree the appearance of meaningful enforcement while moving the reality of enforcement beyond reach. These are some of the difficulties with the Technical Committee:

(1) The Committee has wide powers to look at documents and interview individuals, but has no power to cause Microsoft to behave differently.

(2) The information gathered by the Committee will be confidential, unlike information gathered in the past by the Justice Department, further complicating enforcement (B9).

(3) Since Microsoft appoints one of the first two members, and the third member will be appointed by the first two, Microsoft is permitted to establish a committee with a majority of members who have no interest in enforcing the consent decree, even if thay had the power to do so.

(4) The members are supposed to be individuals who are experts in software design and programming (B2), while they will also require expertise in antitrust law and history.

Even though the terms of the proposed Decree are very relaxed, Microsoft, if it remains under the same management and philosophy of the 1990's, will pay no heed to the proposed Decree. If the Decree is accepted, we will be in the same position as in 1996, with a decree in place, but no enforcement options beyond bringing yet another antitrust action.

It is my belief that breaking up Microsoft would be a bitter experience, full of dislocations for all those with an equity in Microsoft; managers, employees, stockholders, and customers. Yet when the antitrust action is brought yet again, the only reasonable remedy then will be a breakup. The only measure we can take now to prevent this outcome is to provide meaningful, effective enforcement in the current case.

The Committee only impedes the job of enforcement. The dissenting States' proposal does include real enforcement terms, and is a preferable alternative to the proposed Consent Decree.

I have focussed on the Technical Committee, but the present Decree gives Microsoft the imprimatur of the Department of Justice to pursue many anticompetitive strategies. Reading the proposed Decree without context gives one the impression that it was the government that was found guilty of interfering with Microsoft's right to abuse its monopoly. If I have read the news accounts correctly, then it is instead the case that every federal judge who has had to evaluate the Microsoft's behavior (nine, to date) has found Microsoft guilty of abusing its monopoly. Why then, are there so many limitations and exceptions? Is Microsoft in such danger of being unfairly treated by law enforcement, when that enforcement has been vindicated again and again by the courts?

The proposed Decree unfairly limits the ability of the public to seek enforcement of antitrust law against Microsoft, and should therefore be discarded. Even a simple fine would motivate management at Microsoft to learn about the meaning of antitrust law, without limiting the rights of the public.

In addition, the proposed Decree does nothing to ''deny Microsoft the fruits of its violations of the Sherman Act'', as instructed by the Appeals Court.

The importance of implementing an effective remedy looms larger than ever before, since computer security is now an issue that needs very serious attention in the United States:

''In a report released this month titled ''Cyber Threats and Information Security: Meeting the 21st Century Challenge,'' the Center for Strategic and International Studies

(CSIS) concluded that the government and the private sector should be concerned about the ''trustworthiness'' of future Microsoft products'' -cnn.com, December 29, 2000 ''Gartner recommends that enterprises hit by both Code Red and Nimda immediately investigate alternatives to IIS, including moving Web applications to Web server software from other vendors, such as iPlanet and Apache. Although these Web servers have required some security patches, they have much better security records than [Microsoft's web server software] IIS''

-Gartner Group, September 19, 2001

The fact that Microsoft's attitude toward security remains so casual, despite many high-profile security failures is an indication of the unhealthy effect of their monopoly power. In a competitive market, competitive pressure should have caused Microsoft to 'clean up its act' with respect to security. Today, the United States cannot afford an unrestrained predatory monopoly in computer software.

Besides security, the other important reason to reject to proposed Decree and instead insist on real enforcement is economic: Microsoft's policy of extinguishing innovation that it cannot co-opt certainly has benefitted Microsoft and its investors, but threatens the larger United States economy.

The Microsoft monopoly and the consumer software market emerged simultaneously, so no one can say what the economic benefits of antitrust enforcement would be. I can only hope that the Court will give prosperity a chance.

I am in no way a competitor of Microsoft. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard,

Jerry Clabaugh
20 Magoun Street
Cambridge, MA 02140

MTC–00004871

From: Curtis Michelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 1:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I want to just say as a consumer, and as an independent software developer myself, I strongly support the nine states who are looking for tougher remedies against Microsoft. The proposed settlement doesn't go nearly far enough.

Steve Jobs, CEO of Apple Computer made a good point recently that requiring Microsoft to offer software to needy schools is not punishment. It further extends their presence in a market they are looking to further dominate.

It's a gift, and not a sanction. Microsoft was found GUILTY of monopolistic practices and needs to be punished. One billion dollars is a fraction (1/30th more or less) of Microsoft's on hand cash assets.

Finally, I want to draw your attention to some important points made by Robert Cringely, noted computer columnist. http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20011206.html His concerns about the settlement allowing Microsoft to not publish its API's to businesses it deems ''non-commercial'' like Open Source projects needs to be heard. We have to make sure that any third party software developers (like myself), whether working for profit or nonprofit institutions, have the same access to Windows API's as Microsoft's own engineers do.

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely,
Curtis Michelson
Small Company (www.smallco.net)
Orlando, FL

MTC–00004872

From: Michael K McCarty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 2:19am
Subject: Comments about Microsoft Monopoly trial

Hello,

I feel that Microsoft should have no say in what it's penalty should be. If we provided the same oppertunity to criminials we'd have empty prisons and a whole lot of community service for crimes they committed. It simply doesn't make any sense.

What Microsoft has chosen is to do it to seed schools with Microsoft software and make sure a new generation is locked into a Microsoft upgrade path which will provide them continued market share in the future. How does this help?

Please split Microsoft into separate entities. (1) Operating Systems & Develppment tools, (2) Business applications, (3) Online services & communications, and (4) Entertainment.

Michael McCarty
Michael K McCarty :: K6MMC
PGP Key @ http://www.thehunted.net/keys

MTC–00004873

From: Tom Caloz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 9:41am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madame:

The proposed settlement does not take into account that the only real competition to Microsoft, in the x86 space, is from non profit agencies. Apache, Sendmail, Samba, Linux are all non commercial entities, and would be unable to have access to the APIs and other technical information needed for interaction.

Please reconsider the settlement, and provide some form of relief for the groups that have been adversely affected by Microsoft.

Thank You,
Tom Caloz

MTC–00004874

From: Steve (038) Kerry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 9:48am
Subject: Microsoft Sett;ement

I along with many other members of the public have been harmed by the ever increasing number of software enabled services being bundled with the Windows desk-top operating system that has monoply status. Having abused that power, why not strip them of much of it by forcing MSFT to offer a bare bones Windows OS to which the consumer can add service enabling software selected from a competitive marketplace. Given current arrangements if consumers wish to participate in an expanding array of software enabled services into the future, they will be given the choice of MSFT services unfairly advantaged by the wide distribution and the guaranteed interoperability association with the monoply confers. The consuming public, given a ubiquitous bare bones OS could vote with its pocketbook on the value of additive software upgrades. Current monopolistic advantage unfairly limits the economic vitality of competing software enabled services. Innovation is hampered. Innovative services from MSFT bundled with, Windows 95,98,2000, XP while possibly desireable, derive support from and unfairly extend a monoply into new areas. MSFT is able to roll out successive versions of its OS and find a market largely because of bundling new software enabled services. I and peers would be better served by a marketplace in which new software enabled services could be selected from vendors based on value rather than upon advantages derived from membership in a monopoly. To do otherwise merely repeats the browser transgression.

Steve Krogh

MTC–00004875

From: Thomas King
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 9:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I must say I am very disappointed with the settlement that the United States government has reached with Microsoft. You went through all the work and won the case to give them a slap on the wrist and tell them not to do it again. What is this? Fines and threats will not work with Microsoft. They can afford to pay any fines levied against them, ten time over. And as far as threats are concerned they have seen what the Department of Justice can do and I must they are probably laughing right now thinking that they got away with it. The only way you can break the Microsoft monopoly is to open up the code for the operating systems so clones of windows can be made. Until this is done Microsoft has nothing to worry about.

Thomas King

MTC–00004876

From: Honorland@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 12:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement appears to be no more than a slap on the wrist. It does nothing to punish Microsoft for past transgressions, and does not stop them from such transgressions in the future. The proposed oversight committee does not have sufficient power ro enforce corrective actions, nor is it free of Microsoft patronage. The oversight committee should not be funded by Microsoft, but rather from government sources. The members should be appointed by an independent body.

In addition to those concerrns, there is real concern about the effect of this settlement on the so-called 'Open Source' software development, such as Linux. Microsoft is not prevented from circumventing the development of this major alternative to Microsoft products. The Linux development poses a real threat to Microsoft, and Microsoft should not be able to adversely affect such development.

Respectfully,
Howard O. Norland
6212 Buchanan St.,
Fort Collins, CO 80525

MTC–00004877

From: John Hamlet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

they are your enemy and we know it. make them revail the source for windows 95/98/NT

MTC–00004878

From: Doug Armstrong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a professional software developer with over 17 years of experience in the field I feel compelled to express my opinion on the proposed settlement to the Microsoft anti-trust ruling. My livelihood, indeed the future of the entire software and high technology industry, has been and may continue to be directly affected by the behavior of Microsoft should this settlement be approved.

While reading the proposed settlement I was struck by how generous it was to a party which has been found guilty of stifling a very important industry for such a long time. I was also appalled that the victors in this case would agree to terms which encouraged a ruthless monopolist to further its attempts to control each aspect of the software industry, not to mention the Internet.

The company I work for uses Microsoft's office productivity products, despite the well-known security flaws and a history of unreliable operation, simply because the alternatives have been deemed 'too risky' by the corporate IT (Information Technology) department. In explaining what 'too risky' meant, we were told that the IT department was worried that upgrades and support for alternative products might not be available in the future if Microsoft decided to crush the already struggling competition in this arena of software products.

The company I work for also uses Microsoft's software development tools, although not exclusively, and certainly not to develop our own main product. Instead we use their tools to develop test suites to execute within a Windows environment. We have discovered numerous flaws in the tools themselves, and in the compiled code they produce. When we attempted to report this issues to Microsoft's technical support group, we were told that we would have to pay Microsoft for the privilege of helping them find bugs in their own products. No other company in the industry that I am aware of has such an egregiously arrogant attitude toward its customers and developers.

In short, I must convey my strong opposition to the proposed settlement and urge you to continue to work toward achieving a fair and just punishment of Microsoft.

Doug Armstrong
snoop@mediaone.net

MTC–00004879

From: Alfonso Baqueiro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 3:32pm
Subject: Anti Microsoft

Of course Microsoft use monopolic tactics, they want to invade all aspects of computer technology, with their close source technology, and ''use our software or use our software'', they generate incompatibilities and don't listen to the world wide standards, they build the software on their own and define their own standards making hard to provide universal solutions in the world.

One example, that everybody knows is what they do with Internet Explorer againts, defining things that only work on Internet Explorer and aren't part of the w3c consortium standards.

Other example is how they want everybody use Visual Basic, without consider well security issues, so they included VB scripting capabilities in Excel, Word, etc, and for that now exists a lot of macro viruses, but the most irresponsible is they include VB scripting in Outlook Express, providing a way to VB Scripting Macro Viruses to spread automatically across the web. Remember that viruses only affect Windows with Outlook, other mail clients are not affeted, why could be the reason?

Well, we can make the world a better place, with freedom (means freedom, not price) using free software and contributing to open source develpment.

THE INFORMATION IS POWER.
BYE.
abaqueiro@yahoo.com

MTC–00004880

From: John Losse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/24/01 5:47pm
Subject: Fw: Microsoft Settlement
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement is not strict enough and does not limit Microsoft business practices. I believe that they should be split up and the soft ware and operating programs should be separate companies.

John Losse
668 Wakefield Rd.
Goleta, CA 93117

MTC–00004881

From: Bob Jensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/25/01 3:12am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Never have i heard of a more serious case handled so lightly. Fine them(microsoft), break them into at least three pieces, and fine them mightily for what they illegally did to their worthy competition.

MTC–00004882

From: Charles Stanley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/25/01 8:45am
Subject: microsoft

Dear Sirs,

I am but consumer I am not however a lawyer, a rabid Anti-Microsoft person nor a employee of any company working against or for microsoft.

In my opinion the current settlement does not go far enough which is sad to say as I us and prefer microsoft operating systems right now I am using windows 2000.

I would like to suggest you consider an alternative to the issue with Microsoft as follows though. Instead of totally breaking Microsoft up instead could you consider the following suggestions so please put up with me a little bit as I know I am not as smart as the people that work at the DoJ that practice law First the MSN division and all the divisions directly under the MSN division should be separated from Microsoft forming a new entity Next the Internet Explorer browser should be separated into a totally separate entity that is builds a browser sort of like what is being done with Netscape except where MS has no say so in how it is run.

Now we come to the heart of the matter the windows 9x code that is the heart of the kernel of the windows 95, 98, 98SE and ME operations systems should be released under General Public License so other parties could use it. after all they have claimed they have abandoned the 9x kernel for the NT kernel.

This would sort of be similar to what is done regarding the Linux operating system and I think this would foster more competition in the market place.

Let Microsoft keep the NT kernel which is the heart of the windows 2000 and Windows XP and let them keep the Microsoft Office and other programs. In this way I think it would solve the worst problems Microsoft causes yet still leave a viable company.

Sincerely,
Charles D. Stanley

MTC–00004883

From: Harvey Clowers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/25/01 11:22am
Subject: United State v. Microsoft

An article appearing on www.defendersproprights.org has suggested that Jusge Kolleen Kollar-Kotelly should accept the DOJ's proposed settlement with the Microsoft Corporation on the grounds that doing so will insure protection of Microsoft's intellectual property rights, while not doing so will constitute judicially sanctioned violation of those rights.

While the constitutional protection of property rights must be had, that protection does not authorize the property right holder to violate anti-trust law or committ other illegal business practices.

Thus, the just course of action for the judiciary to take is the punishment and penalization of the Microsoft Corporation for its violation of law. It is, after all, an illegally maintained monopoly !!!

MTC–00004884

From: Steve Fisher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 1:55am
Subject: Microsoft Law Suit.

I would just like the Justice Department to know that as a consumer, any Microsoft's products that I have purchased, have only saved me time and money. For the US Justice Department to attack this company is waste of the energy and assets of our Government. This suit to our country as an auto immune disease to a person. It hurts our stock market, undermines our economy and destroys our capitalistic system. We have some serious problems, security, defense, missing nuclear suitcase bombs, terrorist cells in our country,

if we don't focus our energy in the right area we will cease to exist. Settle the suit and get on to important things.

Sincerely,

Steve Fisher

MTC–00004885

From: Quincin Gonjon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 8:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally believe that Microsoft deserves stronger punishments for destroying thousands of potential computer businesses. They have killed the spirit of entrepreneurship in the software arena and no one will never know if such competition will have been better for this nation. I also strongly believe that Microsoft is alienating the poor underclass people of this nation through pricing. Windows is the standard Operating System around the world and every computer must at least have an Operating System to function. Why not have this OS free for all? I believe that software applications should be the point were purchasing should start.

The Linux community is right about providing this world with a free Operating System that will allow everyone to compete on an equal footing. The OpenOffice organization, SUN microsystem and Ximian Inc are demonstrating the potential benefits of open source and proprietary licensing. This appears to be a win-win situation for both the underclass society and entrepreneurship. Microsoft will never allow this to flourish because it could spell the end to Microsoft's empire. That is why this government should force Microsoft to release the needed documentations to allow OpenOffice and SUN to develop products that have the ability to read and write in standard Microsoft formats.

May your conscious guide you.

MTC–00004886

From: Miller, Michael S.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 10:26am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Anything less than breaking up Microsoft into two companies (operating system and applications) will allow them to continue their anticompetitive practices exactly as they have been doing for the last twenty-plus years—to the detriment of the development community and the consumers.

Regards,

Mike Miller

Michael S. Miller, Ph.D.

Director, eLearning Solutions Group

Information Resources Management College

National Defense University

Fort McNair, DC 20319

voice: 202.685.4882

email: millerm@ndu.edu

MTC–00004887

From: Weiqiang Fang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 2:55pm
Subject: United States v. Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

Many of us don't think the settlement will control Microsoft from destroying competitors. Many of the Microsoft competitors have very good products we like. We are so sad to see these technologies (e.g. Unix, Linux, Java, etc) killed by Microsoft. Wayne Fang on behalf of some developers.

MTC–00004888

From: Randall Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to go formally on the record as opposing the proposed Microsoft settlement currently in debate in the Department of Justice. To me, a casual internet user and once-Microsoft customer, the proposed settlement is anything but just. Allowing Microsoft to inundate the education sector with its software products will have exactly the opposite effect required of an anti-monopoly ruling: it will allow Microsoft to further entrench its monopoly in one of the few markets it has yet to dominate. I am an American consumer and I find the idea appalling. I urge you to reconsider alternative settlements in order to find some way to punish a known offender without actually allowing it to benefit. For starters, any software provided to schools ought to be non-Microsoft. I hope you will seriously consider the very well thought out opinions expressed by staff of Apple Computer and RedHat Linux Inc. Regards,

Randall S. Wood

P.O.Box 817

Westhampton, NY, 11977

rsw22@cornell.edu

MTC–00004889

From: madodel@ptdprolog.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,piu@doj.ca.gov @inetgw,attorney.gener...
Date: 12/26/01 3:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I'm writing to ask you to consider removing all preload contract terms that require only Microsoft operating systems as well as requiring Microsoft to release all information regarding their proprietary file formats and APIs to be as part of any real settlement of their predatory monopoly finding. As it stands now the proposed settlement is worthless and a complete sellout by the USDOJ and does absolutely nothing other then validate their monopoly status and treat it as if it is a natural outcome. Microsoft has developed and expanded their monopoly by forcing hardware manufacturers to only pre-install Microsoft operating systems on personal computers for years. It is a disgrace that IBM will not pre-load its own superior computer operating system (OS/2) on its own personal computers. Last year during the trial, several major manufacturers had declared they would offer the Linux operating system as a pre-load option. Then it was only to be available on a few models, then only on one or two models, now, after the farce of a settlement outcome of the trial, try and find more then a handful if any among all the major manufacturers. Microsoft can only continue its monopoly by coersion, requiring only its own software on every PC and charging a Microsoft tax on those of us who purchase these systems, but don't want and will not use their products. The only real solution is to make the operating system an option and all systems must be allowed to be sold without an operating system, or with a choice including but not necessarily limited to, OS/2, eComStation Linux, FreeBSD, and Microsoft's current version of WIndows.

Currently on my chosen platform, IBM's OS/2 and Serenity System's eComStation (an OEM version of OS/2), I can get some interchange of documents with Microsoft Word and Excel using Lotus SmartSuite or Star Office, but other formats like PowerPoint and Microsoft Media Player are completely inaccessible. Open formats and APIs can be ported over to non-Microsoft platforms and break Microsoft's stranglehold on the world's information. Making all their proprietary formats and APIs open and freely available will allow those of us who don't use Microsoft products to not be locked out of electronic discourse and electronic media features.

Please stand firm and refuse to give in to the monopolist Microsoft organization.

Mark Dodel

From the OS/2 Desktop of: Mark Dodel ''The liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic State itself. That in it's essence, is Fascism— ownership of government by an individual, by a group or by any controlling private power.'' Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Message proposing the Monopoly Investigation, 1938 For a choice in the future JOIN VOICE NOW check out http://www.os2voice.org/index.html

MTC–00004890

From: shaun arral
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 3:49pm
Subject: Need another copy of the Finding of Facts.

I have one for you. Don't forget what it says, please. If Microsoft likes the settlement, it's not good. If Bill and Steve are smiling, you're not doing your job. Bill and Steve should only be smiling AFTER THE HEARING IS OVER and when their business is not a mopolistic parasite on the nation and it's economy. Relieve this M$ pressure that's holding down the computer industry in the US. The internet is an open platform, don't give them the power to control that too....

If Microsoft OS's are so user friendly why can't I see Apples and Linux clients and Shared directories? While with my Linux computers I can read microsoft, apple and many, many other types of client manchines (shared folders). This is what openness and no secrets on things that aren't meant to be secrets.

Engineering has standards, protocols (I'll make white wire ''hot'')

Telecomm has standards, protocols (i'll transmit on frequency: 90Khz)

Government has standards, protocols (we'll just buy it, it looks good to me)

Computers have them too....

Happy New Year.

Shaun Arral

PS. I'm not yelling with the caps above.

''My mind is a mind that I have come to know'', Blind Melon

MTC–00004891

From: Joshua A Hansen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 3:51pm
Subject: Urging a stricter Microsoft Anti-Trust remedy

I write to voice my support of a stricter remedy in the Microsoft anti-trust case than has been proposed. Microsoft is more of a threat to the health of the American economy than any monopoly prior to it (Standard Oil for example). This is because what is at stake in this situation is information, and our rights to have and utilize it.

Microsoft should be required to disclose its file format and network protocol specifications to any organization, commercial or not-for-profit, without non-disclosure agreements. This would facilitate interoperability between Microsoft's products and those products which hope to compete with Microsoft. It must be seen that Microsoft has no remorse over its unfair practices in the past, and so it will continue to repeat similar practices to maintain and solidify its monopoly for years to come. Only government intervention can alter this. Specifically, Microsoft is preparing to unleash its proprietary .NET ''application framework'' on the world. Much like Microsoft has done before, it will flood the marketplace with .NET-based Operating Systems and web servers until everything depends on their framework. Then, they will begin ''extending'' the .NET framework so no other Operating Systems will be able to interoperate with it. Through a cycle of forced license-updates, Microsoft will ''lock in'' most computer users in a way that strips the market of competitive forces and heaves Microsoft products only upon anybody who wishes to do anything on the Internet.

These ideas may sound radical and too conspiratorial in tone. Were they not backed by precedent this would be the case. However, the past repeats itself, so I feel justified in saying that just as Microsoft has dominated the Operating Systems, servers, Web Browsers, and Office Applications markets it will attempt to dominate the Web Services market (.NET), the Instant Messaging market (MSN Messenger), the video game console market (XBOX), the streaming audio and video and digital audio market (Windows Media Player), the Handheld Computers market (PocketPC 2002), and the embedded devices market (Windows XP embedded). Such a wide-based attempt at monopoly solidification and expansion is simply not healthy in a market economy such as ours.

As a computer science student, I hope that through wise government intervention and promotion of competition, the workplace I enter in a few years will not be further enslaved to the Microsoft monopoly. My future will be a much happier one if I can choose software products based on quality, not based on whether or not it will read Microsoft file formats. It is a well-known saying in the computer world that once Microsoft enters a market, all hope is lost for incumbents who try to compete with their products. Is this due to superior products on Microsoft's part? Sometimes, but usually not. It is really due to tricky marketing and product lock-in schemes. This is not right. A market economy will only thrive when exchanges are made willingly, not through product lock-in. A market economy will only thrive when competition forces higher product quality, not when monopoly causes sloth in product development on the part of the monopolist. For the sake of America's economy and the freedom of choice of America's consumers, I urge the Department of Justice and the judge in the Microsoft anti-trust case to impose stricter remedies on Microsoft.

Hoping for a just outcome in this case,
Josh Hansen
Student, US Citizen, Registered Voter

MTC–00004892

From: christopher Dehaan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 3:59pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is my greatest disappointment to see the judgment that was rendered regarding the Microsoft case. It is sad but true that might is right, and the people that have the power to make policy and to right wrongs are avoiding their responsibility. Based on the years of unfair business practices, illegal activity and the fact that Microsoft has repeatedly used its monopoly power to influence and control the software and OS market, anything less than a fine of a few tens of billions of dollars is unacceptable.

The leadership of Microsoft should also be barred from the software or technology industries, the company should be forced to reveal the file formats for its office products. Anything less than this says to people that would break the law both in its letter and spirit, that it is ok to do so, provided that you are big enough. This company has no respect for the rule of law, has been guilty of attempting to lie and mislead the court during part of the video deposition, which was videotaped. The fine leveled against Microsoft should be severe. I would suggest a minimum of about 30 billion dollars, believe me after this judgment, those companies that were thinking of breaking the law will think twice.

If evil is allow to triumph in a democracy, then democracy cannot long last. This has always been true and will always be true. While it may appear that my suggestion is severe, please note that suggestion comes after this company has been tried before and has broken the law before and still continues to break the law. And continues to fight and refuses to yield. The Government should continue to litigate until Microsoft gives in to the demands of the Government and of the people. Then they should be forced to pay the court costs of the Government, this will set a very good example for this country and the world, failing this we would be sending a signal that breaking the law is ok if you big enough.

Sincerely,
Christopher Dehaan

MTC–00004893

From: Brent R Brian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 4:07pm
Subject: Settlement

To put Microsoft on competative ground. Windows should only be an operating system.

a. no media players
b. no web browsers
c. no office tools, databases, or such
d. no bundling rules put on OEM's
e. no ''built in ad's'' for Microsoft products
f. no ''ET phone home'' gimmicks for upgrades
g. no system management tools
h. no fax capability out of the box

If consumers want these other tools, let them get them on their own.

So long as Microsoft gives away free-bies, they control file format standards, and they control the industry.

There should be no ''accountability'' of OEM's to Microsoft. If an OEM chooses to install Windows, fine, but Microsoft should be kept in the dark about the installation of other OS's.

Brent R Brian
95 Smith's Creek Dr
Clayton, NC 27520

MTC–00004894

From: Charles H. Courtney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 5:09pm
Subject: Comments Microsoft Settlement

I am dismayed at the proposed settlement as it, in fact, does little to break Microsoft's de facto monopoly in the personal computer industry. To accomplish this, the Department of Justice should require as part of the settlement that:

1. All of Microsoft's data file specifications be made completely public for all to see without any restrictions or preconditions whatsoever. This will in no way compromise Microsoft's true intellectual property—the source code of their operating systems and applications programs. However, it will give users of Microsoft products the freedom to use alternative applications programs, networking protocols and operating systems without having their, or their business partners', data held hostage within an unconvertable proprietary Microsoft file format. Doing this will give Microsoft's competition a much needed ''foot in the door'' that will allow them a fair shot at competing for market share.

2. All of Microsoft's networking protocols must be made completely public for all to see without any restrictions or preconditions whatsoever. This will prevent Microsoft from locking out competing vendors by making the latter's networking protocols unable to interoperate with Microsoft's, which, if not prevented in this manner, in effect limits users to only Microsoft networking products. Again, this does not give away Microsoft's intellectual property, but it does give potential competitors a fair chance at market share.

Sincerely yours,
Charles H. Courtney, DVM, PhD
Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies

College of Veterinary Medicine
Box 100125
University of Florida
Gainesville FL 32610–0125
tel: 352–392–4700x5111
fax: 352–392–8351
e-mail: chas@ufl.edu

MTC–00004895

From: earendil@chicagonet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 4:17pm
Subject: proposed settlement of microsoft antitrust case

As a long time computer user, I would like to respectfully register my dissatisfaction with the proposed settlement of the antitrust case brought against the Microsoft Corporation. It is my understanding that the Court has determined that Microsoft has indeed illegaly maintained a monopoly. It is my belief that any settlement that has the public interest at heart will require Microsoft to open its networking and file format protocols. At this stage in the development of our country, it would be retrograde to allow one corporation to dictate the manner in which ideas are to be exchanged. Moreover, to allow the continuance of a one company monopoly in such a crucial field as information exchange and technology would be detrimental to the economic well being of the country because it would allow Microsoft to continue to impose its inefficiencies on the public as a whole. Opening the market to choice in this regard would be of significant benefit to our economy.

Finally, Microsoft has repeatedly exhibited a totally irresponsible disregard for security in its software products, most recently by releasing on an unsuspecting public, even while its harmful practices are scrutiny by the Court, a seriously flawed operating system: Windows XP. The wide publicity that has attended this arrogant and irresponsible act (including an FBI warning regarding XP's serious security flaws) speaks volumes regarding Microsoft corporate philosophy. At a time when the US is increasingly under threat of terrorist act, we can no longer afford to allow Microsoft to operate an illegal monopoly that exposes our whole information infrastructure to devestating attacks. The only solution is to require Microsoft to open its proprietary formats and protocols to allow creative Americans to forge solutions that will be conducive to the free and secure exchange of ideas and information.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you carefully rethink the proposed settlement in order to provide a more constructive and secure basis for the future of information technology in America.

Thank you,
Mark Wauck

MTC–00004896

From: Jonathan Spearman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 5:27pm
Subject: Antitrust Lawsuit

Mr/Mrs Renata Hesse,

I would like to voice my opposition to the microsoft settlement. I feel that if the courts have found microsoft to be in violation of the antitrust laws, then they should pay a stiff penalty for breaking that law. I also feel that any resolution that does not allow for stiff penalty will show americans that if you break the law, the only punishment you will get is a penalty, that will allow you to continue your monopoly. When AT&T and IBM were found to be monopolies, they were broken up and had to pay a stiff penalty for breaking this law. Microsoft is a monopoly that has hurt competition in many areas. If they have a product that can withstand the pressures of competition, then they will show this by the sales of their products. I a consumer, do not like the fact that if I buy a system and don't want microsoft on it, I still have to pay the price as if it was present on the system. Resellers, manufacturers, still have to pay microsoft and that cost is push on to customers like myself.

Also according to reports that microsoft may have to put system's into poorer schools would further it's monopoly, this is a very bad decision and I for one, would not be happy about it. Also I feel that microsoft should as part of their punishment, have to purchase systems with other OS's and put them for free into the poorer school districts. This would be a fair solution. And have to pay the government back all that it spent to prosecute them for their crime, and break up the company Did you know that if microsoft continues it's monopoly, that it will control most of the data on every server, and that microsoft can at it's decretion, do whatever it feels necessary with that data. Would you be confortable in knowing that all your personal data belongs to microsoft and that you may have to pay large amounts to retrieve this data, and also that the servers it sits on, because of the Microsoft OS is not secure allowing terrorist and any hacker to obtain this information. Would the Government like to know that it's top secret information is controlled by microsoft and that anyone may have access to that information. If you feel comfortable with knowing that a corporate company has control over all data on the internet and private networks, and can do with it what it wants, then you are sadly mistaken. What are we showing our children about the law, when a company that has committed a crime, is let off with a slap on the wrist and has successfully controlled the U.S. Government and let them know that they cannot do anything with microsoft because it rules this country and not our Government.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to read this, I hope that by voicing my opinion it will not fall on deaf ears.

Jonathan Spearman
3535 14th St #2804
Plano,Texas 75074
May GOD Bless america!.
May GOD bless you richly
Jonathan Spearman
jspearman@onebox.com—email
(972) 354–2521 x6161—voicemail/fax

MTC–00004897

From: Chris Woodard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 5:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am not a reflexive Microsoft hater. I have friends who work there and have worked there, and I know that they have produced some really good software. Having said that, I believe that the ''settlement'' worked out by Charles James and Microsoft is woefully inadequate.

Microsoft is a company that seems incapable of changing its corporate culture, and that culture is cut-throat and win-at-all-costs. The history of the digital revolution is littered with the corpses of companies who brought out a product, built a business, and provided jobs only to have Microsoft offer a slightly lower-quality (or in some cases much lower-quality) product for free ''because it's part of the OS''. Bye bye, market. Bye bye, company. Bye bye, jobs.

Microsoft has already ignored one consent decree, and another one with a laughable penalty of ''if they break this agreement, it'll be extended for another two years'' is the briar patch that the Department of Justice is throwing Br'er Rabbit into. There's no reason whatsoever to think that Microsoft won't just ignore this settlement too, since they're still convinced that they didn't do anything wrong.

The dangers of having an essentially unfettered monopolist provide the software infrastructure for an entire digital economy, which is in their plans, can be illustrated nicely in two words: Windows XP. Or, if you prefer, three words: Internet Information Server. The dangers of having an unscrupulous monopolist in a position of power should be obvious to anyone with two brain cells connected by a synapse.

The states' counter-offer is the least that Microsoft should suffer for flouting the lawful judgements of a duly appointed court. Money alone shouldn't carry the day, unless that's the message you want to send your children. If you won't think of anything else, think of them and think of what it would tell them about breaking the law and getting away with it if you let Microsoft off with the faintest slap on the wrist.

Chris Woodard

MTC–00004899

From: John Saxby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 5:59pm
Subject: Monopoly

Clear DayDOJ,

At one time the computer industry was ramping up to the PC revolution, as it was called. SOL,Ohio Scientific, Apple !!, Alltar, Osborne and others were designing and creating personal productivity tools. CPM was a simple operating system followed by DR DOS, PC Dos, IBM DOS.

IBM made the mistake of hiring a small but almost legal organization to assist it with creating a multi-programming system for their recently released PC. This venture was to give them the chance to create OS/2 which would grow into a decent PC operating system allowing you to run multiple programs concurrently. The partnership gave this fledging computer company the cash to hire competent staff and move the visual interface to their own proprietary operating system based on OS/2 and what was gleaned from another early innovator in the industry(XEROX).

From what was learned from IBM and their methods of controlling the industry this model was then used to control the PC industry. Make sure that the OEM's cannot ship computers with OS/2 or UNIX or Solarius or Linux operating systems. Force the consumer whether it is an individual or corporation to buy and undesireable operating system and refuse to return their money if they return the product!

When the DOJ was convinced this was a monopolistic practice, allow them to continue, and further their control by infecting all educational systems with this operating system. Making sure they are able to convince students that this is the operating system of choice.

I have been in the computer industry since 1969 after serving 13 years as a marine and a defender of our system of justice. Having seen what has occurred with this mockery of justice, I find it hard to even verbally defend our justice system. As has been stated many times this is the best judicial system money can buy, one does begin to beleive this may in fact be true.

Respectfully,
John R. Saxby

MTC–00004900

From: John Daly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 7:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has demonstrated flagrant and repeated disregard for the rights of other companies in the software business. They have used the legal system to keep competition at bay while eroding the solvency of competitors. Now they are proposing a settlement which is more to their benefit than their detriment. The so-called punishment for their monopolistic actions would further leverage them into markets not entirely strangled by their previous actions. A more fitting settlement would be to treat them as they have treated with their competition by vacating all patents, trademarks and copyrights held by Microsoft Corporation or its members held individually or aggregately.

MTC–00004901

From: Maurice Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 7:22pm
Subject: Public comment—US v Microsoft

December 26, 2001

To Whom It May Concern,

I write to comment on the proposed Micrsoft settlement. I am a software developer and user. I use Linux and various open source software packages for most of my day to day activities because they are technically superior to and much more stable than Microsoft products (as an example, I last rebooted this computer 141 days ago when I upgraded the Linux operating system on it—and this despite the fact that I run web sites and mail services for 20 different small companies and groups on it in addition to a full graphical windowing interface).

While I love the software I use, I find that I can not avoid the need to maintain at least one computer with Microsoft software loaded on it. This is because of their file format lock-in. I need their software only to read their file formats. So, I beg of you, require Microsoft to openly publish their past, present and future file format specifications. In doing so you will also be doing a great service to the country. How many documents being written today will be totally useless 10 years from now simply because they are stored in a .doc file format that has long since been outdated by later Microsoft treadmill upgrades? Must we really maintain old Microsoft applications just to access the information locked away in their proprietary file formats? Here I stress the ''openly publish'' part of my request. It is essential that open source programmers have unmediated access to this information as we currently represent the only real competition to Microsoft. I don't ask for access to their code, who would want it anyway, just the file format specs so that I can get at users' data. Remember that the data does belong to the user after all.

I also have a second request. Require operating system software and bundled application software to be priced and sold separately from the underlying hardware. It is in large part because of Microsoft's past exclusive tie-ins with PC vendors that they were able to establish their monopoly to begin with. How else do you explain the low penetration rate of IBM's superior OS/2 operating system. If you wanted OS/2, you had to first buy a PC with Windows preloaded, then spend for OS/2. As recently as two weeks ago, I was in MicroCenter, a large computer store in Tustin, California. I asked if I could buy a PC without Windows preloaded and was told I could not. Of course, I am sophisticated enough to seek out one of the few vendors who would do this or to piece together my own machine, but what real choice does the average consumer have?

Incredibly, many believe that Windows comes free with the computer. Separating the hardware and software purchase will reveal the true cost of competing options and make it more likely that consumers will inquire about alternatives when it is no longer implicit that buying a PC means buying Window as well.

Put yourself in the place of the average computer buyer and imagine the affect of just these two changes. Now, you walk into a store looking for a computer. There are many brands to choose from. Choices of processor, disk drives, CD–ROM drives and burners, etc. can be weighed on a cost benefit basis but, no matter your selection, you always get Windows because it comes with the computer and, even if you know enough to ask, you're told that it's the only option. Oh, and by the way, you better get that with Microsoft Works or Office or else no one will be able to read your files and data you bring home from work will be totally unusable. Contrast that with a scene in which the buyer learns that Windows will cost an extra $50 or $100, or whatever it costs, on top of the price of the computer. You mean, I could get something other than Windows? Sure, there's OS/2 or BSD or Linux, and BSD or Linux cost much less and are better systems in addition to being easy to use. OK, but what about file compatibility—will I be able to read and write .doc files I get from work and friends? Sure, there are many fine word processing and spread sheet programs which will read those files and better yet you can store your information in universally readable XML format so that they never go out of date. I think that we would then have a choice again and Microsoft would be forced to really compete on price and quality again. As things stand now, they're always a step ahead in the lock-in game.

Sincerely,
Maurice Davis
25 Morning Dove
Irvine, CA 92604
714–549–9745
mjd@networklogic.com

MTC–00004902

From: Charles D Hixson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 8:14pm
Subject: Certain comments on some proposed Microsoft remedies

The proposed solution to the monopoly that MS holds in the software industry, i.e., to allow them to engage in advertising (distributing their products in the schools) as a remedy is ... at best unjust. This is rewarding them with the opportunity to practice further predatory mechandizing. The proposed oversight committee is heavily stacked in favor of Microsoft, and really only has the power to require that it be allowed to look at Microsoft longer than it otherwise would if it finds that they haven't changed their business practices. Either or both of these, if adopted as legal remedies, would ... the legal system of the United States has been increasingly regarded as ineffectual against large organizations with a lot of money. If these decisions are adopted, then the matter would be settled beyond any reasonable doubt. I know that legally this shouldn't matter, but if I felt that the matter was being handled in accordance with justice then I wouldn't feel that I needed to write.

Note: I feel considerably more strongly about this than this letter may indicate, but a desire to be inoffensive has caused me to censor much of the content. I wish that I were more eloquent about this case, but rage tends to cause one to be incoherrent.

Charles Hixson

MTC–00004903

From: rich mycroft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 8:23pm
Subject: Re: MS Settlement

255 Summerfield Drive
Alpharetta, GA 30022
Dec 12th, 2001

As someone who has spent the last 16 years in the software industry, who has worked on everything from tiny embedded systems to mainframes, I find the proposed 'settlement' to be ludicrous. The idea that an organization that is a convicted, law-breaking monopolist should get such a light set of restrictions is almost beyond belief. Microsoft has done almost nothing in the way of innovation, but they are extremely good at tying everything under the sun into Windows and the proposed settlement does nothing to alter or restrict that behavior. I have worked on Microsoft systems as well as many other

systems and as a technologist I can plainly state that their success has nothing to do with the technical capabilities of their products but a great deal with their ability to use their financial and marketing muscle to restrict and destroy alternative technologies they feel might encroach upon their monoploy—and this was clearly stated in the decisions from the two courts. There was a time when I championed the Microsoft products as they seemed designed to give the average user more ability to do useful things with their personal computer systems, but over the last decade or so it has become apparent that they are now simply trying to find new ways to milk yet more money out of the consumers of the world while delivering products that are so shoddy that even the FBI has to call them up to inquire about the latest security holes.

That the current administration via John Ashcroft can seriously submit this so called settlement is almost beyond comprehension. I hope the court will see past Mr. Ashcroft's lack of desire to enforce a section of the law he evidently does not find appealing and in so doing create the real opportunity for technologists in this country and around the world to truly push for innovations. The alternative is to merely protect

Mr. Gates and his monopoly.

Richard Mycroft

MTC–00004904

From: mike woods
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 10:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Domination

I live in the United States and I still have somewhat of a freedom of choice in my life up to this point in time, but if the DOJ doesn't stop Microsoft at this time with something more than a slap on the hand we will be long down the road toward their Monopoly that they have well underway. I want to have the choice of software, operating systems & etc. that I want to use every day without Microsoft dictating to me what I haveto use or run to be compatible with what they want. I have used their product most of the time since Windows 3.0 and they have yet to produce a secure or stable product. Even their products like Word, Excel, etc are some of the most buggy products out there. The only reason most people use them is because they don't know of the other products that are available and Microsoft has people conviced that they have to use their products or nothing will work and because people don't understand computers they think they have to trust Microsoft. Why else would anyone pay for something that crashes several times every day and we have been told or led to believe that that's normal and a good thing. Most people would gladly use something else if they knew about it just to end the aggrivation. Not only Americans need to have the choice of products to use and have available everything out there but so does everyone else in the world that will be affected by this decision of the DOJ. Let's just hope the light will be seen and they will do the right thing for everyone and not something that will benefit Redmond.

MTC–00004905

From: Dave Terret
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 9:57pm
Subject: Re: Red Hat's settlement counterproposal of Nov. 27, 2001

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a computer professional having no connection to either Microsoft or Red Hat other than using their software, I would like to register my support for Red Hat's counterproposal. I felt that Microsoft's settlement proposal had been insufficiently punative. Also, there is no reason to give a monopolist an opportunity to extend its monopoly. While one could say that, by the same token, there's no reason that Red Hat should be allowed the opportunity to benefit from that monopolist's penalty more than other injured parties, their proposal is still vastly more just than Microsoft's.

David Terret

Indiana University

MTC–00004907

From: glenn green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 11:03pm
Subject: Public Comment

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a computer professional, working in what is by necessity an almost pure Microsoft environment. This is not by choice, but necessity. Not because it is the best product for the job necessararily but because Microsoft has so entrenched their monopolistic, blackmail upgrade practices to the point that it is in effect the only viable solution pretty much regardless of the cost at this point in time. Happily, I don't have to make that decision in the work environment, much less justify the expense.

In the performance of my duties I have had forced Internet Explorer upgrades rammed down my throat many more times than I care for, sometimes they cause compatability problems with other microsoft products, creating a domino effect. Sometimes this results in hours of down time, not just for a workstation. The effect as applied to a server can affect an entire organisation. This merly scratches the surface, Internet Explorer upgrades have been 'required'' for as innocous things as printer drivers, this is rediculous no, criminal!! I feel that some of the comments I have read on linuxplanet.com have stated this in an unarguable and perfectly clear fashon that I have no chance of equaling. Rather than plagerise the material I am including links. I implore, no beg of the doj to read very closly these linked comments. The current remedies are virtually benign to microsoft, it will be business as usual, nothing really changes. http://www.linuxplanet.com/linuxplanet/reviews/3973/2/ and http://www.linuxplanet.com/linuxplanet/reviews/3973/3/

To sum up a few key points. The proposed settlement mentions disclosing api's and other intellectual property, presumable file formats. Are these being disclosed to Microsoft's only real competitor?? The open source software comunity? I fear this disclosure will be made only to Microsoft's chosen vendors or develepors under the restriction of non-disclosure. Even were this to be disclosed to the open source community. Microsoft intentionally creates a moving target, by updating and forcing updates of key elements of this material. Not correcting known problems in existing version, but creating enhancements to new versions. We don't need html enabled email, active scripting in email and word documents, we've all seen what this enables. Yet this practice further entrenches the strangle hold on not only US consumers and businesses, but the entire world. Remember the Haloween Documents.

The proposed penalty as it stands does virtually nothing to change this.

A personal experience with my home PCs. My newest one came with Microsoft's Windows ME, which at first glance seemed as if it may be an acceptable solution to maintain compatability with other (Windows 95) systems on my small lan.

Not so!! After downloading the supposedly free DirectX Ver 8 from work, which was necessary because I refused to sign up for passport on my home system when I had another avenue. I then copied it to the home PC over a dialup connection into work, planning to simply copy if over my lan to the broken PC to repair DirectX which was broken by installing a game. Ah, a third party game?? No!! A MicroSoft game, but I digress. I was unable to connect to the Windows 95 machine, unless I installed an ME networking upgrade on the Windows 95 machine. I refused to be strong armed into an upgrade of even a small component of the existing system.

At this point I had a simple solution, reboot the machine to Linux, copy the DirectX ver 8 download to a cd-rw, carry it into the other room and repair the broken PC. Upon returning to my main PC, I promptly deleted the Windows ME partition. Problem solved, I refuse to be blackmailed into any more upgrades on my personal computers.

Enough is enough. It's not as simple, it's not as compatible, it's not as elegant, but I control the upgrades, and I know at least in general terms why they are required. Microsoft will not blackmail me into any more upgrades, I'm done, furthermore I will not rent software for a year or two (XP) or whatever Microsoft's current half baked scheme is.

Again I implore the doj to consider the only real competitor, of which I believe Microsoft is terrified and will eliminate by any underhanded means at it's disposal, legality be damned. The open source community, by introducing competition if given half a chance will force Microsoft to consider something other than what is best for Microsoft. Both quality and security will have to improve significantly if Microsoft is unable to eliminate this newest competitor, or Microsoft is going to be in trouble. Thank you for taking the time to read this, and please consider the open source community in the penalty of the Goliath Microsoft has become.

Glenn Green

1582 Railroad Drive

Carson City, Nevada 89701

MTC–00004908

From: Randy Wieck

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/26/01 11:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs:

I do not believe that the settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ is in the best interest of consumers. It allows Microsoft to basicly continue doing what is has in the past with only a small slap on the hand and also assures them of a gaureented monopoly into the educational market. If you're not going to discipline them, at least DON'T give them a lock on yet another market sector!

Thank you

Randy Wieck

CC:attorney.general@po.stat.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00004909

From: Robert Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 12:05am
Subject: Microsoft

In the first trial that Microsoft was convicted of abusing it's monopoly power, the judge rejected the DOJ's proposed ''punishment'' (which was essentially—stop doing the bad things you've been doing) since it was not punishment. At that point, the DOJ joined Microsoft in arguing that it was. They succeeded in getting a new judge to accept their non-punishment. Now a second trial has convicted Microsoft of abusing it's monopoly power. Again the DOJ has chosen to not punish Microsoft. And this despite Microsoft executives continuously lying or conveniently not understanding their own damning written communications. Despite Microsoft being caught giving deceitful demos, but for which they went unchastised during the trial. Compaq decided they wanted to include Netscape's browser on their computer. Microsoft immediately decided Compaq would not be able to buy Windows. Compaq was forced to longer use Netscape as they couldn't sell computers without Windows. Prodigy Internet wanted to be one of the Internet Service providers preinstalled in Windows. Microsoft said, sure, as long as you switch from Netscape to Internet Explorer. Intel wanted to develop some Java apps. Microsoft said if you do, we will make Windows work better with AMD products. And more abuses, including the current Microsoft license that says no second operating system may be added by the computer manufacturer to any machine which has Windows on it. An item which the DOJ CHOSE NOT TO PURSUE IN IT'S CASE!!!! Incredibly the first trial finally forced Microsoft to stop using a software license that forced payment to them for each machine sold, not just those that had Windows installed; and yet the second trial decided not to pursue their equally abusive current license.

I would be reluctantly expecting a third trial, except for the fact that Microsoft's monopoly is now complete. There is no company to worry about them damaging. OS/2 is gone. Corel is only in business because Microsoft gave them some money. Netscape is no longer a company, and it's new owner, AOL only uses Internet Explorer with their service. Only consumers can force a trial now, and unfortunately, the excessive price Microsoft charges for their products—giving them a huge monopoly sized profit margin and profits—has never been an issue. And a recent class action lawsuit was settled at Microsoft's suggestion with a settlement that just shows Microsoft has the government in their pocket— the ''penalty'' was again a non-punishment—Microsoft gets to give their software (along with machines to run them) to poor secondary schools. Secondary schools, one of the last places where Microsoft had some competition—from Apple. Amazing.

Thanks for making a mockery of justice and right and wrong, DONJ.

Robert Smith

MTC–00004910

From: Brent Farwick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 12:30am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs and Madames,

I am a bit unnerved that such a toothless compromise has been arrived at as a remedy to Microsoft's misbehaviour. It is certainly no secret to those of you in the Justice Department that Microsoft has not lived up to the requirements of the last consent decree. Please show us that you can be trusted to act in the interest of all parties, not just the richest entity.

Brent Farwick

Southern California

MTC–00004911

From: Zach Anthony
To: Microsoft ATR,dennispowell @earthlink.net@inetgw
Date: 12/27/01 1:12am
Subject: A threat to our national defense.

Hello,

I work for a government contractor in the development of information systems. The project I am currently working on is an important intelligence application that has been in use by the Department of Defense since the 70's.

I am writing because I am particularly concerned about the negative impact that non-standard, closed software may have on our project and our national defense.

Development of new functionality of our application relies heavily upon open source software and open standards. Software currently being utilized in our system includes: Java, Apache HTTPD, Apache Tomcat, Apache SOAP, Ghostscript, and various GNU utilities; gzip, gcc, gdb, and the list goes on.

My point is this, open source and open standards provide the public and the government with quality software components that are being used **right now** to reduce costs and increase flexibility. Only by using standards based, open software can the government or any corporation ensure that they are free from control of a single entity.

The Internet evolved from the work of the U.S. government to create an indestructible infrastructure that no one could stop. Why on earth would we want to hand this over to Microsoft?

It has been said in several other articles and correspondence that Microsoft's control over the Internet is dangerous. Their ability to monopolize technologies through marketing and distribution of incompatible software is widely known.

To me, America is about freedom. We must encourage the freedom of the government, corporations, and all individuals by insuring the free exchange of information.

Microsoft seeks to ''loan'' their computer applications, and store information saved with those applications in a closed or encrypted format which only Microsoft applications can unlock. What this amounts to is data hi-jacking * * * you can get to **your** data only if you are willing to pay the price Microsoft asks.

Please, protect your country; every citizen, every corporation, every government agency. Do not let Microsoft continue to release non-standard, closed technology that benefits only themselves.

Sincerely,

Zach Anthony

MTC–00004912

From: Jud Meaders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 1:39am
Subject: TMF: Are you XPerienced? / Apple (AAPL) http://boards.fool.com/

Message.asp?mid=16344903 thought maybe you guys and gals might like to see some of what is being said about your favorite monopoly; one that you seemingly refuse to punish and/or hold accountable. Thanks

MTC–00004913

From: maureen@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 2:07am
Subject: RE: Judgement of Microsoft

As a private citizen of the United States and a computer user, both at home and at work, I was very disappointed to see that the DOJ appears to have been bought and paid for by Microsoft (Bill Gates). There is nothing in the document that protects my rights as a citizen. According to this proposed document I would have to use Microsoft products. When I purchase a new machine, I would have to purchase it with Microsoft on it.

What happened to my freedom of choice. I use three forms of Microsoft products at work. I am a 911 call taker and dispatcher. Our radio system is based on Windows NT. The machines freeze approximately once a month. This means we are not able to talk to the units we have dispatched in the field until we reboot the machine (providing it only has to done once). This could cost lives of the very people who protect and serve the public. Our 911 phone system is based on Windows 2000. Of the six machines we use, at least two of them freeze in the middle of 911 calls once a week. These people call us for help. They have a prowler, maybe a house fire, or a domestic. When these calls get cut off we don't even know where they go. All we can do is try to call the number back (after we reboot the machine, which takes about 3 minutes), or pray they call us back. Our CAD, Computer Aided Dispatch, machines are based on Windows 98SE. These are the machines we use to record the call and the response of the units. It also holds all the

information regarding the call. They freeze at least twice a month. This is not too much of a problem providing all three machines don't freeze at the same time. All our machines are networked. All of been installed by Microsoft certified people. They cannot stop these machines from freezing.

The above happens because Microsoft is the defacto OS. We have three different versions of Microsoft software. All three fail us. There have been no improvements in there software since 3.0 came out. The loss of information has cost companies millions of dollars. The down time of employees increases this amount. The loss of life due to software failure should not be permitted. At home I choose to use Linux. I paid for the boxed version because I believe in supporting companies that supply to the consumer a decent product. It doesn't crash, freeze, or change any of my input information. When I retrieve a file, it is exactly what I had saved. I don't have to reboot. In fact I haven't rebooted my machine in months. I have a multitude of choices in software. I also did not have to pay an enormous fee for the software included with the OS I choose.

Should you continue with the proposed judgement I would not be able to surf the internet as in the past. Microsoft would, with its propreitary software, not allow me to connect to any MNS sites. I would be unduly restricted from many websites including the Goverment ones that I use frequently.

Please reconsider your judgement. Do not allow Microsoft to keep their monopoly in the software market. Protect us, the public, who use software. Allow us, the public, to have the freedom of choice.

Maureen L. Thomas
8234 Autumn Oak Ave.
Port Richey, FL 34668

MTC–00004914

From: Oliver Bausinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 5:35am
Subject: Comment on the Microsoft settlement

First of all, I have to say that I'm not a US citizen (I'm German), so my voice may not be heard in this phase of public comment. But nevertheless:

Microsoft's use of its monopoly in the Operating System, Office and Internet Browser market is a high danger for its competitors. With its proprietary closed protocols and formats (MS Office Formats, Kerberos, etc.), it's limiting its competitors abilities.

Therefore I urge the US Government not to let the get away the easy way: Microsoft should be forced to open up their technical specifications for their file formats and protocols so that competiting products can provide interaction.

Obviously, protocols that are used by 90% and more of the users should not be controlled by one company (but by some kind of non-commercial independent organization).

As non-US citizen, I urge you to apply the appropriate measures to this case.

Yours sincerely,
Oliver Bausinger

MTC–00004916

From: David Kubalak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 8:39am
Subject: Not happy about settlement

I don't know that much about the settlement, but what I have heard of it shocks and puzzles me. What I have heard doesn't seem to me to solve anything—it doesn't actually provide any real punishment for breaking the law, it doesn't even seem to assure that Microsoft obeys the law in the future. I have heard many good arguments for better remedies—opening up file protocols, making licensing agreements public, publishing the cost of Microsoft products bundled with computer sales.

I have seen copies of letters sent to you, and I couldn't tell you anything new, but I do want my voice to count as another heavy computer user and programmer who is not happy with the settlement. Please listen to the suggestions that other have sent to you, and provide a more useful solution.

Thanks,
dave
David Kubalak

These opinions are my own and not my employers. I don't know what their opinions are in this situation.

MTC–00004917

From: Jeff Muse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 9:55am
Subject: proposed Microsoft settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to spend a few moments discussing the proposed anti-trust settlement with Microsoft. One of the ways I make a living is by migrating individuals and business from Microsoft products to those produced by the open-source community, so I am in a good position to assess the impact of Microsoft's actions on the market. For a long time, it has been painfully clear to me that there are a number of issues that need to be addressed in order for the playing field in the computer and software markets to be level. In no particular order, they are:

1) Eliminate the bundling of Microsoft operating systems with hardware. Currently, it is difficult, indeed nearly impossible, to buy a PC without a Microsoft operating system pre-installed. This has the effect of making consumers pay for an operating system whether they want it or not. Worse yet, this situation increases the proliferation of Microsoft based viruses and worms by shipping Outlook and Outlook Express as mail clients. These mail programs are far and away the most common vector for the spread of malicious code throughout the Internet. In the current state of concern for national security—which was one of the concerns cited by Judge Kollar-Kotelly in urging a swift settlement—it is incomprehensible that this situation would not be addressed. As matters stand now, the current Microsoft monopoly has no reason to improve the security of its systems.

2) Require that any Microsoft file formats have published standards. One of the most vexing issues in transitioning away from Microsoft is that many clients feel tied to Microsoft and its office suite because they are concerned that they will not be able to read documents sent to them by others. This is problematic for two reasons. First, rather than choose the best software available based on price and features, consumers choose Microsoft products because that's what everyone else uses. Second, the closed file formats used by Microsoft software allow Microsoft to force consumers to upgrade not only programs but hardware as well, consequently forcing the purchase of more powerful machines which just coincidentally come pre-installed with a Microsoft operating system. This is accomplished by changing the closed file formats every so often.

A case in point is my mother, who had a perfectly functional older PC with Windows 95 and Office 95. She could not read documents sent to her that were written in Office 2000. As her machine was not powerful enough to handle the newer versions of Windows, she was forced to buy new hardware in order to run software that would read her email attachments.

3) Publish all Microsoft interoperability specifications.

Microsoft is notorious for an ''embrace and extend'' policy with regards to industry standards. A case in point in Kerberos, the authentication policy that runs with Windows 2000. For years, this was an open standard used by the Unix community. After Microsoft's embrace and extension, Kerberos on Microsoft failed to work with Kerberos on Unix. Had the specifications for the Microsoft extensions of Kerberos been published, this attempted lock-in to Microsoft products would have failed.

Another example is Samba, a program used to emulate a Windows server on various flavors of Unix. Samba developers have been forced to spend quite a bit of time reverse-engineering rather then developing software. Were it not for them, Microsoft would have a much larger chunk of the server market than they do currently. Having monopolized the desktop, as illustrated above, they then attempted to make sure that only Windows servers would work with the ubiquitous desktop machines.

Opening Microsoft's standards will expose their products to a higher level of scrutiny than previously possible. There is a saying in the open source community: ''With enough eyes, all bugs are shallow.'' These additional eyes can only improve the performance and security of Microsoft products. Consequently, the standards to be opened must be available to all, and at the time of product release. Restricting access to a privileged few will dilute the efficacy of the solutions to Microsoft's monopoly. It is also necessary to realize that the rest of the world, with a few notable exceptions, is moving towards open standards in computing. As globalization and international trade increase, we may find that continued endorsement of Microsoft's practices will have an isolating effect.

In short, the existing Microsoft monopoly is harmful to consumers, to our national security, and to our nation's commercial interests. A strong and vigorously enforced anti-trust settlement, such as outlined above, will rectify these problems.

Sincerely,
Jeff Muse

3895 Connecticut
St. Louis, MO 63116
jmuse@kcnet.com

MTC–00004918

From: Bergmeister, Frank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 10:17am
Subject: name=''winmail.dat''

To whom it may concern,

I just wanted to voice my opinion on why the proposed settlement with Microsoft is a bad thing. My state unfortunately has already conceded (we are a Microsoft state here in Maryland) and signed off on the settlement. Believe it or not, students at the University of Maryland have to pay a fee each year for using Microsoft products ... whether they use them or not!! It's not a lot of money each year, but when you have 20,000 students, it really adds up. Also: Because the most successful competitors in recent years in product markets in which Microsoft holds a true or de facto monopoly (eg. personal computer operating systems, Internet browsers, and office productivity software) have arisen from the open source software community, I believe it is of extreme importance that any settlement protect and enhance this community's ability to produce products that provide end-users with viable choices.

In my reading of the proposed settlement, such protection is not provided. On the contrary, the settlement will serve to allow Microsoft to continue to hinder the open source software community's efforts. The proposed settlement speaks of disclosure of APIs and licensing of intellectual property. I fear that any information disclosed by Microsoft will only be licensed to vendors or developers under conditions of a non-disclosure agreement, thus preventing the implementation of such protocols in an open source project or product.

This settlement, if implemented as proposed, will serve to entrench Microsoft's monopolies further, by allowing it to exclude the open source software community from any future technologies and APIs it develops. As this community is currently one of Microsoft's most serious competitors, it seems unbelievable that the proposed settlement will aid Microsoft in eliminating this ''threat'' to their monopolies. It will give them gain a monopoly in the last place that they do not have one * * public education.

I hope that the decision is changed and that some thought is used to come up with a better solution!!

Frank Bergmeister

MTC–00004919

From: john.andrews@amsys.ie@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 10:26am
Subject: Proposed Final Judgment

Dear Renata Hesse,

As a consumer who uses Microsoft products on a daily basis I feel severely let down by the remedies as contained in the Proposed Final Judgment in the case United States of America vs Microsoft Corporation. While publication of the windows API's may be a good idea in principle it is not sufficient on its own and it should be expanded to include publication of file formats. Let me give my situation as an example of why this should be so. In my case I use Microsoft Word on a daily basis even though it is not my word processor of choice. However I am forced to use it both at home and at work in order to be sure that colleagues and friends will be able to read and update documents that I produce and vice versa. Alternative word processors that I have used have been unable to import and export Microsoft Word.doc files to a sufficient standard for me to be able to use them. This is the only reason I do not use an alternative word processor to MS Word.

The difficulties and frustration at having to use a product that I find poorly designed and counter intuitive cause a considerable loss of productivity in my daily work. While I hope that this loss of productivity is not replicated by millions of other consumers across the US I would not be surprised to find out that it was. To remedy this the judge should mandate the setting up an independent commission that would have the following powers and duties:

1) It would publish all current and past Microsoft file formats, protocols and windows API's.

2) It would require Microsoft to explain and justify any changes to its current file formats, protocols and windows API's. Any changes would have to be justified on the basis of improved consumer utility.

3) It would have the power and the duty to prevent Microsoft releasing products using new file formats, protocols and windows API's in any cases where it was not convinced that the benefits to consumers outweighed the disadvantages of the new file formats, protocols and windows API's.

4) In cases where it was satisfied of the benefits to consumers it would publish any new Microsoft file formats, protocols and windows API's at least 6 months in advance of any Microsoft product using them. This gives other producers the opportunity to update their products in time for a new Microsoft release. Consumers using these non-MS products would not then experience periods during which their product of choice was unable to use the latest Microsoft file format. Items 2 and 3 would benefit all consumers even if they only ever used Microsoft products. Items 1 and 4 are essential to the protection of any consumers who wish to have a choice between Microsoft products and those produced elsewhere.

There are some very important requirements for the operation and makeup of this commission:

The commission should do as much of its work as possible in public. It would be required to consider submissions from consumers before making important decisions. It would need a strong and technically capable staff. Although the commission and its staff would need to be in constant communication with Microsoft none of the commission members would be Microsoft employees or have been proposed by Microsoft. This is in order to insure the commission's independence. Finally the commission must have the power to enforce its decisions at the time that they are made. Any Microsoft appeals should be considered only after the decisions have been enforced.

To Conclude: The remedies as agreed by the government and Microsoft will make almost no difference to me as a consumer. In order to make any improvement to my day to day experience as a consumer of Microsoft Operating Systems and Microsoft applications, most if not all, of the suggestions above would need to be implemented.

Yours sincerely
John Andrews

MTC–00004920

From: Quincin Gonjon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:06am
Subject: Microsoft's Monopoly

This country has been blessed with freedom and the strength to empower its people with it. Freedom is independence, liberty and the exemption from the power and control of another. Microsoft takes away freedom from this country as well as from the entire world. By allowing Microsoft to complete its stated goals to provide the only de facto Operating System, Office suite, and internet tools for the entire world we are giving away our rights as free people. Todays way of living has changed dramatically and more people depend on computers to communicate, buy, find jobs, plan daily activities, organize, travel and search for information like a library. A great deal of control will be placed on one company (Microsoft) to secure our very freedom without selfishly using this to empower themselves into the biggest entity that the world has ever known. I personally don't believe that such power should be given to Microsoft and that the best way is for this government to stop all monopolistic goals and activities generated by Microsoft.

Microsoft products are by nature insecure and they are in constant threat of being hacked or cracked. Their product is not secure because they implement insecure features like portal, hailstorm,IIS, Outlook, vb scripting, remote appliance control through the web, MS Java machine and the macro features in their Office Suite. Microsoft's goal is not to secure its Operating System but to make sure its users find it easier to use. This by nature makes the Operating System even more hacker and cracker friendly. Our nation and other countries will need to have choices. Our citizens should also be aware and have the freedom to choose from different applications without the propriety licenses of file format to hinder one application from communicating to another. I strongly believe that if Microsoft would be permitted to continue its journey of monopolizing the software industry, the entire world would loose its freedom. The only recourse as a free nation is to make sure that the proprietary formats and protocols of Microsoft is made public and can be used by new and older companies to build competing products.

CC:qgonjon@nyc.rr.com@inetgw

MTC–00004921

From: David McKellar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:32am
Subject: Open is the solution

I am sure many other people will be making suggestions like this... The answer for the Microsoft problem is to force them to release all details on all their file formats and protocols. In the future they should be barred from using proprietary format/protocols—strictly ISO/ANSI/W3C standards. This would mean other companies (and non-profit groups) can fairly complete with the 800 pound gorilla Microsoft has become.

MTC–00004922

From: Sherman, Robert (Orlando)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/27/01 11:34am
Subject: Nader & Love said it best!

Linux is not a Cancer attacking innovation...It represents the innovation of every college, gifted user/programmer and even some highly innovative companies. Microsoft is actively trying to squash this movement...look closely at the changes at Corel, a company which once offered a vibrant Linux distribution which had a focus on creating a viable Linux Desktop OS. They experienced some financial trouble, which is in and of itself an odd situation, and when Microsoft bailed them out...they decided to end Linux OS developement.

Mr.(s) Nader and Love Stated ... What is surprising is that the US Department of Justice allowed Microsoft to place so many provisions in the agreement that can be used to undermine the free software movement. Note for example that under J.1 and J.2 of the proposed final order, Microsoft can withhold technical information from third parties on the grounds that Microsoft does not certify the ''authenticity and viability of its business,'' while at the same time it is describing the licensing system for Linux as a ''cancer'' that threatens the demise of both the intellectual property rights system and the future of research and development. The agreement provides Microsoft with a rich set of strategies to undermine the development of free software, which depends upon the free sharing of technical information with the general public, taking advantage of the collective intelligence of users of software, who share ideas on improvements in the code. If Microsoft can tightly control access to technical information under a court approved plan, or charge fees, and use its monopoly power over the client space to migrate users to proprietary interfaces, it will harm the development of key alternatives, and lead to a less contestable and less competitive platform, with more consumer lock-in, and more consumer harm, as Microsoft continues to hike up its prices for its monopoly products.

This open Source movement is important, innovative and should be protected.

MTC–00004923

From: Harka Steinhart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:45am
Subject: Comment on MS case

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the recently proposed remedies in the case against Microsoft.

It is with great regret, that I have found those remedies to be not of such nature at all. They, in their current form, will not in any way change the sad state of affairs in the computer software industry and by extension not enhance and empower the end users of software products.

The proposed settlement in the case will, however, be of great damage to the Government of the United States and the Department of Justice in particular. Essentially people see this case and it's recent development as a sign, that Microsoft's devious ''business'' practices will again go unpunished and nothing will change whatsoever. In fact, now it seems even more legitimized because everything is ''settled'' and ''remedied''. This dramatically undermines peoples faith in the Justice system. I cannot stress enough the importance of this! I work in the IT profession and come in contact with many different people. Even those, who are generally big proponents of Microsoft (products), see this case as ''MS having bought out the DoJ'' and in return having gotten the most benevolent treatment that could possibly have been hoped for in Redmond.

Having mentioned this, I would like to take the opportunity to suggest a couple possibilities, that would really make a difference to the industry and consumers alike. Let me also preface this with the fact, that these following options do not in any way intend to ''damage Microsoft as much as possible'' out of spiteful reasons, but are a real attempt at restoring a healthy and beneficial market atmosphere of competition, where the best product advances on it's own merit, as opposed to a product that is quite literally forced upon users against their will.

1. Decouple hardware from software. The proposed ''non-exlusive contracts'' between hardware vendors and Microsoft do not accomplish this.

Hardware needs to be sold as that...hardware. The Operating System and any applications must be an additional option (if desired at all) based on the buyer's/user's true choice.

Currently it is just about impossible without extensive research to find vendors where one's hard-earned money does not go by default to a significant extent to Microsoft. Even people, who later on exercise their choice in software, tend to have to buy a computer with a Microsoft OS and applications preinstalled, thereby rendering their later choice impactless in the market because Microsoft has already gotten paid, even though their products, including the MS-Windows OS itself, weren't used (which is also why the proposed changes in regards to ''middleware'' are not enough, because they assume the MS-Windows Operating System as being the one used, thus yet again cementing the monopoly of Microsoft!)

This situation is contrary to the *foundation of this country*, which is a free and competitive market, where money votes for which product will survive. The freedom of choice is currently quasi non-existent.

An even more unfortunate extension of this problem of hardware being tied to a particular Operating System and/or applications from a specific company is, that in recent years even the usually generic hardware has become OS specific. An example of that are the infamous ''WinModems''...modem's, which will only work with a Windows-driver and thus precluding any other OS. So yes, theoretically the user could install another OS but won't be able to go online, effectively preventing even the possibility of such a choice of OS. I have seen similar examples with graphics cards and other components. The only true remedy for this is to make the Operating System and applications an *option* upon buying!

Further, Microsoft needs to be prevented from leveraging their financial standing by offering substantial and competitor-hostile discounts on their software, even if it is preinstalled with the users approval. I.e. a copy of the MS-Windows OS should be the same price whether it is purchased seperatly or preinstalled. This also means, that if no Microsoft OS and/or applications were desired by the user, Microsoft should not get a single penny (as opposed to ''per-processor'' contracts, where MS got paid regardless, even if nothing at all was installed). This not only would restore a market balance and give users an extremely important choice over their computing environment, but also lower costs by not having to pay for undesired products.

2. Force Microsoft to open their formats. The proposed opening of the Windows API to ''commercial'' ventures is not only to restrictive in it's scope since it excludes not-for-profit development efforts, but also not effective in eliminating the illegal monopoly Microsoft is holding over the market place. Far more important than the API are the formats used for wordprocessed files (*.doc), spreadsheets (*.xls), networking protocols and the handling of formats such as XML. Microsoft keeps these formats not only a secret, but tends to deliberately change them every so often, not only making it almost impossible for competitors to, well, compete but also forcing even users of it's own products into a viscious and expensive ''upgrade'' cycle if they want to be able to read documents being sent to them by someone with a newer version of the program.

The development of alternatives in the Office-Suite area, for example, are dramatically hindered by the obscurity of the formats used by Microsoft. The situation is so dire, that people don't ask how well an alternative might work as a word processor in itself, for example, but ''how well does it handle Microsoft Word(TM) documents''. Generally it can't possibly handle it well because the developers do not have access to the *.doc format, thus forcing users to use Microsoft's own Word-processor as opposed to a perhaps technically superior alternative just because they have to remain ''compatible'' in the document format.

This is so important an issue, that not only the choice of Office-Suite is currently inhibited, but users are not able to adopt an alternative Operating System such as Linux, simply because it doesn't have Microsoft Office ported to it (although there are several very good Office-Suites available for Linux). The opening of the various formats and protocols, however, would among other

things allow the developer's of alternatives to correctly import and handle MS-Word *.documents and thus give the users the tools they want and can most effectively use. A word processor would be a word processor again and not a ''Microsoft Word(TM) Document Processor''. This step in itself would dramatically alter the unhealthy landscape currently present to a more productive and balanced (not monopolized) market place. Ladies and Gentlemen, these two points outlined above would be far more reaching towards the underlying goal to ''unfetter [the] market from anticompetitive conduct,'' to ''terminate the illegal monopoly, deny to the defendant the fruits of its statutory violation, and ensure that there remain no practices likely to result in monopolization in the future'', than the current proposals. The current terms of the proposed settlement do not accomplish that and are therefore UNACCEPTABLE! It is therefore my hope and and wish to see revised terms including the points made above, that would indeed unburden the market and users from the heavy weight of a monopolist such as Microsoft Corporation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Harka Steinhart

MTC–00004924

From: boyd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:48am
Subject: DOJ proposed Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Reading the proposed settlement, and the arguments put forward by the DOJ in support of it, I find myself wondering how the DOJ could craft a solution that not only does not solve the problems it addresses, but exacerbates them.

As a Computer Scientist who teaches about Operating Systems and Networks, I am very familiar with the problems that have arisen as a result of Microsoft's monopoly on the desktop OS market. These problems have cost the United States billions of dollar in lost time and productivity. These problems threaten our domestic security and make us easy to attack from abroad. Simply put, any monopolist in this area makes us easier to attack, and Microsoft, with their very poor security record, make us a sitting duck for any 13 year old kid with a virus kit. We talk of bioterrorism, but I think there is a much greater danger of real economic loss from computer terrorism.

There aren't any easy solutions to this problem, but the need for remedies is real and the ones put forth by the DOJ are not useful remedies. If you adopt them, Microsoft will have been given your permission to continue and even increase its monopolist behavior and our country will be damaged by a lack of innovation in computer software and by a lack of security. Please give serious consideration to the alternative proposals put forth by the states that have, wisely, refused to accept the DOJ settlement proposal and to the suggestion you receive during this comment period.

Sincerely,

Mark J Boyd, PhD.

Assoc Prof of Computer Science

University of North Carolina

MTC–00004925

From: mark dufour
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 12:11pm

how simple can it be? microsoft should not purposefully make their software incompatible with software by others! require of them to thoroughly document public formats such as Word so there can be honest competition. unless you are being bribed, or your whole government is owned by microsoft, you will agree with me that this can only benefit the consumer. mark dufour, student of computer science, the netherlands.

MTC–00004926

From: Sharon A. Fordham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 12:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the DOJ:

Folks, I urge you to reject the proposed Microsoft settlement which would allow Microsoft to donate old Windows equipment and software to schools, probably at cost, as a way of compensating the ''class'' of consumers who believe they were ripped off by Microsoft due to uncompetitive pricing of their Windows products.

First, let me say that I am a sizeable stockholder in Microsoft and I use their software everyday. It1s good and I1m pleased to have it. That said, I think the proposed Microsoft settlement in patently wrong at many levels and needs to be completely rethought.

First and foremost, the settlement is completely unresponsive to the court case, which defined a class of oppressed consumers who were forced to purchase Windows at a higher premium than they deemed appropriate. How is a proposal to contribute old hardware and software to schools in poor urban districts responsive to a class action lawsuit for unfair, anti-competitive practices? Shouldn1t those in the class be compensated, accepting that a donation to a school is perhaps more noble?

Second, and far more troubling to me, is that the proposed Microsoft settlement is clearly a Trojan horse strategy for Microsoft to begin to dominate one of the few industries where they are not nearly as competitive. In fact, Apple has almost a 50% share in schools, and is the current category leader. This is a very clever way for Microsoft to begin to take control of the school channel as well. Hummm, let1s see...they gave away Internet Explorer and took away a 70% share of the market from Netscape; they1re giving away a free media player to unseat RealPlayer as the leader. Doesn1t a free ''giveaway'' to indigent school systems sound like it1s yet another leg of the very uncompetitive trade practices for which it was found guilty in the first place?

I urge you to reject the Microsoft proposal for the reasons above.

Many thanks for your time...

Sharon A. Fordham

CC:safordham@rcn.com@inetgw

MTC–00004927

From: Nugent, Michael P (SAIC)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/27/01 12:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

In the settlement of the antitrust lawsuit against Microsoft, the DOJ states that imposed restrictions will stop Microsoft's unlawful conduct. My warranted distrust of Microsoft aside, even were Microsoft to adhere to the restrictions set forth by the settlement, Microsoft could and would still continue to wield monopoly clout.

The most profound loophole is evident in Section II ''Overview of Relief'', bullet point 6. While the settlement requires that Microsoft publish its APIs, the settlement does not deal at all with file formats or network protocols.

Without forcing Microsoft to provide information about these, Microsoft would continue to prevent serious competition to its office productivity software monopoly, and hinder interoperability with other networked OSs. Competing products do not have any way to interpret Microsoft's proprietary file formats or network protocols without reverse engineering, which puts competitors at a severe disadvantage. It may also prove legally impossible to develop a competing product, depending on licensing agreements, some of which explicitly restrict reverse engineering.

The most egregious loophole allows Microsoft to continue to extract a price from each new PC sold which is bundled with their Microsoft OS, regardless of whether the PC will ever run that Microsoft OS.

The settlement contains provisions in Section II, bullet points 1, 2, 3 and 5, that allow PCs to feature alternative middleware products, but not provisions to allow PC manufacturers to feature an alternative to the Microsoft OS, pre-installed on nearly all new PCs. That is to say, PC manufacturers must pay for a pre-installed Microsoft OS, even if they de-install the OS before the OS is used, and replace it with another, non-Microsoft OS. The Microsoft OS cost is then passed down to the customer.

A recent and personal case in point: I intend to purchase a notebook from Sony, and though I will never boot to Windows, I incurred the cost of the pre-installed OS. Predictably, Sony does not sell any computers without a Microsoft OS. And, though I do not ever agree to the licensing agreement, nor do I open the shrink-wrapped software accompanying it, I cannot get a refund.

While a recent ruling in another court does permit me to sell the licensed software, I will not likely get the full value. Nor would I like my incidental purchase of a Microsoft product to add to their revenue or bolster their market penetration statistics.

(To read the ruling mentioned above, see http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/CACD/RecentPubOp.nsf/bb61c530eab0911c882567cf00 5ac6f9/574aa79ff518021188256aed006ea2dc/$FILE/CV00–04161DDP.pdf)

MTC–00004928

From: Steven W. Orr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 12:55pm
Subject: Please break Microsoft up.

They need to be broken up for all of the following reasons:

1. They insist on using proprietary file formats. Things like Word and Excel are just the tip of the iceberg.

2. Proprietary network protocols. Separate from proprietary file formats is the format of data used to communicate between different processes which might be on different computers. Microsoft is famous for trying to subvert well established protocols and changing them so that already running software will not work with their systems. At first blush, you might think they were just plain stupid, but in reality they are trying to prevent anyone from running any software at all unless it was purchased from them.

3. Bad security implementations. They insist on implementiung their security protocols in a proprietary fasion. The end result is that it's impossible to evaluate how secure their systems really are unless someone figures out how to crack them. In fact, time and time again, their systems always turn out to be trivially crackable. And when it happens, they do not act in a timely fasion to fix the problem. All of the good security protocols are developed out in the open so people can see how they work.

4. They prevent people from being able to buy computers without their OS. I happen to run Unix systems. I would never be happy being forced to pay the extra Microsoft tax for software I don't want and would never use.

5. They engage in unfair business tactics. They are famous for their deceptive business practices. Little guys are routinely stepped upon and squashed.

And finally, their bad practices are impacting my personal ability to enjoy the services provided to me by others. One recent story I have for you concerns the cable modem I have at home to host my own personal domain. About 5 months ago when the Code Red virus struck, my ISP, RCN, as well as other major ISPs (like MediaOne) simply shut off port 80. They were well within their rights to do this for a number of reasons; the main one being that People are not allowed to run servers on a cable modem. The driving force here is that the Microsoft OS implementation is susceptible to virus in an era when all other OS's are not. The latest episode is that RCN has just shut off all access to all computers within their own router groups, just for the purpose of squashing yet another virus that affects the Microsoft OS.

Please help. This is what government is for. —

-Time flies like the wind. Fruit flies like a banana. Stranger things have— -happened but none stranger than this. Does your driver's license say Organ -Donor? Black holes are where God divided by zero. Listen to me! We are all- -individuals! What if this weren't a hypothetical question?

steveo@syslang.net

MTC–00004929

From: Chris Barr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 1:10pm
Subject: Comment on Microsoft suit

Microsoft has, as we all know, gained its market position via illegal business practices.

Severe penalties should be levied for their misdeeds, including substantial payments to injured parties and substantial changes in the company's future business opportunities.

The proposed settlement is far too lenient in regard to Microsoft.

Chris Barr
21 Riverview Avenue
Wayland, MA 01778

MTC–00004930

From: Bill Rausch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft judgement

I am a concerned user and programmer. I use Microsoft products as well as Apple products. I also use quite a few different UNIX systems as well as Linux. In fact, my use of Linux and related open source products such as Apache has been growing. I'm concerned that the not-for-profit organizations appear to have been left out of the settlement. It appears to me that Microsoft's current competition is these very organizations and that they must be specifically included in the settlement.

I'm also concerned about the make-up of the three person panel. That seems to me to be too small a number of persons to properly assess the vast number of software technologies involved. I've spent my professional career in software development and am familiar with more many operating systems and platforms and more programming languages, yet certainly wouldn't feel qualified to sit on such a small panel wielding such large influence. I don't think any group of three persons could do a satisfactory job. I'd be more inclined to support a group of seven or more persons, along with some support staff.

Bill Rausch Software developer for Numerical Applications, Inc. in Richland, WA Adjunct computer science faculty for Washington State University From comments by Robert X. Cringely:

The remedies in the Proposed Final Judgement specifically protect companies in commerce—organizations in business for profit. On the surface, that makes sense because Microsoft was found guilty of monopolistic activities against ''competing'' commercial software vendors like Netscape, and other commercial vendors—computer vendors like Compaq, for example. The Department of Justice is used to working in this kind of economic world, and has done a fair job of crafting a remedy that will rein in Microsoft without causing undue harm to the rest of the commercial portion of the industry. But Microsoft's greatest single threat on the operating system front comes from Linux—a non-commercial product—and it faces a growing threat on the applications front from Open Source and freeware applications.

The biggest competitor to Microsoft Internet Information Server is Apache, which comes from the Apache Foundation, a not-for-profit. Apache practically rules the Net, along with Sendmail, and Perl, both of which also come from non-profits. Yet not-for-profit organizations have no rights at all under the proposed settlement.

It is as though they don't even exist.

Section III(J)(2) contains some very strong language against not-for-profits. Specifically, the language says that it need not describe nor license API, Documentation, or Communications Protocols affecting authentication and authorization to companies that don't meet Microsoft's criteria as a business: ''...(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, ...''

So much for SAMBA and other Open Source projects that use Microsoft calls. The settlement gives Microsoft the right to effectively kill these products.

Section III(D) takes this disturbing trend even further. It deals with disclosure of information regarding the APIs for incorporating non-Microsoft ''middleware.'' In this section, Microsoft discloses to Independent Software Vendors (ISVs), Independent Hardware Vendors (IHVs), Internet Access Providers (IAPs), Internet Content Providers (ICPs), and Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) the information needed to inter-operate with Windows at this level. Yet, when we look in the footnotes at the legal definitions for these outfits, we find the definitions specify commercial concerns only.

But wait, there's more! Under this deal, the government is shut out, too. NASA, the national laboratories, the military, the National Institute of Standards and Technology—even the Department of Justice itself—have no rights. It is a good thing Afghanistan is such a low-tech adversary and that B-52s don't run Windows. —

Bill Rausch, Software Development, Unix, Mac, Windows Numerical Applications, Inc. 509–943–0861 bill@numerical.com

MTC–00004931

From: Robert Fischer
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general @po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 12/27/01 2:59pm
Subject: Microsoft AntiTrust remedies

To whom it may concern;

I would like to present the viewpoint of a volume consumer of Microsoft products as you consider possible remedies to the judged illegal actions of Microsoft.

1)Integration of products does not benefit consumers. Trust me. We are a $400,000,000.00 + company employing about 700 people. A browser used to cost about $25.00 per copy under the various volume purchase agreements between Microsoft & Netscape. I spend many, many times that fixing bugs, and fending off the latest virus because Microsoft integrates application function in the operating system or vice-versa. It isn't an advantage.

2)My Microsoft licensing costs QUADRUPLED this year because Microsoft is leveraging the fact that there is no competitive operating system or office productivity suite. I can no longer purchase and deploy upgrades as I need them in a cost effective way, I have to buy maintenance on a 3 yr contract, for products that come out every two years or so (that are usually VERY buggy, see the recent XP news) that would take a year to deploy. Do the math, this improves their cash flow tremendously while giving our company nothing. It is cheaper to buy new PC's and depreciate them. In a

down year like this, we can't do that and survive.

3)Microsoft would like to think they are an innovator. Xerox invented the GUI interface, most everything else is the result of acquisition (or theft). XP is experiencing the same problems as Windows 95, Windows NT, or Windows 2000. Where's the innovation? Innovation is usually the result of competitive pressure. They have no competition, they are not innovating. I don't know that this will change anything but I hope that it becomes another piece in the puzzle. PLEASE, do not let Microsoft off the hook. The industry need competition and innovation to survive, and that isn't the way.

Robert Fischer
Director-Information Technology
Communications Supply Corp.
630–221–6620

*''Privileged/Confidential Information of Communications Supply Corp. may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee of this message, you may not copy, use or deliver this message to anyone. In such event, you should destroy the message and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. It is understood that opinions or conclusions that do not relate to the official business of Communications Supply Corp. are neither given nor endorsed by Communications Supply Corp.''

MTC–00004932

From: Thomas R. Bank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 3:38pm
Subject: Proposed DOJ / Microsoft settlement

I have been familiar with computing and the computer industry for nearly twenty years now. I have long seen the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolies in these areas and I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable.

The company has already been found in violation and this is the penalty phase of the case. However, I cannot understand how the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly.

As an example of the current 'problem' of Microsoft's monopoly in the OS and office productivity software markets, I point to the ubiquitous '.doc' file. This one proprietary file format I believe is one of the cornerstones of Microsoft's OS/productivity suite monopoly. Many people I know in the business community regularly purchase updated versions of Microsoft Windows and Microsoft Office for the sole reason that their correspondents send them .doc files as e-mail attachments. The options for importing these files into third party applications are many; however, having personally tried a large number of such programs, both free and commercial, I can safely say that many work well some of the time, none work well all of the time. The continuing cycle of forced upgrades to maintain compatibility with correspondents lies at the heart of Microsoft's monopoly.

As a solution to this kind of problem, I believe that Microsoft should be compelled to disclose the specifications of the file formats used by its products to anyone who sends or receives files in such formats and requests the information.

Left unsolved, this problem is bound to be more severe in the future. It has been widely reported recently that Microsoft is considering moving to a yearly licensing-fee system for its OS and Office software. In this case, files created with licensed software and saved in proprietary formats may be permanently unavailable to the creator or owner of the data in the file if a user or company chooses to terminate its license. I may own the copyright of the work I create, but that is of little value if the only copy of the work in existence is one saved in a format to which I do not have access. I will be required to maintain my yearly license merely to access my past body of work.

Of course the .doc file format is not the only proprietary file format Microsoft products use, and the arguments above apply equally well to other products and file formats. The .doc format is likely the most important however, because text-based documents appear to be the most commonly shared and transmitted.

I am also urging to court to act on future technologies as well. Microsoft is now planning to add vast pieces of the Internet to it's web of interdependencies. With it's initiative .Net, whole portions of the web would be cut off from non-Microsoft technologies. We have seen a glimpse of the monopolist's vision of the future with the UK and MSN portal, designed by Microsoft and accessible only with Microsoft technology.

Thomas R. Bank, II
281 Walton Street
Lemoyne, PA 17043–2025

MTC–00004933

From: Marc Hughes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 4:31pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement Problems

Hello,

I am an adminstrator of several commercial websites which will remain unamed since I send this email on my own behalf and not neccesarily on the behalf of my company. I am no legal expert, so I will keep my comments brief and simply try to convey the following points; I believe I have been hurt by the microsoft monopoly. I do not believe that the current penalties go far enough to restrict the microsoft monopoly. And lastly, I believe that if the proposed settlement is accepted, little, if any, changes will likely actually occur.

On our web servers, we use the linux operating system. Up until recently I ran linux on my workstation as well for it is far easier to adminstrate a linux web server with a linux workstation. I have recently had to document many of the procedures using Microsoft Word, and this has caused me to install Windows on my workstation. This is due to the fact that there are no good alternatives that can read and write the Word .doc files. This is because it is kept secret from the general population. I would like to see this, as well as all their other file formats and network protocols documented fully for anyone to use. Currently, under the current proposal, only for-profit organizations would have access to this information. This seems irrelevant since the greatest threat to Microsoft is open source, not for-profit organizations.

Thank You for your time,
Marc Hughes
8 Lowell St
Worcester MA 01603

MTC–00004934

From: Rudy Socha
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 4:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I would like to publicly state my disagreement with the Microsoft settlement. I do not see anything in the settlement to deter future monopolistic behavior. I also fail to see any immediate remedies for corrective action that can be taken by the oversight commission.

Sincerely,
Rudy Socha
President
WildlifeGifts.Com
P.O. Box 410
Lorain, OH 44052
P-440–288–5400
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00004935

From: Art Mellor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 4:56pm
Subject: comments on MS proposed settlement

While I have many complaints with this whole situation (beginning with MS being declared a target of anit-trust violations in the first place), I feel compelled to comment on the proposed settlement. If you are to accept that MS is guilty of anti-trust violations involving anti-competitive practices surrounding their Operating System and other software, it is (in my opinion) ludicrous to allow their punishment to include the further distribution of their software—especially to schools! This seems like the tobacco companies being allowed to settle a suit by handing out free cigarettes. Also, the dollar value of ''software'' can not be set at retail prices when deeming the value of the *punishment*. The value must be set by the real cost to MS in dollars—the manufacturing and packaging cost of the software plus the lost sales for the schools who would have bought some software anyway (which is not very many, otherwise the punishment is even more ludicrous).

Make them give cash, or other related products that create no future revenue stream for MS. Make them buy their competitor's products for the schools if the damage they have done is monopolistic in nature. But do NOT allow them to seed our children with their poison.

Art Mellor : HTTP> http://www.scumpa.com/art/ : Cool,Humor,Gross Lists at art@scumpa.com : Cell> 617/899–2360: www.scumpa.com/lists.html

Computers are not intelligent. They only think they are.

MTC–00004936

From: steadyed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 5:00pm

Subject: Microsoft Reaches Private Antitrust Settlement

Microsoft Reaches Private Antitrust Settlement

I am the computer specialist at the company I work at. We are a Microsoft based company, not out of choice but because we have no choice. The company is the most powerful monopoly the world has known and now is the time to make real changes so that other companies and software manufactures can provide their skills and products without fear of Microsoft stealing, destroying, or braking interoperability.

This settlement as it stands now is a charade. It makes no sense, looks like a Microsoft pay off and it is horrible for competition and consumer choice as well as the rule of law.

It's like punishing a cigarette company by making it supply schools with free Cigarettes for a few years. I'm sure Apple Computer and network hardware and software companies for example, will find the settlement unsettling, to say the least. How can others compete any longer in their main markets when a competing company is given the key to the facility and a green light to wire and network the district with their proprietary equipment and software?

It's a hard place to be in for the schools who see Microsoft waving one billion dollars (the cost of what Microsoft would charge, not the actual cost to the company), in front of their face. It's blinding. Who can argue the benefits of technology to our youth and at first glance, a cost reduction to our schools.

However, I estimate this one billion investment will pay off handsomely and be a windfall for Microsoft and its products entrenchment in those very same schools within the near future. The schools will end up being dependent on one source, which will be of no benefit to anyone but Microsoft.

This is not a remedy, it is a strangle hold on those very schools which will now be completely dependent on Microsoft. The Ironic thing is that if Microsoft was to offer a billion dollars to set up schools with their equipment in a different environment, it would most likely not be allowed to because it would be anti-competitive since it would block out all other companies that cant compete cost wise. This act by Microsoft is of course not altruistic. It is just the first step in solidifying it's future for the billions of dollars schools will spend in the upcoming decades. It also makes a future anti-trust case more likely and more unsettling. You can not punish a company that has over 30 billion plus in cash in the bank (not including non cash assets), by giving them whole markets (and for pennies on the dollar), and call it a Monopoly remedy. That's just a joke.

One billion dollars is the same amount of money that Microsoft is spending on Advertisement alone for Windows XP. Microsoft plows over multi-billion dollar companies like Sony, as if they are ants.

The company plans on loosing roughly a billion dollars on the Xbox this year alone in-order to solidify a market presence dominated by Nintendo and Sony. The company has factored in a loss of over one-hundred dollars per Xbox it sells just to gain market share. How can a start-up or even a thriving company compete with Microsoft when it can sell it's products at margins of a one-hundred dollar loss per unit. Microsoft can lose a billion dollars a year and survive with no problem for over 30 years.

The rest of the Tech industry lives from quarter to quarter and has to compete (or in most every case chooses not to) with Microsoft, who has grown from a darling to a cancer. This One billion to the schools, like the XP marketing blitz and Xbox expenditures, solidifies a presence in yet another market for Microsoft, one of few markets that it doesn't yet have a Monopoly in. You got to love the Genius behind Microsoft though. They pulled another fast one on US, the public. Microsoft out spends the US government until the United States can't stand up against it. It just going to get worse.

I don't pretend to know what the remedy should be, but it needs to be strong, effective and no-nonsense. Even if there is a strong, effective and no nonsense remedy Microsoft will still be unstoppable in my opinion.

Hopefully, the settlement will prevent a third anti-trust case at my(the consumer/tax payers) expense and allow other companies at least a slight chance to compete in an open market, which at this point is almost exclusively a closed Microsoft market.

Joshua Orzech

California, USA

MTC–00004937

From: Larry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 5:11pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Let the schools decide what computers & software they want to buy for there own and don't put the decision in MS hand. that only empowers them even further than they already are.

thank you for your time

MTC–00004938

From: Rick Wintheiser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 5:26pm
Subject: My ''Bilingual'' Opinion

ON the issue of the Microsoft case, it is very clear to me what is the true way to go, and the Microsoft, good company that it is, is really a Monopoly or at least leading an Oligopoly. I must state that I buy, sell and develop for Microsoft Windows platform products. I feel and see the results of Microsoft everyday. It is my business. On the other hand I choose to us Macintosh for my personal needs. I ''self support'' my machine at the office and in the home. So I feel I can make a fairly unbiased opinion. Microsoft carries a huge stick. They do what the want, when they want (you only need to look into their relations with IBM and the development of OS/2 or the recent Xbox launch). They have the money and the marketshare to hold out or buy out. This is not the behaviour of fighting small company. GM cannot work like this, Nestle, Citibank, either. I think for me it is common sense that Microsoft is pushed or broken up. They cannot have unfair advantage based on market share and size. It kills innovation and stifles creativity. Feel free to contact me at any time.

Rick D. Wintheiser

Methodus Consulting you're going too slow.

351 21 422 8870 (voice)—Mario Andretti

351 21 441 3099(fax)

www.methodus.com

MTC–00004939

From: Valient Gough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 5:40pm
Subject: comments on proposed settlement

To whom it may concern, I am a software developer for a large internet retailer based in Seattle. Having followed the case against Microsoft over the years, I am dissapointed with the results. In our company, all our developers (on the order of 1000) work on Linux systems. Also our hundreds of web servers and various online systems are running either Linux or another type of Unix.

But even though Linux is where all of our real work gets done, every developer also has another computer under their desks which runs Windows. That is because we sometimes have to open Excel spreadsheets or Word .doc files, which are notoriously difficult to decode. The greatest potential for a truely competitive marketplace comes from open source projects, not other companies. Microsoft knows how to deal with for-profit organizations—they can make vapor ware announcements, sabotage competing programs, buy out competitors, basically use their enormous bank account against a poorly funded rival until the rival is dead. But this doesn't work against open source projects, which I believe is why they have succeeded against this gorrila where commercial enterprises have failed.

What bothers me about this proposed settlement is that it is not forward looking. It does not look to prevent Microsoft's illegal actions against what it percieves as the current threat (and our great hope)— open source software. Part of the proposed settlement stated that Microsoft could decide who gets information based on wether or not they were a viable buisness. This seems clearly an attempt to exclude open source software.

In order to really allow competition to bloom, here's what you need to address. Microsoft uses sleazy buisness tactics to destroy for-profit competitors. One solution would be to try and reign in their tactics. This is frought with danger and likely doomed to failure because as long as they have the money and desire, they will find new and inventive ways of being sleazy. A slightly better solution would be to try and reduce their ability to act—by monitary fines, breaking up the company, etc. The problem is this doesn't separate the wheat from the chalf (the sleaze from the innovative technology), so you end up reducing both in proportion but you reduce the good just as much as the bad. If there is no way to make Microsoft compete fairly with other companies, then that just shows that the battle field to concentrate on is not the graveyard of its former competitors but the blooming competition from open source.

It is here that you can make a real difference. The reason is that most of the sleazy tactics do not apply against grassroots

open source projects. Instead of using sleazy tactics, Microsoft is forced to rely on tactics based in technology. Their primary technology-based tactic so far has to been to create interoperable and propietary formats and use their monopoly power to push those formats across the board in an attempt to cut out competition. The reason I think this is where you have a chance at doing good is because this is where the future competition actually lies, and because technology can be easier to control then tactics—as technology leaves a physical existance (source code, run-time behavior) which can be witnessed and serves as a record.

The first step is to open up Microsoft's proprietary formats—to everyone under public domain. I think other people can speak better to other parts of a remedy, so I will limit myself to saying that from my experience, Microsoft's use of proprietary formats is the greatest technological stranglehold on their monopoly. They may have maintained their monopoly for years based on shutting out small competitors, but the real competition today is from open source. That is where you should be focusing remedies. It would take much greater effort to try and revive commercial competition from the dead—you should act on preserving an already existing and viable competition.

Additionally, there are many crossovers of hybrid open source and commercial enterprise entities. This is where open source projects become the basis for a small corporation providing either support or services. By providing the atmosphere for open source projects to interoperate with the widely installed base of Microsoft products, you can turn the fact that they are a monopoly into an advantage by providing an ample audience for new projects, which in turn will provide many opportunities for new companies to provide support and services, all of which are an advantage to the consumer.

regards,
Valient Gough
Senior Software Development Engineer

MTC–00004940

From: David W. Murray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly Penalty

Dear Sir/Madam,

I was astounded to see the proposed penalties to Microsoft Corp., which has been found guilty of maintaining an illegal monopoly, which amount to no penalty at all, or a slap on the wrist. To allow Microsoft to flood the education market, one of the few markets in which they do not hold monopoly position, with their software is not a penalty but a boon.

If I am convicted of speeding, I must pay the full fine in cash. I am not permitted to pay to a third party in the form of a product which will be considered at full retail cost, despite the fact that it costs me but a few percent of that figure to produce. Nor am I permitted to pay my penalty in such a way that it enhances and increases my business, as that would turn my penalty into a simple business investment.

A penalty for a crime must punish past behavior, and prevent such behavior in the future. The proposed penaltied do neither. Microsoft has been so conteptuous of the power of the Justice Department to control it that, far from treading lightly during the protracted proceedings, it has continued to act to extend its monopoly. In the internet arena, which seems to be the next target, Microsoft has repeatedly modified open access tools, such as Java, for no other purpose except to prevent access, except through use of the Microsoft tool. One encounters more and more sites which can be accessed only with Microsoft software, for example.

The Republican party, of which I am a member, has stood accused of being owned by various large industries. It is time to put that lie to rest, if lie it is, and to consider this case on its demonstrated facts.

Sincerely,
David W. Murray
15 Moorage Ave.
Bayville, NJ 08721
732–269–5752

MTC–00004941

From: Jose Castejon-Amenedo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 6:30pm
Subject: US vs. Microsoft

Dear Madam/Sir:

The settlement proposed to bring the US vs. Microsoft legal proceedings falls short from accomplishing any useful social goals in at least two respects: (1) Microsoft has been found guilty of illegally abusing its monopoly position on a regular basis for a number of years now. That is, this company has shown a consistent and olympic disrespect for the law for years, and for that it deserves just punishment.

The proposed settlement does nothing much to administer any significant punishment to Microsoft for its past misconduct. The message that this sends to individual citizens is that the consequences associated with breaking the law can be rendered irrelevant when a sufficiently large amount of money and/or influence are available. By allowing Microsoft the privilege to come out unscathed, the DOJ is actually mocking the foundations of the law.

(2) The proposed remedies do nothing much to prevent Microsoft from carrying on along its past lines of conduct. Worse, in instances they actually provide Microsoft with a leverage to expand its monopoly to other areas where it has not achieved hegemony yet. An expanded monopoly can only result in further limitations of freedoms of choice, with the consequent social damage.

In order to provide effective means to curb Microsoft's monopolist ambitions, and to promote competition, the remedies should include the following:

(a) Force Microsoft to publish detailed descriptions of its proprietary protocols, file formats, and application programmer interfaces (APIs). Microsoft ought to be also forced to publish the details of any modifications that it sees fit to carry out on those items before it releases an actual software implementation thereof. Finally, Microsoft ought to be forced to adhere to such published descriptions.

Notice that forcing Microsoft to make public the source code of its operating systems is neither necessary nor convenient. Microsoft should be allowed to keep such implementation details secret, as long as it complies with the specifications above.

(b) Microsoft ought to be prevented from buying out any competing companies for a number of years. It should always be free to innovate, but by its own means and resources, not by extinguishing potential competition.

(c) Microsoft ought to be prevented from striking secret exclusive deals with any other company. In particular, any deals that Microsoft has with vendors, such that the latter are prevented from preinstalling competing operating systems, ought to be declared illegal.

Sincerely,
JCA
Jose Castejon-Amenedo
1401 Red Hawk Cir.
#N312
Fremont, CA 94538
USA
Phone #: 510–739–3852

MTC–00004942

From: Stephen Besedick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 6:55pm
Subject: Antitrust Case

Dear Sirs,

Microsoft has been determined guilty of violating anti-trust laws but has not been ''punished'' accordingly! No reasonable person would ask that the federal government impose ''corrections'' that cripple Microsoft, but it must find ways of leveling the playing field. With the encroachment of technology into almost every facet of our daily lives, it is imperative that no ONE company be in control. It has become quite obvious over the years that an overwhelming majority of American consumers do NOT really care what computer operating system they use . . . they just want it to WORK. Furthermore, given the inherent communicative nature of computer technologies, the American consumer wants to be able to ''talk'' and/or ''share'' information with others; and have this whole process WORK transparently behind the scenes no matter what make or model of computing device a person uses.This model of compatibility is just the thing that makes the internet such a successful vehicle for communication. When standards are invoked, all manufacturers must meet the criteria or face exclusion from the market. It's sort of like UL approved appliances . . . where standards of safety are set, and all manufacturers build accordingly. If, on the other hand, we let a manufacturer establish the standard(s), the consumer is subjected to the levels of safety this manufacturer deems appropriate. It is quite clear that this latter model most closely resembles the state of technology is our country. In this writer's opinion, Microsoft has been allowed to climb its way (on the backs of unwary consumers) to the position where it alone defines the viability of technology solutions, It answers to no one, and crushes any who may oppose it. Its not

that Microsoft is inherently bad, but that it needs to be put in its place. The federal government is at a crossroads wherein it can help shape the technological future of our country. If it allows Microsoft to continue in its ways, everyone will be tied to its whims and fancy. On the other hand, if it forces Microsoft to become simply a tech company (not the standard), it will truly level the playing field for all who choose to compete. The success or failure of a company will again rest on its ability to meet consumer needs.

Stephen Besedick
Tech Coordinator

MTC–00004943

From: David.Rosario@chase.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 6:55pm
Subject: Monopoly comment

I would like to comment on this topic.

I'm sure that everyone is aware of the fact of Microsoft's monopoly, including Microsoft themselves, yet many reject to acknowledge reality and put a spin on the truth (aka lie!) In fact, I remember Microsoft's vision in the early 1990's: ''Windows everywhere'' is what they called it—in computers, cable boxes, refrigerators—pretty much anywhere they could get it into. That is what they would like to see. Along the way they have demolished many companies to further their cause and gain an unfair advantage.

Toward the mid-1990's they stated that they would port their Office suite to OS/2 when OS/2 reached critical mass—2 million users, according to them. What happened? OS/2 reached critical mass and Microsoft never delivered on their promise. Why? Because OS/2 was superior to Windows and would directly compete with them.

In an effort to fool everyone, Microsoft invested in Apple and updated their Office suite for the Macintosh. They did this because they needed a ''competitor'' that could take some of their market share. Microsoft was merely trying to convince naive individuals that there was a viable alternative to Windows, namely the Macintosh, that could compete with them. I have heard too many reasons as to why the Mac is not as successful as hoped (and you will see the relevance of this) but nobody has stated the correct reason. The correct reason that the Mac has failed is because of their closed hardware architecture and exorbitant prices. Can you buy a Mac-compatible device from another vendor? No. Can you buy a non-Apple computer that runs the MacOS (or OS X)? No. How is this important? The only two operating systems (for desktops, not servers) that Microsoft has attacked are OS/2 and Linux. Why? Because you can use the same computer that runs Windows to run OS/2 or Linux. OS/2 and Linux have had a serious following. Sure there have been other desktop operating systems for the PC like BeOS, but they never received serious support. Microsoft has spread vicious lies about Linux to any non-technical manager that will lend an ear just because those are the ignorant type of managers that make technical decisions.

OS/2 created a version named ''OS/2 for Windows'' (aka Ferengi). With this, the cost of OS/2 would be lower because it didn't include Windows 3.1 which was an additional license charge. You could use your exisiting Windows and OS/2 would incorporate it. Microsoft's response? They released a modified version of Windows which became incompatible with OS/2 for Windows. How's that for uncompetitive?

I heard Microsoft's arguments about how they felt the Netscape browser was a threat to Windows, which prompted them to take the actions they did. However, everyone seemed to overlook the fact that you need an operating system to run a browser. A browser is capable of rudimentary operations. Even with Java applets, they do not have the flexibility of Java applications. However, you still need a JRE (Java Runtime Environment) to be able to run applets, and where does the JRE reside? In the operating system! I don't know how Microsoft was able to argue that Netscape's browser was a threat to their operating system. It is just not possible. Microsoft must be forced to publish API's for all of their products and port their products to competing operating systems. Compilers and window toolkits (like Qt) that grew up on Unix were made to run on Windows—now it's time for them to do the same.

Microsoft has a history of introducting incompatibilities with accepted standards to further their cause. J++ had Windows-specific hooks. Their Kerberos implementation is incompatible (to an extent) with the Unix standard. Their motto is ''embrace and extend''. This is completely uncompetitive. Something must be done about it. Having them donate resources to schools (a proposed remedy) is just a way for them to further increase their penetration into the market. We are in a county that opposes taxation without representation. Now it's time to represent the taxpayers voicing their opinions. Let's see if the U.S. Government's judiciary system actually works they way they teach us it does.

MTC–00004944

From: Brian Pankuch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 7:08pm
Subject: microsoft

Gentlemen:

I'm not a lawyer, but I am a heavy user of software and a Professor of Chemistry. Since Microsoft has been found guilty in several high courts and found to be an illegal monopoly, it is beyond belief that we can even consider making them more of a monopoly than they already are as part of the settlement. The proposed settlement costs Microsoft very little and does great harm to other competitors in education.

Can I respectfully suggest if you want to help poor school systems then money for anything but Microsoft products should be considered. Supplying only their own software helps Microsoft and hurts their competitors, how can this possibly be a punishment??

I do think Microsoft has some good products, but they are also a very dangerous monopoly, please help while we still can still have some competition. Thanks for listening.

Brian J Pankuch Ph.D.

MTC–00004945

From: Pierre F. Fogal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 7:10pm
Subject: Comments of US v. Microsoft

To Whom it may Concern,

I am a scientist, and while not a computer professional per se, I have programmed everything from microprocessors to supercomputers. Thus far, I have always felt that I have had the ability to choose how I will approach the programming task at hand. However, it is clear that the choice has been dwindling in direct proportion to the rise of the Microsoft (MS) empire. Now, don't get me wrong, I have used many MS products over the past 2+ decades, and early on was quite happy with the results. Why and when did that change? Well, to begin with, it changed with the MS mentality that MS should provide the software solution en toto, usually in monolithic applications that lead to the term ''bloatware''. As the complexity of these applications increased, there has been a comcomitant decrease in robustness. So, we arrived at a point where we had the opportunity to do many things (a large percentage of which any one user won't do), but in reality not the ability. Also, as MS further developed their technology, they often managed to break mine. Computers that were perfectly capable in January, became nearly obsolete in June. Why ? They didn't have the capacity to run the latest versions. So . . . don't, we say. However, others did, and eventually, the hardware really did need replacement. Now there exists a hodge podge of things that almost work. Is this a situation restricted to MS products? No, but it occurs on a far shorter time scale when MS products are concerned. I raise these points at various times with various people and a typical response is ''Well, what OTHER CHOICE is there?'' And that's what its all about. Choice. The ability to choose not to upgrade. The ability to choose the functionality we want. The ability to choose the software that will deliver that functionality. The ability to choose INTEROPERABILITY BEYOND and OUTSIDE the MS family of products. To this end, I propose that MS be required to deliver something like the following. . . .

(1) That they be required to support their own earlier file formats as completely as possible. This would ease the requirement for rapid upgrades on the part of users.

(2) That they correctly export documents into other formats, so long as those other formats are capable. This allows us more freedom to choose software.

(3) That if Microsoft writes files in a format that is a ''standard'' and/or largely in the public domain such as html, xml, postscript, pdf, that they be barred from ''enhancing'' those formats and that any functionality they wish to add be submitted to what ever de facto administrative body oversees the various formats, for inclusion. In the past their enhancements have broken other software, limiting our choices.

(4) As for 3, but dealing with communications protocols including but not limited to hardware, software, and the internet.

(5) That they make public in a complete manner, the complete specifications for

operating system API's, where those APIs will allow a 3rd party to provide software capability on par with MS products. This goes directly to the issue of choice.

(6) That .Net not be permitted to evolve into something that can only be effectively used via MS products. Should it do so, the potential for misuse and abuse is staggering!

(7) On a different note, MS should be mandated to keep out of the information gathering and management business. It is utterly frightening that the people who write the software that run our computers on one hand, are potentially also the people gathering information for the use, or by the request of, entities such as insurance companies, financial institutions, potential employers, marketers, special interests, and so on. . . .

(8) MS has also taken to releasing public statements regarding how open source software is not trustworthy, going so far as to say that the open source model is Un-American. These diatribes are rarely factual and MS should be restricted in much the same manner IBM was restricted in the 1980's and 90's from making pronouncements regarding software. It is wrong for them to use their pre-eminent position to distribute fear, uncertainty and doubt (FUD) regarding potential competing products.

To summarize, MS limits our ability to choose how we want to work today. Please ensure that they are limited in their ability to do so.

Thank-you for your time,
Pierre Fogal, Ph.D.
Pierre F. Fogal, Ph.D.
Dept. of Physics and Astronomy
University of Denver
2112 E. Wesley Ave.
Denver, CO, USA 80208
voice: 303–871–3523
fax: 303–778–0406

MTC–00004946

From: Greg Cunneen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 7:52pm
Subject: Reward or punishment

There are extremely large numbers of computers in the world, all of which become obsolete within 2 to 3 years. Many are recycled into other products, many are dumped, yet many get donated to institutions (like schools). The advantage of getting school kids ''hooked'' on a particular system are obvious; they continue to use what is familiar to them in later school years and adult years.

''Punishing'' Microsoft by allowing it to hijack the sole remaining competitive market seems very strange to me. Not only does it kill off the other legitimate businesses (the ones that did not break the law), it will naturally lead to increased sales for Microsoft in the future for the reason stated above in paragraph 1. As a rule, I do not use Microsoft products unless absolutely necessary. I admit my bias. Unfortunately, their products are now so dominant that it is impossible for me not to use them (because everyone else uses them too). I don't know the technical definition of a monopoly, but I cannot think of any other industry that is so completely dominated by one company.

And I cannot help but think that if Microsoft were not an American company, say Taiwanese or Japanese, everyone in US political circles would be bending over backward to nobble the foreign entity to ensure valid competition. Instead, Microsoft ends up being rewarded.

Where is the justice in that?

Greg Cunneen

MTC–00004947

From: Carl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 8:13pm
Subject: U.S. v. Microsoft

To Whom it may Concern:

I've been working with computers for the last six years, and I have seen the growth of microsoft in the marketplace. It has reached a point that a majority of computers sold today are sold with microsoft products, while it is quite difficult to find an alternative offered.

My concern with microsoft's monopoly lies with the internet, a computer network originally payed for by the taxpayers of the U.S., and now is slowly being monopolized by microsoft's attempts at creating 'closed' protocols with their .NET initiative. The internet should be free, the public payed for it, and it should not be dominated by one company for it's sole profit. The internet best represents our right to free speech, and no company should dictate what that speech should be. My ability to 'surf' the internet is hindered by the fact that microsoft powered sites cater only to microsoft browsers, and that is just the beginning, soon, with the .NET initiative, more of the world wide web will be inaccessible. This is not just a problem in the U.S. it is a problem that spans the globe. The internet is such that the people of the planet have the ability to communicate, and the microsoft monopoly will insure that the entire planet is running microsoft products. The punishment of microsoft must ensure that the internet remains free and that all people enjoy the freedom of choice of software products worldwide.

Carl Miles
cmiles@fuckmicosoft.com

''One is often kept in the right road by a rut.''

Gustave Droz

MTC–00004948

From: Lupe Anguiano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 8:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata B. Hesse: I am a Latina small technology consultant. I believe Settlement of the Microsoft Antirust Case is critical to the health of our US technology economy. The interest of consumers and affordable user friendly software applications should be the overriding factor in this decision to settle this case once and for all. It is obvious that companies and States (California Attorney General hired a Washington DC lawyer to advice him) against Microsoft have various personal financial gains at heart. Tax payer monies should not be used to support company and personal gains.

Lupe Anguiano
Technology and Fundraising Consultant
14420 Kittridge St. #220
Van Nuys, CA 91405
818–787–8807
languian@gte.net

MTC–00004950

From: Darren Varner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 9:06pm
Subject: Microsoft case.

They were found guilty of being a monopoly. They are a monopoly. Due to this they charge ridiculous prices for their software. They have put people out of business for years even though their own software is of lesser quality. They got caught cold threatening Apple to kill Quicktime, the superior streaming media, or else they would stop development of Office for Macintosh. They trashed Java and when they got called to mat on this what do they do? They remove it entirely from their latest version of Internet Explorer!

It is even more unbelievable to me that they have had a hand in determining their own punishment. And how do they do this? By helping their chances greatly in the education market! (This same strategy for punishment never used to work when we were youngsters either . . . don't you remember that?) They have shown how unsecure their software is and recently, while they claim that XP is their most secure work to date, we find that the biggest security risk ever to their software has now got them scrambling again. Diversity in operating systems is a good thing in todays environment of hackers. Please do the right thing. Punish them as the monopolists they have been found to be!

Darren Varner
315 E. 68th Terrace
Kansas City, Missouri 64113
darrenv@kc.rr.com

MTC–00004951

From: James Ramsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 9:13pm
Subject: Apparent misperceptions about security

One of the sections from the Final Judgment, III.J.1, has already been noted controversial because it is a possible loophole. However, aside from that problem, it also appears to rest on a false understanding of how to make secure software. From III.J.1: ''No provision of this Final Judgment shall . . . [r]equire Microsoft to document, disclose or license to third parties: (a) portions of APIs or Documentation or portions or layers of Communications Protocols the disclosure of which would compromise the security of a particular installation or group of installations of anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption or authentication systems, including without limitation, keys, authorization tokens or enforcement criteria; or (b) any API, interface or other information related to any Microsoft product if lawfully directed not to do so by a governmental agency of competent jurisdiction.''

The above appears to be built on the idea of ''security by obscurity,'' where security is

dependent upon hiding the implementation used to secure something. In the physical world, this would be analogous to making the mechanisms of a lock or safe a trade secret. In the computer realm, this would mean keeping secret the mathematics or algorithms, source code, protocols, etc. of cryptographic software. While this appears to make sense on its face, it has long been discredited by those who deal with computer security, such as Bruce Schneier, author of ''Applied Cryptography'' and ''Secrets and Lies,'' a book about dealing with real-world security problems. (His business's website, by the way, is http://www.counterpane.com.) In particular, the core problem with ''security by obscurity'' is that it is fragile, that is, the security implementation is not necessarily obscure to the ones who may attempt to break it. Industrial spies or hackers/crackers have the tools and expertise to discover the source code or algorithms of a piece of security software. Even those who are not ''black hats'' may break proprietary, secret algorithms with relative ease. (See http://www.counterpane.com/crypto-gram-9902.html#snakeoil) Much of strong cryptographic and security software, rather than relying on the secrecy of the algorithm or implementation, relies on public algorithms and often public implementations. What is kept secret is a long number, a key, used in combination with the algorithm, and knowledge of the algorithm is useless without the key. Examples of public cryptographic algorithms are the government standards DES (recently ''retired'') and AES (DES's replacement), and RSA, the algorithm behind SSL, the protocol used for secure Internet transactions. Examples of secure software with public implementations are OpenBSD, OpenSSH, OpenSSL, and PGP.

The point of this discussion of ''security by obscurity'' is that Microsoft (MS) should have no need to hide the protocols and APIs used for security. Unless their software has a fragile security implementation, disclosing the protocols and APIs should do no damage or compromise security. The only possible exception to the above points is digital rights management (DRM), which is inherently fragile. (See http://www.counterpane.com/crypto-gram-0105.html#3) However, DRM is more designed to deter would-be casual copyright infringers, who lack technical knowledge, rather than mass-scale pirating operations of the kind one sees in Asia. The documentation of DRM APIs and protocols would be of little use to those whom DRM is designed to thwart.

In general, there is no good technical reason to allow Microsoft to have any private APIs.

I am a fool for Christ. Mostly I am a fool.

MTC–00004952

From: Diveanddig@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 9:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to submit my comments concerning the proposed Microsoft settlement.

Allowing this company to continue the abusive and damaging monopolistic practices that have destroyed many innovative small businesses, and has thwarted competition and fee enterprise, would be damaging to our inventive and superior technology industry the in the United States. Microsoft has used it's monopolistic position to destroy the very competition that has lead to our superior lead in the field of computer technology, and without competition, innovation is stifled. They must be stopped for the sake of our country, economy and free enterprise system that has served us so well. Allowing them to buy their way out of the suit by supplying software and outdated near worthless hardware would be a flagrant disregard for the spirit of our antitrust laws that are in place to protect private enterprise and consumers from anti competitive practices of abusive monopolies. The incremental cost of producing a billion dollars worth of software is pennies on the dollar, and would let Microsoft get away with murder. Our justice system would become a laughing stock, and it would send the message that it is all right for monopolies to pursue abusive practices without consequences. Not only that, the plan to supply schools with this software is almost comical since it would extend their monopoly to one of the last areas they do not dominate. Microsoft has shown total disregard for our antitrust laws in the past, and without an appropriate penalty, and corrective measures, they will continue to do so in the future.

William D. Bird

MTC–00004953

From: Mark Kaiman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 10:49pm
Subject: the proposed settlement

I believe that Apple Computer is correct when it opposes Microsoft's proposed settlement with the United States government. To allow Microsoft to give free copies of its software to schools will only further entrench its position as an abusive monopolist. How can Apple, Sun, or other competitors hope to compete when Microsoft is giving its software away for ''free'' in the name of justice? A far better solution would be to force MS to pay cash (many billions) to schools, which the schools would use as they see fit. If they dont want to buy Microsoft products, then so be it. That is the free market that Microsoft appears to loathe.

Microsoft is a predatory monopoly that is anti-competitive and stifles innovation and technological development. To allow them to get away with a mere slap on the wrist would be a travesty.

Mark Kaiman
Friday Harbor, WA

MTC–00004954

From: Quincin Gonjon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:04pm
Subject: Microsoft the Monopolist

This country has been blessed with freedom and the strength to empower its people with it. Freedom is independence, liberty and the exemption from the power and control of another. Microsoft is slowly taking away our freedom of choice by taking full control of our computer and the internet. They are doing it without having any responsibility over such consequences as security of personal data.

Microsoft products are by nature insecure and they are in constant threat of being hacked or cracked. The thousands of viruses and worms that are propagated each year is proof of Microsoft's lack of security. The fact is that any 10 year old child can become proficient enough in word or excel to create a macro virus sophisticated enough to delete files and email itself to others. It is no wonder that a full range of Microsoft products are by nature insecure and are promoted as secure, for example, Microsoft Portal and Hailstorm, Windows XP, IIS web server, Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Outlook, and Internet Explorer. These products are dangerous to the public at large. They are the most attacked products on the internet and they are the gateways for hackers to get into servers that contain personal public information. Today companies can't compete with Microsoft products because they used their Operating System and proprietary file formats and protocols to Monopolize 90% of the software industry.

Everyone knows that Microsoft killed its competition by not releasing vital information about its operating system on time. In fact, Microsoft may have provided out dated information about its operating system just to make sure other applications crashed. This type of competition is illegal but Microsoft was allowed to play dirty in the early days of Windows 3.X and 95. Now that they have made their products the standard in the industry through illegal practices, why should they keep the proprietary licenses for their file format and protocols? I think that a case can be made against Microsoft's patent for these licenses. This government should not allowed such dirty underhanded and illegal practices to continue unpunished. The law should be firm and strict with Microsoft. The first penalty I would act on is to force Microsoft to make all of their formats and protocols freely available to the public so that compatible products that read, write and understand Microsoft protocols and file formats can be produce.

I strongly believe that Microsoft is a threat to our nations security and to fair competition in the software business industry. The punishment that has been applied to the company is far to lenient. The only recourse as a free nation is to make sure that Microsoft is crippled from performing such actions today and in the future. To make the company give up its competitive edge by releasing its file formats and protocols so that new software companies can rise and compete. This should stimulate growth and allow citizens to choose the best product for their needs.

MTC–00004955

From: Edwin Schwab
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:22pm
Subject: Comment on Microsoft proposal

Please allow for a comment from overseas:

The settlement must make sure that documents created using Microsoft products

are usable 5 years after Microsoft ceases to exist or chooses to no longer support the given software or document format.

This implies:

—It must be possible to still use the software

—Microsoft must publish the document structure

There is high hope for this trial to provide some of the data security needs that are sorely missing now.

With kind regards

Edwin Schwab

MTC–00004956

From: Louise Tremblay Cole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 11:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly

Your Honor:

The proposed ''reparation'' will allow Microsoft to expand its monopoly while shifting the burden of disposing of obsolete equipment to impoverished school systems. This is no penalty.

Louise Cole

MTC–00004957

From: marcsten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:00am
Subject: No Subject

Dear Sirs:

I wish to comment on the proopsed litigationj involving microsoft and the DOJ. AS I read it, in spite of microsoft having been found in violation of the law, they are under the settlement being encouraged to continue to do so. In short, there is no justice in any resolution of this case unless it contains the following:

* Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

* The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

* Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

I trust that you will take these suggestions to heart when attempting to resolve this litigation. War or no war, we do not wish to have an automobile industry where there is only one car company allowed to do business—particularly if that company is YUGO; similarly, the public is done a great diservice if the only available operating system and software is from microsoft, the ''virtual Yugo.''

Thank you for your attention.

Marc Stenchever

MTC–00004958

From: joey@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern—

You have probably received similar statements already. As an ''average,'' slightly technically inclined computer user; I would like to see the following happen to prevent one company from ''owning'' standards and file formats:

1.) All networking protocols remain open and compatible no matter what operating system or device. In other words, NO proprietary extensions for anyone—with incompatibility designed into them.

2.) All file formats for Office (specifically the Microsoft family of Office suites) must be opened up to ensure compatibility with competitors programs.

3.) All graphics files must remain open standards.

4.) Media file formats must remain open to allow for true competition.

This would include not only Microsoft media formats, but also formats from Real Networks, Apple Computer (specifically in this case the Sorenson Vision QuickTime codec), etc.

Most importantly, as the Internet was built on Open Standards and Protocols to allow machines to ''communicate'' over networks, regardless of the operating system or architecture; it's important the Internet and it's connectivity remain Open and that CANNOT be proprietarized and monopolized by one company or group.

In order to ensure compliance:

1.) Set up a ''watchdog'' group of various disinterested 3rd parties and groups, as well as competitors of Microsoft. This includes vendors who write software for the Microsoft family of operating systems. Stiff penalties for violations must be incorporated as well as effectively and swiftly enforced, and continued until the violation(s) are corrected.

2.) As part of the penalty phase, ALL APIs (Application Programming Interfaces) should be made available to anyone after a reasonable fee is paid. This ensures that companies that write software competing with any past, present or future software offerings from Microsoft can engage in FAIR competition, and that Microsoft software won't automatically run ''faster'' or ''better'' than anything the competition may offer; thereby including such software commingled with the Windows operating system kernel—such as Explorer, Outlook, Windows Media Player, and Outlook.

Competitors should be allowed access to the code that will allow their software to run on equal footing with Microsoft software.

3.) No OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer) deals that includes threats (implied or real), bribes, exclusionary contracts or any other illegal means that violate the Sherman Act shall be allowed. Any OEM who wants to install other (competing) operating system software, dual boot operating systems (ie; Windows and Linux), and/or software that competes with offerings from Microsoft that run on their family of Windows operating systems; shall be allowed to do so without impediment. This would include BIOS boot code.

4.) Lastly, I suggest that the true cost of Windows on a new PC computer system be put into the price listing of a PC. This would apply to all other operating systems as well. If the cost is $75 to an OEM, that should be listed. Likewise, the cost of an ''alternative'' operating system (ie; Linux Mandrake, Red Hat Linux or BeOS) should be listed on the invoice or advertisement. This would ensure true, fair price comparisons of the various operating systems out there.

5.) Given Microsoft's horrible security record in the PC and Server computing industries, ''Lemon Laws'' need to be enforced on the software industry as well. Any ''reasonable'' amount of time must be considered to allow for a fixes. However, bugs and security holes that are not patched and/or fixed in a reasonable amount of time must subject Microsoft, as well as other software companies; to lawsuits, claims for damages caused by defective software as well as demands for consumer refunds; provided the media is returned and it can be proven the offending software product(s) from the machine. Given the sheer number of known as well as unknown back doors, security holes and other ills that affect the dominant Windows family of operating systems, it is also advised that:

6.) The government, on all levels; encourage the use of *only* software that's based on Open Standards and Protocols. This includes software released under various Open Source Licenses, especially Free Software written under the GNU General Public License (GPL). This would encourage the distribution and reusing of software code not only in government and business, but also educational institutions as well. It is time to put a stop to all the hand wringing, delaying, stall tactics and legal maneuvering being practiced by Microsoft at this time. The penalties must be sure, swift, and final to allow true COMPETITION to return to the PC market, prevent monopolizing of future industries and allow CHOICE for the consumer mass market. Only then can the consumer have a TRUE choice.

Regards,

Joseph Nicholson

MTC–00004959

From: Charles F. Waltrip
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:58am
Subject: Objections to the Microsoft Settlement

Objection 1. Free Software to Schools

I agree with Apple, Red Hat, et al. that the proposed remedy furthers Microsoft's anti-competitive position. I'm sure Bill Gates is saying: ''Puh-leeeze B'rer Fox, don't throw me in that thar Briar Patch.''

Objection 2. Failure to Break Up the Company

The combination of selling both the OS and the Software Applications was anti-

competitive for IBM and is more so for Microsoft. Microsoft has unpublished Application Programming Interfaces in their OSs which they are free to use in their Software Applications and change at will. These APIs often confer performance and feature advantages over Microsoft's unwitting competitors.

Microsoft is also able to plan both their OS changes and their Software Application product changes together. Again, they are able to gain a time advantage over their competitors.

I can say from personal involvement in purchase decisions that these advantages are often the overriding factor in choosing a Software Application supplier. The clear remedy for this is to break up Microsoft into two companies: one company that develops Operating System software only and a second company that develops Software Applications such as Microsoft Office.

Objection 3. Other Factors

It is clear that Microsoft's monopoly position has damaged consumers. While Moore's Law has so far governed the cost of computer hardware causing constantly improving hardware to cost constantly decreasing amounts, we see no such decrease in the cost of Microsoft software (though the decrease appears elsewhere with software developed for the Java environment being a good example—much of it being freeware). The free Java Software Development Kits provide an environment richer than the standard Microsoft OSs that runs in Java Virtual Machines that can, in turn, run on any OS including the free Linux OS. Much valuable freeware is available written in Java. And much valuable freeware is available for Linux and other UNIX systems. Yet the high cost of Microsoft software continues to eat up the resources of Information Technology departments that might otherwise be spent on the tasks of training and converting to less expensive and, often, better and more productive free or inexpensive software.

And all consumers (individuals; businesses; government) are damaged by the lack of security features in Microsoft products. All of the competitive OSs (UNIX, Mac OS X; and Linux) have better security features. Huge losses are attributable to just one of the Microsoft products: Microsoft Outlook. In aggregate, the losses attributable to security defects in all Microsoft products add greatly to the cost of these products and exacerbate the difference in the cost trends between computer hardware (way down) and computer software (way up). And new capabilities in Microsoft XP's TCP/IP make it possible for hackers or terrorists to disrupt and even bring down the Internet.

While the lawsuit has been in process, Microsoft has gained almost total control of the Web browser software arena and has led the market away from standards such as Java and has introduced non-standard features into XSL. They implement the features they want in the way they want and there is virtually no competition to challenge them by fully implementing and encouraging the use of standards.

Finally, Microsoft's contempt for these anti-trust proceedings is manifest in their recent push into the area of personal portals in which America On-line is the current major player. It is as though they were punishing them for starting this whole business in the first place.

In all of these ways and many more, Microsoft has damaged the market, the economy and the users. Please provide a truly effective remedy.

Your consideration of these remarks is greatly appreciated.

Charles F. Waltrip
5063 Columbia Road
Columbia, MD 21044
(410) 992–1858
chuckwaltrip@home.com

Opinions expressed in this document are my own.

MTC–00004962

From: Greg Walker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 2:38am
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam—

I am writing to express my discontent regarding the anti-trust settlement with Microsoft. The proposal to donate computer hardware and software to schools would only increase the public's exposure to Microsoft products, and therefore, because Microsoft has retained its monopoly, would increase the number of Microsoft customers. Microsoft has already proven itself untrustworthy of managing the power of a monopoly without abusing it, and the school donations would certainly further its ability to abuse that power.

The most effective suggestion I have heard requires that Microsoft make public all of their present and future file formats, networking protocols, and application programming interfaces:

—Files created in Microsoft applications could be read and correctly modified by third-party programs, on the Windows operating system (OS) as well as other operating systems (such as Apple's Macintosh OS and the Linux OS).
—Other operating systems would be able to implement Microsoft's networking protocols, and thus easily interact with Microsoft-based computers on the internet and on local networks.
—As I understand, opening the Windows application programming interfaces is already part of the proposed agreement.

Without requiring these or similar measures, Microsoft would be able to continue many of its abusive practices, in the same or similar forms which caused this trial in the first place. Opening up Microsoft's protocols would require the company to compete on the merits of the design and functionality of their software, and not because they retain full and exclusive control and understanding of those protocols.

Any attempt to curb Microsoft's abusive practices must be made with a broad brush—making demands regarding a specific version of its operating system, or one of its programs in particular, will not end such abuse. Only changes which affect any software Microsoft could potentially create will have a lasting and meaningful effect.

Thank you for your time, and for considering my sentiments.

Sincerely,
Greg Walker

MTC–00004963

From: P=??B?5f==?=1 Hvistendal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 3:46am
Subject: Opera Software's reaction to proposed settlement DOJ-Microsoft Corp.

This memorandum outlines Opera Software ASA's view on the proposed settlement on the case US Department of Justice (hereinafter ''DOJ'')vs. Microsoft Corp.

1. INTRODUCTION The Norwegian company Opera Software ASA has on an equal footing with Netscape been systematically targeted by Microsoft Corp. by way of illegal business practices in order to monopolize the browser market. Although Opera Software has created critically acclaimed browser technology, the Company is completely dependent on an open market where free and fair competition sets the criteria needed for success. Opera Software ASA's sole product is browsers, and the Company does not have the financial muscles of a large parent company behind it, such as Netscape has in AOL. To secure a competitive marketplace, Opera Software ASA offers to provide the DOJ with its view on the proposed settlement. In this short memo we wish to draw the attention of the DOJ to issues which we find are especially troubling seen both from Opera Software's stance as a browser provider, and seen from the software industry as a whole. It must, moreover, be emphasized that the topics discussed herein does not represent an exhaustive list related to Microsoft's abuse of a dominant position in the browser market.

2. COMPANY PRESENTATION

2.1 Opera Software ASA

Opera Software ASA (hereinafter ''Opera'') is an industry leader in the development of Web browsers for both the desktop and the embedded Internet markets and ranks number three among the most widely used Internet desktop browsers in the world. Opera is a world leader in the embedded space.

What started in 1994 as a research project at Norway's largest telecom company Telenor ASA, led to the founding of the independent development company Opera Software ASA. The Opera browser has received international acclaim for its small size, speed and stability. Opera has not only survived in a tough market; it has become a rival to the two major browser-makers AOL/Netscape and Microsoft's Internet Explorer.

Opera has grown strongly since its founding. As of November 1, 2001 Opera Software had 100 employees.

2.2 Commercial breakthrough

Opera has had a commercial breakthrough in the years 2000 and 2001. Opera version 5 for Windows, the first version of Opera to be offered as a no-cost ad-sponsored browser, was launched in December 2000, and more than 6 million users from all over the world downloaded and installed Opera by November 1, 2001. During this period Opera also closed several important strategic agreements in the embedded space with some of the world's leading Internet companies. In addition to several still

confidential deals, agreements with companies like IBM, Advanced Micro Devices (AMD), Sharp, Symbian, Canal+ Technologies, and Ericsson, have made Opera a well-recognized world leader on browsers for non-Microsoft systems.

2.3 Market and future potential

The Internet had a breakthrough in the 1990s, with millions of people all over the world becoming accustomed to using this new communication medium. Still, Opera Software believes that the Internet is only in its infancy. Currently, approximately 8 percent of the world's population has access to the Internet, and millions more new users will log on within the next few years.

Not only will the sheer number of Internet users increase; the way the users access the Internet is also most likely to change. Until now, most users have connected through a PC/desktop from home or work, running Microsoft's Windows Operating System. In the near future, the Internet will move out of the confines of the traditional desktop computer and into many new environments, such as that of handheld devices and WebPads. Such devices will be designed to perform specific tasks, whether it is completing work-related tasks in the workplace, or entertainment functions at home.

From being 100 percent focused on the Windows operating system, Opera Software turned its focus in 1998 focus towards this new emerging market of embedded Internet products. In most cases, embedded Internet products are memory-constrained, and the platforms and applications that run on them have to be scaled to fit the device. Opera has turned out to be the ideal Web browser choice for this platform environment since it's compact and efficient coding has produced a small, fast, and configurable browser. The success of this strategy shift is reflected in the many strategic agreements that Opera Software has entered into in the course of the last couple of years, with the market leaders of producers of embedded Internet products. Opera Software's development aim is to maximize the commercial results by creating a multi-platform, high quality product. One central aspect of the development strategy is the platform-independent kernel (core), to which thin platform-specific layers are added. This enables the browser to easily be ported to other emerging platforms and simplifies overall maintenance. Opera has been released for several platforms. Currently the Opera family of browsers consists of releases on Windows, Linux/ Solaris, Mac OS, Symbian OS (EPOC), QNX, BeOS/BeIA, OS/2, with other potential ports under continuous commercial review.

3. OPERA AND MICROSOFT

3.1 Introduction

Opera Software has on an equal footing with Netscape been systematically targeted by Microsoft by way of illegal business practices in order to monopolize the browser market, in conflict with US antitrust legislation, cfr. Judge Jackson's findings in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice of the United States(1 U.S. Department of Justice, Complaint in Civil Action No. 98— 1232, May 18, 1998, at http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/ cases/f1700/1763.htm.),

Despite the findings of Judge Jackson, Microsoft's campaign to gain a monopoly over the browser market continues.

Relative to Microsoft, Opera Software is a small company both in terms of finances and staff. In this short memo we wish to draw the attention of the DOJ to issues which we find are especially troubling seen both from Opera Software's stance as a browser provider, and seen from the software industry as a whole.

3.2 Embrace, Extend, Extinguish

3.2.1 Accessibility and unreadability

It is a recognized principle that Internet tools and applications shall respect the standards established by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), see below. Such standards are necessary to upkeep in order to maintain the Internet principle that Internet technologies shall be interoperable and accessible to all.

Microsoft claims that it does its utmost in order to comply with the W3C issued standards, while it in reality pursues a conscious policy of embracing only parts of the standards, and thereafter pursuing a strategy of extending the standard, i.e. developing a standard only present in its own browser client Internet Explorer. Thus Web page authors that create web pages to fit Internet Explorer's Internet standards may find that their web pages are not accessible to other browsers and that they in many cases only work on the Windows operating system. Since testing Web pages with several browsers running on several platforms is time consuming and expensive, many Web developers stick to testing and developing only with the current market leader Internet Explorer. In this way Microsoft has gained control over standards which were meant to be open and accessible to all.

Microsoft's purpose with making Internet sites unreadable to browsers that do not have access to the developments added by Microsoft is to motivate or force the users that do not use Internet Explorer and Windows to convert.

Gaining control over the browser market again provides for possibilities to direct users to Microsoft's own Web properties, such as the MSN portal. In this way Microsoft will gain control over much of the Internet traffic, and thereby making the situation of its Internet competitors, such as Opera Software, increasingly more difficult.

3.2.2 The World Wide Web Consortium

It is in the interest of Internet users that the Internet shall be accessible to all no matter the software used to access the net. In order to keep up the speed of the development of universal, converging infrastructure on the Internet, consensus is needed among developers on what languages may be used and the sets of rules needed for communication computer-to-computer. The World Wide Web Consortium [W3C.org] (hereinafter ''W3C'') is the Web's international standardization body created to ensure a convergent development of the technical aspects of the Web. The W3C develops and coordinates common languages and rules for the Web, to ensure the W3C's long term goals:

Universal Access

To make the Web accessible to all by promoting technologies that take into account the vast differences in culture, education, ability, material resources, and physical limitations of users on all continents.

Semantic Web TO develop a software environment that permits each user to make the best use of the resources available on the Web.

Web of Trust To guide the Web's development with careful consideration for the novel legal, commercial, and social issues raised by this technology.

Opera Software is an active participant in developing the Web to its full potential through the active participation of its Chief Technology officer, H+kon Wium Lie, a member of the W3C's Advisory Board.

3.2.3 Opera's compliance with the W3C standards

No browser is a 100 percent in conformity with the W3C standards. There is an industry tolerance for slight divergences. These must however not represent a conscious act to further develop the standards, and thereby making the developments inaccessible for other standard compliant products. Opera Software respects the open standard policy, and is today to a great extent fully compliant with the standards set by the W3C.

3.3 Control of browser—control of Internet traffic

Recently, Microsoft introduced an update to its portal MSN.com. A portal is an electronic gateway to the Internet. The portal is really an extension of the search engine idea, but instead of providing lists of sites matching someone's search criteria it relies on a selection process to choose starter sites that new users might be interested in visiting.

Portals try to create stickiness (making surfers visit and then getting them to return again), and do so by providing a range of information on services and entertainment that will encourage visitors to return. The information provided might include a directory of other sites, a search facility, a weather service, chat rooms, free e-mail and a selection of sports, cinema and other entertainment sites.

The MSN.com portal and the Microsoft.com Web sites are some of the most visited Web properties on the Internet. It is therefore of vital importance that all browsers are given full access to the site on equal terms. This is further underlined by Microsoft's resent linking between its operating system and the MSN: Microsoft has an almost perfect monopoly in the market for operating systems, and uses this position to increase the traffic on the MSN.com portal. The new Windows XP is thus full of hooks, which directs traffic to MSN.com.

Opera Software was earlier this year alerted by users that the newly released version of MSN denied access to Opera both from the main page itself, as well as to links leading to subsections of the portal. The MSN server was thus checking which browser was being used, and programmed so as not to give Opera users full access. In effect the Opera browser and its millions of Internet users were blacklisted. Microsoft admitted that it was watching out for so-called Opera strings (the identification of the browser sent from the browser to the server), but stated that it did so to encourage people to use a standard-

compliant browsers. Microsoft claimed for example that Opera did not follow the XHTML standard. This is incorrect, as Opera in fact has excellent support for XHTML. It is in general incorrect that Opera is not standard compliant as the Opera browser is well known in the market for its adherence to standards set by the W3C. The misplaced criticism raised by Microsoft against the Opera browser is in fact applicable to the MSN site itself, as it is far from following the W3C standards of web development. The standards are broken consistently on every page, and the blocking out of Opera users must therefore be seen as a conscious policy to manipulate the users to leave the Opera browser and swap to Internet Explorer. After a media uproar, Microsoft promised to fix the problem of non-accessibility for the Opera browser. Some items have been fixed (the one's mentioned in Opera's press release on the issue) but Microsoft has now again reverted to the same tactics, but in a less obvious manner, by hiding their targeting of Opera in subcategories, or by giving Opera users identifying as an Opera browser user a slightly distorted version of the web page presented to Internet Explorer user. Opera Software worries that if the current pressure towards Microsoft to end its anticompetitive behavior ends without a serious legal reaction, no public uproar will manage to make Microsoft backtrack in its determination to get control of the browser market.

3.4 Predatory pricing

Microsoft has an almost perfect monopoly on operative systems for PCs. Judge Jackson found that from 1998–99, Windows has held a market share of at least 95%. There is reason to believe that market share has increased since. Against the background of a high percentage of the market, Microsoft's pricing behavior, the fact that there are no viable alternatives to Windows, as well as Microsoft's behavior towards other firms, Judge Jackson concluded that Microsoft had monopoly power.

Microsoft is known to use its monopoly power to maximize its profits where it holds a factual monopoly, while it sells products at a loss in markets where it is not in a monopoly position, the purpose of such pricing policy being to gain market share and market power in markets where it does not hold a monopoly. Opera alleges that this practice amounts to predatory pricing. The fact that Internet Explorer was included in Windows for free, had the result that Microsoft managed to take 40–45 % of the browser market from the end of 1996 to late 1998, while Netscape's market share dropped from around 80 % to about 55 % in the same period. Today, three years later, Internet Explorer has a market share close to 90 % of the market and Netscape barely 10 %. The consequences of this price policy have thus been dramatic. Microsoft is now pursuing the same policy with respect to its operating system for embedded products, the so-called Windows CE / Pocket PC. The price for the new Windows XP for the desktop market has recently dramatically increased, while the price for Windows CE on the other hand is much lower.

There is no objective reason for this dramatic difference in price. Windows CE builds on the same platform as Windows XP, but is designed to take up less storage space in order to be more adapt to the limited storage capacity of embedded products. There is thus reason to believe that there is no correlation between the cost of developing Windows CE and the price currently being charged. Opera Software is of the opinion that the price charged for Windows CE is probably below the average variable cost, and may pursuant to the Areeda-Turner Test be classified as predatory pricing.

3.5 Tying

The allegation of predatory pricing is closely linked to Microsoft's practice of tying products. Opera Software alleges that operative systems and browsers are separate products, without any natural or necessary link. Microsoft's inclusion of Internet Explorer in its operative system Windows thus amounts to an illegal tying of products.

Microsoft's practice in the desktop market is well known to the States, as Judge Jackson's findings in the case against Microsoft in the United States discusses this issue in depth. The company's practice has, over a period of five years, increased the market share in the browser market from close to zero to almost 90 percent.

Microsoft is still practicing the tying of Internet Explorer to the operating system Windows: The newly released Windows XP contains the latest version of Internet Explorer.

3.6 The server market

Apart from controlling the market for operating systems, browsers and some of the world's largest Web properties, Microsoft is also a dominant and aggressive player in the server market. This position has been used to harm Opera Software, and with Microsoft's growing dominance in this market, the future provides for even greater opportunities for misuse of market power. A dominant position in the server market gives Microsoft the possibility to abuse its position in the following manner: It is technically speaking an easy operation to program the server's software to only give users of the Internet Explorer browser access to web sites. Microsoft has done this in the past, and only relented after Opera Software raised this issue with Microsoft directly. The problem is however yet not fully solved, as users of Opera have to mask their browser as Internet Explorer in order to get full access. Opera Software worries that if the public pressure of antitrust fades away without a serious legal reaction, nothing will stop Microsoft from effectively closing Opera browser users out from millions of Web sites around the world.

3.7 Consequences of Microsoft's business practices

The business effect of Microsoft's business practices with regard to the points discussed in the above have been severe. Many of Opera Software's potential partners have chosen not to enter into cooperation with Opera Software due to an expressed fear about becoming subject to a campaign by Microsoft by themselves being ''blacklisted''.

Due to the confidential nature of these negotiations Opera Software is, as yet, not able to provide examples hereof.

4 REMEDY

4.1 Proposed remedy in settlement

Opera Software alleges that its market share would have been considerably higher in the present situation, had not Microsoft continuously practiced a policy of predatory pricing, illegal tying of products, extension of open standards and manipulation of the server market. Opera Software further alleges that its present market position will be severely damaged if the present illegal business practices by Microsoft are not curbed.

In the view of Opera Software the proposed settlement will not stop Microsoft from continuing its abusive tactics for dominace and monopoly power, to the detriment to all Internet innovators. In addition, the settlement is not a punishment for Microsoft's predatory behaviour.

4.2 Opera's suggestions for remedies

In the view of Opera Software, a series of actions need to be taken towards Microsoft, to reflect the damage they pose to the entire computer industry.

4.2.1 Standards compliance

Microsoft must be forced to follow the international, open standards set by organizations like the W3C. Microsoft would have to follow these standards to the letter, not partially or by introducing proprietary standards under the guise of ''innovation.'' Only with that measure in place can Microsoft's practice of ''embrace, extend, extinguish'' be put to a halt. To ensure compliance, an independent body should be able to check all Microsoft products before their public release.

4.2.2 Competing browsers

To ensure a competitive browser market, Microsoft should bundle Netscape and Opera in all their Operating Systems.

4.2.3 Stripped Windows at lower price

Microsoft should be required to offer only an unbundled version of their Operating Systems, meaning that browser, mail client, streaming media, etc. would be excluded. The extra Microsoft applications can then be offered in a separate packages, but no tying of the application packets and Operating System should be allowed.

4.2.4 No blacklisting on servers

Also, because of Microsoft's position also in the server market, the Company must be held to promise that it will stop identifying what browser is used to access its servers, to avoid blacklisting competitors.

4.4.5 Pricing

The price of Windows CE and Windows should be the same, or Windows CE should cost more as it includes more applications.

The proposed solutions should all be simple for Microsoft to introduce, while at the same time opening the marketplace to true competition, restoring a balance to the marketplace for the benefit of the whole computer industry as well as all computer users.

MTC–00004965

From: PAULAnNEAL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 7:18am
Subject: Microsoft case

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to comment on microsoft case/settlement. By my reading of the settlement,

msft seems to be more rewarded for their monopolistic practices than punished. The biggest reason why msft ran afoul of the law in the first place was the fact that they bundled and integrated all their extras in with the operating system, essentially making their standard the defacto standard. If you read msft's own press over the past years prior to the introduction of the new xp operating system, they have gone even further doing this with this new system and nothing in the remedy prevents them from doing this again and again. Msft has also in the past built things into the operating system to make competing programs work less well than their own products. This gives msft an unfair advantage that is not addressed in the settlement. Msft continues to try to run afoul of accepted standards in order to allow their own brand of product to prevail.

Also as part of the settlement, Msft offered to give a billion in used hardware and software to schools. By structuring the settlement in this way, it essentially furthers msft's monopolistic practices by shutting out other potential solutions to the school market, a market that msft has not been able to totally dominate yet. A more proper penalty and solution would be to have msft make a cash donation to the schools to help with purchasing the technology they feel they need, not the technology that msft wants to give them to further their dependance on msft products in the future. In addition, msft software donations would be valued at full retail value but actually cost msft pennies on the dollar. This would hardly penalize msft at all.

Lastly, competing products must be given a fair chance to compete. Msft needs to adhere to standards chosen by the computer industry, not try to force their solution to the defacto choice simply because they control the majority of the computer desktops.

Sincerely,

Neal

MTC–00004966

From: Bombs@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 7:25am
Subject: Comment on Microsoft Settlement

The settlement has done little to protect consumers. One of the original issues was the bundling of MS Internet Explorer into the OS. A browser is not required to control the disk, memory and peripherals of a computer, which is the job of the OS. Fast forward to November 01. MS in attempt to thwart soon-to-be-announced DOJ penalties, releases the latest OS (XP), weeks ahead of schedule through OEM sales, such that it could not easily be recalled. This OS has numerous additional software features built into the OS such as multi-media players, CD burners, etc. These latest inclusions reflect MS blatant attempt to monopolize the PC market and put other software companies out of business. In fact, the settlement offers more PCs and MS software to educational facilities. This will only help MS crack the educational market, one of the last segments that had yet to dominate. The actual cost to MS is virtually nil, the CDs are pressed for mere pennies, yet they can write each off for several hundred dollars. What a joke, again MS is laughing all the way to the bank and the DOJ looks like a weak idiot. MS needs to be broken into a Commercial Software Company and Commercial OS Company. Obviously, MS is resistant to this as the Software Company would have to compete against the OS company which they know is a losing battle. However, the Software Company should win out in the end: if MS Office was released in a Linux form, it would continue to be a best seller. However, it would lose many of its OS customers, which is why MS is the only major computer company that has failed to jump on the Linux bandwagon (even staunchy IBM has thrown serious muscle into the effort). Do your job and protect the consumers from an acknowledged monopoly. The current settlement is weak, pro MS and fails to protect the consumer. God knows XP protects nobody, after being proclaimed the most secure OS ever from MS, the FBI had to issue an alert to warn all citizens of serious security breaches. Bravo

MTC–00004967

From: HMAletter@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 8:54am
Subject: Antitrust settlement

After years of waiting and hoping, I cannot find many in the corporate IT world that is satisfied, or even a bit happy, with the currently proposed settlement with Microsoft. For a company that has scoffed at Justice for many years, I find it hard to believe that those involved in the case would let them proceed as they have.

For those that are unaware of just how much we have all suffered as a result of this monopoly, I offer just some of the hardships. Microsoft took over the browser market by incorporating Internet Explorer (IE) into Windows. Outlook and Outlook Express, Microsoft's e-mail software, virtually eliminated all development from other competitors. Outlook Express comes with virtually all Windows computers for no additional price. I might add that Outlook has been the prime delivery mechanism for hackers looking to spread dreaded viruses. As the Justice Department looks for a speedy end to this case, Microsoft has made it very difficult for new browsers and other software to work with their latest buggy system called Windows XP. RealPlayer and various other small competitive products have been locked out from the system at various points, as have any non Windows computers into the MSN networks.

For those that are not tech-savvy, I must do my best to dissuade you from believing that Microsoft's monopoly position has not stifled creativity or slowed down technology. Many ''new'' features in the current release of XP have been standard fare on Apple computers for over 3 years. As one who both owns and supports both platforms, I can attest to the decreased stress level and increased productivity on the Apple platform. Many Apple standards are simply adopted by Microsoft at later dates and used to further entrench their monopoly. Apple stands today only as a result of the infamous 1997 deal with Microsoft in which Apple dropped all pending lawsuits against them in return for 5 years of continued development of the popular Microsoft Office Suite. I might also add that Microsoft Word and Excel were originally developed for the Macintosh platform, not Windows.

If Justice or the Court needs any impetus to look for a stronger settlement against Microsoft they need look no further that the current Windows XP or the .NET strategy and corresponding products. I suspect that Justice will have to revisit this issue 4 years or so down the road. Unfortunately, it might be too late for the many companies and products that have been destroyed by current monopolistic activities. I am always saddened to see Windows machines in the classroom, an area that has long been the strength of Apple. Down the road, school districts will have to grapple with the issues of Microsoft's licensing practices, not to mention the tremendous support budget increases required to keep the systems up and running. This is fact, not merely statements. There are far more issues to contend with than those brought up in the original antitrust case. In fact, I believe if Justice had the foresight, they would be preparing a new case based on the events that have transpired between 1998 and the present. At any rate, I would advise anyone looking into a reasonable settlement to discuss the current situations in the PC world with the users, and the executives of companies that sell the hardware and software.

Steve Hinchey

MTC–00004968

From: Curtis Garrison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 9:12am
Subject: Facts to keep in mind

Microsoft owes everyone, not just the schools, for their abuse of maintaining a monopoly. Here are a couple of examples in which I was personally impacted:

—Several times up until a couple years ago, I wanted to purchase a Dell, Compaq or Micron computer primarily to use as Linux servers if not for other reasons that put me in the position of NOT wanting a Microsoft related license. I had no choice but to continue to buy the computers with MS Windows of some sort since it was a violation for the vendors to sell me a customized or ''blank'' computer. The only other choice I had was to build my own computer out of parts which was not what I wanted to do considering the reliability I needed from a vendor and my experience and abilities to do this.

—During the browser wars of Netscape and Internet Explorer, there were many web sites (StarTrek.com for example) that wold only allow you access if you used Internet Explorer. This cost me time to download and install this software when I was perfectly fine with Netscape. This was imposed on me and also further cost me in hard disk space usage at a time when it was not as cheap as it is today.

—In the mid 90's I was on a committee at Nortel and we evaluated Novell and Windows NT as possible Network Operating System Solutions. Microsoft held stiff penalties over our heads

regarding licenses overall such as on the 60,000 Microsoft Office licenses we had to have. If we did not make the choice to go to their platform, we would not be looked at favorably when it came to further license arrangements for Office, etc.. . . They also emphasized to us that Novell was on their way out as their technology was destined to be outdated and limited. This cost several people training options and career directions that they were in the middle of pursuing and stagnated developments in that industry unless it was Microsoft related. These are just a few examples of how I am many many people were personally effected with Microsoft's continued abuse of their monopoly. If this is not resolved in a manner that is legit and more beneficial to the public, I am sure that there are very many people like myself that would be disappointed and not satisfied. I already have feelings that someone is being bought out or influenced in an unethical way simply in light of these Microsoft proposals even being considered. I implore you to make sure the right thing is done to help correct things by taking some action that will help realign the balance in the industry some what accordingly and/or compensate the public for Microsoft's actions.

Imagine the growth in the technical sector if all of a sudden tens of thousands of small developers and related businesses could get funding and support if they didn't have to worry about the hopeless idea of trying to compete against Microsoft.

Thank you

Curtis Garrison

InteractiveSociety.com

''Join Our Click''

http://www.InteractiveSociety.com

P.O. Box 801548; Dallas, TX 75380

214–808–2878

MTC–00004969

From: Fred Butzen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 12/28/01 10:00am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

The following gives my comment on the proposed settlement with Microsoft corporation. My comment is based on my 20 years' experience as a computer programmer and technical writer. Among my published works are ''The Linux Network'' (MIS Press, 1998), ''The Linux Database'' (MIS Press, 1997), ''ANSI C: A Lexical Guide'' (Prentice Hall, 1988), and ''The SuSE Linux Network'' (M&T Books, 2000).

—Criteria for a Settlement—

The settlement with Microsoft must fulfill the following criteria:

1. It must, as much as possible, preserve Microsoft as a corporate entity and engine of commerce.

2. It must alleviate Microsoft's illegal monopolistic influence on the market in computer software.

3. It must be clear, verifiable, and enforceable.

The first point is obvious: while Microsoft has behaved illegally, it is still a vital entity in the marketplace. It needs to be tamed, not destroyed. The second point is also clear: the point of the settlement is not to punish Microsoft, but to preserve the integrity of the market from Microsoft's illegal monopoly. That is the goal: to preserve the market. The third point is often overlooked: unless Microsoft's behavior can be verified objectively, the result of any settlement will simply be another round of lawsuits—an outcome that no sane person could wish.

—The Proposed Settlement Fails These Criteria—

The proposed settlement fails on all three criteria.

1. The proposed board of oversight will interfere with Microsoft's internal operations, slowing its ability to work and complicating the already complex task of writing software.

2. The proposed settlement addresses some contractual issues, but does not address Microsoft's warping of the marketplace in technology—which is by far Microsoft's most damaging behavior.

3. The proposed settlement's oversight provisions are vague, and are subject to interpretation and dispute.

With all due respect, the proposed settlement is something only a lawyer could love—and litigious lawyer at that. It is possible to write a settlement that will be fair to Microsoft yet preserve the marketplace from its predations—but only if one understands the techical core of Microsoft's threat to the marketplace.

—Technical Basis for Preserving the Market—

Much of the government's case against Microsoft depended upon the internals of Microsoft's software—particularly the Windows operating system. However, this is misleading: the most important feature of a software program is not how it behaves internally, but how it interacts with other programs. Computer programs exchange information through the use of *protocols*. A protocol is simply a set of rules that define how data is interchanged. A protocol can govern how data are written into a file, so the data can be retrieved and processed again; or it can govern how two programs ''converse'' with each other over a network.

This point is vital: ** A monopolist can extend its influence from one software arena into another arena if and only if it controls the protocols with which the programs in the one arena communicate with the programs in the other arena. ** The vast computer network that we call the Internet is governed by a set of protocols that have been written by the software community at large. A mechanism called a ''request for comment'' allows an individual or group to propose a protocol; others comment, amendations are made, and votes taken before the protocol is adopted. This openness permits a free market in software and services: all software that adheres to the protocol can participate in the marketplace, and exchange data with other programs by other vendors that also adhere to the protocol.

** The key to Microsoft's distortion of the marketplace is that it unilaterally rewrites protocols.**

Sometimes the rewriting consists of changing a protocol's rules. More often, it involves adding extensions to the protocol. These features are not documented, and often are patented or copyrighted. They are offered as improvements or enhancements to the protocol; but whilethese changes may or may not improve the protocol, but they *always* have the effect of blocking other software vendors from participating in the software arena.

The rewriting of protocols is allowing Microsoft to extend its monopoly in desktop operating systems and applications into the server market: its ability to unilaterally rewrite how client and server communicate means that commercial users will have to use Microsoft servers in order to receive business from Microsoft clients.

This extension of influence from one arena into another is precisely the abuse that antitrust law was meant to stop—and it is precisely the abuse that the proposed settlement does *not* address.

—A Settlement That Works—

Fortunately, the technical nature of the abuse also makes possible a technical settlement—one that fulfills all three criteria that I outlined above. My proposed settlement has the following points:

1. Microsoft software will use *only* commonly accepted protocols for communication between clients and servers. No additions or modifications will be allowed, except where approved by the software community at large through the normal request-for-comment process.

2. Microsoft will document and submit to the request-for-comment process all of the file formats used by its applications, in particular, Microsoft Word, Microsoft Access, and Microsoft Excel. Once the submission is made, Microsoft must adhere to the file formats so documented, and can change formats only by submitting revisions to the software community at large through the normal request-for-comment process.

3. A set of computer programs will be written by a court-appointed third party. These programs will test whether Microsoft software adheres to protocols as openly documented.

4. Should the test program show that Microsoft has violated a protocol, and should the violation be verified by a third party, the court will order adherence, and prescribe appropriate penalties.

This settlement will let Microsoft carry on its work unimpeded by supervisors or court-imposed bureaucracy. It will stop Microsoft from extending its illegal monopoly into other arenas, and it will let new companies compete in the Microsoft arena. Most importantly, it is clear and objectively verifiable.

—Conclusion—

Thank you for taking the time to read my comment. I hope that my comments will help the court to arrive at a settlement that is truly fair and truly effective. Most importantly, I hope the court will take to heart the need for any settlement to address Microsoft's abuse of protocols. This is the heart of the problem, and any settlement that does not address it will be a failure.

Fred Butzenfred@lepanto.com [home]

4320 N. Claremont Avenuefred@vailsys.com [work]

Chicago, IL 60618–1612 USA(888) 599–8854

CC:fred@lepanto.com@inetgw,jith @stanfordalumni.org@in. . .

MTC–00004970

From: MWLAURSEN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 11:03am
Subject: Microsoft—Problems

Dear Sir;

I do have problems with Microsoft and there size as a computer company. I believe that Microsoft is out to control the software industry on both the Windows and Macintosh operating systems. I am a long time Apple Macintosh user, and Microsoft has cause me to purchase upgrade of their software for Operating system changes. Now I know that some times this is a necessity, but the last time I had to upgrade was not. This is why I believe that they are out to get the consumer.

Example of this case: I have an Apple Macintosh G3, that was running system 8.6. I then purchased the next version, 9.0.4. All the software that I had moved to the new operating system except for Microsoft products (Word, Excel, PowerPoint). I needed to upgrade from my pervious version. Now since all the other software worked, even a shareware game that I have for years, and several operating systems. Why does Microsoft write their software not to function on new operating systems.

This upgrade cost me the cost of the operating system and the 249.00 for the upgrade to the Microsoft software. Another items is the number of choices that I have word processors, and spread sheets. It has dewinelled to one and that is Microsoft.

They have become the standard in the software business for desktop computers, and in some case this is good, because the data that is created for any desktop computer and be shared with another, not worry about the maker of the computer, even Macintoshes can read data from intel base desktop computers. The items that Microsoft needs to share with the rest of the computer world is the standards. The data formats are now default standards, which should be disturbuted freely to all that want to communicate with a piece of software (Word processor documents). Then a standards committy can then determine the changes to the standard and distibute to all that would want them. Microsoft is a strange computer company because they are the only company that creates an operating system for a computer that they do not build. All the other companies build a computer and write the operating system for it. This one of the reason I use an Apple Macintosh, it just seems to work better.

Thank you
Mark Laursen

MTC–00004971

From: Monty Nicol
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 11:25am
Subject: Settlement Comments

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am not a Microsoft-hater or one who loves any particular brand or type of software more than any other. I believe, however, that the current proposed Microsoft settlement is extremely detrimental to today's software customers and to the competitive market at large. The current proposed deal seems extremely weak to me in light of Microsoft's past infractions. I urge you to re-evaluate this settlement and choose impose not just government oversight and enforcement, but also organizational and structural changes to Microsoft itself in order to better facilitate competition in the marketplace.

Thank you,
Monty Nicol
Internet Developer
Brooklyn, NY 11238
Do You Yahoo!?
Send your FREE holiday greetings online!
http://greetings.yahoo.com

MTC–00004972

From: Joe Morse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 12:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it amy concern:

I'm writing to express my extreme dismay and sense of betrayal at the DOJ's proposed settlement of the United States v. Microsoft civil antitrust case. I am a software engineer with 7 years of experience in the computing field. I also have a bachelors degree in Economics from the University of California at Berkeley, where I focused my studies on antitrust issues relating to technology industries.

For years Microsoft has been able to get away with using anticompetitive practices to anihilate any company that seeks to enter the markets it dominates (OS, Office Suite, Etc). The absence of competition has resulted not only in higher prices, but also in software of dubious quality. Every major worm and virus on the internet in the last 5 years has targeted blatant vulnerabilities in Microsoft software. These vulnerabilities exist because Microsoft has quashed (or acquired) competing products whose presence in the marketplace would have induced Microsoft to produce better and more secure software. Consumers (especially business consumers) lose because they get a shabby product at a higher price. Security and other defects also increase the cost of computing. On two occasions in the past year I have seen my company's network shut down for days at a time because of security holes in Microsoft's operating system. This resulted in several thousand lost man-hours and millions of dollars of financial loss for the company.

The proposed settlement would allow Microsoft to continue its predatory business practices unabated. Antitrust violations are often a cultural phenomenon at a corporation like Microsoft. Procedural and behavioral remedies fail to address Microsoft's conduct in markets it may seek to dominate in the future. There's an atmosphere of lawlessness in Redmond that only a structural remedy will cure.

Markets are created by society to fulfill its needs and desires. When a business enterprise becomes destructive of those needs and desires the government has a moral and legal obligation to step in and take strong corrective measures under the Sherman Act. The DOJ's proposed settlement falls well short of that obligation and betrays the public trust. I strongly urge the DOJ to abandon the proposed settlement in favor of an effective structural remedy.

Sincerely,
Joe Morse
Do You Yahoo!?
Send your FREE holiday greetings online!
http://greetings.yahoo.com

MTC–00004973

From: Jon 'maddog' Hall, Executive Director, Linux International
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 12:47pm
Subject: Additional comment and proposals for Microsoft/Open Source solution

80 Amherst St.
Amherst, NH 03031–3032 USA
Honorable Colleen Kollar-Kotelly
U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

Your Honor,

I am writing in support of the change to Microsoft's penalties as proposed by Mr. Matthew Suzlik, CEO of Red Hat Software, Inc. As a former programmer and educator with over thirty years of experience in the computer industry, I feel that Mr. Suzlik's proposal of replacing the over-priced, closed-source Microsoft software with Open Source GPL'ed software has real merit. However, I have some additional comments and suggestions to further increase the benefit/function of his proposal.

Mr. Suzlik correctly points out that his proposal would increase the number of systems from 200000 to over 1 million. From my understanding of the original proposal, the total amount of the punitive measure was about two billion dollars. I also understand that a lot of the computer equipment was to be ''refurbished'' equipment, which would do little or nothing to strengthen the economy. At today's equipment prices, I would encourage this course of action:

Generate a Request for Quote for a hardware vendor to produce one or two fixed models which would give basic multimedia desktop or server capabilities to the school systems, almost at manufacturer's cost. The schools would then be free to order these machines from this list of systems. If the manufacturer did not have to pay the Microsoft licensing fees, I believe that the cost of these computers would be able to deliver basic multimedia functionality to close to 2 million computers, not the one million that Mr. Suzlik estimates, and at a cost less than it would be to collect, recondition and redistribute refurbished models.

These units would then have a consistent set of hardware that would make it easier for both Red Hat Software to support the operating system, and easier for the school districts to support the hardware in the long run. The use of new hardware will also typically generate a longer warranty from the manufacturer then the use of refurbished hardware also. I am sure that the hardware companies will work very hard to generate the best possible bid on this contract, both for the amount of systems it represents, and for the publicity that they will get in being part of this solution.

The building of these new machines, rather than the refurbishing of the older machines,

would help to create jobs needed at this time in the economy. While refurbishing machines also generates jobs, it is not guaranteed that the number of refurbished machines would allow a consistent set of hardware across the entire program, nor with a consistent warranty and replacement program.

A second comment that I have on Mr. Suzlik's proposal is that the Open Source software that he is suggesting be used has a benefit to the students in the school system that Microsoft's code does not provide. While both sets of software allow the students to browse the web, write papers, use spreadsheets, and do other tasks a student has to do in education, only the Open Source code allows the student to see HOW these tasks are done. As a former college professor, I would have given my eye teeth to have an operating system like Linux to teach operating system design, or compiler suites like GNU (which come with all Linux distributions) to show students how compilers are actually written. I would have been overwhelmed with joy to have a database system like MySQL or Postgres to show my students now only how to use and manage a sophisticated database, but how they worked inside. This can be done with Open Source software, but can not be done with closed source, proprietary software like Microsoft's.

But today Open Source software goes beyond just operating systems, compilers and database engines, and if you go out to the place on the net called ''SourceForge'' (www.sourceforge.net) you will find over 30,000 projects with over 300,000 people working on them. These projects cover almost every area of academic pursuit, and the use and encouragement of Open Source software would allow these students in the ''fourteen poorest school districts in the United States'' to work along side other students from all over the world. Perhaps some of these students from these poorer school districts would get their work recognized and publicized, increasing their self-confidence, not only in the areas of computer science, but biology, mathematics, physics and other areas where the United States is beginning to lag other countries.

Finally, I would like to point out that in a lot of these poorer school districts there exist already some local Linux user groups nearby that might be willing to act as ''sponsors'' and ''angels'' for this program, to provide support and help for these districts, in addition to what Red Hat would provide. If you need any additional information in considering this proposal, please feel free to contact me at the address given above, or the telephone numbers give below.

Warmest regards,
Jon A. Hall
Executive Director
Jon ''maddog'' Hall
Executive Director
email: maddog@li.org
Voice: +1.603.672.4557
WWW: http://www.li.org
Linux International(SM)
80 Amherst St.
Amherst, N.H. 03031–3032 U.S.A.
Board Member: Uniforum Association, USENIX Association (R)Linux is a registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in several countries. (SM)Linux International is a service mark of Linux International, Inc.
CC:maddog@li.org@inetgw

MTC–00004974

From: James Lancaster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:16pm
Subject: Harsher consequences!

My tax dollars are going to this lawsuit so I want to pay for something that accomplishes the task it was set up to perform. Giving Microsoft a slap on the wrist will not prevent them from engaging in further gouging of the market. I propose that all Microsoft OSes be removed from all government computer systems. Why would the government want to trust the code of a proprietary Operating System that has more security issues than any other operating system in existence? Would not an open source solution allow for greater security among government-owned systems? Anyway, my 2 cents have just been added.

Sincerely,
James Lancaster
27157 Shadowcrest Ln.
Cathedral City, CA
92234

MTC–00004975

From: JBMARKETS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:23pm
Subject: Comment re Proposed Settlement

Microsoft's proposed settlement is a travesty which makes mockery of the findings and further, serves as a marketing plan to extend its monopoly into the education market, and it clears the way for Microsoft to continue it monopolistic practices for years to come. The ''$1 Billion donation'' consists primarily of seeding-enveloping less prosperous schools and children with lesser-quality/refurbished computers and Microsoft software which costs pennies per copy to provide. It is not a penalty, but a marketing reward, harmful to some of the same competitors Microsoft has already been found to have harmed. Cash with no Microsoft strings attached is the only proper remedy for this aspect of the settlement. Schools and all markets deserve the freedom to choose the products they want. The provisions relating to supposed assurance of monitoring-preventing future anti-competitive practices by Microsoft are woefully inadequate in the face of a company culture that historically ignores and obfuscates the law and any rulings and findings.

Justice is not at all served by this settlement, nor are consumers and competitors. Continued delays have and continue to play a major role in promulgating Microsoft's anti-competive practices and strategies. There is great risk that an inadequate settlement and loose behavioral restrictions will result in Microsoft soon controlling the internet and ultimately the bulk of all electronic devices and systems in the all-connected-wired future. The court needs to impose a true and just settlement, quickly.

Jeff B.
Columbus, Ohio

MTC–00004976

From: Joejensen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly Must Be Stopped

MICROSOFT IS A THREAT TO THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES. Microsoft was found guilty in that it ILLEGALLY Maintained an operating system monopoly. As Microsoft did not in any way and at any time willingly cooperate with the investigation (and in fact continued to lie, mislead and use undue financial resources to shape p[ubhlic opinion, IT THEREFORE SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO PLEA BARGAIN AT THIS TIME OR TO SELECT ITS OWN DESIRED PENALTY. This case is a travesty!

Microsoft's business tactics are ruthless. Based on the company's anti social and arrogant behavior The company is determined to exercise total control of all companies that it enters into business agreements into and to enslave all who utlize it's operating systems. The company regularly applies extorsion to its business clients in forcing them to pay ever higher maintenance fees, and its sole interest is to extract money from every available resource.

I FEEL VERY THREATENED BY MICROSOFT'S POWER AND INTIMIDATION. It seems that every time the justice department hones in on Microsoft, there suddenly appears a crisis that totally diverts attention away from itself. Examine the history of its bad luck with the courts and crisis like anthrax appear out of nowhere, alowing microsoft to hide away from national attention. Is Microsoft behind these attacks?

WHEN I READ ABOUT MICROSOFT'S PROPOSED SETTLEMENT WITH THE STATES, I really lost faith in our government and the leadership serving our nation, because apprantly Microsoft is somehow controlling or blackmailing them. I COULD NOT BELIEVE THAT THEY WOULD DONATE ABOUT 100 MILLION CASH, WITH THE REST OF THE DONATION DEAD INVENTORY OF OBSOLETE PRODUCTS THAT MICROSOFT KNOWS WOULD NOT REALLY HELP ANYONE.... AND IN RETURN THEY WOULD GEET A $550 MILLION TAX DEDUCTION!!!! Have we lost all of our better senses? The $550 MILLION Tax DEDUCTION WOULD GIVE MICROSOFT $275 MILLION OF CASH. IN OTHER WORDS, THEY WOULD EARN A PROFIT OF $175 MILLION paid for by us dumb tax payers. IN ADDITOIN MICROSOFT SHOULD BE FORCED TO SEPERATE ITS OPERATING EARNINGS FROM ITS TOTAL EARNINGS, a practive it refuses to do. In other words, there is no way of knowing whether microsoft made a profit from operating the company or from its investments. FINALLY, I sincerely hope that Microsoft is severly PUNISHED for being the criminal organization that it is, and that the company should be made to pay a penalty of one half of all its assets to be held by the US Treasury. The funds should be returned to the public at large via tax refunds and tax credits. In addition a percentage of these

funds should be used to expand competing operating system technologies, such as MacIntosh,

Linux, etc.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

MTC–00004977

From: gatzke@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft must be punished.

Greetings,

I am a real person. I am NOT employed by Microsoft to write letters of support. Concerning the Microsoft Monopoly, I think Microsoft has acted unfairly in the past. This hurt consumers and continues to harm consumers. Microsoft should be punished severely.

1. To limit Microsoft's use of muscle to control hardware vendors, prices should be published for the operating system for all vendors, not just the top 20 OEMs. Loopholes should be avoided, such as ''dealer incentives''. People should be able to decide what operating system to run. A PC should be available without an operating system.

2. File formats should be specified. These should be released 6 months prior to a software release. If the software does not conform to the file specifications, Microsoft should be punished by stiff fines or refunds to customers. I am sure there are many other items that should be considered. Others with better knowledge of the situation may have more useful insight.

Thank you for your time.

Ed Gatzke
Assistant Professor, Dept. Chem. Eng.
Univ. of South Carolina
Swearingen Engineering Center,
Chem. Eng. 2C32,
Columbia, SC 29208
(803)777–1159 wk,(617)461–3634 cell,(803)419–9655 hm,(803)777–8265 fax

MTC–00004978

From: bfox@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,webmaster @ago.state.ma.us@inetgw,att...
Date: 12/28/01 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a citizen of the United States and the State of Massachusetts, I am dissatisfied with the proposed settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust settlement, announced on or about Nov. 20, 2001.

The proposed settlement, to compell Microsoft to donate $1B in SW, HW, and services to K-12 schools, will further entrench Microsoft's image as the only OS option in the minds of children. What about the competitors. Thats what this is all about. The settlement is effectively a windfall for Microsoft. Microsoft's marketing division probably views this settlement as $1B windfall How will we have Microsoft account forthe ''cost'' of $1 Billion in exquipment, software, and services? I am sure Microsoft will argue for ''full cost'', while their true cost is nil. Consider the economics of the software industry. Software creation is 90% of a product's cost, reproduction is 2%.

The toothless settlement proposed will only further encourage Microsoft, and corporate America at large, to flaunt the DOJ as merely a nuisance to business as usual, not a formidable market police body to be respected. I suggest restrictions of Microsoft's market access. It is clear Microsoft is moving on other facets of the IT industry such as online services, entertainment, and telephony. Perhaps a settlement that freezes them out of several of these industries to prevent them from further controlling the technology infrastructure of this country.

Similar to the AT&T settlement of the early 80s Another option is to limit Microsoft's access to Federl and State contract awards for a period of several years, limiting them to XX% of all awarded contract $$s These types of punishments show teeth to the DOJ's and State AG's actions.

William J. Fox
Director of Systems Architecture
400 West Cummings Park
Suite 2350
Woburn, MA 01801
781–938–7283 x272
781–389–3110 (mobile)

MTC–00004979

From: Robert Poreda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Antritrust Case
From: Robert Poreda
31 East 25th Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74114
December 28, 2001

The proposed settlement allowing MS to give a large sum of money, product and services to the educational market will only serve to strengthen the Microsoft monopoly. This proposal tells independent software developers that here is another market segment we will lose, courtesy of the Department of Justice. I'm trying to start an internet hosting company. At the outset, I'm running into sites that either strongly recommend the use of the MS internet browser or fail to show properly when accessed by Netscape 6. Some sites developed by MS products are completely inaccessable by other browser versions such as Netscape 4.x or Opera. Now, MS introduces their .Net program, which I understand will exacerbate the problem by creating more sites unusable by anything other than MS Explorer. I was raised to keep my options open, to not put all my eggs into one basket. The United States has done just that with office services software and now appears to be doing the same with the internet. This aspect alone creates substantial vulnerability to our economy and technology, let alone the problems related to you regarding competitive markets and creativity. Microsoft needs to be divided into at least two companies, and perhaps as much as four.

MTC–00004980

From: Mark Bej
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Public Comment

Sirs and Madames:

In my view, nothing short of breakup would be an appropriate resolution to the monopolistic behavior of Microsoft. It would be one thing if there were a situation analogous to the car, oil refining, or breakfast cereal industries. Each of these has several major players with fluctuating market share, but in no case does one company have 90+% market share. So, to bring the analogy back to the computer market, if 30–50% of computers were Windows+MS Office, and there were sizeable proportions of OS/2+SmartSuite, Mac OS+Claris Works, and Corel Linux+Corel Office, I would not be writing you. But all of you know that this is not the situation at all. Breakup would be the best remedy. If DoJ persists in not pursuing this policy, only the most detailed, long-term, and invasive scrutiny of Microsoft would, in my opinion, be an appropriate response. This would have to include review of Windows source code to confirm that Microsoft is not leaving itself back doors, undocumented procedures, and ''time bombs'' for other vendors' software. To date, only one company has been able to thumb its nose at Microsoft and get away with it—Intuit. It behooves DoJ to know exactly why.

Many thanks for the opportunity to respond.

Mark D. Bej, M.D.
bejm@eeg.ccf.org
Section of Epilepsy & Sleep Disorders
Section of Neurological Computing
Department of Neurology Cleveland Clinic Foundation S-51 9500 Euclid Ave. Cleveland, Ohio 44195 U.S.A. CC:attorney.general @po.state.ct.us@inetgw Phone (216) 445–2565 Operator (216) 444–2200 bpr 24095 Fax (216) 445–6617 (public) Voice mail (216) 444–0119 (nonclinical only)

MTC–00004981

From: Timothy Clark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear People,

When people look back a 100 years from now Microsoft will be listed as one of the all time great robber barons of our history. Who knows where are computer industry would be now without their predatory tactics. Please do not let them off the hook.

Tim Clark

MTC–00004982

From: Robert Cheetham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ Antitrust Division,

I am writing to submit comments during the Tunney Act public comment period regarding the Department of Justice's settlement proposal of the antitrust case with Microsoft Corporation. My company is a Microsoft customer. We are software developers that rely on the Microsoft platforms and developer tools to make our business work and to help our clients do the same. However, over the past seven years we have repeatedly witnessed the bullying of competitors, stifling of innovation, obfuscation of security flaws in the software, increased prices for operating systems and office automation software and a dramatic decline in the choices we have available to us as consumers of computer software.

Observing these events, we believe the case brought against Microsoft over the past several years was fully justified. Moreover, the behavior of Microsoft's representatives during the trial was appallingly dishonest and disingenuous at best. In light of this, we submit the following points:

* While we do not support the originally proposed breakup of the company, we agree with the Court of Appeals that Microsoft is a monopoly and that it has illegally abused that monopoly.

* The OEM terms requirements in the settlement are positive moves and will be helpful.

* The settlement requires licensing of operating system APIs, but it allows so many exclusions for security, anti-piracy, authentication, etc., that there will be an enormous amount of the operating system that will remain closed. Moreover, whether an API is subject to exclusion or not will be subject to interpretation, turning compliance into an argument over terms.

* The means by which the compliance will be monitored includes a 3 person technical committee, with one member chosen by the plaintiff, one by Microsoft and the third agreed upon by the first two. We do not believe that Microsoft should have a voice in forming the committee that will monitor its own behavior.

* While the OEM terms are positive, we do not believe that the settlement arrived at by the DOJ and the States is going to be an effective remedy to Microsoft's past behavior. It is therefore not in the public interest. We encourage the Court and the plaintiffs to reject the proposed settlement and consider other more effective, remedies including requiring Microsoft to release into the public domain or to open source both the APIs and source code for its Office, Windows operating system, and Internet Explorer browser. These are the products with which Microsoft both has a monopoly and has abused that monopoly. If the source code for these products were available to the public for re-use, we believe the result will be a more competitive market, more secure operating systems, and greater innovation.

This still leaves an enormous range of competitive products (such as Visual Studio, SQL Server, MapPoint, etc.) upon which Microsoft can innovate and make money. Moreover, with Windows, Office and IE as either open source software or in the public domain, a common platform for future software development will be maintained for the benefit of the consumer. Such a remedy would cause short-term damage to Microsoft's revenues, but in the long run, the result will be a healthier Microsoft, a more robust software industry and a more secure information infrastructure. Despite the events of September 11, we are confident that the American economy is fundamentally healthy. The settlement that was agreed upon in October and November 2001 is, quite frankly, toothless and nothing more than a slap on the wrist for Microsoft. It rewards the company for its past illegal behavior and will do more to stifle the American economy than it will to encourage it. Microsoft's monopolistic behavior has stifled far more innovation than it has encouraged, and the US economy is increasingly based upon such innovation. Microsoft's monopoly abuse should be prevented in the future, and we encourage the Department of Justice and the State Attorneys General to consider remedies that will do so. We believe the current proposed settlement does not. We want to see Microsoft be a successful company, but we also want to see that happen on a level playing field in which smaller companies, like ours, have a chance to both compete fairly and to purchase innovative, competitively-priced software products. Please consider withdrawal of the proposed settlement and negotiation of a settlement that is in the public interest.

Sincerely,
Robert M Cheetham
President
Avencia, Incorporated
Philadelphia, PA
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00004983

From: Randy Nye
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov',
'attorney.general(a)po...
Date: 12/28/01 2:38pm
Regarding: Microsoft Corporation Antitrust Litigation Settlement Agreement,
MDL Docket No. 1332

I have serious concerns, questions, and problems with the proposed Microsoft settlement. The reasons why I feel that the settlement is unfair and does not properly compensate the plaintiffs for the charges they have filed against Microsoft in their civil suits are the following.

*The final outcome of the settlement will be a very large program aimed at training our students attending the underprivileged K-12 schools and their teachers on how to use Microsoft software.

*This program is designed to guide the teachers on how to use Microsoft software in their education curriculum.

*The computers purchased through this program will be limited to those which are certified by Microsoft. This means that these computers will be configured to run Microsoft software.

*The settlement excludes completely the ability for rival software companies from providing software and services to these underprivileged K-12 schools, which compete directly with Microsoft's own software products in the PC software market place. This provision astounds me. It would be more appropriate in an agreement where the Justice Department were the offending party making amends to Microsoft.

*The fact is there is a budding new software industry based on free software otherwise known as GNU or Open Source software. The term free applies to both free in cost and free as in freedom. This new software industry is based on software written by many programmers working together through loosely tied collaboration using the communication tools provided by the Internet. (e-mail, file transfers, web browsing).

*These same tools of communication and methods of collaboration which the Internet provides, are the ones which we wish for the students of the underprivileged K-12 schools to take advantage. This is due to the fact that this is the same modality by which our scientists use to achieve the latest advances in science and technology.

*I am aware that Microsoft is working to try and stop this new software industry based on GNU/Open Source software. This GNU/Open Source software industry is one of Microsoft's biggest concerns since it threatens its dominance in the personal computer software market. The current settlement is structured to directly shut out this segment of the software industry.

I do not understand why you entered into this settlement agreement with Microsoft which is so clearly beneficial to Microsoft. I would have expected the agreement to pursue corrections on inappropriate conduct, not rewards. What I am interested in seeing is;

*Ensure that the plaintiffs understand our concerns regarding their settlement with Microsoft.

*Ensure that you, as attorneys representing the plaintiffs in this civil class action suit, inform your clients that there are no provisions in their settlement to allow free and open competition for the needed software products used to upgrade the computers, networks and computer based teaching aids for the underprivileged K-12 schools the settlement funds will be targeting.

*Find ways to actually halt actions found to be illegal and not be used to support and dictate further market penetration. I would further request you to change the terms of the settlement such that Microsoft have no say what so ever in how the money of the settlement be spent. This should be accomplished by having Microsoft donate cash grants to the underprivileged K-12 schools which were targeted in the original settlement. The size of the individual grants should be in proportion to the number of students enrolled in the school. The schools should then be directed to spend the money on computer hardware, software, networking infrastructure and Internet connection bandwidth for systems used by the teachers and students, as they best see fit for themselves. We emphasize that these funds be restricted to upgrading the IT infrastructure just mentioned, used directly in the classroom environment. These would be upgrades to system used in general class rooms, libraries, science labs, computer clubs or which ever other teaching forum the school has developed for the teaching of their students. The role of the Foundation, as created in the settlement agreement, should expend its efforts to ensure this funding policy be enforced.

Furthermore, in order to ensure that Microsoft has no part in directing how the settlement funds be spent, the Foundation created to manage the settlement funds should be made up of people from our leading science and education institutions. Examples of the people who should be sought to sit on the blue ribbon board of this foundation would be the head of the National Science Foundation, the head of the National Academy of Sciences, the Presidential Science Adviser, directors of our national laboratories, presidents of our renown

universities, heads of teachers unions, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Commerce or other people who have great knowledge of both education, its advancement and the free and open market system upon which the strength of this country is founded. The task of forming a search committee for these board members should be given to Honorable Judge Motz or someone to which he delegates this task.

Thank you for your time and your assistance in this matter.

Randy Nye
IS Director
Northland Services, Inc.
rnye@northlandservices.com
<mailto:rnye@northlandservices.com>

MTC–00004984

From: Eric Pickup
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 2:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement just postpones the problem until tomorrow. In five years, you'll be back in court for some other violation. Settling for a slap on the wrist for the sake of a tiny boost to the economy is bad judgement. If this was decided politically you have little choice but at least put some teeth in to it. Right now you have behavioral remedies that can be easily worked around that in the end will have little effect on Microsoft's business and a laughable enforcement mechanism which invites them to ignore the settlement. You are doing a disservice to the industry and the country. If you want to revitalise the industry you need to allow the small and mid-size businesses to survive the displeasure of the reigning monopoly—afterall it's those small businesses that are being truly innovative. Microsoft just takes other's ideas, slaps them into a bundle and calls that innovation. If Microsoft repeatedly crushes smaller companies, in the end there will be fewer and fewer innovators and with no one else to copy Microsoft will just stop bundling and then where will we be?

Eric Pickup

MTC–00004985

From: Ben Rady
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 3:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: I work in the Software industry as a developer, and I work with Microsoft products every day. Due to the extensive experience I have developed over the years it is my opinion that Microsoft would have to do (at least) the following in order to be considered non-monopolistic:

1) Publish all the internal API's and specifications of their products, before or at the time of the release of those products. Anything less than full and complete documentation of these specifications should result in the loss of any income due to the related product.

2) Terminate and abstain from any licensing agreements that prevent or discourage computer manufacturers or re-sellers from installing competing products on the systems they sell. Furthermore, all licensing agreements with said computer manufacturers/re-sellers should be made public. There are many more areas in which I believe Microsoft could and should make their business more competitive, but these two are the most glaring and any settlement that even pretends to look out for the consumer's interests should include them.

Thank You,
Ben Rady
Houston, TX
Ben Rady
ben@int.com
PGP Key available at keyserver.pgp.com

MTC–00004986

From: Steve Stites
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 3:02pm
Subject: Dear Sir,

Dear Sir,

There are three remedies that I would like to see included among those imposed upon Microsoft. These are:

1. Permanently allow the hardware vendors offer any operating system they chose, or none if they so chose without any coercion from Microsoft to use Microsoft's operating system. During Microsoft's probation period any computer sold with a Microsoft operating system must also have a second, non-Microsoft operating system installed at Microsoft's expense. The hardware vendor can choose which alternative operating system to install at Microsoft's expense.

2. Permanently dissallow Microsoft from dictating to a hardware vendor what application software will be installed on new computers. During the probation period Microsoft must make the source code, file formats, etc. for all Microsoft applications available to anyone who wants them.

3. During the probation period Microsoft must adher to all Internet standards. Miscrosoft cannot create product differentiation on Internet protocols and software. None of the various Microsoft Internet applications can be set up to where they will not work with rival products as long as the rival products are adhering to the standard Internet protocols.

Sincerely,
Steve Stites
GO.com Mail

MTC–00004987

From: arigsby@buffalorock.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 3:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I am definitely opposed to the current settlements with Microsoft neither do I see how the proposed remedy of breaking up Microsoft would resolve the issue or help level the playing field. What I think should be done is to force Microsoft to separate the Windows user interface and the Windows operating system. I know that Microsoft claims this is not possible but if they truly can not then they have used a very poor program development methodology. Once they separate the user interface, they should make the Windows user interface available for sale on their major competitor's operating systems and they should allow their competitors to market competing user interfaces on the Windows operating system. This would increase the competition in both operating systems and user interfaces and many third party software vendors would have a better environment in which to support their products across multiple operating systems.

This is a personal opinion and not the official policy of Buffalo Rock Company.

Thanks,
Jack Rigsby
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00004988

From: Adrian Byng-Clarke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 3:19pm
Subject: DOJ/Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

I am a computer programmer and web designer at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I should make it clear that the views that are presented hear are strictly my own and necessary those of MIT. I believe that Microsoft should be more severely sanctioned for its anti-competitive behavior. It is important at this time to make sure that this behavior does not continue. Perhaps the most effective way is to have Microsoft release the source code for its Operating Systems (or at least the main core of them). Microsoft has imposed itself on 95% of the desktop systems. However it has done so through an unfair advantage: its monopolistic network. Releasing operating system will help to restore the competitive balance to the market. Releasing the source code to the public will open the market in a couple of ways. First off, it will ensure that software manufacturers are on equal footing with Microsoft. Because 3rd party software manufacturers aren't privy to the inner workings of the MS operating systems, they are less able to compete with the Microsoft programmers.

This should not be allowed to continue. Opening the Operating System Source will nullify Microsoft's advantage for developing software to run on its own operating system. Microsoft's software will have to compete based on its functionality and performance, not on the fact that its programmers get insider information. Releasing the source code to the public (vs. just to computer manufacturers) will also help to restore competition to the operating system market. At this point it is very difficult for an emerging operating system to be successful due to Microsoft's strangle hold on the OS market. This is because most software is built around Microsoft Windows. Operating systems can only be as popular as the software that they support. If one releases a great operating system- it might just disappear because there is no word processor or spreadsheet for it.

However, with the Windows source code open, operating systems will be better able to emulate Windows and thus run windows software. To continue to succeed (or dominate), Microsoft will have to prove itself by the quality of its products and service; not just its universality. Operating system competition can only benefit consumers with better products at more competitive prices.

Microsoft should also be prohibited from leveraging hardware manufacturers and

computer retailers for a certain amount of time (5 years at least). As a preventative measure, I believe that Microsoft should be prohibited from penalizing companies that don't bundle their computers with Microsoft software, particularly Windows. This should further open up competition in the OS/PC market. A final note should be made regarding Microsoft Office. I believe that this is an excellent product that has universal appeal.

However Microsoft has historically used this product to unnaturally control the market. Word and Outlook use formats that are inherently proprietary so as to prevent users from migrating or using other products. Microsoft has consciously stayed away from proven, open and universal standards that foster the easy transfer of information. Instead they have relied on proprietary/closed formats to maintain their dominance. Because Office is so universally used in business, this makes it particular difficult for a user to use another program. I submit that Microsoft has intentionally made it difficult for other programs to open word documents or for people to transfer other document formats (such as Star Office). This kind of sabotage, known as ''Breakware'', should be illegal. Information should be kept in open formats to foster knowledge transfer. Program choice should be left up to the user. Right now, If I wrote a program to open up a outlook email message file, it would be impossible without violating several patents and lice.

MTC–00004989

From: Neufeld, Jonathan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/28/01 3:35pm
Subject: RE: Appropriate Penalties for Microsoft's Antitrust Law Violatio ns
RE: Appropriate Penalties for Microsoft's Antitrust Law Violations

The following are the flaws that I see in the 'penalties' that essentially seem to leave Microsoft better off than they were before the trial. I do not see that Microsoft is penalized in any way in that there is no separation of integrated software that harms and stifles competition to the Microsoft operating system. Further I see no provisions for computer manufacturers to be able to offer other and more viable operating systems in a fair and price competitive atmosphere—essentially nothing has changed. I do not see that the proprietary protocols for the operating system, networking and other elements are to be made public in order that others may have equal opportunity to develop applications in a spirit of healthy competition and to encourage innovation. Microsoft appears to be allowed to maintain the closed, proprietary and monopolistic systems that started this process. Again it appears that nothing has changed and it will be business as usual for Microsoft.

I am perplexed at the current 'penalties' being 'imposed' on Microsoft. They seem to be more of an encouragement for Microsoft to continue in the same ways it has been and those are the very same ones that brought this issue to the DOJ in the first place. If these are implemented as currently stated then fair business practices, innovation and competition are DEAD in the computer field.

If Microsoft's agreements with computer vendors forced the vendor to disclose to the computer purchaser the price of the Microsoft products included, it would help consumers choose products and vendors that were appropriate to their needs. Microsoft has stated concerns that selling computers without operating systems equates to software piracy. This assertion is absurd, and has become irrelevant with Microsoft's newest release of Windows XP, which requires license activation. Having consumers and end-users with more information is clearly in the public interest. All of what is suggested here concerns supplying information that enables computer users to make informed decisions, and to access their own work on their own computer.

Another issue I have with the proposed settlement is the restrictions that are placed on the entities with which Microsoft must share their API's. In the explanations I have seen of the proposed settlement these entities are restricted to 'commercial' ventures, implying for-profit status. This is simply wrong and way too restrictive. I believe that to be truly effective the parties with whom Microsoft should share their API's and the like should be broadly defined, maybe something like 'any party or entity that could potentially benefit from such information'. In other words this information should essentially be in the public domain.

In order that Microsoft be brought into line and with any hope of curbing their horrid business practices, it will take REAL penalties and serious oversight. With the obscene amounts of money that Microsoft has managed to accumulate through its less than fair business practices (to be kind) there is some doubt as to whether that can actually be accomplished. It has become quite obvious to anyone working in the field that there is no honor or integrity in Microsoft, only the search for more money in complete disregard for the good of the industry, the users and at this point in time it becomes rather blatantly obvious that national security is at risk due to the poor quality and serious lack of attention to security that is epidemic in their products. That alternatives are few is a direct result of the issues that DOJ is supposed to be addressing in this matter.

Microsoft products, by virtue of being a monopoly, have been designed without concern for security or reliability. I can prove that the design of Microsoft products leads to the spread of countless virii in the computer industry. They (Microsoft products) are the perfect products to use to send damaging virus from many groups like the terrorists from Afghanistan, Israel, Palestine, Egypt.... And do not imagine that these places have not already done damage.

And it is not only because Microsoft products are in such wide use, but the real problem is that the products have been very poorly designed. It seems Microsoft has enough money to do the job right, so the remaining reasons why the products are so poorly written is that there is currently no need to be ''best of breed'' when you are the only option.

This comments have been quoted from other contributors, and I reproduce them here as an indication of my full agreement.

Jonathan D. Neufeld, Ph.D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
UC Davis Department of Psychiatry
(916) 876–5149 voicemail
neufeldj@saccounty.net

MTC–00004991

From: Jon 'maddog' Hall, Executive Director, Linux International
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 4:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement: Data Formats, Open Source Developers and Global Economy
80 Amherst St.
Amherst, NH 03031–3032 USA
Honorable Colleen Kollar-Kotelly
U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

Your Honor,

I have been trying valiantly to keep up with the proposals for settlement back and forth between Microsoft, the different state attorneys and yourself, and I can not find three points that I hope have been covered.

1) In several of the documents I have seen people refer to ''interfaces'' (used in programming and running applications) and ''protocols'' (used in transmitting data across networks), but little if anything in the area of ''data formats'', used in the exchange of documents (e.g. the ''.doc'' format used by Microsoft Word). As a barrier to entry into a marketplace, the inability of a word processor to read documents created by 90% of the marketplaces' word processing people (i.e. users of Microsoft Office or other Microsoft products) is very detrimental. While products like Corel's Word Perfect, Applixware and Star Office all attempt to read and display Microsoft Office's data formats, often they are not able to decipher the data format, and therefore the document interchange is incomplete or wrong. The same is true for spreadsheets (Excel) and presentation packages (PowerPoint). This tends to be a stopping point for people purchasing alternative products. In the past there have been several successful products that have created data interchange standards that were uniform across vendors because the designer of the interchange language documented it and pushed it as a standard. The level of documentation that Microsoft has created for their data formats does not allow complete transference of all the information needed to create, read or write a document with a simular product from another vendor. Microsoft should either be forced to document the data exchange formats more fully, or make as their product's default data formats one of the standard data exchange formats for documentation.

2) Specification of who has access to Microsoft's specifications and standards In a lot of the documentation around the trial, Microsoft is expected to make information available to ''ISVs, OEMs, ISPs, etc., etc.'' However a lot of Open Source developers are not part of any of these organizations. For most of them, signing a non-disclosure or other type of license is not an option, either because of the time consuming aspect of the act, or the fact that they would usually want legal advice in signing such a non-disclosure, and this is expensive for a person who

normally receives no financial compensation for their work. I feel that any of these interfaces which are available to all of these aforementioned groups should be PUBLIC knowledge, openly available to ANYONE without license of ANY kind. After all, Microsoft should WANT people to use these interfaces, protocols and data exchange formats and make them as easy to understand and use as possible. If Microsoft complains about the cost of documenting these interfaces, protocols and data exchange formats to the extent needed, they should be reminded that when a company reaches the size of a monopoly these are the natural costs of doing business.

3) Microsoft is a world-wide company in a global economy. This last issue may be harder (or impossible) to impose, but I would like to make the problem known. I have traveled to Taiwan, and spoken to various members of the educational sector in that country. They have told me that Microsoft has been approaching Taiwanese magazine owners and threatening to remove all Microsoft and Microsoft-assisted joint advertising in PC magazines that print articles on Linux and Open Source software or run advertising for Linux or Open Source products. Since in some magazines Microsoft sponsored advertisements cover over 70% of their advertising revenue, these magazines are hesitant to have Linux articles or advertisement.

Similarly, I have been told by Taiwanese motherboard manufacturers that Microsoft has been threatening them with raised royalty fees on any Microsoft products unless they bundle in Microsoft licenses to all of their motherboards, Since a large quantity of systems built in the United States have Taiwanese motherboards, this means that (in effect) all systems have Microsoft operating systems ''built in'' before they even start to enter US jurisdiction. These licenses (and therefore these costs) are then passed on to the US companies making end-user products out of these motherboards. While I could not verify any of these rumors with actual Taiwanese companies, I did hear it from several reliable sources. I have also heard of similar instances of intimidation by Microsoft from companies in Brazil and Argentina.

As the strongest economic power in a global economy, the United States has a moral obligation to protect companies in other countries as we would protect our own, particularly when these companies are part of the total manufacturing chain for US-bound products. Microsoft should not be allowed to by-pass the judgment against them just by moving the affected business outside the United States, yet still expect to sell the final product to US citizens.

Please make sure that these three items are covered in any final draft of the agreement. Again, if you have any issue or need any clarification in the above areas, please feel free to email or call me at (603) 943–6666.

Warmest regards,
Jon A. Hall
Jon ''maddog'' Hall
Executive Director
email: maddog@li.org
Voice: +1.603.672.4557
WWW: http://www.li.org
Linux International(SM)
80 Amherst St.
Amherst, N.H. 03031–3032 U.S.A.
Board Member: Uniforum Association, USENIX Association

(R)Linux is a registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in several countries.

(SM)Linux International is a service mark of Linux International, Inc.

CC:maddog@li.org@inetgw

MTC–00004992

From: Peter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 5:09pm
Subject: The DOJ apparently considers this monopoly to be a positive outcome.
CC: dennispowell@earthlink.net @inetgw

To whom it may concern, Though I could find no reference to this provision in the judgement, information has been widely circulated of a gift of software to underprivileged schools. It should be obvious to the government that the provision of software to the underprivileged by Microsoft, might have been done even without the court decision, in the interest of discouraging piracy and the use of alternatives, and that the cost of this remedy is insignificant to Microsoft. This ''remedy'' could just as easily be written off as a small part of the marketing cost for Windows XP, as it in no way penalizes the company. The prohibition against retaliation against OEMS for shipping dual-boot systems is very weak., as are the provisions concerning ''middleware.'' In any event, The concern with middleware is a red-herring. Why has the entire Microsoft Office suite been excluded from the middleware definitions?

That product is the single biggest application platform for Microsoft, and one of the chief tools for broadening the monopoly, yet it is not touched by the judgment. The limited disclosure provisions for source code and file formats does nothing to encourage competition from the biggest group that has the potential to compete with Microsoft: the free software community. That community cannot participate in ''limited disclosure'' schemes, nor distribute the results of work based on those agreements.

The blanket permission to keep security and rights management API's essentially secret, (J. 1.) lays the groundwork for making it illegal to produce competitive software. The Department of Justice should know that all electronic commerce is predicated on the use of such systems, and that this exception amounts to a gift of additional market share to the company in markets where they do not already dominate, by raising the barrier to entry for competitive companies still higher.

While it is certainly legitimate to keep keys or tokens secret, the provision covering authentication mechanisms allows Microsoft to divulge essentially nothing about key technologies such as Passport. It further will reduce the security of desktops wordwide, by allowing Microsoft to rely on ''security by obscurity.'' which is widely discredited in technical circles. As a counter example, one need only look to the NSA's own release of a secured operating system (http://www.nsa.gov/selinux/). Mechanisms and API's need to be public, in order for them to undergo sufficient scrutiny, and provide a level playing field for competitive implementations.

As for the technical committee, it is inconceivable that Microsoft should have any say whatever in who oversees their compliance. This makes as much sense as giving a prisoner his choice of jailer.

Taken together, it would appear that the government has decided that, in this particular case, a monopoly is good. In order to make the monopoly as complete as possible, The government's remedy ensures that no viable alternatives can be legally produced. This is a misguided conclusion in countless ways. It takes for granted that the current monopoly will continue for the foreseeable future, so there is no point in encouraging any competition. It assumes that there is no cost to the US economy for the continuation of this monopoly, when in reality there is an incalculable cost in lost innovation. There is a tacit approval of what will essentially become a tax on all citizens, payable to Microsoft, in order to function in the digital environment. In fact, every effort must be made, not only to forestall the encroachment of monopolists into new markets, but to roll them back in markets which they already control through the past and current use of illegal tactics.

Leaving the weakness of the proposed remedy to one side, one has to consider what an adequate remedy for this monopolist is. The clear answer is to encourage competition to arise, and for the monopolist, as a form of reparation, fund the leveling of the playing field. There is only one direction to look in to find a potential competitor for Microsoft: Free Software. There is a reason why Microsoft characterizes free software as cancer. (Steve Ballmer http://www.suntimes.com/output/tech/cst-fin-micro01.html) (see http://www.linuxuser.co.uk/articles/issue12/LU12-ebenmoglen.html, an article by Columbia University legal history professor Eben Moglen, for a fuller discussion.) Free Software has the potential to compete and beat Microsoft, and encourage a more vibrant software and hardware industry.

Current examples of such products are the apache web server, which has a larger market share than Microsoft's own IIS, and is immune to the many infections which plagued the Microsoft driven portion of the internet this past summer, in spite of the secrecy of their current security provisions. All key technologies of the internet are public, and allow for different companies to produce competitive implementations. Why should the Microsoft Word file format (for example) be any different?

Free Software means simply allowing programmers in thousands of companies to co-operate to produce ever better software in a much more competitive environment, where the best implementation wins, and the others wither and disappear. It is, in no way, an impediment to free enterprise or for profit software development. It has nothing to do with altruism, but is instead a method of harnessing the self interest of vast numbers of technical people, trying to help their

respective companies innovate. Free Software is about leveling the playing field to allow innovation to arise from anywhere. All major computer systems vendors, (such as: ibm, sun, dell, hp, compaq, intel) both support and benefit from Linux development, for example. Innovation can come from any direction, when the environment is open to it. It can come from a company that wants to sell cheaper network file servers (www.raidzone.com), cheaper internet routers (www.snapgear.com) to any hardware device that requires an operating system, which can include anything from cellular phones to dishwashers.

All of the products mentioned above can be produced today, based on free software technology. If free software withers because of an inability to legally produce competitive products, the US economy will suffer. A big part of the problem with the Microsoft monopoly is the immense chill it puts on any software development project. The first barrier is that information required is not available. There is invariably a cost associated with obtaining information, if it is available at all. The second barrier is finding the information (reverse engineering is complicated, costly, and includes legal complications beyond the means of small start up companies.) The third barrier is the natural cap on the market. Since any successful software company, once they achieve a certain market presence, will either need to compete with Microsoft in the current, steeply tilted environment or be swallowed outright by them.

Currently, products based on Free Software can survive because they use IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) standardized interactions with other devices, and can leverage their efforts off those done in the mainstream desktop free operating system realm. If Microsoft is the only source of devices to interact with, and knowledge of the protocols is only available at high cost to select individuals within large corporations, the pace of innovation will be severely constrained, the number of people literate about computing devices will be severely limited by the lack of an ability to reference others' work in practicing their art. In short, the software industry, outside of Microsoft, will be largely limited to point-and-click installation of Microsoft applications. It is fundamental to realize that the Microsoft monopoly is hurting innovation, and sooner or later, that will hurt US competitiveness. Combating the harmful effects on the US software (and hardware) industry should be the chief object of the remedies.

Any remedies should take into account the needs of Free Software to remain viable. First, there should be full disclosure to the public domain of all file formats and networking protocols, as well as validation suites, to allow quick and complete implementation of competitive products. For example, there should be a collection of reference word documents, which, taken together, exercise all of the features of the format, such that an implementer can have confidence, that should Microsoft Word work differently with a given file than a competitive suite which successfully interacts with the reference documents, then it is a bug, and must be remedied in a timely manner (IE. either Word must be changed to conform, or the reference documents improved to include the missing functionality.) While the cost of maintaining that information should be borne by Microsoft in perpetuity, given the inherent conflict of interest, it would be best if it were maintained by a third party.

Second, there should be a ban on the bundling of an operating system with the sale of a desktop computer. Buyers should have to make the choice to explicitly purchase software (which could be packaged on a CDROM ''recovery disk'', such that the installation only requires a few clicks.) The cost of software needs to be indicated separately from the hardware. Buyers will then know what the software costs, and have the choice of purchasing or using alternatives. Third, the remedies should not do anything to further extend Microsoft's monopoly, but should instead encourage competition. In that direction, Microsoft should provide funding for other parties to provide Free Software alternatives, including technical consulting and ongoing support for five years) to the under privileged, so that the institutions have a chance of being free of Microsoft software by the end of that period.

In summary, the remedy proposed is a counter-productive encouragement to Microsoft to not only continue their unbridled monopolistic practices but expand it into other markets, and constitutes a government stamp of approval on those practices. Proper remedies should aim at reducing the harmful effects of the Microsoft monopoly, and encouraging competitors to arise. I hope the Department will take these concerns, spoken by a neighbor who knows the impact of this case will be worldwide, to heart. Thank you.

Peter Silva,
(a concerned Canadian)

MTC–00004993

From: Christian BAYER
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general @po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 12/28/01 9:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

Hello,

In my opinion the proposed settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust case is absolutely absurd. The Microsoft Corporation has abused it's monopolistic position in a severe manner. The actions of the company have greatly harmed consumers and businesses by suppressing competitive and innovative products, many of superior quality to Microsoft's offerings. The proposed settlement does nothing to curtail the illegal practices of the Microsoft Corporation, nor is it a punishment fitting with the crime. The donation of Microsoft Software to schools is a twisted and downright sick idea. I suggest the settlement be changed to a simple fine for about 20 billion dollars. Some of the funds should be used to finance a new lawsuit against Microsoft for it's Windows XP product. It is my sincere wish that the judicial system perform it's function of enforcing legislation and providing suitable punishment for crimes. If the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case prevails, it will effectively place the corporation above the law.

Thank you,
Christian Bayer

MTC–00004996

From: Ann Evans
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/28/01 11:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly

I am a home user of Microsoft Windows operating systems. Working with these systems can be a nightmare, even for those of us who have been using computers for about 25 years. We recently purchased a new piece of hardware for our home network. We got an antenna that hooks us to an ethernet card for high speed wireless internet access. Living in a rural area, our choices broadband choices were limited. The hardware installation went without a hitch, but the installation and configuration of the drivers and software have been a week long nightmare.

We were using one of Microsoft's ''home'' versions of operating systems. It baffles me why Microsoft seems to think that a home user would some how need less of an operating system than a business would, especially since businesses have support people available to help when problems arise. The Windows ME we have been using for about a year and a half of frustration and dreaded blue screens, hung up and destabilized during the installation of the network software. During the time we have used this system software, it has been a struggle to install even the simplest program on the computer and get it working- much less keep it working. This time, not only was the system unable to install the new software, but it became unable to manage normal operation. (This same software later installed without any problems on the professional Windows 2000 system)

The system became so corrupted that we were completely unable to restore it from the original, licensed installation disk. I went to the OfficeMax to purchase a better operating system, Windows 2000. The young man at the store insisted that even though the box clearly stated that the version I was buying would upgrade from Windows 98, it would not do so, but would only upgrade from Windows NT. I pointed out to him that if necessary I could format my hard drive and reinstall Windows 98, if it wouldn't work with Windows ME. He insisted that I should continue to use the Windows ME, until the hardware drivers I required became available for Windows XP home version. That was out of the question, since it was non-functional, and couldn't be repaired by its original disk.

He insisted that I had no business purchasing the Windows 2000 software, because it was designed for business, not home use. Apparently he had been trained to believe that home users are not entitled to stable and secure operating systems. He made his judgment of what I needed for my computer not by asking me how I use my computer, but by looking at me and determining that I am a middle aged woman.

When I mentioned that I might format the hard drive, he began a speech about how that would be horribly expensive and require the

installation of a new motherboard. Clearly this was a misconception (big fat lie) on his part, which I pointed out to him. Reformatting and rebuilding a computer from scratch is tedious, but does not require a new motherboard. After all, my husband had found it necessary to do this procedure three times since we ''upgraded'' from Windows 98 to the software that Microsoft felt would be ''good enough'' for home users. Formatting erases all information on the hard drive, including system, programs and files. We have lost our work, many hours of our time required to reinstall and configure every program we have, and have also lost program upgrades that proved to be no longer available at the time we had to format, requiring the purchase of new software to replace a perfectly good program. I have used Macintosh computers and system software for 15 years without going through all this even once.

I feel that my family has been harmed by the monopolistic hold that Microsoft has on the computer industry because for all practical purposes, our choice of operating systems has been limited to one company's product, which has proven, at least in the ''home'' versions, to have been a shoddy piece of work engendering anger and frustration whenever we try to use it. Many software functions, especially in regard to internet and networking use, are only available for Windows computers—the programmers simply don't write versions for other operating systems.

We have been victimized by this company which has made its own decisions about our needs without consulting us, and then has trained technicians all over the country to force these inferior and non-functional products upon us, and to ''baffle us with you-know-what'' in the process. I am a very experienced user, and was able to stand my ground with the young technician, though I had to become loud and obnoxious before he was willing to <allow> me to purchase the Windows 2000 product, which I did as he grumbled away. I was not interested in any more inferior ''home'' versions of this software, and I was very much aware of when he crossed over the line of giving an honest opinion. Another person, less experienced than I, could easily have fallen for this Microsoft-trained jerk's confabulations, and could have ended up forking over a large sum of money to fix a problem that was entirely caused by the slap dash quality of the system software that Microsoft has determined was ready for release to the ''home'' user.

Not only has Microsoft put a strangle hold on the software industry itself, but it is also well on its way to putting that same vise like grip over everyone who uses their product by means of its proprietary training programs, which include, in my experience, training in the same patronizing and demeaning attitude that this young man displayed. Just because a person is able to pass a test based on rote memorization does not mean that they have any particular ability to make computers function properly, and from what I have experienced, they are quite likely to inflate their income by fixing things that are not broken, or by randomly installing parts until they accidentally replace what was broken—while not really ever understanding what went wrong. In addition to that, there were no clear instructions anywhere on the Microsoft website, nor in the help files about how to configure the Windows software to work with this network arrangement- which was not a particularly complicated one. I was finally able to find instructions at a website called http://www.annoyances.org—which is a revealing choice of titles, I think.

I would point out that if I had suffered this much trouble with a brand of car—I would buy a different brand, wouldn't I? I would have that choice, wouldn't I? If a car manufacturer trained its service people to be universally rude and demeaning, one would simply deal with a different manufacturer, right?

Apple Computer, as a sharp contrast, has only one set of system software—both for home and for business use. The newest system, OS X, only costs $120 for the full professional version. Windows 2000 cost me $199 for the upgrade version. The full version was $269. There is no possible way that Windows 2000 is worth almost three times as much as an operating system than OS X.

Only in an atmosphere of monopoly could this company inflate its prices to three times that of its competitors, sell a crushingly inferior product, and not be beat to the ground by the normal forces of fair competition.

I hope that the Department of Justice will examine the business tactics of Microsoft very closely—not only as they take advantage of their competitors, but also in how they use their monopolistic position to take advantage of their customer base as well. In a fair, competitive market, I should have had the choice to use someone else's product if I was unhappy with Microsoft's work, shouldn't I? In reality, there is no choice.

Sincerely,
Ann Evans
Citizen and Voter

MTC–00004998

From: Scott Sayre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 4:51am
Subject: U.S. vs. Microsoft

As a period for public comments in the above case has been allotted, the following are my views: Microsoft Is a Monopolist. Once the Windows operating system (OS) became the dominant platform for computing, Microsoft clearly used its position to bully IBM, to coerce PC clone manufacturers, to dictate to Apple, to stifle Netscape, etc., subsidizing it's efforts with the windfall profits from it's OS. This is clear to the most casual observer, as it was to Judge Jackson, and the Court of Appeals. On-Going Monopolist Behavior.

In the absence of a swift penalty, Microsoft continues to flout its monopoly position. It's most recent OS, Windows XP, has integrated even more software, including an internet browser, messenging, e-mail, photo, and video functions, all offered for free, virtually eliminating the possibility for real competition in these areas. Windows continues to be plagued almost daily with security flaws, viruses, and other bugs, yet the structural barriers to competition insulate Microsoft from acting seriously on these critical issues. Apple Computer and the Linux distributors, for example, cannot move against the enormous inertia of the Wintel marketplace. In order to win in such an environment, competing products must be not just good, but massively superior, a nearly impossible task for small companies to accomplish at the OS level.

The Public Interest Has Been Damaged Microsoft has argued that it is the dominant software purveyor simply because the public prefers it's work. Yet courtroom testimony has demonstrated a persistent pattern over the past ten years of using threats and intimidation to secure a position for Microsoft products, by bundling additional software, usually for free, with Windows, rather than through open and free competition. The demise of Netscape's browser and Corel's WordPerfect are the two most obvious examples. Microsoft is pursuing a similar strategy against Real, Intuit, and numerous others at this moment. Clearly, the public would be better served by real choice. An Appropriate Punishment.

The change of administration has apparently caused the Justice Deparment and a number of States to shrink from seeking a substantial penalty, something more firm than the toothless consent decree issued in a previous judgment several years ago. However, the remaining nine states are exactly right to pursue severe sanctions, preferably ones that do not need on-going supervision to succeed. Here are some suggestions:

1) The PC manufacturing community must be freed from some of the most onerous provisions of their agreements with Microsoft to use Windows, such as paying a license fee even for computers sold without any OS, or some other OS, pre-installed.

2) Windows must be compartmentalized, so that the PC manufacturers, and the general public, have the ability to freely chose which browser, messenger, e-mail, etc., software they want to install. Microsoft has fretted publicly that these items are merely ''features'' of their OS, and are not separable, but this is clearly a dodge, a device to avoid putting their software up for competition on an equal footing. Dividing Microsoft into pieces is the only certain way to accomplish this. Supervision by any select group will most likely be evaded, as has happened before.

3) The API's, or hooks by which third party software companies link their work to Windows, must be made entirely public. It is common knowledge that Microsoft creates hidden API's, known only to its employees, for use with it's other software products, giving it's own work tremendous advantages over that of competing firms.

4) Some punitive monetary damages should be assessed, to strip the company of some of the huge economic power it wields to absorb emerging technologies and subvert industry standards. This could be given to the U.S. government as a fine, or as rebates to purchasers of Windows, or both.

Thank you for your consideration.
Scott G. Sayre
Arcadia, California

MTC–00004999

From: Sean S.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 10:34am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I just wanted to offer my opinion regarding the proposed settlements of the Microsoft anti-trust case.

I think the DOJ offer is in no way satisfactory. It does little to punish Microsoft for past illegal activity. The dollar value of the proposed contribution to schools is a paltry sum for Microsoft, it won't actually cost them anywhere near the claimed value, and it could entrench Microsoft in one of the few markets (education) where other computing options (Apple, Linux) still have a chance of competing. The DOJ settlement offer also does nothing to prohibit Microsoft from continuing their past behaviors—no penalties for further illegal behavior are outlined.

The proposal from the six states who rejected the DOJ proposal is much better. This proposal requires Microsoft to release source code for some of their applications, which will open up competition and remove some of the competitive edge Microsoft enjoys from owning the operating system. It requires Microsoft to sell a version of Windows that does not have bundled applications. It prohibits Microsoft from retaliating against vendors or developers for providing non-Microsoft software with systems or developing for non-Microsoft platforms. The proposal also has teeth—there are very specific penalties outlined for breaches of the agreement.

I strongly urge the DOJ to abandon its proposed settlement, and adopt the settlement offer of the six states.

Sean Sawtell

MTC–00005000

From: RNG
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 11:17am
Subject: Comment on proposed Microsoft settlement

Let me first clearly state that I am not a US citizen. While this may disqualify me from truly participating in the public comment period, I wish to voice my opionons on this matter for simple reason that in our globalized economy any action taken by the US government will have profound implications on the state of the IT industry world-wide. To put my comments into perspective: I am a computer/programming professional with a degree from a respected US university and 10+ years of industry .experience. I have worked for (major) US software firms in development, support and various consulting roles.

First of all, it is beyond my understanding why the US government would want to accept the proposed settlement after having succeeded in getting the court system to declare Microsoft a monopoly which has (in the past) abused it's market position to further it's own ends. The current settlement does very little to 'fix' the issue which caused the current situation in the first place.

In my opinion, any settlement should include the following:

1) Microsoft should be prevented from using Windows licencing as a means of coercing hardware vendors from not offering to pre-install alternative operating systems. The ability of a vendor to obtain a windows licence from Microsoft must be unencumbered: the same contract terms should be granted all Windows licencees, regardless of their size and any other discretionary factors.

2) Microsoft should be forced to document all file formats used by it's applications (such as the MSOffice suite) to allow 3rd parties to develop document reading/authoring capabilities with regards to Microsoft application file formats. This documentation should be available to all interested parties for free (which includes the open source community).

3) Microsoft should be forced to document all network protocols in order to allow 3rd parties to develop dependable interoperability. This documentation should be available to all interested parties for free (which includes the open source community).

4) Microsoft must be prevented from further integrating external components into the operating system. There are no fundamental technical reasons for doing this; it only serves to cement the stranglehold they currently have over the industry. There is nothing wrong with integrating more components into and operating system, but when a monopoly with limitless funds does so (and gives the products away as part of the Operating System), the consequences are far more damaging and far-reaching than when a 'normal' company does so. In fact, it could be said that Microsoft destroyed the market for web browsers: since Internet Exploer is (in essence) free, there is no incetive for other companies to continue development and marketing of another browser; most people will not buy it since Internet Exploere is available for free.

Lastly, I believe that Microsoft has shown that it is willing to undermine past consent decrees by carefully exploiting ambiguities. Any settlement put forth should be devoid of such ambiguities and amount to more than a 'slap on the wrist'; any remedies should be clear, strict and painful. Microsoft has never entertained the notion of competing on equal ground and will not do so until the US government forces it to do just this. They are an entrenched monopoly fighting to keep their grip on the IT sector. What is at stake is nothing less than the openness of the IT industry, the long term competitiveness of the US software industry and competition in the operating systems and applications markets.

Respectfully
Robert Gasch
CC:dennispowell@earthlink.net@inetgw

MTC–00005001

From: Ron Nath
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 11:37am
Subject: Concerns regarding the US DOJ settlement with Microsoft Corp

To whom it may concern:

I would like to submit my concerns and thoughts regarding the recent settlement with MS corp. I do not believe that the settlement as it stands is in the publics best interest.

MS has been found to be a monopoly in the operating systems arena. To restore balance in this area, the government needs to take much more aggressive steps. I would go so far as to suggest that the company should have been broken up not in two, but into 5 parts (Commercial/business OS, Home OS, Commercial apps, Home apps, and internet services). However, as this will not happen we need to do the next best things:

1. Require that the OS be ''unbundled'' from hardware such that users can see the cost of proprietary operating systems vs. open/free software alternatives.

2. Require MS to open source its OS code to all those who purchase it.

3. Require MS to port ALL its apps to alternative operating systems (Linux, the BSDs, Mac OS X, Solaris, AIX, HP–UX) to ''level the playing field''

4. Require MS to license its OS code to others who could sell various ''versions'' of the OS, ie having different apps added on by default (AOL/Netscape Windows, IBM Windows, Oracle Windows, Red Hat Windows containing open source apps running on top of core windos os, etc.)

5. Require MS to sell a lower cost version of its OS that is devoid of all ''bundled'' apps, ie Internet Explorer, Windows Media Player, IIS, instant messenger, Passport, Outlook Express, etc. Beyond that, the government needs to take its own steps to encourage adoption of open source systems and apps (Linux, BSDs, MySQL/PostgreSQL, OpenOffice, etc.) as an alternative to current costly commercial/proprietary systems. This should be at all levels of government—Federal, state, local, all public schools, etc.

By requiring that all purchases of commercial software must be justified when an equivalent open source solution exists (much like generic drug substitution for brand name drugs) we could save tax payers an enourmous amount of money. More tax breaks would make the current government look even better in the eyes of the voters.

I hope you will consider these suggestions in light of the remaining 9 states who have not ''caved in'' to the might of Microsoft who is basically holding the government hostage. Its frightening to think that one corporation wields this much influence and power over what is considered the most powerful country in the free world. We must take the above steps to change this horrid situation.

Thank you for your time and interest in my thoughts.

Ron Nath
Wolcott, CT.

MTC–00005002

From: Hubert Daugherty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 12:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good day,

Please modify the language of Section III(J)(2) to insure that Microsoft must share protocols used over the Internet with ALL organized programing communities. The substitution of the description ''organized programing communities'' instead of just commercial entities would allow both for-profit commercial and non-profit open source projects to compete for the interconnected

future of our society. The changes in descriptive terms should apply to Section III(D) as well. Competition is a good thing, but it should include all of the innovative elements in our society, not just Microsoft.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Hubert Daugherty

Hubert Daugherty Rice University/Rice Multimedia and Edupop Project

hd@rice.edu (713) 348–4035 Fax (713) 348–6099

insight + planning + funding + participation + documentation = creation

CC:Hubert Daugherty

MTC–00005003

From: Russ Wright
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 12:03pm
Subject: My thougts on the US vs. Microsoft Case

I am a developer who for the past ten years has benefited financially from developing applications using Microsoft products. My income came mostly from developing software solutions using Microsoft development tools. I have however experienced many frustrations when attempting to give my customers what I consider the best solution and not just the Microsoft solution. I would dearly love to be able to suggest to my customers solutions that fulfill the users needs from Open Source or Microsoft. However, the largest obstacle preventing me from doing so is kept secret by Microsoft. Many of the projects I worked on, experienced limitations when we were unable to ''look under the hood'' and understand how a particular protocol or file format was created. To be more precise, network protocols, and the layout of Microsoft's Office files are a secret. If these protocols and file formats were published, then I would be able to suggest the best solution, whether it was Microsoft or another company's product. I ask that Microsoft be forced to publish these protocols with all detail.

I also see that the new .Net technology touted by Microsoft has the potential to monopolize large portions of the web. Users who do not want or have Microsoft products will be cut off from using portions of the web built on .Net technology. I ask the court to prevent this extension of the Microsoft monopoly by forcing microsoft to disclose and publish all protocols and formats to be used with this technology so that the monopoly will not extend further into the web.

On a separate note, I understand that Microsoft may be forced to give hardware and software for use in underprivileged inner city schools. I believe that this would only benefit Microsoft and enable the extension of their monopoly. It will benefit Microsoft of another generation of students grow up to think that the only solution is Microsoft. I suggest instead that a trust be set up from the fines that Microsoft must pay and that the monies be used to purchase the best solution for the need. Again, the point being to meet the needs of the consumer and not limit their choices.

Regards

Russell Wright

MTC–00005004

From: rj-lambird@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 12:02pm
Subject: United States v. Microsoft Corp. Settlement

Ms. Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division

This is not a legal memorandum. As an elder member of the computing community, I bring to this commentary 45 years of experience.

My education and practical experience with computers and their software began in 1956. My age (70) and health have slowed me down a bit, but I am still a licensed electrical engineer and CPA. I, and the companies I work for, are users of Microsoft, IBM, and Oracle products. In the past, Sun Microsystems has been a source of hardware and software. My experience with IBM dates back to 1956.

During that 45-year period, I have seen many companies enter and leave the computer industry. Ultimately, the companies that remain do so because users perceive VALUE in their products. I see little practical difference in the business practices of Microsoft, IBM, Oracle and Sun. If anything, Microsoft and IBM do a better job of supplying the needs of the small businesses that I am associated with. Two examples follow: First, I regularly receive notices of free and low-cost education from Microsoft. Second, IBM (through American Express) offers quality hardware at very attractive prices. In contrast: Although I have been an Oracle customer for years, I rarely hear anything from them—and special offers of products and education are rarely included. Sun Microsystems treats us like we don't exist!

Why do I mention IBM, Oracle and Sun in this commentary? After all, Microsoft is on trial here. I do mention these companies because they, directly and indirectly, have financed the anti-settlement campaign in at least a dozen States of the Union. I don't think that the DOJ Antitrust Division should become further involved in what is really bitter personal rivalries between top executives of the above four companies. That is not in the public interest.

In conclusion, I support the proposed Settlement. It is time to move on to other issues.

Robert John Lambird, PE, CPA

MTC–00005005

From: Tedd Potts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 12:51pm
Subject: Microsft Settlement

The proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft is flawed because it does not recognize Microsoft's property rights. In fact it presupposes that society has the right to the property of Microsoft and it is simply a matter of compromise to determine how much of its property Microsoft should retain. Microsoft is ''guilty'' simply because it has too many customers. If customers had chosen either IBM's of Apple's operating system then Microsoft would be ''innocent''. Microsoft negotiated with the DOJ under the threat of physical force, so the proposed settlement should be scrapped and Microsoft should be compensated by the Federal government for its legal costs.

Tedd Potts
President
Heartland Chevrolet, Inc.
Liberty, MO

MTC–00005008

From: Chuck Weitzel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 3:07pm
Subject: Microsoft's monopoly on Operating Systems

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this as a concerned citizen, one who is forced to use the Windows Operating System of the Microsoft Corporation. There is no real competition for this system due to the influence of Microsoft. I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found guilty. The company has been found in violation, and this is supposed to be the penalty phase of the case. It appears to me that the settlement contains no penalties and in fact seems to actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly.

I would suggest that it would be a step in the right direction in preventing a continuation of Microsoft's monopoly that Microsoft products should be an extra-cost option in the purchase of new computers. This would permit the user who does not wish to purchase Ms (Microsoft) products to have a choice and not be forced to purchase MS operating systems. This would mean that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, would clearly be a choice the customer could make. That would truly be market place competition in a meaningful way.

Also, any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet which at this time it nearly has done. This case is of paramount interest to the United States as a nation as well as us individual consumers as the Judge in this case has suggested. Microsoft needs to be reigned in and others permitted fair competition in the pursuit of continued advancement in the computer world.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Weitzel

MTC–00005009

From: Leon Mintz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 4:51pm
Subject: Comments on proposed settlement

I've been programming since the early days of personal computers and I have watched Microsoft' tactics since the beginning of Dos. They have always used the revenues from their operating system monopoly to put their competitors out of business by either buying them under threat to put them out of business by selling a competing product at

artificially low prices or by gradually copying the best features of competitor's programs. In my opinion they have always been more interested in eliminating competition than in producing reliable programs. Their programs are always the ''buggiest'', especially their operating systems.

In the early days, when IBM was paying them to participate in a joint program to develop the OS2 operating system, Microsoft secretly stopped signiificant work on OS2 and started to work on Windows. OS2 is a superior and much more reliable system than Windows, but even IBM could not overcame MS's monopoly.

All of these comments are my own opinions as an observer of the personal computer history and I cannot supply any information useful in court. It is also my opinion that laywers and judges, with rare exceptions, do not have the necessary knowledge to understand how MS undermines and eliminates competition. I have no doubt that they will quickly emasculate the proposed settlement. They should be broken into at least three companies to have a chance of bringing competion back into the industry.

Thank you for your attention.

MTC–00005010

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement: Serious Problems with the PFJ

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally;

I am neither an employee or major shareholder of Microsoft, Sun, AOL, Oracle or any of the other major participants in the long-running Microsoft antitrust battle. But I am a software executive that over the past 10 years has run and sat on the Boards of a variety of small and medium sized companies that have partnered with all of the above.

Over the past 6–12 months many of my fellow CEO's are laboring under the triple whammy of a terrible tech economy, the necessity of overseeing layoffs in their own companies and the virtual shutting down of capital markets. As a result, many of us, including myself, have taken little or no time to study the PFJ. Then of course there are many of us who have been beaten by Microsoft before—and are now afraid to be yet again 'Redmond Roadkill' '—and so are willing to accept whatever decision our government comes to.

However, over the holidays I decided to take the time to actually review the PFJ and study its probable implications for our industry. And that is why I am now writing. I am shocked at the fact that our DoJ has apparently decided to give Microsoft not only a free pass on its long-standing monopolistic practices (the Appellate court's finding certainly came as no surprise to anyone here in Silicon Valley)—but also that the basic go-forward agreement is almost completely lacking in any real restraints.

I'm sure I don't have to go into detail for you on the numerous loopholes and almost complete failure of the PFJ to actually ensure anything like a level playing field for current or future Microsoft competitors. Leaving it up to Microsoft to determine which company, if any, is 'viable'—or to allow them to 'bolt' important new software to their OS—are just two examples of the ridiculous nature of much of what the PFJ holds out as 'remedies'. The PFJ truly leaves the proverbial fox to guard the ever shrinking henhouse.

The PFJ is not just a potential disaster for all non-Microsoft supporters— it is a potential death knell for one of our country's most dynamic and powerful job creators and export industries. It is clearly a long-term blow to all software consumers and users. And it is a travesty for all who believe in the free market and the power of competition to drive simultaneous product innovation, job-creation and cost-reduction. . .the true brilliance of the American economy. Finally, it sends the wrong signal to every company that may be able to establish a defacto monopoly in any field—that illegal activities will not be pursued diligently and penalized.

Judge Kollar-Kotally: please use you power under the Tunney Act to send this back-room deal back to the DoJ for a complete overhaul. Or at least remedy those portions of it (and it appears to me as a layman that there are many) that are completely ineffectual if not downright harmful to our industry and our country.

Out of respect for your greater knowledge in this general area I have endeavored to keep this note short. But please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions on any of these points. . .or any others. I am sure that I speak for hundreds—if not thousands—of my fellow independant software executives in voicing my deep concern with the PFJ as it now stands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Gregory Slayton
Palo Alto, CA
cell: 650–906–0155
CC:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC–00005011

From: Thomas L. Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 4:58pm
Subject: Penality Phase

Dear Sir or Madam,

Microsoft was found to have violated US law. The remedies that have been shared with the public fall short of what is needed to correct the situation and redress the damage done by Microsoft's unlawful activities. Indeed, the penalties seem to have been designed by Microsoft's own brilliant marketing department. If the these one-sided ''remedies'' stand, it will undermine the government as a force for fairness and justice. With what is going on in the world today, this is not the time for the Department of Justice to undermine the perception of the United States as a fair and just country.

Respectfully,
Thomas L. Wood

MTC–00005012

From: Randall Edick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 5:07pm
Subject: In the interest of small commercial software developers

Having a standard platform worldwide is beneficial to small commercial developers everywhere. This standard allows one to write, test and distribute worldwide ones work. It is ESSENTIAL to small software developers everywhere to keep this standard alive.

Do what you will to stop illegal practices but DON'T damage the infrastructure.

Randall Edick
Thin-Walled Structures Software
redick@thinwallsoftware.com

MTC–00005013

From: David Thompson (LC–DS)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 5:22pm
Subject: MS Antitrust Suit Settlement is fair

Judge Jackson erred grievously in the early going when he defined the entire market for operating systems as Intel—based systems only. By his logic, Apple has a predatory monopoly on Motorola based systems; Sun has a predatory monopoly on Sparc based systems, etc.

The settlement as proposed is fair, and on a par with the actual wrongdoing MS has been found guilty of. The alternative settlement proposals go far, far, beyond the revised findings of the appellate court. Some of these alternate proposals would force the company to create software for other, non Intel platforms against its will. This is completely against the foundations of our capitalist society.

David Thompson
Microsoft Platform Support
LC Professional Directory Services Team

MTC–00005014

From: a brody
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 5:31pm
Subject: My feelings on the Microsoft Monopoly

Your honor,

I agree with the judges before who have claimed that Microsoft has maintained a monopoly. By maintaining a monopoly they violate the Sherman Act, and current remedies do nothing to solve the monopoly. Any remedy that lets Microsoft get away with less than losing half their value for practicing this monopoly, and doesn't let other operating systems to prosper in the face of Microsoft does not do justice for America. Microsoft has gained a 95% market share on all computers today, and even on the 5% is allowed to produce the only Office software package for business, namely their Microsoft Office. Their Internet Explorer Browser even on the Macintosh platform is the default browser because they bullied web developers into supporting standards that Netscape and other browser developers can't develop for because of plugins and standards specific to Internet Explorer, Microsoft's web browser. Microsoft has corrupted a standard developed by Netscape by not supporting some of the Netscape standards, and introducing some of their own, by making Javascript into their own JScript standard. A look at—Javascript the Definitive Guide— by David Flannagan (ISBN 1–56592–392–8, O'Reilly Publishing, 1998) page 4 will reveal that there are 2 Javascript 1.2 standards, one for Netscape, and one for Internet Explorer. Pages 417–749 will show just how divergent these standards can get in Javascript 1.2.

They have gone as far as to remove Java from their latest operating system, Windows XP. Java was the last hope to make an independent system for internet browsing that doesn't depend on platform. Now with Microsoft no longer installing Java, the home user will have to download it for themselves if they want to. Most do not know how to do this. They must continue to install Java by default. They also should conform to the same Java standards Sun Microsystems has created by making their Java standard. In numerous cases they don't and when they don't it makes internet developers write Java code that doesn't work on all browsers. If you were to join http://chat.yahoo.com/ on Apple Computer's Mac OS X with Internet Explorer you get a Java error. Yet on Internet Explorer on a Windows system it works just fine. Internet Explorer for Mac OS 9 is able to join that chatroom without a problem. Why does this happen? Consistant standards even on the standard creating platform haven't been set by a variety of Javas on the market. Microsoft made their own Java Virtual Machine (or engine) for their own Windows browsers that accepts its own code in conjunction with ActiveX. ActiveX is a Microsoft standard which has not been ported over completely to other platforms. This is a monopolistic practice since it forces people to use their operating system if they want to be compatible with the web.

To make matters worse, Microsoft's monopolistic practices have exposed businesses to numerous computer viruses by their being such a big target, and having closed source code. Holes in their database engine have been reported exposing numerous internet databases to potential viruses have been reported on:

http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/ptech/12/27/sql.holes.idg/index.html

And their Windows XP operating system which was billed their most secure system ever, now is found to have a serious hole letting any hacker take control of their system by the FBI on:

http://www.idg.net/go.cgi?id=621579

That's two serious security holes in one week exposing 95% of the internet population to potential data damage because Microsoft has not opened their source code to developers to find the holes before the operating system hits the streets. If the had done that, most likely these holes would have been found and plugged before the public had to worry about them. And how many of those members of the public will read those two news stories and know how to plug the holes themselves. Microsoft should offer free CDs to update the operating system with security patches. By making themselves 95% of the market, more hackers have found the holes in their operating system and exploited them as opposed to other operating systems by a ratio of 50,000 to one. The bigger you are, the harder you fall. You've probably heard of Code Red, Melissa, and NIMDA viruses. They have cost industry billions. Yet Microsoft does not pay?

Each of those viruses did not affect Apple Macintosh or Linux systems, but did affect Microsoft based systems exclusively. All we ask is you make remedies that make Microsoft no more than 50% of the market in operating systems, office applications, and web browsers.

Microsoft should pay developers to make competing software in each of these fields, and not get money back for those payments. That's the only way to balance the computer market. Making Microsoft pay schools $1 billion is a drop in the bucket, especially when it will be Microsoft's software the current agreement is calling for schools to buy. In fact that $1 billion should not be forwarded to any Microsoft software. It should only be used to rebuild schools and the rebuilding should go to hiring new teachers, and buying books for schools that need them. And it really should be more like $50 billion. If you are going to make a monetary punishment, make it cash with the allowance it will not be payed on computing. Unless the computing it is used to pay for is a non-Microsoft system. Apple Macintosh has been the system of choice for schools, and is cross platform, and now is more compatible to other computers than even Microsoft thanks to http://www.connectix.com/ VirtualPC software. An Apple Macintosh can run 12 operating systems simultaneously thanks to this. A website called http://www.macwindows.com/ devotes its efforts to finding additional crossplatform solutions. To help in the migration of people away from Microsoft these solutions should be considered to ease the migration so it is less painful.

Additional reasons to not let Microsoft be the soll provider of operating systems is that it costs more to maintain than any other. A very good report here explains the cost benefits of not using Microsoft based software exclusively:

http://homepage.mac.com/mac—vs—pc/Intro.html

As you can see if people saw Apple Macintosh as an alternative, which it really is to running Microsoft based software applications and operating systems, then Microsoft's monopoly would weaken to the point that it wouldn't hurt the market anymore. It wouldn't cause the lack of software development to proceed. It is time to encourage a crossplatform world. It is time make Microsoft no longer the rule in software.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abraham Brody

MTC–00005015

From: John C. Glasgow II
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 8:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern,

I object to the Microsoft settlement. Microsoft, agreeing to distribute their operating system free of charge to underprivileged schools, costs them little, and amounts to a government sanctioned promotion of Microsoft's operating system in one of the very few sectors in which Microsoft does not enjoy an operating system monopoly. That will create future victims of Microsoft's monopolistic practices and do nothing to help their current victims. It is not a remedy, and is in fact, a reward for Microsoft.

John C. Glasgow II
33 Mooney Rd.
Ft. Walton Beach, Florida, 32547
CC:jglas@gnt.net@inetgw

MTC–00005016

From: Michael Getter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 8:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am protesting the terms of the proposed settlement offered to and accepted by Microsoft. I am a Macintosh user and have appreciated some Microsoft products for years. Excel, for example, is a terrific spreadsheet—the best that there is, in fact. However, I use far more non-Microsoft products because they are better at doing the job for which they were designed. In most cases, Microsoft offers similar, though inferior, products. In the future I hope I will be able to continue to choose better products from competing software publishers just as I can today.

However, the illegal behavior practiced by Microsoft in the past will not be significantly abated in the future under the proposed settlement. Microsoft will continue to be able to offer inferior applications similar to superior products on the market, wrapping them up in the latest Windows operating system that now controls over 90% of the market. This practice alone will make it increasingly difficult for small companies, let alone larger ones, to stay in business even though in many instances they offer better solutions to user needs. This is unfair, and I would think, illegal. I ask that the remedy be altered to reflect this inequity. Today, it does not. I do not wish to become a part of the Microsoft .Net strategy, I do not wish to use Windows in any flavor. I do not wish to be ''tracked'' by Microsoft software. I do not wish to be forced to purchase software, and hardware, upgrades in order to feed Microsoft's profits. Rather, I prefer to make independent choices for better software based upon my knowledge that I am free to make those choices and not be precluded from doing so due to Microsoft's insatiable drive to eliminate all competition.

Please consider the following:

1 Allow computer buyers to choose the operating system they prefer. Make the operating system an separate, extra cost option at the time of the hardware purchase. This will give buyers a true choice when purchasing the computer and the operating system. It will also compel Microsoft to sell the operating system CDs at the time of purchase as other companies do.

2 Microsoft must be made to reveal its document formats and operating system requirements so that competing products may interact with them. This will enable all software publishers to compete in a meaningful way.

3 Disallow Microsoft from embeding any software in its operating system or offering it for free to drive out competition. Demand that all Microsoft products be sold at a true and reasonable cost. This will open the door to software competitors—a door that is being closed more tightly as time goes on. If Microsoft offers superior products in the

future, it will continue to thrive. By the same token, other vendors will be given an above board opportunity to compete in the software and operating system market. They, too, will have a full and fair chance to succeed. Please review the proposed settlement and make the changes required to allow the software industry to regain its competitive balance and prosper.

Respectfully,
Michael Getter
20206 Waterside Dr
Germantwon, MD 20874

MTC–00005017

From: Jack Fenchel
To: Microsoft Monopoly
Date: 12/29/01 10:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly

Microsoft Monopoly,

American system of justice is indeed horribly wrong in this Monopoly Case. The Justice Department, '' Alone '' is the only qualified body by law to try this antitrust case against Microsoft. If not, then from now on All, S.A.G's will take a part in all upcoming Monopoly Cases. Hal Stratton, a former Attorney Gereral of New Mexico, says States should think carefully before they branch out beyond their traditional fuctions. The State Attorney General's paraded across the stage, hit all the night shows. They committed one of the worst sins in judicial history. (A public Show Trial) South Carolina, State Attorney General, pulled out '' No Monopoly '' The United States Government, issued Microsoft the License for Windows. The S.A.G's are in over their head, by law. As Tom Miller, paraded across the stage Charaacter Assassination, Bill Gates was an Icon. At this point in time, this tanked the Market & 401K's. Investors lost 80B in one day by the S.A.G's actions. Bill Clinton, committed one of the worst Justice Sin, by inviting Bill Gates, to a Sat. TV. Lunch, for Political Reasons. ($$$ Gore)

When this monoply case started, there were at least two cases of purjury by the prosecution's witnesses. There were people who got up on the stand raised their hand and did not tell the truth. The DOJ, hid letters till after the testimony. Congress got wind of this and questioned Joel Klein, on the validity of the findings of the facts. Shortly after Joel Klein, resigns. At that point in time the S.A.G's changed Wall Street to Short Street and they pickpocketed, investors and 401K's to death. The terrorist attack on Microsoft, by our Government, destroyed many 401K's and retire funds like mine at the age of 72. I lost $1,500 this past month from my retiremet. I do not own any Microsoft stock. I would like to see the DOJ, close this Monopoly Case, and not do any more damage to All America.

Thank you, God Bless America,

Jack Fenchel, 185 Friendship Rd. Beaver Falls Pa. 15010 (724–843–4276)

MTC–00005018

From: Andrew S Van Heden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 10:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please breakup the Microsoft monopoly by:

1. Breaking up the company

2. Forcing them to release their source code.

Thankyou,
Andrew VanHeden
Engineering Student and Systems Administrator

MTC–00005019

From: Bill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/29/01 10:59pm
Subject: Microsoft decision

Microsoft is an 800 pound gorilla. You finally have it afraid of you. To my way of thinking, you may never be able to wrestle this 800 pound gorilla to the floor again, so you had best do the job right this time.

I urge you to make the settlement harshly punitive. If you don't pen the gorilla now, it's unlikely you ever will. Write a ''plain English'' settlement. You should be able to wrap the whole thing up in a single brief paragraph. The more you write, the more ammunition you are giving Microsoft.

Do not allow Microsoft to dictate any of the terms. Microsoft is NOT repentant and will NOT encourage language that allows a ''level playing field''. It is clear that they well know how to craft a settlement that looks good but is totally without teeth. Take away their paper and don't let them write on yours. They MUST repudiate all current license agreements which require that their operating system be installed on new computers. They MUST repudiate any license agreements which forbid ''dual-boot'' with their operating system and another (without restriction). They MUST repudiate any license agreements which forbid revelation of actual price paid for their operating system as reflected in the retail price of a hardware device.

They MUST agree to submit to the decisions of internet standards bodies. ANY network protocol that they implement MUST adhere to those published standards and NOT extend them in any fashion. Moreover, they MUST consent to roll back modifications already made to the kerberos standard as presently utilized in their operating systems to those in agreed upon by the accepted standards bodies. The change is simple to make. They should be given no more than 90 days to comply.

They MUST accept that failure to abide by the terms of the settlement ... to the letter ... will result in immediate seizure of all their financial assets without further recourse. The law, particularly at this stage of the game, is generous in the latitude given prosecution. Go for the throat now or C.Y.A forever.

Sincerely,
W Canaday
Detroit, MI

MTC–00005020

From: Doug Munsinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 9:37am
Subject: comment on Dept. of Justice settlement with Microsoft

Dear Sirs and Madams:

I am a Systems and Network Architect with a hardware company in Marlboro, Massachusetts. I can implement as part of my company's network and communications infrastructure any technology I wish. Or I could if it were not for the presence of Microsoft on the scene. I would choose, and do where it is possible to do so, to implement Open Source software such as Apache webserver, RedHat Linux operating systems, and many others. In some cases this has proved impossible because of Microsoft's sheer overwhelming presence and effect on the marketplace.

I recently purchased a Network Appliance File Server, a specialized server for holding and providing large quantities of data to users. After several months of attempting to make this product function without resorting to a Microsoft Windows NT server for authentication, I was finally forced to turn to this for two specific reasons. The first is that Microsoft, to extend their control and reach, perverts and changes and adds to existing interoperabe open sourced and publicly defined protocols, making them no longer work except with Microsoft products.

In this case the Samba program, an open source alternative to an NT server, communicates in this case differently than an NT server in an obscure manner. Forcing Microsoft to cease to alter defined protocols or to publish their specifications for any network communications would allow competition that is not possible at present. Second, Microsoft's threatening position in the marketplace causes companies such as Network Appliance to heed what works with a Microsoft solution and effectively ignore interoperability which signifigantly cripples software development by fragmenting programs into those that adhere to the Microsoft line and those who do not do so. While Network Appliance pays lip service to interoperability, the actual performance is not present. This wastes an amount of effort truly unimaginable. Microsoft can and does incorporate new ''features'' all the time into its ''operating system''. Many of these new features, beyond the browsers, represent formerly independent companies who were forced to make a deal with Microsoft to license or sell their technology, or are forced out of business as Windows now contains that feature.

Much more importantly, having a single corporation guide all commercial software development direction forces a single viewpoint on how humans should interact with computers. This is flat wrong. The windows interface (it is truly NOT an operating system as such, merely a way to interact with hardware) is only one logic for dealing with data and a very limited one. As these machines become more interleaved into our culture, such a mono-theism is s serious mistake. Despite Microsoft's claims to innovation, they on the contrary stifle and prevent an extraordinary amount of development by their currentl monopoly. The remedy proposed by the Department of Justice is very weak and not really effective in curbing Microsoft in the market. This solution is inadequate and should be rethought before this moves forward.

Sincerely,
Doug Munsinger
egenera, Inc.
dmunsinger@egenera.com
508–858–2612 Cell: 508–326–0872

165 Forest Street, Marlboro, MA 01752

Sarah: And finally, does your computer ever crash?

Bill: Oh definitely, believe me I get to the bottom of it every time and that's part of the passion that I and a lot of Microsoft people have is we want to make a tool that we want to use ourselves and we know from our own use we can make it a lot better and a lot more reliable.

—Interview 6 December 2001 with Bill Gates by BBC Children's TV

PING!

ICMP: the protocol that goes ...

MTC–00005021

From: rpjday
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 11:38am
Subject: Comments on proposed Microsoft settlement

Dec 30, 2001
Robert P. J. Day
President,
Eno River Technologies
Chapel Hill, NC
Re: Microsoft anti-trust settlement

Sir/Madam:

I'm writing to express my opinion on the proposed settlement regarding Microsoft's illegal monopolistic behavior. While there are numerous issues that could be addressed, I'm assuming others will cover those issues and I'm going to confine myself to discussing just one topic which I would dearly like to see addressed in any settlement proposal—this involves Microsoft's forced bundling of their operating systems with almost every OEM's personal computer.

As everyone knows, it is virtually impossible to buy a PC from any major vendor (Dell, Compaq, Gateway, etc.) that does not come pre-loaded with some version of a Microsoft operating system. The consumer is, in all of these cases, never given a choice of a non-Microsoft operating system or, for that matter, the choice of no OS at all. For years, the situation has been: if you buy a new PC, you got a Microsoft operating system whether you wanted it or not.

And let's be clear: you paid for this software, whether you ever used it or not. While vendors would (disingenuously) claim that the software was tossed in for free, it's clear that the actual cost was simply tacked on to the final price of the PC. But it gets better.

Once you got the PC home and got a chance to read Microsoft's end user license agreement (EULA), you were told quite directly that, if you did not agree to the terms of the EULA, you had the right to return the software for a refund. However, if you tried to return it to the vendor, their response was that you had to contact Microsoft. Microsoft, of course, pointed the consumer back at the vendor, with the result that no one was prepared to refund the price of the software back to the consumer. In short, the consumer, in purchasing a PC, was forced to accept and pay for software he did not want, and was not given the opportunity to return it for a refund, despite the guarantees of the EULA. (By the way, this additional forced cost to the consumer is jokingly referred to in the industry as the ''Microsoft tax,'' for obvious reasons.)

If anyone needs evidence of Microsoft's monopolistic power, it's hard to imagine a better example than a company which has the clout to force a consumer to purchase and accept, with no opportunity for refund, a product that the consumer explicitly says he or she does not want. What more proof does anyone need of Microsoft's abusive behavior?

There are many changes I'd like to see in the current proposed settlement, but at an absolute minimum, Microsoft should be enjoined from forcing OEMs to bundle their operating system if the consumer does not want it and, furthermore, consumers who choose to forego a Microsoft product should have their purchase price adjusted (by a realistic amount) to reflect this.

Thank you for your attention.

Robert P. J. Day
Chapel Hill, NC

MTC–00005022

From: tim stoughton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 12:12pm
Subject: microsoft

microsoft has done nothing illegal. get off their backs tim stought

MTC–00005023

From: don@dbivens.dyndns.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 2:09pm
Subject: please reject proposed settlement

The proposed settlement with Microsoft, in its current form, will in my view do practically nothing to rememdy the behaviors for which Microsoft was brought to justice in the first place. I urge you to withdraw the proposed settlement and implement the penalties that were imposed upon Microsoft by Judge Jackson in the first place.

Before I comment any further about the actual settlement proposal, I should start by saying that I am totally baffeled as to how a convicted illegal monopolist found to violate the Sherman AntiTrust laws in at least three or four instances is in a position to negotiate with the United States government. I have never heard of any other criminal who has been found guilty negotiating their own punishment. Furthermore, what kind of punishment is it when the convicted party gets to select two of those who are tasked with overseeing its compliance with its punishment? This seems to me to be a case of the fox guarding the henhouse. As well, the proposed punishment appears to be that if Microsoft is found to be in violation again then they will be in the position of being watched for an additional period of time. This is no punishment at all.

As far as Microsoft opening their protocols, etc., entirely too much leeway is given to Microsoft in how, where, when, and to whom it will document said protocols. If they are allowed to determine the criteria then they will do what serves their own interest which has proven in court to be illegal.

If breaking Microsoft up is no longer a consideration, although I feel it would be an equitable remedy, then they should be forced to document all networking and application protocols and file formats so that people can create alternatives and thereby introduce competition into the Information Technology realm.

Thank you.

Don Bivens
1059 Croyden Court
Fort Mill, SC 29715

MTC–00005025

From: hsrodgers@UCLAlumni.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 3:43pm
Subject: Settlement?

In my opinion the following article should be required reading by everyone in the Justice Department, Congress, and the White House: The Wall Street Journal, December 27, 2001 Microsoft Has Good Year,At Expense of Customers By WALTER S. MOSSBERG IT HAS BEEN a terrific year for Microsoft, but average consumers of its products haven't fared so well.

Microsoft made major progress in its goal of using its Windows operating system to push its other products and services at the expense of its competitors. Consumers are the losers.

When 2001 started, the software giant was under the threat of a court-ordered breakup, having been found guilty by a federal district judge of violating antitrust laws in multiple ways.

In June, an appeals court threw out the breakup order and harshly criticized the lower-court judge, although it upheld the legal core of his findings. The seven appeals judges ruled unanimously that Microsoft was a monopoly that had violated the antitrust laws by integrating its Web browser into its Windows operating system in an effort to freeze out other browsers.

Expressed in plain English, the court said Microsoft shouldn't be allowed to design Windows in a way that limits consumer choice—the ability of users to discover and easily use other companies' products and services. The court said it was OK to add features to Windows, as long as they weren't added mainly to maintain Microsoft's monopoly.

DESPITE THIS DECISION, the company went on to launch a new version of Windows—Windows XP—that continued to integrate tightly into the operating system new features that are crucial to extending Microsoft's monopoly onto the next battleground: Internet-based services. And it added these features in a way that hinders consumer choice.

For instance, Windows XP allows users to easily perform instant messaging, to authenticate their identities across the Web and to order prints of photos on their hard disks. But these features work only with Microsoft's own proprietary Internet services, or services owned by companies that pay Microsoft for inclusion in Windows XP. Competing services, including those better-established or more popular than Microsoft's, aren't integrated into Windows XP in the same smooth way, so users are less likely to turn to them. Microsoft attempted an even more breathtaking attack on consumer choice and online competition. It tried to integrate into Windows XP a feature whereby the built-in Web browser would automatically add links to millions of sites across the Web, without the permission of the owners. These Microsoft-imposed links, called browser

Smart Tags, would have led users to Microsoft's sites and those of its partners. The company dropped the feature only after it was discussed in this column (''New Windows XP Feature Can Re-Edit Others' Sites'') and sparked a massive outcry. But it reserved the right to try again.

Given this unrepentant behavior, you'd expect the Justice Department to react adversely. Instead, it has proposed to settle the antitrust case in a way that would leave this sort of conduct unfettered.

The settlement reached in October, now pending before yet another federal judge, does bar some offensive Microsoft behavior. But much of it pertains to the company's relations with the hapless makers of PCs, which aren't in any position to defy Microsoft. It isn't about consumer choice, except indirectly; it's more about placating Microsoft's competitors or partners. And it's all about the past, not the future battle in Internet services. It doesn't touch the company's ability to use Windows XP to extend its monopoly to these new areas.

WHAT'S WRONG with Microsoft building new features or gateways to services into Windows? Nothing, per se. I have never agreed with critics who assert that Windows shouldn't contain any feature that other companies want to sell separately. A more useful Windows is good for consumers. The problem is the way these features are designed.

It's great, for example, that Windows XP contains a built-in interface for doing instant messaging. But that interface should be neutral about which service a consumer wants. If I prefer to use the America Online instant-messaging service with the built-in Windows interface, I should be able to do so, just as I can use the built-in browser and e-mail program with non-Microsoft services. Instead, Microsoft has wired the interface to its own service.

So what, some might ask? Isn't it common in a free market for companies to use one of their products to cross-promote another? Doesn't AOL use its online service to boost the movies made by its Warner Brothers studios? Doesn't The Wall Street Journal run ads and plugs for its sister publications and Web sites?

The difference is that these other companies aren't court-certified monopolies, and when you're a monopoly, you have to follow different rules, as the appeals court said.

So, in my view, the proposed Justice Department settlement with Microsoft is bad for consumers. It isn't about preserving or enhancing consumer choice. It seems to be about getting the nettlesome case out of the government's hair.

Our government and courts shouldn't try to destroy, or run, Microsoft. But they should require the software monopoly to expand consumer choice in its dominant operating system. Unfortunately, in 2001, that's not what happened [1]Howard[o]

MTC–00005026

From: darklord@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 5:29 pm
Subject: Monopoly.... ;-(

I think that the recent Dept. of Justice decision is a step in the right direction, but sadly, does not go far enough. Firm, corrective enforcement must be applied to Microsofts monopolistic ways. Imagine that David walked up to Goliath and slapped him on the wrist. Do you honestly think that he would have stopped slaying the Israelites? No, of course not. In the very same context, Microsoft will not stop dominating (I really should use ''domineering'' there!) any and all competition by whatever means it feels it can get away with. I'm also very disappointed with the thought that Microsoft will open its API's/standards to any ''business'' that meets its qualifications. Hello? Just how many competitors do you think will qualify for that? Linux (the only real threat to Windows) will certainly fall under Microsofts list of ''not really a business'' so we won't help you candidates...

Let me try one more analogy with you...imagine you get up this morning and your car won't start. Its an older model with lots of problems so you decide to just trade it in on a new one. You go down to your car dealer, and say, ''I'd like to buy a GM to replace my old jalopy''. The dealer looks at you funny and says, ''sorry buddy, we only sell Fords here''. No problem, you just decide to go to another dealer...except that every dealer tells you the same thing, that only Fords are sold. You -can't- buy anything else. No problem, you think. I'll just repair my old car. Except that you can't even buy parts for your old car, because all the ''standards'' only work with the Fords being sold. Your right to a choice has been taken away. This is what its like in the world of computers now... I don't want my children and grandchildren to grow up in a world where there is no choice...

I don't think the founding fathers of our great nation would have wanted this either...

I'm not looking for the complete and total destruction of Microsoft, just a little fairness please...some equalisation...like:

Ford
GM
Chrysler
let there be:
Linux
Apple Macintosh
Microsoft

Please -think- about this...its probably one of the most important decisions you'll ever make.

Thank you...
Dark><Lord

MTC–00005027

From: Dan Pandre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 9:34 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There are two issues of monopoly maintenance, one of which I believe the revised proposed final judgment misses. The contract/licensing issues that prevent OEMs and others from switching away from Microsoft products, or to building integrated solutions have for the most part, adequate solutions in the settlement. The one that it completely misses is the programmatic ways in which Microsoft maintains its monopoly. By use of their power, they have been able to charge anything they want for what is, ultimately, a commodity.

A computer without an [available] operating system, or an office suite arguably, is without real commercial value. Yet Microsoft has nothing to fear from competitors attempting to replace them in the market, because they control all integrative bundling; their products will work better (or with less effort) with their other products, regardless of any attempts by competitors to replace individual commodities in their product line. The fact that bundling occurs is not in and of itself a bad thing; it makes things easier for the end user. However, regulating this bundling on an individual basis is a brain-dead approach. Any other developers should be able to integrate their products with Microsoft's on the same level of tightness that Microsoft itself does. For this to be possible, all Microsoft APIs (Application Programming Interface) of all products must be fully documented, up to date, and public. Their previous [documented] attempts to 'embrace and extend' existing standards to tie people to their products will no longer function. Also, all developers will be able to, for example, make emulators that run Microsoft software on other platforms, or add a new file system to windows, or in the case of AOL, instant messaging, browsing, and shopping; all of which Microsoft's Windows XP provides, furthering it's grasp on the end user's possible spending and product use.

The fact that their monopoly exists necessitates the openness of their APIs, otherwise they can, by pricing, licensing, or simple permission deny any competitors the opportunity for innovation. To this end, they should be monetarily punished for their illegal uses of monopoly force in the past and their compliance with open API requirements should be monitored closely. The judgment as it stands misses the technological points of monopoly maintenance, and establishes neither precedent nor deterrent for future such attempts by Microsoft.

-Dan Pandre

MTC–00005028

From: tom@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/30/01 9:53 pm
Subject: microsoft monopoly

Dear Americans,

Since reading all the published comments about the microsoft monopoly, I find that most of the other companies involved in the desktop computer industry, support microsoft by not competing. For example, IBM spends one billion dollars on Linux, porting many of its web and enterprise software, but does not port any desktop software from its lotus subsidiary.

If you want to punish microsoft and increase competition, then you can make it easy for Microsoft software competitors to port their software to other Operating Systems, including Linux, FreeBSD, Solaris, Mac X, etc.

This would have the effect of stimulating competition, and opening export markets to American software, other than Microsoft. The lesson of what American users did to IBM

after it was let off by the doj, should not be forgotton. A similar fate for Microsoft would be disasterous to the world economy at this stage.

Your faithfully
Tom Russell, Australia

MTC–00005029

From: stephen rector
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 12:35 am
Subject: Microsoft Proposed Settlement

I would like to state that I have read the text of the settlement Microsoft agreed to, and I was stunned at the concessions which the DOJ appears to be ready to let Microsoft have. The $1B of software and support offered by Microsoft has strings attached all over it, and the ''platform-independence'' which Microsoft mentions once or twice in the document has statements so vague and full of loopholes as to be meaningless. I see no guarantees that the boards of independent directors Microsoft has agreed to will place any priority on extracting for schools what they ask for if Microsoft places incentives to choose Windows.

The settlement is not only *not* a punishment, it is a reward to Microsoft for behavior unrivalled even by the Standard Oil Trust. Indeed, Microsoft is rewarded in the language it understands best—market control—being given an inroad into one market where it doesn't have a 90+% monopoly. Besides that, the $1B is external value to Microsoft, the actual cost to the company being much less for distributing its own product. The DOJ seems to be abetting the crime rather than punishing it by agreeing to this settlement, and that is an outrage. I protest. I favor the alternative proposed by Steve Jobs, which does not place strings on the money provided to schools.

As for what has transpired between Microsoft, the DOJ and the Courts in the past 10 months, the journalist Dan Gillmor of the San Jose Mercury News summarized it well in one paragraph today (Dec 30): ''* The Justice Department and nine of the states prosecuting the Microsoft antitrust case snatched a humiliating defeat from the jaws of victory. Having trounced a corporate lawbreaker in court, they sold out competition and consumers with a vacuous settlement. Nine states, led by California, Iowa and Connecticut, couldn't stomach the deal and stayed the course. But the odds now favor Microsoft, which has never wavered in its determination to continue brutalizing an industry over which it gained absolute control through unethical and illegal practices, and ultimately to control the choke points of commerce and communications. Makes you wonder if crime pays.''

Regards,
Stephen Rector,
Tempe, AZ
mailto:stefano@amug.org

MTC–00005030

From: adi@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:05 am
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust settlement

U.S. Dept. of Justice,

I wish to express my whole-hearted dissatisfaction with your decision to settle your suit against Microsoft under an agreement which is severely flawed. The agreement will not solve any of the problems which brought this suit against Microsoft in the first place. In many ways it will actually help Microsoft continue its monopolistic practices.

For example, giving software to low-income schools looks like a kind-hearted gesture, but in reality it is nothing but a public-relations ploy because it actually helps Microsoft break into new markets it didn't otherwise have access to. That software they'll be donating is simply a loss leader. All Microsoft products are designed to work better (or sometimes, only work) with other Microsoft products. Those kids who learn basic computer skills on the Microsoft platform will be trapped into using it for years to come.

The effect is that it will extend Microsoft's monopoly. Let me also give you a bit of my background, to show you another reason why Microsoft is hurting the computer industry.

In 1998 I graduated from Cornell University in Computer Science. Since then I have been working for a startup venture which is building a platform-independent, standards-compliant healthcare transaction processing engine. Due to various factors the venture has had limited success. If the venture fails, I have made a decision that I will not support the Microsoft monopoly by lending them my software development talent. The main reason is that I believe Microsoft is harmful to our economy, our country, and our civilization as a whole.

I have already examined job opportunities outside the computer software/hardware field, and plan to leave the field permanently if I cannot find work which does not support the Microsoft monopoly. I simply do not want the headaches, hassles, and guilt associated with working with Microsoft technology. Microsoft technology is shoddy and weak, and the stress I'd have to put up with is not worth the higher salary it would bring me.

That's one highly skilled and talented information technology worker (in very high demand in this economy) the industry will have lost because of Microsoft. I'm sure there are many more like me.

Sincerely yours,
Adi Fairbank
Chief Architect
CertSite, Inc.

MTC–00005031

From: Tim Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:03 am
Subject: Proposed Settlement Comments

To Whom it may Concern:

I believe the proposed settlement currently being considered is woefully incomplete, for the following reasons:

It simply does not address enforcement or punishments, nor even attempt to. The DOJ should know from past experience (the 1995 Consent Decree) that they'll simply continue business as usual. The DOJ's failure to curb Microsoft's vicious behavior would be similar to allowing Usama bin Laden to continue his pre-September activities.

Past wrongs are not assigned any kind of monetary amount. The damages can easily be valued in the tens or hundreds of billions, when you try to fathom the losses caused by crashes, prolonged downtime, endless viruses, insecure software, increased costs, decreased choices, entire sub-industries of software absolutely devastated, jobs lost, and entire generations of computer users who are terrified to use more than a small set of their their PC's capabilities. Microsoft alone has set back the information age at least 20 years back from where it would have been otherwise.

If a breakup is still anywhere on the radar screen, let me add these observations:

Two, 3 or even 5 or 10 subdivisions of Microsoft based on any conceivable lines (product line, industry, etc) would not be enough to keep them from pooling their resources together in a way harmful to everyone but themselves in the future. Put succcinctly, every single line of business must be cordoned off from all others, unable to communicate with the others. Each business unit must be forcibly held separate and not have the authority to engage in any business deals beyond producing and selling their products on uniform terms. That means no 'partnering', no 'affiliates', no 'reseller', no product tying, no discounts of any kinds. Each of these devices they have ruthlessly employed to further the monopoly.

The very freedom of individuals and companies to choose their technologies that run their lives and businesses is at stake. The ability of users to choose their own software, in all devices (especially those smaller than PCs), is the one thing that will save us from routine daily acts of privacy invasion and further exploitation of the public from all large companies. Microsoft has never willingly indulged the users in any meaningful kind of choice, and has proven time and again, that THEY CANNOT BE TRUSTED.

Their file formats, network protocols and media codecs are all tools used to hinder creativity and freedom—they must be forced to publish and document them for ALL PARTIES to see, FREE OF CHARGE. Anything less will result in another market for them to own outright, either through restricting to (their definition of) 'legitimate businesses parties' or outrageous licensing fees.

In this country, we do not let the Al Capones of the world run free, keep their money, and continue their business practices and reigns of terror. The current proposal would let them do just that.

Tim

Timothy Jones—tim@timjones.com / tjones@tsiconnections.com

Unix/Linux/Java Programmer/DBA/SystemAdmin & Brasswind Player

MTC–00005032

From: Jason Hoke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:37 am
Subject: Microsoft VS. DOJ and our Freedoms

DOJ,

I think it is only fair that other companies be given the same chance, to develop new software and operating systems that Microsoft has been given. I am furious as a consumer, and as a citizen of the United

States to think that we the people and our laws cannot stop a company like Microsoft from monopolizing and dominating the computer and software markets. We as consumers do not have freedom of choice when our choices are being monopolized, while I think that Microsoft does make good products, I also think that other software developer can do as well or better if given the chance(which at this time are not given the chance). And I think that Microsoft is dominating our freedoms of choice, and is manipulating our laws to their own benefit.

a. Controlling Manufactures to loading only Microsoft Windows operating systems does not give us choice.

b. Forcing their integrated internet browsers does not give choice.

c. Microsoft trying to seize control over the internet through their .net strategies does not give us choice

d. Microsoft not allowing thier software to be open source avalible to the public does not give us the consumers any choice.

My main concern: Why is our goverment and our judicial system allowing this to continue? Or the better question will our goverment be able to stop this from happening and not be willing to accept watered down deals with loopholes?

How can we allow/have allowed this continue? When will we have a choice?

Thank you for your time

Jason Hoke

MTC–00005033

From: Jason Hartley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:44 am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
December 31, 2001
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Dept. of Justice
950 Penn. Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I heard that the public comment period for the Microsoft antitrust hearing was in full swing, and so I thought it would be important to announce my support for Microsoft and the agreement. It's fair to Microsoft, consumers, and the government, so I would like to thank the people who've worked hard at the Department of Justice to reach this settlement.

It wasn't wholly proper to bring this suit against Microsoft in the first place. Microsoft has never been a monopoly; they just simply make a better product than their competitors. This suit was likely begun by those competitors in order to attack Microsoft, not outraged consumers looking for a break.

The government has better issues to spend taxpayer's money on than attacking American companies that help our economy to the extent that Microsoft does. Supporting the American economy is important in this time of recession, and the government should do all it can to help.

I hope that you take my opinion into account, along with the millions of others who depend on Microsoft's products. It's safe to say that we all hope that the government will end its vendetta against Microsoft. Thank all the people at the DOJ again for their work, and thank you for your work in this matter.

Regards,
Jason Hartley

MTC–00005034

From: George Cannon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:44 am
Subject: Microsoft penalties

NOW is the time to STOP Microsoft aggressions.

George W. Cannon,
1404 Stratford Road, SE,
Decatur, AL 35601–6019
Voice: 256–351–0602
Fax: 256–351–0677
Email: <gwcannon@bellsouth.net>

MTC–00005035

From: Ike Bock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:44 am
Subject: Settlement

Its time to settle this case once and for all. Punishing a company for developing a great product to me seems wrong. If there is a better product around, put it out there, custumers will buy it. Let companies compete in the market place, not in the courtroom.

Walter Bock

MTC–00005036

From: David Roth
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 10:50 am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
December 31, 2001
Atty. Gen. John Ashcroft
US Dept. of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I have been convinced for some time now that this lawsuit against Microsoft was ill advised at best, and represented one of our government's lowest points with respect to supporting American business interests at worst. Now that this settlement has been reached, I am hoping that it will be supported through the public comment process and implemented as soon as possible.

Not only are there far more important issues facing our nation today needing our undivided attention, but this would be a good time to renew the American consumer's opinion that our government exists to promote our corporate and economic interests, rather than to hinder them with this senseless bickering heard by all through the halls of Congress, or, worse, through the courts. Now is the time to renew our national spirit of economic health and prosperity, rather than to hold ourselves up for scorn and ridicule because we seem intent on devouring ourselves in front of the entire world.

Sincerely,
David Roth
President
908.790.9400 ext. 11
Stratis Group, Inc.
76 Floral Avenue
Murray Hill NJ 07974
908.790.9200 Main
908.790.9543 Fax
http://www.stratisgroup.com <http://www.stratisgroup.com/>

MTC–00005037

From: Michael Scottaline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:47am
Subject: Proposed Settlement

I'm taking this opportunity to express my dissatisfaction with at least portions of the proposed settlement with Microsoft Corporation in the US v. Microsoft case.I do not use Microsoft products for the most part (I use Linux), but I do not consider myself one of the ''enemies'' of the their software. While I believe some of their OS's are rather unstable, and some of their software is ''buggy'' and problematic, I actually do believe that some of their software has been resposnible for the incredible increase in the usage and usability of personal computers.My personal view is not that Microsoft must be *punished* beyond the scope of the proposed settlement. I have no personal interest in punishment, per se. I am interested in the settlement enhancing competition in the computer software market.I will stress only two areas of concern at this time. As an educator for the past 28 years, I am naturally delighted that part of the agreement has Microsoft providing computers to underfinanced school districts. It is unthinkable that students might graduate from High School, unexposed to even the most basic computer skills. However, I don't think that providing what are sometimes called *Wintel* machines enhances competitiveness. Microsoft simply gets another opportunity to teach young people that Windows is what an Operating System is! Many students where I work, even those that are reasonably computer literate believe that x86 computers MUST run on Windows. This portion of the settlement would simply provide Microsoft with an opportunity to extend that type of growing dominance in the education market (likely at the expense of Apple Corproation). Perhaps Microsoft should be forced to provide the hardware running an alternative OS along side the ubiquitous Windows in a dual boot fashion (this would have to be monitored; IBM might be willing to provide some expertise in this area).I'm also concerned that little is done to insure that Microsoft not take advantage of their near monopoly in OS to cripple competitors in other software areas. Perhaps Microsoft should be required to make the filters of their productivity software (Office suites, databases, etc.) OpenSource. For example, competing Office Suites should have acces to Microsoft code to make their own Office Suites capable of importing and exporting Microsoft Office files. I fear the propsed UCITA will provide Microsoft with an opportunity to make changes to their proprietary extensions (.doc, .xls, etc) while it will be illegal for anyone else to reverse engineer that file format to create new import and export filters.Again, my concern is not necessarily punishment, but enhanced competitiveness. I'm not certain the proposed settlement/compromise goes far enough in this direction. Thank You for the opportunity to express an opinion in this matter,

Michael Scottaline

85 Edgewater Ave.
Bayport, NY 11705
(Home) 631–472–4866
(Office) 631–321–3360
nbhs2@i-2000.com

MTC–00005038

From: Tony Lyall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:57am
Subject: Microsoft case

Hasn't this continued long enough. A great company is being riddled with legal costs and shareholder value is declining so a few attorneys can line their pockets in hopes of keeping legal process alive. Enough is enough-time itself has allowed Mircosoft's competitors sufficient time to get their act together and be competitive. It's a free market-time to set Microsoft free!

MTC–00005039

From: Richard C. Haight
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:56am
Subject: Microsoft has NOT reformed!

A friend has reported to me thet Windows XP will not read data CD disks that are recorded in ISO (International Standards Organization) 9660 format. The same CDs that failed with XP work fine on a Windows 98 system. This is just another case of Microsoft subverting standards to exclude other operating system software. Richard Haight

MTC–00005040

From: Arlin Sorensen
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 10:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
December 31, 2001
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

It is no particular secret that Microsoft had always maintained an aggressive competitive posture. I am not sure, however, that this posture should have earned them a lawsuit by our own government. That having been said, I am gratified to see that the government has chosen to settle this suit, rather than pursuing it through the courts. We have all seen the impact that this suit has, in part, wrought upon our economy. While there are a great many factors that have contributed to our economic slowdown, I am convinced that this suit has played more than a minor role.

I am writing to voice my support of this settlement, as well as my hope that this sort of legal action against any American company can be avoided in the future. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Arlin Sorensen
President
SCCI
653 Oak Road
Harlan, Ia 51537

MTC–00005041

From: Shepherd, Darren
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 11:21am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Dear Sir or Madam;

I think the point has been made clear to Microsoft and it is time to let them do what they do best, software and make money. Both of which are good for the economy and time for other companies to stop crying and start competing. Most of the requests made by the states would be asking smaller companies to fold.

I have worked in Technology for 17 years and I have seen Microsoft grow from being ridiculed for releasing a network OS when everyone knew that NetWare was the big Cahuna, to developing solutions, to the Bill & Melinda Gates Charity Foundation.

From someone who has seen all sides of technology, believe me when I say that to be fair, we need to quit looking towards Microsoft by smaller companies who can't compete. They need to have the technology as well as the media. I have seen both sides, but seldom done as well as Microsoft. That is the key to their success.

Sincerely,
Darren Shepherd
CNA, MCP+Internet, MCSE, CCNA, CCDA

MTC–00005042

From: Michael Jordan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Michael Jordan. First, I would like state for the record that I am presently working for a company that advocates the use of an alternative operating system known popularly throughout the world as Linux. I previously used the Microsoft operating systems known as MS–DOS, Windows 3.1 and Windows 95. Shortly after purchasing Windows 95, it became apparent to me that the goal of the Microsoft Corporation was not primarily to sell me products to help me develop computer software and to use computers more efficiently, but to put me on a ''treadmill'', so to speak, of never ending costly software updates and of buying new computer hardware on which could only adequately work using Microsoft products. I was trapped inside the Microsoft way of doing things and I wanted the freedom to develop on my own terms. Linux afforded me that freedom.

My purpose for writing is to argue that the settlement that the Department of Justice has reached with Microsoft is far too lenient for the egregious violations of both US law and common ethics that the Microsoft Corporation is guilty of. I would like to point out briefly two things which have happened to me, and I can safely assume this has happened to others, regarding Microsoft and software and computer purchases.

In 1995, after having bought Microsoft Windows 95. I attempted to open files created with software that I had purchased from Microsoft to run under Microsoft Windows 3.1. I was informed by way of a dialog box that I could not open these files. That is to say, I could not open files made by an earlier version of a Microsoft product with an updated version of the same Microsoft product. This proves that at Microsoft along with usability, obsolescence in just as important a design issue. The do this in an attempt to put users on the ''update treadmill'' that I mentioned earlier. If these frequent upgrades were justifiable on the grounds that newer versions Microsoft's product would enhance computer performance, I wouldn't be writing this letter. It it usually the quest for mere profit and continued dominance in the software industry that Microsoft releases frequent upgrades. Moreover, it has been observed that Microsoft either holds back or releases upgrades of their and other companies' software only for considerations of market share, never taking into account the importance that certain software innovations could have in bettering the industry as a whole. That is to say, if Microsoft is behind on innovation, they either pressure strategic partners to not release their software on schedule or they hastily releaseill designed and poorly tested software. This is done in order to give the appearance that they were the ''first'' with that particular innovation, thus getting a jump on other firms, who are, though technologically superior, unable to compete with Microsoft purely for reasons of name recognition and capitalization. Due to this, innovative companies with highly competent staff often are forced out of the market and the world is deprived of new and important developments in software.

A year after being introduced to the Linux operating system, I decided to buy a newer computer. Due to the aggressive and, as has been proven in court, illegal attempt by Microsoft to pressure computer dealers to pre-install only Microsoft's operating systems, it was by all intents and purposes impossible to get a ''plain'' computer without Microsoft Windows pre-installed. I should add that due to Microsoft's illegal dominance in the operating system market, anyone who goes to a computer dealer today is almost, de-facto, pushed unwittingly into buying a Microsoft operating system along with her computer. This takes on an especially alarming significance since the attacks of September 11, 2001.

It is clear and has been proven by countless computer security experts that Microsoft operating systems are by far the most vulnerable to those computer attacks popularly known as ''hacking''.

In the interest of brevity, I will leave these two examples to speak for themselves. As I mentioned, my motivation for writing is to argue, from an informed perspective, that the settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case proposed in early November 2001 is far too lenient. The basic flaw that can be seen in the settlement is that it does not attempt to effectively remedy the two most dangerous consequences of Microsoft's monopoly and of which I have given two personal examples here: stifling of innovation and stifling of competition.

In order to set things right in the computer world, the settlement should oblige Microsoft to do two basic things:

1) Open up all source code for all software products released on the open market. This will give all developers the opportunity to produce file formats which are compatible with Microsoft's software. If we have proven in a court of law the Microsoft has maintained a monopoly, what better remedy

than to give software companies the opportunity to compete on an equal footing with them. This is particularly important as well, in light of the attacks of September 11, 2001. Microsoft's code is flawed from a security point of view. What better way to audit and repair these flaws than countless numbers of experts being able to look at the give their opinion of their development practices.

2) Prohibit Microsoft from operating directly with computer dealers. The settlement should expressly prohibit Microsoft from getting their operating system installed on a computer before the consumer purchases it. Just as a person buying a new car is not obligated to forever use the same brand of gasoline, a person should not be obligated to use an operating system on a computer. This is why a computer dealer should have the freedom to buy various kinds of operating systems to have in stock and then inform the consumer that they have a choice. The computer dealer should be the one to initiate any purchase orders with Microsoft. Microsoft should in no way initiate a contact or attempt to influence or consult in any way about how a computer should be sold.

This of course means that Microsoft can and has the right under our free system of government and our system of free enterprise, to manufacture their own hardware and market it with their own operating system as is done by Apple Computer. But independently manufactured and assembled computer systems should not contain an operating system until the consumer either installs it herself or makes arrangements with the computer dealer to purchase a system from a company that she deems fit.

I believe that these two simple measures would provide the best remedy to the situation of Microsoft's illegal monopoly. It would also create a climate where computing is enjoyable for all, where innovation is freely pursued and security for individuals, governments and businesses is assured.

Thank you for your attention,
Michael J. Jordan
Website developer
Computer Assisted Language Learning software developer
US Citizen
160 Western Ave.
Essex, MA 01929
Michael J. Jordan—Director, Academia Boston
www.englishbos.com / www.spanishbos.com
e-mail: info@englishbos.coms

MTC–00005043

From: Michael Daconta
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to comment on the proposed settlement with Microsoft for its antitrust violations. As an IT director and developer, I was dissapointed to see that the settlement does not address Microsoft's illegal hindrance of the Java platform. Nor, does the settlement prevent future hindrance via its C# language and .NET platform. Furthermore, it did not require Microsoft to support a JVM in its Internet Explorer Browser, whose now dominant market share was gained illegally.

Microsoft's illegal use of its OS monopoly to thwart the Java platform continues to hurt consumers by increasing the barrier to entry for Java applications on Windows. As Java is a current defacto, internet standard for running applets (java programs that run inside the browser), Microsoft must be required to ship a compliant JVM in its browser to redress its past violations and level the playing field. Additionally, to level the playing for standalone applications, Microsoft should be required to incorporate a compliant JVM into its operating system (the browser could be designed to use the same JVM).

Additionally, the proposed settlement in no way guarantees that Microsoft's abuse of Operating System APIs (using hidden APIs, or adding code in an API to thwart a competitor's product) will not occur in the future. Thus through delay in providing API documentation, or more importantly via API thrashing (changing frequently) Microsoft can continue its dominance due to its close coordination between its Operating System group and its application group. The settlement makes no effort at creating a ''chinese wall'' between these parts of Microsoft.

The only guaranteed way to do this would be a structural remedy. I would prefer a structural remedy be again considered.

I hope the settlement can be modified to address these shortcomings.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,
Mike Daconta
Michael C. Daconta
Director, Web & Technology Services
www.mcbrad.com

MTC–00005044

From: Zakariya, Shamyl
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 11:54am

Mrs. Hesse,

I'm writing with regard to the inadequate proposed settlement for the Microsoft antitrust case. As a graphics artist & hobbyist programmer I work with computers, frankly quite constantly; as such I have been made painfully aware again and again of Microsoft's astonishingly monopolistic practices. But the fact that Microsoft is a monopoly isn't in question. The trouble, as I (and I think *many*) of my peers see it, is that the proposed remedy will do nothing to aid in the situation.

Let me describe a common situation. A year or so ago I bought a new laptop computer. The operating system I installed was one called BeOS (the CEO of the company which made BeOS, Jean Louis Gassee, testified in the trial). BeOS was exactly what I wanted from an operating system (reliable, easy to use, fast, modern, with concise developer documentation and well documented programming APIs) and as such I had no use or desire for windows. But, I had no choice, and had to pay at least 100 dollars (I can't recall how much now) for a Windows 2000 install cdrom which I didn't want, didn't use, and was forbidden from selling or using on another computer. It lies untouched in my closet.

Now, if you look at any (x86) computer manufacturer's product listing, all their computers come with windows. This is understandable, as most people prefer windows [this is a bit chicken-and-egg, as most people haven't had the opportunity to see what other operating systems are out there]. But we aren't given the option of buying the machine at reduced price without windows.

Our hands are tied here. Frankly, I have several windows install cdroms from various computers I've purchased over the years, none of which have ever been used—as I installed my preferred OS's myself (Linux & BeOS). Specifically, I have a windows 3.11 install diskette package, a windows 95 cdrom, a windows 98 second edition cdrom and a windows 2000 cdrom. None of which have ever been wanted, asked for, or used; all of which I paid for. It seems reasonable to assume I've spent about 1000 dollars over the years for these disks.

[For reference, the BeOS operating system is no longer in existence, as no computer manufacturers were even *allowed* to preinstall it on their own hardware due to binding licensing agreements with Microsoft] My next concern is the preponderance of closed protocols and proprietary behavior Microsoft is famous for. As we all know, most office work is done via the Microsoft Office suite of tools. The tools aren't bad, but as most people will agree, there *were* better suites out there, but all computers now come with MS Office... regardless, we are dependant upon this suite, which puts MS in the position of no longer needing to provide high quality office/business products.

Just a few weeks ago, the email servers here at my office were brought down for several days fighting off the GONER email worm. As they were with the previous worm, and the previous worm before that one, and so on. This is a trait unique to Microsoft tools, in that MS apparently has zero interest in fixing the problem.

[For reference, again, when a bug is found in an open source product, like OpenSSH or Apache for example, it is fixed immediately. This is the nature and benefit of open protocols and peer review, something Microsoft labels as ''anticompetitive''.]

—But why should Microsoft fix any problems? They already have our money, after all. Billions of dollars have been lost due to these virus outbreaks, and what is Microsoft's response? Apparently, instead of fixing bugs in their shoddy protocols, their response now is to threaten legal action on parties who *find* and make public weaknesses in their protocols. Microsoft's argument is that if these parties didn't make the bugs public, people wouldn't know or thereby take advantage of them. Is this the behavior we want from the de-facto king of modern computing? I think it stands to reason that were Microsoft actually in competition with other companies, their behavior would be different—e.g. they would quickly fix bugs and not attack legally those who find them.

As a staunch capitalist, I don't think America has any business breaking up

Microsoft, and I'm glad that option was thrown out (as most folks agree, it would have probably actually been *good* for MS). What needs to be done is some action which doesn't unfairly hurt Microsoft, but *does* open the market up to fair competition.

Many wonderful companies with good ideas and great talent have been broken by the rich behemoth MS—this can't go on. Microsoft can't be allowed to strong arm computer manufacturers. Microsoft can't be allowed to continue to develop closed internet protocols and document formats.

Thank you for your time,
Shamyl Zakariya
APCO Worldwide
1615 L. St NW
Washington DC, 20036
202.778.1031
shamyl zakariya
202.778.1031

MTC–00005045

From: S. Vetter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 12:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I thank you for allowing me at add my comments to the Microsoft Settlement proposal. Hopefully it is not too late to do so. I would also like to congratulate those states for wishing a more harsher settlement as they are proper in doing so.

For many years Microsoft has grown to proportions that this country has rarely seen and they continue to grow. This company has also expanded into other areas such as: The Internet which they have stated they would not do, but they did, they have gone into the game station arena, they are going into TV / news stations (MSNBC and MSFN), and a few others.

Microsoft has also bought out other companies and continue to do so and with no end in sight. If they cannot purchase the product they may either produce a similar one or force that company out of business. Another Microsoft tactic is to bad mouth the company unjustly as you may recall the words about Linux. Another favorite tactic of Microsoft is to take them to court. Recently you may have heard about a company making a product called Lindows. This product runs the Linux operating system but is trying to allow Microsoft's products to run on it. Microsoft is claiming it will cause confusion to the consumer. So, in order to prevent this Microsoft is claiming the Lindows is too similar to Windows and will take them to court about it. If Microsoft wins, the company making Lindows will probably go out of business (one less competitor of the few remaining). You may recall the Netscape browser and the operating system called OS/2. Eventually Microsoft will be the only choice.

Lets also see another way Microsoft dominates the market place. They woo developers into making software that only works on their operating systems. Other platforms are left with little or nothing since most have gone to the Microsoft way of doing things and on their platforms.

For those of you that have not seen this at work, I invite you to look in the archives. Microsoft buys a company or a product from a company. In doing so they tell the consumer you must switch to their product or be left without support. And to do so you must pay a slightly more amount than what you purchased the original product for. Now all Microsoft has done is changed the packaging and the product to include Microsoft's name, and perhaps a new feature or two. Six months later, or maybe a little more time goes by, and they release a newer version with again a new feature or two more. And once again for a little more money. If the consumer does not buy this new version, then support will be dropped. And it continues on and on.

They have applied pressure to companies to market ONLY THEIR products of face repercussions. Such as Intel, Creative Labs, and Compaq. If an individual or company wanted to buy a computer system with another OS, where would they turn? I encourage you to try! Ever try to buy a scanner or printer that works with some other operating system? And have you walked into a computer store to buy a software package for something other than Windows?

As for Microsoft's claim about innovation. This I would like to see myself! DOS started out as someone else's product. Windows is the same. Viso and Microsoft Office, yes someone else developed these as well. The list goes on...

For the remedy the ones that have been proposed are too light and can be expressed best by calling them a slap on the wrist. Also they have no real consequences should Microsoft violate them. The idea of splitting the company in two, while a good thought at the time, has a flaw. You end up with two Microsofts. There was no real split and prevention of people having control of both.

Some ideas on how I would propose a settlement:

Microsoft cannot purchase other software companies. Or hardware companys.

They must publish all of their interfaces—with documentation.

They must also open up the way files are stored.

Security must be added to their products.

Open up the source code.

Java / Javascript must be included in any more of their operating system releases.

They must not be able to branch out in other areas such as game machines, TV / news networks, or cable companies. (Just to name a few)

The browser must be independent of the operating system. Also any browser must allowed to be used on the operating system.

Microsoft's must be freed from controlling computer part manufacturers, software and hardware developers.

Computer vendors must be freed to market any hardware or software as they please.

To allow other vendors to get a foot hold in the market place no new releases or variations there of must halt for at least two years.

Ever wondered why Microsoft agreed to the latest proposal? Because it had little impact on them. They would loose virtually nothing.

Any action on Microsoft has to be harsh, with no loopholes, and is monitored and enforced. It must also give competitors some real hope of succeeding with their products.

I thank you for allowing me to voice my opinions.

Respectfully,
Scott Vetter
45118 Geddes Road
Canton, Michigan 48188

MTC–00005046

From: Trace Windham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 12:18pm
Subject: Open Comment

I am writing this out of concern and fear. I don't want to lose the internet to MS.

I don't want to be forced to have MS products to obtain information. I don't want a 'passport'. I don't want my services to be forced to use the .Net framework.

I don't have to have a particular phone company to make or recieve certain types of phone calls. When I buy a car, I don't have to agree to use a certain brand of gasoline to make it run to certain locations.

I am free to speak on the phone, and my government protects that freedom for me. I am free to travel across the country in my car, and my government protects that freedom for me.

I am free to access information on the internet with my computer that I built, with the operating system that I chose. Will my government protect that for me too? I hope so.

Trace Windham
Centralized Systems Development
PDX Inc.
101 Jim Wright Freeway
Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76108
817–246–6760 ext 4415

MTC–00005047

From: Ken Otwell
To: Microsoft ATR,dennispower @earthlink.net@inetgw
Date: 12/31/01 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement position

Gentlepersons of the court;

As a 20-year computer programmer and small business owner, I have used virtually all Microsoft products since DOS 4.0. Due to high cost, constant crashes when used as intended, inability to be integrated with products from other vendors, and radically increasing hardware resource requirements, I now find myself constantly looking for realistic alternatives to Microsoft products, and usually coming up short.

My opinion on the findings of fact in the Microsoft case is that it is a reasonable compromise based on available and provable evidence. I strongly suspect that the actual case would be much worse for Microsoft if more evidence were available, but given what is known, the ruling seems quite fair. My opinion on the proposed settlement, however, is not nearly as sanguine. The settlement does virtually nothing to grant relief to those harmed or to prevent future abuses, and does a fair amount to increase Microsoft's monopoly and even extend it in new directions, like educational software.

The minimal changes to the proposed settlement that I feel are necessary is to simply:

(1) Require every distinct functionality in a Microsoft operating system to be separately accessible by a complete API that Microsoft must publish at least six months prior to each version release of said functionality. (If Microsoft cannot provide an API at six months prior to release, then their software development practices are simply not acceptable in a world where financial and economic security depends on correctly functioning software.)

(2) Require that every protocol and data format used in the saving of application data or in transmitting data from one Microsoft application to another must be published six months prior to each version release of said protocol or data format. This requirement holds for all data transmitted via the internet or stored on any medium.

(3) Require that where internationally recognized standards committees have established standards for such APIs, protocols, or data formats, that Microsoft systems must be configured, by default, to fully and completely adhere to those standards. For example, Microsoft's implementation of XML, while ''technically'' standard, is embedded in other protocols in such a way as to defeat the clear intent of the standard in that competing products cannot make use of the Microsoft XML documents.

A typical Microsoft operating system will include an internet browser, image browser and/or image editor, music player, video player, file editor, file browser, internet connection subsystem, network configuration subsystem, and many more proprietary products from Microsoft. Each of these are nominally distinct products that continue to benefit from the network effects from Microsoft's operating system monopoly. The only way to provide meaningful remedy is to allow the competitors to have reasonable access to the technologies necessary for integrating their competing products into each Microsoft operating system, and to enable competing applications to process documents or other data streams that are generated by Microsoft software.

Furthermore, since the fastest-growing competition to Microsoft now comes from the non-profit, open source community, these APIs, protocols, and data formats must be published not just to proven business competitors, but must be freely available to anyone in any location around the world. I cannot emphasize this latter point too much: the strongest competitor to Microsoft's OS is Linux, and if the Linux development community is barred from relief under the settlement, then Microsoft will have clearly ''won.''

Without this minimal relief, Microsoft will continue to benefit from the network effects caused by their monopoly and they will continue to extend their monopoly deep into uncharted waters of internet business, and even further into our collective wallets.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak out on this grave issue. I wish you the best of luck in your deliberations.

Sincerely yours,
Kenneth H. Otwell
CTO, Calidris Ltd.
http://www.calidris.com/

MTC–00005048

From: Bruce Lill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:01pm
Subject: letting them off easy is wrong

The least microsoft should get is that we shouldn't be required to purchase their products. If I purchase a computer and it comes with Microsofts products I should be able to sell them to someone else if I'm not going to use them. This would require microsoft to recognize the resale. I also should not have to give them any information if I want to use their product. Now I have to sign up to use XP. With passport there isn't a way to get your information deleted.

The consumers have been hurt by lack of quality software and the cost of the current software. They have made it hard for novice users to purchase computers that are configured for them or technical users to not have the restrictive software.

Bruce Lill

MTC–00005049

From: Mike Pestronk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 12:57pm
Subject: Ms settlement

I just wanted to voice my opinion on the settlement. Microsoft needs to be broken up, into at least two separate entities, but three would be better. One needs to be the OS part, one the office/productivity part, and a third part encompassing Internet Explorer and it's new .Net software. Microsoft has continued its monopolistic practices with its new .Net initiative, as it will not cooperate with the rest of the industry's liberty alliance and j2ee systems. They continue to use the os to leverage this new technology, as they were doing when with IE when the complaint was first filed. I am very dissapointed the justice department decided to drop the case, even though it might show a sign of cooperation between MS and the government over security issues. Microsoft is continuing their monopolistic practices worse than when the case started and will need to be broken up eventually. I hope the nine remaining states or the EU can have some effect.

MTC–00005050

From: Larry D. Burton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Since we are inside of the 60 public comment period I thought I ought to put my two cents worth in. The more and more I think about it the more I like the Red Hat proposal for a solution. Microsoft has offered to give away $X of hardware and software to needy schools. Let them give it all in hardware and take up Red Hat's offer of them providing the software. This way, no one is tied down to a platform controlled by any one company and it will go an awful long way in reversing the damage done by Microsofts monopolistic practices.

Regards,
Larry
mailto:larry@pickett.com
(423) 875–8034
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005051

From: David Parsons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The major difference between the Microsoft trial and the ''OJ'' trial is that maybe OJ wasn't guilty; Microsoft actually managed to have the case decided on the emotional value of various libertarian slogans like ''we're being punished for our success'' rather than the actual facts of the case.

Microsoft's monopoly makes Standard Oil's look trivial. Microsoft won, big time, and it's stranglehold over the field of Information Technology remains intact and will continue to tighten in the years ahead.

The DoJ, or rather the politicos who so arrogantly place their uninformed opinions of what they think 'should be' above the facts, should be ashamed. And now the States are letting Microsoft pay off their 'penalty' by giving CDs of their software (costing $1.00 or less to produce) to schools and claiming $400.00 retail price, all the while increasing their monopoly into yet another area.

I for one am ashamed
David Parsons
Regional Technical Officer
US DHHS—OIG Region II
dparsons@os.dhhs.gov
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005052

From: Debbie Andree
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I do not agree with the terms of the Microsoft settlement. It is not in the best interests of our schools, our children or represent fair and open market competition.

Sincerely,
Debbie Andree
eVision-Ventures AG
da@evision-ventures.com

MTC–00005053

From: Diana Rogers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:29pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft

I am writing because I am a 66 year old woman who, thinks the whole antitrust is all wrong. It was only brought my Microsoft's competitors who are not as resourceful as Microsoft.

I like what Microsoft has done, because I am not that great in figuring out how every thing works, but I like all the programs together. It is much easier for me. My granddaughters figure things on the computer much faster than . I love the BUNDLING, it helps me. I really like the way Office is put together, it has all the programs I need. I will only use MSN, because I believe that AOL is one of the Competitors that is trying to stop Microsoft growth. My not stop AOL's growth.

The only program I use that I like better than a Microsoft is Quicken. It has some great reports, that Microsoft doesn't have. Microsoft has agree a to fair settlement. Don't let the State Attorney General's have their way. They just want to make a name for

themselves or run for Governor of their States.

Does anybody remember when the Stock Market went down? It was the day that the other Judge ruled against Microsoft. The People of the United States don't want any more penalties, they want a settlement now.

Diana Mayhew Rogers
23221 -60th Court So
Kent,WA 98032
253–373–1569

MTC–00005054

From: Shlomi Harif
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:34pm
Subject: Comment on the proposed Microsoft anti-trust settlement

To Whom It May Concern and Attorney General, State of Connecticut: Pursuant to the Tunney Act of 1974 I am commenting on the proposed settlement between the government and Microsoft. I feel I am particularly capable of providing professional input, as the father of three children in school, and the Chief Technology Officer for a finance-related software firm, Austin Logistics, here in Austin, Texas.

I would love to be able to say where my traffic fines are spent: my sidewalk could use a little fixing up. Oh, and I'm real particular as to the kind of cement, and who does it. Did I mention that I'm in the concrete business? I'll Just make the check out to myself, and I'll take care of the whole thing, okay?

I'm not sure if the cynicism was obvious enough, but punishments should never enhance the crime for which a defendant is being punished. Giving Microsoft additional revenue and a tightened lock-hold on the educational system is monopolistic in and of itself.

This action, if executed, will set a precedent for any future anti-trust cases, and impinges on the ability of the public, through the offices of the government, to get pure legal redress for actions impacting citizens. An independent, court-appointed monitor should disburse the funds in a manner that benefits the schools, not the criminal.

Sincerely,
Shlomi Harif
13303 Ivywood Cove
Austin, Texas 78729
shlomi@liquidmind.net
(512) 249–8888
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005055

From: alex.qu@atfreeweb.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 1:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
AtFreeWeb.com, Inc.
801 Calle Mar Vista
Oxnard, CA 93030
Tel: 805–278–9548
Fax: 805–278–9554
http://www.atfreeweb.com
December 31, 2001
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530–0001
CC: Representative Elton Gallegly

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I write this letter in accordance with the Tunney Act expressing my support of the settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department. I believe that this settlement will be beneficial to both the IT industry and the consumer, but continuing on with more court nuisance is a fleecing of the American taxpaying citizen. To prevent this from continuing any further, the D.O.J. should finalize the settlement as soon as the Tunney Act comment period is over.

This settlement is fair and reasonable. If anything,

Microsoft was treated a little spitefully. A few terms of the agreement follow, which should underscore the severity of this settlement: the DOJ will establish an independent technical committee, monitoring Microsoft's compliance with the settlement; Microsoft also cannot retaliate against computer makers that may ship software that would compete with the Windows operating system; and Microsoft will open up their vault of secrets concerning system interoperability to competition.

Even though the settlement prevents laissez-faire economics, the right thing to do is to settle the suit now and work to ensure that the industry and the economy can move forward again. Microsoft must be allowed to return to innovation, rather than litigation.

Sincerely,
Alex H. Qu
President

MTC–00005056

From: Mike Friedman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:11pm
Subject: Comments on the Microsoft ''settlement''

I'm completely appalled by the so-called settlement that the government has reached with Microsoft. When will you people learn that the only thing that will stop MS from doing what it does is to go ahead and break it up. Microsoft only understands the raw use of power. The only entity that has the power to keep Microsoft from doing what it does best (gobbling up all its competitors because it has a monopoly) is to break it up into pieces so that others have the possibility of keeping the Internet and the computing world diverse.

The recent revelations of serious security holes in Microsoft's latest operating system and the hideous security implications of the new .Net Passport technology should only serve to reinforce this sort of strategy. Minimizing Microsoft's power to keep engaging in anti-competitive behavior is in the best interest of the whole world.

Thanks.
Mike Friedman
2310 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005057

From: Jim Acker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:36pm
Subject: Settlement

I am writing this email to express my concern over the proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft Corporation. It seems to me that the settlement does not directly address the points on which Microsoft was found guilty. Any settlement should address these points in a manner that at a minimum prevents the behavior from continuing, and where possible, provides payment to parties damaged by the past behavior.

At the heart of Microsoft's business model is the extension of the Windows domination on the PC platform. They accomplish this in two ways; they strong-arm hardware vendors and they bundle applications into their Windows installation media to eliminate competition. On both these fronts, Microsoft was found guilty of monopolistic behavior. On the first issue, it appears that an effective settlement has been reached.

On the ''bundling'' front, the settlement is tough enough. For example, they are currently bundling the Microsoft Media Player with every copy of Windows. It is not an innovation, as it offers nothing that can't already be found in competing products in the market, e.g. Real Player and QuickTime. It has no valid operating system function. It is purely an application which gets enormous market share simply because it is included with Windows. It gains that market share w/ o having to compete on it's own merits in the market. This was done with their browser, their media player and will be continued with future products under the guise of ''innovation''. It is very hard to regulate the software business, but some remedy should be proposed that determines if a product is truly performing an operating system function or is an application. Where it is an application, why must it be ''bundled'' with the Windows operating system? Are there strong competing products already in the market? With such simple scrutiny, Microsoft would not have been allowed to bundle their browser or their media player into Windows.

Finally, on the subject of restitution for damages resulting from the behavior Microsoft was found guilty of, this seems to be miss the point. Giving lots of Microsoft products to schools around the country is from one perspective nothing more than an expensive marketing campaign for Microsoft. Hook the kids while they're young. A better solution would be to require hard cash payment in the form of grants to the various school districts to be used for the same purpose, with one important difference. The grants would have no strings attached regarding what type of hardware/software was purchased. If a school wanted to purchase all Apple products, then they would be allowed to do so.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005058

From: ryan.morillo@convergys.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I would still like to see the separation of Microsoft into an operating system division and an other software division, with strong legal definitions of what an operating system is. Not something very costly to the tax payer

or to Microsoft (possible loss of revenue is not a cost or a loss no matter how the large corporations may try to make it seem as such.) The Operating system is a moot point, but the other software bundled with it is cutting into ability of anyone to have a chance.

Ryan Morillo

—The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of Convergys Corporation—

MTC–00005059

From: Jackson, David (Engineering)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs

This is my opinion of the proposed settlement of your case against Microsoft. Needless to say I find it less than satisfactory. I am surprised at the ease at which the DOJ can be disregarded by a corporation operating in this country. Microsoft does clearly use it's monopoly to the disservice of the people of this country and shows no signs in being interested at all in voluntarily changing it's ways. The settlement you propose is either naive or motivated by something other than the best interest of the people you purport to represent. At best it's nothing more than a slap on the wrist and a promise from the company to not do this sort of thing in the future. This company has made promises like this in the past. The fact that they have ended up back in the sights of the DOJ should tell you what you need to know about how that went last time.

As a user of Microsoft products (by necessity), Apple products (by preference), and Linux/GNU products (for stability) I have watched as my options have grown increasingly smaller over the years. This is become unbearable for me from an economic standpoint. An example for this can be given. I recently needed to buy a better video card for my Apple Macintosh G3 computer which I use for the majority of my computing at home. I find the system to be more stable than Microsoft Windows (any version) and more pleasing to work on from an aesthetic and ergonomic point of view. The video card in my Macintosh was simply not up to the task and so I went to my Local electronics store to find another, better, and faster card. That's when I saw the end result of what you are so ready to settle over.

There is only one current video card available for Apple Macintosh computers through retailers. It's an ATI Radeon card with 32MB of RAM and has very good performance. For Windows this card retails for $69 after rebate and is one of well over a hundred options I might have. Windows video cards vary in price from under $20 to well over $400 (excluding the grossly expensive video cards used by graphics professionals, these can run in the thousands of dollars) giving Windows users a card for every need or budget. For the Macintosh this card is priced at $229. It's the same card. It has the same graphics chip on it and it has the same amount of memory. The Microsoft monopoly has effectively destroyed any choice I have in upgrading one of their competitors machines by it's sheer size and weight. The cost of making this card with an Apple Macintosh ROM on it simply doesn't justify it being priced in the same range as the version for Windows.

In Linux you have a similar situation. Here you can certainly buy any of the countless PC video cards but you cannot find any companies willing to create the driver software to make these video cards perform to their abilities. The Windows versions of these drivers get updates and rewritten multiple times per year but the same companies will not expend the time or effort to create equal quality drivers (or most often ''any'' drivers) for Linux. Again my choice is limited and again Microsoft and it's standard way of doing business are at the root of the problem.

My own personal solution to this has been to not spend money on anything that will make Microsoft richer. It's a uniquely American idea that the market is free and that it will all come out in the wash. By my estimation I have not given Microsoft a penny since 1994 and I will continue to do that even though it means my stepson might just be the only kid on his street to not get an X-Box, ever. Proceed with your settlement and see how many kids own Nintendo Gamecubes or Sony Playstation's in five years by the way. Whenever I can at work I push for the non-Microsoft alternative and I even win some from time to time. Realistically though I know this isn't making any difference. I'm watching the products and companies I do support slowly vanish from the computing landscape. Individual consumers cannot reign this company in and it's a matter of time before we are all connecting to the internet, playing games, getting work done, or doing any of a hundred thousand other things that will help our lives by nothing more than the grace of Microsoft.

Honestly when one looks at what this company has done, is doing, and will be capable of doing if they remain unfettered by the laws of the country they do business in it is frightening. At the same time if the settlement is approved and those other states which have turned away from it are stopped from doing what is right I have to think that my views on the Right and Wrong of my government will have changed for good. It's been my idea for most of my life that this country was usually (if not always) ''right'' and those who stood against it were usually (if not always) ''wrong''. How can that be the case if the DOJ is interested in selling my best interests out because the administration of the moment wants Microsoft to keep fueling their economy?

There is a right and a wrong and it's not difficult to tell the difference between the two. I urge you to not pursue this settlement and instead actually make Microsoft do business on an equal footing with their peers.

David Jackson
Systems Support Technician
713.755.1147

MTC–00005060

From: Kevin Buterbaugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Greetings,

As a concerned citizen of the United States, I would like to register my opposition to the proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft. This settlement amounts to nothing more than a slap on the wrist. Even worse, it contains so many loopholes at to be totally useless. Of course, since Microsoft is the defendant, if a meaningful settlement were enacted, it would have to be vigorously enforced. Microsoft has repeatedly shown that it will do whatever it can get away with.

Microsoft has been convicted of breaking the law. An appeals court unanamously upheld that conviction. Why in the world is the DOJ letting them walk away scott-free??? About the only good thing that can be said about this settlement is that, unlike the proposed settlement in the K-12 Education suit, at least the DOJ is not proposing to reward Microsoft for breaking the law.

It is extremely obvious that those who have made this decision are totally ignorant of the ultimate consequences of their actions. Consider this: Microsoft now has a 90%+ monopoly in the desktop operating systems market. Let's just say this farce of a settlement is allowed to stand ... Microsoft will then continue to extend their monopoly ... they will inevitably someday achieve a 100% monopoly, not just in desktops, but servers as well ... when that day arrives, when 100% of the computers used by the United States government run a Microsoft operating system, who then really runs the United States, George W. Bush or Bill Gates? I would not be surprised to find that those who support this settlement are so ignorant about what they've done that they cannot even see that the answer to that question is the latter.

It is my sincere hope that those who support this settlement will realize their ignorance to this point and choose to pursue a meaningful settlement, before irrepairable harm is done not only to the consumer (it's probably too late for that), but to our very government and way of life.

Literally nothing short of the freedoms we hold dear is at stake.

Kevin Buterbaugh
1500 Deal Road
Burns, TN 37029
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005061

From: Michael Haag
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 2:52pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust file...

The corporate version of O. J. Simpson style justice—bought and paid for.

MTC–00005062

From: Matias Moyano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 3:12pm
Subject: About the settlement

hi, like an user of Microsoft Products, i have to say that the settlement reached by microsoft and the DOJ with the 9 of 18 states is a joke, MICROSOFT is not only allowed to keep doing their ANTI COMPETITIVE activities, this will not help the consumers at all, how can someone say that if microsoft is break in 2 parts is going to hurt the economy? what kind of joke is that??? MICROSOFT is

destroying the economy by just being there and doing what they do all the time! the economy grows if there is a way to compete arround!, the economy grows when someone decides to create a product and start selling and doing some competition, but with microsoft arround like that.... no one will have the chance to even take a product to the market because microsoft will buy them or..... wors and the most common strategy by microsoft that is.....''adding a new feature to the OS'' and that feature is the one that is created by this new company, so, with this kind of market, go will want to compete if they know that they will be doom anyway or another? they can loose because microsoft haves the money to make you loose, or they can loose because microsoft haves the most selled OS arround, they just have to bundle a new feature and the company is dead, So now tell me, how this deal will benefit the consumers? if i will still not have the right to choice what ever i want? when i use winamp i know that some day it will not be manufactured because loose of money, and what i have? windows media, and so on so on so on, whats next?

how much time we have to wait until someone realises that MICROSOFT IS NOT THE ANSWER TO THE ECONOMI? i hope for the good of every consumer out there, that this deal between the DOJ, 9 states and the HUGE MONOPOLY OF MICROSOFT is cleared, and a new one.... the one that is proposed by ''rebel'' 9 states is taken as the remedi, please, hear what the people haves to say, not what some idiots that dont know what is to use a computer... whe dont need to benefit microsoft, whe need to benefit the consumers, and with the settlement that the DOJ accepted, the consumers are not happy at all.

that is all i have to say.

Matias Moyano.

MTC–00005063

From: john.m.curren@mail.sprint.com @inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general @po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 12/31/01 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I have never written a letter of my own initiative to any government body until now. I have been in the computer industry since graduating from college so I have been observing Microsoft's behavior for about twelve years. I cannot in good conscience allow the proposed ''settlement'' to pass without at least voicing my opinion.

I recall a time when there was competition in the PC operating systems and application software markets. You could use DOS, DR–DOS, OS/2 and possibly others as your operating system. You could also choose between WordStar, WordPerfect, and Microsoft Word for your word processor. You could choose between Lotus 1–2–3, Excel, or Quattro for your spreadsheet. There was competition. Microsoft has completely annihilated all competition in those and other markets. I remember Stacker and the Borland development tools. Unless something is done competition will never be restored to those markets.

I do not see how the proposed settlement benefits the plaintiffs one iota. I doubt most of the schools have or can afford the resources to keep a handful of networked PC's running. I doubt that it will really cost Microsoft one billion dollars in hard cash to dump a bunch of outdated PC's and copies of software onto underprivileged schools. A columnist in InfoWorld suggested something that I believe would truly restore competition in the PC marketplace. In a nutshell, make the Windows operating system and the Office platform a public standard or API which other companies can write operating systems and applications for. Make it illegal for Microsoft to extend or go beyond the API without first extending the public definitions as they have done in the past with the Windows API. This would instantly create two huge markets that would create jobs, stimulate the economy, and benefit consumers globally. Of course Microsoft would vehemently object but somehow I think they will be able to manage. Furthermore if Microsoft's software is so good they should be able to compete and win on a level playing field.

Thanks for your time.

John Curren

System Administrator

MTC–00005064

From: sssfjet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 3:58pm
Subject: ms

Microsoft has been a bad, bad boy. You should do what the last remaining states (and the citizens of America) want and wack the hell outta Microsoft's pee pee. It's time for the big bully Microsoft to get a taste of their own medicine. There is no need to keep this in the courtroom for another 10 or 15 years.

The court system has already found them guilty. But what good is that if the court system does nothing about it. Pass sentence and kick their ass in the process!

sfjet

MTC–00005066

From: TQME2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 4:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Court Decision

I, as a citizen of the United States of America, longtime computer user, and former manager of Information Technology acquisitions for the US Department of Agriculture, make a public record on my great concern over and disapproval of the proposed settlement made between the Federal Government and Microsoft in this case.

The strictures themselves and the results stemming from implementation of them cannot and will not solve the basic problem of Microsoft's illegal monopolistic activities. They can and will embolden the firm to continue its illegal practices and will adversely affect individuals, corporations, and governments around the world.

Please revise the settlement such that the current and future actions of Microsoft will be modified commensurate with the actual legal findings of monopolistic practices by the company.

T Q Stevenson
tqme2@aol.com

MTC–00005067

From: Chas433@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 4:21pm
Subject: Antitrust?

After spending my hard earned tax money talking with Microsoft all these months, you have lost the wet noodle for the wrist slap, and are providing a craven settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case on weaker terms than negotiated before you won the appeals case. I realize the slogan ''Go Nuke???em'' was taken by the other side before you started but given the egregious Microsoft conduct this settlement is ridiculous. Their cries of preserving ''innovation'' are smoke. Were the gross incompatibilities of Wind ows Millennium innovation, or the big security holes in Outlook and Windows XP? I read in the Washington Post for Dec 22, 2001 that the FBI is now giving advice to XP users on measures to block hackers. There has been little innovation except on how to block credible competition. Adding insult to injury is the proposal to provide school donations of software as a follow-up aimed at knocking out the meager competition remaining. I cannot say I am proud of the DOJ in this one. The hold-out states have my appreciation and may they prevail. May a better operating never appear and your Windoze eternally be hacked and crash. The only thing worse than this settlement was the one proposed by the FCC for the Nextwave wireless license fiasco.

MTC–00005068

From: Dramen Mendra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly

I would hope that the continued monopolization of the software and internet markets by Microsoft will be stopped. Microsoft has been determined guilty of violating anti-trust laws, that's good. But the present solution is hardly worth the effort that brings us to this point. I can only hope that the DOJ take another careful look at their present plans because those plans do nothing more than improve Microsoft's' position to further control the software and internet markets. Please protect the American consumer, business and ultimately the citizens of this country by re-evaluating your proposed ''penalty'' for violating anti-trust laws. How many more enterprising software developers must bite the dust. How much more can consumers be forced to swallow whatever Microsoft dishes out? Will it have to get so bad that we will be forced to go down this road again, and will we have the dubious luxury at that point?

A concerned consumer and citizen.

MTC–00005069

From: tsungshiang sun
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:23pm
Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern:

As a pride American citizen, I definately support Microsoft. It will be great to settle this anti-trust case as soon as possibe for the benefit of consumers and our economic.

Fred Sun

MTC–00005071

From: Graham Grist
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:25pm
Subject: Settlement

I am amazed at the leniency of the settlement proposed. It is evident that Microsoft have flagrantly disregarded the law in building a dominant monopoly position.

It is also clear that the settlement in no way adequately prevents the company from using its monopoly power again, and it is doing so as much as it can.

The key architect Bill Gates should be banned from any executive involvement. The company should be split up. Just because the original judge was foolish enough to breach protocol does not mean his remedies were wrong and that the American people and the world should suffer the predatory pricing and other actions that this company has at the root of its culture.

Graham Grist MA (Oxon) FCT

MTC–00005072

From: John Peters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is beyond me why my tax dollars are even being used to investigate the so called monopolistic acts of Microsoft.

I realize that this whole thing is the fact that Internet Explorer is considered a part of Windows. But I as a consumer have the ability to go on the web, download, and install any browser I feel. I do not feel forced to use Internet explorer. Also as a consumer I can purchase and install any operating system I chose again I do not feel tied to Windows.

I feel that the worse thing that Microsoft has done is find out what the consumer wants and put into an operating system. I think we need to get rid of all these anti-Microsoft special interest groups and let them find something else to complain about. Perhaps they could complain about the lack of affordable health care instead of complaining about Microsoft.

What effect does a finding against Microsoft have on the big picture.

Again please don't waste my tax dollars on investigating this or on any further court cases against Microsoft.

I Love Microsoft!!

Also, if the DOJ replies to these messages please feel free to send it through the mail. I am proud Postal Worker.

John Peters
730 Armistice Blvd.
Pawtucket, RI. 02861–2749

MTC–00005073

From: Tjack1931
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:25pm
Subject: Settlement

I Would like to voice my Opinion on the Microsoft settlement.. I think it is in our Interest for you the Justice dept. to settle this ongoing witch hunt against Microsoft, I think that there is more of a monopoly going on with AOL and Time Warner than any other outfit out there.. why are you not faulting them that brought the suit in the first place.. For Gods sake settle and move on to more pressing problems that we have in this country then picking a Company such as Microsoft apart that has done so much for us computer users,

Sincerely
Helga Jackson
4318 So 325th St.
Auburn, WA 98001
Tjack1931@msn.com

MTC–00005074

From: Jerald Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft should not be penalized for its business practices. I use Microsoft products as well a many of their competitors and I believe these companies should be let alone to compete. We consumers can decide what products we want to buy. Please end this case and let everyone get back to developng products.

Jerald Hill
8020 Thunder River Way
Cumming, GA 30040

MTC–00005075

From: William R (Bill) Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

While I feel strongly that the entire case against Microsoft has been an abuse of power by the Justice Department pushed by companies who could not compete and for various self-interest groups, it probably is best to put this matter behind us and get on with business. I do not feel that the restrictions and sanctions being placed on Microsoft will significantly impact its ability to provide quality products and enhance the overall computer user community whether it be business or personal. It may impact those companies who sought to rely on government and judicial powers to be able to compete. Maybe now they will attempt to be more competitive on a product basis.

William R. Moore
1300 Pebble Drive
Greensboro, NC 27410
William R. (Bill) Moore
www.big-m.com
wilmoo@triad.rr.com

Where there's a Will, there's a way but only the saavy survive! It's lonely up here on Olympus.

MTC–00005076

From: Lee Pollard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

There are many more important issues for this country than DOJ meddling in the free enterprise market. It is ironic to me that AOL / Netscape can essential do the same thing as Microsoft has been charged with, although not nearly as well, and those companies are not under any type of wasteful investigation.

Microsoft provides a solid platform for the majority of computer users worldwide to be able to communicate and work together.

Take whatever they have decided to give you and leave them alone.

Lee Pollard
USMA '86
Owner—Computer Therapy

MTC–00005077

From: Rollie Hallen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Th Whom it may concern;

I feel that the US government was completely taken by microsoft in this ordeal. Big business won, the government and people from all over the world lost. But what would you expect, doesn't business run the US government?

Roland W. Hallen
3310 9th St.
Lewiston, ID 83501

MTC–00005078

From: Gene Owens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is time to stop this nonsense and quit wasting my taxpayer dollars on this case. Microsoft has literally created the computer industry. The interchangeability of applications on different brand PC's is a tribute to the Microsoft operating systems. Who cares if it comes bundled with MS products. Their products are good—and they work! That's what consumers really need. The vast majority of PC users want something easy to use— that's MS products. They've made a lot of money—so what? They deserve it. They earned it.

Let's settle this case and be done with it. The Federal Government should devote its efforts to tracking down criminals and terrorists—not good businessmen!

Gene Owens
Shrewsbury, PA

MTC–00005079

From: Dick Foreman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:31pm
Subject: Re: judgement

This is a farce, you have given in to Microsoft and their monopolistic practices. They will continue to screw the public knowing the government will do nothing to stop them or punish them for their transgressions. The golden rule is alive and well in the USA, ''he who has the gold, rules.''

Dick Foreman, dick@foremanart.net
Foreman Art, Research & Technology
1002–1 Pacific Grove Lane
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Phone: 831.657.9493
http://www.foremanart.net

MTC–00005080

From: Hannum Dion G.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally think this settlement is just. In my opinion it would be a waste of taxpayers money to prolong this case.

Dion G. Hannum

MTC–00005081

From: Jim Davlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:32pm
Subject: Please read

There was once a time in this country when a man could invent a better mousetrap. He could benefit from it and live the good life. Microsoft is such a company. Don't punish them because other big businesses can't figure out how to beat them. To bad you did not watch Enron closer.

Jim Davlin
8833 Jaylee Drive
San Gabriel, caCA
91775
626–309–0429
CC:RFC-822=0—23163—79E0AE9D-3CC5-D211–86EF-0008C7DAAE...

MTC–00005082

From: Jim Marsh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs

Please stop wasting our money going after the American dream. This type of company growth is what our country was built upon.

If government keeps stepping and trying to make all types of companies the same then why not have one company run everything i.e. ''The Government Company'' that provides software, support, etc.

I for one am very tired about the wasted time and money being spent on trying to kill Microsoft for the hurt feelings of the few. If these companies products were better then they would have been brought! I had various M/S software clones and they just don't do the job!

I bet you are looking at this e-mail on some M/S software product.

Regards
Jim Marsh
Public Citizen

MTC–00005083

From: Jim Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

Please initiate the settlement with Microsoft and get on with other more pressing businness fo the Department. This has gone on long enough.

I have used Microsoft products for years, I understand the breadth of their market share and don't blame their competitors for being worried, they provide a good product at a reasonable price, and that is why they have the market they do.

Let Microsoft get on with developing new products and helping the computer industry reach its potential That after all is why they call it ''FREE'' Enterprise.

James E. Miller, Alameda, Ca
A concerned consumer.

MTC–00005084

From: Ralph Heymann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft's competitors have caused enough damage and should be restrained from causing more havoc

As a satisifed user of Microsoft's products I believe that the proposed settlement is good for all concerned, the consumer, Microsoft's competitors and, most of all, our economy.

There is a need that these proceedings come to a close and the DOJ settlement be accepted as a good and fair one.

Ralph Heymann
Chapel Hill NC

MTC–00005085

From: Killraven
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm posting this in response to a Microsoft FINFlash e-mail asking people to give their opinions to the DOJ in regards to the proposed Antitrust settlement.

My opinion is that the current proposed settlement would make the money spent on the investigation a bigger waste than that spent on the Whitewater investigation.

For a token penalty (less than 10% of MS's petty cash!) Microsoft would be handed a huge victory in being able to strengthen their Operating System monopoly in the one area that they have largely been kept out of, the Public Education System.

Years back, prior to Windows 95, the PC public had a choice of at least three different Operating Systems (MS-DOS, PC DOS, and Novell DOS (aka, DR DOS)), all of which would adequately run the Windows 3x environment. Now we are restricted to Microsoft only. This has certainly stifled innovation in the technical arena, as history shows that Microsoft has almost always been a copier or purchaser of innovation. The existence of alternative OS's (Linux, Be and various Mac flavors) is simply not adequate as the majority of the worlds computer programs are designed for the various flavors of Windows, from business applications to entertainment.

In my opinion, the nine states that did not readily accept Microsoft's tainted bait have an acceptable solution in forcing Microsoft to offer a stripped down version of Windows that will allow users to build their OS with only the tools they desire or require.

Also, in my opinion, the best overall solution would be to require Microsoft to license the portions of Windows code that would allow competitors to build their own Operating Systems that would be completely Windows-x compatible so that consumers would once again truly have freedom of choice. Competition is the true mother of innovation, and innovation helps everyone.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Paul A. Hoerner
Bismarck, ND
USA

MTC–00005086

From: Jbrumwell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please wrap this thing up and move forward! Examine every dissenting state AG and you will see MS competitors among their constituents and/or politically ambitious grandstanders who are attempting to keep the pot boiling on this issue to put their names and faces in the newspapers. I have been using computers for years and can assure you that these machines were merely word processors before Windows came along. If we want the new industry leaders to be based offshore then keep on harassing our innovators.

Sincerely,

James Brumwell (MS stockholder, I'll buy Sun & Oracle too when they put their primary emphasis on improving their products rather than placing it on trying to pull down the industry leader by court action!)

MTC–00005087

From: Robert Keating
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Leave Microsoft alone. Microsoft is the market leader in software because they make the best products. The market has voted with their dollars, and Microsoft has won the election.

Microsoft's competitors could not compete in the marketplace and are trying to use the government to help their cause. They should compete with their products instead.

Targeting Microsoft in the first place was a bad idea. This DOJ suite has contributed to the downturn of the economy. Encourage the companies of the nation rather try to throttle them.

Robert Keating
Oklahoma City, OK

MTC–00005088

From: Frank Rice
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I strongly believe that it is in the best interest of the economy and US consumers that the government settle the DOJ case against Microsoft. I find it extremely difficult to understand why the government (both federal and state) continues to pursue litigation against a company that has created thousands of much needed jobs and provided so much benefit for the consumer. Continuing this litigation will only worsen an already sluggish economy with no additional value to the consumer.

Sincerely
Frank Rice

MTC–00005089

From: Wright, Michael
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave American Business alone!!! All things being equal.it could never become as corrupt as a government.

MTC–00005090

From: shannon Gamba-Lewis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

D.O.J.—

This needs to be done with. The government should seriously have more important things to do than interfering with private enterprise. Get off their backs for the sake of the public, and stop spending tax dollars to support vindictiveness on the part of MSFT's rivals. They have done nothing but help our economy and our daily lives. Microsoft touches all our lives every day. This is America, remember? ''Land of the free''. Thank-you

Shannon Lewis
7230 Harbor Light Way
Sacramento, CA 95831
916–255–4676

MTC–00005091

From: Keith R. White
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:47 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time for the litigations to end, even though I do not believe Microsoft did anything wrong or improper, the settlement is as close to fair as we are going to see.

Keith R. White
Comp TIA A+ Certified
whitek1@airmail.net

MTC–00005092

From: Glenn Fincher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:09 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This email is to lodge my concerns regarding the settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ. PLEASE cease and desist from wasting ANY more of MY money on pursuing this frivolous suit! Microsoft is being pursued not by Justice, but by jealous competitors who are unable to bring to market satisfactory products able to compete with Microsoft in the free market. Thus, they, NOT JUSTICE has pursued this ongoing and costly suit to the detriment of free enterprise, the consumer, and untold employees in the IT industry.

It is my opinion that Microsoft has been driven unfairly to make concessions that bode well only for those faithless companies that have pursued them in the courts, not the consumer. End this charade, and allow this final settlement to put at rest the pursuit of a company that has built an industry. AOL, Sun, Netscape, Oracle and the others wish only to supplant Microsoft as the single most successful company in American history; NOT to provide any real alternative nor innovation of their own.

Glenn Fincher
Microsoft Certified System Engineer
Windows 2000 & XP MCP
InToto Technologies, Inc.
gfincher@intoto.com

MTC–00005093

From: marty-solveig@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:47 pm
Subject: Microsoft/Government Settlement

Sirs,

Please by all means end this situation. Microsoft is on our country's plus ledger with respect to our balance of payments; as is the Boeing Airplane Company and other very large companies.

From my read the settlement appears OK and it should get implemented.

This opinion from a World War 2 vet who can remember the Depression Era and can still think about assets in our national intrest.

Yours truly,
Martin Schames

MTC–00005094

From: Kevin Tracy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:58 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

As long as I can remember I have always been a user of microsoft products, and now, as a business owner, their products make up the backbone of my company. Recently, it has come to my attention that they had reached a settlement which can still be contested. While not clear what the opposition wants as an end result to the settlement, it is clear what harm could be caused to microsoft, and indirectly to my company. The longer Microsoft is busy dealing with legal issues and spending more money on them, the longer it may take for them to release an innovative new product. It may also cause a layoff of a worker.

This worker may be the one who could have saved a contract for my company through excellent and fast technical support. While this is a improbable example, the longer and more expensive the legal battle is for Microsoft, as well as perhaps any increased damages resulting from it, the more this concept becomes a reality. And this is not just my reality, there are millions of people just like me who rely on Microsoft for products and as a company. That is why I ask that you as a group to finish this as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Kevin Tracy

MTC–00005095

From: Larry Babcock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:49 pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please do what ever it takes to settle this, it has gone on long enough. The longer this litigation takes the more obvious it is about money, not fairness to the consumer. We need to move on.

MTC–00005096

From: Stu Thomas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:49 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the US government—you need to do whatever it takes to keep Microsoft in this country. They could do like American Express has done, or like Pinnacle West has done and move the operations to India. This takes you out of the picture. They could just move north less than 200 miles and you are out of the picture and what would you do for software to run your computers? What would I do? What would the people who haven't used their brains that are pushing for this do for software? Lets realize that many people would not be employed today if it were not for what Microsoft has done. While I realize that your efforts protect me and others in the industry, please consider that the money Microsoft has spent on this means that I pay more for their products and I pay more taxes. Any company must make a profit and if you cost them money, they must pass it on to the consumer. My taxes pay your salary! So lets work out a compromise that keeps Microsoft in the country.

If you want to prosecute someone or a company look to companies that hire consultants from India or Pakistan or the Philippines or Australia. They say its because of a lack of qualified applicants. That is a lie. Why can I say that? I work for a company that hires consultants from India and the last two openings that were posted had over 87 qualified applicants after very careful screening. There are literally over a thousand computer programmers in the Phoenix area alone looking for work and you and I mean you allow companies to hire consultants from another country and the money flows back to that country. It doesn't help the US or the local economy. This slowly erodes our society—it is done slow—it is done subtle—you are fooled—the communities are ruined forever. Why are the communities ruined? People go bankrupt—they are ruined over greed. And who cares about a few people? Well let this continue and it may be you. Think of the teachers from India teaching your school children! What American history, or perspective can they give your school child?

This goes on—do you have the integrity to do something about it?

MTC–00005097

From: Greg Manning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:50 pm
Subject: Tunney Act

DOJ

As a consumer, I would like to comment on the ''Public interest'' of the Microsoft litigation case. It is my opinion that further litigation would only cause harm to consumers. Given the events of the last few months, it is more important than ever to move forward in a positive manner and allow consumers and the markets work...the way this country designed them to work. The penalties put in place should allow all companies to prosper in the highly competitive, and ever changing, technology marketplace, with the end result being better products for consumers. Further litigation would only harm consumers. Close the case...move on...and let everyone get back to business.

Thank you for your time,
Gregory J. Manning

MTC–00005098

From: Mark Eden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:50 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to add my voice to the ''settle already'' column. The settlement is fair and just. Please allow the software business to get back to business. This on-going litigation only helps a few large companies and does nothing to help consumers or other competitors.

If the lingering states' litigation was actually based on protecting me I might feel

differently. It is about greed and anti-competitiveness. Using the government to try to help sales of their products is abhorrent. They should be making better products.

Thank you,
Mark Eden

MTC–00005099

From: Sharyn Verdon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:50 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this lawsuit. Enough time and money has been spent. Let's get on to something more pressing...like responsible immigration policies and tracking.

Sharyn K. Verdon

MTC–00005100

From: randaus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:49 pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

YOU THE DEPT OF JUSTICE ARE TRYING YOUR TO MAKE US A THIRD RATE COUNTRY.

YOU MAKE THE RUSSIANS PALE IN COMPARISON TO YOU.

MTC–00005101

From: Vitula Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:51 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very pleased that the DOJ and various states have come to common ground in the suit against Microsoft. I have always felt it was terribly wrong to blame a company for being successful. I understand the final settlement has not yet been reached and I hope for a prompt and complete closure in the near future. May all the companies in the United States be as successful as Microsoft!

Ida Vitula Green
22506 SE Highland Circle
Issaquah, WA 98029–5207
12–31–2001

MTC–00005102

From: Jason D. Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:52 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I just wanted to voice my opinion that it is in the public's best interest to allow the Microsoft settlement to go through.

Thanks,
Jason D. Miller

MTC–00005103

From: Shelley Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:52 pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

I am not a computer whiz and I could only parrot statements and articles others have written about the Microsoft case. The best that I can do is tell you how scared I am about the things I read about what Microsoft could do if not held back—the control over ME they could eventually have—and all the other little guys in the USA. My understanding is that they are hoping to crush the Internet freedoms provided by other browsers and have total control.

No one or no company should have total or nearly total control over anything in our country. Isn't that what outlawing monopolies is all about? What has happened in our country that we no longer protect and encourage the little guy? Why does Microsoft need so much control and/or so much money?

''Settling'' the problem with ''free'' computers to schools sounds noble, but to me it's just another way to capture another segment of the computer world. It's interesting that Microsoft's recent attempts at operating systems (the ones with ''Window'' in their name) are also attempts to be as much like another operating system as they can possibly be.

Why would we want to reward a system that has ''allowed'' the hacking, worms and viruses that have crippled the whole world of computing at times? I've even read that they leave loopholes on purpose so they can heroically ''fix'' them later.

Please, please consider very carefully what the outcome will be in this case. Microsoft has, after all, been found guilty of violating monopoly laws. Shouldn't the penalties be in line with those of other monopoly abusers?

Shelley Anderson

MTC–00005104

From: JOHN J JOHNSTON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:53 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

GENTLEMEN,

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. The Federal Govt. should close this case and tell the States to fall in line with the Fed Govt. settlement.

MTC–00005105

From: Stephen Cracknell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:54 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I just wanted to make certain that the DOJ decision makers were aware that there is a great deal of support for Microsoft around the country. It seems apparent that most of the commotion about monopolies and unfair practices is being generated by Microsoft's faltering competition and not by the end users. These end users are currently experiencing hyper-innovation to a point where they are beginning to complain about the pace of change in the industry. Please focus your energies on industries that are clearly being driven by unhealthy monopoly practices like the airline industry's International Airline and Transportation Association (IATA) who's primary role is to fix prices. Also please crack down on the major airlines' oligopoly practices used to squeeze startup airlines out of business.

Stephen

MTC–00005106

From: Larry Davenport
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 5:58 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very much NOT in favor of the settlement you have negotiated with Microsoft. It appears that once again, Microsoft has outwitted the DOJ. It seems that the DOJ is more interested in a quick settlement than a just one. For those of us who must do business with Microsoft, and we must since that have a monopoly position, we know that it is their actions and not their innovations that are a corner stone of their marketing practices. Just look at their latest policies for upgrades.

You must reverse your settlement and do something to eliminate the monopolistic position that Microsoft exploits.

Lawrence G. Davenport
Executive Vice President & CIO
Foamex International Inc.
(610) 859–3618
(610) 859–3613 Fax

MTC–00005107

From: coolcraw@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:54 pm
Subject: Microsoft:

Microsoft:

Cannot believe that the DOJ spent such little time and money on the terrorists and so much on Microsoft. (Of course before 911

Carl K. Kapikian

MTC–00005108

From: William and Gwen Fisk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 5:57 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We think The Tunney Act should be accepted. This case should be settled. It's now four years old. Our economy does not need more litigation. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for us, the industry and the American economy.

Thank you,
William & Gwen Fisk

MTC–00005109

From: Ben Vega
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:00 pm
Subject: My Public opinion

End all litigation against Microsoft.

all litigation against Microsoft is against the public interest and the capitalist system.

Benedict J. Vega

MTC–00005110

From: Joe Ciconte
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:00 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in full support of Microsoft. I belive that an American Tax Paying company has a right to make money. Being a computer professional I know that consumers have the right to choose their software (bundled or not), there are other companies that offer Microsoft Microsoft makes top of the line software and with Windows a lot of people would not have the ability to run a computer. Microsoft should not be punished for being a successful corporation.

Joe Ciconte

MTC–00005111

From: (123)USER(u)FIRSTNAME(125)
(123)USER(u)LASTNAME(125)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:01 pm
Subject: Microsoft settllement

I am of the belief that the Microsoft suit brought by the various State attorneys General should be dismissed in the interest of justice and that no further prosecution of Microsoft should occur.

Ronald
Matthews, San Diego, Ca.

MTC–00005112

From: JPW Consulting
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:02 pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Hi,

I do not agree with the terms of the Microsoft anti-trust case settlement. As a member of the software development community I am more than aware, and have suffered under Microsoft's licencing policies for several years. I especially find the ''donation'' to schools of Microsoft software to be cruel and unusual punishment. This money should be up to the schools to spend and not to force additional Microsoft products down the school's throat. Head back to the table and come up with something more than the current slap on the wrist! CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005113

From: Ben Vega
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:02 pm
Subject: MIcrosoft Setlement

End all action against Microsoft. It is NOT in the interest of the American public or Capitalism

Benedict J Vega

MTC–00005114

From: john keener
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:04 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs, To make this as simple as possible, I am asking you to allow companies in an extremely competitive and changing marketplace to do business. We don't need to have all of the restrictive practices of past decades.

Thank you for you consideration.
Regards,
John Keener
6500 Edgewood Court
Granbury, TX 76049–4318

MTC–00005115

From: GETAM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:03 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I have comments about the Microsoft Settlement. This entire matter has been out of control since the beginning. There are many companies that do business a certain way, and the customers either buy or patron the manufacturer or supplier or they do not. All of Microsoft's competition has had the same opportunity to manufacture products that the consumers will buy, but the customers do decide what they want. If Microsoft supplies a product the consumers want, they will continue to purchase it, if they fail the public, likewise, the public will let them know. This settlement is more than fair for Microsoft. To me, I feel it is totally unfair to penalize a company for going after the American dream, and providing the world with products that have excelled, and advanced the world.

The jealousy of others to go after Microsoft, cost many in the business world their businesses, and jobs. My opinion, it created most of what we deem ''the recession'' due to job losses.

I suggest, what would be a more meaningful avenue to pursue is all of the fees and surcharges American's are paying in their telephone bills, and cable bills under the FCC fee's, Universal Fee's which amount in excess of $300 annually per account. These funds were not appropriated by Congress to be taken from the consumers. These are taken from as I said Telephones, Cable, Cell Phone bills, and these are uncalled for, and robbery from all Americans. These collections are just the same as before when Americans were paying for the Spanish American War still from Phone bills recently, those funds were not repaid to Telephone subscribers either. This is something that does need investigation and cleaning up.

Please end the unjust Microsoft ordeal, it is a total waste of the taxpayers money, and has cost America dearly in jobs and businesses. Again, I feel strongly, the consumer will purchase what they wish, leave the manufactures to make the best they can offer, and allow the public to choose. The ones that are sore at free enterprise, need to come up with ideas and products that drive the consumers to buy their products, they just need to be better, instead of fight this way. Please end the ordeal, the settlement is past being fair to those who have suffered nothing, but are jealous of ''Free Enterprise of the American dream.'' Thanks for your time. God Bless America! May 2002 bring us a very good year and blessings to all.

Sincerely,
Gerry J Slobe
CEO/President GETAM Enterprises
GETAM@aol.com
CC:GETAM@aol.com@inetgw,Hannity @foxnews.com@inetgw,Ru...

MTC–00005116

From: Sherry Berghefer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the matter of the Microsoft antitrust settlement, I have to say I disagree with the judgement. For years, I have watched the DOJ and several states (unfortunately, mine is included) waste time and money on a pointless case. Because of Microsoft's success, they are now to be penalized and I question the logic in this endeavor.

I was raised to believe that I lived in a free enterprise system and that regardless of what I did, I should do my best at it. What this case has shown us is that the free enterprise system works as long as everyone agrees to be mediocre. Success is punished, while mediocrity is lauded. What a puzzling concept.

For a time, Netscape was the predominant browser available on the market. Why? Because it was free and, for a while, more robust and user-friendly than Internet Explorer. Along comes a significant improvement in Microsoft's technology and, hold the phone, Netscape gets scared. It realizes that it can't keep up with Microsoft anymore, that it's product is nowhere near as desirable as Microsoft's. Now, instead of demanding more innovation from its programmers, Netscape ran crying to the federal government that it wasn't fair. Other companies decided to join them on the anti-Microsoft bandwagon. After all, if someone is making you look bad, it's easier to push them out of the picture than it is to change yourself.

What I wonder is whether anyone has thought about how Microsoft came to be so dominant? The answer is simple: consumers.

Consumers want something that works the way they want it to at a reasonable price. Microsoft now offers that. I didn't used to like Microsoft's products. They were cumbersome, bloated and were not designed with the user in mind. They learned from their mistakes, though, and have created very robust and easy-to-use programs. I've tried many of the other options out there, and have to say, that I'm very unimpressed. All these other companies have apparently devoted too much of their R&D money to pursuing the big, bad giant. Meanwhile, consumers have been moving away from the so-so software and going to something they know works. Microsoft has implemented a consumer wish list for their products. Other companies just sit back and whine.

I would suggest that perhaps the government should take the time to see how many consumers are really feeling put-out by Microsoft's success. I would wager that the vast majority of consumers feel that this entire pursuit is unwarranted.

Sincerely,
Sherry Berghefer
Nevada, Iowa
slbergh@home.com

MTC–00005117

From: Andy Baldwin
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

As an IT professional I would like to cast my $.02 worth on the Microsoft Anti-trust settlement.

First and foremost I have always been of the opinion that the lawsuit should never have been brought in the first place. The reasons are numerous but the best way I have been able to voice my view is by means of an analogy. If I were a headlight manufacture and I as a businessman signed a contract with my clients to provide an alternate headlight to the standard headlight deployed on a Chevrolet car and I was making money doing so I would be set for a long time financially. Then one year Chevrolet changes their body style (without consulting me first of course) and my headlights no longer work without the clients doing some modifications to their cars then what is my course of action?

In the case of Netscape they sued to make Microsoft change their product to more easily accept Netscape software. This is much like me in the above analogy suing Chevrolet to change their new car model to accept my old headlights. What should happen is that I as

a business man should adapt my product to work with the new model OR start manufacturing a car of my own that comes with my headlights standard. Netscape could do the same.....

If your product is harder to install or does not function properly with the new versions of Windows then create an OS of your own and try to buy into the market, not use taxpayer money to have the government order a private business to change and accept a product that was created and modified and relies on certain things in Windows to work. Netscape has modified their software to run under Linux, Unix, Mac OS and you do not hear them gripe when Mac changes their OS and software needs updating.

I would love to see yet another OS on the market that can perform and is supported like Windows. Personally we have tried to use things like Linux but found that the OS is harder to use for end users and much more difficult to maintain. We have elected not to use it for these reasons. The point here is that we made a financial decision to not use an ALMOST free OS because it does not perform at the same level as Windows.

You always hear about the patches and fixes being release for MS software. MMMMM .....Readhat has release at least 3 version this last year and a multitude of security and bug fixes along side these versions.

If you want to write software that relies on a 3rd party OS or 3rd party software and that manufacture changes something that disables your tool then you have a choice. Change your product to work or STOP RELYING ON THE 3RD PARTY ALL TOGETHER!

Why is Microsoft at the top of the food chain? In my opinion it is because the founders had a dream, a goal, and did what it took to accomplish that goal. Mind you this was done in a time when your average Joe Person had no idea what a computer was. When this turned into a windfall of financial rewards, those who did not latch on to the possibilities cry foul and ask the government to step in and give them a piece of the pie that they were not fore-thoughtful enough to cut into in the beginning.

If this lawsuit goes on then I plan on asking the government to step in on my behalf. A decade ago a company called Wal-Mart went public. I did not think it would amount to much so I did not buy stock in the company. Now I think I am entitled to the profits that I COULD have reaped had I invested. Is the government going to use taxpayer money to help me recover my ''LOSS''? I don't think so. Neither should the government be stepping in to help companies that did not perform when they should have been to recover their so called ''LOSSES''.

To sum up the reason for this email I would like to encourage DOJ to accept the courts rulings, and most of all put this lawsuit to rest for good. In other words ACCEPT IT and MOVE ON. This goes for the 9 greedy states that are standouts from accepting the offer for whatever reason they stated. Think of the possibilities that all the funds (taxpayer money) used in the frivolous pursuit of Microsoft could have been used for. All the real DOJ interest such as home law enforcement, national safety, public safety, and other endeavors. For instance think about how quickly things like the Ford / Firestone problem could have been identified if DOJ had gone after them instead of private individuals who finally got the Transportation Safety Administration involved.

Think about the possibility of a much lower crime rate if that money had been used by state and local law enforcement. Think about the backlog of cases that could have been prosecuted in the last 4–5 years. After all this I would once again as a voter and a taxpayer HIGHLY ENCOURAGE you to accept the Court findings (including the 9 stand out states) and move on to more important endeavors.

Andrew Baldwin
Programmer/Analyst
Anatel Corporation
abaldwin@anatel.com
<mailto:abaldwin@anatel.com> 303.417.8149

MTC–00005118

From: Edward Kalabus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:08pm
Subject: M/S Settelment

Dear US Government:

The Microsoft penalty should be far more harsh and should be cold hard cash, a penalty they would understand. The current XP operating system shows there is no contrition what so ever by this certified monopoly.

Ed Kalabus
607 Thunderbird Dr.
Prescott, Az 86303

MTC–00005119

From: Cranham@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

New Year's Eve, 2001.

Your Honour(s), Ladies and Gentlemen of the District Court, and anyone else relevant:

Re: The Microsoft situation

First, for the record, I am not a Microsoft shareholder, employee, or otherwise have any interest in the Company, except that occasionally I purchase (and duly license) its products for my small business purposes. Second, please let me be transparent and state that I believe that Microsoft has been dealt with harshly. There is ample evidence that the Company's competitors have been, and continue during this comment period, to be instigators.

Third, the Company's products are a tremendous facilitator of the small business owner, including all the interchangeability and cross-referencing between programs that can be accomplished. Lastly, my view is that the time has come to cease all the litigation. If there is an end to this matter, after the Appeals Court ruling, then fine, regardless if one thinks it too harsh.

This country is in danger from terrorists and other economic constraints. We need all our economic, legal, and judicial power to be constructive and progressive in times like this. So let us have the settlement finalised at the end of this commentary period, let us get on with the pursuit of our true enemies, and let us rebuild from the damage of 2001. These goals will be greatly aided by getting our economy going again.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you may have with regard to verifying this public comment. My office (Pacific time) is (760) 930–0500 -0520(fax).

Yours very truly
Anthony W Fox
President
EBD Group
6120 Paseo del Norte, J2
Carlsbad CA
92009

MTC–00005120

From: Rob Foster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The whole Microsoft issue has been carried on for far too long at your countries tax payers? expense, it is time to come to a settlement whereby the public are the winners. I believe the settlement outlined appears to be acceptable to all parties and should be adopted as early as possible. I have not always agreed with Microsoft's policies but they have been handled completely unfairly during this ongoing farce ? it is time to put an end to it

Best Regards
Rob Foster
Foster Information Services
web: www.fis-uk.comHYPERLINK ''http://www.fis-uk.com/''
email: rob@fis-uk.com
tele: +44(0)7710 255561
fax: +44(0)1784 488142

MTC–00005121

From: michael govern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:12pm
Subject: Den of Thieves

What share of market do the pirates have? In China, it is some where around 90%—almost the same for Latin America. The Court, Media, & Microsoft Haters never address this issue. If Penfield Jackson says that MSFT has a 90% share, it must be true. If Judge Edwards says MSFT has a 90% share, it must be true. If Clinton said he did not sleep with that woman, it must be true.

MTC–00005122

From: EBrauer712@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please!! Enough is enough. If you're interested in ability of the consumer to receive the best at the least cost, continuing this lawsuit is not the way to do it. Allowing certain companies with agendas of their own to push for the continuation is not fair to the public, who are the only ones (besides Microsoft) who will suffer. Please end this thing.

Thank you,
Adrienne Brauer

MTC–00005123

From: Walter Ullengren
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:18pm
Subject: Freedom

To whom it may concern,

Listen folks you still have the best product out there and that should what it's all about! If you our blocking somebody's else's dream well then that's another story!

E.O.M

MTC–00005124

From: Timothy Gorski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

While I am generally sympathetic with businesses that choose to make their own decisions in the marketplace, I am very concerned that the DOJ is setting Microsoft free to engage in new and greater abuses of its monopoly power. In particular, I see now that Microsoft's new XP operating system *forces* users to upgrade, is configured to interfere with the users' ability to upgrade their hardware components, and that these features appear to be primarily designed to wring cash out of users of the Microsoft XP products. Microsoft has said right along that it's Windows operating system should be thought of just like an automobile—their favorite comparison.

But what automobile forces its users to purchase additional modifications from the manufacturer? What automobile quits working when the owner puts in new upholstery or makes other changes to the vehicle? I urge you to reopen the Microsoft case and consider these continued and, from the looks of it, planned bigger abuses of Microsoft's monopoly power with respect to PC operating systems.

Respectfully,
Tim Gorski MD

MTC–00005126

From: CHARLES CLAYWELL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the Department of Justice or government and a group of people including the judge that first tried the case, and the state attorney generals that joined the case and the news media with their lip service in general, all were banded together because they could not compete. Microsoft was treating the public fairly plus doing a better job of developing new software at a better price then their competition. I think it is time for everyone to tiptoe away and let Microsoft do an even better job than they have before.

Thank you,
Charles F. Claywell

MTC–00005127

From: Charles Romanus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

Please bring this case to a final conclusion. it ahs gone on long enough and we need to concentrate our national efforts and resources in other areas. I highly recommend that the DOJ and all of the States involved in the Microsoft case mutually agree with the settlement that has been accepted by the DOJ.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and Happy New Year,

Charles F. Romanus
595 Eat Gate Drive
Thomasville, GA 31757

MTC–00005128

From: Richard F Schneider
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement in fair to all concerned and this should be settled without further litigation. We need Microsoft back doing what they do best and not spend any more time in the courts. They have enough good computers to keep progress on a path forward to keep the US computer industry up to or ahead of the rest of the world.

R.F. Schneider

MTC–00005129

From: ragweed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer user. I hope the Microsoft case can be finally settled. The uncertainty has hurt the market place and the consumer. I am a Microsoft supporter; I am also a Sun, HP, Motorola, and Apple stock holder and just updated my Real Networks Real One software. I use a lot of Microsoft software but I use Quicken, Corel Draw and other none Microsoft software. I use Windows XP, I have been a beta tester for Microsoft and I have been impressed by the work done to obtain compatibility with software from various sources. I have both the Microsoft and the Netscape browsers on my computer. I choose which software I use. I welcome Microsoft adding perks to its software, but if other companies make better products, I use them. I hope the computer industry can concentrate in building better solutions for the consumer instead of legal arguments.

David Shulan
ragweed@msn.com

MTC–00005130

From: Greg Post
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am firmly in favor of the proposed settle of the Microsoft Anti-Trust case. As a small business computer consultant, I rely on Microsoft to provide operating systems and applications that work well together. The only thing that I saw Microsoft do wrong was in their dealings with OEMs. OEMs should be free to install whatever operating system they want without fear of any reprisal from Microsoft. The settlement agreement adequately addresses this issue.

There is nothing wrong with any of the Microsoft products in how they present them in an integrated fashion. Yes, they should be complete in the their disclosures of how the operating system works, eg. a complete API disclosure, but the settlement agreement adequately addresses this issue. In my business I work with a lot of regular users, people who aren't heavy duty technical types but just people who want to get something accomplished with their computer. All of the improvements that I've seen Microsoft make in Windows have been toward the end of making the computer easier to use. The same cannot be said of all other software/hardware vendors although there are exceptions. The chaos in the computer industry that would have resulted without Microsoft's leadership and standard setting (even defacto standards) have been largely mitigated by Microsoft's ability to freely innovate and produce good products. A simple example is CD-RW technology. Before Windows XP, there was no good user interface standard for how to create CD-RW disks. With Windows XP handling the disk creation, all the different user interfaces are gone and users can now easily, intuitively create CD-RW. AND they can help other Windows XP users do the same.

Thank you,
Gregory Post
Cedarose Consulting

MTC–00005131

From: Neale, Miles
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 12/31/01 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a user of Microsoft products for over 16 years, a developer of software, and a native born American I would like to see the Microsoft Anti-trust case settled. The action of the Government on behalf of the people was warranted and the settlement that is currently in place should be finalized. As a long standing application developer and data manager, I feel that leaving Microsoft in tact is the prudent and necessary action. Making two or three companies out of the one company would be an unnatural and abhorrent decision. Let the company over time grapple with this issue, we might find in the future a division that would be natural and logical. Historically we have noted that when an external mediator or arbitrator, who is not intimately involved with software development, gets into the process and initiates decisions, the lack of in-depth experience and knowledge will most often cause damage to all sides represented in the decision. In short, a person or organization who has limited knowledge or a vested interest to divide or not to divide, then the people get shorted. We should eliminate this shorting of the American public and let this thing play out. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this.

Miles Neale
Data Administrator
Wash State Dept of Ecology
360–407–6592—Voice
360–407–6493—Fax
''If there is a way in, there is a way out.''

MTC–00005132

From: Jim Paxton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement, I believe it is fair-minded, tough and well within reason. Any further delays, or negative actions could cause additional harm to the US economy.

I sincerely believe that is in the US consumer's best interest to put this issue behind us.

Thank You
James Paxton
1351 Rosenkranz Rd

Tieton, WA 98947

MTC–00005133

From: Richard Jennings
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Section E of the agreement only covers communication between two products on a Microsoft platform. The definition should be expanded so APIs can be extended across operating system platforms.

MTC–00005134

From: Bruce Hagen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Have we come to the point that we must punish those that excel? I hope not. The previous DOJ cost all of us a ton of money only because they hated success and had a twisted understanding of the computer business. If it was not for what Bill Gates has accomplished we'd still all be stuck with operating systems such as CPM and computers would only be for the Geeks.

Bruce Hagen

MTC–00005135

From: Michael Jacquet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

Enough is Enough, you have wasted MILLIONS of U.S. Citizens tax payer dollars litigating an absolute obserd law suite against Microsoft Coporation over the last four years. As a U.S. taxpayer, and a Microsoft share holder I strongly urge you to accept the settlement terms both parties agreed to earlier this year and fight FOR the fair and equatable settlement both parties reached in future court hearing. I cannot believe that a few special interest groups and some lazy competitors are trying to derail this long sought after settlement.

Enough is Enough, quit wasting my TAX Dollars !!!!

Regards
Mike Jacquet
Concerned Citizen

MTC–00005136

From: Tom Shipley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am a user of personal computers—since 1977. Before Microsoft got involved. I used WordPerfect until Microsoft Word overtook it. I used Lotus until Microsoft Excel outperformed it.Buy all of the old files have always been accessible with Microsoft's products. I think that we should continue to have the advances that Microsoft has been continually introducing. I speak purely from the standpoint of a user and I don't think you are getting enough input from users. We are too busy—and that's too bad.

Tom Shipley
tom@tshipley.cnchost.com

MTC–00005137

From: EFchristi@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom it May concern,

I am a Microsoft OS user, not because it was on my computer when I bought it, because I found it was the only system offered that is user friendly. All the other system I have experience with are very hard to work with and not very friendly when you make mistakes. I have had the opportunity to change my OS and browser to Linex and Netscape, Unix and Oricle, and several others, but I didn't because I use these system at work and find they do not handle user mistakes very well.

In my opinion, and I know my opinion and 75 cents might get you a cup of coffee in the cafeteria, Microsoft has brought the computer industry forward by leaps and bounds. It has come along way in the past 20 years. I remember when the home computer was just a dream, now just about every husehold can afford one. I have five and all of them have Microsoft systems installed. My original Apple II, is of no comparison to what these computers can do today.

I think the settlement with Microsoft is fair and just.

Sincerely,
Edwin F. Christian
P.O. Box 669
Scottsville, TX 75688–0669
E-mail: efchristi@aol.com
Phone: 903–934–8226
Fax: 903–934–8607

MTC–00005138

From: Onetonyc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

I am one who wishes to voice my opinion about the ''Tunney Act.'' The Tunney Act, provides for a fair and just settlement for those involved in the lawsuit. Please see your way clear to move ahead with the settlement as outlined in the Tunney Act and give Microsoft back their right to pursue commerce in the competitive business they have chosen to engage. Any further delay will add to the already bogged down economic crisis we are experiencing.

Let Microsoft do what they do best, innovate and invigorate the computer industry.

Sincerely,
Tony Chalupnik
San Diego, CA

MTC–00005139

From: bob@osterhout.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir;

Please LEAVE Microsoft along! They are the best thing we have to keep the PC industry going.

Thank You!
Robert Osterhout

MTC–00005140

From: Richard Dauphine
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I do not think Microsoft has done anything wrong and that the U.S. Department of Justice should settle the case and move on to matters of national importance, not repressing innovation.

Richard Dauphine

MTC–00005141

From: MORRIS KAY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:53pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom It May Concern:

It appears to me that this litigation has been going long enough. The settlement agreement, in my opinion, is fair to all parties involved. Let's bring this action to a conclusion NOW....

Morris Kay

MTC–00005142

From: Paul van Ast
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:53pm
Subject: microsoft setlement

Please approve settlement

MTC–00005143

From: jimlab2
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

To Whom It May Concern:

We are sick of the ''grandstanding'' of a few businesses and the government officials that support them and cater to them because of political contributions. The Microsoft prosecution caused the current recession (commonly known as the Clinton/Reno economy) and the quick settlement of this case is a must to get our economy back on track. It is way beyond time to move on and there are only a few people in the country that feel that Microsoft has hurt anyone. The real reason for the suit was they were not contributing to the Democrat Party. Plain and simple. Settle it now!

R. James Labyak
Irene L. Labyak
6142 NE 154th St
Kenmore, WA 98028–4333
CC:Congressman Jay Inslee,President George W Bush, Sen...

MTC–00005144

From: Marlin Ritchie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ;

I think Microsoft has been punished enough with the settlement that they have offered to agree to. I think that this trial has been driven by disgruntled competitors and the by the states where they are located. I further think that AOL-Time Warner and Comcast are just as guilty in not sharing their cable control thus preventing competition in the cable communication field.

Settle for what Microsoft has offered to do in response to the law suit and give them the room to continue to innovate in the area of software development in a way that will not stifle the development of software that the consumers need in a reasonable time frame. Do not load them down with legal

bureaucratic oversight that is not required for their competitors and that adds cost to the consumer. A concerned US citizen,
Marlin Ritchie

MTC–00005145

From: Robert B. Yonaitis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it may concern,
I have followed the Microsoft Case for Some time. I believe in the beginning there was no harm to the consumers and no harm to the competitive environment that helps the consumer. I wanted to take this moment to state that I think that the settlement reached was extremely fair and that Microsoft and the DOJ did excellent work in reaching the settlement. I believe it is excellent for the consumer and the collaborative and competitive environment that innovation requires.
Best Regards,
Rob Yonaitis
CEO
HiSoftware Inc.
www.hisoftware.com

MTC–00005146

From: Alex Kaufman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:16pm
Subject: My comments on MSFT
I firmly believe that the issue that our country should have with monopolies is monopolistic power that can be used to raise prices while subsequently lowering standards. This kind of abuse is simply not happening with Microsoft. They are constantly on the ball and coming out with better and better software. Granted, it is extremely difficult to beat the Microsoft empire, but the empire is not yet an evil one by any account. From the consumer standpoint, Microsoft has been a beneficiary for small and large corporations alike. My father could not have started his own business without the excellent tools provided by Microsoft. I really don't care if MSFT took Netscape's market share away, if you had ever used Netscape you'd know it was a crummy browser compared to IE. It is not Microsoft that has engaged in anti-competitive practices, but rather our government has done so by bringing this lawsuit against the company. Competition breeds excellence. Why would MSFT not want to use every means possible to squash its competitors? That is just what competition is all about. Gates realized that the OS battle would be a winner-take-all one. He won. He receives the spoils of war. Now he has stayed on top of his game yet again by identifying the internet as a potential threat and directing the machinery of Microsoft to fully take advantage of the opportunities it provides. The Internet battle is slowly being won by MSFT as well, and why shouldn't they? To the victor go the spoils. Please settle the suit against MSFT quickly, because Bill Gates has done nothing but see to it that the industry gets better and better.
Alex Kaufman

MTC–00005147

From: DanSorkin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir or Madame,
As a citizen of the USA I implore you to release the Microsoft Corporation from the tyranny of the past Administration's war on Capitalism. Microsoft should be able to move freely to compete in the open marketplace. May the BEST product win.
The settlement in this case should be a blanket dismissal of all charges.
This paragon of American Free Enterprise should be held up as a model for all to emulate. It should not be emasculated in any way. To do so would be to say to the world WE DO NOT BELIEVE IN THE AMERICAN DREAM.
Thank you!
Dan Sorkin
President & CEO
GFFC, Inc.
2109 Skycrest Drive
Suite one
Walnut Creek, CA 94595–1828
(925) 952–4408

MTC–00005148

From: Dwight Bale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
To: DOJ
Don't you people have anything better to do than to do as much as you can to make some other lawyers richer...
Please start working on monopolies such as gas and electric companies like PSE in Seattle area, who have no competition whatsoever.
Please start doing something for the ''public'' and let big business fight for themselves. They got the money, let them spend it on themselves. But you should be helping us...

MTC–00005149

From: John Reese
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
As an end user I feel the settlement is fair for Microsoft. I don't even think there was a case against them from the start.
As a Customer I've always been treated fair and am very happy with their products and support.
Thanks for reading this,
John Reese
Sacramento, CA USA

MTC–00005150

From: jerrystuart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,
As a user of Microsoft products for years, I am quite satisfied with the terms of the DOJ's proposed settlement with MS and would like to see all further effort to litigate stopped. Please let us all get back to our work and lives and move ahead.
Jerry Bonow
Pompano Beach, Florida

MTC–00005151

From: Paul Wheeler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:35pm
Subject: Settlement Agreement
I support Microsoft's position in the settlement.
I am not an employee of Microsoft nor compensated in ANY fashion by Microsoft. I have been in the computer industry over 25 years and have seen a lot things come and go. The worst of which is when I have worked hard for a company only to see them close their doors for any of a variety of reasons. Starting the job search and starting at the bottom again and again gets old. I have seen the industry ignore a lot of activities FAR WORSE than Microsoft's behavior, which I will not list here, but I could.
My position is, our US Justice Dept. should go in the direction of what the majority of the industry and litigants WANT and AGREE to. Special interests risk softening an industry and economy that needs STABILITY. If you have chanced jobs a bunch of times like I have, not by choice but because you were laid-off, you will know what I am talking about.
I feel we should clarify and re-clarify and re-clarify computer laws so that they are FAIR and apply them EQUALLY in the industry. Keep POLITICS out of the computer industry. I support Microsoft's position and whatever they agree to.
Thank you and God Bless America.
Paul A Wheeler,
MCSE NT 4.0, A+, MOUS certifications. (currently studying for Cisco's CCNA)
y2kpaul@tns.net

MTC–00005152

From: JACK FORD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
It is my opinion that the current settlement arrangements are as fair and just as possible. There is nothing to be gained and much to be lost in prolonging this matter further.
Jack Ford
14690 Fame Ave.
Colfax, IA 50054

MTC–00005153

From: PAUL NOLL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:45pm
Subject: Settlement
Microsoft has helped Americans like myself, but if you no settlement favors Microsoft,then only wealthy other Ceo's and their companies will enrich themselves at the sacrifice of our economy. As an average (or below average) American, Microsoft has made my life better, so please give them the proper settlement.
Thank you,
Paul E. Noll

MTC–00005154

From: Ron Jenkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 7:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sir(s)

I work in the Computer Industry and after many months of watching and listening to the DOJ vs Microsoft, enough is enough. Did Microsoft participate in illegal practices, I feel we can safely say yes.

Did they hurt other inferior products, I doubt it it. Should this mess be settled and go away and stop spending my money on the company that helps feed my family as it is the premier player in my industry, ABSOLUTELY! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

If the DOJ spent as much time and effort prosecuting real criminals who seem to always get off on technicalities this would be a much safer place to live. Instead we have several individuals who wanted dot make a name for themselves, and did. So they have accomplished their objective. Let's move on.

Ron Jenkins

Knoxville, TN

MTC–00005155

FROM: Ray Parsons
TO: MS ATR
DATE: 12/31/01 8:01pm
SUBJECT: Microsoft Settlement

We, [the voting public] think this has gone far enough. It is a very waste of money to let this gone any longer. Get this done, now.

A voter,

Ray Parsons

MTC–00005156

From: Ganesh and Sashikala Prasad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 6:11pm
Subject: Comments on the proposed antitrust settlement 01 January 2002

Dear Sirs,

I wish to submit my comments (attached) to the database of public feedback on the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft, which must reach you before the 27th of January.

I am submitting them in both plaintext and HTML formats for your convenience.

Regards,

Ganesh Prasad

Sydney 1 January 2002

Dear Sirs,

I am an Australian citizen with about 15 years in the computer industry. What happens in the US vs. Microsoft antitrust case affects me professionally as well as personally, since I am a fairly heavy user of computer software and technology. I would like to comment on the settlement jointly proposed by the Department of Justice and Microsoft. To be blunt, I believe the proposal is a dishonest one that sells out the public interest. I will explain why, and offer some guidelines for a fairer remedy.

1. Microsoft's main crime (not bundling, but the prevention of bundling) has had lasting anti-competitive effects that the settlement should address but doesn't The argument that has most often been used against Microsoft is the ''bundling'' one, the allegation that Microsoft bundled its browser (and now its media player and instant messaging software) with its operating system. By doing so, it leveraged its monopoly in operating systems to enter other markets. Though this is a classic antitrust argument, people who believe in a free market are not convinced because the remedy does not sound right from the standpoint of the consumer interest. Consumers enjoy greater convenience, not less, when extra software is bundled with the operating system they buy. That is why the harsher remedy proposed by some of the states is also wrong. Forcing Microsoft to unbundle such software needlessly inconveniences the consumer. It also takes away from Microsoft's legitimate right to decide what goes into its products and puts the courts in the avoidable position of having to define the scope of technologies such as operating systems when they are not technically qualified to do so. The only parties that are benefitted by such a remedy are competitors. Doesn't this add credibility to Microsoft's claim that its competitors are inefficient and require government intervention to survive?

However, the prosecution has failed from the start to argue this point with the right emphasis. What Microsoft did that seriously disadvantaged the consumer was not so much bundling its own browser with its operating system, but preventing computer resellers (OEMs) from offering consumers a choice by bundling competing browsers such as Netscape Navigator. Microsoft threatened OEMs such as Compaq with the withdrawal of their Windows 95 license if they dared to bundle Netscape Navigator with the PCs they sold. Given the overwhelming dominance of Windows 95 in the operating system market at that time, a withdrawal of that license could have bankrupted even an OEM as large as Compaq. The threat was credible and secured the compliance of all OEMs. So certainly, Microsoft did leverage its monopoly in operating systems to gain entry into the browser market, and it did so both through the relatively benign means of bundling its own browser, and by the decidedly illegal means of preventing consumers from sampling the wares of its competitors. Any free market advocate can readily see the consumer harm in this latter action of Microsoft's, but the prosecution has damaged its own case by not emphasising this enough.

Microsoft has also had secret agreements with OEMs that prevent them from offering consumers the choice of which operating system to boot when they start up their computers. This is often known as the ''bootloader clause''. Microsoft abused its monopoly in operating systems by threatening OEMs and blocking, at the source, the entry of other operating systems into the market. Consumers have had no opportunity to know about or sample competing operating systems. In other words, Microsoft abused its operating system monopoly to maintain that monopoly, which is another violation of antitrust law. The fact that no OEM except IBM dared to testify against Microsoft during the trial is itself proof of Microsoft's terror tactics. Their silence speaks louder than any testimony.

Microsoft's history is full of such anti-competition and anti-consumer actions. Bristol Technology won a case against Microsoft (over Microsoft's sudden withdrawal of support for their Unix interoperation software Wind/U) but was awarded a laughably poor compensation of one dollar. Caldera had a strong case against Microsoft (over the illegal way in which Microsoft used Windows 3.1 to force consumers to buy MS-DOS rather than Caldera's DR-DOS) but its silence was bought through an out-of-court settlement. The consumer has been the ultimate loser in all these cases because Microsoft's actions removed competitive choice and interoperation options.

The DoJ's proposed settlement shows an awareness of these abuses and aims to prevent their recurrence, but it needs to be far stronger and bolder. The damage to the industry has been done systematically, over more than a decade, and significant network externalities have been created that work to perpetuate the Microsoft monopoly. How can this damage be reversed by a mere forward-looking arrangement? Consumers and Microsoft's competitors now face nearly insurmountable market hurdles to creating a viable alternative computing environment, even though technically good alternatives are available. Even if Microsoft's abuses are halted, the structural and systemic forces they have created over the past decade will continue to work in their favour. At a time when consumers look to the government to right these historical wrongs, the settlement that the government proposes is inexplicably defeatist. It resigns consumers to the status quo! One would imagine that a prosecution that has had its argument upheld by two courts would have the momentum, confidence and real power to broker a deal that restores genuine choice to the consumer, not step lightly around an entrenched monopoly that was the problem to start with.

2. A criminal should not be allowed to keep his ill-gotten gains Microsoft's monopoly profits are the direct result of these and other illegally anti-competitive tactics.

The antitrust case established that the absence of competition emboldened Microsoft into charging $89 for Windows instead of $49. In other words, consumers paid extra merely because of a monopoly that was being illegally maintained. Four eminent economists filed an amicus curiae brief during the remedies phase of the trial in which they showed that Microsoft's rate of return on invested capital was 88%, while the average in other industries was about 13%! [See www.econ.yale.edu/nordhaus/homepage/Final%20microsoft%20brief.pdf] Microsoft could never have made such huge profits without its illegal maintenance and extension of its monopoly, and therefore a major part of its current wealth is illegally earned.

There is absolutely nothing in the proposed settlement that addresses the issue of these ill-gotten gains, or how these will be reimbursed to the public from whose pockets they came. This simple omission easily amounts to billions of dollars, and by itself makes the settlement a sellout of the public interest, even without an assessment of its other shortcomings.

3. Ill-gotten gains should not be allowed to influence the outcome of this case It is disturbing to read that many states are settling because they are running out of funds to pursue the case further as they would like to. Meanwhile, Microsoft, with its multi-billion dollar war chest, has no such

constraints. They can outlast all their opponents. The world is learning the cynical lesson that the American justice system is a mere extension of the free market—you get as much justice as you can afford to pay for.

What happened to the principle (so successfully applied in the A1 Capone case) that criminals should not be able to use their ill-gotten gains to pay for their legal defence? Wouldn't a scrupulous application of that principle prevent the distortion we see here? If a convicted abusive monopolist has more funds than its prosecutors, and that fact is forcing them to settle, can't the monopolist's funds be frozen, or can it not be made to pay the legal costs of its prosecutors? A simple ruling along those lines might see Microsoft scrambling to agree to a fairer settlement, one that will better safeguard the freedom of the consumer.

4. There is no attempt at punishment for wrongdoing Though it has been established that Microsoft has repeatedly broken the law, the settlement only defines mechanisms to prevent future wrongdoing. What about punishment for past wrongdoing? Are murderers let off scot free with mere provisions to prevent future murders? What kind of example does this set? And what confidence does this inspire in the American justice system? Any remedy must include appropriate punishment.

5. The economy is being used as a bogeyman to prevent punishment It is being argued that in the current difficult economic climate, Microsoft should not be broken up or otherwise punished, because that will in turn affect the rest of the economy (through a fall in the stockmarket index, a delay in the recovery of hardware sales, more unemployment and hardship, etc.). On the contrary, the lessons of Economics are that monopolies are always bad.

They reduce efficiency, innovation and economic activity. In other words, Microsoft's monopoly has already affected the economy adversely. An end to the Microsoft monopoly may result in some churn, but that churn will be the ferment of genuine innovation from the rest of the industry. The impact on the stockmarket from a fall in Microsoft's share price will be more than offset by the rising stocks of independent software companies that can operate without fear of a monopolist's wrath. A decisive curbing of Microsoft's stifling influence will create more confidence in the rule of law, generate more jobs and help the economy.

Therefore, it is dishonest and self-serving on the part of the DoJ to suggest that this settlement proposal is the best one from the viewpoint of the economy. Moreover, the state of the economy should not determine whether or not a crime should be punished. It takes a statesmanlike judge to see beyond the petty posturing and to do the right and wise thing.

Guidelines for a fair remedy:

Any remedy in a case that has been so clear-cut in its findings must be more assertive in its defence of consumer interests. Regardless of specifics, such a remedy must address the following:

1. Recurrence: Microsoft must not be able to continue to abuse its monopoly the way it has in the past.

2. Reimbursement: Microsoft has no right to retain the excess profits it has earned as a result of its illegal actions. This money should be repaid to the consumer.

3. Reparations: As Microsoft is responsible for the current uncompetitive market in operating systems and related applications, it must underwrite efforts to restore competition and consumer choice. The rest of the market should not have to pay to recover from Microsoft's abuses.

4. Reference: Microsoft must pay punitive damages over and above its reimbursement and reparations obligations, to serve as a warning to deter future monopolists. The remedy must in no case send out a signal that a large enough violator can get off lightly. Future tax dollars can be saved by discouraging abuses instead of having to prosecute them. The DoJ is supposed to be acting on behalf of the consumer, and they must pursue a remedy that addresses all the above issues.

For example, a remedy that required Microsoft, among other things, to only sell through channels that offer at least one other operating system, could address the reparations issue and break the structural forces perpetuating their monopoly (If an OEM requires training to support another operating system, Microsoft may be forced to subsidise such training).

The proposed settlement goes partway towards addressing the issue of recurrence, but does so only half-heartedly because it creates significant exceptions and loopholes for Microsoft to take advantage of. It completely ignores the other three issues. An impression is created that the DoJ is more sensitive to Microsoft's interests than to the interests of consumers who have been systematically robbed of both their choices and their money.

Therefore this proposed settlement must be rejected as not being in the public interest. History will be the judge

After the immediate tumult over this case dies down, there will be a dispassionate analysis of all aspects of the Microsoft phenomenon in the computer industry, and the roles of all players will be dissected. It seems fairly certain that the Department of Justice will be likened to a champion boxer who was paid to throw his fight. Judge Jackson will probably be faulted for his many indiscretions, but it may be remembered that his analysis was on the mark, and his verdict fearless. The appeals court will probably be remembered as being fair though it started with a reputation for being consistently lenient towards Microsoft.

What will Judge Kollar-Kotelly be remembered for? Will she be known as the one who meekly accepted an agreement that sold out the public interest, because it was politically expedient to do so? Or will she be remembered as the person who braved the prevailing political winds to do the right thing and restore balance to a corrupted system?

The world is watching to see what she will do.

Regards,

Ganesh Prasad Software developer and web architect
3/1 Doomben Avenue
Eastwood, New
South Wales 2122
Australia
Tel: +61–403–902–483 e-mail: sashi@easy.com.au

MTC–00005157

From: Tony Safina
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Public Comments

I have been using Microsoft products since the 1980's. I do not think Microsoft should be broken up. I do not think they should be punished for being successful. What ever happened to the American way? Would Horatio Alger today be considered a criminal for wanting to better his lot in life? Why does government in America encourage people to make an honest buck but once someone has earned a billion honest bucks or fifty billion honest bucks it is immediately assumed they are doing something dishonest.

I think a lot of the Microsoft brouhaha was started by cry babies at Netscape. They want the DOJ to think they invented the web browser. I am here to tell you Netscape did not invent the web browser. They improved the web browser just as every company before them improved the web browser. I know because I switch web browsers every time a better web browser becomes available.

In 1989 I did not use a web browser because the web had not been invented yet.

In 1990 the web was invented and people surfed the few web sites available using the text browser Lynx. It was free. The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice. By late 1991 the first browser for Windows was invented. It had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was a lot better than Lynx. This program was called Cello. It was free. The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice. I don't think the authors of the Lynx program tried to coerce the DOJ into suing the authors of the Cello program. I guess that is because the authors of the Cello program were not billionaires. If they had been billionaires you would have called them evil and said lets sue their sorry crass butts. I'm glad that didn't happen because change is good, especially so when a new program is a vast improvement over an earlier program. I switched to Cello the instant I saw it.

By 1992 another browser for Windows became available. It too had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was better than Cello. This program was called Winweb. It had a cooler slicker look than Cello. I don't know that it was any better than Cello, it just looked sharper. It was free. The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice. I don't think the authors of the Cello program tried to coerce the DOJ into suing the authors of the Winweb program. I guess that is because the authors of the Winweb program were not billionaires. If they had been billionaires you would have called them evil and said lets sue their sorry crass butts. I'm glad that didn't happen because change is good, especially so when a new program is a vast improvement over an earlier program. I switched to Winweb the instant I saw it.

By late 1992 or early 1993 another browser for Windows became available. It too had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was better than Winweb. This program was called Mosaic. It had a cooler slicker look than Winweb. I don't know that it was any better than Winweb, it just looked sharper; I think it could handle a wider variety of HTML tags than any web browser before it. That made better looking web pages possible, pages you could surf faster too. It was free. The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice. I don't think the authors of the Winweb program tried to coerce the DOJ into suing the authors of the Mosaic program. I guess that is because the authors of the Mosaic program were not billionaires. If they had been billionaires you would have called them evil and said lets sue their sorry crass butts. I'm glad that didn't happen because change is good, especially so when a new program is a vast improvement over an earlier program. I switched to Mosaic the instant I saw it. By mid 1993 or late 1993 another browser for Windows became available. It too had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was better than Mosaic. This program was called Netscape. It had a cooler slicker look than Mosaic. I don't know that it was any better than Mosaic, it just looked sharper; I think it could also handle a wider variety of HTML tags than any web browser before it. That made better looking web pages possible, pages you could surf faster too. It was free (at least initially, probably right up til Netscape's IPO it was free). The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice.

I don't think the authors of the Mosaic program tried to coerce the DOJ into suing the authors of the Netscape program. I guess that is because the authors of the Netscape program were not billionaires, at least not initially. If they had been billionaires you would have called them evil and said lets sue their sorry crass butts. I'm glad that didn't happen because change is good, especially so when a new program is a vast improvement over an earlier program. I switched to Netscape the instant I saw it.

By mid 1994 or late 1994 another browser for Windows became available. It too had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was not better than Netscape. This program was called Microsoft's Internet Explorer. It did not have a cooler slicker look than Netscape. I didn't like it at all and did not switch. I continued to use Netscape. As I hope to make clear I do not switch web browsers the instant a new one becomes available, I only switch when a better one becomes available. In 1994 Netscape had the best web browser available, bar none. They program was so awful they couldn't give it away, at least not to a seasoned web surfer like myself. They couldn't have paid me to use it. Well, perhaps if we were talking billions, okay millions, well I guess for just a hundred or so I would have given it a try.

By 1967 a new improved browser for Windows became available. It too had a graphical user interface (GUI) and it was better than Netscape. This program was called Microsoft's Internet Explorer IV. It had a much slicker look than Netscape and it improved the functionality of Windows as well. It was definitely better than Netscape. It didn't just look sharper, it was more functional because it worked better in Windows. Maybe it could also handle a wider variety of HTML tags. This time the authors of the previous best browser which was Netscape did try to coerce the DOJ into suing the authors of the Internet Explorer IV program. I guess that is because the authors of the Microsoft program were billionaires and they now had a great product. Netscape didn't care to sue when Microsoft had an inferior web browser which they had with Internet Explorer I, II, and III, but as soon as they had improved their product to a point where they were now better than Netscape Holy Hevell broke out. They called Microsoft evil and they whined to their Uncle Sam and said lets sue their sorry crass butts, I'm sorry that happened because change is good, especially so when a new program is a vast improvement over an earlier program. I switched to Microsoft Internet Explorer IV the instant I saw it. I switched just as I had always switched when a better web browser became available. It's being a Microsoft product meant nothing to me. What mattered was it was a better browser and I always switch when a better browser becomes available.

In Microsoft's case it was a big deal that it was free. The authors gave it away. I guess they wanted to be nice. Nobody sues people who want to be nice unless it's Microsoft that is being nice. Then suddenly it is no longer a question of nice. Now they call it criminal if your only fault is having a few billion dollars more than the next guy (or gal). This is why I decided to submit my comments today. Microsoft has done nothing but excel at what they do best, making and marketing good software products. So what if they want to give it away for free. Being a 1980's software junkie I have never paid for a web browser to this very day. I used Netscape for four years and never paid a penny for it. If you run beta versions and use ftp to download them you can use Netscape for four years and never spend a penny. Same for the Microsoft browser. I fail to see what the big deal is all about.

I think you should tell Netscape to go scratch and then drop the case against Microsoft. It should not be a punishable offense to excel at your job and that is the only thing Microsoft has done wrong. They are guilty of being too good, and that in my opinion is not a punishable offense.

Sincerely,
Anthony X. Safina, Jr.
425 S Hubbards Ln, Apt 431
Louisville, KY 40207–4097
502–899–3723
tony@iglou.com

MTC–00005158

From: GRIZ1000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If Microsoft broke the law punish them but don't reorganize them or tell them how to design their products. Ernest Ruterman, GRIZ1000@aol.com

MTC–00005159

From: Doyle E. Whitten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:08pm
Subject: Comment

I just want to say that Microsoft sometimes drives me crazy with the way they do things but they do not deserve what the previous justice department did to them. It is important that the market place be the place where the decisions are made. There are advantages to having one company for many different software programs. Let's get off their back and let the customers decide which company to support.

MTC–00005160

From: dhamm1@airmail.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Dear Sirs,

I have believed in Microsoft all along. I still believe they are innocent of any charges. However the fact that a settlement has been reached is wonderful it is about time. Lets do it drop it and move on. The economy is weak enough without penalizing one of the major contributors to this economy. It is a crime for this to proceed any further and will serve no justice.

Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion thank God we live in the United States and thank God for innovation keep on keeping on Microsoft I am behind you 100%.

David Hamm
MCSE, MCDBA, MCP and A+
dhamm1@airmail.net
Microsoft XP rules

MTC–00005161

From: NIMRIHLDGS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I would like to urge the decision makers to settle the Microsoft issue in a quick manner to remove any cloud hanging over that company and their employees, who after all are consumers in this country, and consumer is the backbone of the economy.

Andy Nimri

MTC–00005162

From: Lexx
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I have been advised that the Tunney Act requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the ''public interest.''

Unfortunately, I am aware that a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing our American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. I, for one, a Microsoft stockholder and a committed user of its products, wish that this would all be over and let's get things back to normal because to settle these matters is in the public interest, in my humble opinion. If you build

a better mousetrap, everyone else will copy it very quickly and if the competitors of Microsoft cannot compete fairly, why should the Government help them with special legislation and by burying Microsoft with lawsuits. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Please settle the cases as soon as possible.

Virginia M. Norris
10712 Highland Park Court
Las Vegas, NV 89144–4119

MTC–00005163

From: Gil Milbauer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to comment in support of the REVISED PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT settlement agreement among Microsoft Corp., the Department of Justice, and the various states who have agreed to it.

It seems to me to be more than adequate penalty Microsoft's activities. Drawing this out further would not be in the interests of justice, the economy, or consumers. I think it would be a mistake to allow the Department of Justice to become a weapon that competitors can use against successful companies.

Thank You,
Gil Milbauer
6308 154th ST SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
gilmilbauer@myrealbox.com

MTC–00005164

From: SALLYA28@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:14pm
Subject: Comment regarding Microsoft settlement

I support the current settlement with Microsoft by the Department of Justice and half of the states involved in this lawsuit. I do not think any more severe penalties are warranted. Microsoft probably deserved a little hand slapping because of the way they dealt with the computer manufacturers. But the issue surrounding the operating system improvements and add on???s is frivolous. The Internet Explorer was a needed part of the operating system and add on???s such as these should be allowed. It was also very easy for others to use Netscape if they wanted to. Bottom line is that Internet Explorer wound up being the best browser. I believe that a large part of the fuss on this issue is being made by Microsoft???s competitors who have wound up second and third best and have tried to compensate for their under performance by supporting the antitrust law suit against Microsoft. I believe that a major motivating force for the hold out states is purely political as it relates to companies in their area and political contributions.

As a consumer, I believe that Microsoft has been good to us. They have provided outstanding products at reasonable and decreasing prices. Some states would prefer that consumers buy all of the add on???s and that could be big down the road. Where Microsoft has been dominate in a particular software application, prices have fallen. I also believe that Microsoft has contributed mightily to the US economy. They have probably been the biggest contributor in the last 10 years. They should not be punished for being good to consumers and the economy. I might also add that Microsoft is a good corporate citizen.

It is time to settle this suit as the Department of Justice and Microsoft have proposed. The more harsh remedies that are being proposed by the non agreeing states should be rejected.

Sarah W. Andrews
1864 Castle Oaks Court
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

MTC–00005165

From: Ed Sackley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement—Public Comments

Dear Federal Official:

My first experience with a computer was as a high school student in 1969 . . . working at a hospital that used punch cards as input to a primitive ''computerized'' accounting system. In the years that followed, I was always around computers . . . even serving as an operator for a University of Illinois mainframe operated in support of Department of Defense research in the early to mid-70s. I've had a PC on my desk since 1982.

Why the history? It wasn't until Microsoft INSPIRED and ENABLED the necessary economy of scale in the personal computer business that computer applications and hardware became possible for every American. In the 80s, we all struggled with applications that didn't work together and companies that were unwilling or unable to stand behind their products. Our nation, our economy and all of our citizens have benefited from Microsoft's innovation and leadership. By most accounts, the company did abuse some of its power and market position and for that they have paid a price. It is now time to close this chapter and move ahead.

I urge you to support the Tunney Act and turn aside those remaining special interest groups who would have you derail the settlement. Microsoft will be under more scrutiny in the future than they have ever experienced in the past. They are a fine company that has played a significant role in America's technological dominance for over 20 years. Please allow them to devote all of their resources to improving our lives and our world.

Thank you for your consideration and understanding.

Ed Sackley
10314 Archwood Drive
Portage, MI 49002–7101 USA
Voice: 616.323.8119 Fax: 616.323.0470

MTC–00005166

From: JOSEPH
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft sentiment.

Hi,

I would like to let you know my thoughts on the microsoft question. I do not agree with the settlement. However, if it is the only way to get this behind microsoft. It has always struck me as odd the way the government tries to help the consumer. In this case, it would seem it seeks to help us by making us purchase what we clearly don't want. We know of the other browsers. We know of the other operating systems. We like Windows. You treat Microsoft as if making a good product that people want is evil.

You definately, seem to believe that it is somehow illegal. As if it is Microsoft's job to make us like their competitors? Are you kidding? Tell them that if we wanted a Yugo we would give them a call (the competitors). We want the Rolls Royce (Microsoft). You can't make us drive the Yugo. It's not what we want. We will buy Windows. We will use as many or as few browsers as we want. If they can't compete maybe they should try a different line of work. Stop punishing success. Unless of course, failure is what you're after.

Joseph morris

MTC–00005167

From: scn@san.rr.com
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 12/31/01 8:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DoJ settlement with Microsoft is fair. Don't let the renegade states that are representing competitors interest drag this case on. This negativity is detrimental to economic recovery and productivity improvements. Close this case now by accepting Microsoft's fair settlement offer.

Thank you for hearing our opinion.
William and Stephanie Necoechea
6509 Caminito Catalan
La Jolla, CA 92037

MTC–00005168

From: B. Mitchell Loebel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello:

Please pass my comments to the DOJ.

I believe that the so called anti-trust suit which was levied against Microsoft was a travesty of justice! It's promoters were disgruntled Microsoft competitors, i.e. Sun Microsystems, Apple Computer, Oracle, Netscape, Novell, and perhaps a few others. It's no coincidence that members of the hate Microsoft crowd are often affiliated with the hate America crowd ... in both cases, theirs is a hate of our Capitalist system. They are the ones to be stopped ... now! I don't always agree with Microsoft's strategies and tactics, e.g. I'm not happy about the highly restrictive licensing rules that the company is applying to WinXP. However, and this is important ... we consumers and stockholders (I am both) can care for ourselves through the free market! We don't need and don't want (usually incompetent) government intrusion.

B. Mitchell Loebel
Executive Director
The Tech Startup Connection 408 264–2068
(formerly The PARALLEL Processing Connection)
CEO and Chief Technical Officer
Multinode Microsystems Corporation 408 264–2068
CEO and Chief Technical Officer

Minute-Tape International Corporation 408 264–2068

MTC–00005169

From: Anarg Frangos
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

Please settle the Microsoft case without further litigation in the best interests of our country.

Anarg Z. Frangos

MTC–00005170

From: Evan Heckel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

As provided for under the Tunney Act, I would like to express my strong support for the current terms and conditions of the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice, the various States, and the Microsoft Corporation. I believe the terms of this proposed settlement, as well as other aspects of this litigation, strike a proper balance between enforcing the Law and maintaining the viability of the United States interest's in a strong technology sector.

I realize that there are those who would prefer stronger punishments, but I think such expansion is primarily at the behest of the competitors of Microsoft and simply is not appropriate or in the best interests of this process.

I think the proposed settlement sends the right messages about abuse of marketing position, while at the same time recognizing that dealing with evolving technology is different than dealing with simple market dominance. I think you have struck the right balance in this case and that further constraints and/or penalties are not appropriate.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on this very important matter.

Evan Heckel
1619 Corral Drive
Houston, TX 77090

MTC–00005171

From: Connie87@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to ask you to put a postive end to this horrible persecution that has been going on over the last few years of Microsoft and Bill Gates. I'm sure you do not consider it to be persecution, yet I'm sure that many man-hours of productive time and many thousands, perhaps millions, of dollars have been spent during this procedure which has seemed, too much of the time, like a witch hunt. Microsoft is competitive...otherwise they would not have survived this long. Microsoft is innovative and creative in their improvement of technology, and this has made them the giant that they are today. They are open to new ideas, to creativeness from their employees, to listening to the needs of consumers. These qualities have allowed them to thrive. They have single-handedly done more for today's computer users than any other company, bar none. Other companies are jealous of their achievements and because they are jealous, they seek to force Microsoft to stop being so successful in hopes that they may be able to gain more customers. This is what has caused all this problem with the law-suits. A company can not give away their ideas, can not give away their technology and expect to survive. To expect Microsoft, or any other company to do that, is to ask them to commit suicide and is unreasonable.

We've heard a lot about America recently, because of the horrible tragedy in NYC in September. We're all proud to be Americans, and to have the freedoms that we do. On the other hand, one of the freedoms that we cherish here is the freedom to be what we can be, to develop our potential, to become successful without unreasonable restrictions holding us back. Why is it then, that Microsoft which is obviously very talented and very good at what they do, should be so threatened, so persecuted and so prevented from being a success? We have an open market. We have the freedom to buy Microsoft, Netscape, Symantecs, McAfee, or any other type of software that we feel will enable us to use our computers in the way we need to work. No one is forced to buy Microsoft products. I buy them because they are easy to use, and because they are compatible with other software and hardware. I want them to CONTINUE to be easy to use, and to be compatible with my software and hardware. I do not want the company split up, the software dis-assembled, or to have to go through a bunch of hoops to get it to work just because another company is jealous. Please...Please, allow Microsoft to get back to work without worrying about all this lawsuit stuff. America needs them, we have important work to do!

Thank you,
Connie Williams
(teacher)
P.O. Box 4515
Davis, Ca 95617
connie87@aol.com

MTC–00005172

From: JeremyC
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a member of the public I am obliged to voice my opinion re: the above mentioned settlement.

For many years I did not respect Microsoft and their software. Things have changed a great deal in the eleven years I have used a PC for my work, I do now think that the company produce a good product, (so do most consumers judging by the number of copies of Microsoft software legitimately used daily.)

The bitter competitors of Microsoft are still willing to try and block any settlement. But if their products are so much better and their business practices are In the interest of the majority of people, why are their sales so poor in comparison with Microsoft? Why do they not unveil a superior product for the benefit of all?

I am fed up with the wasting of time and the potential damage to the international progress in the world of IT.

Please approve this settlement and make it clear to Microsofts 'competition' that to compete, they need to put their resources into innovation and skill instead of negative destruction.

May I wish all of you in the US a good 2002, you all deserve to have one, God bless.

Sincerely
Jeremy Carr

MTC–00005173

From: Mary Euyang Shen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do settle and help the economy trend upwards.

Mary Shen

MTC–00005174

From: jeff—rouse@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

In the strongest words possible, I write in support of Microsoft. Though I could go on in support of Microsoft for quite some length, I will keep my comments relatively brief. Microsoft is the standard, the underpinning of our economy. To attack it or break it up would be like attacking the Interstate Highway system (cars and trucks need the same highways in New Hampshire, Indiana, or Wyoming), the Air Traffic Control System (airplanes landing in Chicago, New York, or Atlanta need the same kind of controls), or money (our European friends will soon learn the benefits of one currency).

If the Department of Justice wants to help users like me, they should join with Microsoft to educate the Microsoft-hating press and the Microsoft hating public to stop attacking Microsoft. My relatively new and wonderful broadband Internet connection is in a shambles because of the nearly constant attacks I have suffered. The recent Windows security problem that was in the news counts me as one of its victims. On my other computer, I cannot connect to the Internet now. I compose this e-mail on another computer using a 56k dial up connection, cowering behind a software firewall, hoping not to be attacked Microsoft has caused no victims. Microsoft-haters have.....me.

Warmest regards,
Jeff Rouse

MTC–00005175

From: Carl Forester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am 100 percent in favor of the settlement unless the government decides to withdraw completely and admit its part in terrorism against an American company.

Carl Forester—
Advisory IT Specialist—
IBM Global Services—
carlforester@us.ibm.com—
Office/Fax (904) 928–4595—

MTC–00005176

From: P. Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:09pm

Subject: Settlement

This ''settlement'' is unfair and premature. MSFT is guilty as sin and trying to monopolize the Internet by putting other companies out of business. That is unAmerican. How can the DOJ let this go on?

MTC–00005177

From: Bill Lemon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think you shoul leave the settlement as is so we can all get on to more important matters.

Bill Lemon
Woodridge, Il.

MTC–00005178

From: Mark Grossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have worked in the software industry for over 20 years and have been a Microsoft employee for a little over seven years. My personal experiences at Microsoft have led me to believe that this company has provided consumers with reasonable quality products at relatively low prices. It is mainly for this reason that Microsoft has succeeded and grown, consumers have had many choices and they chose Microsoft. I believe that the current settlement terms are appropriate to remedy the problems found by the courts with Microsoft's behavior in the past and I believe that the leadership of Microsoft has the integrity and has made the commitment to follow the letter and spirit of the agreement, an agreement under which consumers will continue to benefit from Microsoft's development of new software and other technologies. While many of Microsoft's competitors and politicians would like to handicap the company with additional constraints for their own economic and political benefits, the average citizen will most benefit from the fair open competition that the current settlement provides for.

Mark Grossman
6435 132nd Avenue NE #201
Kirkland, WA 98033

MTC–00005179

From: Betty Trembley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Microsoft case has dragged on entirely too long. In this period of major lay offs and many people becoming termed the ''poor''' please see to it that the lawyers get no more and that money spent on this litigation will be freed up to be in circulation and to help those who need it. I think Microsoft has done a superior job to bring the computer into almost every home and has made it ffordable. Why should they be penalized for doing eactly what we have encouraged people to do. ''Build a better mousetrap, Etc.''

Betty Trembley
1314 23rd Avenue
Longview, WA. 98632

MTC–00005180

From: Richard Postrozny
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Whom It May Concern .....

Let's put this case to rest once and for all. America is supposed to be the land of opportunity ... and that includes the freedom to innovate. I'm an engineer and my main responsibility is to come up with new product and process ideas at the lowest costs that will benefit both the producer and the consumer. I'm not only speaking for myself, but for other technical people as well. How can we be creative if we fear that the fruits of our labor will result in lawsuits on top of lawsuits ... ad infinitum???!!! It's the freedom to create and invent that made our country what it is. PLEASE don't destroy that freedom, especially now in these difficult economic times.

Sincerely,
Richard Postrozny
21 N. Quincy St.
Hinsdale, IL 60521

MTC–00005181

From: BOBA28@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:30pm
Subject: Independent Institute in Oakland

Attached is a piece that I recently received from the Independent Institute in Oakland. They make some good points that you should consider in your settlement with Microsoft.

Attachment: STATES' PERSECUTION OF MICROSOFT: Throwing Bad Money after Good Because government bureaucrats don't bear the costs of their actions directly, governments are especially bad at not knowing when to stop throwing bad money after good. The Microsoft antitrust case clearly illustrates this truism of government pathology. Although the U.S. Court of Appeals discarded the guts of the government's antitrust suit against Microsoft last June, nine states — led by California and New York—have chosen to keep fighting Microsoft. And although the federal antitrust trial uncovered no proof that consumer welfare was harmed by Microsoft's fiercely competitive behavior, the nine states perpetuate the pretense that they are pursuing Microsoft for the sake of consumers rather than Microsoft's rivals.

As Dominick Armentano put it in a recent op-ed: ''The first trial produced not one shred of evidence Microsoft's software licensing or browser integration resulted in any consumer injury; the new trial will be similarly cursed. Instead, the testimony will confirm Microsoft plays competitive hardball (who doesn't?) and intends to take market share from competitors with new innovation, savvy marketing and low prices.'' ''But that kind of behavior (engaged in by all free market firms) is the very nature of the competitive process and should be applauded, not condemned. Yet the holdout states and their politically ambitious attorneys general falsely believe antitrust laws exist to preserve specific competitors or specific products and that government must constantly level the playing field or micro-manage inter-firm business dealings with antitrust litigation. So the states will put the competitors on the stand and let them whine.

''Consumers (and businesses) in all states require government protection from force and fraud but they don't require decade-long antitrust assaults on firms that innovate and lower prices to consumers. Such assaults are economically inefficient, create incentives for additional litigation, perpetuate business uncertainty and harm society's long-term welfare. Enough already.'' The British legal system requires that the loser pay all court costs; this helps discourage frivolous lawsuits. If American antitrust law imposed a similar penalty, perhaps business rivals would spend more time competing and less time in antitrust litigation. And perhaps government antitrust bureaucrats would also curb their costly excesses.

See ''It's Time to Quit,'' by Dominick Armentano (NATIONAL POST, 12/21/01), at http://www.independent.org/tii/news/011221Armentano.html By the way, I think the right long term job for Attorney General Lockyer of California is City Attorney of Berkeley. He would be great for that City.

Bob Andrews
1864 Castle Oaks Court
Walnut Creek, CA 94595–2358
925–933–6569
925–933–8991 (Fax)

MTC–00005182

From: Dragster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir, Please dont stop short of breaking up the Microsoft monoply. Windows is the most troublesome backward system there is. Why the world should have to bow to this giant is beyond me. I run windows xp because my new computer came with it and Ive had to bing the thing back to the shop 3 times in 30 days! It wont work with all my OLD software. Im going to run Linux from now on as I cant afford to keep fixing this ''more stable system'' !!! Thank you and I pray you wont bow to the giant just to end this. Sincerely, Phil Winter pob 104 Dewitt, Ia. 52742

MTC–00005183

From: Bruce G Murray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Our family would like to see the Microsoft Settlement move ahead, beyond the 9 States who have already agreed. We are long-term residents of California and believe that California should agree to this same settlement so that Microsoft can focus on innovation and job creation, as opposed to the litigation of the past several years that primarily benefits attorneys.

Sincerely,
Bruce Murray

MTC–00005184

From: cvinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 8:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a user of Microsoft Win '95 and Win '98 SE software on my personal home computer, having purchased these items from Gateway and the local Comp USA stores. I

have used Microsoft software for the past 7 years as a professional engineer in the employ of Rockwell International. This software has made my job much easier, work output greater and significantly increased my ability to generate professional thesis, proposals and written communications. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. In my opinion, this settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I further think the settlement is good for the consumer, the software industry and Windows XP may boost the American economy as it recovers from recession.

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few of Micrsosfts wealthy competitors, stifles innovation and lines the pockets of the legal profession.

The federal government has spent far too much money in pursuing this case already.

Clay Vinson
P.E. Retired

MTC–00005185

From: James Meehan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:49pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please, you people who haven't the brains to compete, get off Microsoft's back. James Meehan

MTC–00005186

From: Roy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 9:57pm
Subject: Monopoly Suit

My opinion of this suit all along has been that Microsoft produces the best operating system in the world for home PC's. To break it up would be just like the phone service. You go from the best, most reliable in the world to the piecemeal crap we have now.

MTC–00005187

From: Timothy Bell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer professional and as a computer hobbyist I believe the settlement is a fair and reasonable agreement. This settlement will allow the end user more options to customize their system and will encourage competing products that will benefit the computer using public.

Timothy A. Bell
Ypsilanti, MI

MTC–00005188

From: Jeff (038) Gerrit Huston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:11pm
Subject: Microsoft case

To Whom It May Concern,

Now is the time to think about the larger impact that Microsoft has on not just the technical sector of the computer world, but also the large impact this great company has on the economy. We have seen the burden this continual trail has on the country. It is time to put it to rest and to move on to much more important issues.

It is doing very little to continue to pursuit issues that have already fallen to the past. Technology has and will continue to change. We need to allow companies to meet the wants of the people. What we want now is to settle and to move on. Let the government stay out of the fundamental freedom of capitalism.

Thank you for your time,
Gerrit Christine Huston

MTC–00005189

From: Bobby Cammer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a very small user of Microsoft products. Being retired I only use the Microsoft products for personal work.

Problems I see with Microsoft having complete control over the world's and my operating system.

1. I cannot sell their product (Windows 95 or Windows 98)to someone else without including at least one part of hardware. This is just intimidation by Microsoft. What if Ford motors restricted the sale of a part from their vehicles without sending the motor?

2. My operating system Windows 98 is loaded with Microsoft stuff that I either have to accept or find out how to delete or over ride it. Tell Microsoft to keep their extras and sell the on the open competitive market. If I want their stuff I'll buy it.

3. There is no competition in the operating systems market that an old amateur like me can buy or even compare costs. With this monopoly Microsoft can and does sell the product at an inflated price. They will only sell at their controlled market price. You can't go to a discount store and buy the product at a volume price.

4. Windows 98 frequently goes belly up and stops in mid function. There is no customer complaint department that really listens. They state that they have most of the problems taken care of. Where I come from that's called horse dung.

5. When I was working in the manufacturing sector if you had a product that garnered at least 80 percent of the market you had to routinely justify the selling price. How in heavens name can Microsoft justify the current cost of Windows 98?

6. If you buy one of the popular PC's it will come with the Windows operating system bundled on a single CD with the other software. If you dump, trash or upgrade (build your own)your PC you cannot take the software to the new PC. It's like Microsoft put a soul in the machine and only Microsoft, decay or God can remove it. The CD now is only usable as a Frisbee! Who do you think forces the PC builder to bundle their stuff?

7. Try selling your old copy of Windows 95 on eBay. Now that you have one of the later versions you no longer need it. Microsoft controls the sale by eBay and their sellers. You can't sell it without complying with Microsoft's rules. Microsoft has a large paid legal staff to monitor and protect against violations of their monopolistic rules.

I hope my name is kept in confidence. I don't need either the FBI or Microsoft legal eagles checking me.

Regards

MTC–00005190

From: Joe Swafford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To all concerned:

Microsoft is a great and innovative company which has contributed immensely to the American economy. They are a symbol of the American dream. They have fore-sight, ingenuity, and determination. They innovate to make the best possible software solutions which have made our lives easier, simpler, and more enjoyable. They are aggressive and pervasive. I admire this company; a company which is truly an American business icon. I cannot say enough good things about Microsoft because they have truly helped shape the future of our country and the future of our planet.

That being said, I must admit that I do not agree with some of the business practices in which Microsoft has chosen to pursue. I would never want Microsoft to stop innovating or developing top-notch products. I would never want them to cease as the business entity they are today. But I cannot, with a clear conscience, admit that they have participated in practices which have not stifled competition. I am just an average consumer. I could say nothing and be perfectly happy with using my Microsoft products and nothing else. However, I think our country is the greatest country on this planet for a reason. I believe that reason is opportunity; the opportunity of success without unfair interference.

I feel there has been a major swing in respect to the legal aspect of this antitrust case. It seems the tone of this case has changed. It seems the seriousness of this case has changed. It seems the outcome of this case has changed. It seems the judicial process has changed. In effect, it seems the whole development of this case has been tainted due to a change in political power or a change in the agenda of the government because of the current economic environment.

It disturbs me to think that our judicial process is influenced to such an extreme by the other powers of our government. Whether it is from the legislative or executive branch; this doesn't matter. What matters to me is that the principles of our founding fathers are preserved and that we always do the ''right thing''.

Again, I think Microsoft is one of the most extraordinary companies in history. Microsoft is a company which will be in textbooks and will remain a strong contributor to our economy regardless of this legal matter. I still cannot understand how a court can overlook the code mixing of Internet Explorer and the Windows operating system. This is an obvious example of ''bundling'' which is never mentioned in the final judgment of the antitrust case.

As a native born American consumer who appreciates Microsoft and its software, I am not disappointed in Microsoft. I am disappointed in our judicial process for allowing the letter of the law to be misconstrued and distorted in order to serve

the interests of the lobbyers, the politicians, the big money making machines, and the special interest groups. I think in the end, the consumer has lost and this is very sad. Because, when it comes right down to it, the individual consumer is the one who makes our economy work.

Thanks for your time,

A Microsoft fan who disagrees with a few things

MTC–00005191

From: Lorimar712@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

As a concerned Citizen I urge you to ensure that the proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft does not get derailed by wealthy competitors or special interest groups. The American economy NEEDS this settlement.

Thank you, Mark G, Costa, San Diego CA

MTC–00005192

From: CHPETERSON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:55pm
Subject: MICROSOFT ANTITRUST CASE

GENTLEMEN:

I REMAIN AMAZED AT THE TIME AND RESOURCES MY GOVERNMENTS (BOTH NATIONAL AND STATE) CONTINUE TO WASTE PM THIS CASE. MICROSOFT HAS DONE MORE THAN MOST COMPANIES IN AMERICA TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY, CREATE WEALTH AND GENERALLY IMPROVE AMERICA'S QUALITY OF LIFE.

THIS CASE SEEMS TO BE DRIVEN BY SEVERAL LARGE COMPETITORS MOTIVATED BY THEIR OWN GREED AND JEALOUSY, BY GREEDY STATE GOVERNMENTS LOOKING FOR ANOTHER DEEP POCKET (LIKE THEY FOUND IN BIG TOBACCO) AND BY THE PREVIOUSLY DEMOCRATIC PARTY DOMINATED FEDERAL GOVERNMENT JUST SEEKING A SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS TO ATTACK.

IT IS TIME TO CALL IT A DAY AND LET MICROSOFT AND ITS COMPETITORS GET BACK TO COMPETING.

CHARLES H. PETERSON
3724 N. HULLEN STREET
METAIRIE, LOUISIANA 70002
CHPETERSON@AOL.COM

MTC–00005193

From: David Oakes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:08pm
Subject: Microsoft law suite

Dear Government and States,

Please leave Microsoft alone. They have done nothing but create jobs for Americans and help lead the USA in the technology world. They also have helped make the computer more user friendly throughout the world. The politics of these lawsuits stinks.

David Oakes
daisyo@home.com

MTC–00005194

From: CKlein545@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I urge you to quickly approve the Microsoft settlement. We do not need further litigation of this matter. As a consumer, I have not been harmed by Microsoft's actions. Computing costs—hardware and software—are extremely low. I appreciate the standards that Microsoft has set.

Sincerely,
Carla Klein
Sunnyvale, CA
cjklein2@msn.com

MTC–00005195

From: basil johnson jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:14pm
Subject: Microsoft ; us government

Microsoft's team, keep up the good work! Lazy assholes (US government) and other companies that are too lazy or to damn stupid to be integrative! MSN tries to keep up support and free up dates for their products but interference has damn near stopped MSN. Assholes heed to get off their lazy ass and build their own products! I spent 30 years of my life outside rain, sleet, snow, heat for 12 hours a day to as many as 57 hours straight building and repairing railroad tracks. My choruses . $1.00 a day for meals and lease money an hour than a Food Lion bag boy would make! This was because of the US governments lick common sense. Which they still have a lack of! We would go as long as 8 years with out a contract be cause congress would average wages using all railroad workers together. Upper officials $5,000,000 to over $36,000,000 a year to our $18,000 per year. The railroad like the US government , may be corrupted , but not stupid. So their cut the real work force 80%! Damn R.R. workers per employ makes a hell of a lot of money! Same shit the governments are trying to do to MSN ! You have the money and power '' FIGHT'' for all of our rights !

bcjr1@msn.com

MTC–00005196

From: Richard Tackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:21pm
Subject: to the DOJ...were I stand with microsoft

This case is nothing but a bunch of crybabies that don't like Microsoft success. I support Microsoft in this fight.

Rich Tackett
19811 Portal Plaza
Cupertino, Calif. 95014
408 253–7810

MTC–00005197

From: sheris Swain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would really like to see this case settled once and for all. I am not only a stockholder of Microsoft, but I have 2 relatives that work for Microsoft (one retired, one currently employed) I lived in Bellevue just across the road from Microsoft for over 10 years. I enjoy all of their products and I commend them for originally having a concept when on no else did and capitalizing on it. I believe Bill Gates dream of everyone having a computer and I don't think it is Microsoft's intent is to be dominate, just to be a pioneer and keep forging new paths that others dare not attempt, but want to reap the benefits.

I think it is time to settle in the favor of Microsoft. It would do other companies a lot of good to look at Microsoft, their culture, their healthplans the employee moral etc. They not only make great products but they are progressive in their employee relations.

MTC–00005198

From: Mike McAtee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:34pm
Subject: Please drop charges against msft, time to move on.

Please drop charges against msft, time to move on.

MTC–00005199

From: Ron Nath
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 11:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I have reviewed to proposed settlement and would like to submit additional, revised comments from my previous ones. Overall, I believe the requirements are inconsequential and ineffective in stopping this convicted monopolist. The best course of action would have been to break-up the company as originally suggested by Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson (or even more so). However, as that is almost certainly not going to happen, alternatives need to be found.

The current list of remedies (besides being ineffective) requires oversight and will undoubtedly allow Microsoft to find loopholes. Moreover, the duration of the requirements are only in effect for five years. I would suggest a much simpler, but more stringent set of remedies that would require no oversight. In addition, they would be in effect as long as Microsoft maintains a dominance (largest share) or monopoly (>50%) in ANY market- operating systems, office applications, internet browsers, etc.

These would include:

1. Microsoft must license its operating system to hardware vendors who can customize it any way they choose. In addition, the operating system cost must be separated out from the hardware cost so that consumers will have the option to install a free operating system.

2. Microsoft or the hardware vendors who licensed and installed the operating system must provide a 90-day money back guarantee should a consumer wish to return the operating system (after having it deinstalled on their machine by the original seller of the system).

3. Microsoft must provide source code (for an additional but reasonable fee) upon request to those who purchase a copy of any of their software (though it will remain copyrighted and can not be duplicated, etc.)

4. Older, unsupported versions of their software (e.g. windows 95, office 95, etc.) will enter the public domain and be completely open source and free for any use.

5. ''Core'' applications (Office, internet explorer, SQL server, etc.) must be made available for all major operating systems (Linux, FreeBSD, AIX, Solaris, etc.) while all

their other applications should be eventually ported to these other OS's.

6. Their client and server operating systems must interface equally well with alternative platforms (ie, win9x or win2k clients will provide native support to connect a unix server via an X-server GUI or a win2k server will allow unix clients to connect via a provided terminal server client) Though these requirements are not as drastic as the original break-up, it goes much further than the current, almost worthless stipulations.

S. Nath
Wolcott, CT.

MTC–00005200

From: Tdpage@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This suit was ill advised from the start. Settle NOW!

Don Page
Dragoon, AZ

MTC–00005201

From: Don Stults
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the litigation against Microsoft should cease. I have a difficult time understanding why the case was litigated. There seems to be a ''punish the proficient'' attitude in this case. Microsoft has invested a lot of money to develop products CONSUMERS WANT and they have accepted ALL the market risks (sales, worldwide copyright infringement, and yes, competition).

Let Microsoft get on with their business (which they do well). . .the continuing litigation expenses will NOT be paid by Microsoft, it will be paid by consumers of their products.

Don Stults
donstults@hotmail.com

MTC–00005202

From: Bob Levittan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle it NOW!!!!! Don't let this travesty continue. From the very beginning, this whole thing has been about Sun, Netscape, AOL et al, using litigation as a means to compete. END IT NOW! STOP WASTING MY MONEY! SPEND MORE TIME TRYING TO MAKE OUR LIVES SAFER. STOP WASTING TIME AND MANPOWER!

END IT NOW!
Bob Levittan
50 Cliftwood Drive
Huntington, NY 11743

MTC–00005203

From: Donald Hetrick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please record my support to finally settle the endless litigation against Microsoft. I find the current settlement harsh, but feel its fine if it can finally be concluded so our country can move on.

Thank You,
Donald J. Hetrick

MTC–00005204

From: tobeyd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I've been working as a software developer since 1964.

In my opinion, Microsoft has attained their current position is because—

1) They listen to the requests of Computer Users.

2) They develop quality solutions based on Users requests.

3) They provide an integrated platform for Independent and Corporate Developers to provide effective solutions for their clients.

Imagination and Innovation are the keys.

Thanks,
David Drake

MTC–00005206

From: Rick Weyenberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle now!

MTC–00005207

From: Miriam A. Detert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:32am
Subject: Microsoft

This entire case is the most unjust case your so called Justice Department has ever taken . You are prosecuting an innocent man and company. They have done more for this country than anyone in many, many years.

Miriam A. Detert

MTC–00005208

From: JRob98@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is harsh, and more than enough penalty for Microsoft. Prolonging this only benefits a few special interests, for their own greed. AOL is prime for a monopoly investigation, and is campaigning for more against Microsoft to benefit their own interests. The few states protesting were only being more greedy than the rest, looking for a free ride on someone else's money. No one is forced to buy Microsoft or use IE, but do because it is a better product. Leave them alone. Jan Roberts

MTC–00005209

From: DigitalBurn2k1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear to whom this may concern,

I am an upcoming programmer at a major university. And, this court case has caught my attention. I would like to tell you that I do not agree with the government completely in the solutions to this problem. Microsoft has been in violation of some monopoly laws, I agree. However, I feel that to impede on the authoring writes of a company is not legitimate. Something would have to be changed, granted, but I do not agree that Microsoft Middleware such as Internet Explorer should be changed.

A major step that Microsoft made in the 1995 windows was the integration of internet explorer. I understood this major step, as it makes the operating system more closely tied to the internet. This is a convenience to the user. Sure, it may impede on Netscape; however, I believe that this is a must have feature with today's internet fueled economy/society. This technology has led to other web integrated technologies that Microsoft has developed and have greatly impacted the world, making our computer lives easier.

I feel that if the government impedes on Microsoft's freedom to produce technology, then they are stopping progress. If you would have told Microsoft that they could not have integrated net features with the OS years ago, then

1) this ordeal would not be in court

2) Microsoft would have surely lost consumers as someone else would have moved on the idea The government I understand is trying to keep competition in the marketplace. However, I would like to see progress thrive. Competition will always survive as it drives software makers to produce better software. Netscape is not better software, that is half the reason they have fallen in sales, just a personal user opinion. How can the government say what the best road is for technology? What if they are taking a wrong turn by penalizing Microsoft, which will in turn cause technology to slow progression? That is neither healthy for our citizens or our economy.

I think that if the government is going to penalize Microsoft, they should do it in a way that is not hurting their creative rights, rights that have made the US dominant in the computing field. Lets face it, it is Microsoft that has given us an edge in the technology industry for the past 20 years. Do not ruin that because of some useless company like Netscape.

Sincerely,
Brad Davis

MTC–00005210

From: Daniel Telford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I believe that the settlement reached between the DOJ and Microsoft is more than fair since Microsoft in my opinion has never violated any anti-trust law. Take what you have and go.

Daniel Telford
Kearney NE

MTC–00005211

From: Jason
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Given the number of years that have passed since the trial began Microsoft have very much responded to criticism and in my view have made all efforts to remedy the situation.

Given that free operating systems are around (how competitive is that!—what if the situation existed with free cars!) and piracy

is rife—if microsoft was ever judged a monopoly it was on its merits.

The level of piracy, the level of competition, all work to undermine microsofts efforts to conduct fair and legal trade. The settlement is fair and just in my opinion, if anything its too harsh. We all know how big business works, with coca cola signing exclusive deals with suppliers, sports stars signing contracts that mean they can only advertise with nike etc, so why microsoft should be held aloft on a pedestal for its alleged actions is beyond me.

If anything would be ultimately in the publics interest it would have been a long time ago that the whole matter was dropped. Right now, barring that, the best thing is for all parties to accept the settlement and for those competitors of microsoft to stop trying to use the courts for financial gain when instead they should employ smarter people, up the R & D, and increase the quality of their products.

Jason

MTC–00005213

From: lynn orser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I believe that it is time to finalize this ridiculous fiasco and get on with the work of the people. Please move forward with the proposed settlement and put this case behind the American people. I believe there are more important issue that the government should be dealing with.

Sincerely,
Lynn Wm. Orser
11288 James Court
Genoa, IL. 60135

MTC–00005214

From: Robin Datta
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Honorable Justices:

I have used Microsoft products from MS-DOS 3.0 onwards through 6.0+; Win 2.0 (yes, 2.0, when the IBM OS2 was priced at $400+ but the MS product was quite reasonable to dabble with) and on through 3.0, 3.11, Win 95 (briefly), WinNT3.5, 4.0 through SP6 and on to Win2kProf and WinXPPro. Other OSs have attempted to take the place of Windows but have not offered the options and versatility that we have now.

Microsoft was under no obligation to offer automatic updates to its OS but has done so. It is a wonderful feature. And Windows will be the OS to be proficient in, in much of the foreseeable future. To say that MS will have an unfair advantage in providing its software to the educational system is to neglect the unfair disadvantage that the students now have when screwing around with the Apple/MacIntosh system. While MS does make its Office Suite available for the Apple/MacIntosh system (which refutes the argument that the Office Suite holds the user hostage to Windows), there are so many other features of the Windows and so many other applications and devices that run under windows, that it is almost cruel to deprive the student generation of proficiency in these.

It is time for the pirhanas to get off Microsoft. If they cannot compete in the market, it is not right that they try to make good in the courts. We have already seen a candidate who could not win in the election installed by the courts as the President-pretender of this country. I do not believe that the court system should replace the people's choice whether in the software market or at the ballot box.

Sincerely,
Robin Datta
robbin@ix.netcom.com
9228 N Stoneridge Ln
Fresno CA 93720–1210
(559) 434–0370

MTC–00005215

From: zach cross
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:00am
Subject: microsoft settlement

to whom it may concern,
The One and Only, Zachary B Cross

MTC–00005216

From: Michael Knight
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/1/02 8:10am
Subject: microsoft settlement

back off you idiots and get blumenthal to do so also.

Michael J. Knight, CPA, CVA, CFE
Licensed Life, Accident and Health Agent
Michael J. Knight & Company, CPAs
Licensed Mortgage Brokers, Consultants
116 Sherman Street
Fairfield, Connecticut 06430
Tel: (203) 259–2727
Fax: (203) 256–2727
Website: http://www.mjkcpa.com

MTC–00005217

From: MarstonB@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a 64 year old sole practicing attorney in Marietta, GA who has been sufficiently computer literate and fortunate to be able to practice by myself (no secretary, paralegal, etc.) for the past several years due, in no small part, I truly believe, to Microsoft's providing a simple yet comprehensive ''workplace'' for me.

Many will say others could do as well or better...I do not believe others would make my PC platform as simple, user friendly and idiot proof as Microsoft has.

Leave them alone and able to continue to provide as they have, please.

MTC–00005218

From: l.heath@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:00am

This is not a settlement but a travesty. There is no meaningful change to the status quo which means Microsoft continues to benefit from its past monopolistic practices and, indeed, benefits from this action by expanding its influence though our school systems. Where is the corrective action that our laws are supposed to provide?

Thank you,

Larry Heath
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005219

From: Gregg Christman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:08am
Subject: Nine State Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am very dissappointed with our government over this entire court case against Microsoft.

First and foremost Microsoft has created an industry that has made our country number one again in the world and has created jobs, increased productivity, and more importantly for the Federal Government Billions of Dollars of Tax Revenue!

The idea that they are a monoply is absolutely absurd they have to compete against thousands of competitors daily to win and earn their revenues. They spend Billions on Research and Development to provide better software.

The notion that they are controlling the software industry is ridiculous. Every consumer in the marketplace has a choice whether or not they want to own Microsoft Software no one is putting a gun to there head and forcing the consumer to purchase Microsoft. This lawsuit which was initiated by President Bill Clinton and

The Clinton Administration is an absolute conspiracy to undermine the American Way,to create, build, and sell products to be successful.

This lawsuit has been counterproductive from its' inception and has cost our economy Billions in lost revenue, and Billions in investors portfolio's value.

I believe the settlement reached by the Nine States and Microsoft is extremely generous a Billion Dollars worth of Software and other computer related items for the low income schools. I think this is a fair and reasonable settlement.

I believe the US Government needs to rapidly agree with this proposed settlement by Microsoft and conclude this total unfounded, ridiculous, lawsuit and let's get on with what is important getting our Technology Economy rolling again. Microsoft is the engine that is pulling the Technology Sector forward. I hope our government can see this however; sometimes I think our leaders are in a closet.

Concerned Citizen,
Gregg Christman
greggchristman@earthlink.net

MTC–00005220

From: jack3108
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get this case over. Even the few states that are still objecting are purchasing Microsoft products—The attorney generals don't seem to know what most of their dept. purchasing agents are buying.

MTC–00005221

From: Joseph W. Guillory
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the only thing that needs to be changed in this settlement is that Microsoft should give cash instead of software and computers. This way the receiving schools or benifactors can choose how best to use these funds.

Thank You

Joseph

MTC–00005222

From: Sun-Tzu1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A recently purchased computerized billing and scheduling system running Windows XP has made a tremendous difference for my business. The efficiency of this new system is significantly greater than the older non Windows based system and yet was extremely affordable. As a consumer of computer and compter related goods I have been greatly satisified with the reliability, performance, variety, innovation and affordability of Microsoft products. In today's current environment the citizens of this country have fears that extend well beyond Microsoft. The threat of terrorism, nuclear weapons, unemployment, the decline of America's auto manufacturing, and the rising costs of health care have become the issues that require attention. As a country we should be comforted by the existance of strong global companies, such as Microsoft, which through their existance provide fuel to America's economy and ultimately enhance the power of our nations leaders. We must remember that the blanket of freedom that covers our nation is the direct result of the economic strength we possess. It seems ironical that a country that relies so heavily on its financial strength to resolve world crises would spend so much energy to disrupt the very source of its strength. Any other country in the world would welcome Microsoft with open arms because with its ecomomic might comes bargaining power. In summary, be thankful that Microsoft exists and let us, as a nation, encourage other American companies to become as successful. Let us begin to concentrate our efforts on the issues that require immediate attention and will have the most impact for the American people.

Sincerely,

Richard Watson

MTC–00005223

From: BryantKing
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:18am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please continue with the settlement as agreed to and put this behind us. We need less government and permit the American entrepreneur to flourish. Businesses have to compete to stay in business and it requires long hours and hard work.

Sincerely,

Bryant A King

MTC–00005224

From: Jack Stoutenger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:20am
Subject: microsoft settlement

i do not think microsoft has done anything wrong other than make some awesome software that makes it very easy for anyone to use

MTC–00005225

From: Robert Gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern

I believe that the proposed settlement should be accepted for the common good of USA & the world in general. The continued uncertainties around Windows creates a depressed marketplace, full of apprehension, tightened purse-strings. Additionally it makes the US look foolish when the Appleals court overturned a decision, which granted Microsoft the right to integrate the Web Browser into the Operating System.

What the SUN Microsystems, AOL/Netscape & affiliated companies complain most about is that Microsoft has produced products that integrate well together. SUN has its StarOffice, but no one seriously accepts it, as it offers little to build a business system from. There is scant integration between StarOffice and other software applications produced by independant software vendors.

Continued poor integration of open-source software will damage consumer confidence by offering too many options, that most people do not understand the reasons why they should choose one over the other. This is why the Open Source community would welcome Microsoft Office to the Linux operating systems. From what I understand the latest version of MS OFFICE for

MacOS10, would take little to port to the Linux operating systems. It should be pointed out that other computer related companies have violated fair trading practices in a much greater way, for example:

1) SUN also offered its Solaris operating system for free, but after signing up for it, I then found I was to be charged $75 (US) for media. What a blatent misrepresentation!

2) Apple allowed, and openly greeted other companies who were to produce clones of their Mac's. But when it was evident that Apples share of the overall computer market was not increasing, they then witheld their operating system from the clone builders.

3) When the Mac OS was witheld, the clone builders started offering G4 upgrades for G3 machines, but then Apple changed the BIOS routine so that these upgrade cards would not function.

In closing, I hope you agree that in the interests of the world economy, particularily after September 11, that this proposal must be accepted.

Sincerely Yours

Robert G Gardner

Port Macquarie NSW

Australia

MTC–00005226

From: Cdmorse@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom this may concern,

I spent 2 years in the computer industry in the US. I have had no problems with Microsoft except they beat their competition. Is this the US or not? Does free enterprise exist or is the concept for fairly tales and uncensored history books? I do not understand a 'free society' the penalizes a company that delvers services to a majority of the market, out distances their competitors then is criticized for being successful.

Settle the dispute as quickly as possible and allow the business of business to get on...

Sincerely,

Cindy Morse

149 Wallinwood NE

Grand Rapids, MI 49503

MTC–00005227

From: DavePenn60@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:35am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I'm writing in support of the settlement negotiated by the DOJ and Microsoft.

I am both a user of Microsoft software and an owner of Microsoft shares.

I have worked in the information technology arena since entering the workforce in 1962. I have known what it is to develop systems for computers with only 4096 bytes of memory (that is not a typo). For computers for which punched cards were the only storage medium. For computers that were anything but personal.

In my career the focus of my development efforts changed from developing systems for mainframe computers to developing systems for personal computers in early 1988. At that time the operating systems ''war'' was being fought among IBM, Microsoft, and Apple. I can personally attest that there has been an ''order of magnitude'' improvement in the Windows operating system since that time. That improvement was primarily attributable to the ''invisible hand'' of competition among that group of competitors.

As a user of application software, I can personally attest to the value that Microsoft has brought to that field. The organization I was a partner of (Andersen) had adopted Lotus 1–2–3 as its standard spreadsheet software. The improvements that Microsoft made to Excel that even the most diehard supporter of 1–2–3 had to acknowledge that Excel was the better product and ultimately we changed to Excel as our standard spreadsheet.

I'm also aware of the improvements that Microsoft has made to programming languages and the other software that facilitates development in those languages.

In short, Microsoft has done a great deal to foster improvements in information technology and that has rippled throughout our entire economy. If Microsoft has broken the law, it should be punished in accordance with that law. If current laws are not adequate for the world we now live in, new laws should be written and adopted in the cold light of day. We should not, however, develop new laws through the judicial process. And, we should not develop new laws through the judicial process at the urging of organizations who have not enjoyed the success they believe that they deserve in the competitive arena.

Yes, you need to consider the source and I acknowledged I was and am a Microsoft

shareholder. I'm a shareholder because I recognized the value Microsoft was bringing value to the field of information technology. And, I continue to believe that Microsoft will continue to bring value to that field as long as the competition with other information technology providers is fair. As I understand the terms of the settlement agreement, I believe that the proposed post-settlement environment will be fair to all concerned.

Thank you for considering the voice of one consumer and one owner of a part of the American economy.

David Brunn

Professor of Business Administration

Carthage College

MTC–00005229

From: CF000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Mr. Attorney General,

How much longer will we let a select group of people continue to perpetuate an issue such as the unsettled Microsoft litigation to cause so much uncertainty in our economy. It seems often that powerful and self serving people, directly or through organizations they influence, are able to manipulate government actions that works contra to the needs of the greater good. Certainly, that seems to be the case with this new scheme to delay this settlement.

Everyone now knows this settlement is the right thing to do, because it is right in its own merits, and because the economy was hurt by the original suit and needs to be made right. A lot of other companies and market segments were hurt by the original action. And not just the capital of those companies, but more importantly employees and their pension plans, their livelihood and the very fabric of their family and sense of security. So now these self interest are making one last attempt. Is it because they are being influenced by short sellers who are trying to make yet one more killing in the market—if they can cause confusion on the stocks of the high tech sector, see these stocks crash and burn again, so they could buy back low. Is this what the DOJ and the Bush Administration have in store for the country in 2002—to let this happen. If so, its so Clinton like.

My family, neighbors and friends are watching this closely, and I can assure you, a lot of others are too. We don't see how fixing this economy is possible without sticking to the existing agreement and closing this issue immediately. It's time to take leadership and complete the job you people were put in office to address in 2000.

Thank you,

C. Figueroa

New Jersey

CC:RFC-822=3—23163—987C91CF-ED8E-D211–9F48–00C04FB98E...

MTC–00005230

From: Barbara Sanborn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get it done so business can move on. Settle this so competition in business and the right to innovate can continue. If Microsoft has done things wrong...I am sure they are not alone..but they have certainly demonstrated what this country is all about..the right to succeed in business and to be rewarded for that success.

MTC–00005231

From: GDingoian4972035@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:05am
Subject: I FEEL THE STATES SHOULD TAKE THE OFFER FROM MICROSOFT

i am writing because i feel since the D.O.J started legal action against microsoft in 6–2000 to present that it has caused a mess within all the technology area microsoft is the heart and engine of the tech and they like the 3 auto makers feed alot of vendors we in short as investors not only tech but the whole market suffered the worse loss of 5 trillion .

not all of it was caused by the legal matter against microsoft by also greenspan 6 rate hikes the same time the legal matter against microsoft we are in one of the worst recession since 73–74 and it is global i feel this matter has gone long enough and i have followed this case and understand some of problems but they were in the past and now alot of the problems are gone microsoft admited to some wrong dueing and is will to pay damages the justice department agreeded to some kind of settlement but 9 states want to drag this and really what would they gain i doubt that they could win if they are going out to split microsoft first it has been stated by appeal court that braking up microsoft was off the table and settlement was only thing on the table finally i feel alot of tax payers money has been wasted and will be wasted more for i truly believe that these 9 state attorneys have political movities and not really interested in settling i urge the D.O.J to wrap this matter and let microsoft pay for damages to which they already have agreeded to then they will then spend money on r/d instead of attorney fees then with the 11 rate cuts and energy saving and restruturing we will more r/d and hiring layoff people plus those who lost alot will start getting some of it back so i urge you not on my behalf but the whole economy to end this bleeding and urge to wrap this matter up so microsoft can spend the money back into r/d we have had a massive layoff mainly coming from technology all good strong companies all have laid off 10% some even higher i feel once this matter is wrapped up thinks will improve with economy and then alot of these companies like cisco,oracle,sunmicosystems,cien,junper,all networking, and semi-conductors will get fed by microsoft and they will feed the smaller it is like a domino it just travels i urge you the end this as fast as can be for people are still fearful that we may continue another year like 2001 that is why 3 trillion dollars in low 1% money markets because with technology there is no economy no growth and no stock market

it is like the engine to the car for it will not run it also effected the global markets for like i said once you cut the leggs off then the rest falls like a domino

finally i urge you to tell these hold outs that it would be in the best interest

to all that they settle for they would loose if they wanted to continue miscrosoft just is to big and with over 30 billion in cash it would take these 9 states 20 to 30 years to get an answer and it would be no they can not beat a giant like microsoft and neither will anyone i was against this whole matter for what did any citizen or investor get out this whole matter

nothing and in fact paid a hell of a price because all you got was what

microsoft offered from the begining

thank you

george g. dingoian

gdingoian4972035@aol.com

MTC–00005232

From: James Button
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs,

I believe that any settlement addressing a companies monopolistic and/or anti-competitive actions should fulfil at least 1, and preferably all of the following::

1) Financial restitution to the actual, and prospective 'competing' organisations for the damage already inflicted.

2) Financial restitution to the actual, and prospective 'competing' organisations for the loss of future profitability.

3) Financial restitution to the actual, and prospective 'customers' for the probable inflated costs due to lack of availability of products from alternative sources.

4) Enforcement of 'proper' business practices in the future.

5) Require the offender to ensue that the products they are currently supplying are brought up to the standard that would have been required to achieve their current dominant status if they had been competing in a 'fair' marketplace In the case of Microsoft, I as a user suffer because Microsoft OS and Office products have become the 'defacto' standard in industry.

My organisation also has to (at our expense) have somebody regularly monitor the internet and PC systems for 'security' gaps, and ensure that the holes found are addressed In order to interact with business peers, and maintain the business's employability the organisation is forced to purchase the new releases of Microsoft products (with the required hardware upgrades). This being essential due to the Microsoft policy of discontinuing support for old versions. (To date about $1000 per PC system directly attributable to business compatibility upgrades). While I accept that providing substantial assistance to educational establishments may form part of a 'penalty'' that does nothing to provide restitution to the prior purchasers of their products, nor does it actually impose a real penalty on the organisation unless that organisation is inhibited from adjusting their prices and marketing to recover that cost from their customers. If they are allowed to include their own products in costs of their penalty, they can simply ship 10,000 CD'sets at a quoted $500 each ($5,000,000 billed for $2,500 worth of media) and site licences of 20 accompanying each CD set (accounted for @ say $5 per user = $10,000,000).

Not only does such an approach increase their dominance in the market, as businesses will have a greater incentive to use their products because their new employees will have already, at an education cost billed to the public purse/wallet, gained experience in the offenders products, but also opens an opportunity to charge for increases in the licensing (to say 100 users per CD set @ say $4 per user) giving profits of $4 x 80 x 10,000 = $3,200,000— Booked cost of the action = $15,000,000, at a net cost of $2,500 minus $3,200.000 = ?? Considering the above:

I feel that any settlement allowing the offender's products to be promoted is greatly flawed. I also believe that the proposed settlement will actually increase Microsoft's dominance, at the expense of the US taxpayer, businesses, but also to the detriment of PC users throughout the world.

J.B.C.S. Limited. (a UK company)

MTC–00005233

From: scottwquigley@netscape.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I have been following the Microsoft Anti-trust case now for quite some time, and feel the need to offer some input on the subject. My hope is that you will give due consideration to input that I and others from the public community offer, as the decisions made by the judicial system will have a significant impact on the consumers' ability to choose products that meet our needs at reasonable prices.

Civil Action No. 98–1232, (Antitrust), COMPLAINT devotes a significant amount of text to the subject of the ''bundling'' of Microsoft products in its operating system. The main argument seems to be that, by including products such as Windows Media Player and Internet Explorer on PC's using the Windows Operating System, consumers are prevented from using other products. This is absurd. I am writing this e-mail from a computer running Windows 98 Second Edition, which came ''bundled'' with IE, but I am writing this e-mail from a Netscape 6.2 browser window. I normally use IE, not Netscape. However, after reading the text of the Complaint, I decided to see just how hard it is to get Netscape onto my machine and use it. I found Netscape to be free, with the task of downloading and installing to be quite simple. Further, I was able to eliminate IE from my machine using the Windows Add/Remove function in its control panel. (I have since subsequently downloaded and insatalled IE back to my machine for free, with equal simplicity). I found it interesting that Netscape came with AOL Instant Messenger (AIM) ''bundled'' with it! Frankly, I believe the charges against Microsoft are being generated by individuals that do not have the first idea of how to use computers and the internet. If they did, they would know how ridiculous these charges are.

''Bundling'' is a common practice in one of the largest industries in the US and the world—the automobile industry. Imagine going to a dealer and trying to buy an automobile with a Cadillac body, Ferrari interior, Porsche engine, and a Ford transmission. Not possible. We can't pick which brand fuel injectors we want, which brand audio system we want, which brand tires we want, which brand paint we want, or which brand suspension components we want. We choose a package. If we don't like a particular package, we go to another dealer and choose a different one. The freedom to choose which package we want is the freedom that needs to be protected. Years ago, when the Chrysler Motor Corporation was on the verge of failing, we protected this freedom bailing them out. We did NOT try to protect this freedom by forcing GM and Ford to be broken into smaller groups, nor by forcing GM and Ford to stop ''bundling'' so as to allow consumers to ask for Chrysler components to be included on their GM or Ford products. Why, then, are we trying to take these actions against Microsoft? The fact that no other product is being offered that competes with Microsoft is, perhaps, reason to provide some sort of initiative to potential competitors, but certainly not to order the breakup of Microsoft or to force them to stop ''bundling''. Browsers and media players are as much an integral part of a computer as engines and transmissions are for automobiles. Microsoft should be able to provide the packages that they choose to offer, as they are doing now, based on the wants and needs of the users.

I urge you to consider carefully the comments I have provided, and all others offered by the public through this and other avenues. I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments to you. I look forward to you decisions on these matters.

Sincerely,
Scott Quigley
606 Ashford Place
Newport News, VA 23602
Phone: 757–890–0017
E-Mail: scottwquigley@netscape.net

MTC–00005234

From: Mr Bleakley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:15am
Subject: Microsoft settelment

Sirs:

I ask the D. O. J. discontinue ANY further action that is detrimental to Microsoft and the business community. I suggest a full settlement of the charges against Microsoft as outlined by the court. In my opinion, the governments should all be ashamed of themselves for persecuting a company that has done as much for an industry as has Microsoft. Mr. Bleakley

MTC–00005235

From: Milton Karafilis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:19am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please approve the settlement of the Microsoft case. This is not the time to be undoing a settlement to the harm of a US Company like Microsoft. The problem seems to be with the States that have Microsoft competitors, let them find their profits in the marketplace like the rest of us. Thank You for your consideration...

Milton Karafilis,
Sole Proprietor & Microsoft User

MTC–00005236

From: Bob Little
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement of the DOJ vs. Microsoft case should NOT include free Microsoft software for schools. That would only further Microsoft's Monopoly. Microsoft should put up cash and let the schools decide how to spend it. In fact, rules should be put in place so that the money must be spent at companies other than Microsoft. That would be a proper punishment for Microsoft's monopolistic practices.

MTC–00005237

From: Suji Singh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

USDOJ —-

In my opinion Microsoft Settlement is fair and equitable. Enough is enough! No company should be punished for its success.

Sincerely, Suji Singh, Professor of Mathematics, SW Texas State University, San Marcos, TX 78666.

MTC–00005238

From: Charles Stark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I oppose all attempts to institute government control of Microsoft. Leave them alone! Let free enterprise solve the problems of free enterprise.

Charles R. Stark

MTC–00005239

From: Mike Ezekiel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have no great love for the way Microsoft does business. They essentially did the same thing Apple and other computer companies have done through the 80's—they stole their ideas from others. The result is, that they have been highly successful and a dominant force in the industry. But, that's not what I'm writing about.

Fairness! It is unfair to go after Microsoft when you have the bloodsuckers at AOL doing whatever they please. I would like to know what happened with that 18 Billion dollar lawsuit against them. Swept under the rug? I have not heard anything about it. Lots of states also had lawsuits against them. And believe me, those were valid lawsuits. I owned my own computer company in 1999—2000, and we had nothing but problems with AOL software. Causing hardware problems and essentially taking over the computer and not allowing other dial-up software to work properly.

So, unless your going to be fair across the board! Leave Microsoft alone!!! Settle, and let Microsoft innovate!

Mike Ezekiel
Concerned IT specialist

MTC–00005240

From: Peter Shikli
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/1/02 10:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DoJ,
Microsoft is asking those of us they feel are partial to them to send you our requests to be lenient with them. Please have the resolve to finish what you started in a way that protects us from monopolies. There can be no doubt that Microsoft has stifled the competition on our desktop. You will never again have this chance to restore a level playing field.
Sincerely,
Peter Shikli
CEO, BusinessWare
2738 Camino Capistrano,
San Clemente, CA 92672
949–369–1638 x77—
pshikli@bizware.com
www.bizware.com
Automating Online B2B Communities
Reply-To: <3—23163—02E08142–9573–4226–979F-8BBBFBCCCBDF—US@Newsletters.Microsoft.com> From: ''Microsoft'' <0—23163—02E08142–9573–4226–979F-8BBBFBCCCBDF—US@Newsletters.Microsoft.com>
To: <info@bizware.com>
Subject: DOJ Wants to Hear From YOU!
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:15:49 -0800
For nearly four years, your voice has been instrumental in the debate over the freedom to innovate. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens have communicated to their public officials about whether the Microsoft case should be settled or further litigated. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

However, this settlement is not guaranteed, and your voice is more important than ever.

The law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the ''public interest.'' Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest.

Between now and January 28th, it is critical that the Department of Justice hears from you about the Microsoft settlement. The Department of Justice will then take all public comments and viewpoints and include them in the public record for the District Court to consider. Please send your comments directly to the Department of Justice via email or fax no later than January 28th. Whatever your view of the settlement, it is critical that the government hears directly from consumers. Please take action today to ensure your voice is heard.

Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov . In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.
Fax: 1–202–307–1454 or 1–202–616–9937
To find out more about the settlement and the Tunney Act comment period, go to the Department of Justice Website at: http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm.
Thanks for taking the time to make a difference.

MTC–00005241

From: Freund, Robert W
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ,
It is time to move on and make this settlement final.
Our interests as a country will best be served by completing the settlement in the form contained in the Tunney Act.
I can't imagine a more productive end to this farce. thanks
-bob

MTC–00005242

From: Ken Partridge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:36am
Subject: State opposition to settlement
Consumers voted with their dollars on who would be the leader in operating systems. We should be thanking Microsoft for standardizing an industry. These states are looking for a free ride in revenue. Why would the US Justice Department support ambulance chasers? Settle this now and let Microsoft get back to innovation.
Ken Partridge
Chandler, AZ

MTC–00005243

From: Baraneetharan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Respected Sir,
Microsoft case should be settled , there is no need to drag it further. The current settlement is tough , but it is reasonable. I feel the settlement is good foe everybody.
Thanks
Baraneetharan

MTC–00005244

From: DMcKerch@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Consumers Perspective
Microsoft has good, products and low prices. In now way do I believe Microsoft is trying to take advantage of the consumer. Their actions are precisely what capitalism is all about. Perhaps they are more aggressive than other companies, so what, that is why they are number one in the world. Having everything nicely integrated makes my life much easier. Punishing Microsoft because their competitors whine is placing the government in a role of subverting capitalism. There are much better uses for our national energies than beating up on successful companies.
David McKercher
Farmington Hills, Michigan

MTC–00005245

From: Dolores Freund
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/1/02 10:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ,
I wish to voice my support of Microsoft's position in the current lawsuit. Microsoft has fueled the growth of our economy with its superior innovations. It is the quality and quantity of these innovations which has made Microsoft software the standard for excellence that consumers have come to rely on. Microsoft has shown an AMAZING ability to innovate and continue to innovate. This continuous innovation has made it very hard for competitors to keep up. Excellence should be applauded and encouraged, not discouraged because it makes it so hard for competitors to keep up. Microsoft should NOT BE CRIPPLED. It should not be PUNISHED for its successes. Microsoft innovations FUEL the growth of our economy by fueling PRODUCTIVITY for ALL AMERICANS.
VERY Sincerely,
Dolores Freund

MTC–00005246

From: john makara
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I have been following the Governments case against Microsoft and I believe the settlement should be enacted by both parties in the interest of our national economy. The tactics and market conditions that Microsoft acted on and what fostered the governments claims have clearly changed so much that any anti-trust remedy aimed at changing Microsoft's business practices will be inapplicable and ineffective now. Microsoft is clearly a player in a global competitive economy and should be allowed to exercise business practices in a effort to promote its products. As a consumer I have reaped the benefits of Microsoft success by purchasing amazingly productive software from Microsoft in the last 10 years at prices that have remained stable even though inflation has reduced the actual cost to me. Even had prices been high due to 'monopoly' power I still would have a choice of when and how much software to buy.

The governments case against Microsoft however has cost taxpayers millions of dollars and is an example of a cost I am FORCED to bear. It is not my choice to spend my money this way but the choice of a few wealthy government officials and lawyers.

MTC–00005247

From: Edwin Mizrahi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ,
I think the settlement is a step in the right direction. But, I think companies should not be forced to prove if they are in the public interest or anti-competitive. Companies should be allowed to profit from their work just like individuals. If the contracts are voluntary, and don't violate the other parties rights, then their practices should be allowed

to continue. My existence and Microsoft's should not be based on permission. This is not Soviet Russia, or Communist China. America is for the rights of individuals. Which includes having the government protecting peoples right to their property. This to me means being able to create property, (Windows 2000) and being able to dispose of that property as they sees fit. (Selling it bundled or under certain conditions with other software). I think Justice means people get what they have earned. Microsoft has not used force or fraud to sell its products. It has earned everything morally. Therefore, if Netscape or Sun or whomever doesn't like it, they should just accept it or get out of the business.

Sincerely,
Edwin Mizrahi
NYC
Be Seeing You.....
Edwin
personal e-mail emizrahi@yahoo.com

MTC–00005248

From: Mauro Gandini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with Microsoft
Mauro Gandini
The Outsourcing Company
Milano Italy

MTC–00005250

From: Tom Pate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please include my comments in the public record for the District Court to consider for the Microsoft Settlement.

I support the settlement as is. I oppose government/judicial action that interferes with free-market trade. Those businesses suing Microsoft are taking advantage of the political system to compensate for their failure to perform in the free market system.

I am not an employee of Microsoft. I own no Microsoft stock directly (but probably some through Mutual Fund investments).

MTC–00005251

From: clayton sherwood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:27am
Subject: End

Microsoft settlement. C Sherwood

MTC–00005252

From: Gremelkin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please continue with the settlement. No further litigation is necessary.

Lynne Nelson

MTC–00005253

From: balbert@claritas.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Honorable Justices,

I have been a professional software developer for fifteen years and have been using tools developed by Microsoft and other vendors throughout my career. I believe, that although Microsoft has engaged in some questionable business practices, they have greatly benefited the software and computer industry as a whole. Prior to the Microsoft standards, software development was chaotic due to the many incompatible platforms that prevailed. Microsoft solved this very burdensome situation by introducing DOS and later Windows. Their development and promotion of COM was a major achievement in software development which allowed components developed in different programming languages and using both Microsoft and non-Microsoft compilers to communicate with one another.

I believe that Microsoft should adhere to your recent decision and not be further penalized for the good of everyone.

Sincerely,
Bob Albert
Director, Application Services Development
Claritas Inc
53 Brown Rd
Ithaca, NY 14850

MTC–00005254

From: Joseph (038) Taylor Hilden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:34am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Enough is enough . Four years of this unnecessary waste of taxpayers money instigated by a few competitors is enough. Let the competitors compete in the marketplace and save litagation for the proper cases. The anti-trust laws are suppose to protect the consumers but this travesty of an investigation has been unneeded. The public has never been reequesting this witch hunt. Please let this case die soon. Thank You in Advance Joseph and Carol Hilden

MTC–00005255

From: THOMAS J CLINTON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I want to express my opinion that to continue this litigation any further will hurt our economy and free enterprise.

MTC–00005256

From: Hilda899@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I heartily approve of the DOJ's settlement with Microsoft and wish that it would take place promptly. Too much time and federal dollars have been spent trying to beat down a company that has contributed a great deal to the development of technology and wealth in the U.S. The DOJ's and competitors' concern for the lowly consumer is a farce. No consumer that I am aware of ever complained about Microsoft's behavior. It's the company's competitors who used the consumer argument to challenge Microsoft because of Microsoft's dominant leadership. Your settlement and supervision of future developments will keep the company in check without destroying its initiative.

H.F. Marx, 380 Prospect Ave., Hackensack, NJ 07601

MTC–00005257

From: Bobo462@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

When is this tragedy going to end? When Microsofts competition learn its easier to innovate and not litigate. Its amazing how the same states and senators as there competition are the ones who dont want to settle. This case has never been about the publics best interest but that of other companies such as sun micro, orcle, aol, csco, and the list goes on. The public was never really harmed by Microsoft and alot of other software companies and tech firms who associated anything with windows became great succsesses. I dont think we need ten different operating systems or ten different internet exploreres. Linux is free and I would never use it. This company's litigation has single handedly destroyed the whole tech sector. Thanks for 3 years of zero growth and a devastated Nasdaq. I'm sure all these Goverment Officials should be proud of what they accomplished in the name of competition and innovation. Maybe they should look at how much money Microsoft spends on research and developement. When Phillip Morris diversified noone worried about there other bussinesses, but sun micro started all this litigation in this country and abroad when Microsoft when into the server market. What kind of company trys to hurt another American company abroad. Especially when our technology is one of our greatest assets. At this rate we will fall behind the rest of the world in technology innovation and then it will devastate our economy for years to come.

Please stop the madness..
Steven Woolverton
Staten Island, Nerw York

MTC–00005258

From: Geb Blum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to show my support for the DOJ-Microsoft settlement. We're not going to get anywhere getting the country moving again by using our resources to bash and try to destroy honest and successful US companies like Microsoft.

Geb Blum
Tulsa, OK

MTC–00005259

From: Sean Parsons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I would like to express my disappointment in the settlement against Microsoft. District Court Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly's demand for expediency was at the cost of accomplishing true justice.

The settlement codifies the legality of Microsoft's predatory practices. While it forces Microsoft to share its APIs with the competition, it also forces those who use the APIs to share their finished code with Microsoft. The result is that Microsoft would

see all of its competition's trade secrets and easily replicate them. Or, though the ruling ensures that Microsoft competitors be allowed to get their icons on PC desktops, the clause only applies to companies who have sold more than a million copies of their software in the United States. The very companies who need a competitive advantage in this case can't get it.

As if the antitrust settlement wasn't determined in poor enough judgement, the civil settlement is worse. After documented proof and testimony from various respected professionals about how Microsoft has gouged consumers by charging over four times as much as what a competitive-market would allow for similar software (generating billions of extra dollars due to its OS monopoly) all they have to do in return is donate old Microsoft computers and software to poor schools, something it needs to do periodically anyway to keep its staff in the latest tools. This also creates some inroads into schools, the one market it has had some trouble in (it only controls about 50% of that market).

I sincerely hope that upon further reviews of the DOJ's decisions that someone will attempt to correct this terrible injustice.

Sean E. Parsons
seanparsons1976@yahoo.com

MTC–00005260

From: george h byrkit
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Opinion of George Byrkit, 4755 Dexter Pinckney Road, Dexter, MI 48130 USA: I find that this suit was brought by a consortium (cabal) of Microsoft's competitors. Most of these competitors made poor business decisions on their own, without Microsoft's involvement. Then these competitors got an overly-friendly justice department to prosecute a very thin case, which only had merit in a very thin area.

It is more than likely that Microsoft will NOT be a going concern in 20 years, based on my experience in the IT industry. To punish them too harshly will only hasten the end of Microsoft, but to no advantage to the customer or to Microsoft's competitors, as the users will NOT necessarily adopt their inferior product to replace that offered by Microsoft. Judge Jackson erred in evaluating the magnitude of the challenge offered by Linux and other Open Source initiatives. As such, his remedies were excessive and over-zealous, not to mention recommended by a Macintosh fanatic/fancier.

Do NOT allow the few states that are hold-outs to keep this otherwise meritorious settlement from proceeding. They are mostly home states to Microsoft's competitors, so are less than impartial in this matter. Most of those objecting to the proposed settlement object on the grounds that 'they' don't get a piece of the action. Too bad!

Regards,
George Byrkit

MTC–00005261

From: Tom Hallis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

You and Microsoft have finally reached an agreement the seems to be acceptable by all except those few competitors who have not been able to compete due to their own inabilities to satisfy the customer, and those District Attorneys who just can not let go of an issue that the majority of us believe should be over.

I used to use all of the Competitors of Microsoft in my business because they were better. They did not keep up with my needs so I switched to Microsoft because they listened. For Microsoft to be penalized for doing a better job for the consumer is a blow to the consumer and any company who succeeds as a result of aggressive marketing and product development. Please do not go backwards and get caught up in the unpopular minority consensus put forward by Microsoft's competitors or those few states' Attorneys that can not let go for there own personal reasons.

Best regards,
Tom Hallis, Realtor(R)
GRI, CIPS, CRLS, CLHS, CCRS
''Serving the Tampa Bay Area''
''If it matters to you, it matters to Tom''
Mail to: thallis1@tampabay.rr.com
Web Page: http://www.tomhallis.com
Office Phone: 727–367–2793 Ext 128
Office Fax: 727–367–8733
Mobile Phone: 727–215–3156

MTC–00005262

From: John Verger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I have been following the DOJ case concerning Microsoft for the past couple of years. During that time I have never written you but I feel that the time has come to voice my opinion. I have, in the past five years, spent approximately $2000 buying various MS products ranging from operating systems (98SE, 2000 Pro, XP Pro) to Flight Simulators (2000, 2002, and multiple Air Combat) to Office (97 and 2000). My point is that I have continued to buy their products because of the value, and enjoyment, I get from them. When I go to a store I have the money to buy any compaies product but I normally buy MS. Not because of advertising or magazine articles but because of my own experience with various products. MS has what I consider to be the best track record of any software company in the world today. And I spend my money where I know it gets its best value. For example, I build my own computers because I like working with the various components and setting it up exactly the way I want it. When I buy the Central Processing Unit (CPU) I buy AMD instead of Intel because I consider them to be the best even though they are the smaller and less known. I would do the same with software if anyone out there is better than MS I will buy them! Please settle this case so that Microsoft can put this behind them and do what they do best-write the best software programs known to man.

Thank You,
John D. Verger
9500 Springdale Rd.
Austin, Texas 78754–9639

MTC–00005263

From: Jerome D. Bashinski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

I am a consumer and have been a computer user and small system designer since the early days of PCs. One of the greatest things that happened in our world was when Microsoft software was selected through choice by users as the dominant operating system and as the final choice for office applications such as Word, Excel, Power Point, etc. Before that occurred, it was nearly impossible for inter agency and cross agency information sharing and for connection of various system. The same thing is true with browsers. I am tired of seeing the United States Government in the form of the Department of Justice taking sides between Microsoft and its competitors in the software market place. I have bought and will continue to purchase very good Microsoft software as excellent values for their cost in place of software produced by other publishers. For years because Microsoft has given and continues to give the best value for the dollar spent. And, I am one hell of a lot better judge of that than is the US Department of Justice, the State of California, or Microsoft's competitors.

The action taken by DOJ against Microsoft isn't just unfair, it distorted the entire idea of a monopoly. It is literally unAmerican to use the Government Monopoly in a such a fashion. From my point of view the agreement which has been accepted by Microsoft is unfair to Microsoft. I believe, the agreement, do to the idiocy of the Department of Justice, the Courts, and other branches of government will result in higher prices, and the sniveling of competitors will result in shoddier and higher priced products for consumers. However, an agreement has been forged and accepted by Microsoft.

So, Get on with the agreement as it has been made and stop listening to whining and complaining of Microsoft competitors and other government units, such as the State of California, that are trying to get additional money for for their own political purposes. They surely don't care about me or the other consumers who already chose Microsoft in a free market place. They are concerned only about themselves.

Jerome D. Bashinski
3114 Brackenwood Pl.
El Dorado Hills, Ca.
95762

MTC–00005264

From: Terry Myerson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:10pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft settlement

It is wonderful to see that a rational discussion of the issues has finally taken place between the government and Microsoft. It would be wonderful to see the settlement approved, and watch our capitalist system grow on.

Terry Myerson

4114 187th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

MTC–00005265

From: George Flake
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I think that the harrassment of Microsoft Corporation via the antitrust court case should be terminated promptly. I am an owner of Microsoft stock and feel that he government has unfairly cost me money because of this lawsuit. Please bring this case to closure.

George H. Flake
17867 Amberwood Lane
South Bend, IN 46635

MTC–00005266

From: GARY STOGSDILL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is reasonable and fair, how much longer must this go on. Let's get this economy rolling we don't need this to further delay our wishes.

MTC–00005267

From: Dick Schwab
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice,

The time has come to put and end to continuing legal action against the Microsoft Inc. and complete the proposed U.S. Microsoft Settlement. The Department of Justice (i.e injustice) together with the Federal Reserve started in the year 2000 the Tanking of the US economy buy spooking the investment community. Now that you both have succeeded and cost me the majority of my life savings I wish you would get your heads out of your butts and allow me to live out the few years I have left with a return of the investment community to investing in their beliefs and not being dictated to by US Government agencies who think playing with the laws is a game. All of you are hired to serve all of America not just a few special interest groups trying to force their products on people by using US Government actions. In this country, the better product and better service is what gains product acceptance and the consumer should not be jerked around by US Government agencies serving a few special interest groups. Now go and do the right thing and serve all of America's consumers and investors instead of serving just a few special interest groups.

Richard Schwab
38 Howard Street
West Haven, CT 06516
rj.schwab@snet.net

MTC–00005268

From: hal gronewold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I'm relieved the Department of Justice has finally settled its antitrust case against Microsoft. I hope the other states will soon see the light and sign on to this agreement.

We in Iowa believe we have benefited from Microsoft products. Had it not been for Microsoft's policies the average American would not be able to afford a PC. I hope Microsoft will be able to get back to the business of providing innovative software and other products for consumers without this distraction. Our economy depends on high technology to keep moving it forward and Microsoft is one of the prime stimulants.

Thank you for supporting this settlement. I trust you will continue to make the decisions needed for the stability and security of our American way of life. Thank you for your attention.

Harlan L. Gronewold
PO Box 524
Atlantic, IA 50022
712–243–2083
E-Mail halagron@metc.net
FAX 712–243–5812

MTC–00005269

From: Joseph Duffey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:50pm
Subject: the proposed mircrsoft settlement

Blank I am really flabbergasted at the lack of concern for consumers displayed in the proposed settlements in the matter of Microsoft

Joseph Duffey
2801 New Mexico Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20007
jduffey@earthlink.net

MTC–00005270

From: Nancy Swaim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:53pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Where do states rights end and state Attorney Generals (who wannabe governors, at the very least) end?

Let's see if you can get politics out of this case and end it fairly. How much ''tax payer's money'' has already been spent on this case? Outrageous!

Thanks you.
Nancy Swaim
1/1/02

MTC–00005271

From: wolfgang manowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Lets settle the Microsoft Settlement now; nothing could be more ''in the publics interest''.

Regards,
Wolfgang Manowski
25 Southridge Way
Daly City, CA 94014
4153335610 wolfm3@yahoo.com
Regards, Wolf.

MTC–00005272

From: Dave Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsofot Settlement

I believe that the current agreement is in the best interest of all those concerned, Thanks Dave Moore.

MTC–00005273

From: Hank Sauls
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:10pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Wait a minute—aren't you supposed to represent the public? Then why did you put out such a STUPID agreement? Is this the best you can do? Next time I suggest you use lawyers that have a legit law degree and not the ones that learned law in jail! Nincompoops! You make a mockery of justice! The ordor from this stinky agreement will NOT go away. Am extrememly disappointed with your actions. No wonder the Senate is investigating. Thanks for selling us all out. No wonder people loathe lawyers. You are now part of the problem and NOT part of the solution.

Assholes.
Sincerely, WHS

MTC–00005274

From: Claudio Vacalebre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please Stop the litigation ang give Microsoft the opportunity to continue improving its products! We leverage, as IT Providers, the Microsoft Platfom, considered by us the best IT platform the market can offer.

Dr.claudio
CEO & CIO dotMMS srl
Messenger: claudiov99@hotmail.com
Sito Istituzionale: www.dotmms.it
Portale dimostrativo: http://dotmms.tv
Sito Personale: http://claudio.tv

MTC–00005275

From: Helchie Charles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope that the nine states who want to create even more trouble for Microsoft are told to go on their way. Four years is enough time having disruptions occur to a great American company such as Microsoft.

Our country is at war and all these states can think of is their own agendas. Well, our economy is trying to rebound after the worst attacks on American soil ever. Hearing the Attorney General of Connecticut whine about the terms of this settlement is sad and he is humiliating his state. They were very close to Ground Zero and this is what he focused on? Time to get this settled and give Microsoft a chance to continue to raise the level of perfection in the field of software. If this company wants time to adjust to the settlement then I think they should get it. After the blistering they received at the hands of Judge Jackson they deserve some break in this whole mess. Now at a time when we are all asked to ''keep the economy moving'' who

are these nine states to show us they are not willing to do the same?

Thank you for your time.

Helen Charles

MTC–00005276

From: Flash Sheridan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Re: DOJ Wants to Hear From YOU!

On Monday, December 31, 2001, at 02:17 PM, Microsoft wrote: Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov. In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.

Please don't believe Microsoft's orchestrated pseudo-grass-roots campaign. They're an illegal monopoly and should be treated as such. CC:Flash Sheridan

MTC–00005277

From: Elizabeth Lester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a citizen of California, and am in STRONG FAVOR OF proceeding with the Microsoft SETTLEMENT in lieu of further litigation. Far too much effort has been spent to demonize a company which helped spark the pc revolution. Many technology companies have benefitted from the success of Microsoft, and it is undeniable that Microsoft has created countless American jobs. Microsoft's philanthropic efforts have been earnest and most generous. Great philanthropy does not justify wrongdoing. But what is so wrong about revolutionizing the way we live and work and making a profit in the process? I can think of many other ''villains'' to attack: Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, John Walker. Did they put personal computers in schools or money in workers' pockets? I don't think so. Let's start attacking our real enemies, and stop biting the hands that feed us.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth H. Lester
Fremont, California
CC:Larry Hollis,Tim Lester

MTC–00005278

From: Larry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am for proceeding with the current settlement.

From everything I've read, I believe the settlement reached between the DOJ, Microsoft, and 9 states is fair, reasonable, and healthy for the software industry and consumers. Further punishment or shackles on Microsoft would only serve to weaken American strength in the global technology industry.

Dr. Larry Novak
1751 Oakmount Rd.
South Euclid, Ohio 44121–4007

MTC–00005279

From: Stephen Myers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My view is that Microsoft has acted in the publics interest to come to settlement terms with the DOJ and nine states, even though they could prolong litigation to receive a more favorable outcome. I think the terms should be accepted, and the resourses of the government put to better use elsewhere.

Thank you
Stephen Myers

MTC–00005281

From: Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft

The people and the business world has had enough. A settlement was reached and it's time to get on with life. Do not allow others to derail what has taken a very long time to settle.

MTC–00005282

From: Jim Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to urge the government to settle this case quickly. Our economy is in dire need for this case to be resolved as quickly as possible. Microsoft is one of the gems of our global economy. Our entire world's economy is in bad shape directly as a result of the actions of a few misguided individuals in the previous administration.

The Bush administration, the justice department and the judges involved in this case owes it to the public to resolve this case quickly and get our economy back on track.

It is no secret and historical market data/charts can prove that the stock market meltdown started immediately after this case was ruled upon by Judge Jackson. As Microsoft's stock started falling the rest of the tech sector started falling thereby causing a market meltdown. Ironically many flourishing new competitors with low cash and high market cap were able to compete with Microsoft with their stock capital. Now those companies are gone also because of these state attorney generals and the previous administration.

It is ironic that the competitors of Microsoft got hurt by this case more as well as the entire dotcom economy crased after this case was decided upon in the lower courts.

The government and Microsoft's Competitors must learn and realize from this mistake that our software industry and the entire IT industry is linked by a common fabric of stability, leadership and innovation led by Microsoft, the independent software and hardware vendors and partners that build high technology solutions around this fabric.

Every day as more PCs are sold with the standardized Windows platform, there is secondary (trickle down) demand created for:

1. Semiconductor components that make up a PC—Memory, processors etc.,

2. Peripherals that are attached to the PC such as disk drives, video cards, modems, network interfaces, etc.,

3. Software from 3rd party developers that build solution around Windows all over the world including bridging competitive platforms around Windows

4. IT consulting by—EDS, Price Waterhouse, D&T, and many many small consulting firms all over the world

5. Servers—IBM, SUN Microsystems, Compaq, Dell, Gateway, Sony, Fujitsu, Unisys, Hitachi, etc., to serve web pages to the masses that will go online after their PC purchases

6. Advanced backoffice software to provide infrastructure to millions of PC users (eCommerce, B2B, B2C, etc.,)—SAP, People Soft, Oracle, IBM, and other similar products by many smaller companies Microsoft's competitors had gained just as much benefits by Microsoft's success as a result of this secondary and trickle down demand until the stock market meltdown.

Lets not forget that the Internet economy was created by the masses that logged on to the information highway and started the eCommerce craze. These same masses use Windows based PCs to participate in eCommerce thereby generating demand for Servers; yes the very same servers that Microsoft's competitors make such as Sun, IBM, Oracle etc.,

It was extremely shortsighted and misguided for these attorney generals to be waging this war against Microsoft in the name of consumers. In fact ironically, more consumers and general public have been economically hurt by the careless actions of these attorney generals.

As a direct result of this DOJ case against Microsoft, many 401k and retirement funds have been wiped out both in the private as well as the Goverment sector and not to mention the millions of dollars that has been wasted on this case to please a few wealthy, envious and greedy executives of the tech industry.

Lets resolve this problem right away by accepting the settlement between Microsoft and the goverment. Furthermore, the state attorney generals should be scolded by the judge for trying to derail this important settlement.

Sincerely,
Tax Payer.

MTC–00005283

From: Robert G. Parsons
To Microsoft ATR,john.hostettler@mail.house.gov@inetg...
Date: 1/1/02 1:55pm
Subject: Letter regarding Microsoft AntiTrust Suit

Gentlemen,

Attached please find a letter regarding the Microsoft AntiTrust Settlement.

Thank you for listening.

Bob Parsons
Robert G. Parsons
President
AUTOMATED OFFICE SOLUTIONS 2100 N. Cullen Ave.
Evansville, IN 47715
812–471–5005 Phone
812–471–5858 Fax rgp@aos-evv.com www.aos-evv.com

December 31, 2001

Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Dept. of Justice: 950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

Over the years I have encountered several instances where I believe that Microsoft had crossed the line of overly aggressive sales and service techniques—particularly with respect to its technology partners. I have never been convinced, however, that this business-savvy attitude warranted something as severe as this antitrust lawsuit instituted against them by our own government. More likely than not, should Microsoft's aggressive attitude have continued, market pressure would have brought them back into a more cooperative spirit anyway. Certainly, our government's threats to break the company up were a bit over the top.

Now that the lawsuit has been settled, however, I am sure that Microsoft will be more likely to treat its technology partners with a greater degree of cooperation, helpfulness and respect. I am therefore hopeful that the settlement will be affirmed through this period of public comment, and that no further federal action will be required.

This letter is a measure of that hope. We cannot allow the government to spend any more of its valuable resources and time on this. There are obviously so many other more important matters with which to deal. The Justice Department itself is especially busy lately, perhaps more so than any other agency. Our government can do great things for America in areas such security and the national economy now, and it should focus instead on that.

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion in such a meaningful way. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Parsons, President
AUTOMATED OFFICE SOLUTIONS
2100 N. Cullen Ave.
Evansville, IN 47715
rgp@aos-evv.com 812–471–5005
cc: Representative John Hostettler

MTC–00005284

From: Tom Conrad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Resolution

To whom it may concern:

I would like to express my opposition to the Microsoft Anti-Trust ''settlement''. The settlement is clearly insufficient punishment for a corporation that controls in excess of 90% of the personal computing market and attempts to dominate every aspect of the consumer electronics marketplace.

As a senior software engineer for a major defense contractor, I indirectly depend upon Microsoft for my paycheck; however, I see Microsoft abuse its monopoly power on an almost daily basis. Numerous small companies that provided excellent customer service and superior products (Visio Inc., AutoMap Inc., and many others . . .) were purchased by Microsoft in the name of ''progress'' and ''innovation''. The technology developed by these companies was dissolved into the ''MS Monopoly'' (a phrase that is probably trademarked by Microsoft by now), with Microsoft claiming credit for the ''innovation'' of the original products. As part of the ''Microsoft overhaul'', the products from these former companies were usually packed with useless features (such as promotions for other Microsoft products) and sold at higher prices (ironically, because of the new ''features'').

As a software developer, I'm forced to decipher Microsoft's pathetic documentation in an attempt to create products that compete with their own applications. I've tried using Microsoft's so-called ''technical support'' to try to determine how to implement new software, only to be told I ''couldn't'' or ''shouldn't'' do what I'm attempting. After failing to receive answers from their technical support staff after literally weeks of waiting, I would resort to using ''undocumented'' techniques to determine how to make my software work with their operating systems. Naturally, Microsoft detests those who would dare use ''undocumented'' features, although a quick analysis of their software indicates their internal developers use the same functions I use. I simply can't imagine Microsoft's ''Office 200(whatever)'' development team having to wait for weeks to get answers to their questions!

In summary, in order to restore competition into the computing marketplace, Microsoft must be broken into at least two divisions (operating systems and software applications). This would allow smaller companies to compete with Microsoft and would give consumers limited relief from ''MS Monopoly 2002''. More importantly, such an action would force Microsoft's application developers to live in the same environment as the ''rest of us''. If you really want to see ''innovation'', not merely ''MS Innovation 2002'', break them up! Contrary to Microsoft's statements, the computing world is very unlikely to abruptly end!

—Tom Conrad
Senior Software Engineer
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005285

From: Kenth Astrom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

It is my firm oppinion that DOJ should dismiss the case against Microsoft entierly.

The charge was not just in the first case and was politically motivated. Microsoft has done more for this country and this economy than any other large corporation in history, with products which makes life easier and are enjoyed all over the world.

Please take the only plausible action and dismiss this case when the ruling takes place this month.

Freedom to invent must endure, especially in this downturn in economy!

Yours Sincerely
Kenth Astrom
Northford, CT

MTC–00005286

From: Stanley Holman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To those of you that are concerned. Please lay off Microsoft, they have done more to offer help to potential competitors than any other company I can think of.

As a simple computer user, (As the vast majority of us are), It is EXTREMELY important that all of the programs within the computer do not conflict with each other. No other entity that I know of is nearly as concerned with this aspect of the business as Microsoft.

Bill Gates, In my opinion, did nothing wrong except to look out for those of us that are not computer programmers by incorporating a working browser for free. Additionally, he has not sent us looking for drivers or asked us to go into our systems and fiddle with programs, system ini files, etc.

Bill Gates is a true American hero and a perfect example of how to become a Millionaire. The exact opposite of (AOL ''Arabs on line'' and Time Warner) who have many Anti American policies and employees.

Sincerely;
Stanley L. Holman

MTC–00005287

From: dave
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust non-settlement

The proposed settlement of the antitrust action against Microsoft is unacceptable. This settlement could be compared to citing Hitler for not having his apparatus for killing people up to the current safety code—no safety valves for the pilots on the oven burners.

David Freeman

MTC–00005289

From: kathie grimsley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 2:47pm
Subject: Microsoft

In my opinion . . . the message to Microsoft AND it's competitors should be that innovative ideas are needed to keep us moving towards the future and ensure the best products are available. However, designing operating systems or software applications that are not openly compatible stiffles innovations and limits the consumers ability to use whatever OS and applications best meets their needs.

In spite of already losing in the courts, Microsoft continues to use every means possible to stifle any competition that could provide alternative products. ''Open'' competition would force ALL hardware and software manufacturers to provide products that are cross-compatible AND user friendly. Their software continues to demand more memory, faster processing, upgraded programs, etc. Technical support for older (last version) hardware and software products is non-existant. You can no longer buy any hardware or software that you can expect to use for more than 6 months to a year. What kind of resources (plastics, metals, haz-mat substances) are being wasted by making these products ''disposable''? How much money must the consumers be expected to spend just to keep a system that is useable AND supported?

Microsoft's latest release (Microsoft XP)now threatens to infringe upon privacy issues. They are not threatened by the monetary fines assessed by the courts so far. They have consumers by the short hairs and

will just continue their practices which will continue to make them more money than is imaginable.

Microsoft has the advantage of being able to set the ''standard''. Everyone else (consumers & competitors) are force-fed the Mircosoft standard because there isn't anything else acceptable. The Microsoft systems continue to be unreliable. Systems crash, vital information and productivity is lost. How is this acceptable? The old DOS systems were VERY reliable and cross-compatible. Never any crashes, no lost information, etc.

Part of the blame also rests with consumers for not demanding alternative products. Alot of consumers (individuals and businesses)jumped on the Microsoft bandwagon before it's systems were time-tested. Most are unwilling at this point to make critical changes because of the expense that would be involved.

Microsoft continues to operate in a manner that is not conducive to a competitive environment and will ultimately do more harm to the consumers and the industry if left unchecked.

Now that this has been brought to the fore-front, we have the ability to force change for the betterment of the industry and the consumer. The message to Microsoft must be strong ''CEASE and DESIST the unfair practices'' they continue to use. Their products should be openly compatible so the consumer can decide what they want to use. If Microsoft is truly the superior product, they will have lost nothing and gained the respect of the industry and the consumer. If they are not the superior product, the industry and the consumer wins the chance to find or create something better.

Thank you.

MTC–00005290

From: Mike KAZEEF
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a user of Microsoft products and would like to support the current terms of the settlement.

I am urging DOJ to place a great dal of weight on the value of innovation.Economic growth and technological leadership do not happen by themselves. They are triggered or supported by advances in thinking and improving the execution of business strategies in all walks of life.

Thank you for considering the long term well being of the US economy.

Regards
Mike Kazeef
2000 Santiago Drive
Newport Beach, CA 92660

MTC–00005291

From: TheRHogue Hogue
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the ''public interest.''

During this public comment period, I would like to state that the settlement is fair for all parties and for the American people.

The current settlement is in the best interest of our country. Given the current recession and the terrorist assault on our country, I ask the court to end this litigation by accepting the settlement. 2002 is an election year. I ask the court not to allow this matter to, once again, cause political mischief.

It is true that a few of Microsoft's rivals wish to continue litigation, and it is their right to do so. But, the settlement isn't designed to help these rivals. The settlement is for the benefit of the American people. I ask the court to help the American people do what they desire most...to move on in troubled times.

Sincerely
Robert Hogue

MTC–00005292

From: Joan Ruffing
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sirs:

Please settle this conflict immediately.

Our economy is in enough difficulty at this time. Steel mills are closing. Many industries are fleeing to the low employment costs of other countries. When an American industry is thriving, why do we spend all these tax dollars trying to destroy it?

Leave Microsoft alone and spend your time and MY DOLLARS trying to fix our struggling economy.

Sincerely,
Joan Ruffing, LMS

MTC–00005293

From: Mark Genung
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been involved in the computer industry since 1978. It is my humble opinion that we would not be were we are today without industry leaders like Microsoft. Microsoft has almost single handedly paved the road to get technology on the desktop, where it is today.

I have never really understood the government trying to protect me, the consumer, from a good company like Microsoft. An American company that started out with nothing, was in the right place and the right time, made good decisions and through the same basic business philosophy that we preach to our children, become one of the most successful companies of all time. Now my government says they have gotten to big and successful, that that cheap operating system or browser they provide for free can't be good.

I know this, if it were not for Microsoft we would still be in the dark ages with computers, and to purchase the software that Microsoft almost gives away it would cost 10–20 times what Microsoft charges for it.

I'm a small business man, I understand competition, if I do my job better than my competitor, I will survive , If I don't, I won't.

What message should record in history? Be successful, but don't be too successful? This Microsoft story is as American as apple pie. Don't mess with my apple pie. Let this story play out. Just as Microsoft got on top, they could be just as easily tumbled by some other innovative concepts we have not considered. The government is trying to handle this; time will take care of any antitrust problem on its own.

Settle with Microsoft and let's get on to the things in this country that are important.

Sincerely,
Mark A. Genung
8247 Indy Court
Indianapolis, IN 46214
317–271–1000

MTC–00005294

From: leo coro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

The proposal that Microsoft has put forward is just more of the same thing that they have been doing. Their offer of ''used computer equipment'' and software is ridicules. The cost of the software should be counted value wise, at the cost of the materials only, so its value is about $0.02 per copy not street cost. The value of ''used computer equipment'' is again nothing for a Corp. of their size the upgrading of equipment is constant, and makes a good tax rite off so we the ones they have been robing with their ''we will do as we please '' and no one can stop us must end or the total industry will collapse.

Leo S. Coro
Richmond VA.

MTC–00005295

From: Jim Botts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am 100% in favor of this settlement. It should not of been filled in the first place.

James W. Botts
jsbotts@earthlink.net

MTC–00005296

From: Mark Josephs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 3:50pm
Subject: Comments

Dear Sir:

I have worked with computer software for over 18 years. During this time I have seem the growth and death of many software companies. However, the Microsoft monopoly has grown using illegal practices. I have been damaged by these illegal practices when I purchased WordPerfect for Windows and it did not work. I was forced to buy Microsoft Word as a word processing tool.

The proposed settlement does not punish Microsoft for its illegal behavior nor does it provide any means of assuring that Microsoft will not continue to use its vast economic, political and technical power to continue to extend its monopoly in the computer hardware and software business.

Please do not accept this settlement offer. Please impose measures that will allow competition to again flourish and protect consumers in the software markets.

Thanks for your time,

Joseph J. Simpson
6400 32nd Ave. NW #9
Seattle WA. 98107

MTC–00005297

From: marsha.hunter@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen I have watched the Microsoft case and think it's time to settle the case once and for all.

Please settle this case so everyone can move on.

MTC–00005298

From: Jesika
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I wish to voice my displeasure over the settlement made in the Microsoft Antitrust case. While it does address some important points, the most egregious of Microsoft's actions go unmentioned. I was pleased to see that it prohibited Microsoft from asking OEM's to discontinue their current practices of pre-installing competing software and OS's, but this is simply not enough. The simple fact is that consumers are being forced to pay a Microsoft ''tax'' on every complete system purchased. It is impossible to purchase a complete system without Microsoft pre-installed, even if you have no intention of using the product.

What I'd really like to see is a true offer of competition. I would like to see Microsoft prohibited from requiring OEM's to offer their OS exclusively, or in combination with another OS. Until I can walk into a store and purchase a pre-built x86 PC without a Windows operating system on it, Microsoft is still monopolizing my options. I will not be satisfied with the rulings against them if I am not given an option to either purchase a computer with out Windows, or a method of receiving a refund for Windows if I remove it from the system.

Thank you for considering my opinions. I appreciate the work you have done so far on this issue.

Sincerely,
Jesika Hurdelbrink
San Antonio, TX

MTC–00005299

From: Alex Lima
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe that the reached settlement is fair enough to all. In this time of economic uncertainty the Government should be doing everything within their power to restore confidence to the American people. Microsoft is a great company to this country and to the entire world. Lets get back on track and show the world that the U.S. Gov. And private industry can work together for the better of all.

MTC–00005300

From: A&L Solutions
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's settle this and move on. Tax payers have more to worry about than ever and every minute this thing goes longer we (tax payers) pay, pay, pay. There are more immediate concerns to invest tax dollars in with our economy in the trash can and terrorists crossing our boarders freely. Settle now and allow our country's industry to progress.

I use Microsoft products and although they are not perfect, I find them to be the best available and will continue to use them regardless of what other programs are available. Microsoft stands by their technology and personally I feel this whole long drawn out litigation is ridiculous.

I am a consumer of computer products and do not feel that Microsoft has infringed on my freedom to purchase any brand by any company. Personally, I feel that Microsoft is just another victim of attorney greed. I'd like to see the figures on how much of the ''settlement'' winds up in attorney hands. I'm betting I'm correct in saying that it would be shocking.

Further litigation serves no one. Enough is enough. Settle this now.

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion.

Linda Wood

MTC–00005301

From: Stehlikjf@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the Government to settle this suit as soon as possible. The agreement that was worked out by the Government and Microsoft seems to bring a reasonable conclusion to this case. It is unfortunate that some others want to continue to litigate this effort for an extended period of time for an unknown benefit. I believe that very little good can come of a continued debate over the completeness of the settlement. This whole argument about Windows and its associated software will be old news in another year or two as the progress made in the operating system software is expanding extremely fast.

Microsoft did accomplish some major benefits for the consumer. The primary benefit is that it made the computer usable to a myriad of people who have little on no technical background. Prior to Windows and its integration, we all struggled with a DOS based system that provided most users with high levels of frustration. Today, we now have 90+ year old grandmothers and grandfathers using the Internet to say hello to their grandchildren and great-grandchildren. It has also given them a feeling that life has not passed them by. Hurray!

Lets us get on with the settlement. It is not perfect and it never will be. It seems to be reasonably fair and that is all we can ask. We do not need more punishment.

Jim Stehlik

MTC–00005302

From: Xactman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Jan 1, 2002

I am taking the time from my New Year's Holiday to write you concerning the Microsoft settlement.

I am now a database applications developer making a very good salary. I am self trained, having taken advantage of numerous free training opportunities provided by Microsoft and gaining free access to their technologies through their websites and publications. Microsoft has been the only company that has provided me this opportunity.

From my point of view, if it hadn't been for this accessible training availability, I would not be in the position I am today. I have never found Microsoft to be anything but helpful in providing opportunities and assistance along the way in my career development.

Gene Stebley
1310 Santa Rita #26
Chula Vista, CA 91913

MTC–00005303

From: Michael King
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Virtually every industry in the United States, and hence our national economy, has benefited from the breakthrough performance opportunities the technology sector has enabled. This scenario has promptly made the technology sector a fiercely competitive industry itself. It unnerves me that in order to compete with Microsoft, its competitors seek political intervention as the ?killer play? that enables one of them to leapfrog Microsoft to victory, or at least to get a bigger slice of the pie. These tactics undermine the principle of hard work, and hail government intervention as a business management option.

Settle this case fairly, and let Microsoft do what it has proven it does so well ? make business, and the economy, better. And not just the national economy; the global economy benefits substantially from the technology sector which Microsoft should be allowed to participate in vigorously, aggressively, intelligently, and passionately. Anything else is a failure of our government to recognize the same spirit that wins wars wins success.

MTC–00005304

From: Bruce Gladstone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:47pm
Subject: Settlement

I am thoroughly in agreement with the settlement reached by Microsoft and the Justice Department. I believe the continuing objections by the State's Attorneys General are politically motivated and are not designed to benefit consumers in the slightest. This is especially true of Atty. Gen Lockyear in my home state. It is no coincidence that both Sun and Oracle are California Corporations, both would much rather not compete with Microsoft based server applications and database software and both were significant contributors to Atty. General Lockyear.

Bruce

Bruce Gladstone email:
brucegl@pacbell.net

3937 Sumac Dr. tel: (818) 986–2950
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 fax: (818) 981–5922
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw,Cringely@bd...

MTC–00005305

From: robow31@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my honest opinion that spending more taxpayers dollars in continuing the anti trust action against Microsoft is totally uncalled for. Without Microsoft,our country would not be a leader of the technology is this field.

There are certainly many other places our tax dollars could be spent to make a positive impact on our whole way of life.

Lewis Dahl,
Retired taxpaying veteran of WW2

MTC–00005306

From: Butch Fuller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel the Microsoft settlement is in my best interest and that of other consumers.

I feel opposition to the settlement is based on self serving attitudes of some companies, and is not in the best interest of consumers. I do not own stock in microsoft or any technology company.

Sincerely,
Clark H. Fuller, Jr.
4926 York St.
Metairie, LA 70001
ph: 504–456–2946

MTC–00005307

From: hawks-75@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

When ''Human Intelligence'' (HUMINT) is collected by our military and other government sources; perhaps the most important aspect if the information lies in ''Who's Talking''. In this case, I am a Retired, US Navy Captain; having served as a jet fighter pilot and ''Administrator'' for 30 years. I have commanded the TOPGUN squadron, (Navy Fighter Weapons School), an F-14 Squadron as well as an overseas Shore Station. My wife of 39+ years and I continue to vote and pay our taxes. We are PROUD Americans who are grateful to live in this magnificent country.

Having said all that, we appreciate that our ''Opinion'' is no more significant than any other family's opinion, but we welcome this opportunity to have our opinion considered.

We are very well informed on the merits and basis of the case against Microsoft, and of the proposed settlement(s). We believe it's time to ''Git on with Bidness!'' If ''Both Sides'' can accept the existing elements of the proposed ''Settlement'', then we propose DOJ MAKE IT SO! We have been worn to a frazzle by this overly-long and drawn out process seeking some sort of ''Justice'' at taxpayers expense. This has been particularly adverse for all Americans as there can be little doubt this litigation exacerbated the economic downturn and possibly fueled the subsequent Recession our economy has experienced to date.

DOJ should answer the question; . . . ''What possible GOOD can be served FOR ALL AMERICA by refusing to settle and continuing an extended court case against Microsoft?'' The ''Answer'' should be couched in terms that the ''Average American'' can both understand, and, perhaps more importantly, AGREE WITH on a ''Cost vs Gain'' basis. Is there no other way in which our tax dollars could be spent more productively? Only DOJ can answer that.

We appreciate the complexities involved, but strongly recommend that DOJ accept the settlement as written and move smartly into the future beginning early in 2002.

. GOD Bless YOU in your decision process, and GOD Bless AMERICA! With Sincere Best Wishes for the BEST OUTCOME;

John Monroe Smith
Virginia H. Smith

MTC–00005308

From: RR-
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to ask the DOJ to please settle the lawsuit with Microsoft. Since the inception of this lawsuit it has been about other corporations and the governments fight against Microsoft for the benefit of these other corporations. Myself and millions of other people believe that Microsoft has helped the consumer immensely. We were given Internet Explorer free of charge as well as other software programs.

Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation.

I own 2 small business in Salem, Oregon and we depend upon the innovation of the Microsoft products as well as the support they give the consumer. Please settle this litigation, and let us and everyone else get on with their life!

Sincerely,
Ray Reid

MTC–00005309

From: UKRbuff@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft ;

In my opinion Microsoft Corp..is no different than some one's musical scores—They should have the right to protect their inventions in the electronics field just the same—and not be infringed upon—just because they were smarter and first on the market with certain features that were appealing to competitors—

If this right were to be extinguished —you would totally allow theft of other persons hard work and realization of fruits of their labors.

The one thing I have noticed in my 75 years on this earth—Greed seems to take total control——'He's got it—I want some too' attitude prevails...Rather than taking the bull by the horns—inventing something that will do the job just as well—but in a different manner..

I fixed TV's for a living as part of my training to become an Empirical Eng..(Electronic)—I couldn't afford college—with sick parents etc..I had to work-improve myself as I went—and wound up Chief Eng.in three organizations—23 of those years of my last employment —Manufacturer of Nuclear Measuring Equipment. as Final QC. Eng-and Field Service Eng.

I take it personally that a person starts a company—perhaps at the ''right time'' in their life and time for that their products are needed by the general public—and they work hard-fast-efficient and do a good job—THEN have someone else say ''I want that Too'' but the original owners of the system they invented naturally don't think it right to be forced to give up their control of their products..that they invented....

Thank you for taking the time to read this one small voice—against oppression of the country's people's right to innovate and follow-up with improvements of THEIR OWN INVENTIONS——

James A.Eastham
Indianapolis, Ind.

MTC–00005310

From: MChernev@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the Microsoft settlement stand. Marlene Tonkin Chernev, Fair Oaks, CA—MChernev@aol.com

MTC–00005311

From: Robert V Robertson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please bring an end to the suit against Microsoft. Some of their competitors are jealous of their success and are try to go to all lengths to hurt the company and their shareholders. If it were not for Microsoft, we would not have all of the ability and knowledge that we have to conduct business in today's world.

It is not right to penalize a company for their ability to provide superior products as that is what is needed for us to provide for the future.

Thank you for your consideration..
Robert V. Robertson
5731 Emmaus Church Road
Providence Forge, Virginia 23140

MTC–00005312

From: Andrew Suchy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Department of Justice Staff,

I have read the posted court documents related to US vs. Microsoft, and would like an opportunity to comment. While I do not have training in law, I am an active software developer, and have seen the industry evolve for the past 12 years. With all due respect to the legal minds that have worked to find remedies for Microsoft's antitrust violations and anti competitive conduct, I deem the measures grossly insufficient.

I do not wish to reiterate any points already covered in the document, it is sufficient to say that I have seen first hand some of the complaints raised by the plaintiff, and seen the devastating effect on

competition and innovation. Instead, I would like to point out why some of the remedies will not work, and bring to your attention how Microsoft continues anti competitive behavior even today. First the remedies:

a. The requirement that Non-Microsoft Middleware have at least one million copies distributed before it is considered ''competition'' is ridiculous. In the software business, one needs to have access to the API's in order to deliver a competitive product. This is a chicken and egg problem: one can't get to one million copies without having technical details (such as Section III.D) and the ability to replace Microsoft Middleware free of restrictions.

b. Regarding Microsoft's restrictions on subsection III.C.3 which require that Non-Microsoft Middleware activated during the boot sequence look and behave the same way as Microsoft Middleware, this clearly favors Microsoft. If a competitor cannot distinguish itself by the way its software appears on the screen, or behaves during operation, than it is doomed. Why would anyone load (or buy) software that looks just like Microsoft's, when Microsoft's version is already included in the OS? This restriction must have been dreamed up by Microsoft's marketing department.

c. The remedies regarding Middleware can easily be avoided by Microsoft, by simply moving functionality into the greater ''OS''. Any feature can be hidden from competitors by putting the functionality into proprietary operating system components (otherwise known as libraries). The remedies are so full of holes, no software developer can take them seriously. There are other concerns not already addressed by the court papers, as well:

a. There is no remedy for the hundreds or thousands of businesses already killed by predatory behavior,

b. There is no remedy for standards subversion. In the computer industry, standards for communication protocols, application protocols, and internet protocols (just to name a few) are made up by representatives of the industry in committees. Undue influence from a giant like Microsoft is unavoidable. The attempted subversion of Java is one example, the introduction of the C# (pronounced C sharp) programming language is another (because software development tools are also monopolized by Microsoft—not a well publicized fact). There are also internet protocols at stake, where interoperability of software is prevented by diverging from established standards (or evolving standards). Doing this guarantees Microsoft that competing products will not work, and lets Microsoft dictate the protocol.

c. There is no remedy for other software getting ''tied'' to the operating system. A good example is the dispute between Microsoft and Kodak over digital photography software included in Windows XP. CD writing (CD–R) software is another recent addition. In fact, Microsoft continues to kill competition by including software that has nothing to do with the operating system. As an analogy, would any of us feel comfortable if the power company started to include all the electric appliances we needed, along with the electricity it sells us? Soon, GE, Maytag, etc. would all be out of business, and we would have nowhere else to go get a refrigerator but the power company. It doesn't sound like the world I want to live in.

None of the remedies in the settlement deal with this problem.

I hope my comments are constructive and help bring about a settlement more effective than the current one.

Sincerely,
Andrew P. Suchy
CC:asuchy@cyberinnovate.com@inetgw

MTC–00005313

From: philip solar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:36pm
Subject: One person's comments

I and my wife for one, Praise Microsoft for their inovativtive policies. We would not be able to conduct our business and be productive if it were not for Microsoft and their products. I for one have always felt that there policy and pricing has been fair.

There is no question in my mind that without this company our balance of payments would be considerable more than it is.

Philip Solar
Panzer2020@msn.com

MTC–00005314

From: John G. Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

Hi,

I would like to encourage the Government to stop hassling Microsoft, They are a prime example of capitalism at it best. You are discouraging people from building a large compaies, why not spend your time and our Money tracing down Bin Laden or Omar. Do you know how much money Microsoft and Bill Gates donates to charity? Get off it and do something useful.

John G. Jones

MTC–00005315

From: William Spurr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 5:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to stop punishing success. Equating bigness with badness has been the hallmark of anti-trust legislation from the time of J. D. Rockefeller. This case, like most of the others, has not been about the consumers, who are supposedly protected by anti-trust laws. It is about competitors who can't compete and about political favoritism. If you have tried to use even the latest version of Netscape (6.2) with many of the websites that use Java (a Sun product—not a Microsoft product), the pages don't load properly, even though they work fine in Internet Explorer 5.5 and above. If this doesn't show that Netscape is uncompetitive, and that it is not the choice of consumers, what does?

Sincerely,
William A. Spurr
webmaster@crossroadspc.org

MTC–00005316

From: RBSINTL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:05pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETLEMENT

Dear Mr. John Ashcroft:

I am Rafael Beltran III a hard working Hispanic who pays taxes as most Americans do.

I am writing to you today to request that the case against Microsoft be settled:

a. As soon as possible before the new elections

b. To ensure our economy gets back on track as soon as possible The only thing Microsoft has done wrong is to once again put the USA ahead of other countries in the world with the very best technology that can be created.

We can no longer be protective of companies that change technology every three months and we get stuck with the bill. When is this going to end? Please accept Microsoft and The Justice Department terms so we can move forward and bring our economy where it supposed to be. Stop those states that continue to delay the settlement and have no common sense and no vision of the future. These states are nothing but protectionist states for political reasons that have nothing to do with technology.

Thank God for Microsoft I can put food on my family's table. Microsoft's technology does not discriminate. Microsoft is good for America. Please stop those protectionist states that are trying to torpedo the settlement that has been agreed upon.

If those companies that say they are being left out continue to be protected because they are not able to compete squarely and fairly then they should shut down and move on to something they are good at. Technology will embrace what makes sense and what is efficient, if those companies' products were not efficient and did not make sense then the American public did not support them and therefore we do not need them.

I am most confident that Microsoft will comply all the way and at the same time stimulate our economy and yes bring a better life to little people like me.

Microsoft products do not discriminate and do not see colors and origin and they way you sound and the way you look.

Please stop harassing Microsoft.

Very Respectfully,
RAFAEL BELTRAN III
1898 Ascot Drive
Moraga, CA 94556
925–247–0777
US NAVY Reservist

MTC–00005317

From: Kirk Shaeffer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please complete the settlement process as soon as possible. The country is in a recession and it is not productive to continue this Microsoft case any longer.

By prolonging this process the advancement of technology will be slowed. In addition, the nine individual states are wrong not to settle this case as they appear to be in on a MONEY GRAB of the profits of one of America's most successful companies.

The saddest part of the Microsoft case was that it's competitors had complained to the Clinton Administration until they finally pressed the case against Microsoft. I certainly would not act in this manner to any of my successful business competitors!

Thank you for time in reading this email. A response is not necessary.

Kirk Shaeffer Real Estate Analysis Northwest

MTC–00005318

From: William Noble
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft Settlement

End this nonsense once and for all. Microsoft has done nothing that Netscape, Yahoo, Sun, Novell, Orcale and others have not done. If the DOJ wants to stick up for the ''consumer'' take a long hard look at the banking industry, insurance idustry (They make the Mafia look legit) or maybe cable tv markets. Great job they did going after the cable company's, last time. So pretty soon we'll have comcast and comcast to choose from. The lawsuit agaist microsoft is wrong and bad for consumers. The last administration is gone, let their wrongful, anti-consumer lawsuits go with them...

William Scott Noble
Nashua, NH

MTC–00005319

From: Richard H Rosenberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement as proposed sounds reasonable for all parties. In these uncertain economic times it would be best to concentrate on the challenging future, not the past misdeeds of Microsoft. I think Microsoft has learned it must deal more fairly with competitors. Continued attention by DOJ to Microsoft's compliance with the settlement's terms is merited.

Sincerely,
Richard H. Rosenberg
2568 Indian Ridge Drive
Glenview, IL 60025–1049

MTC–00005320

From: DONALD SCHUMAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 6:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Department of Justice Member

From: Donald L. Schuman

I thought we had finally settled the case against Microsoft but I now hear that 9 states have decided to go against the settlement and continue the case. How absurd? Let's put this action to bed. Enough is enough. We have far more serious problems to worry about than a bogus lawsuit.

Without Microsoft's initiative in producing quality software this country would not have produced the gains in productivity that helped this country over the last 7 to 10 years. Now these states want to ''penalize'' the company further because they have created something that their competitors could not have. Where is the sense and reason for this action. This country was built on innovation, hard work and creativity!!! Now we are letting those who feel, since they didn't invent it, its something bad and injurious to their company. That's just plain b.s. Microsoft products have always been open and competitive. Let's let them continue to innovate and help us to move forward. For those companies that are not that creative, well maybe they should ''fall by the wayside.'' Let us not punish the good for those who are not as smart. I am a taxpayer and a consumer that feels strongly that you must not stifle creativity for the benefit of those that are just not that bright and creative. Go Microsoft!

Donald L. Schuman
donald.schuman@worldnet.att.net

MTC–00005321

From: AWzr1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a Consumer I strongly believe that the settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft is a good deal for us and the American economy.

In the ''public interest'' lets end this mess and avoid any prolonged litigation. That's as brief and to the point as I can be.

Sincerely,
Anthony Wieleba
AWzr1@msn.com

MTC–00005322

From: Stanislav Fritz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I would like to briefly comment on the potential settlement on the Microsoft Anti-trust case. At a time when the nation, and the state of Washington in particular, is in economic dire straits and struggling with change, it would seem like this settlement is something that should go forward as quickly as possible.

The landscape of high tech continues to change and if the U.S. has any chance of remaining a leader in portions of this, such as software, biotech, and aerospace, we need to have strong innovative companies.

If Microsoft is continually shackled by the DOJ, private lawsuits, and uncertainty, it will indeed falter and no other punishment will be needed. This can do nothing but hurt the economy and high technology.

2002 is a crucial year for all. I urge speedy action.

I have been an executive at three software companies. My personal experience tells me that Microsoft is indeed an innovative company and it acts aggressively, but not unreasonably. I am not a Microsoft employee.

Sincerely,
Stanislav Fritz
6717 46th Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98136

MTC–00005323

From: Ron Burk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ron Burk, Founding Member
ronburk@hightechinfo.com
HighTechInfo.com
P.O. Box 3082
Redmond, WA 98052
(425) 869–0233

This is a comment on the proposed government settlement in the Microsoft antitrust action. We believe the proposed settlement does not fall within the range of acceptability, and is not within the reaches of public interest.

This comment on the proposed antitrust settlement with Microsoft argues two things:

* That the government attorneys negotiating the settlement were unable to judge the boundaries of their own competence on technical matters, leading them to assumptions that were starkly incorrect.

* That the settlement is detrimental to national security. That is due to the fact that, contrary to the government's uninformed assumption, security software that is centralized and kept secret is much more vulnerable to attack than security that is open, public and decentralized. Courts versus Technology

Two effects must be taken into account when assessing the technical competence with which this settlement was arrived at and accepted by the participants: the accelerating complexity of technology, and accelerating permeation of technology in society. On the one hand, the technological acceleration of the last few decades guarantees that the courts must deal with highly technical issues where government officials have no hope of holding personal competence. On the other hand, the permeation of technology into society gives its non-technical members the illusion that they understand the technology well enough to judge when they are, or are not, competent to act with common sense.

For example, when powered flight first emerged, few members of the public would have ventured any opinion about how airplanes work or are piloted. By the time passenger flight was cheap and common, however, most people formed at least some very rudimentary level of understanding about airplanes and flight. Thus, most people would apply common sense to their own limited experience of airplanes to assess that flying closer to the ground is safer than flying high, and that flying slower is safer than flying fast. Unfortunately, both of these ''common-sense'' reactions are exactly wrong, as all student pilots must be taught.

A more compelling example of technological surprise comes when an airplane stalls, which causes the nose of the craft to pitch downward. It is only the most obvious form of common sense that the nose of the aircraft must then be immediately pulled back up, to keep the aircraft from diving into the ground. Unfortunately, this ''common-sense'' response is also exactly wrong. The correct response, which must be repeatedly drilled into new pilots so that they can overcome their ''common sense,'' is to push the nose even further down and apply more power. So powerful is this incorrect feeling of ''common sense,'' that there have been recorded accidents caused by passengers in small aircraft seizing the controls and preventing the pilot from recovering from a life-threatening stall.

Thus, we see that well-intentioned people with a passing familiarity with some form of technology may be incapable of judging the boundaries of their own competence. Moreover, technology provides many situations where the layperson's common-sense assessment of the correct course of action is incorrect, or even disastrous. We believe that this settlement provides an example of such a disastrous application of ''common sense'' being applied outside a party's areas of expertise.

In the area of computers, most everyone in government has some experience using computers. While most non-technical computer users hardly believe themselves to be experts, most have enough basic experience to feel that they at least know what the limits of their competence is. As with airplanes, this assumption is generally false, and when that incorrect assumption affects court proceedings, the results can be as disastrous as an airplane crash.

Secrecy versus Security

One of the areas where the government's team clearly was incorrect in assessing the boundaries of their own technical competence was the controversial blanket exemption for disclosing any information that ''would compromise the security of antipiracy, antivirus, software licensing, digital-rights management, encryption or authentication systems.'' The November 9, 2001 issue of The Wall Street Journal quotes the government's Mr. James as saying that this grant was ''one of those 'duh' issues'', continuing ''Microsoft has security protocols. Are we going to tell everyone how they work? Do you want people to get access to your credit-card information when you shop on line?''

Mr. James' common-sense response to this issue is entirely logical to the layperson—and stupendously incorrect. Mr. James is presumably not aware that the security protocol used to protect almost every Internet-based credit-card transaction is public knowledge, has been so for years, and has been studied extensively by large numbers of programmers, including those who would like nothing better than to be able to steal credit card information.

Non-technical computer users often have some personal experience with ''passwords,'' which tends to instill a belief that secrecy and security are identical. Although it contradicts the average computer user's ''common sense,'' security experts know that the only proven way to create security protocols that can withstand attack for any length of time is to make them public. Time and time again, the history of computer security has taught programmers that security measures that rely on secrecy (e.g., I bet no one will discover where my software stores this password) have quickly fallen to attackers. Even the security protocols historically put forward by the government itself were first exposed in detail, so that they could be studied and their weaknesses assessed before critical systems were made to rely on them.

Furthermore, Mr. James would presumably be astounded to learn that the main competitor (called Apache) to Microsoft's web server product, not only uses publicly documented protocols for security, but also provides the entire source code for the server itself. That's right, any attackers who would like to steal credit card information can freely study absolutely every bit of source code that goes into the most popular web server in use on the Internet today. Once again, the layperson's ''common sense'' is confounded, since the number of security vulnerabilities discovered in the completely exposed Apache web server has dwindled to a trickle, while a steady stream of security flaws continues to be exposed in Microsoft's proprietary and secretive web server. Indeed, the most virulent attacks to date on the government's own computers were implemented by exploiting security flaws in Microsoft's IIS web server (ironically, some of the computers involved in the attack belonged to Microsoft—they had neglected to install their own innumerable security patches on some of their own computers).

Even Microsoft is quite aware that secrecy is not a sound basis for security, and (eventually) learned to rely on robust, publicly examined security protocols. However, they still do use secrecy extensively in order to prevent (via legal attacks, if necessary) competitors from creating software that is compatible with their own. Thus, when Stac sued Microsoft for violating their patents, Microsoft countersued—essentially claiming that no one could make the product in question compatible with Microsoft software unless they had reverse-engineered the necessary information, which Microsoft indeed deliberately kept secret (said secrecy offering no security, only a way to prevent competition).

Thus, although Microsoft incorporated a well-known public security protocol (called Kerberos) into Windows 2000, they ''extended'' it in order to deliberately render it incompatible with third-party software. Again, the goal was to prevent competition, not to benefit customers. This is precisely the sort of thing that any remedy should eliminate, and precisely the sort of thing that the government's settlement would nanvely accept as necessary. Microsoft was no doubt happy to accept the government's ignorance about computer security and, with it, the blanket exemption that will allow them to continue to hold the power of life or death over companies that need to make their products compatible with Microsoft's monopoly products to survive.

The Interests of National Security

The same Wall Street Journal article implies that thoughts of war and terrorism influenced the settlement negotiations. Here, too, it's likely that the government was unable to assess the bounds of their grasp of the big (technical) picture.

Microsoft Passport (a so-called ''single logon'' service) is cited as an example where Microsoft must keep information secret. Not only is it false that Passport's security relies on keeping interoperability information secret, but Passport is ironically promising to be one of the biggest threats to national cybersecurity the United States has ever seen. Because Microsoft wants Passport to be centralized and under their control, they essentially hope to put all of the nation's passwords, credit card numbers, phone numbers, and other personal information in a single location. As it is now, a foreign hacker who wants to steal credit card numbers (or blackmail a company whose customer data he stole), must do so one company at a time. With Passport, there will be a single place where a hacker can affect all customers (if Microsoft is successful at signing everyone up, which their new Windows XP tries very hard to do). Thus, part of the system that the government hopes to prop up with their settlement is a system that could become the juiciest target for cyber-terrorists of all time.

Customers have generally failed to voluntarily select Microsoft's Passport product (despite it being free), so Microsoft has resorted again to using its monopoly powers to force a product on the marketplace. They first made using Passport a requirement for certain products, though that still failed to force a large enough number of customers to participate. Most recently, windows XP is designed to nag, cajole, and otherwise convince nanve users that they are required to use Passport. The government's settlement, with its misguided blanket exemption for security, allows Microsoft to use their monopoly power to tie this non-competitive product to their operating system, and thereby force it on the marketplace. The result is to make the nation more vulnerable to cyber attack.

An example of why a centralized and non-open design like Passport is so vulnerable was provided on November 2, 2001, when a programmer openly demonstrated a technique for stealing any Passport user's complete information (including credit cards) simply by getting the victim to open an email message. Microsoft had to shut the Passport service down for an extended period to effect repairs. Customers relying on Passport were simply out of luck for the duration of the repairs. Imagine if everyone in the U.S. used a single service for their passwords, and therefore most Internet work came to a halt every time Microsoft needed to fix a security bug. The Internet depends on decentralization for its robustness (it has withstood power outages, cable cuts, and even terrorist attack). Microsoft hopes to force consumers to use a service that will make much Internet use highly vulnerable to all the problems the Internet itself has survived.

Unfortunately, discovering a security bug is not necessary to shut down Passport. Because the Passport design is centralized rather than distributed, it can easily be shut down by any denial of service (DOS) attack. It is currently virtually impossible to prevent DOS attacks on the Internet (experts estimate that several DOS attacks are in progress at almost any given moment on the Internet). A DOS attack may temporarily render one, or even several web sites unusable simply by ''clogging the pipes'' near those sites, so that all other traffic is stopped or slowed to a devastating degree. There is virtually nothing that can be done to prevent DOS attacks in the current design of the Internet (more to the point, it is a community problem, and not something that Microsoft can affect in any way by changing their software).

The centralized design of Passport (Microsoft needs it centralized so that they can control consumers' data rather than allowing competing companies to do so) assures that it is completely vulnerable to DOS attacks. Thus, the government's settlement is helping to prop up an anti-competitive single logon system that can be shut down at any time by a disgruntled teenager (often found to be the source of such attacks) with moderately high technical skills. Various arms of the government claim to be highly concerned about the threat of cyber-terrorism, yet the government proposes to accept a settlement that will prop up a monopoly's plan to build the most enticing and vulnerable cyber-terrorism target in U.S. history.

It is our belief that Passport is one of a great many areas of Microsoft anti-competitive activity that this settlement will have no effect on.

Samba: Canary in a Coal Mine

Non-technical observers typically deem the impact of any antitrust action against Microsoft likely to be difficult to measure or prove. Technical observers, however, can point to any number of concrete situations that are entirely dictated by whether or not Microsoft can continue to abuse its monopoly power.

Samba provides a good case in point. Microsoft sells server software that provides file sharing, and security management (among other things). Microsoft has, of course, tried to make their networking software largely proprietary, so that they can control who is, or is not, allowed to create compatible software. Samba is the name of a product that tries to allow users of non-Microsoft operating systems to expose services (such as file sharing) compatibly with Microsoft networks. Thus, a company that has both Unix and Windows computers can run Samba on their Unix computers to allow Windows users to easily access Unix files.

The problem with Samba is quite simply Microsoft's refusal to document their protocols. Thus, with each new release of Windows, Microsoft changes their protocols, and the Samba team has to tediously reverse engineer all the changes (just one example of the huge amount of American productivity that is wasted nationwide on reverse-engineering interfaces that Microsoft refuses to document). Microsoft knows full well that Samba will be able to eventually make their software compatible (secrecy and security being two separate things, as described earlier), but by constantly making changes and keeping Samba one step behind, they can convince companies that Samba is an inferior choice for any company that has workers using Windows.

Any antitrust settlement that allows this situation, in which Microsoft can use its standard anti-competitive techniques to keep Samba from ever catching up to ''complete'' compatibility with Windows, is a failure. Some believe that Microsoft will also patent their incompatibilities and then use legal means to prevent Samba from fully interoperating with Microsoft products. All of which may be perfectly acceptable in a competitive marketplace, but not in a marketplace dominated by a single monopoly.

We believe that this is just one example of the many important areas that the government-accepted settlement will allow Microsoft to practice business as usual. An integral part of what Samba does is password management. Microsoft should be able to claim to any government overseer that their network services manage passwords, and therefore they must (as they do now) refuse to document their network protocols (despite knowing full well that said protocols will eventually be reverse-engineered, and that that results in no compromise of security).

Astoundingly, the proposed settlement lets the convicted company help choose the members of its own somewhat toothless overseeing ''technical committee.'' That fact, combined with Microsoft's prodigious ability to delay and dissemble, and the settlement's incomprehensible restriction of terms to the oddly defined ''middleware'' should allow Microsoft to continue to press their anti-competitive tactics on products such as Samba.

It is our belief that Samba is another one of the great many areas of Microsoft anti-competitive activity that this settlement will have no effect on.

Summary

We believe the government likely also exceeded the bounds of their competence in the area of economics. Another subtext of the negotiations (and one Microsoft pressed relentlessly in public), was that Microsoft's success is crucial to the economy. In fact, Microsoft's monopoly has consistently wiped out small businesses and innovation of all sorts for years, decimating what was once a thriving sector of the economy. Another recent Wall Street Journal article predicted that the current lack of innovation in technology would help prevent any economic turnaround in that sector. We believe that a settlement that vigorously curtailed Microsoft's ability to exploit its monopoly (which is obviously not what this proposed settlement does) would greatly stimulate the technology sector of the economy. We have not pressed that particular issue here because our credentials are in technology, not economics.

While Microsoft's lawyers had to get their negotiating agreements approved by a qualified technical overseer (Bill Gates), the government's attorneys had no such technical authority over them. As we have shown, that clearly led government negotiators to make incorrect decisions in areas where they mistakenly believed their own common sense was sufficient.

This antitrust action was an opportunity for the government to force Microsoft to take responsibility for their past flouting of the law, and to rejuvenate an industry whose main enemy is not the current economic downturn, but the illegal actions of a single monopoly. Unfortunately, the settlement appears to be ineffectual at both penalizing past law-breaking and preventing any future law-breaking. The settlement appears to be good deal for Microsoft and a few large companies. It appears to be a very bad deal for the nation's security and economy.

Ron Burk

HighTechInfo.com,
www.hightechinfo.com

MTC–00005324

From: wencheng
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I believe the proposed settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Sincerely,
Wen-Ching Cheng
301–330–8512

MTC–00005325

From: Tom Hemmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:54pm
Subject: settlement?

I want to register my dismay at the lack of backbone that the justice department is showing (again) in this case. I am a computer professional that remembers the last antitrust settlement (or should i say lack of settlement) the previous time the justice department to microsoft to task. My, my, how that really helped stem the microsoft criminals!

Now once again, the justice department is going to roll over. Is it because the party was found innocent? no, it is because of politics (Ashcroft is a lackey for big business). Using the state of the economy as a reason to give microsoft a slap on the wrist is wrong, wrong, wrong. this is really short term thinking. Think in the long term! But hey, a shot in the arm for the economy would bolster Mr Bush, Mr. Ashcroft and the republican party.

What should be Microsoft's punishment? why let's subsidize their push into one of the markets they do not dominate! As for the people who came up with that solution, well, Idiot school never graduated a better class!

So much for my government working for me.

A Vietnam war era veteran (from a family of veterans) who supports his country when right and will not hesitate to change it when it is wrong.

MTC–00005326

From: OrcaUSA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 7:57pm
Subject: Fax: 1–202–307–1454 or 1–202–616–9937

Sir I believe it is in the public's interest that the Microsoft case be settled without further litigation.

Respectfully,
Donald W Seymour, MD

MTC–00005327

From: John Myles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that Microsoft and Bill Gates used the system to its most true purpose—to make money.

Sure, some of the things that they did may have been immoral, but to enter the business arena and then cry foul when you get knocked down is just plain stupid. Expecting to be treated fairly is unrealistic when many people are competing for the same dollar. Microsoft will have its day and so will the

next multinational business behemoth that comes along.

MTC–00005328

From: Anthony Shipman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:29pm
Subject: comment on the U.S. v. Microsoft case

A penalty is not a penalty unless it stings. The current proposed ''penalty'' does not sting Microsoft. The simple fact that they are saying positive things about it, calling it ''fair'', shows that.

A real penalty that would be of great benefit to the computer-using public would be to require that control over the Microsoft Office file formats be transfered to a public standards body such as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). This would include, at least, the formats for Microsoft Word documents, Excel spreadsheets and Powerpoint presentations.

This would make it possible for a variety of software companies to develop office software that interoperated with Microsoft products. The goal is that an ANSI-conforming document produced by vendor X software would be guaranteed to be readable by vendor Y's software. Since it is a common practice to e-mail documents, spread-sheets etc. from person to person and business to business one would expect that the formats should be standardised and that the standardisation process be impartial. As well as revitalising the software industry this remedy would also go a long way to solving the problem of archived documents. It is well recognised by historians and librarians that much of the documentary material in an electronic format produced by today's society is ephemeral and will not be available to historians of the future. This is not only because physical formats such as magnetic tape become obsolete but also because the file formats become obsolete. Even now, if you have a Word document from 10 years ago you will have great difficulty in reading it as current versions of Word do not recognise formats that old.

You will have to hunt around for a software product that can convert it to a newer format. This problem will continue to get worse in the future. In short, since office file formats have become an integral part of the information infrastructure that the public depends on in this day and age it is important that they be under impartial, public control rather than be subject to the whim of Microsoft's marketing department.

I believe that this would be the biggest step that could be taken to level the playing field for business software.

Anthony Shipman

Elektrichore—The muse of high technology.

als@labyrinth.net.au

MTC–00005329

From: Kevin S. Cavanaugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:46pm
Subject: Micsosoft Settlement

Dear USDOJ: I am writing to urge to complete the settlement with Microsoft as soon as possible. I also urge you to influence those states now unwilling to settle with Microsoft to ''get over it'' and agree with the usdoj settlement terms.

I have been a Microsoft customer for nearly 20 years and I do not see Microsoft as the evil that it is portrayed. Over the years other companies had many opportunities to compete effectively and to overshadow Microsoft but did not; mostly due to their own stupidity, not overreaching by Microsoft.

Your continued pursuit of Microsoft is now far more harmful to consumers than any perceived anti-competitive behavior on the part of Microsoft. Let's settle this dispute and move on.

Thank you for listening,
Kevin S. Cavanaugh
kcavan@yahoo.com

MTC–00005330

From: Pratik Chipdey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to see this case settled as early as possible. For one, I can't even imagine why an icon of American economy, like Microsoft, has been put thru such tough lawsuit by of all the parties the US Government.

Microsoft has done nothing but good to the world of computers and the economy in general. Remember the days when companies like IBM controlled the market? If it were up to them, computers would still have been an esoteric tool, limited to the rich and the powerful.

I do not believe that Microsoft has ever stifled competition. They have consistently come out with the very best products. Netscape died a natural death I don't know of a single person who would like to use Netscape after having used Microsoft's Internet Explorer. If you notice, the only companies concerned about Microsoft are the ones that have been sitting pretty so far due to lack of competition. This includes companies like Oracle, Sun and AOL (and IBM to some extent). All of a sudden, they have to improve their products so that they are not killed by better products from Microsoft.

There is nothing wrong with the survival of the fittest. Isn't this what capitalism is all about?

Myself, and millions like me, who have benefited directly or indirectly from Microsoft, would like to request you in the public interest to drop this lawsuit altogether. If not that, please at least settle it so that consumers are not harmed. We are all comfortable with someone like Microsoft play the leader. Hate to see it go folks like Oracle, Sun and AOL?

Regards,
Pratik Chipdey
Little Ferry, NJ

MTC–00005331

From: hcmcdonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:52pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am a 73 year old man, and my wife and I depend upon my computer to connect with the world—the whole world. I am in touch with my old workmates, my children and my grandchildren. Also, I can find out everything I want to know through MSN.com. I know there are lots of smart people that can do everything with computers, but if it weren't for Microsoft and Windows, I would just be lost and not in touch with anyone or anything. I feel empowered by my computer, and I don't feel that I paid too much for anything. I love the simple world of Microsoft. Everything works, and I don't have to experience the stress of installing a new program. If something would not work on install, I don't know what I would do, as I can't understand complicated instructions. I have many friends that feel the same way, although some of my friends have kids that can do everything on computers, but they are the luck ones.

Please, don't put Microsoft out of business, because some of the other companies are mad at them.

Regards, Henry

MTC–00005332

From: Robert Lippert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 8:55pm
Subject: The Waste of Money

How can the Federal Government and some states, continue to waste tax payers money? What was at stake some years ago, is now a moot point. At what expense are you willing to continue this joke? Have the states disclosed the total legal expenses to their taxpayers? I bet not or at least not the correct amounts. Microsoft will continue to exits, its competition will continue to exist and our tax money will continue to be wasted!!

MTC–00005333

From: Higgs Glenda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:34pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I think this case should be settled. Microsoft has done so much to help older people like me be able to use the computer. There should never have been a suit period. enough time and money wasted. * * *

MTC–00005334

From: EHessek@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:37pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT SUPPORTING THE 10,000 POOREST SCHOOLS

Hi—

I am looking for information on Microsoft's settlement supporting the 10,000 poorest schools. I would be interested if the court would consider our school for this settlement. If you could e-mail me with some information, I would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you—
Kristie Hess
Children's House of Bucks County

MTC–00005335

From: Flavien@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

As a consumer and an end user of Microsoft products, I would like to be on record as saying that I think the court case was a waste of time, and my tax payer money to begin with, so now that there is a settlement I am all for that. I want this case to be over as soon as possible. I am 100% in favor of this settlement and do not wish to see the case go to court again. I don't feel that Microsoft has taken advantage of me or overcharged me for any of its products. I feel that Microsoft has gotten to where it is from a lot of hard work and some creativity, and now that they are where they are some jealous folks want to try and take that all away from them. I feel that the settlement is good for me, the industry, and the American economy in general.

Folks over at the DOJ, there are much more important things to worry about now.

MTC–00005336

From: JoAnn-Souvenir
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:46pm

Microsoft is and always has been a benefit to me. I am so very against in further action against Microsoft and or Bill Gates. I've been a computer user and programmer for 22 years and I would hate to think of a computer world without Microsoft and Bill Gates! Please do not prolong this litigation.

Jo Ann White

''God Bless America''

MTC–00005337

From: Phyllis Onofrietti
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to encourage the settlement worked out with the USDOJ and Micrsoft to stand as agreed. The objections of the nine states is a shakedown inspired by the competitors of Microsoft and the states themselves in order to enrich their own pockets just as they did in the tobacco settlements. Enough is enough, dismiss the nine states objections now.

MTC–00005338

From: Stringer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:01pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft Settlement

As both a shareholder in Microsoft and a computer professional I am opposed to the current settlement proposal.

The traditional remedy for an abusive monopoly is to split up the company, and this has usually been a win-win situation which benefits both the shareholders of the company and the general public. The only losers are the egos of the small group of people who run the monopoly.

The original judge's proposed remedy was primarily correct and only in error in splitting the company into too few parts.

His remedy was an obvious solution.

For the DOJ to wimp out in the face of Microsoft's lobbying efforts undermines the rule of law in the USA.

Roger Stringer

CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005340

From: ancient7qwest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:22pm
Subject: Missing the boat

To Whom it may concern,

I am a computer professional and have been in the field since the early 80's. I am president of a small company that does computer manufacture and repair in Tucson AZ.

1. I do not understand why the scope of the suit against Microsoft is so limited. They are still embedding their browser in their OS's, not offering ''Radio Button'' choices during install as is offered for other components. Please hear this next concept, if you own an MS OS and want to see what security patches, updates, or upgrades are available on the OS upgrade site, you are told to come back when you are running Internet Explorer. It pointedly denies critical patches and updates to users of other browsers, i.e. Netscape or Opera. Is this not an embodiment of anti competitive practice?

2. The Microsoft corporation has been using the FBI as an enforcement arm to exempt itself the effects of supply and demand. They have re-defined the concept of software piracy. It is not just making illegal copies and selling them. MS considers original, authentic software with the hologram, etc. to be counterfeit if they are purchased from anyone but an authorized distributor.

Example 1: The Compaq/HP merger goes through and the new entity has 20 thousand copies of Windows ME with an HP logo on it. They prefer not to distribute it with their product and resell it to a broker who sells it to small system builders at a substantial cost savings. When the builder installs the os on a system, Microsoft considers that piracy and declares those once authentic, legal copies to be counterfeit. This used to be called gray marketing, now it is criminal.

Example 2: Small company goes out of business and an auction is held. Someone buys all the software the company had, including Microsoft products. If he distributes these legally purchased products to dealers or end users, yup piracy and counterfeiting.

Buying an OS should be like buying a car, replacement parts should be available for 10 years. Another parallel to the automotive world that is missing is that manufactured products that are marketed with known defects, that cause damage to people and things of value should be liable to remediation of damages. Personal and Corporate data and production impacted by flaws in operating systems have value based on cost of input, availability of replacement, and the guilty manufacturer should be subject to punitive damages.

I have other gripes about MicroSoft's business practices and products and again state that the severe limit of scope of the work done by the DOJ almost smacks of collusion, hopefully ignorance, but I can not understand what kind of investigation could miss such basic problems in a system. To Date, every major release of an operationg system by Microsoft has been followed by patches, updates and indicat premature release to meet or attempt to meet target dates. Available for additional discussion,

Cliff Levy

President Hi-Tech Computers
520–918–8911

MTC–00005341

From: Jere Stahl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:23pm
Subject: Settlement

Hi,

Having been a microcomputer owner since 1979 and reading many many computer publications over the ensuing 22 years I find it incredible that you folks cannot see what Bill Gates is doing to the DOJ and american public. He has done nothing to reduce his efforts to control the computer world. In fact, with their latest offering of XP they have claimed even more control.

In the meantime Microsoft's offer to give computers to schools in reality is sowing the same seeds that Apple did many years ago, in that they gave schools a super deal, knowing the kids would go home and bug unknowing parents into buying similar systems.

If you want to punish Microsoft and Gates and company for thumbing their noses at you since day 1, then I suggest you force Gates and Balmer to retire from the company, and never have any more contact with it. Otherwise the control issues will become greater and greater. If you look at many of Microsoft's new pricing policies you'll see where they are punishing their customers for the hassle and costs you folks have put them through.

MTC–00005342

From: Matt Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Under the Tunney Act, I wish to comment on the Microsoft settlement's inadequacy in improving the competitive environment in the software industry. Some serious shortcomings relate to:

1) Middleware

Section H.3 states ''Microsoft Middleware Product would be invoked solely for use in interoperating with a server maintained by Microsoft (outside the context of general Web browsing)'' This does nothing to limit the company's ability to tie customers and restrict competition in non Web-based networked services under .NET, as they fall ''outside the context of general Web browsing''. Microsoft has already begun abusing its desktop monopoly to tie customers into .NET revenue streams and set up a new monopoly over the network.

Part 2 of the same section states ''that designated Non-Microsoft Middleware Product fails to implement a reasonable technical requirement . . .'' essentially gives Microsoft a veto over any competitor's product. They can simply claim it doesn't meet their ''technical requirements.''

2) Interoperability

Under the definition of terms, ''B. 'Communications Protocol' means the set of rules for information exchange to accomplish predefined tasks between a Windows Operating System Product on a client computer and Windows 2000 Server or products marketed as its successors running on a server computer and connected via a local area network or a wide area network.'' This definition explicitly excludes the SMB/CIFS (Samba) protocol and all of the Microsoft Remote Procedure Calls needed by any SMB/CIFS server to adequately interoperate with Windows 2000. Microsoft could claim these protocols are used by Windows 2000 server for remote administration and as such would not be required to be disclosed. The Samba team have written this up explicitly here: http://linuxtoday.com/news__story.php3?ltsn=2001–11–06–005–20–OP–MS

3) General veto on interoperability

In section J., the document specifically protects Microsoft from having to ''document, disclose or license to third parties:

(a) portions of APIs or Documentation or portions or layers of Communications Protocols the disclosure of which would compromise the security of anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption or authentication systems, including without limitation, keys, authorization tokens or enforcement criteria'' Since the .NET architecture being bundled into Windows essentially builds ''anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, and authentication systems'' into all levels of the operating system, ANY API, documentation, or communication layer can fall into this category. This means that Microsoft never has to disclose any API by claiming it's part of a security or authorization system, giving them a complete veto over ALL disclosure.

4) Veto against Open Source

Substantial amounts of the software that runs the Internet is ''Open Source'', which means it's developed on a non-commercial basis by nonprofit groups and volunteers. Examples include Apache, GNU/Linux, Samba, etc.

Under section J.2.c., Microsoft does not need to make ANY API available to groups that fail to meet ''reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business.'' This explicitly gives them a veto over sharing any information with open source development projects as they are usually undertaken on a not-for-profit basis (and therefore would not be considered authentic, or viable businesses).

These concerns can be met in the following ways:

1) Middleware:

Extend middleware interoperability with a Microsoft server to ALL contexts (both within general Web browsing as well as other networked services such as are those being included under .NET).

2) Interoperability:

Require full disclosure of ALL protocols between client and Microsoft server (including remote administration calls)

3) General veto on interoperability:

Require Microsoft to disclose APIs relating to ''anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption, or authentication systems'' to all.

4) Veto against Open Source:

Forbid Microsoft from discriminating between for-profit and nonprofit groups in API disclosure.

Sincerely,
Matthew Johnson
32753 Mono Lake lane
Fremont, CA. 94555
MattJ

MTC–00005343

From: Walt Zwierzycki
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 1/1/02 10:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I oppose the settlement agreed to by the DOJ and some of the states. It does nothing to stop Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior and even provides legal protection to perpetuate some of it. I support the recommendations of the nine other states.

MTC–00005344

From: Daniel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 10:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Antithrust Case
Renata Hesse,
Trial Attorney,
Suite 1200,
Antitrust Division,
Department of Justice,
601 D Street NW,
Washington, DC 20530
Daniel Wells,
1936 Pawnee Drive
Yukon Ok, 73099

This letter is for your consideration as part of the public comment ordered by the court concerning the penalty phase of the Microsoft antitrust case.

It is not necessary for me to express why Microsoft is guilty of ''maintaining'' a monopoly, the court has already found this as fact. My concern is, in light of recent world events and an economic slowdown, that our judicial system is in fact turning from its role of justice to one of politics. Justice demands that Microsoft give up its monopoly of the Windows operating systems, including:

Microsoft Windows 95,
Microsoft Windows 98,
Microsoft Windows 98 Second Edition,
Microsoft Windows Millennium Edition, and
Microsoft Windows XP Home Edition.

Microsoft has sufficient operating system competition in the business market to compete for its versions of Microsoft NT, 2000, and XP Pro, to remain a viable and competitive company. But, unless the plug is pulled on the Home Operation System market while the opportunity exist, irreparable damage will result in our nations ability to continue being a leader in the microcomputer mass marketing arena.

Each industry goes through a period of time where a basic infrastructure has to grow. At some point, basic services, become so common place, that it remains inconsumable to imagine them being solely owned by one company. When that happens, entrepreneurship and competition stagnates. This is the case today with the consumer computer industry. Microsoft now controls what, how, when, and by whom, all new computer data communications technologies, peripheral hardware and software products will become marketable.

Microsoft once was a great company for America, but now has become her enemy, becoming more and more aggressively forced onto everything we do on computers today. If you must play politics, then demand justice first and foremost.

The court should order the public release of 100% of the proprietary information, compilation tools, and development software, concerning the above listed operating systems. In addition, the court should revoke the licenses of the OS and turn it over to the public domain, thus allowing competition to proceed now, and not wait for the endless appeals processes that Microsoft lawyers will undoubtedly use otherwise. Additionally, order Microsoft to place all of this data on high speed servers so that is readily available over the internet with a bandwidth that is at least equivalent to its current online support sites.

Lastly, demand that this be done immediately without delay, and appoint court officials to oversee the process, imposing extremely heavy fines for non compliance and order a freeze of assets if Microsoft does not comply. Order future monitoring of Microsoft activities, and impose heavy fines if it regresses into future attempts to monopolize.

Now surely, companies will spring up selling exact copies of the current MS products, but that market will not last, it will be those companies that bring new innovations, tools, and improved security to the foreground that will get America back on track as the industry leader. Certainly, Microsoft will remain in the best position to compete in an open market. This action will give America the shot in the arm that it needs, whereas the current proposed penalties will result in further economic slowdown and create the unprecedented litigation that our economic future is to be driven by the whims of Mr. Bill Gates.

Thank you for requesting public opinion.
Daniel Wells

MTC–00005345

From: Doug Campbell
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/1/02 11:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

If the previous administration spent as much energy chasing Bin Laden as it did chasing Bill Gates we might not be in the mess we are in now. The proposed settlement is probably to harsh and unnecessary, but lets implement it and move on. Get the ''outlaw'' states on board, close this issue and let the economy recover. Bill Gates and the other creative minds of the computer age have truly revolutionized the world (for the better) created millions of jobs, huge efficiencies in the way the world works and communicates—he is a hero not a villan. In

my own smalll business automation has enabled us to cut costs in half while growing sales 20% Implement the proposed settlement, strongarm the remaining states to go along and move on to more important things.

Sincerely,
Doug
Douglas A. Campbell, CIC
President & CEO
CRES Insurance Services, LLC
(800) 880–2747

MTC–00005346

From: Ann Randall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the US Government has done more than enough to wreck a thriving company. It has been four years of harrassment. Please proceed with the settlement and do what ever possible to stop the continuous litigation so Microsoft can go back to innovating for the rest of the world.

John Randall
161 Ashton Drive
Burr Ridge, IL 60527

MTC–00005347

From: EDWARD LANGON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:12pm
Subject: msft settlement

to: renata b hesse,anti trust division.

i am not a attorney or a computer engineer but i am a msft customer. i have become disappointed again. during the past months the state attorney general in california has made inflammatory statements regarding this judgment. it appears some states want it to never end. the proposed final judgment with strong compliance and enforcement procedures provide a certain remedy for the msft violations. thank you

elangon5@hotmail

MTC–00005348

From: XaNeX
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:26pm
Subject: Microsoft

As the Network Administrator . . . it is my responsibility oversee the deployment of new technologies to our company. My position gives me ample freedom to implement whatever software or hardware I see necessary to keep the company network running smoothly and to satisfy user requests. Unfortunately, though my position may give me that freedom, the current software economy cannot.

''I would dearly love to replace all Microsoft technology in my office with Open Source software, and if the software economy can give me as much freedom as my job did, I would do just that. However, the most defeating problem is what Microsoft chooses to keep secret—it's network protocols, the layout of it's Office files, and the precise technology needed to migrate from their email server. . . . I am asking the court to force Microsoft to publish these protocols in detail. I am also urging to court to act on future technologies as well. Microsoft is now planning to add vast pieces of the Internet to it's web of interdependencies. With it's initiative .Net, whole portions of the web would be cut off from non-Microsoft technologies. We have seen a glimpse of the monopolist's vision of the future with the UK and MSN portal, designed by Microsoft and accessible only with Microsoft technology.

Ryan Stagman

MTC–00005349

From: dino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 11:34pm
Subject: Why are you being so nice to Microsoft

Dear Sir (or Madam),

This Linux user (look at the headers on this e-mail) feels the DOJ is being far to nice to Microsoft. The plan to donate computer goodies to poor schools sounds nice, but it is bogus—it's just a way to drive out the competition.

Why don't they offer to give software from Mac or Linux OS to the schools? This is merely ''business as usual,'' (nod-nod, wink-wink) under a different guise. Or just give the bully what he deserves? But the bully doesn't seem to realize that this is the age of the Internet—dirty games like that become known fast, and ''nod-nod, wink-wink''—and the payoff—become known in a hurry.

Sincerly,
Dean Moore
2435 7th Street
Boulder, CO 80304

MTC–00005350

From: Quent Cordair
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm an artist in Burlingame, CA, where I also run a small two-person art gallery. I am in no way associated with Microsoft, nor do I own any Microsoft stock. But over the years, my art and my small business have much benefited from the use of Microsoft's Windows products. Please leave Microsoft alone. They've done no wrong to the consumer; they've done nothing but help us greatly. They're guilty of nothing more than continually making their products better and cheaper for us, year after year. To punish Microsoft is to reward the mediocrity of their competitors, and by extension, to do harm to me, the consumer. Morality and plain common sense would dictate that the Justice Department spend its time, focus and efforts, and our hard-earned money, in defending us against real criminals, rather than shackling the best and most innovative, those who add the most value to our lives. How on earth has it come to this, that are you choosing to hurt us, rather than help us? Let's see if anyone in the Justice Department has the courage and integrity to stand up and do the right thing at this point. It would take a true hero.

Regards,
Quent Cordair
Quent Cordair Fine Art
346 Lorton Avenue
Burlingame, CA 94010
(650) 344–1134
quent@cordair.com

MTC–00005351

From: SOster629@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the DOJ has been fiddling around and avoiding definite action vis-a-viz the Microsoft case. How can it be 'in the public interest' to continue to delay this case? In the unlikely event that you come up with a solution to give Microsoft's assets to johnny-come-lately competitors who would like to cripple Microsoft for little reason other than to abscond with Microsoft's wealth, would the world be better off without Microsoft? You can bet your boots that the world and the US economy will both suffer.

Sincerely,
F. Samuel Ostertag, Mesa, Arizona

MTC–00005352

From: Ellison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General John Ashcroft:

We wish to see the Microsoft mess ended. The Department of Justice settlement agreement was both fair and reasonable and it has gone far enough.

Russ & Doris Ellison
N8579 Hay Creek Road
Willard, WI 54494
Phone or Fax: 715 267–7284
e-mail: elli@badger.tds.net

MTC–00005353

From: Neal Shafto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the companies that have charged Microsoft and its officers with the complaints and have cost the American Tax system Millions on $'s on litigation should cease and desist. The judges have dealt with the cases before it and have reached an agreement. Since this has been accepted by both parties involved, I believe the case to be completed and no further action is required. If the system continues to do harm to the free enterprise system that is in place in the global economy, it will cause irreparable damage and further the decline of the economy. Stocks are affected by this child-like actions of a few who are jealous of the power and business skills of Microsoft. Please do not allow this to continue to erode the financial system, which is in place in this international economy. We have been ''raped'' by a few for too long and deserve better.

I remain concerned and committed, to free enterprise of equality for all, not for a few who ''can not'' continue to evolve in the system with the generation of new and better ideals for the consumers.

Neal T. Shafto
Simcoe, Ontario
Canada

MTC–00005354

From: philip solar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:51am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a consumer of Microsoft products, this should go away. The American problem would not be the same regarding productivity y if it weren't for Mr. Gates and company. They had made me far more productive and without there feedback. This is one terrific company. As consumers we do that tike all the prods. 'Do n to profit

MTC–00005355

From: triscgd@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to speak out (albeit from Australia) against the settlement proposed in the Microsoft anti-trust case.

As has been pointed out by Robert X. Cringely (http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20011206.html), the details of the proposal will potentially put Microsoft in a position to target open-source software, which is in fact the only true competition which Microsoft faces today. It will thus end up increasing, rather than diminishing (as is the case's intent) Microsoft's market power. In addition, organisations such as our own require the flexibility to be able to choose open-source software, which we know is secure and not subject to ''back-door'' snooping by Redmond, or anyone else whom they are ''in bed with''. A percieved ''cosy deal'' between the US Govt and Microsoft will drive foreign governments and organisations away from US software and towards software they can trust.

In short the deal is not in the best interests of Microsoft, the US, or foreign software users. It will not address the problems raised in the anti-trust case.

Regards,
Graham Daniell
Helpdesk Administrator,
Department of Treasury and Finance
Western Australia

MTC–00005356

From: Chris Striker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My name is Chris Striker, and I am a consumer interested in the case concerning Microsoft. I want to register my disapproval with the case, and consider it imperative that nothing whatsoever be done to Microsoft. Nothing less than a quick dismissal of the entire case will be satisfactory. America cannot afford to spend time or money crippling companies, and I certainly don't want such actions performed by the government in my name with my money. Lay off. Let the competitors compete.

MTC–00005357

From: Robert Warren
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:30pm
Subject: Feedback on Settlement Issue

Hi DOJ,

I just thought I'd offer my thoughts as I was invited to by an email from www.redhat.com I've got to say this MS witch hunt is absolutely appalling from my point of view.

As the centre of entrepreneurial achievement, I would have thought Microsoft would be something to be proud of. Why start a company if you are not in it to become the biggest company in the world, even if it means other companies will suffer from your success?

Sure, fine MS for their monopolistic practices. I think almost everyone would agree with this on principle. But using the anti-monopoly laws to protect other competitors from the success of another company reeks of 'tall poppy syndrome' and 'sour grapes'.

Honestly, telling a company they cannot incorporate THEIR OWN product into THEIR OWN operating system is an absolute farce. Worse still, now I hear others calling for MS to make a scaled-down version of THEIR OWN product so others can use it to promote their own products?!? You MUST be joking!!

The lesson I have learnt is 'don't become too successful or even the DOJ will attack you'. Not really what you should be about, don't you think??

Just my two cents...
Cheers,
Robert Warren

MTC–00005358

From: Robin Schroeder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07am
Subject: DOJ Input

I feel that the current settlement that was reached between Microsoft, the federal government, and nine states involved in litigation is fair to all and not stifiling to innovation. My position still remains that companies producing inferior products are attempting to gain via Microsoft's loss. If their products were superior, they would not need to resort to such tactics. Judges in our country have allowed attorneys to run rampant finding loop holes in the law and hence allowed these same individuals to become wealthy via lawsuits. Prolonging this litigation is, in essence, punishing a company for being successful and innovative, and this approach does not support the American Dream. Where would we all be without Windows?

MTC–00005359

From: Marc Jullien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:42am
Subject: Support from France !!!

As Great Things must go on, Microsoft has still to run the show accordingly to world interest !!!

MTC–00005360

From: joanpeterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this matter so that our economy can begin to improve. All this fighting with Microsoft has placed a heavy burden on our economy.

MTC–00005361

From: Don Clear
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:42am
Subject: Dept. of Justice/Microsoft Settlement

Please finalize the pending settlement without further litigation. The agreement reached between both parties is fair and will benefit consumers.

PLEASE SETTLE NOW!
Respectfully,
Don Clear

MTC–00005362

From: Elvin Kever
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/2/02 10:28am
Subject: Why MicroSoft?

I for the life of me can not understand why Microsoft gets off so easily. Think of what it would be like if we had only one auto manufacturer, or one kind of restaurant. If only you would have the courage to stand up to the crap that the lawyers from Microsoft are dealing you. When you hear crap about how the economy would be affected by the disassembly of Microsoft, well Ma Bell was broken up and look at that market. If the software industry was given a level playing field and hardware manufactures where aloud to choose open source you would see a economic boom like no other.

Regards
Kevin Power

MTC–00005363

From: Keith Godfrey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings,

Please accept the following as public comments relating to the Proposed Final Judgment in the current antitrust trial against Microsoft.

Thank you,
Keith Godfrey

1) The 5 years allocated to the agreement is a very short time. Assuming this were the perfect agreement to 'level the playing field' and provide competitors the chance to fairly compete, Microsoft will be allowed to resume business as usual in a very short time. At a minimum, such an agreement should be readdressed by the court every 5 years until it is deemed to be no longer needed.

Additionally, the agreement appears to be less than perfect if for no other reason than it lacks any method for redress of grievances from past monopolistic abuses, providing those competitors of Microsoft (those that remain in business, which notably does not include Netscape or Be, Inc.) with no advantage to regain market share lost to demonstrated illegal Microsoft business practices.

2) Protocols and middleware interfaces, even if released, provide Microsoft with an inherent competitive advantage over competitors. Not only is there the time advantage, where Microsoft product development based upon these protocols or interfaces will likely be going on for weeks or months before public release of the interface, the interfaces are developed and tailored specifically for Microsoft product needs.

3) Incorporation of low cost or free middleware with the operating system yields a large competitive advantage to Microsoft because many consumers are not inclined to actively download or purchase alternative products without a clear advantage to doing

so. Additionally, users without a technical background (specifically, for example, my parents and grandparents) may have no knowledge about alternative products, have little incentive to find them, and even if they do, lack the confidence and minimal ability required to download and install them

4) The agreement seems very weak given the dominant Microsoft market position—this agreement may have been appropriate several years ago but now is likely to be largely ineffective

5) The settlement seems to address only the issues outlined in the narrow scope of the trial, and fails to consider additional monopolistic abuses against competitors who were too timid to testify, those that lacked the financial resources to testify, and those that fell outside of the prosecutions list of top 20 witnesses. The demonstrated pattern of abuses clearly implies the existence of similar behavior that the penalty should address and seek amends for.

6) The settlement does not appear to address favorable treatment by Microsoft to OEMs who produce operating specific hardware. Most OEMs now include 'WinModems' (modems operable only through Windows) with nearly every new computer in place of what used to be fully functioning modems operable under all operating systems. Microsoft mandating the inclusion of such hardware for favorable pricing effectively raises the barrier to entry for operating system competitors, as the end users are forced to buy additional hardware (a second modem) to use the computer in an increasingly online world. This same argument can be made for network interface cards.

7) There seems to be no allowance for an OEM to manufacture computers without installing Windows and not incur penalties by Microsoft. The proposed final judgment section III, A.2 and C.4 specify that computers can be manufactured with an additional operating systems installed, but do not mention manufacturing computers using only alternative operating systems. This can allow continuation of the 'Microsoft tax' to end users when purchasing a computer when they do not want, and will never use, the Microsoft products installed on it.

8) Section J.1.a—there appears to be a potentially large loophole prohibiting the final judgment from forcing disclosure of APIs, Documentation or (importantly) communication protocols that compromise the security of 'a particular installation' of a series of products, including encryption, authentication tokens and authentication systems, when the announced direction of the company is towards a distributed network strategy which heavily relies on these elements. It is technically very easy to create a specific implementation that disclosure of protocols or APIs might threaten the security of and hence allow the locking up of all these disclosures.

9) While possibly beyond consideration of the court, an effectively homogenous network of computers using software and operating systems from a single manufacturer makes for an ideal 'breeding ground' for computer viruses and worms. This should be considered a strong threat to national and economic security. Structural remedies to break up the monopoly held by Microsoft seem to be the only method to resolve this issue.

MTC–00005364

From: brian@apthand.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.
general@po.state. ct.us@inet...
Date: 1/2/02 7:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm yet another information technology person that can not understand why Microsoft is not being broken up. Their monopoly status in not in dispute. The fact that Microsoft used this status to exend its Monopoly to other markets is not in dispute. The Sherman Anti-Trust Act has been broken and the only effective, long-term solution is to separate the application software (Word, Excel) development company from the operating system (Windows) company.

Needless to say, I oppose the current settlement proposal. Is is not in the best interest of the public.

Brian Blevins
brian.blevins@apthand.com
http://www.AptHand.com/
Mobile Consumer Intelligence: Home Buying for Digerati

MTC–00005365

From: Riverhiker723@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:56am
Subject: (no subject)

my opinion on the microsoft case is bill gates should be incarcerated.

MTC–00005366

From: Cheyenne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Reader,

Please Do Not stop good companies from making great products! Let's get this case behind us and move on. This settlement is in the best interest of the US and world economy and everyone that uses Microsoft's products.

A very satisfied customer.

MTC–00005367

From: Cessna, Joel R (Wooster XJP 60C)
To: 'MICROSOFT.ATR(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:03am
Subject: Microsft Case

Please settle this case ASAP! Americans and the economy have suffered long enough. Lets don't forget all the positve things that Micosoft has done for all of us including you and everyone else on the planet!

MTC–00005368

From: ed.smallwood@twcable.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:05am
Subject: RE: Microsoft Settlement, Public Comment

It is my opinion that the US govt. should tread lightly and issue leniant sanctions against Microsoft. This company may have violated the letter of some law but it (in large measure) also brought to our world a wave of usability and productivity the likes of which have never been seen. I know that it's become popular these days to denigrate the giant software maker, but in the interests of fairness, I ask that you please be gentle.

Regards,
Ed Smallwood
Matthews, NC

MTC–00005369

From: Rivera William
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:04am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Ruling

Dear sirs,

I am writing to inform you that I do not agree with the settlement ruling in the Microsoft Antitrust Case. I do not think that the settlement is in my interest, as Microsoft is still able to bundle software which I do not use or need nor WANT. I respectfully request that a different ruling be looked at and chosen which would require Microsoft to separate the non-necessary and unwanted components from the operating systems which it sells. Further, I request that this ruling take into account software that Microsoft is presently selling which was not being sold when the Antitrust Case was begun, as this software also includes unwanted software in the programming code.

Sincerely,
William E. Rivera
wrivera@t-online.de
Unit 28043 Box #18
APO AE 09112
CC:'attorney.general(a)po.state.ct.us'

MTC–00005370

From: Ferraro, James A
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the litigation favors Microsoft's competitors and not the general public.

James A. Ferraro
Lockheed Martin Missile & Space
Air Force Reentry Systems Programs
230 Mall Boulevard, King of Prussia, PA 19406
Phone: 610–354–2932
Fax: 610–354–5225

MTC–00005371

From: Jeff Seiler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hey Folks,

Please get this over with. Let the settlement stand as is. I was not forced to use Microsoft products. They are just the best for what I do. This has gone on too long and as both a user and a stockholder, I'm sick of it. Let the settlement stand. . . move on to something more important like predatory lending.

Jeff Seiler
President
S&S Benefits Consulting
219 Darien
Dundee, IL 60118
P:847–428–5353
F:847–428–9876
jseiler@ssbenefits.net

MTC–00005372

From: Boyer, Jonathan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:29am

Subject: Comment on proposed settlement

I am a United States citizen exercising my rights under the law to comment on this case. I believe that accepting the proposed settlement as it stands is will be a huge mistake on the part of the US Department of Justice and the 9 states who have also agreed to it in principle. In essence, far from damaging Microsoft (MS), this settlement will actually aid them in extending their current monopoly of the operating system market into a segment of the market where there is traditionally far more competition than in the general business and home markets.

As it stands, the market for academic computing at all levels is far more likely to support alternative operating systems, such as Apple Computers' Mac OS or the open-source Linux operating system. The proposed settlement can only serve to erode that competition through a means that is essentially unfair in the sense that schools cannot afford to turn away donated materials, and those donated materials will be all MS. A far more judicious version of the same settlement would be to force MS to pay the full dollar value of the settlement in cash to the proposed foundation, rather than allowing refurbished PC's and MS software to make up any portion of the value. This would give the benefit of a much stronger financial base for the foundation along with providing for free choice in a critical market. Even then, the remedy is on the light side, considering the size of MS cash reserves, which it has in large part amassed through monopolistic practices that have often seemed lacking in ethics.

Jonathan R. Boyer
Tek Systems / Eaton Corp.
Eastlake, OH USA
Desk: 440.954.5719
Cell: 440.725.9117

MTC–00005373

From: Lyn Norstad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the time has come to put this behind us, and allow the industry to go about it's business. As a computer user since the late 1970s, I am convinced that this whole ''ill-advised'' action was one of the principal causes of the economic recession we all now face. It was . . . and still is . . . shameful behavior on the part of a few self-serving entities who instigated it.

Lyn Norstad
Chicago, IL

MTC–00005374

From: SSchwartz@MICROS.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You need to revise the settlement, as it is not in the best interests of the people who use computers. First, it needs to punish the perpetrators, which it currently does not, second, it needs to set an example that will stop companies from behaving in a similar way in the future and finally, it needs to restore confidence that the government is for the people and not owned by the company with the most money, which is what people think.

Steve Schwartz

MTC–00005375

From: jshansen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I wish to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft Anti-trust settlement situation. My honest opinion is that this trial has proven the lack of integrity now in our court system. Their should simply be a rule of law which decides right and wrong and let justice be served. Opinions are expressed constitutionally through the voting processes. Specifically, the laws which were passed in this case are out-dated and have no bearing upon private intellectual property. In other words, this case should have never been before a court.

As for the public interest, is it ever in the public's interest for a corporation to be forced to spend it's money on lawsuits and settlements? Certainly not and even more so when the country has fallen into recession and a large corporation such as Microsoft is forced to take its finances out from the private sector and place it into the hands of the government where it will not be used properly. Case in point, the Tobacco settlement. Large sums of money went to multiple different states, many of them claiming that it was money ear-marked for their Education programs in an attempt to persuade the ''public's interest''.

Now that they have the money, it has been spent on a multitude of wasteful programs and in only a few cases has there been distributions to the educational programs.

Please let the Free Market decide what companies should be punished for hurting the public. It is very clear that consumer spending can make a difference.

Sincerely,
Joel Hansen
Lancaster, OH
(740) 654–0682
CC:US@Newsletters.Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00005376

From: Borkholm, Clay
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

This e-mail concerns the Microsoft antitrust settlement. In my estimation, it is time to put the enormous cost and effort behind us and look forward to the future. Microsoft has been a phenomenal innovator in the industry and deserves to continue to compete effectively. In that Microsoft has, by finding of fact, engaged in unfair business practices, it seem appropriate to censure, fine and monitor Microsoft against anti-competitive practices. However, additional penalties and litigation seems wholly unjustified. It seems that Microsoft, by their very success, has created industry standards in an industry lacking in such sorely needed guidance. This is due to extraordinary growth in the discipline, I'm sure. Because of the lure of wealth, other companies seek any legal means to replace the defacto standards with their own. Litigation is one means to this end, and has become widely accepted as an appropriate business practice. I urge you to see through this attempt and respond with even-handed justice. Turn away those who would tie up the courts in an attempt to weaken the competition.

Thanks for your consideration,
Clay Borkholm
Chief Technology Officer
BST Consultants, Inc

MTC–00005377

From: Forrest Hawkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Clear DayFolks,

Put me down as one who strongly believes the Microsoft settlement should be settled.

I am not a Microsoft fan. I don't like their software and I don't own their stock.

However this case should never have been brought. It is obviously sour grapes by competitors.

Please stop the attacks on perhaps the most innovative company in American history.

At the same time their competitors had a hard time, thousands, if not millions of others have made fortunes from the development environment provided by Microsoft's Windows.

Forrest Hawkins

MTC–00005378

From: John A MacNeal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I approve of your efforts to settle the Microsoft litigation. Please get the matter resolved and let the competitors go compete. The Courts and the lawyers need to get out of the way.

MTC–00005379

From: shawnlab(a)microsoft.com
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My opinion:

Punishing Microsoft now, for activities stopped years ago, could only benefit a few large, powerful competitors and hurt the economy as a whole.

Microsoft produces great software that we all use. Crippling them will only serve the lawyers and some politicians needing a ''David and Goliath'' slant on their next election campaign.

MTC–00005380

From: Dave McClintock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:27am
Subject: Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior

I work for a public school district in Delaware. Recently, the high school librarian sent me an e-mail asking me why she could no longer access Microsoft's Web site for Encarta (encarta.msn.com), an online information resource similar to an encyclopedia. When I checked this out, I found that I could use Internet Explorer to bring up the Web site just fine. But when I

used Netscape Navigator, I received the following error message: Microsoft VBScript runtime error '800a000d' Type mismatch: '[string: ''']' /intl/bver.inc, line 8 Microsoft has ''fixed'' this Web site to make it appear that Netscape does not have the capability needed for displaying this Web page. This Web page has a Visual Basic script embedded. Internet Explorer ''understands'' Visual Basic, but Netscape does not, hence the error. Visual Basic is a proprietary Microsoft technology, not an Internet standard. Microsoft could have just as easily used a Java script (which is an open Internet standard), but chose not to do so in order to make non-Microsoft browsers inoperable on this site.

The Web is a wonderful educational resource for our public school students. These resources should be constructed so that a variety of technologies will work properly. Our public libraries used to work on this principle—one didn't need special glasses, or technology, to read World Book Encyclopedia as opposed to other encylopedias. A student who opened World Book could just as easily (and in a very similar manner) get information from any encyclopedia written by different publishers.

Microsoft's use of Visual Basic scripts on their Web sites is just another example of their monopolistic behavior. Quality of content in Encarta should be the benchmark for how they compete with other resource sites, not proprietary technology (especially when open technology standards already exist). If Encarta has better content, then people will use it instead of other online resources which have less quality of content. But the only way they can use it now is to access it via Internet Explorer.

Dave McClintock
Supervisor of Technology
Lake Forest School District
Felton, DE
302–284–3020 ext 113

MTC–00005381

From: Mark Korolevich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I will make this short and to the point. Microsoft makes great products that are of great value to their consumers. Do not hinder their ability to continue to produce these great products. The government has already spent too much money in litigation with Microsoft.

Leave Microsoft alone.
Mark Korolevich
Sr. Programmer
Arrow-Magnolia

MTC–00005382

From: Guy, Brendan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov',' attorney.general(a)po...
Date: 1/2/02 9:45am
Subject: Microsoft ''Settlement''

This is a disgrace.

The proposed administrative remedies are so light-handed and irrelevant as to be laughable if the subject weren't so serious. Letting MS off the hook for their anti-competitive practices by allowing them to further their monopoly is some of the most byzantine logic yet applied, and allowing them—retail—value—in the fine structure is an insult to every intelligent person involved.

Microsoft is in this mess because of their flagrant violation of the last round of administrative remedies. They have proven time and time again that they hold no respect for the rules that govern corporate behaviour in this country.

Cut them up and break them down, do what's needed to—change—the entrenched culture of intimidation and bullying that has gotten them to where they are. Administrative remedies that ''level the playing field'' are useless in an industry where the playing field changes every six months unless you change the underlying culture that created the violations in the first place.

Brendan Guy
Brooklyn, New York

MTC–00005383

From: Edward Chan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 9:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Competition and choices are critical to a capitalistic society like ours. I have the choice of using and choosing Apple Computers, Wintel platform, Linux, SUN and even IBM. To say that Microsoft is a monopoly or customers have little or no choice is ludicrous. Why spent so much of our tax dollars trying to destroy such a great U.S. company is truly unwise and definitely unpatriotic. Let's face it, there are a lot of smart people in India, China, etc. but they don't have Microsoft! If we choose to destroy our great companies, impose unreasonable fines and restrictions. . . . U.S.A will be the loser down the road.

MTC–00005384

From: Ken Mays
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:02am
Subject: Comment

Please consider the long-term negative impact on innovation and creativity in the educational environment if Microsoft is allowed to negotiate a settlement that puts their product in the nation's school systems. The net effect will likely be to increase their market share and result in yet a new monopoly in just a few years. I add my voice to those against this settlement. Thank you.

Ken Mays

MTC–00005385

From: Devon Bingham
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 10:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I felt I should comment on the settlement since it directly effects me. Personally I feel that the whole lawsuit should not have been filed in the first place, but that is another matter. I feel that the settlement that was reached recently is more the enough to ''punish'' Microsoft. I do like the inclusion of money/software to the public schools. I think this whole thing should be finished as soon as possible, its been dragged on long enough by the lawyers and politicians who are looking to make a name for themselves.

Devon Bingham
IS Analyst
USD School of Medicine / University Physicians
http://med.usd.edu <http://med.usd.edu>
http://www.upclinics.org <http://www.upclinics.org>

MTC–00005386

From: Dan.Stern@born.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Technology winners and losers should be determined in the marketplace, not the courts. It's time to settle the Microsoft case. Let the public decide if it wants new features bundled into their software or if they'd rather pay several manufactures for a more expensive and difficult to manage solution. Who is the government protecting? Microsoft offers outstanding products at a fair value. Their only crime has been their success.

MTC–00005387

From: Pursley, Hank G.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 10:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this!
Best Regards
Hank Pursley
Site Support Consultant
Marconi Managed Services
Office (714) 986–8464
Pager (888) 650–7957
henry.pursley@marconi.com

MTC–00005388

From: Lilli Sassenhagen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

It seems to me that those entities (states and companies) trying to derail the settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ are interested in protecting their states or companies from competition rather than protecting the consumer. Microsoft's innovations have made my life a lot easier.

If the DOJ is interested in saving the consumer money let them stop these unwarranted delays of a settlement. Because the longer the delays the higher the legal fees for Microsoft and the government, which in the end would be passed on to the consumer by higher prices and higher taxes.

Sincerely,
Lilli Sassenhagen

MTC–00005389

From: bgbergmann@aep.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,RFC-822=attorney.general%po.state.ct...
Date: 1/2/02 10:38am Subject' Proposed Microsoft settlement harms children and continues Microsoft's Monopoly

Proposed Microsoft settlement harms children and continues Microsoft's Monopoly I agree with the spirit of the following and would refuse to accept the settlement if I were a plaintiff. As a professional computer user and United States citizen, I urge you to do what you can to

make sure that the settlement is not made in its current form. Thank you.

Open K-12 Petition Letter

To: Plaintiffs in the Nationwide Settlement Class Action Suit filling against Microsoft's Anti-trust practices, MDL Docket No. 1332

From: The 1245 Petition Signers of the Open K-12 Petition Drive project

Dear Plaintiff,

We, the 1245 signers of this letter are petitioning you to reconsider your decision, made on behalf of your attorneys representing you in your class action antitrust suit against Microsoft, to settle your suit with Microsoft. The reason being is that we feel the current conditions of the settlement to be unjust, not only to you, but to the software industry which provides software products and services to the K-12 school system.

The reason why you have joined this class action suit filed against Microsoft is because of Microsoft's antitrust behavior which has caused you damages you are seeking to remediate in court. The settlement you are about to enter into with Microsoft will in effect shutdown competition in the software industry which serves the K-12 school program. This outcome, that of cutting of avenues of competition, is precisely what you are fighting against in your suit against Microsoft.

By entering into this current settlement with Microsoft, the following actions will occur. You will dismiss all your charges against Microsoft, and agree never to pursue them again. In return, Microsoft will spend up wards of $500 million dollars in cash to promote Microsoft software products and services, and training on how to use these Microsoft products and services, in the nations ''underprivileged'' K-12 (kindergarten through high school) schools over a period of 5 years. $100 million of this is a 1 for 2 matching fund raising program. (i.e. for every $2 dollars raised through fund raising efforts, Microsoft will donate $1 dollar, up to $100 million dollars.) If no further funds are raised through private means, then the sum total would be $400 million dollars over 5 years.

Microsoft will subsidize the purchase of up to 200,000 refurbished personal computers, by paying for 1/3 of the cost for desktop systems, and 1/2 the cost of laptops. These PCs must be purchased through Microsoft certified refurbished PC dealers. Microsoft will provide software for these systems in the form of several hundred thousand licenses for various different Microsoft software products. These will range from operating system software, to office productivity software, to compilers. Microsoft is given the right to deny any wrong doing or admission of any guilt in your case you filed against Microsoft.

The fact that Microsoft is spending money in this educational program for the underprivileged K-12 schools in return for you dropping your charges will not be considered an admission of guilt or any wrong doing which you state in your case. All material which you brought forward as evidence in your civil suit against Microsoft will either be destroyed or placed in custody of the attorneys representing you and/or Microsoft and labeled as confidential. This evidence which you brought against Microsoft will never be used in court in any other cases brought against Microsoft.

Copies of any legal material written by your attorneys in regards to this case will be kept by them under confidentiality and thus will never be used in future cases against Microsoft. We, the 1245 signers of this petition, would like to inform you that we feel this settlement to be unfair in that the final outcome of the settlement will be a major promotion of the use of Microsoft software in the nations underprivileged K-12 schools. This will be done in the following way.

A ''Foundation'' will be established which will receive the funds of the settlement. This foundation will be governed by a board, made up of 5 members. Two of these members will be appointed by Microsoft, two will be appointed by the attorneys representing you, and one will be appointed by a unanimous vote of the first 4 board members. The ''Foundation'' will create an ''Education Council'' which will take charge of helping the board spend its funds. The members of the ''Education Council'' will be appointed by the board members of the ''Foundation''.

Among other responsibilities, the ''Education Council'', will be to educate the K-12 schools on how to spend the money they receive from the settlement. Included in this education program will be training material, curriculum materials, and training on curriculum integration, provided to the teachers of these K-12 schools. Section IV.d(d) of the settlement stipulates that the ''Education Council'' must consult with Microsoft on which training and curriculum material will be used as well as how to integrate this training material with the curriculum. Furthermore Microsoft will create a Microsoft certified refurbished PC seller, and funds from this settlement can only be spent on computers bought from these Microsoft certified refurbished PC sellers.

In other words, Microsoft will setup a legal structure, though its ''Foundation'' and ''Education Council'' to ensure the funds are spent on promoting the use of Microsoft software in these underprivileged K-12 schools. Microsoft is also setting up a training and education program to train the teachers how to use Microsoft's software product under the control and guidance of Microsoft. Finally, Microsoft is making sure the schools spend the settlement funds on purchasing used personal computers which are configured to run Microsoft software. There are other details in the settlement which further promote the use of Microsoft software products, but what's listed above makes up the foundation of Microsoft's K-12 education program.

From these facts, we, the 1245 signers of this petition, recognize Microsoft's efforts to use this settlement to train teachers and students on how to use Microsoft software. We also recognize that the ultimate goal of this settlement is to further expand Microsoft's customer base through this aggressive training program aimed at the children of our underprivileged K-12 schools. We find this kind of targeted training program to be ill suited to be used as a settlement agreement for charges of antitrust behavior brought against Microsoft.

We, the 1245 signers of this petition, would like for you to take one of two actions.

1. Contact your attorney, and ask him to change the conditions of the settlement. The settlement we propose is to have Microsoft donate cash grants to the underprivileged K-12 schools which were targeted in the original settlement. The size of the individual grants should be in proportion to the number of students enrolled in the school. The schools should then be directed to spend the money on computer hardware, software, networking infrastructure and Internet connection bandwidth for systems used by the teachers and students, as they best see fit for themselves. We emphasize that these funds be restricted to upgrading the IT infrastructure just mentioned, used directly in the classroom environment. These would be upgrades to system used in general class rooms, libraries, science labs, computer clubs or which ever other teaching forum the school has developed for the teaching of their students. The role of the Foundation, as created in the settlement agreement, should expend its efforts to ensure this funding policy be enforced. Furthermore, in order to ensure that Microsoft has no part in directing how the settlement funds be spent, the Foundation created to manage the settlement funds should be made up of people from our leading science and education institutions. Examples of the people who should be sought to sit on the blue ribbon board of this foundation would be the head of the National Science Foundation, the head of the National Academy of Sciences, the Presidential Science Adviser, directors of our national laboratories, presidents of our renown universities, heads of teachers unions, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Commerce or other people who have great knowledge of both education, its advancement and the free and open market system upon which the strength of this country is founded. The task of forming a search committee for these board members should be given to the Honorable Judge Motz or someone to which he delegates this task.

2. Or opt out of the settlement. Section 5 of the settlement states that you have a right to opt out of the settlement and preserve your right to pursue your claim against Microsoft. To do this, you need to send a letter to ''The Settlement Notice Administrator'', indicating your wish to do so. You have 150 days to exercise your ''opt-out'' options after entry of the Court's order for preliminary approval of the settlement.

We thank you for reading our petition and listening to our concerns regarding the settlement you are about to enter with Microsoft. We, the 1245 signers of this petition, are very encouraged that Microsoft is willing to fund so handsomely a computer education program for our underprivileged schools. But we also want to make sure that it is done in a fair manner that promotes an open market place for software products and that this settlement not be used to exclude other software vendors from participating in

this education program. We also recognize that in order for our country to keep its role as a global leader, we need to ensure our children are properly educated using the latest technology tools. We must also ensure that the tools which they use are ones which they have chosen freely.

MTC–00005390

From: RWeis21634@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I believe the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling is both fair and just. I also believe that rapid settlement of the suit against Microsoft will be in the best interest of our country, and our economy.

Thank you
Richard Weis
74 Farragut Rd.
Cincinnati, Oh. 45218
rweis21634@aol.com

MTC–00005391

From: KWMEAD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs-Dept.of Justice

I believe strongly that the current settlement agreed with DOJ and nine states is very fair to all parties, especially CONSUMERS.The freedom to innovate should be protected for the continued benefit of consumers and a competitive economy.The pending objection by the nine states and their efforts to stop the settlement is just a ploy by less competent competitors via their lobbyists to restrict Microsoft and add to the costs paid by consumers for inferior products.Consumers have not been properly heard in this case;they would have thrown it out long ago;it has been a waste of taxpayers money to proceed against Microsoft without any significant complaint of MICROSOFT USERS and that they were harmed in a material way !

Kenneth W. Mead
5357 Newport St.
Lisle,IL. 60532

MTC–00005392

From: Forest Majors
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is more than fair. I say this as a consumer and as a software professional that served the industry for thirty years before retirement. Continued litigation would not serve the software industry or the consumer well. It is time to settle and bring this litigation to term.

Forest Majors
PO Box 459
47 Clark Hill Road
Hadlyme, Connecticut 06439
(860) 526–5964

MTC–00005393

From: Ronald Kegge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern at the U.S. Department of Justice, Please end this ridiculous court case now. It is a complete waste of taxpayer money. If anything, the current settlement is unfair to Microsoft and only serves to benefit it's competitors. Allowing this case to continue will only waste money, give Microsoft competitors unfair advantage, and bolster the ego's of the state AG's who filed the case against Microsoft. Please stop wasting my money!

Sincerely,
Ronald Kegge

MTC–00005394

From: Laura Riera
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:56am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case—further litigation is only in the attorneys' interest and NOT in the public's interest.

Laura Riera
PO Box 12479
San Francisco, CA
415–333–8063

———-Original Message———-
From: Microsoft [mailto:0—23163—A43FE97C-035E-D211–8ED5–00805FA7C50A—US@Newsletters.Microsoft.com] Sent: Monday, December 31, 2001 2:18 PM
To: roaringdragons@hotmail.com
Subject: DOJ Wants to Hear From YOU!

A FINFlash Alert: The DOJ wants to hear from YOU!

To cancel your subscription to this newsletter or stop all newsletters from microsoft.com, read the directions at the bottom of this message. For nearly four years, your voice has been instrumental in the debate over the freedom to innovate. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens have communicated to their public officials about whether the Microsoft case should be settled or further litigated. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

However, this settlement is not guaranteed, and your voice is more important than ever.

The law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the ''public interest.'' Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest.

Between now and January 28th, it is critical that the Department of Justice hears from you about the Microsoft settlement. The Department of Justice will then take all public comments and viewpoints and include them in the public record for the District Court to consider. Please send your comments directly to the Department of Justice via email or fax no later than January 28th. Whatever your view of the settlement, it is critical that the government hears directly from consumers. Please take action today to ensure your voice is heard.

Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov . In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.

Fax: 1–202–307–1454 or 1–202–616–9937

To find out more about the settlement and the Tunney Act comment period, go to the Department of Justice Website at:

http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm.

Thanks for taking the time to make a difference.

MTC–00005395

From: Tom Gottshalk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

As a computer user and as a citizen interested in good government which includes equal justice under the law. I have written to the DOJ and my elected officials several times on the subject of our government's anti-trust suit against Microsoft several times. On each of those occasions I stressed my conviction that the search for justice has been completely distorted by all parties involved. I am convinced to this day that justice has not been severed most particularly for the party stated by the DOJ as the injured party, namely the consumer. Everyone involved in the case has benefited except for the computer buying public and the taxpayer of this country. Lawyers have gained fees, politicians have gained in reputation, The DOJ has gained by saying they are protecting the public, Microsoft stock holders have gained despite the efforts of the US Government, and most especially Microsoft's competitors gained by having their arch rival entangled in a legal briar patch. I'm not saying I think Microsoft is innocent of the allegations, clearly they are not. I am saying in this case a monopoly producing a personal computer operating system was and still is a good thing. I am also convinced that the only process remedy that makes any sense for the public and for Microsoft especially for their competitors is the process of the open market undistorted by any hand of the government even in the slightest way.

For proof of the truth of the above statement just look at the recent introduction of Microsoft's newest version of the Windows Operating System, Windows XP. In their attempt to make pirating impossible (the real problem in the software industry) they have made the multiple computer home user buy separate copied for each computer. This is as much a marketing ploy as it is a copyright issue. As a marketing gimmick it will backfire and cost Microsoft tens of thousands of sales. I predict Microsoft will be forced to relax this requirement to gain additional sales. And Microsoft has already had a serious security issues with XP which will

cost them more sales a situation that will require MS to re-write portions of XP. In the end the dominance of MS Windows will falter because users will find better ways of doing the same kinds of things they now do on PCs. The government is on the verge of institutionalizing the MS Windows operating system in the interest of justice for the consumer by strict so called process regulations and rules. Such a mission by the DOJ is bound to fail because regulated products survive only because their regulation survives.

Please consider the only possible justice for the consumer is open markets that reward producers of good products with sales at fair prices and punish producers of inferior products with no sales regardless of their price. The DOJ should keep in mind the consumer as an equal to the law and that in the end exercises more power than the law.

Sincerely,
Tom Gottshalk
344 Remington Dr.
Oviedo, FL 32765

MTC–00005396

From: mt mdt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please allow the tentitive agreements that Microsoft has made to be implemented and do not levy anymore penalties against Microsoft. I have been against this litigation from the start and it should be dropped.

Milton Till
Milton D. Till
love ya babe

MTC–00005397

From: Jerry Bordic
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to conclude the Microsoft Settlement and end more litigation.

MTC–00005398

From: John Zubac
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 11:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not feel that you have not served the public interest litigating Microsoft. I feel that Microsoft should not get away with their sneaky and devious past practices. They continue with their same practices today. They offered a free Microsoft Certified Professional exam for upgrading from Windows NT 4 to Windows 2000 (Microsoft Windows 2000 Accelerated Exam for MCP's Certified on Windows NT 4, Exam #070–240) but do not give you final marks to measure your skills in the new operating system. Is this because they want to waste your time and money by failing everyone on this exam, so that they are required to take four exams which cost $600 US. This exam is also four hours long. These are the first things I thought because I don't trust anyone and NOTHING is free in this world. I also wanted to know my weaknesses in order to get my employer to upgrade my education. They need the proof. You should make Microsoft pay to the full extent of the law. They should finally pay for everything they have done to ruin small businesses, control education, and control this industry.

John Zubac, MCSE, MCP+I, MCP
CPSO
80 College Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G2E2

MTC–00005399

From: A. Bairamian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The following is my input regarding the DOJ settlement proposal for the Microsoft lawsuit.

I have been in the software industry for about 20 years. I use Microsoft products both at my work and personally.

Microsoft is one of the greatest companies ever created in the world. Their dominance—achieved by hard work, innovation, and marketing skill—is a great boon to the PC and software industries: a common OS, and applications that work seamlessly is very, very important to have.

If Microsoft does no innovate and produce quality products, it will become irrelevant and disappear, like so many other software and hardware manufacturers.

We the people buy Microsoft products because we want to: unlike the government, Microsoft cannot compel us to hand over our money to them on pain of jail.

DOJ must not hamper Microsoft's ability to innovate.

DOJ must stop wasting our tax money on a frivolous lawsuit brought on by petty and jealous Microsoft competitors, and presided over by a biased judge.

DOJ's lawsuit against Microsoft triggered the slide in the tech market which eventually turned into a crash: average Americans lost $billions in equity, because of DOJ misadventures.

It is well past time to stop harassing Microsoft, a great American asset, and settle the suit ASAP.

A. Bairamian
Glendale, CA.

MTC–00005400

From: Karuna Karan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:47am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Hello

I understand this is the US government site that accepts comments from world citizens on the Microsoft case.

Let me first give you a background of myself. I am an engineer and I run a small electronic business in Hong Kong. I was retrenched from my job six months ago and so started this business. I am at present working hard to meet my needs.

When I started this business six months ago, I bought a brand new laptop which was bundled with Windows ME operating system. Now, everyday, my computer system crashes on an average three times. The hard disk had also crashed once in the last 6 months time.

This sad situation is that I have no other alternates to help me. Microsoft has effectively killed the growth of any good software that answers to consumers needs pro-actively.

I am sure millions of computers users around the world are facing the similar problem to mine. Microsoft has effectively reduced productivity and efficiency all around the world. If someone was to calculate the amount of time and data lost due to mal-functioning of Microsoft products, I am sure it will run into Trillions of USDollars.

Microsoft has to be stopped immediately ! They should also be made to return their ill-gotten wealth to the world citizens. PLEASE DO IT NOW ! best wishes Karunakaran

MTC–00005401

From: Sally Sargent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The Department of Justice—

I would like to urge you to discontinue any further litigation in the Microsoft case. I believe that the actions taken against Microsoft 2+ years ago spurred the most devastating recession in this nation's history and it is time for the Government to do the right thing and stop this direction. One could argue the direct correlation to the economic downturn, but I challenge you to look at the statistical data about tech performance and economic performance since the DOJ first took action against Microsoft, if you are so inclined to ''argue.''

It is beyond time for this country to heal, from Sept. 11 and from the downturn in our economy. In order to do this, the strongest, most talented, most productive company in the United States should be allowed to perform without intervention of the government. Microsoft's business practices that were once challenged no longer exist and, in fact, the market is different and there are many other companies who have technology that could essentially, lock out competition. However, I am not advocating that the DOJ even attempt to identify these companies. I am advocating that for profit companies who may compete in these areas, including Microsoft, should be smart enough and tough enough to ensure they can compete. Clearly, the government can only dilute excellent performance in an industry it knows little about. Actions against private industries are detrimental to our country's economic health. Please, I urge you to end the Microsoft case now.

If there is something you want to look at closer, in the interest of football fans across America, check out and do something about the collusion that exists between network TV, NFL football team owners, when they black out games in the local viewing areas that are not sold out. Who benefits? NFL team owners. Who's getting paid off? ??? It is very difficult to build a local fan base if fans cannot attend a game via TV. Who is hurt? Local fans, local sports bars and restaurants, local advertisers, local tv stations, local players, local coaches. I urge you to take this on instead. I highly doubt this would cause a 2-year downturn in our economy but would greatly benefit millions of Americans while taking to task the otherwise undetected NFL powerbase.

Thanks for your time,
Sally Sargent
Seattle, WA

MTC–00005402

From: Frankhouser, Douglas—HFD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To all concerned:

I would like to express my support of the Microsoft Settlement. I believe that it will benefit all parties concerned, especially consumers.

Regards,
Doug Frankhouser
Conroe, Texas
dlpa-frankhouser@worldnet.att.net
<mailto:dlpa-
frankhouser@worldnet.att.net>

MTC–00005403

From: Mauvais Genie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:00pm

Subject: Little red Linux-hood and the big bad Mcrosoft For years now people have been railing against Microsoft for various reasons. Personally, my dislike began with Windows 3.11 over nothing important. See, I just found it to be a little patronizing. I wanted some little digital Toto to pull the curtain back and show me the truth. I could not understand why Microsoft was so insistent that they not tell me how it works. Here it is a decade or so later and its only gotten worse. Enough of the Adjectives, here's the point. Microsoft, to their credit, managed to create an operating system that an intoxicated monkey could use. At the same time, an office suite and later a web browser, and all too soon...'.net' which from my perspective kinda like steering into the skid.

As for me, there isn't anything I can do about it. If you create something geared for the dumbest person you know, before you know it everybody's using it. Everything is based on the lowest common denominator, and in this case its real low. Some one with absolutely no computer knowledge can use Windows and their expectations will be met because they don't have any. The demands they place on the operating systems and tasks running with in it are insignificant. And there are all too many people out there that don't even understand that there is a difference between the computer itself, the operating system, and the Internet. This speaks volumes about the way Microsoft blinds consumers and encourages ignorant users.

As I said, for years now people have been railing against Microsoft. I had my reasons and other people had reasons I couldn't understand. For some it was that Microsoft got too big too fast. Others had conspiracy theories that I found to be absurd. But through it all, there were those of us out there, forced to use it at jobs, forced to tolerate friends and family using Windows and having to deal with them. Deal with them in the non-descript phone calls of 'something' being wrong and being sent files that need to be opened with Microsoft programs or just deleted for lack of interest. For the most part, the fight against Microsoft's 'attitude' (I guess that's the best word) has been something akin to poking a polar bear with a really short stick. There have been small gains in the Open Source community, And keep in mind that any gain in any technology that competes with Microsoft to date is an impressive one which I support completely. But these gains I believe are exaggerated and have little impact on the market. I don't believe, given the current climate, that Mr. Gates is loosing any sleep over the Open Source community.

That said, the Open Source community needed a bigger stick. One I had hoped they'd found in the DoJ. I thought it was clear, that Microsoft had gone too far in too many ways. I mean really, even the stupidest monkey will only go so far out on the limb. And I'm not even really talking about from the standpoint of legality or technology which are not as readily visible. I'm talking about 'corporate arrogance'. Its a kind of arrogance that comes from a company that knows they have you. Like Ma Bell before the breakup: ''what are you going to do, go with another phone company??'' Funny now isn't it. But think about what long distance prices would be at now. Think about the state cell phone technology would be at. Think about the fact that there would be no DSL or DHL connections. These advances seem largely the result of competition. As it stands now, I can get an Internet connection through a satellite dish and a cellphone from any number of companies willing to give me a phone just for signing up. I don't even need a home phone and the phone company knows it.

The phone company analogy serves no more than pointing out an example of the good fight gone right. Where very innovative people, given more opportunity explode onto the scene, pushing technology forward in some small part to fly in the face of their oppressors. I think the fight against Microsoft's 'policies' is a good fight. It warrants consideration. I also believe that the pending outcome seems to be more of a nod to Microsoft than any sort of penalty. All this talk of freedom is fine and has merit, but it really isn't my point. My point lies in the idea of doing what is fundamentally right in the ethical arena, to ensure that technology has the ability to move forward in the most efficient, beneficial way it can. If there is a matter of National Security here, it is in the idea of protecting the advancement of technology, not in protecting the advancement of Microsoft.

At this point, I would predict that a post-trial celebration party will be thrown by Microsoft's new spokesman....O.J. Simpson. History will frown on this case's outcome as short-sighted.

Sincerely,
Jack Ware

P.S. This was typed on a Compaq Deskpro EN computer with a sticker on it that says ''Designed For Microsoft'' in Microsoft Word running on Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 Service Pack 6, where it was routed through a Microsoft Exchange Server on the way out of the LAN via a Microsoft Hotmail being fed into Outlook. I'm at work.

Permission to reprint in part or whole, granted to Dennis Powell and his ilk as he feels is appropriate. Its the least I can do.

MTC–00005404

From: chuck(u)mathis Mathis
To: Microsoft ATR,chgojoe44,Fussebd,Cliff Knudson,Rick...
Date: 1/2/02 12:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With regards to the Tunney Act;

Dear DOJ Participants in The Microsoft Settlement, I know you feel you have the welfare of the common man at heart with your decision making, regarding the Microsoft Suit, and I say, ''God bless you for your concern.'' But, correct me if I am wrong, did not all tech stocks in general take a fall upon the outset of the MS suit? And has it not continued to plunge even further discounting 9–11–01?

Now I am by no means a rocket scientist, an economist or, ''thank God'', a lawyer but I am able to see that this absurd suit against innovative free enterprise has had a decidedly adverse affect on my world. I repeat, MY WORLD!!!

Now, more than ever, my beloved USA needs strong economic factors to bolster it as we teeter on the edge of untold disaster. In God's name, why would any entity tamper with the economics of the company that started it all as well as continues it? Look around you. You may not personally be affected but if you take the power hungry glare from your stare you will see countless others who are drastically affected by the MS Suit and our common state of the day. Could you sleep at night knowing that you drove the final nail into the coffin? I think not.

Leave Microsoft intact where it can continue to be the Flagship of our great nations technical infrastructure. If we are to overcome the current economic crises we must continue to lead the way in information and technology. If a fourth of a company is good in your thinking then a whole company is fortuitous beyond belief for this country.

I thank you for taking the time to read this and I apologize if I have offended you in any manner, but in my defense, the actions against Microsoft that are being bandied by the Department of Justice are an offense to me, my country and the capitalist spirit which has made the United States the greatest nation in the universe.

Use your powers to be wise not vindictive.
Best regards,
Charles R. Mathis Jr.
1642 Country Lakes Dr., #A
Naperville, IL 60563
chuck—mathis@msn.com

It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt.

John Philpot Curran: ''Speech upon the Right of Election'', 1790.

MTC–00005405

From: Bill Liedtke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:18pm

Subject: Microsoft/ Tunney Act Comment
To: Department of Justice
From: William P. Liedtke, Attorney 27443 Linwood Circle, North Olmsted, OH 44070 440–777–0478

Dear Sirs,

Regarding the Microsoft Settlement/ Tunney Act Comment Period, it is the personal opinion of this writer that the Government (State and Federal) has gone well beyond what was necessary in the above case. The conclusion of the Federal case should have concluded all litigation (including state Anti-Trust litigation). Microsoft is the only true success story of a large U.S. business recently, in what has been termed a ''down economy''. Must this nation attack each success story (when we have so few recently). Any rule or regulation agreed to by settlement with Microsoft must be made mandatory upon each of its competitors, so that none may take advantage of a company hamstrung by Anti-Trust litigation. .

Cordially,
William P. Liedtke, Attorney at Law
bliedtke@easyon.com
1/2/02

MTC–00005406

From: Wu, David
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:24pm
Subject: Settlement

As a software developer, I support the settlement between DOJ and MS.

David Wu

MTC–00005407

From: Lee Behel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

For God's sake, settle the damn thing! It has gone on way too far already. Microsoft should never have been put through this.

Lee Behel

MTC–00005408

From: William Pennington
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:24pm
Subject: Settle.

The case against Micrsoft is a joke. Whatever settlement they are willing to offer, take it.

William Pennington
President
Pacific West Builders, Inc.
7025 Longley Lane, Suite 60
Reno, NV 89511
775–852–8453 x17
775–852–1042 fax

MTC–00005409

From: Brad Nickel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:25pm
Subject: Time to move on.

Enough wasting our time and tax dollars pursuing Microsoft because they are successful. The whining losers that started this process at Netscape and others, just could not figure out how to compete effectively, because they were morons. Microsoft should be held up by our government as a model of what competitive capitalism should be.

Thanks,
Brad Nickel
717 Laurel Way
Casselberry, FL 32707
407–388–9975

MTC–00005410

From: Terry Voss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear People,

As a software developer age 52 I have seen the state of competition before and after Microsoft was formed as a company. Competition is still healthy and very important there is much more importance attached to created standards that help businesses communicate with each other.

I was ill-concerned when Microsoft was charged by our government, but now feel that the settlement has been somewhat fair.

Thank you for allowing my opinion to be heard.

Terry Voss
Developer/Owner
Computer Consulting
Microsoft Certified Partner
http://www.computer-consulting.com <http://www.computer-consulting.com/>
tvoss@computer-consulting.com
2403 North Nettleton Street
Spokane WA 99205
Tel: 509–327–7202
Fax: 509–327–2303
http://www.spokaneoutdoors.com <http://www.spokaneoutdoors.com/>

MTC–00005411

From: Small, Vincent
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop dragging this thing out.

There is plenty of competition in the Software and Online Services Space. For the most part, the states that are dissenting are backed by companies that do not want to compete with Microsoft. They are the real nemesis of innovation and change.

Vincent Small
Vice President
Financial Software Systems Inc.

MTC–00005412

From: George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:27pm
Subject: Allow Microsoft to Innovate

Allow Microsoft to continue focusing on product innovations rather than defending itself in the courts. I strongly suggest that the government drops all charges against Microsoft.

George Polychroniou

MTC–00005413

From: Clay M. Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:27pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I strongly support the Microsoft settlement in its current form. Please bring this case to a prompt conclusion. Clay M. Smith

MTC–00005414

From: Jiang, Peng
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I believe the current agreement between Microsoft and the federal government and the nine states represents the best interests of consumers and the American economy.

Thanks for your time.
Peng Jiang, Ph.D.
Member of Technical Staff
SonoSite, Inc.
21919 30th Dr. SE
Bothell, WA 98021–3904
Tel. (425) 951–1337
Fax (425) 951–1201
Email peng.jiang@sonosite.com
Web www.sonosite.com
SonoSite*
Imagine What You Can Do

MTC–00005415

From: Jrloans@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:27pm
Subject: Re: microsoft settlement

Time to settle for a small amount and everyone get back to business.

MTC–00005416

From: Smith, Georgia
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion with regard to the Microsoft Settlement. I support the courts ruling and ask that you continue to uphold the decision. Our economy has faced enough uncertaincy in recent times and it is important that we move forward and do everything possible to strengthen our position. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Georgia B. Smith
Vice President,Federation Services
Newspaper Association of America
1921 Gallows Road, Suite 600
Vienna, VA 22182
(703) 902–1784
(703) 902–1773 fax
smitg@naa.org

MTC–00005417

From: Wayne Newcomb
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I really believe the current settlement is harsh enough on Microsoft. I believe the states who are still against the settlement are looking to gain an unfair advantage, (take advantage) of the situation and I believe if you allow this our economy will be further damaged by vultures who occupy places of authority!

Wayne Newcomb
Dean of Students
Word to the World College

MTC–00005418

From: Stephen Land
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept this communication as my support for the negotiated settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft. I hope you will not be distracted by the politics that underlies the position of the dissenting states and certain members of Congress.

Stephen Land
(770) 698–9500
http://www.divorceland.com <http://www.divorceland.com/>

MTC–00005419

From: Frank Johnson
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time to move on with this case, this settlement is reasonable. there will always be those who have an agenda that will be disgruntled, do not allow them to hold our economy hostage to their own interests.

Frank Johnson

MTC–00005420

From: Robert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

Having read the proposed settlement in detail, I believe that it is clearly in the best interest of the government, the US consumer, and the world economy to conclude this matter as soon as possible by implementing the settlement as published.

Sincerely,
Dr. Robert F. Hausman, Jr.
President
Rockridge Information Systems, Inc.
1214 Camino Carlos Rey Suite 2
Santa Fe, NM 87505
(505) 474–7404

MTC–00005421

From: Jack Warring
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft settlement that has already been agreed to by 9 states and Microsoft. Let's put the Microsoft case to bed and stop wasting a lot of money on legal fees.

Thanks,
Jack

MTC–00005422

From: Mark Reed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

TWIMC,

I am not a Microsoft employee, however I am completely on Microsoft's side of this case. They have helped greatly helped our country and should not be punished for the success they have earned. I believe it should not be the Governments job to play referee between competing companies—especially in the highly competitive Hi Tech Computer industry. Sun Microsystems, IBM, Oracle and the like should desist in wanting government intervention. If they were in Microsoft's position—they would behave the same way.

Thank you for your time,
Mark Reed
Mark M. Reed
Senior Systems Engineer
(972) 728–8161
mreed@mh2.com

MTC–00005423

From: Dave Howland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:27pm
Subject: Gov. Meddling

Why don't you investigate Tyson Foods and leave Microsoft alone. You are only hurting the stock market and the economy.

David J. Howland

MTC–00005424

From: Paul Jasper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To the District Court:

It is important that this case be settled now. Microsoft is an innovative company, without whom the Internet would not be as good as it is. This case needs to be settled now without further cost to the taxpayer.

Sincerely, Paul T. Jasper
Paul Jasper
tuck1@earthlink.net

MTC–00005425

From: Mike Stolper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: settlement

The government should look at areas that stifle innovation rather than encourage it. Stay away from technology. Leave Microsoft alone.

Michael Stolper
1606 Clemson Circle
La Jolla, Ca. 92037

MTC–00005426

From: Dan Messersmith
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:04pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my desire for you to accept the current proposed settlement and stop the litigation associated with Microsoft. Our business has been and will continue to be a Microsoft customer. Their innovation is second to none and we want that to continue.

Thanks,
Dan E. Messersmith, CPA
Duncan, Newman, Messersmith & McCormick, Ltd.
Certified Public Accountants & Consultants
1700 Malvern Road
Hot Springs, Arkansas 71901
Phone: 501–624–7400
Fax: 501–623–6451
Email: dan@hscpas.com

MTC–00005427

From: Jeffrey C. Graber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: DOJ: I think the time has come to settle the case against Microsoft.

The DOJ:

I think the time has come to settle the case against Microsoft. The proposed settement is fair for both Microsoft and consumers and in the interest of the country I propose that the DOJ accept the settlement.

Jeff Graber

MTC–00005428

From: Jones, Michael L
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to show my support for the settlement currently in place. While I think the case against Microsoft was wrong in the first place, at least we can put this behind us now. As a economist I am particularly concerned about our economy. I am especially concerned about businesses using the anti-trust laws as a tool to harm another company in order to gain competitive advantage. The case brought against Microsoft had more to do with hurting the competition than with helping the consumer.

Please settle without further delay. If you change anything, reduce the impact on Microsoft.

Thanks,
Michael L. Jones
Albuquerque

MTC–00005429

From: Judy Morris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Time has come to put this ugliness behind us and move forward. Although harsh, I believe the settlement terms are fair and acceptable to the American public.

Let's be done with this witch hunt and move on.

Thank you,
Judy Morris
Spokane Washington

MTC–00005430

From: Michael A. Strasser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I believe it necessary to settle the case against Microsoft and convey to you my desire that the Department of Justice accept and implement the proposed agreement as it stands now.

There are many reasons to do this at this time, one being that it will help add a stabilizing effect on the business community and help bolster our national economy.

Additionally, while I don't always agree with how Microsoft conducts it's business, I felt that this was a waste of taxpayer money and was a major part of damaging our national economy. Sun, Oracle and Netscape were upset because they couldn't compete (mainly because they were too busy fighting with other companies and not paying attention to their own products) and duped the government into being their champion. We all lost on that one!

Thank you for your time.
Michael A. Strasser

MTC–00005431

From: Prince, Lee

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I would urge the government and the USDOJ to retain the settlement reached. The sentiments of the other nine states to continue the warfare is not helpful to the future of my industry.

I work in the software industry, in no way related to Microsoft. But the uncertainty introduced by the litigation has harmed the industry as a whole. It needs to be stopped for the future of our industry and ultimately for the future of the consumer of software.

It is time for the litigation to stop and the right to innovate be validated.

Please affirm the settlement and reject the demands of the greedy nine state attorneys-general.

Lee Prince
5632 Mavis Place
Hansville, WA 98340
Lead Technical Support Analyst
ERP Backup & Recovery
(360) 638–0116 (direct)
(360) 908–1214 (cell)
Lee—Prince@bmc.com

MTC–00005432

From: Ken
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I want to express my support as a consumer for the settlement.

Ken Weissblum

MTC–00005433

From: Philip Royalty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept my opinion that I believe the Microsoft Settlement must be settled at once. The consumer and the American economy is not being helped by prolonging this. Let's get it behind us and go on to bigger and better things. Philip Royalty

MTC–00005434

From: JerrydeannaPHX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please stop the letigation the settlement is more than fair since Microsoft was never guilty in the first place.

The fultons
jerrydeannaPHX@aol.com

MTC–00005435

From: Jeff Aaron
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!

Thank you for all that you have done on behalf of the public but I believe the agreed upon settlement is adequate and fair to all parties involved. Please do not bring this back for further litigation...it will only benefit a few parties and stifle further innovation from Microsoft. As history has shown, innovation not litigation is beneficial to the consumer. We as consumers are what matter not the lawyers. Thanks again!!

Happy New Year!!

MTC–00005436

From: Shahbaz, Ali
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am happy to see Microsoft has not been broken in to two. However, I think Microsoft must support Java, and open system. Open system is the key. The new Microsoft XP has many problems with other programs. Microsoft should not dictate its terms to the industry.

Regards,
Ali Shahbaz, B.A.Sc.
Tel: 604–643–7372

MTC–00005437

From: Herb Biddle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

It is critical in my view that the litigation regarding Microsoft that has consumed the public record be settled as agreed. To do so will only benefit the country.

H. D. Biddle

MTC–00005438

From: Buss, Bob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a taxpaying citizen, it appears the settlement is fair and reasonable. Thus, it would seem in the best interest of all concerned to minimize additional expenses by ending the time period for additional litigation.

Thank you!
Bob Buss
Senior Manager
Wipfli Ullrich Bertelson LLP
469 Security Blvd.
P.O. Box 12237
Green Bay, WI 54307–2237
(920) 662–2851(Telephone)
(920) 662–0024(Fax)
bbuss@wipfli.com
www.wipfli.com

MTC–00005439

From: David Chester Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear US Dept of Justice:

I am firmly of the opinion that the whole lawsuit against Microsoft was a huge waste of taxpayers' money. I find the settlement overall to be oppressive to Microsoft, but I would be satisfied to accept it to end the controversy. I am a user of Microsoft products, and greatly appreciate the order and consistency that Microsoft has brought to the computer world in general. Their leadership has always kept the consumer in mind.

David Chester Smith
Metairie, LA
dsmith@accesscom.net

MTC–00005440

From: Greg Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was totally opposed in the beginning to this lawsuit as I view it as a very biased action to afford competitors of Microsoft a competitive advantage. This is totally contrary to a free market society. All of the other states that haven't signed on to this settlement should be forced to sign on. I think that this lawsuit serves to stifle and restrict innovation and private investment.

Gregory A. Taylor

MTC–00005441

From: FreeH1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I think the DOJ/Gov have better things to do ,, What a joke ,, If it was not for Microsoft we would be 10 years behind. When you buy a new PC, windows /XP are the cheapest thing on the PC, I do not use all of Microsoft's soft ware i use what i like ,, DOJ should be looking at ENRON,,,,,,

Howard & Elaine Freeman

MTC–00005443

From: PAUL M. MCKINLEY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We urge you to settle the Microsoft case; no more litigation in the matter.

Paul & Layne McKinley

MTC–00005444

From: Tucker Cheadle
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

The Microsoft case has gone on long enough. By way of background the Wall Street Journal reported that this case was instigated by Sun Microsystems and Oracle who were worried that Microsoft would develop products in their areas. They spent $3,000,000 on a mock trial for Joel Klein's benefit, made all of their lawyers and engineers available to the government and then Joel Klein agreed to pursue the case.

The original allegations have long been dismissed, ie., the browser, or lost and the government is left with a monopoly finding and no ability to break up the company.

Yet, Sun and Oracle go on and on and on. In an unrelated civil case Sun and Oracle are opposing a settlement with over 100 plaintiffs and Microsoft...and neither Sun nor Oracle are or ever have been parties in the case. And, they prevailed on Governor Davis to join them on behalf of California. Most interestingly, among the chief complaints of Sun and Oracle were the Windows desk top system. Although Windows has been out for some 9 years, neither Sun nor Oracle have ever created their own desk top system. They could have done it years ago, or even now, but they do not do so. Rather, they have embraced the Windows platform and have extended it in their own ways.

It is long time to move on. The settlement is reasonable and should be approved.

MTC–00005445

From: Willner, David
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
As a long-time PC user, I ask that the settlement agreed to by the DOJ and Microsoft be accepted and that the objections raised by the dissenting States be rejected.
The integration of services Microsoft provides (operating system, productivity applications and internet browser) continue to be of highest importance to me. Requiring Microsoft to disable such integration and manage these services through separate companies would be a major technological step backward, offering consumers only a false sense of product choice while adding significantly to the complexity of PC setup.
Thank you for your attention to this comment.
David Willner
This message and attachments, if any, contain information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message or its attachments. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail to <mailto:dwillner@gowebway.com> dwillner@gowebway.com and delete the message. Thank you very much.
CC:David Willner (dfwillner@yahoo.com)

MTC–00005446

From: Jim McChesney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
010202 1127
I support settlement of this spurious and frivolous lawsuit under the terms of the Tunney Act. Let us put a stop to this egregious nonsense and allow Microsoft to get on with its innovative and profitable business.
Sincerely,
JPM
James P. McChesney
Parker College of Chiropractic
2500 Walnut Hill Lane
Dallas, Texas 75229
Attn.: C.I.R.A. Ste. 238 South
EMail: jmcchsny@parkercc.edu
VOICE: 1.800.438.6932 Ext. 7130
972.438.6932 Ext. 7130
FAX: 214.902.2446
WHB

MTC–00005447

From: Kathleen Jane Dunlap
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To the Justice Department,
I strongly urge settlement of the Justice Deparment's case against Microsoft. This case should be closed and no continuance or extensions of the case by individual states should be considered or allowed.
Kathleen J. Dunlap
General Manager
Dunlap Consulting Int'l
Dunlap Consulting International, LLC
Niue Tourism Office
959 Thornhill Road
Lexington, Va 24450
540–463–7092
540–463–7182–fax
dunlapkj@yahoo.com

MTC–00005448

From: Marwan Shouery
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I think it is totally wrong to punish Microsoft for being the most successful company ever. Microsoft should be the one who decides what to put in its software packages and no one else.
M Shouery

MTC–00005449

From: Kaplansky, Lazar (ECCS)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir/Madam,
I strongly believe that the settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved. The settlement is good for the consumers and American economy and should be approved. The nine states that do not want to settle are not looking after 'public interest'; all they want is to confiscate as much money as they can from the Microsoft. That should not be allowed to happen.
Thank you and Best Regards,
Lazar Kaplansky
22 Garwood rd.
Fair Lawn, NJ 07410
email: Lkaplansky@exchange.ml.com
<mailto:Lkaplansky@exchange.ml.com>

MTC–00005450

From: Dr. J. Rumpakis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
You have reached a settlement, now stick to it! The nine states that are holdouts are acting like children who didn't get their way on the playground. Let's all get back to business, Lord knows the country sure needs it. Thank you for your time in this matter.
Regards,
John
John M. B. Rumpakis, O.D., F.A.A.O
Chairman & CEO
Practice Resource Management, Inc.
www.PracticeResourceMgmt.com

MTC–00005452

From: Paul N. Norton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:32pm
Subject: Re: Settlemnt Issue
It is my opinion that the issue has been fairly judged and the settlement does allow Microsoft to continue in their intention to provide great software. It also does allow for a choice and it forces their products to succeed only if they are reliable and more beneficial to those of their competitors.
Paul N. Norton 1/2/2002

MTC–00005453

From: Dcstacks@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern
I am in favor of the settlement of the lawsuit. It is time to get back to the business of innovation.
Thank you for your time.
Pray for America
Peace,
Deborah Stachowiak

MTC–00005454

From: Steve Ross
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft
I think the DOJ has invested way to much time and tax dollars trying to destroy a successful technology contributor. Microsoft has lead the US, in many ways others haven't, couldn't or wouldn't.
Leave Microsoft alone.
Steve Ross
President

MTC–00005455

From: Evelyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please proceed with settlement. It is in the best interests of customer to settle now without further litigation.
Gordon R. Phillips @ phillund@earthlink.net

MTC–00005456

From: Ray (038) Debbie Reaume
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies and Gentlemen:
We live in a capitalist society. Those who make great products will drive up demand. Those who don't create great products fall by the wayside. Please settle this Microsoft lawsuit now.
Sincerely,
Raymond and Deborah Reaume

MTC–00005457

From: Timothy N. Tangredi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Justice Department:
I wanted to share with you my two cents about the pending Microsoft settlement. Microsoft needs some oversight as you have proposed to limit any strong-arm sales tactics. Technology is moving rapidly and the operating system will be radically different in just a few short years. Further restrictions on Microsoft will only serve, in my opinion, to move this industry into a fragmented state with foreign firms taking the lead given strong government support. I liken the situation to that of Boeing and Airbus. The US needs to maintain its superiority in the high technology arena.
The nine States protesting the settlement are needlessly wasting taxpayer dollars as the ends suggested do not justify the purported crime.
Please accept the settlement and let Microsoft get back to what it does best—making great software at great prices.
Sincerely,
Tim Tangredi
Dais-Analytic Corporation

11552 Prosperous Drive
Odessa, FL 33556
727.375.8484 Ext 305
707.924.2352 FAX
http://www.daisanalytic.com

Privileged/Confidential Information is contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone.

In such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by reply email. Please advise immediately if you or your employer do not consent to Internet email for messages of this kind. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of my firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.

MTC–00005458

From: Kecia Bruce
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Microsoft settlement is in the public interest. Our economy does NOT need more litigation that benefits a few special interests, and harms consumers.

MTC–00005459

From: Mike Gallop
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

To Whom it may concern,

As an investor and U.S. citizen, I think it's high time that the U.S. Gov. stopped spending our tax money on the pursuit of one of the most successful companies in the U.S. at the behest of a small group of well funded special interests. Former and current U.S. officials have been paid to lobby against the settlement, these are the only voices of dissention, most people, myself included, only to want this witch hunt to end. Let the market sort it out, not results purchased by special interests. Our enemies are outside our borders, we don't need to be torn apart from within.

MTC–00005460

From: George J. Popovich, Jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

All things considered, it would be in the best interest of all consumers to settle the Microsoft case per the agreement already reached between Microsoft and the DOJ.

MTC–00005461

From: Ken Shelton
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I feel that as long as I have the option to use any software with the windows platform that Microsoft can add all of their software to the platform for all I care.

Example. I use CompuServe as my internet provider and not msn. I use the office program which is an add-on simply because it is more universal. But I use Quicken and Quick Books instead of Money for my financial program and I use TD Waterhouse for use as a financial tool. Anyone has the ability to use a software program from any other source.

If they decide that there is a better program out their. Just as I feel that Quicken is a better program than money and is a more universal program. Unix is a platform that is winning a lot of support and so is the Macintosh platform and they seem to thrive.

I am a business man and I guarantee you that in a competitive market we stay on our toes to keep our position and improve our position. Many companies have set up easier access to the product I sell but it is my responsibility to viably compete against them not the court system.

Ken Shelton
Ken Shelton Agency

MTC–00005462

From: MEDFACTOR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: I like MS products and pricing

Mark Colbert, President
Medical Factoring Concepts, Inc.
2848 East Bell Rd #200
Phoenix AZ 85032

MTC–00005463

From: GideonZik@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Fair settlement.

The Microsoft settelment is more then fair,and should be accepted.

Bernard Anker

MTC–00005464

From: Bobby (038) Nancy Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

I strongly object to any further prosecution of Microsoft. You are destroying our economy. If you remember, when Janet Reno and Company brought charges against Microsoft, our economy went down hill and continues to decline. Of course, I'm sure all personnel in the Justice Department will deny this.

Why not do a little research and determine how many school retirement systems have went broke because of the legal actions against Microsoft?

I'm just wondering what kind of operating systems that the billions of computers will use, if you are successful and bankrupt Microsoft. I know that is what is going on. Companies like Sun and Oracle have been instrumental in getting you to press more and more charges against Microsoft.

Thank you,
Bobby J. Johnson
210 La Luz Ln
Ruidoso, NM 88345–7809
505–258–1159

MTC–00005465

From: bob dollar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off Microsoft's back.

Settle this thing, for the sake of the consumers and the US ecomomy. What would we have if we didn't have Microsoft.

Bob Dollar

MTC–00005466

From: Rob Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am happy with the Microsoft settlement as proposed by the federal government. I am very, very unhappy with the continued persistence of the states that have not joined. Please work to accept the federal governments proposal.

Thanks,
Rob Green

MTC–00005467

From: Svlgolfer@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Gentlemen

Settle this matter NOW so we can all work toward moving our nation and the economy forward. I feel this case has reached the point that any presumed gains does not justify the effort and expense.

James H Carr

MTC–00005468

From: Calvin Guthridge
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies & Gentlemen:

I think it is ridicules dragging out the Microsoft anti trust case. Microsoft should be praised instead of hounded by a bunch of poor losers. I think Enron should be more worthy of attention than Microsoft.

Calvin Guthridge
6543 West Cameron
Tulsa, OK 74127

MTC–00005469

From: Mr. G
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Civil Action No. 98–1232

My name is Gerard Gambino 3812 Quentin Ave Boynton Beach Florida 33436 phone 561–742–0978

I feel the settlement agreed upon by the parties is more then fair to both sides and this matter should be put to rest for the good of the economy, tax payers and computer enthusiasts.

Thank you

MTC–00005470

From: Papaioannou, Michael G.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I think that the settlement is reasonable and fair. This issue has to be put to rest.

Sincerely,
Michael Papaioannou

MTC–00005471

From: Anthony York
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:36am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please! Now is the time to get this matter behind us once and for all. For many of us who are not legal scholars—and for many who are—this whole lawsuit never made much sense to begin with. Whatever the merits of the case, those who want to punish Microsoft have never made a case that is convincing to the public at large. Now that we have finally have some progress, for God's sake don't go backwards and start this thing all over again.

Sincerely,

Anthony D. York

Professor Emeritus of Englishand Comparative Literature

Univ. of Cincinnati

MTC–00005472

From: D. Alexander
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: microsoft case

I think the USDOJ should get out of the way of business, microsoft does not have monopoly (Linux, Apple, Sun etc). You're only hurting millions of taxpayers and their investments.

Doug R. Alexander

www.douglasalexander.com

MTC–00005473

From: Kecia Bruce
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is in the public interest, PLEASE settle it. Our economy does NOT need more litigation that benefits a few special interests, and harms consumers. I want Microsoft to keep developing innovative products!

MTC–00005474

From: jdfain@tmch.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement that Microsoft has proposed is adequate and fair.

I have always believed that Microsoft has done more for the computer industry and the consumer than any other computer vendor in the world. This has never been an issue with the consumer. This battle has been about what the DOJ thinks is good for the consumer without polling the consumer. Anti-trust law suits should be brought about because of what has happened to the consumer. Not what happened to Microsoft's competition.

Joe Fain SR

jdfain@tmch.com
<mailto:jdfain@tmch.com>

337–266–2113

MTC–00005475

From: Graham Flood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

Please see these comments from a consumer perspective rather than an employee.

''I have used MS software for many years (before I was a MS employee). I am very open to new technologies and software but the reality is that if you want to get your job done quickly an easily then MS software usually provides the answer. I use an Apple Mac (as I work on the Macintosh team) much more than a Windows PC and I think MS have done a great job with Mac software and have really spurred on Mac sales. I use many other types of software other than MS software only if it is any good. If I buy a PC or MAC that has pre-installed software and it doesn't do what I want I don't use it or remove it, I then go and get better stuff if its there.

Anyway I think for the economy sake and for thousands that work in the industry you should put a lid on this ASAP so we can all get on with much more important things. Why should a company be punished just because they are successful, in this business you don't get anywhere by lying down.''

thanks

Graham

MTC–00005476

From: Steven Lombard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the government should accept the settlement and forego further litigation, which, I believe, is not in the public interest. Please, do NOT pursue the litigation further.

Sincerely,

Steve Lombard

P.O. Box 356

Laie, HI 96762

MTC–00005477

From: Lorraine Storeno
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is appalling to see how Micrrosoft has been singled out with all the anti-trusts suits when that company has done so much for the computer industry.

I have been using a computer since 1987 and can remember how difficut it was to use a computer and download every morning the DOS and etc. After Microsoft came along with Windows, I was so relieved and enjoyed computer use. It was so useful.

Our American has always recognized the leaders of our industry in whatever catagory they excelled. Please don't criple this nation's innovative technology and make them humbled to the weakest link in the chain. We need leaders, not sniviling whiners who want the government to protect them from advancement of the technology.

Let up on Microsoft. It has been a shame how ignorance has prevailed.

L. Storeno

MTC–00005478

From: Michael Gambro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this litigation has gone on long enough. I strongly support the proposed settlement. I think the 9 dissenting states are not at all interested in protecting consumers but rather are interested in protecting businesses in their states who compete with Microsoft. Meanwhile, technology and business applications are continuously evolving and changing, such that this litigation is even less relevant now than it was when it was first brought. Enough is enough. I do not want my tax dollars spent on this anymore. Very few consumers believe they have been harmed by Microsoft. Rather, they believe that Microsoft has created tremendous efficiencies for consumers and businesses. I strongly believe this, based on my experience working at home and at work.

Let's focus on maintaining our competitive edge in the rapidly changing, global technological and business landscape. This can be done by settling the litigation now, and let the businesses work on developing better products as opposed to more creative litigation strategies.

Michael S. Gambro

Partner

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft

100 Maiden Lane

New York NY 10038

(212) 504–6825

Fax:(212) 993–2666

Fax:(212) 504–6666

email: michael.gambro@cwt.com

MTC–00005479

From: Gregory Guzman-Moss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Government should get off Microsoft's back. This settlement is about Netscape's inability to compete in the marketplace. Stop punishing successful entrepeneurs and corporations.

Greg Moss

MTC–00005480

From: wyatt to
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I feel that the Microsoft case should be quickly settled. Why are we trying to hamstring one of the country's most productive corporate citizens? Because of Microsoft, our country is the leader in the computer software industry. It is in America's best interest to get this corporate witch hunt out of the way and concentrate on rebuilding our country and our economy.

Sincerely,

Wyatt To

MTC–00005481

From: Sullivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To DOJ:

Please end the Microsoft litigation as quickly as possible, minimizing fines and damages against Microsoft.

If you hurt Microsoft, you hurt the US economy, and all of us voters and taxpayers.

Dr. Daniel T. Sullivan

Mrs. Susan M. Sullivan

61 Frontenac Dr.

St. LOuis, MO 63131

MTC–00005482

From: WALKER, CHARLES B (HP–USA, ex1)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: This settlement is tough, but

reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. It is doing what is best for the consumer.

Charles Walker

MTC–00005483

From: MARVIN KALLSEN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope this settlement can be finalized quickly so our economic system can function as it should without undue government influence. I'm not a lawyer, but I don't understand how the objecting states have any ''basis'' or ''standing'' in this issue anyway.

Marvin Kallsen

MTC–00005484

From: metamorphous
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already.

Microsoft has done everything you asked. Microsoft is still innovating. Do you want to stifle innovation and creativity? I am an inventor in a non tech industry. I am a senior citizen spending much of my cash reserves to develop a better process and product. This process will eventually revolutionize an entire industry. Will you make me pay a penalty too. Finish this and stop spending more taxpayer money. You will never satisfy everybody so do the right thing.

Alfred Niederman

MTC–00005485

From: RONLOMCMIL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that the Microsoft suit should be settled in an expeditious manner.

This has taken much too long and has cost the taxpayers excessively. It has also taken many dollars from the pockets of the senior citizens of this country who are the major stockholders. As a widow on a fixed income, I can tell you it has been costly for me and the suit has caused the tech stocks to all suffer.

Sincerely,
Lois L. McMillan

MTC–00005486

From: Jon Missert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am sending this email to urge you to settle the Microsoft anti-trust suit. I would also ask you to urge the states not currently supporting the settlement to join those who have to resolve this as soon as possible. There are many investors, mostly individuals, that would benefit tremendously from a resolution to this matter. The suit has accomplished its goal, prices continue to drop, and products continue to improve. The computing public is now safe and it is time to move on and let Microsoft get back to doing what it does best—making good products and increasing its share price.

Jon Missert

MTC–00005487

From: William R. Michelman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:34pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ:

I am writing to express my support for the pending Microsoft settlement. In my opinion, the lawsuit against Microsoft was ill conceived and, without coincidence, it coincides with the start of the downturn in our economy. Without Microsoft we would all be in a computer age Tower of Babel, because Microsoft brought a stable format to the computer industry that allowed it to develop to the point it is at today, and to where it will be tomorrow. I am still waiting for the testimony of a single consumer who can show he or she had to pay a higher price for a computer or for software as a result of anything that Microsoft did. If it was not for politically connected whiners like Sun Microsystems and other companies trying to take market share from Microsoft, there would not have been such a misplaced use of the antitrust statute. I support this settlement, not because I think that Microsoft actually harmed consumers, but because anything that gets the case over with without doing unnecessary harm to Microsoft is a good idea. In my opinion, the states that are refusing to go along with the settlement are just like gold diggers.

They need money and they see the lawsuit as a means to that end.

WR Michelman
Tacoma, WA

MTC–00005488

From: OHIOHOTDOG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

This email is to support the Microsoft Settlement.

1. It is fair. If any of the competitor's of MS really want to do a service to the country all they need to do is develop an OS that is better and/or cheaper than Windows Systems.

2. Stop this endless expensive litigation now.

John T. Frankfurth

MTC–00005489

From: Grahame
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

MTC–00005490

From: Lenny Woods
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Feedback

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to send a short note of feedback regarding the Microsoft decision. I believe the decision that stands should be accepted by all states and I'm happy to see that Microsoft will have sanctions against them without destroying their ability to produce innovative and exciting technology.

Regards,
Leonard M. Woods

MTC–00005491

From: Doug Klappenbach
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the proposed settlement between DOJ and Microsoft is fair. I feel that the 9 States that refused to join the Settlement Agreement are driven by special interests of companies competitive to Microsoft and are both i.) delaying the completion of the case and ii.) tiring to impose remedies that benefit companies in business competing with Microsoft. This will not result in benefit to the consumer.

Doug Klappenbach

MTC–00005492

From: Matthew Foldenauer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government should stay out of Microsoft's business. Evidently, only a certain amount of success is tolerated in this country. When a government attempts to create an artificially level playing field, they inevitably do more harm than good. Keep government out of the way of free enterprise.

Matthew Foldenauer,
griffinmo@hotmail.com

MTC–00005493

From: Potter, Bob Ext.1411
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Please, I'm begging you—Get Off MS's back—for the good of the economy!!!

Regards—Bob
Bob Potter
Information Technology Department
Potterb@co.monterey.ca.us
(831) 796–1411

MTC–00005494

From: Dan Plastina
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Shutdown the Microsoft competitors from further harming a great american company Microsoft is a good company. Microsoft does good things for people. Software and PCs have never (ever!) so affordable and great.

This case is now so obviously about Microsoft competitors wanting to slow Microsoft down.

I do not believe that the US Court system should kill one company for the sake of the other STRIVING and BILLION DOLLAR competitors. Let them spend R&D money instead of lawyer fees (and corporate espionage). Yes, Microsoft is big. Past contractual behaviors may not have been fair, but the proposed consent decree does address those issues and will do what it is supposed to do—Reinstate a competitive environment by cleaning up the playing field, not by knowing out of the ring one of our great companies.

MTC–00005495

From: Bruschi, Gene
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Comments on the Mircosoft Antitrust Case

My name is Gene Bruschi (gene.bruschi@wxsms.com) and I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on the Microsoft anti-trust case. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties. Please do not allow the interest of a few special groups to delay the settlement of this case.

MTC–00005496

From: Howard (038) Connie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Settlement

Let us not use this phase of the settlement process for the 9 states to try to gain more concessions from Microsoft. The DOJ settlement is fair,lets get on with better things.

Howard Simpson
380 Dolphin Ave NE
Ocean Shores, Wa 98569
360 289 3635

MTC–00005497

From: PAULS401@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It has been judicated, let's move on. States which did not accept the settlement offer are nothing more than opportunists and have only self interest objectives.

MTC–00005498

From: Dkbul@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My wife and I fully support the final settlement of this case without any further litigation or legislation.

D.K. & B.E. Bullard
1116 Woodstock Lane
West Chester, PA 19382

MTC–00005499

From: Al Kulp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust settlement

Please get this over with. Microsoft's monopoly power is limited to their ability to produce better software than competitors, including open-source. The software industry can and will change quickly based on the product's merits. Microsoft has developed good software that consumers and businesses want. Alternatives are available. Let the market decide.

Al Kulp
Anaheim Union High School District

MTC–00005500

From: MailittoLinda@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern: Please know that I oppose any future litigation against Microsoft. I thought the government settled the case against Microsoft, but apparently The Tunney act says the states can sue also if they disagree with the govt. decision. I urge everyone contemplating suit to forget that. We need to end this and soon. We need to get our economy growing again, that's earnings, profits on production, not law suits. Thankyou.

Sincerely,
Linda Jackson
Chicago

MTC–00005501

From: Josh R. Mitts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear the DOJ,

I just wanted to say that I am in full support of the settlement and hope things proceed. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Josh R. Mitts
jmitts@treasureonthenet.com

MTC–00005502

From: George Gowland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: U.S. Justice Department Anti Trust Division

The U.S. Department has a chance to make amends for the Clinton-Reno version of a Justice Department in the case of the Microsoft settlement. There was so much wrong in the handling and subsequent trial that it would take more than this letter to detail the unfair practices by the government. It is time to move on. Microsoft is one of the World's premier companies representing all that is best about the United States and entrepreneurship. Bill Gates and his wife have through their charitable foundations shown what separates them from the moronic politicians who have pressed this witch hunt.

The present attorney general of California, the State I reside in has chosen to lead the other State malcontents in continuing this vendetta. He did not have the courtesy to reply to my written objections. Settle the case and lets get back to work increasing the country's technological lead.

George and Patricia Gowland

MTC–00005503

From: Miguel F. Sarria
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: FINAL JUDGMENT

I believe that to maintain justice, all parts of the FINAL JUDGMENT should be applicable to all players in the technology industry. But this should not hinder the R&D of the technology industry. If we see that such rules become RED TAPE and slow the progress of R&D of Operating systems, software in general and hardware, the courts should allow for deregulation

Miguel F. Sarria
Miguel F. Sarria, IS Manager
Alliance for Transportation Research Institute / University of New Mexico 1001 University Blvd SE, Suite 103, Albuquerque, NM 87106–4342, USA Phone (505) 246–6442 Fax (505) 246–6001—Email: msarria@unm.edu, Web Sites: www.unm.edu/atr and www.trex-center.org

NOTICE—This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

MTC–00005504

From: Hugh Solaas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let this prosecution of one of our great American companies end. Our economy and stock market has been hurt by this insane prosecution. It is very much ''in the public interest'' to let this settlement stand and to move on.

Thank you for the consideration,
Hugh Solaas
Hansville, WA

MTC–00005505

From: Bremner PA (Phillip) at Aera
To: 'Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a programmer with 10 years experience. Currently I am working as a SAP ABAP programmer for Aera Energy in Bakersfield, CA. The government's case against Microsoft has been driven from the wrong position. This case has done nothing except strength Microsoft's competitors at the expense of the consumer and the software development industry. This is and has been a farce.

Please stop the insanity... let the world continue in a path that lets technology grow. Get out of the way!

Thank You.

Philip Bremner—ABAP Programming Analyst
Aera Energy LLC—SAP Support
Location: 1B06 Voice: 661–665–5589 Pager: 661–337–1963 Schedule: B
Email: PABremner@AeraEnergy.com <mailto:PABremner@AeraEnergy.com>
PBremner@bak.rr.com

MTC–00005506

From: Gil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: MIcrosoft Settlement

Stop the persecution of Microsoft. Bill Gates gave the world what they wanted when nobody else cared to, and is reaping the rewards of those efforts. As for all those whiners—let them eat their sour grapes!

MTC–00005507

From: Luby, Thomas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With all due respect leave Microsoft alone. Drop all charges and back out quietly. Anti-trust cases are supposed to be about consumers that are harmed. I have seen no evidence about any consumers being harmed.

Only competitors being pissed off because Microsoft is good at what they do. Please don't punish success.
Sincerely,
Thomas F. Luby
Thomas@Luby.com
678–560–1180—Home
404–579–6170—Cell

MTC–00005508

From: Jef Gazley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Dear Sir;
Dear Sir;
I really feel that Microsoft has done nothing criminal and that the government should get their hands out of it- both state and federal.Jef We believe better health begins with better Mental Health.
Jef Gazley M.S.
http://www.asktheinternettherapist.com

MTC–00005509

From: Planter26@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: settlement
Settlement would be good for consumers and stock holders.

MTC–00005510

From: Fullilove, Doug
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:
I think the settlement offer by Microsoft is more than fair. Everyone should accept this generous offer and let Microsoft get on with creating jobs. In my opinion the suit was ridiculous, and never should have been brought. I am better off because of Microsoft Products. Microsoft has never hurt me in any way.
Sincerely,
Douglas
Fullilove

MTC–00005511

From: GK2043@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE SETTLE THE MS CASE ASAP, DO NOT TAKE ANY FURTHER ASCTION AGAINS MS.
SINCERELY; GREGORY t. KERN

MTC–00005512

From: grossklas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:37pm
Subject: proposed settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
I believe the settlement is not only unfair to Microsoft but that the whole proceedings against Microsoft are illegal. Given the understanding of the Founders of our country, and, as laid out in the Federalist Papers and the documents of the Federal Convention of 1787, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which gives the Federal Government any authority whatsoever to take any action against this company.

However, if Microsoft is willing to settle for this restriction on its rights then this agreement should be allowed to proceed.
William P. Grossklas
PERSONAL INFO:
William P. Grossklas, Sr.
609 Spring Road
Elmhurst, IL 60126
Phone: 630 530 2973
Fax: 630 530 2976

MTC–00005513

From: Paul Kay
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I would like to comment on the proposed DOJ settlement with Microsoft. I believe the settlement is fair to all concerned and I would like the settlement to proceed. I do not understand why the 9 states are allowed to pursue their case separately. The suits against Microsoft by the states are ridiculous. The US Government found a way to settle the case and the states should agree to the same terms.
Thank you.
Paul Kay

MTC–00005514

From: Kevin White
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: enough already
The amount of time and money spent on trying to dismantle Microsoft should be an embarrassment to the DOJ. It is obvious that the states that either have prominent Microsoft competitors, or are just trying to put themselves in the news, are continuing the witch hunt to further their own agenda. I am in the medical industry and see the tremendous abuses of power by J&J and Tyco, yet never a sign of the DOJ. Too busy chasing its tail. Enough is enough. Let Microsoft continue to produce products that benefit consumers. Look at other industries with the same scrutiny.
K. White
Oregon

MTC–00005515

From: John Crean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I think it's time to put all of this baloney behind us.
The only thing Microsoft is guilty of is putting great products on the market at fair prices.
John Crean
Oneonta NY

MTC–00005516

From: Bud Aaron
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern—please get this behind us. We really need to get on with business as a small developer and we need stability more than any other single thing in my view.
Bud
Bud Aaron
http://www.checkmaster.com
760–757–6635

MTC–00005517

From: Jim S. Craft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Case should be Settled
I think that the Microsoft case should be settled as decided. I think that the case was weak, since Microsoft is not a monopoly (look at the palm pilot, Epoc, Apple, etc.). This case was never in the interest of the people, as Microsoft has become the largest software manufacturer by selling their product for less than the competition with more features. The monopoly laws were meant to keep companies from charging more for inferior products, and that is not what Microsoft has done.
I say that the government should stay out of free enterprise and allow for companies to compete. If Microsoft were making a bad product and making huge profits, it would be a different ball game. Until then we should be happy with the way things are now.
Jim Craft
Battle Creek, MI

MTC–00005518

From: dennis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I believe the Microsoft settlement is in the best public interest as it now stands, and object to any changes.
dennis g bouscal
209 e sierra ave
spokane, wa 99208
509.468.0177
dennis@bouscal.net

MTC–00005519

From: Benjamin Strong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I believe that the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Dept. is seriously deficient and will not protect the rights of the American people, computer users all over the world and Microsoft competitors. I believe the position of the nine dissenting states is reasonable and well founded. One of my prime objections to the proposed settlement is there is far too much reliance on Mr. Gates and his company to be ''good citizens''. His past record rebuts this. Mr. Gates has always taken the position that ''What is good for Microsoft is good for the industry and the Country''. He has given ample proof that he is not to be trusted.
I hope and wish that the DOJ will reconsider its position and give serious consideration to adopting the position of the dissenting States. Thank you.
Benjamin R. Strong
6550 Chardonnay
Pensacola, FL 32504
ben@strongb.com
Phone: 850–494–9857
Fax: 850–477–3133

MTC–00005520

From: James Mosimann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm

Subject: settlement
Thanks for the just settlement, and the DOJ's moving on this. The economy needs entrepreneurs at this time of slowdown.
James Mosimann
5 Balmoral Court
Rockville, MD 20850

MTC–00005521

From: Nicholas Cloyd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 2, 2002
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001
RE: Microsoft Settlement
On November 6, 2001, the United States and Microsoft tentatively agreed to the entry of a revised proposed Final Judgment <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm> to resolve the United States' civil antitrust case against Microsoft. Please settle this case as currently proposed, Tunney Act (Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. ? 16).
This settlement is in the best interest of our nation, free enterprise and the American people.
Business and People, (time, intellect, money and testimony) have all had due process. Thankyou for providing such and now please settle this case.
Yours Sincerely,
Nicholas K Cloyd
cloydn@wwdb.org

MTC–00005522

From: Caroline.Cacas@ey.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I urge you to please settle the Microsoft case and not allow further litigation.
Thanks
Caroline

MTC–00005523

From: M.G. (q)Ravi(q) Ravichandran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hello,
I have been following this case since it started. As a consumer, I believe this case had more to do with competitors complaints rather than consumer interest. Regardless of that, I am happy to see that DOJ and Microsoft reached a settlement. In spite of the fact that this settlement is harsh on Microsoft, I believe it is time to close the case and move on.
Thanks
M.G. Ravichandran
Northville, MI

MTC–00005524

From: Tom_Smarsh@cargill.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern!
As a user of Microsoft products, I feel there is a fine line between being an aggressive marketer of your products and breaking anti-trust laws. Seems to me both the U.S. Government and competitors yell foul when a company like Microsoft grows and becomes successful in marketing great products that fill the need of many consumers worldwide. How is Microsoft any different than Wal-Mart in marketing and pricing practices? When Wal-Mart comes into a new market their buying clout puts many grocery stores, filling stations, tire dealers, clothing stores, lawn & garden stores, and other stores out of business. If a law was definitely broken by Microsoft, fine them appropriately, make them dedicate free resources to what the U.S. Government is currently paying to have done, and let's get on to better things that strengthen our Country. . . .
Have a Sterling Day !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Tom Smarsh
Office Phone = 316–291–2936
Cell Phone = 316–393–3808
Office E-Mail= Smarsh,Tom J./wich
Internet E-Mail= Tom_Smarsh@cargill.com

MTC–00005525

From: John Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I think that the Microsoft suits should be settled as it determined by the courts. Hurting Microsoft more now will hurt the overall economy.
John L. Wagner
780 Norfolk Drive
Carson City, NV 89703

MTC–00005526

From: Jack McDaniel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please don't drag out this settlement any longer. The settlement reached is fair and equitable. Our economy needs stabilizing, not more conflict brought on by competitors interests.
Jack McDaniel
POB 1409
4705 240th St SE
Bothell WA 98041–1409
(425) 486–9205

MTC–00005527

From: Regan, Kevin
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern,
Please understand that anymore time and money spent on the MS case is counterproductive and futile. The freedom to innovate is what made this country strong, the freedom to sue is what has reduced this country to a bunch of babies. Get off MS back. Spend the money on real enemies. Tell Oracle to go and make a product sell it and quit whining.
Kevin P. Regan
Kinko's—National Business Development Manager
IKON—The Way Business Gets Communicated
Toll Free: 800–804–0315
Direct-In-Dial: 425–803–5206
Personal Fax: 425–803–5237
Business Cell: 206–799–3788 U.S.A.

MTC–00005528

From: Nikisher, Michael
To: ''Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:
It is time to settle this case and move on.
Michael Nikisher
Round Rock, TX

MTC–00005529

From: James Bratsanos
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Please allow the agreed upon settlement to stand. This issue has taken far to long to resolve and I for one thing the settlement is fair. Let's start spending our taxpayer money on other more pressing matters!
Thanks
James Bratsanos

MTC–00005530

From: John Victor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft case
I strongly urge the DoJ to settle with Microsoft. It is in the best interest of consumers and our economy to end this lengthy lawsuit.
Sincerely,
John Victor

MTC–00005531

From: Charles Jaffe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
DROP THE LAWSUIT.
Charles Jaffe, CPA

MTC–00005532

From: Loy, Betty D.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
II very much support the DOJ setlement. As a consumer I don't believe it is in the best interest of consumers and taxpayers to continue to harass Microsoft. In my opinion they are doing what an innovative provider should be doing and I don't think they should be penalized for that. I thought the decision not to break up Microsoft was a wise one and I urge you to not overturn this decision. Our economy is too fragile at this point to continue litigation against a company that is doing so much for the USA and its people.

MTC–00005533

From: RAY2001@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Let's stop beating the dead horse. Microsoft is one company America should be proud of. Stop the persecution and get on with life. Why punish a company that has brought us so much good? I would question the motives of their competitors agenda. Let's use the gov't to get rid of all of my competition. Microsoft's good works and good products

speak volumes for their case. Get it over with now!

MTC–00005534

From: H20br@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

To whom is concerned:

I believe that NOTHING should be done to Microsoft. When you can find a company that does as much as Microsoft does for our CHILDREN, whom I believe is OUR FUTURE, that we should be saying THANK YOU. This country is based on the right to enjoy FREEDOM. It seems to me that the companies that oppose what Microsoft did by not including their product, need to quit the whining and get busy developing a better product and put it in their own software. By finding Microsoft guilty of not allowing other companies in the Microsoft products is ludicrous. Make GM put a Chrysler body on their frame and have it powered by Ford. I know, Toyota would file a lawsuit against you! LET MICROSOFT do what they do best, and leave them alone! I will bet that you are reading this thru Microsoft products and therefore are guilty as Microsoft for not giving the other companies the opportunity. I WANT MY MICROSOFT.

Thank YOU . . . Bill Roland

MTC–00005535

From: TINNELLFIBRE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DEAR SIR,

AS A CONCERNED CITIZEN AND USER OF MICROSOFT PRODUCTS I FEEL IT IS TIME TO ''LAY OFF'' MICROSOFT AND FOCUS ON IMPORTANT ISSUES. MY FEELING IS THERE A LOT OF STATE ATTY. GENERALS THAT WANT TO MAKE A NAME FOR THEMSELVES AND SOME WINDFALL MONEY FOR THEIR STATES. THIS IS NOT IN THE GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

ALSO MICROSOFT HAS COMPETITORS THAT WOULD LIKE TO SEE MICROSOFT LOOSE SOME COMPLETIVE EDGE THROUGH GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT. THIS IS NOT GOVERNMENTS JOB IN MY OPINION. MY VOTE GOES FOR DROPPING ANY PENDING ISSUES AGAINST MICROSOFT AND MOVE ON. ALSO I HAVE NO SIGNIFICANT DIRECT INVESTMENT IN MICROSOFT THAT WILL BE IMPACTED BY THE GOVERNMENT DECISION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.

HAPPY NEW YEAR AND BEST REGARDS,
WILLIAM R. TINNELL
ORANGE, CA 92869

MTC–00005536

From: Allen Benas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good Day:

It seems to me your efforts can be much better applied to our current national problems with terrorists instead of further attacking a company who's products have revolutionized the nation and the world, employs thousands of highly paid employees including every minority there is and donates tens of millions of dollars to numerous charities, in an effort to enhance the life styles of the disadvantaged. All this, while companies like AOL/Time Warner are allowed to create the largest communications monopoly in the history of the world, right under your noses. Isn't it about time we realize that enough is enough, and look upon Microsoft as an overall fine and upstanding national citizen, facing with stiff competition, that is simply trying to remain successful?

Yours truly,
Allen Benas
P.O. Box 69
Clayton, NY 13624

MTC–00005537

From: Bobjytte@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this now as worked out in the courts.

MTC–00005538

From: Uskup, Ergin
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a citizen and also as the Chief Information Officer of a $ Billion company would like for you to know that I support strongly the DOJ settlement terms of Microsoft conflict. I think Microsoft has been attacked by their competitors who Seem to be unable to compete fairly in the open technology market place. Microsoft products are essential to corporation (to ours) and to consumer. The integration they provide between their products improves our productivity & saves us time & money. Both the corporate Information Technology world and consumer will be worse off if this conflict does not get settled ASAP and along the lines of DOJ agreement.

It is hard enough to cover all aspects of technology in the corporate or consumer world (security, inter operability etc) within the current environment where Microsoft provides integrated products. The competitors of Microsoft should spend their money on R & D instead of in legal fees and work hard. It is not that hard to hire lawyers or get in front of senate committees and complain. Let them roll their sleeves & get to work. In the mean time let us go forward without unnecessarily further complicating the technology environment.

I would be happy to provide additional views if you wish. Thanks

MTC–00005539

From: Betty Seymour
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This country is based on feedom. Let's settle this so we don't waste any more paper, money and breath on it, and can go back to accomplishing the inovation that Microsoft was born to carry on. What a waste of steam.

MTC–00005540

From: Rahl, Francis R.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Public Comment

I believe the proposed settlement to be sufficient and am hopeful the matter can be put to rest.

Francis R. Rahl, Jr.
27 S. Stricker St.
Baltimore, MD 21223
410–765–7828

MTC–00005541

From: Faye, Judy
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the proposed settlement is in the best interest of all concerned and should stand as is.

Judith R. Faye
Senior Application Consultant II
USinternetworking, Inc.
612 Wheelers Farm Road
Milford, CT 06468
Telephone: 203–701–3838
E-mail: judy.faye@usi.net

MTC–00005542

From: B42241@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Jan. 2, 2002

As a Microsoft stockholder I firmly urge you to settle as soon as possible.

Best Regards, Beth Scott

<A HREF=''http://www.campnapa.com/ ''>http://www.campnapa.com/</A>

MTC–00005543

From: ECLAUSNER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are aware that DOJ lawyers deliberately prolong law suits to help their brothers in the civilian community line their pockets. Settlement of this matter has been delayed long enough.

MTC–00005544

From: CJyourDJ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to bring this whole affair to a close based on the previously agreed settlement. As a professional, my work has become so much more efficient than in years past because of the advances in computer science—much of it developed by microsoft. It's time to get the rest of the states on board and everyone back to productive work

C. J. Lehane

MTC–00005545

From: Anthony D'Attomo-Home Office
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DEAR SIR:

I am the Chief Financial Officer for a national company. I have worked with computer people my entire career, and in fact, I now have over 20 IT professionals reporting to me. If you have not realized it already, they can be a most unusual breed of people. In the case of Microsoft, the feelings

become intense and personal. For those that do not like Bill Gates, it is as if he ran over the family dog. The only analogy I can make is if you had some deep hatred for the President of Ford, and therefore refused to buy a Ford automobile for that reason alone The PC came about when I first started my career in 1979. I have operated the original type that wrote files to a tape player, all the way up to the amazingly powerful clusters that exist today. I can tell you that clearly computing owes Microsoft everything. What I can do in this companies network could not be accomplished without what Microsoft did with its software. No matter how a person feels about Mr. Gates, we cannot overlook this simple fact.

The rocks being thrown by other software makes is nothing but sour grapes. They got beat, and they do not like it. I can tell you for example in the Apple vision for the world 20 years ago, it was use Apple software and hardware, or you use nothing at all. Thank god we were not being led by that group.

The bottom line is that Microsoft made computing what it is today, and they continue to provide the best product. I can tell you that XP is beautiful as are all of the Microsoft products. If someone makes something better, we will buy it, and run it under XP. As far as operating systems like XP, 2000, 98 and 95, they fact that they provide a standard for us to run our desktops and networking is imperative to keeping this process on track. Imagine that if every time you bought an appliance for your home each device required its own particular power source. You would have a mess on your hands. In computing the desktop operating system is like the electricity in your home, a standard is imperative.

As far as my two cents, I am glad that you are near settlement. I would rather see my tax dollars spent chasing a real problem, and not one generated by software vendors who failed to deliver a good product and now stand behind the government to get them back into the game. The protraction of this debate is also upsetting the stock market and the financial stability of the nation. Dragging this out hurts everyone, and helps no one. By the way, if you want to understand a true monopolistically aggressive company, check out AOL. They better fit the pattern that you are looking for

Anthony D'Attomo CPA

MTC–00005546

From: james—flynn@urscorp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement agreement is fair and is in the public interest. It was negotiated by experts over an extended period of time and should be acceptable to all parties.

Regards,
Jim Flynn
Senior Hydrogeologist
james—flynn@urscorp.com
URS Corporation
1501 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1400
Seattle, Washington 98101
206–438–2700 (Reception)
206–438–2113 (My direct line)
206–438–2699 (FAX)

MTC–00005547

From: Rdso@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this suit quickly. It was an unjust litigation at the beginning, brought by competitors to bring down a successful company. We must reinforce the business climate in this period of economic uncertainty. Ardis Ostrom

MTC–00005548

From: Mauiti@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I feel that enough is enough. Let's get this hole thing over with. Microsoft and the government have come to a settlement, let's get on with business. Let the other states cry all they want. They just want there own company's in there state to profit like Microsoft has. They don't want to have put out the money nor the time they just want it given to them. Sorry but I disagree. I hope they lose big time.

Bob Kassner JR.

MTC–00005549

From: B.J. Fornadley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why doesn't the Fed. press the States to accept the settlement that was fair to all.

It's is only politics by those senate and house members who are ''friends of SUN and Oracle CEO's etc'' that are keeping this thing going!

Quit wasting the tax payers money!

MTC–00005550

From: Annabel Wayne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:40pm
Subject: Lawsuit against Microsoft

I am very concerned that the suit that you have against Microsoft, stops the innovations that one company single handedly has given to the world. Because of Microsoft, I have become a better teacher, using their software which came on my computer to enhance my lessons. If I had had to purchase another program, I would not have known what to do, let alone where to get another program in a small town. When my programs came on my computer, I did not feel that Microsoft was pushed down my throat. I am sure that milliions like myself were very glad to have their programs already installed on our computers.

Annabel Wayne

MTC–00005551

From: Prakash Puram
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Federal Govt's settlement of the Microsoft case is a fair and just one. Microsoft's competitors are attempting to unduly influence the settlement to gain an unfair competitive advantage for personal benefit. In a market economy, demand and supply forces should be allowed to work over a period of time. I am a small software company that works with Microsoft and find them to be incredibly cooperative and encouraging of my company's product development work. They have rightfully earned their place in US Businesses as a crown jewel and the U.S. Govt. should not pay any heed to the 9 States attempting to derail the settlement on the table.

The U.S. Economy as a whole will benefit dramatically from the innovation and increased productivity to be release by Microsoft if it is rightfully allowed to continue operating its business with all due freedom accorded by the U.S. commercial and trade laws. The stock market will surge higher, the recession will end, businesses will return to a growth mode, and many unrealized benefits will come to fruition the moment the DOJ and the United States close this case without much further legal proceedings. Competitors are trying to leverage their government elected officials unfairly to benefit their personal agendas and I am not willing to put up with this.

I spent most of my working career with IBM and saw how the DOJ shackled IBM's innovation when it too was dubbed a monopoly. After a decade of dragging IBM thru relentless battering, the United States Govt. unwittingly was the main factor in destroying that company's competitive advantage in the marketplace and they passed on the power not to other American firms, but sadly to Fujitsu, Hitachi, NEC, and other Japanese firms. The very basis for assaulting IBM became moot since with or without the DOJ's help, Microsoft rose to leadership thus clearly verifying the fact that innovation and market forces are ultimately the most invincible arbiters of winners and losers. If Microsoft doesn't continue to innovate or provide value for money, within days or weeks corporate America and the individual consumers will cast away Microsoft for better products and services from other companies.

Please end the legal wrangling now and take conscientious decisions to return America, Microsoft and the entire software industry to focusing on their work—not on legal proceedings. To not close this case immediately bodes bad tidings for the US Economy in 2002 and beyond and we just cannot afford that. Sun, WordPerfect, Palm Novell, AOL, Netscape are all losers because they have bad unproven products. The brand name and the market share of Microsoft is hard-earned and should be preserved not destroyed.

Please end the litigation now and ratify the Microsoft—DOJ Settlement without further delay.

Prakash Puram, CEO, iXmatch Inc.
612–840–6979
http://www.ixmatch.com
iXmatch—For Mission-Critical Matching

MTC–00005552

From: Emilie Hernandez
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:36pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please allow Microsoft to settle this case as soon as possible. The proposal is very fair and benefits many individuals. The economy

is so uncertain at this time, the government could better use the money it is wasting on this suit.

Emilie Hernandez
hernandez@fergwell.com
<mailto:hernandez@fergwell.com>
503.226.1444

MTC–00005553

From: Mister Thorne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Please advise as to when the 60-day period for comment on the proposed settlement expires.

Thank you
Mister Thorne

MTC–00005554

From: Chris Holt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

Here's what I think:

Enough already! Settle. It really IS for the benefit of consumers and other companies. Sure Microsoft competes hard with companies like Oracle, AOL, etc. but what many people don't understand fully is how many THOUSANDS of small companies out there THRIVE off of Microsoft's innovations and technology. The companies who continue to complain about Microsoft like Oracle, AOL, SUN, etc. would only LOVE to be in Microsoft's situation and are simply using the government to attempt to get ahead because they cannot compete on there own merits.

Thanks you for the opportunity to write,
Chris Holt
Salinas, CA 93907

MTC–00005555

From: Bob McConnell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: I think the Microsoft settlement should go through, dont delay it

I think the Microsoft settlement should go through, dont delay it

Bob McConnell

MTC–00005556

From: Murray Oldman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement between Microsoft, the Federal Government and nine States should be adopted with no further modifications.

Cordially,
M. M. Oldman
murf5@prodigy.net

MTC–00005557

From: John/Sharon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We (a family of three, voting age consumers—owners of four active computers at the moment) definitely feel that the settlement of the Microsoft case is in the best interest of the consumer. Each of our computers uses a Microsoft operating system. Two use Windows 98 and two use Microsoft 2000. In addition to the operating system we also use the Microsoft Office 2000 Professional in our computers. At one time we had a computer with a different operating system. It was a nightmare, the support for the consumer was poor, and ultimately it was removed from the computer and replaced with a Microsoft product.

We each believe that this whole Microsoft suit was ridiculous. Microsoft has hired the employees who develop their software. Their employees seem to be well treated and content to remain with Microsoft...and to try to hurt this company for their foresightedness is ridiculous. When it comes to customer support, Microsoft is the best. They stand far above many other companies in this aspect.

What I see happening if this suit is not settled is: continued uncertainty for Microsoft, which if I were running the company would definitely result in a delay in further development (not good for the consumer); increased costs to Microsoft which would be passed along to the consumer (again not good for the consumer); possibly some gain for CEO's of other software companies in terms of financial gain. This would not benefit the consumer either. We have always been very pleased with Microsoft and will continue to remain loyal to them.

The other 'cry baby' companies who are unable, or unwilling, to compete in the marketplace will never gain our support in terms of buying their products or any other means. What they have attempted to do through a legal suit does not have our support. The states that are holding out and the companies who desire to continue this suit are definitely NOT putting the best interest of the consumer at the front of their decision.

Sincerely,
Sharon, John & Greg Nawalanic

MTC–00005558

From: GKohn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I SUPPORT THE SETTLEMENT. I CONSIDER INNOVATION TO BE A KEY ELEMENT TO THE
PROSPERITY OF OUR NATION.
GEOFFREY KOHN

MTC–00005559

From: Paul A. Kittle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

010202 @ 12:30 PM EST—

Dear DOJ—

I am an active computer user as well as an active supporter/user of Microsoft's software. Even though I do not agree with the origins of the suit against Microsoft, I am certainly willing to support that the DOJ + 9 state settlement is suitable since Microsoft itself acknowledges it is suitable. The idea that this whole event would continue for another year, maybe longer, just so several state AG's can keep their name in the paper seems to me to be nonsense.

Many of the complaints about the software produced by Microsoft are completely unreasonable, in that anyone who can read can alter the Desktop, change browsers, add software, and/or choose to use or not to use items included with any given version of Windows. For instance, I use many of the included features, but I do not use their included diagnostics, I use Norton as an alternative. I do not use Microsoft Visio, I use Smart Draw, etc. Microsoft does not require you to use each subsection, they provide it just as my car provides a radio with a tape drive, even though I only use CDs. The list goes on and on.

Please settle this completely and finally and get on to doing something worthwhile—go find Osama, for instance. Microsoft is NOT a national or international threat.

Thank you.
Regards,
Paul A. Kittle
foamman@aquafoam.com
http://www.aquafoam.com
Phone—610–804–0100
Fax—909–257–8266 (NEW)

MTC–00005560

From: Tony Kennedy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ;

We are now entering a new year and one would hope with the most recent disasters in New York and the deficit spending that is occurring in rebuilding New York and the National economy related to the after effects of 9/11 that someone would be wise enough to finally settle the Microsoft anti trust litigation. It seems that everyone is interested in penalizing one of the greatest companies in the world, a company that has single handedly had the greatest impact on businesses becoming more efficient which has lead to the USA once again be seen as the ultimate world leader in some many industries where we have halted the advances that other non USA countries were making at the USA cost.

I urge you to settle this case so this great Nation can turn it's attention to more important issues!

Regards,
Anthony J Kennedy
Vice President Finance & Administration—North America

MTC–00005561

From: Murray Powell
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been opposed to this litigation from the beginning. Now that a settlement has been reached it is time to close this affair. To delay this settlement only benefits the few special interests along with the government bureaucrats and attorneys who are feeding off of this legalized boondoggle.

MTC–00005562

From: Hawley@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Does not seem to be significant enough to disrupt the monopoly...

MTC–00005563

From: Annabel Wayne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very concerned that the suit that you have against Microsoft, stops the innovations that one company single handedly has given to the world. Because of Microsoft, I have become a better teacher, using their software which came on my computer to enhance my lessons. If I had had to purchase another program, I would not have known what to do, let alone where to get another program in a small town. When my programs came on my computer, I did not feel that Microsoft was pushed down my throat. I am sure that milliions like myself were very glad to have their programs already installed on our computers.

Annabel Wayne

MTC–00005564

From: Bill Beyer
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the Microsoft Antitrust Case. Over the past several years the Microsoft Antitrust Case has been litigated on both the State and Federal level. Recently the Federal government and 9 states have reached an agreement with Microsoft.

I believe coming to settlement with Microsoft is good for consumers, the industry and most importantly the American economy. Now is NOT the time to continue litigation on this case. Doing so only benefits the lawyers and a handful of wealthy competitors. More importantly prolonged litigation on this case negatively affects consumers, the industry and the American economy.

Please settle this case now as I believe it is in the people's best interests.

Bill Beyer,
707 West 4th St. #25,
Long Beach, CA 90802

MTC–00005565

From: lawrence price
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Mricrosoft Settlement

I am pleased that a settlement has been reached and approve of the tentative settlement. Any further litigation would be against the best interests of the American consumer.

MTC–00005566

From: John.Walentia
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Gentlemen:

It is time for this to end. We need to move on. Accept the settlement...review Microsoft's actions over the next few years. If they step out of line by exceeding the terms of the settlement then they should be punished, but whatever the government does it is time to move on.

Thank You.
John R. Walentia

MTC–00005567

From: Warren Dunlap
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am in favor of the settlement as currently agreed upon. I think it is fair to both parties and is in line with the antitrust laws of the United States. Trying to read more into the laws than is there runs the risk of dampening the incentive to innovate, a building block which has led this country to its leadership position in new technology.

MTC–00005568

From: Leslie, Jon
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

It is my opinion that no action should be taken against Microsoft. No action should've ever been taken against Microsoft. They are being punished for being good at what they do. Giving away the MS Internet Explorer software was questionable, but they still do not charge for it. Plus, LINUX is an entirely free OS and no one is up in arms about that. Microsoft deserves no punishment. They have already been punished enough. Please do not interfere with the Free Market System.

Best Regards,
Jon Leslie
Jon Leslie
Sr. Project Manager
Tibersoft Corporation
One Research Drive
Suite 300A
Westborough, MA 01581
main # (888) 888–1969
direct # (508) 621–2320
fax # (508) 898–1820
< http://www.tibersoft.com <http://www.tibersoft.com/> >

MTC–00005569

From: The Computer Help Desk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please Settle This Issue A.S.A.P.
Thank-you,
Ronald D Whobrey
528 North Ingram Street
Henderson, Kentucky 42420
270–827–0784

MTC–00005570

From: Anderson, Mark (MLIG)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I think it is time for the suit against Microsoft to be dropped. It is a waste of taxpayer money, government resources, and time. The general public doesn't want it anyway. Most people want Microsoft to continue to operate as is, since a healthy Microsoft is able to develop and market new and better products that enhance our productivity and happiness.

In business, the strongest, most aggressive, and savvy are the survivors. If I want to buy a luxury car, it is going to be a Lincoln or a Cadillac and not a Dussenberg or a Cord. The only Packards around are Hewlett-Packards. Yes, it is a shame to see companies fold or sell out, but it is survival of the fittest and it is ridiculous to punish Microsoft for being the most fit. If they pressured hardware manufacturers to bundle their products that's OK with me. The computer makers didn't have to go along because there are other operating systems out there. If they want to include WIndows with their PCs, then the price to pay is including Explorer. They can choose not to, but they are smart enough not to do so.

Accept the settlement and close the book on this case.

Mark Anderson
(609) 627–3823
Manderson@na2.us.ml.com

MTC–00005571

From: Jerry Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!

Justice Department,

Please accept the Agreed Settlement with Microsoft ASAP!!

Tks, Jerry D. Robinson
665 Wren Drive
Casselberry, Fl 32707

MTC–00005572

From: B Duensing
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please pass the tunney act and close the microsoft issue once and for all. Your efforts will be much better spent elsewhere than involving yourselves in to private business issues.

MTC–00005573

From: IOFZ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Fwd: Microsoft Settlement

Jan.2nd 2001

Mr. Gates & Associates have performed superbly for the whole world, in the use of their products and only envy and jealousy collectively from other manufacturers has caused the Government to take an unnecessary action against them, to the detriment of world wide users. So what if individuals of Microsoft benefitted financially; their earned money will come around again and so benefit the Country. Why can't Government leave them alone and let them progress unhindered, producing products for the benefit of mankind.

Drop the case against Microsoft.

A.E. IOFZ@AOL.COM

MTC–00005574

From: PBHansan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

settle it now and let he company continue to make money for itself and shareholders as well as be the leader in software. less intrusion in the marketplace please

MTC–00005575

From: Tony Meier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Let's be done with this!

MTC–00005576

From: BargBobbo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Leave Microsoft alone! Why penalize a company for developing a great product.You're undermining the very thing that has made this country great.
Bargbobbo@aol.com

MTC–00005577

From: Laura Hemler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement—yes!
Please approve the Microsoft settlement. This is costing the gov't too much money and punishing a great company. The competitors are just sore losers and the states are just trying to extort money from Microsoft.

MTC–00005578

From: David Chen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:
I am a consumer of the computer hardware and software, the recently agreement of the government and Microsoft was in process, the settlement will be good for the general users, companies and for the economy, especially after the 911 events, we need reboot the economy to all the states, the settlement is one of the best things we are doing right now. It will help the users, companies even government of the states back to our economy and inspire the confidence of the consumers.
I would like to see the settlement to be proceed successfully and hope everybody have a good starting for business. Good keep bless America!
A consumer—David Chen

MTC–00005579

From: Patrick Clemins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft/DOJ Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
As a consumer, I am happy to see an end to the Microsoft/DOJ legal battle. Microsoft, I believe has done their best to make quality products over the years and listen to the consumer so as to include features that the consumers want. The end of the legal battle is welcomed as now, Microsoft can now dedicate their efforts to producing software, instead of using resources to fight, what has been in my opinion, a ridiculous lawsuit. Microsoft is NOT the industry leader because of anti-competitive measures, but because they put out better software. I used to use the competitions products, but as I and other consumers discovered, as the years went by, Microsoft's product got better, and the competition's didn't, so we switched. Microsoft should be allowed to market the best they have to offer and the government should let the consumer decide what to buy.
Respectfully,
Patrick John Clemins

MTC–00005580

From: Peter Cline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I am requesting that you approve the most recent settlement decision offered by the Justice Department and not further litigate this matter. It has gone on long enough and I believe the proposed settlement does enough to more than protect the consumer. Further litigation would only damage the consumer and the economy which is completely unnecessary.
Sincerely,
Peter W. Cline, CFP

MTC–00005581

From: HYLER, BUCK
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I am in total agreement with the proposal settlement.
I hope the Judge will not be inclined to give any consideration to the special interest groups that are trying to derail this for their own benefit.
BV Hyler

MTC–00005582

From: Nick A. Corcodilos
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
For years we have watched this ludicrous attack on Microsoft—and we heard the complainants demand justice from the courts and the government. Now, the government has worked out a reasonable settlement with Microsoft, and some of the complainants once again reveal their intent—not to resolve anything, but to turn this into a permanent battle, wasting taxpayer's and Microsoft's time and money. The courts are not the place for competitors of Microsoft to make their case—they need to make it to the consumer and the market. Please don't encourage them to continue this unproductive legal battle.
As a consumer, I consider the settlement fair and, more important, necessary to all parties involved. I urge the District Court to approve it. For what it's worth, I never saw any benefit to the consumer (including businesses that use Microsoft products) behind this attack. Competition in our free market is complex. Few survive. And that's as it should be. The states and companies that have agreed to the settlement are to be commended. The rest should go back to the drawing board and develop better products. Let's get this over with, finally. Perhaps those hold-outs ought to be charged the ''consumer'' costs of this protracted litigation—as a consumer I believe Microsoft has been hampered from innovating while it has dealt with this battle.
Respectfully,
Nick Corcodilos
ASK THE HEADHUNTER
web: http://www.asktheheadhunter.com
tel: (908) 236–8440 (NJ)
email: northbridge@sprintmail.com

MTC–00005583

From: Craig Stewart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
I urge you to accept the current settlement. Justice has been done. All parties have been duly served.
Microsoft along with its many competitors, must be able to serve the consuming public. It serves no useful purpose to continue to pursue Microsoft. Only the attorneys stand to benefit, not the consumer.
Sincerely,
Craig W. Stewart
206–729–0807

MTC–00005584

From: DeBona, Dave
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
The events of the past few years have brought to light many things, few of which have been earth shattering, enlightening or consumer friendly. So it was with great pleasure that I heard of the settlement. As a professional who deals with not only Microsoft but other industry players and as a ''home user'' I was thrilled to hear this action was coming to an end. I was also happy to hear that Microsoft as a company would not be ''dismembered'' as so many of Microsoft's competitors had hoped for.
I think this decision by the DOJ shows a committed and honest concern and fairness for both the consumers, Microsoft, and their competitors. The cost of this trial and the resultant ebb and flow in the economy has put more strain on the industry than those practices Microsoft had been accused of. The sad fact of the matter is that Microsoft dominates because there are few alternatives worth chasing. I liken this to grocery stores. There are often times 1, 2 or even 3 within a few miles of a home. However, usually only 1 place gets shopped consistently. The only time a change occurs is when one store has ''better'' products or better pricing, i.e. something compelling to make me change. Of course this is simplified, but to the average consumer, simple is understandable and desired.
It's sad to see companies such as Oracle, Sun, and especially AOL screaming about the practices and policies of Microsoft. Oracle has dominated the database world for a long time, their product has been somewhat slow to adopt new standards and upgrade performance. They consistently lose ground to Microsoft and IBM in this area. Sun has always dominated the Web server market, again, being somewhat slow to react and upgrade. They too face increased competition from many hardware vendors, due largely in part to Microsoft's NT operating systems and the performance/value proposition they provide. And AOL, I can't say much good about AOL, so I won't. Suffice it to say, they are certainly in the pot calling the kettle back category. So as you can see, I'm very happy

that this case if finally coming to an end and I thank the DOJ and the new administration for putting emphasis where it belongs. I would also urge the DOJ to do whatever it can to put an end to the other 9 states who possibly feel the need to file their own cases in light of not accepting this settlement. Those 9 states attorney general's should be ashamed of themselves. They play politics while spending their states money, not too mention pressuring Microsoft to continue spending legal dollars on this. Of course this will eventually translate into passed on cost to the consumer. But of course, the 9 states AG's don't seem to care about anything other than their own political interests.

I would very much appreciate information on where I can write these 9 states AG's.

Thank you for your Time.

David DeBona

Technical Consultant, eCommerce

Victoria's Secret Direct-The Limited, Inc.

eMail

Work: <ddebona@vscat.com>

Home: ddebona@columbus.rr.com <mailto:ddebona@columbus.rr.com>

Phone

Work: 614–337–5258

Home: 614–478–9177

Cell: 614–582–6072

6145826072@myvzw.com <mailto:6145826072@myvzw.com>

Pager: 614–520–4005

MTC–00005585

From: Landguy2k1@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

As a Microsoft user and share holder, I felt the lawsuit at the time was a bogus political ploy on the part of the Clinton Administration to punish Microsoft for not putting enough of my retirement money into the coffers of the Democratic Machinery. I also feel anything the new DOJ can do to make this thing go away is a good thing. The settlement is adequate. The DOJ needs to keep its focus on kicking people out of this country who come over here with the sole intent on killing Americans.

Mike Madden

Gulfport, MS

MTC–00005586

From: Houlihan, Kelly P.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Can this be over? We all know the computer industry is so fast paced that Microsoft could be gone by next year if you try holding them down.

Kelly Houlihan

Construction Supt.

Oakland

510–773–6353

510–835–2492 fax

MTC–00005587

From: Svenski50@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:

As a consumer in the software market place I want to express my opinion regarding the Tunney Act. I believe it is fair, reasonable, in the publics best interest and should not be further litigated.

Lary Simpson

MTC–00005588

From: Ron Black
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen—

I wish to express my approval of the proposed settlement with Microsoft Corporation. I believe this is a fair and reasonable settlement and is in the best interest of the consumers of Microsoft products and the technology industry in general.

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Black

PO Box 682

Peru, NY 12972

MTC–00005589

From: JPEO826@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Settlement

I feel that the DOJ settlement is sufficient and should be final. It is my belief that Microsoft should be allowed to innovate without government interference.

John Peoples

MTC–00005590

From: rdmtscott@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm

For the sake of the Nation lets end this lawyers fee management effort to delay progress.

Richard McGregor

MTC–00005591

From: Edwin McClannan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this suit now. Microsoft should not used as a test bed for social law engineering. Investor confidence and world-wide investors have had their confidence shaken by the manner in which the Clinton Justice Department handled and choose American Corporations for litagition. It is apparent that campain contributions could have prevented this injustice against Microsoft in the first place. This corporation has paid their taxes and has provided untold wealth of many Americans, either in the form of jobs in manufacture, development or on computers. Microsoft has managed to make our lives a little better. No Democrat Social Agenda should ever be allowed to wrangle cash from corporations for spending of people by intimidation or changing the law as we go to secure funds for frivilious social spending.

Edwin L. McClannan

Jumper74@yahoo.com

MTC–00005592

From: Joseph Sabrin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

It is important that our government spend time and money on creating jobs rather than going after a company that has created over 1 Million new jobs in the USA.

Regards,

Joe Sabrin

eHire

40 Fulton St.—19th Floor

New York, New York 10038

212–513–7160

jsabrin@ehire.com

www.ehire.com

MTC–00005593

From: Gary Evans
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has continued to provide the products I need to deal with my responsibilities and get my work done faster. In an effort to create a better product they have bundled other products into the code of their operating systems. I love this! For me, the consumer, I can choose to pay the price Microsoft wants me to pay and get a FULL featured operating system—that continues to have more features (programs) added to it in each release—or I can choose Linux for free and find pretty much everything I need for free. It's ALL about my choice. Microsoft is out to get their operating system to as many people as they can. So how would you do it? GIVE THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY WANT...A GOOD PRODUCT (which means integrated the different programs into the operating system...it's convenient for me).

Thanks for listening,

Gary

MTC–00005594

From: Cheryl Schuh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

If the voice of the people still has any meaning in this country, then please hear mine.

Stop further litigation against Microsoft. The settlement is fair and just so let it be. Given the current state of our economy further litigation seems rather senseless and destructive. Even though I do not reside in Washington state, I can see how the hit that the airlines industry has taken since 9/11hurt the state through the Boeing company. Microsoft is a major industry in that state, let's let them get on with business under the the current settlement and help to bring strength back to our economy.

''Justice for all'' should include the big and the small companies, the rich and the poor, give the American Dream back to Microsoft.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Schuh

MTC–00005595

From: Count Curtis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Stop the nonsense

It is time to drop the case.

1.Many of the attackers of Microsoft appear to be motivated only by their own self-interest. Most of the state Attorneys General have reportedly received support, monetary

and otherwise, from various competitors of Microsoft. From the numerous press conferences it seems that the AGs are in this for their own self-interest—headlines and hob-knobbing with the rich and famous.

2.The competitors appear to be sore-losers. From a consumer point-of-view they are guilty of far worse than they charge Microsoft with. An example is Netscape. Once I installed their product only to find that it had insinuated itself as the default system and made the original browsers unusable. It took me several days to repair the damage caused by Netscape.

3.The president of Sun makes pronouncements that seem libelous. As a user of a personal computer I do not want to be forced to waste time and money to obtain features that should be part of the operating system. If the silly proposals by the states AGs were implemented, I would have to spend a lot more money and time buying, installing, and resolving inconsistencies.

Why don't you charge the states Attorneys General and their corporate accomplices with racketeering? It certainly looks to me like that is what they are doing. They are not helping the consumer only themselves.

Sincerely,
E. C. Curtis

MTC–00005596

From: kenboyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to drop a note to say that I support the proposed settlement between the federal government, the nine states, and microsoft. I feel that the current enviroment is competitive, and that any more draconian steps against microsoft would serve only to help their competitors and not help the consumer.

ken boyer

MTC–00005597

From: Deborah Mangiamele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Like millions of Americans, the computer has become part of my everyday life. Thanks to innovations from Microsoft, my skills continue to improve and I continue to learn—right at home. With continual online updates, tech support and user-friendly style of troubleshooting, I've been encouraged me to expand my computer horizons. Microsoft must continue to develop technology that compliments our world without sanctions or restrictions. I believe the settlement is a fair answer at this point.

My wishes for a healthy, peaceful and prosperous 2002!

Sincerely,
Deborah Mangiamele
Rochester, New York

MTC–00005598

From: Phillip Wertheimer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a Microsoft customer for 15 years. In my opinion, it is in the best interest on the consumer public and the tax payers of America that we settle this now and move one. Back in the old days of operating systems we had many choices. But when someone wanted to write a software application that had to decide what operating system they would write the program for. Now they have only two choices Mac or Windows operating system. We are seeing more products come to market now.

Phillip Wertheimer
Intersea Fisheries West
Tel: 206–285–5630
Fax: 206–283–7627

MTC–00005599

From: Brian Frink
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement is Fair

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am writing to express my total support for the settlement of the Microsoft antitrust matter. As a consumer and taxpayer, I view this settlement as fair and logical.

Brian Frink
16 Premier Ct.
Chico, CA 95928

MTC–00005600

From: Jchance007@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

please

no more delays. i agree with the present settlement as is between the usdoj and microsoft. we as a nation have to get on in life after 9/11/01. microsoft as a major company can only help the united states. please let microsoft do there work and research to better help our society

sincerely yours
jeffrey a. chance

MTC–00005601

From: MADuniho@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To add to the views of others about the proposed settlement, I will just say that I think that in the fast moving world of computers and the internet, Microsoft hasn't long to ''live'' anyway, and you had better settle this case before there is not a significant company left to deal with. I also think that Microsoft's competitors are ridiculous to have pushed this suit in the first place, expecially given how the landscape is and also has been shifting so quickly.

MTC–00005602

From: Michael C. Moll
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am for this settlement. Please consider this during this final process.

Mike Moll

MTC–00005603

From: Elena Luisa Garella
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: TUNNEY ACT PUBLIC COMMENT— MS SETTLEMENT

It is ESSENTIAL to the development of the American computer industry and to the rule of law that the Windows monopoly be dismantled and more importantly that Microsoft—and all who admire it— learn that laws are there to be obeyed, and the judicial system is the final word. The district court and the Court of Appeals found egregious and repeated violations of the law. This settlement appears to reward Microsoft for its intransigence and fails— in my opinion— to do anything to repair the damage done to the consumers.

HAVE YOU USED A WINDOWS PRODUCT LATELY? Windows OS and many MS products are unwieldy, subject to crashes, and generally inferior to Macintosh and other non-MS products such as real networks, true JAVA, etc.. . AND YET MS HAS THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE MARKET due to their predatory practices. The settlement will not revive the competition and will simply ensure the continued dominance of second rate products and the insufferable Microsoft arrogance.

PLEASE STOP THIS SETTLEMENT AND PURSUE LEGAL REMEDIES IN DISTRICT COURT! Why is MS pushing this settlement so hard? Because they know that it is vastly favorable to them than the result that would be obtained in Court— and you can't tell me that the result in Court would not be more favorable to consumers in the long run.

Elena Garella,
Seattle, Washington

MTC–00005604

From: Enrique C. Perez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft' settlement

I want to show my support to the Court settlement and for that reason I'm sending this e-mail.

Have a nice day!

MTC–00005605

From: Hoffman, Bob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly believe that the settlement agreement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice is both fair and reasonable. In my opinion, the agreement more than adequately addresses all issues raised during the trial. Furthermore, I feel that a quick resolution to these proceedings would be beneficial to consumers and taxpayers alike. During this long process, it has seemed to me, that the concern has been for the interests of a select few corporate entities, and that very little attention has been paid to the harm, or lack thereof, to consumers and taxpayers caused by Microsoft's practices. This action against Microsoft, the long proceeding associated with it, and the deplorable behavior of Judge Jackson have caused more harm to consumers and taxpayers than Microsoft ever has.

Robert Hoffman
Flushing, New York
rhoffman1@nyc.rr.com

MTC–00005606

From: Don Carlson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: For Microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ,

I am writing to let my voice be heard that the settlement with Microsoft should be done. The cost and disruption of business spurred by the interests of a few greedy competitors and their state attorney generals is disgusting. Please stop this insanity and get on with life. Microsoft is a great company with fantastic products. I use their products as well as other software companies and find theirs is the best and most reliable at a reasonable price. Thanks for taking the time to read this and please lets get this over now.

Sincerely, Don Carlson

MTC–00005607

From: Russ East
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Settlement

Please accept the settlement as it is. Microsoft has done so much for the economy and for humanity! Before home computers I would have had to work outside my home in a hospital or doctor's office. Because of Microsoft I now work at home where I am available to my children at any time. We have products other than Microsoft on our computer and certainly don't feel forced to only use Microsoft products. America was built on ingenuity and it should not be squelched. thank you. criss east

MTC–00005608

From: Mark Gabrielle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Settle and get on—this is nuts to begin with

Microsoft offers a superior product and should not be penalized for it, its one of the few global business that a US company is dominant (other countries encourage and even support, sometimes US does the opposite and pushes to break them up-sometimes this is right and sometimes it is not, in this case I support Microsoft). Yes, Mr Gates is a character, probably not a good public defender of Microsoft, but he has made his company into something that many other companies wish they could.

MTC–00005609

From: Robert Beene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Dear Department of Justice,

First, let me thank you for your efforts with the case regarding Microsoft. As an employee of Microsoft, I have watched the case with great interest and I firmly believe both Microsoft and the Department of Justice want the same thing—Happy Consumers who are not being taken advantage of and a company that competes fairly.

I wanted to take this moment to voice my opinion in that the settlement proposed to bring the case to settlement is a very just and reasonable proposal. I believe the proposed changes will positively impact consumers and make positive changes in the way that Microsoft does business that will not hamper Microsoft's ability to innovate and will also allow competitors to continue to compete with Microsoft and vice versa.

Thank you again for the time you have spent working on this issue and for the proposed settlement.

Sincerely,
Rob Beene, MCSD

MTC–00005610

From: CThomp8789@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is good for consumers, the industry, and the economy. It is time to move on.

Clayton K. Thompson
2420 Winnetka Dr.
Rockford, IL 61108

MTC–00005611

From: JKIRKPATRICK@PILLSBURY.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We have had enough litigation on this matter. It is time for the settlement to be consumated.

James S. Kirkpatrick
P. O. Box 1715
Dension, TX 75021–1715

The information contained in this message is private and confidential information which may also be subject to the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine. This information is intended only for the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copy of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return e-mail and destroy all copies of the message. Thank you.

MTC–00005612

From: Jim Jones
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The existing settlement is in the public's best interest and should be enacted to finally resolve this dispute. The state attorney's general who do not believe in this settlement are not acting in the publics best interest.

Sincerely,
Jim Jones

MTC–00005613

From: JWD321@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please tell the DOJ to move on to important subjects like terrorism, etc., and leave Microsoft alone.

MTC–00005614

From: GMontgo465@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Comments

It is my considered opinion that the proposed settlement IS in the public interest as well as in the interest of the market and all investors in the market and NOT just the Microsoft investors or Microsoft itself. The settlement has been too long in coming and the conclusion has been delayed for one inane reason after another. If ''interest groups'' would stop debating what ''their interests'' dictate we might be able to put this one behind us and get on with our struggles in this unusual economy where all software companies proceed to gain market share by virtue of their ''products'' and not try and stifle the progress of superior products in the marketplace.

We are where we are in the overall world economy because of our free market/free enterprise system. That system should not be thwarted for ''special interest'' reasons advanced by the so called special interest groups. Let's get on with it and get it DONE, once and for all.

Thank you.
George C. Montgomery

MTC–00005615

From: ACNAPT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: (no subject)

Further pursuit of the Microsoft case makes absolutely no sense. Accept the settlement and get along with the nation's business. With the political and economic issues at stake in the world today it is absurd to divert our energies from what is really important.

Paul F. Teryl
7450 NW 4th Street
Apt 206
Plantation, Florida 33317

MTC–00005616

From: Rich Hoffman
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the DOJ:

I believe the settlement is fair and reasonable. It is time for the parties to move on.

Rich Hoffman
Vice President—Taxes
Outsourcing Solutions Inc.
390 South Woods Mill Rd., Suite 350
Chesterfield, MO 63017
T: 314–514–2607
F: 314–576–7949
E: rich.hoffman@osi.to
<mailto:rich.hoffman@osi.to>

Outsourcing services are primarily performed by OSI Outsourcing Services, Inc.; collection services are primarily performed by OSI Collection Services, Inc.; letter series collection services are primarily performed by North Shore Agency, Inc. and Transworld Systems Inc.; portfolio services are performed by OSI Portfolio Services, Inc.

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited.

MTC–00005617

From: chris.higgins@horizon.ie@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:39pm
Subject: RE: Microsoft Judgement—comments

Hi,

The proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case doesn't solve the underlying issue—Microsoft's ability to, and intent to control its market place. It also fails to provide any remedy to the rest of the industry for the years that Microsoft abused its position.

Most of the people I talk to are not seeking punishment for Microsoft, but rather a balancing of the playing field. A change in the rules which promotes competition and allows other vendors (the existing vendors, and new startups) to compete in an open and fair way with Microsoft. Then let the consumer choose which product(s) they want. The issue that exists is that with its current position, Microsoft can smother any sector of the industry by 'integrating' that sectors technologies it's operating systems

In the early nineties, there were loads of independent vendors of TCP/IP software for windows (Microsoft didn't include it with Windows—and you had to pay extra for it). Loads of companies made money by adding value to Windows, by solving problems for users.. Microsoft eliminated that entire market by bundling TCP/IP with windows.

The same has happened with the office productivity suites— Lotus/Corel have all faded into insignificance because they cannot compete in a market where Microsoft not only owns the operating system—but through that forces people to use it's propietary file formats..

The same happened again with the WWW browser market—Netscape has died a horrible death because of Microsoft's abuse of it's position.

Microsoft are currently attempting to eliminate their competitors in the WWW server market space by bundling IIS as part of NT—and they have clearly set their sights on controlling the internet with their promises for .NET technology. When does enough become enough ? Will we all have to wait for total global meltdown—when there is only Microsoft left ? Or will we go on forever—promising ourselves that it's really isn't that bad, and it's a sign of a healty industry ? The playing field needs to be level, and kept that way. To fix the problems of old, Microsoft needs to make full details of it's file-formats public. It also needs to make full details of it's network protocols public.

No-one is suggesting that any intellectual property that microsoft owns should be given away—but how a sequence of bits can translate into intellectual property is beyond me.

Microsoft keeps it's implementations that it uses in it's operating systems—but in the case of new technologies—it should release the source code for a reference implementation—one that fully adheres to the standards.

It's up to other people to innovate, but the underlying data format should be available to all. Why is my data stored in a format to which only Microsoft own the key? Is that protecting the consumer or Microsoft..

If you doubt that statement—try (using any non-microsoft software) to extract your email in a usable format from a Microsoft outlook .pst file... If you succeed—please let me know as I have 19Mb of email I can no-longer get access to because I haven't paid for my software license to microsoft for the exchange server. People worry about not being able to get access to information in the future—there are loads of us being denied access to our own information *now*.

Based on the current proposed settlement, Microsoft seems to be exempted from publishing authentication system information. What is there to prevent Microsoft from adding a password field to the start of every file format—and claim that the format is now an integral part of the authentication system? Alas, the settlement needs to be clear, concise and needs to define the environment for all technology companies to operate without the monopolistic approach of Microsoft.

Many thanks for your time and efforts reading this far,

Rgds,

Chris

CC:Chris Higgins

MTC–00005618

From: Gary Gromet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: approval needed

Acceptance of the settlement is in the best interest of the consumers. Obviously, the competition does not like it because it will allow Microsoft to continue to cut into their profits by forcing them to lower prices. No where in the entire litigation morass has anyone shown how the consumer has suffered. All that is repeatedly shown is the suffering of Microsoft's competition in that their profits are down. The anti-trust efforts against Microsoft are analogous to the fairy tale of the emperor without any clothes.

The competition that Microsoft faces cannot compete successfully, so they say it is Microsoft's fault when in reality it is there own inability to do their own job correctly that prevents their own success. Like many Americans, they won?t accept responsibility for their own mistakes.

All the government anti-trust attorneys could then concentrate their efforts on ending the petroleum monopoly which is the cause of artificially inflated prices for energy. The price of petroleum does not take into account the cost of production only the stranglehold of production exercised by petroleum exporting countries.

Discount Health Foods
www.DiscountHealthFoods.net
858 N.Krome Ave.
Homestead, FL 33030, USA
Tel: 305–247–8487
Fax: 708–575–6632

I use Hotmail because all incoming and outgoing e-mail is screened for viruses by Symantec (Norton Anti-Virus)

MTC–00005619

From: GLee361504@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: (no subject)

A company must have the freedom to innovate. I want to see this case settled ASAP. I am in favor of Microsoft's position.

G. Lee

MTC–00005620

From: Joe935
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time this case was settled. The government should not be penalizing Businesses that do well. They do well because the people buy their products and that means the people want them.

The government would better spend their time going after the real menace in this country, DRUGS.

Joe Calderone

MTC–00005621

From: GOHAMILTON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: MY REPLY RE. MICROSOFT ANTI TRUST LAWSUIT FIASCO

AS A GOP CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR / US SENATE FROM MICHIGAN IN 2002, I HAVE ALWAYS OPPOSED STRONGLY THE DOJ AS WELL AS MY OWN STATE'S ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE ILL ADVISED STUPID LAWSUIT AGAIINST A LEADING AMERICAN JOB PROVIDER SUCH AS THE MICROSOFT CORP. WHEN ELECTED AS THE NEXT GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN I WILL CUT THE BUDGET OF THE STATE A.G. OFFICE AND GET RID OFF THE SOCIALIST LAWYERS IN THAT DEPARTMENT.

SINCERELY AND HAPPY NEW YEAR,
ED H-A-M-I-L-T-O-N
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR '02
GOHAMILTON@AOL.COM
(248) 643–0403 OR (248) 701—3670—CELL PHONE

MTC–00005622

From: L. Scott Masi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it May Concern:

I am writing today as a taxpayer and as a computer professional. I must say that I am appalled at the waste of time and money by the US government regarding their continued pursuit of Microsoft.

I think that we all should look at the overall benefits from Microsoft products. The computer industry has benefited greatly over the past number of years due to the fact that Microsoft has taken a leadership role in the development and deployment of useful tools for each and every consumer. Without the leadership that Microsoft provides, there would be far too many standards and applications that probably could not and would not interact with one another in an appreciable way.

Please lets just accept the agreement on the table and allow Microsoft to continue to innovate and produce the high-quality software that every computer user has become accustomed to using. The proposed remedy, to which Microsoft has agreed, should allow many more companies to have

access to the parts of the Windows operating environment so that they, too, may be able to develop robust, useful applications. Why continue to try to destroy one of the best examples of corporate success in America's history.

I applaud the management team at Microsoft for helping virtually every computer user in the world today. OK, there may be a few apple hold-outs, but whose programs are used by the overwhelming majority of personal computer users in the world? Microsoft! Whose programs are the glue that holds together countless production applications and environments? Microsoft! Let the nay-sayers try to imagine for just one moment how difficult their jobs would be without the standards and programs provided by Microsoft.

So, as far as I am concerned, I think that the government (courts) should approve the agreement, and let Microsoft continue to provide me, and all of the other computer users in the world, with the fine software products that we have come to expect from them.

Sincerely,
L. Scott Masi
Senior Analyst
215–345–0997

MTC–00005623

From: Arthur Tuber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: Anti Trust Suit

This lawsuit has infuriated me from day one. It strikes me that the government is against ingenuity and success. It also appears Clinton was angry about not receiving a contribution for his 1996 re-election campaign, eventually leading to this unnecessary law suit.

Enough is enough. All phony charges should be dropped, allowing Microsoft to continue improving their software for the benefit of ALL our people.

Sincerely,
Art Tuber

MTC–00005624

From: Ringering@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: Microsoft

I have been a long time supporter of Microsoft and I am against any further action against the company. I believe it has been wrongly prosecuted and that the company and country have suffered on account of this action. I am a strong advocate for competition in the marketplace. However, I disagree that the government should try to ''level the playing field'' in favor of those companies that are unable to compete without the government intervention.

Sincerely,
Robert L. Ringering

MTC–00005625

From: ESKIMOPUP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft suit is hurting our country. A few competitors should not be able to destroy the greatest company in the history of technology. Settling the suit will help us get out of a recession. There are more important things going on now. Get this suit settled now! It should NEVER have been filed against Microsoft.

MTC–00005626

From: LEGAC2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to urge the Department of Justice to proceed as quickly as possible with the positive settlement of this case. I feel this whole litigation was politically motivated and that Microsoft, the corporation, has taken the brunt because they were innovators and leader in a new economic field which did not contain all the restraints and laws normally in place in a more established field. Our economy suffered because of this litigation. Consumers have expressed many times their disagreement with the government that they have suffered damage. Microsoft has supplied a whole new way to communicate and consumers have agreed. With the election of a new President and the events of September 11, it is time to let this go and work on positive ways to support the people of the United States.

Judith R. Petersen,
Public Citizen and Voter in the State of Washington

MTC–00005627

From: Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

Please do not impose any more harm upon Microsoft than was placed upon its customers. That is to say, if you can quantify how much less the consumers should have paid for their Windows software, that should be the damages.

I, for one, would gladly pay again for the use of this software. As the browser was free, as are many updates from Msft, there would be no harm there. I have both Netscape and IE on my computer and I never use Netscape unless I have to.

Microsoft's rivals should not control our courts in their deliberations or punishments meted out. The proposed settlement is fair to all sides, and the States should follow the lead of the Federal Government.

Mike Stoddard
Tampa, Florida

MTC–00005628

From: Robert Andersen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

As a consumer and tax payer I urge you not to mess up, keep Microsoft whole. We have something that works lets keep it that way. If other suppliers are better let them come forward without government (state or federal) intervention. In a free nation the best will win.

R. B. Andersen
Oceanside, CA

MTC–00005629

From: Krupoff, Marty
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlemet

I think you should settle with Microsoft based on the latest agreement sannounced in the newspaper.

MTC–00005630

From: Tzadik8402@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may Concern:

My wife and I believe that the Microsoft settlement is a good one.We hope that the nine states opposing the settlement be convinced of that as well. It truly is a wonderful company and I believe they really have the best interest of the consumers of their products. If it were not for this company and what products they have created in the last 18 years we would not be where we are today!!!

Please settle this case as soon as possible!! Please convince the nine states that it is best to settle. I believe that the Microsoft company has been humbled to some extent by this case will be more attentive to the needs of the consumer, business piers and all the users of their products globally!

Theodore & Shelley Gruber
18132 Meandering Way
Dallas,TX
75252

MTC–00005631

From: Bud (038) Nell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case reminds me of the time that our goverment was looking out for the consumer and broke up the Bell Telephone system. HA!! What a laugh!! Talk about killing innovation as this country went from the best and cheapest telephone system in the world to one of the most expensive and shoody. Butt out!!!

LAD in Texas

MTC–00005632

From: Dickon Smart-Gill
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir / Madam,

I would like to voice my opinion on the United States vs Microsoft case number 98–1233

After reviewing the documents, in particular http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9500/9549.htm I am in support of the current settlement agreement. I believe that the action taken by the United States is fair to both Microsoft and the consumer.

Dickon Smart-Gill

MTC–00005633

From: Deptula,Elaine(NXI)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The settlement is fair to all so let's be done with it. It is about time that we get on with America's business and settle this lawsuit. It seems like there are certain groups that want to keep this going just for the joy of it... it

is important to our economy that we get this behind us. We have a lot to do and are wasting time with this effort.

Elaine Deptula
Director, External Contracts
PH: 312–822–1284
Fax: 312–817–2272
Elaine.deptula@cna.com

MTC–00005634

From: Jeffrey A. Schmatz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: A Small Business Owners Perspective

I challenge anyone from the DOJ to come to my office, sit across from my desk and tell me how Microsoft has hurt my business. I have a choice everytime I go to the store.....if they have the best product I buy it....if they don't I buy another. That is called the American way. This action was a huge waste of the taxpayer's money and as a taxpayer I am pissed off. Why don't you go after some real criminals?

Jeffrey Schmatz
JS Media LLC
112 West Hawk Avenue
McAllen, Texas 78504–1802
956–682–2766
956–682–9472 (fax)
work jschmatz@jsmedia.net
home JeffreySchmatz@aol.com

MTC–00005635

From: Kirk Conklin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. This sums up what I as a consumer think about this attack on free enterprise. Put the Clinton era of political attacks and payoffs behind us and let innovation thrive.

Kirk Conklin

MTC–00005636

From: Penny Woods
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm

Go along with government settlement and don't prolong agony any further. Took years to resolve this far and country needs to move on.

MTC–00005637

From: joseph harrison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my view the Microsoft Settlement known as the Tunney Act is fair and reasonable. I believe after four years of litigation it is time to move on and stop wasting the tax payers money on a case that should have been settled years ago. The nine states that don't want to settle are not thinking about consumers. They are only concerned with the competitors of Microsoft. The Anti-Trust law was not established to even the playing field between competitors, it's purpose was to keep prices competitive. I think Microsoft has kept the prices of it's products competitive. The competitors of Microsoft should stop whining. If they came up with a better product for a lower price, people would buy that product regardless of whether Microsoft Windows was loaded into the computer at the factory or not.

Joe Harrison
7320 E. Patricia
Port Orchard, WA 98366

MTC–00005638

From: Viken
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Support Microsoft. Thank you.

MTC–00005639

From: Richard Jackson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Please accept this mailing as a request that The Department encourage a hasty settlement in this captioned case involving Microsoft's anti-trust violations. M/S has already lost a bundle and the consumer is the big loser so far.

Let these folks out in Washington state get on with what they do best,,,,help business and individuals save money and time. While I personally think Microsoft should fight to win, if they think this is a fair settlement, so be it; let it be done.

Thanks for your consideration of my plea.

Sincerely,
Richard W. Jackson
3425 Crosswinds
Alexander City, AL 35010

MTC–00005640

From: HankAsh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

It is our opinion that the recent settlement reached in the Microsoft case should be allowed to stand, so that this litigation can be brought to an end.

Thank you.
Henry and Dian Ash
3766 E. Lake Drive
Land O Lakes, FL 34639

MTC–00005641

From: Jim Rubino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement should proceed without further delay.

Jim Rubino
2521 W. Marion Ave. #311
Punta Gorda, FL. 33950
941–575–1340
jrubino@sunline.net
and during trial phase
jrrubino@home.com

MTC–00005642

From: TomKohl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

This trial has wasted enough time and money for both this country and Microsoft. Please see that it is brought to a speedy close. I feel the settlement agreed upon is fair for all concerned. thank you,

Thomas D. Kohl

MTC–00005643

From: DKingN7KGX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:47pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear sirs

With the economy as it is and the harrasement of those that would like to see the eventual demise of Microsoft, i think that a quick and fair settlement of this case. Microsoft is not doing anything that any other big business is doing or has done.

Thank you
Dean King

MTC–00005644

From: Sam George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to please consider settling the Microsoft case as it stands. I believe (as a consumer) that this is the best course of action.

MTC–00005645

From: Jim Hurst
To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the proposed settlement, lets get on with business and stop waisting taxpayer money. Thank you.

James R.Hurst

MTC–00005646

From: Buttinzki@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

Dear Sirs,

In my humble opinion, Microsoft's Bill Gates has been truthful and forthcoming, and a champion of leadership in spite of the intolerable scrutiny his business has undergone these past four years. Mr. Gates has singularly propelled the information age, and I daresay that his attackers are not only motivated by petty jealousy and greed, but were it not for Mr. Gates and Microsoft, his detractors and defamers, some of them, would still be in the technological dark ages. Mr. Gates has behaved in an exemplary fashion with the Department of Justice, and were it you or I or most anyone, can you not imagine feeling the most callous disregard for this nation, can you not imagine just walking away from it all? Mr. Gates continues, however to show us the spirit that built Microsoft, and appears, unimaginably, undaunted.

For God's sake, please don't break Bill Gate's spirit.

Tim Rummell

MTC–00005647

From: db—design@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ

Please leave Microsoft alone and alow them to continue to developing sepurior Window and business applications. If the competition can not keep up that is their fault. Microsoft should not be punished for be able develop great products.

Richard Power
DB Design Consultants

MTC–00005648

From: engler@csi.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlemnt

This DOJ should settle the Microsoft case as soon as possible. There is a hatred of successful business people in this country as reflected by the consistent anti-trust cases against successful businesses.

This form of bigotry must stop.

Sincerely,
Edward L. Engler
857 Berick Dr.
St. Louis, MO 63132

MTC–00005649

From: Giacomo Zardetto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

The settlement with Microsoft must stand, let's get this over and done with. Litigation of our government and a industry leader can only give America a NEGATIVE CONCLUSION. Lets move forward and support the innovators, the leaders of our private enterprise, providers of jobs, providers of taxes, they are the whole purpose of our Capitalist Society. Without capital creators there are no taxes, without taxes there is no government.

World affairs, current national circumstances show us that the time for bickering amongst ourselves is BAD POLICY. UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL. Team players is what we should be, private enterprise and government. Do you think that if Microsoft would be a company from any other country in the world, that ''said'' country would be trying to weaken or destroy it as it is, as it stands today?

Please conclude the settlement and lets move our country forward, we've got bigger problems to deal with than to harm a company for being good at what they do.

Giacomo Zardetto
Orcas Island, WA
zardetto@rockisland.com

MTC–00005650

From: Ervin, Craig (INV-EDH)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement is fair.. No more litigation so be sought!

Craig Ervin

MTC–00005651

From: Laurence Lewitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It's time to stop the harassing. Settle and be done with it.

MTC–00005652

From: Ronald Merrell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:37am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe very strongly that the remaining states should be required to accept the settlement agreed to by the Justice Department. In my judgement, the Justice Department's initial handling of the case was overly influenced by Microsoft competitors and was a major factor in bringing about the current recession. It is important to the economy that the Justice Department insist on the current proposal agreed to by the Justice Department and Microsoft.

Ronald D. Merrell
Ph.D. Business Administration
Ronald D. Merrell, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

MTC–00005653

From: CHARLES SPENCE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAYCONCERN,
REFERENCE THE MICROSOFT JUSTICE DEPT. SETTLEMENT.

THIS SETTLEMENT IS MORE THAN FAIR ESPECIALLY SINCE THE SUIT SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN BROUGHT. THIS SUIT WAS A CLINTON JUSTICE DEPT. PAY OFF TO SOME OF MICROSOFT COMPETITORS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CLINTONS AND THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE. IF IT IS A CRIME TO DEVELOP A BETTER PRODUCT AND BRING IT TO THE CONSUMER AT A LOWER COST THEN WE BETTER RETHINK OUR WAY OF LIFE. THIS CONCEPT IS WHAT HAS GIVEN AMERICANS THE BEST WAY OF LIFE ON THIS EARTH.

CHARLES E. SPENCE
2500 EVANS DR.
PLANO, TX 75075

MTC–00005654

From: RSteve2259@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen

I believe that the setllement is a good thing for the country. Approve it. Certainly the antitrust laws mean well and are needed but this settlement goes far enough.

Thanks for your diligence but lets move on.

Sincerely,
Robert W. Stevenson

MTC–00005655

From: Ted Ahre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please add my name to the list of citizens who believe that the proposed settlement with Microsoft is more than fair to the nation. This obvious effort to stifle a successful corporation's success should end here.

Theodore R. Ahre, CPA
Oregon

MTC–00005656

From: Debbie McMillen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

This case should be settled and closure obtained ASAP. The settlement is reasonable and fair. It's good and is needed for consumers, the industry, and our economy. This case should not be allowed to go through more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors, stifles innovation, and only hurts the American economy even further.

Deb McMillen
Microsoft Consulting Services
469–222–1961
debmc@microsoft.com

MTC–00005657

From: King Tam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled now. The settlement is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy.

MTC–00005658

From: Joel Klopfenstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally believe that Microsoft did make some bad decisions in the past, and they are no doubt a Monopoly, but in some respects the consumer did come out ahead as far as a multipurpose mainstream Operating System that could do everything you needed it too. But the price could (and should) be a lot cheaper for mainstream use, I think it should cost as much as any other software package (around 30–50$). The settlement that Microsoft will not effect the average consumer, and home schools are not allowed in the settlement as well. I think the consumer was hurt in the pocket book, and therefore the prices should be mandated cheaper, or even have a version that is less scaled down just the O.S. nothing more, no fluff, for a reasonable price 29.99.

Joel Klopfenstein

MTC–00005659

From: WUTS, PETER G (091)SUP/0200(093)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

First of all I would like to say that the government should not have been involved in suing Microsoft in the first place. This is a country that supports free enterprise and innovation—-no government intervention should be involved. The settlement that is proposed should go through so that the company can get back to the work that has helped propel the tech revolution of the 90's.

Peter Wuts

MTC–00005660

From: Marie Robinette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please note that taking all things into consideration, what in the competitive field has remained the same since this antitrust suit was first brough to bear? VERY VERY

LITTLE!... Note also that those companies that sought relief are engaged in their own interests— creating monopolies in their own arenas—meanwhile, Microsoft continues to innovate and through immeasurable community service in all locations around the world still strives to make lives of others improved through technology—see the entire package that is Microsoft—not just what the competition is whining about!

Have a happy and prosperous New Year!!!

Marie Robinette, MCSE
Back Office Support
EMail: marierob@microsoft.com
Hours: 9:00 am—6:00 pm (Mon—Fri)
<<Picture (Metafile)>>

Work Hard—Do your best—Keep your word—

Never get too big for your britches—Trust in God—

Have no fear—and Never forget a friend. —-Harry S. Truman

MTC–00005661

From: shabels
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please honor the integrity and intelligence of our best businessperson in the US and get off Bill Gates back. Let him go to work for us as he always has.

Best,
Sharron Belson

MTC–00005662

From: JS8522@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's my opinion that the Microsoft settlement benefits both me and the public interest. I strongly support the settlement and request that DOJ take action to end this controversy and allow all parties to get on with business.

James E. Shrader
401 South Miller
Wenatchee, WA
98801

MTC–00005663

From: Tim L Norris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to express my desire that the Department of Justice (DOJ) conclude the Microsoft case as agreed to in the recent settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft. I am increasingly concerned that certain companies are using the legal system as a vehicle to reduce the competitiveness of Microsoft in order to improve their own position in the marketplace . Under the guise of increasing competition, these companies are attempting to thwart their competition, in this case, Microsoft. It is shameful conduct and the DOJ should publically denounce these attempts to abuse our legal system for parochial ends. Let these companies compete in the free and open marketplace that characterizes our American system of capitalism and end this abuse of our judicial system.

Sincerely,

Tim L Norris 310–647–0803
tlnorris@west.raytheon.com
Raytheon Systems Company, Airborne EO
Bldg E1, MS E123
2000 E. El Segundo Blvd
El Segundo, CA 90245

MTC–00005664

From: Rocky859@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: (no subject)

if msft has the best product on the market ...let the other companies compete....don't have a bully fight for those who can't compete... i thought that america was free rnterprise

george saunders

MTC–00005665

From: Yazen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a consumer, I am in support of concluding the governments case against Microsoft and allowing Microsoft to stay intact as one corporation, who have in the past served their customers with efficient, cost effective software products, making our business and personal lives easier and more productive. To shun a company for innovation is not only counter productive, it is harmful to the consumer sector and the economy as a whole. The time is ripe for the government to settle with Microsoft and end litigation. Thank you for your time and effort to this matter.

Yazen Alhassan
Alexandria, VA

MTC–00005666

From: andrew minkin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The next generation of all technology adoption by the masses depends on the end of this case.

Microsoft can narrow the digital divide. The settlement offering to help schools is the best way to do this. I do not think that consumers have been hurt, but if there is any group that needs to benefit from a paying of Microsoft's debt to society, it is the underprivileged. Do not make any settlement a victory for another company or law firm, but a victory for the betterment of the people who need it the most.

MTC–00005667

From: Kelly Chen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the settlement. And I beleive the settlement would definitely help to stimulate the slow economy.

Regards
Lai Yuen Leung
Ming Chu Chen

MTC–00005668

From: Bentleyboys@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: (no subject)

The Country needs to put this behind them and get on with more pressing matters. Windows XP is a marvelous piece of technology for $99. Maybe someday we can deal with why you can buy an inkjet printer for $99 that takes $85 worth of ink cartridges to keep it working. Roy Magnuson

MTC–00005669

From: Bcd268@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get this over with and let the public carry on with their daily activities. The settlement is just and should be implemented immediately. With AOL and Time Warner merging, one can hardly say that Microsoft is a monopoly. I use AOL, when I purchased my computer, there were several software options to choose from, including MSN. Our economy is suffering enough, let's get this settled and start anew. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Dion

MTC–00005670

From: Jim Earley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please terminate this exercise in futility. To prolong this any longer will only further unsettle a recessive economy. We consumers will be just fine without additional ''protection''.

Jim Earley
Premier Magnetics
20381 Barents Sea Circle
Lake Forest, CA 92630
jim—e@premiermag.com
www.premiermag.com

MTC–00005671

From: Mark G Filler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough, already! Wrap this up now!

Mark G. Filler
mfiller@filler.com

MTC–00005672

From: Donald J. Helsel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed Microsoft settlement seems fair to all parties concerned. This cases should be settled now as further legal efforts offer no real benefit to the everyday citizen and would be a further waste of tax payer money.

Don Helsel
donhelsel@earthlink.net

MTC–00005673

From: Jack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Mlicrosoft Settlement

I have been a user of Microsoft Products for over 10 years. I see no reason why there should be any delay in settlement.

The law suits brought against Microsoft are instigated by competitors that have been

unable to keep up with Microsoft Research and Development and are turning to the law instead of the open market. Microsoft has been the reason for the widespread use of the computer by millions—their approach to marketing as compared to Apple is the reason for their success. There is no reason for Microsoft to be punished further. Settle the case and let the free market survive.

John K. Jouett
2134 N. Stoney Beach Lane
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

MTC–00005674

From: Walt Sweyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Get off their backs!!!!

MTC–00005675

From: IFJUDGE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am urging you to consider the proposed Microsoft Settlement to truly be in the best interests of the general public. Our current economic situation in the U.S.A. should lead the Court to take the steps necessary to resolve this matter, to avoid protracted litigation, and to allow the economy to move forward.

Thank you! ISABEL FLEISHER New London, NH

MTC–00005676

From: Sfin5259@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Enough is enough. How many times must one party defend itself against the same charge?? If the states not accepting the settlement were party to the suit in the first place, then they should not have the option to continue for another ruling that suits their interests. Does'nt this border into double jeopardy territory?? The states not accepting the negotiated ruling should be dropped from all compensatory releif. This is the case in other types of litigation.

MTC–00005677

From: RMcamis858@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm very much concerned with waste of taxpayers money in the Government continuing to pursue the Microsoft antitrust suit. I believe that it's time to get on with more important things, such as taking care of our more serious problems, such as the New York terrorism situation, and the pursuit of those responsible. Microsoft has continued to lead the world in innovations in various software fields, and we certainly wouldn't be where we're at today without Microsoft's many, many contributions. Plus the contributions Microsoft has made to our learning institutions. Let the other cry baby companies do their own research, there is nothing to stop them. So, enough already, let Microsoft get on with their business.

Ron McAmis
1835 Truckee Way
Salinas, CA 93906–2125

MTC–00005679

From: McGregor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm writing to urge you to accept the settlement proposed by the government in it's litigation against Microsoft Corporation. Further litigation by the states is an egregious ploy designed to wring competative advantage for corporations residing in those states as well as to line the state's public coffers. As the owner of a business with over 30 branch locations and 400 employees, I can assure you that we could not do our job half as well today if not for Microsoft products and services. They're reasonably priced, they work and they work well together. I'm an agnostic when it comes to which operating system, word processor or accounting package we use. Unix, IBM, MAC, we've tried them all. We use Microsoft products because they deliver, period.

Continuing litigation to prop up dying companies like Novell, or companies like Sun that are trapped between open standards and cheaper Wintel systems serves no one except the corporate interests of those companies.

End the litigation. Kick out the states. Settle with Microsoft.

David McGregor

I didn't fight my way to the top of the food chain to be a vegetarian.

Phone: (801) 944–6333 Cell: (801) 502–7544

MTC–00005680

From: TEHSHEEL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir: I am grad the settlement had been reached between microsoft and your department. I think this settlement is fair and good for the comsumers and our country.

Thank you!

MTC–00005681

From: bob(u)patti1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

What company in the history of the United States has given back more to world communities? Mr. Gates has and is continuing to return Millions of dollars to benefit people all over the world. Most of his resources go to benefit people who have a real need. I believe the recent settlement agreements are fair and provide a real benefit to young Americans.

Don't let the overzealous competitors and their over paid lobbyist and government friends stand in the way of a TRUE AMERICAN FRIEND in helping to provide the world with improved technology. Mr. Gates is a businessman who has compassion for his industry and the people it serves.

Settle this and let Microsoft get back to what it does best.....develop products that help improve the quality of life for Americans and the rest of the World.

Thank You,

Bob and Patti Turner

MTC–00005682

From: The Third Millennium
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the judge in the case should accept the settlement worked out with DOJ and MSFT. This is obvious to any clear and open minded public citizen!!

Clearly special interests with political motivations in 9 states (Just look which 9 states are dragging their feet!) are objecting to final settlement disregarding the interests of the public and tech industry as a whole.

Let's get on with it—the longer things are dragged out the worse it is for the economy and a recovery!!!

Accept the DOJ and MSFT settlement they negotiated!!

Bill Breseman—a concerned citizen

MTC–00005683

From: QORG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

If Microsoft had not progressed the way it did, we would still be limited to 640K memory on our computers and, heaven forbid, the OS2 operating system. Their innovation is what paved the way for increased capacity on the PC platform, for both disk and for memory. Without it, the Internet would be used only by the government, E-business would be nonexistent, and AOL wouldn't exist to pressure the suit.

AOL does not allow access of their system by other Internet providers (buddy chats, etc.) Shouldn't this be viewed as unfair practices?? Thanks for listening to the electronic side of my reasons to back Microsoft. Economically, their suit caused the bubble burst in the NASDAQ. How many billions did that cost consumers??

Thanks,
Amy Cottrell
MIS Director, Retired

MTC–00005684

From: Howard Todd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings,

I am writing to register my support for the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the US Government. It is time to put this case behind us, for the benefit of consumers and the US economy. Please do not let a few states acting on behalf of Microsoft's competitors delay or derail the fair resolution of this case.

Thanks you,
Howard Todd
21464 President Point Rd.
Kingston, WA 98346
howard@wendertodd.com

MTC–00005686

From: gene—
wedge@notes.teradyne.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear People,

As a long-time customer of Microsoft products I have followed the progress of the DOJ legal actions against the company. Having read the current proposed settlement I believe that it correctly limits the company's ability to engage in anticompatitive marketing practices while allowing Microsoft to continue to develop innovatively integrated products. Please register my support for the settlement in the public record.

Thank you,

Gene Wedge

Oak Park, CA

MTC–00005687

From: Holly Simmenroth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settllement

I hereby take this opportunity to thank the Federal Government and States for negotiating a tough but reasonable settlement in the Microsoft case. I know this is in the best interests of the consumer, the industry and the American Economy in general. I trust the Department of Justice will forward my position, as a consumer, to the District Court as encouragement to conclude these proceedings as quickly as possible.

Truly Yours,

Henrietta Simmenroth e-mail: holly@goes.com

MTC–00005688

From: Jeff Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

End this process. The proposed settlement is in the best interests of all of us.

Jeff Smith 513 791 5074

MTC–00005689

From: James Muir
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am so glad the trail period is over and even though I feel the whole mess was a political interference with Business. Spurred by competitors who found it easier to compete through their State representives and the political arena than the market place the situation of Microsofts monopoly has gone on far to long. I feel in no way damaged by Microsofts efforts in Technology neither financially nor by lack of innovation in the market place. They deliver superior products for very reasonable prices and they provide great jobs and support their community and the rest of the U.S. charity needs. BOTTOM LINE: I think the Government and Microsoft resolutions are tough, adequate, and sufficient. Lets get on to the next big problem. Thank you. Jim Muir

James Muir

jmuirbrkr@earthlink.net

MTC–00005690

From: Phillip Kirby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern;

I feel that Microsoft has proven there commitment to innovate many times, and continues their innovations today. They are a revolutionary company, who has not only made great software but made the world the technologically advanced society that it is now in 2002! Without there groundbreaking software, I truly believe computers would not be used nearly as much as they are today! I feel that the settlement if very fair for both Microsoft, consumers, and our American Economy!

Phillip Kirby:

mt—man40@hotmail.com

MTC–00005691

From: RLFiala@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO THE DOJ,

It is my opinion that this case against Microsoft should be settled as quickly as possible and that Microsoft should be allowed to get back to doing what it does best—creating and exploring new technologies to benefit our civilization now and in the future.

Rhoda Fiala

MTC–00005692

From: Patty MacDuffie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Proposed settlement is terrific! Go for it!

Patty MacDuffie

MTC–00005693

From: Robert Van Winkle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let this chapter close without additional litigation. The economy has suffered enough already and will only continue to suffer as this continues to go on.

This whole process has been a senseless act driven for the benefit of the few such as Sun, AOL and Oracle and not the people. I have yet to see any evidence in this whole process that people were harmed in any way.

Robert Van Winkle

MTC–00005694

From: Janell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop all further action against Microsoft—the current settlement is fair.

Phil Stover

MTC–00005695

From: Jay Cull
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that this settlement is fair and should be approved

MTC–00005696

From: Lepianka, Tamara
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe we have wasted enough time and money on this case. A settlement is in the best interest of all involved and the current agreement seems reasonable. I am disappointed that not all states accepted the settlement and continue to drag out an issue that will only continue to cost their states money. Especially at a time when funds would be better spent bolstering the economy, assisting families and reducing debt instead of throwing their state funds at an issue that has ceased to interest even the Information Technology industry, much less the general population. The case needs to be put to rest on ALL sides. I only hope that our judicial system exerts as much effort prosecuting foreign terrorists as it does in protecting? us from American companies.

Tamara W. Lepianka

Elizabethtown, KY

lepianka@infi.net

''MMS <hilliard.com>'' made the following annotations on 01/02/02 12:53:22

MTC–00005697

From: Chuck Newton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to put the Microsoft issue behind us, and the actions of various State Attorneys General fail to support the public interest in this matter. Suitable penalties have been adjudged on Microsoft, and further action at the state level on a matter which is predominately a matter of federal jurisdiction will do nothing to further the cause of consumers or government. By delay, it has just the opposite effect. My suspicion is that, like the tobacco settlement, the interest of the states is more for financial benefit than for consumer protection. These actions should be repudiated by the Justice Department, and a final settlement pursued with all due haste.

Charles G. Newton, Jr.

30 Bunker Hill Lane

East Greenwich RI 02818

MTC–00005698

From: scott cuddihy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The USDOJ needs to end/settle this situation asap.

I believe the USDOJ has been manipulated by competing businesses that could not win in the marketplace.

The consumer has a much easier and less expensive time with their computing needs today; then ever in history, thanks to Microsoft products. The purpose of anti-trust law is to protect the consumer who has not been harmed. Please pressure the 13 states attorneys general to stop their farce, their motivation is to benefit their own political careers, not aid the unharmed consumer.

Thank you,

Scott Cuddihy

MTC–00005699

From: Dennis Hardman
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is fair. Further litigation is NOT in the public interest.

Dennis Hardman

6210 88th Ave West

University Place, WA 98467

MTC–00005700

From: DonaldF342@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Industry and Government

A Great Nation-built upon Industry doing its thang, and Government doing it's. It is only when one or the other tries to interfere in the others' areas of expertise that the trouble begins. keep it a great nation. Back off this stupid Microsoft Vendetta. Go find Osama Bin Laden.

D.Fitzpatrick
627 NW 47 Avenue
Deerfield Beach, FL
33442

MTC–00005701

From: Jane Larkin
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Do you think it's a coincidence that it was when the DOJ first started persecuting Microsoft that the stock market started to crater? Please recognize that it is the health of companies like Microsoft that drive a prosperous economy. Let entrepreneurs be entrepreneurs—and for all our sakes stay out of the way.

MTC–00005702

From: stu96
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: lawsuit

its time to end this charade called a monopoly and get on with business the law suit was filed because of companies that couldnt compete if they had been given the keys to the barn.

MTC–00005703

From: Ryan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government should end its case against Microsoft Corporation. I am a re-entry student in my 40s and having Microsoft products has increase my chances to be re-employed.

Thank you
Ryan F Peters
351 Lone Tree Road
Oroville, California 95965

MTC–00005704

From: Steve n' Gwen Secor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: MicroSoft settlement

My concern is . . . Will the further action against Microsoft help ''fix'' the problem or just creat more caos?

Steve Secor

MTC–00005705

From: Mule887@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern: I would like to show my support for a settlement of the Microsoft case without further litigation. Nine states have already approved the offer which I believe is in the best interests of consumers.

Let the free enterprise system work.
William Marvin, Hooksett, NH

MTC–00005706

From: Chuck Schulien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

This case reminds me of the injustice the government did to the tobacco industry. For years our government has been making money off of tobacco with all the taxing, then you turnaround and sue them for billions! Now it seems that the States that missed out on the Tobacco settlement are jumping to get a piece of the Microsoft pie.

I never smoked a cigarette in my life. I would be glad to give the $300.00 back that the State of Illinois gave me, if the government would back off and stick to the business providing a safe place to live. People have a choice, they do not have to buy computers or cigarettes! We do however need a safe place to raise our families.

Chuck Schulien
8421 Parkdale Drive
North Richland Hills, TX 76180
817–514–1936

MTC–00005707

From: Roy Carlton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft

What the DOJ and the states have done to Microsoft borders on criminal acts. Microsoft has made my life as an accountant so much more easy. In addition, Microsoft has created more millionaire business owners who have spun off new products based on the Microsoft line of products. It's disgusting what the Federal and State Governments have done to a highly successful corporation. It's too bad we cannot sue former AG Janet Reno and President Bill Clinton for the damage this anti-trust action has done to the stock market.

Roy E. Carlton
6524 Gray Fox Curve
Chanhassen, MN 55317

MTC–00005708

From: Limitup16@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get the Microsoft settlement settled. This has dragged on for long enough without any benefit whatsoever for the consumer. The consumer has any number of choices. . . . Microsoft has done more for the economy than many government programs.

James W. Toole
1114 Baltimore Dr
Orlando FL 32810

MTC–00005709

From: MHarme5683@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:54pm
Subject: Freedom to Innovate.

To Whom it May Concern:

Please end all the litigation in reference to Microsoft. In the interest of the American economy and the right of Microsoft to continue on without further litigation is in every ones best interest. As a stockholder of Microsoft it truly aggravates me that all those states have entered into the litigation against Microsoft. I think they are trying to get a monetary settlement from the company without ever investing a penny in the company. If you can explain to me the damage that Microsoft has done to those individual states perhaps it would be easier to understand. I think we would be technologically behind if not for innovative companies like Microsoft. Stop paying all the lawyers and allow the company pay a dividend to the people that have invested in the company. Thanks for hearing me.

Mary Harmening

MTC–00005710

From: LMi3280257@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Approval

Approve this settlement and let's get this thing behind us!

Luana Miller,
San Rafael, CA

MTC–00005711

From: TJ Robinson, CPA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop this insane slide into a total depression by keeping one of the countries best companies doing what it does best. I have met no one that has been harmed by anything Microsoft has done if you exclude the competition. Things are cheaper, faster, and better.

MTC–00005712

From: PAUL G. BRUNNER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I THINK IT IS TIME FOR GREEDY MONEY HUNGARY STATES TO ALLOW THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF FREE ENTERPRISE WORK, THANK GOD FOR MICROSOFT, WE NEED MORE INOVATIVE BUSINESS INSTEAD OF USING THE COURT SYSTEM TO SLOW DOWN PROGRESS ENOUGH IS ENOUGH , I AM FED UPWITH THE COSTLY LAW SUITS THAT ACCOMPLISH VERY LITTLE EXCEPT SLOW DOWN THE COMPETITIVE SPIRIT, THERE ARE BETTER WAYS TO USE OUR COURT SYSTEM. I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO AFFORD MY COMPUTOR IF IT WEREN'T FOR MICROSOFT

SINCERELY
PAUL G. BRUNNER

MTC–00005713

From: Charles Roberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the honorable members of the court:

The revised proposed Final Judgement against Microsoft seems to me to be too harsh on Microsoft, however Microsoft has agreed to it and says they think it is fair. Therefore I urge you to impose the revised proposed Final Judgement and close the proceedings

for good. I am a computer user and have been for more than nineteen years. Microsoft products have been very good for me.

Charles E Roberts
628 N. Glenn Ave.
Springfield, MO 65801

MTC–00005714

From: Andy Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

It is important to America for the DOJ to settle the Microsoft litigation NOW. Thank you.

Andy Smith
Houlihan Smith & Company, Inc.
312–499–5910 Direct Phone
312–499–5901 Fax
www.houlihansmith.com

MTC–00005715

From: SabineMcManus@aol.com @inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Justice Department should leave Microsoft alone. The case against Microsoft is a pathetic embarrassment. We should be praising people like Bill Gates/Microsoft not suing him. Every time a company gets too successful, the government cracks down. I don't think Microsoft is a monopoly, and think that the only ''true monopoly'' is a government generated one. Obviously, Microsoft does not fall into this category. We are lucky to have entrepreneurs such as Bill Gates who create so much good for our society in the form technological advancement, jobs, and charitable organizations.

Sabine
Sabine McManus and Associates
Healthcare Search Consultants
433 North Camden Drive, Suite 600
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Tel: 310–205–2006
SabineMcManus@aol.com

MTC–00005716

From: Mr1031@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: Seattle area guy

I have resented seeing our court system miss used. Sure it is legal but is it right? I don't think it is.

This is no different from some business person using their influence to get a piece of real estate down zoned in order to drive out his competition. I feel the high tech industry should be allowed to innovate and grow and let the public decided what is best by what they choose to purchase. Any regulation the courts will establish today will likely be irrelevant in a year or more just because their is no way any group of legislators or judges can KNOW the future. If they could they would be in a different business. The public is watching and has a keen sense of FAIR and knows why the remanning states are holding out. Just like the guy who holds out selling his property to a developer who is assembling real estate for a project. He does it because he wants to gamble the developer will pay him the highest price for his property. Have you ever noticed when you see a large new project with one remaining old structure niche into the site? That is how those nine states holding out should find themselves. Maybe those states should be allowed to increase their state sales tax on any Microsoft products. . . . The buyer could buy mail order and skip them. These states will not join the others and settle until they feel they would get less. Right now their bottom side is covered and they only stand to appear as heroes if they get more for their state. That is a miss use of the courts.

Ron

MTC–00005717

From: Binney, Peter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attn US Dept of Justice,

Please accept this note from a constituent as a vote in favor of expeditious settlement of the Microsoft Anti-trust litigation. I think the settlement is more than fair to me (as a consumer of software products, I don't think I was harmed to begin with) and we need to put this behind us.

Thanks
Pete Binney
508–339–9213
Mansfield, MA 02048

MTC–00005718

From: Scott, Vivian
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: settlement

It is my feeling that this law suit has gone on long enough, cost the tax payers plenty of money and, in fact, probably shouldn't have happened at all.

Settle it and be done with it.

I would also like to know why the Mac has not been brought in to this mix. At least on the PC you have a choice for start up programs (and have always had a choice once they were written) whereas on the Mac it is limited to their operating system only. Doesn't that effectively cut the competitors out of the picture entirely. Isn't that what this is all about, the competition feeling they aren't able to compete?

Last I don't think the states should get anything. Talk about jumping on the band wagon. What consumers are they talking about getting taken advantage of. When I bought my computer I inquired about the cost when buying an operating system separately it was noticeably more then to buy as a package. I believe this is a fairly common practice in many venues. Again, settle and be done with it.

MTC–00005719

From: Deborah Merklin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

U.S. Dept. of Justice
Washington, DC

I vote that the U.S. Department of Justice do all that it can to expedite the Settlement as outlined in the Tunney Act.

Deborah Budz-Merklin
dbudzmerklin@earthlink.net
Fax—(815) 550–5169

MTC–00005720

From: H S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough foot dragging. Let's put an end to this settlement, and the sooner the better.

I think that DOJ should have other more revelant issues to pursue. Yes, Microsoft is powerful, but let consumers vote on that with their dollars. If they don't want to use Microsoft, that is their choice. Computers have always been about choice. If I don't like Microsoft, there is always an alternative.

MTC–00005721

From: winsonmc@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very much in support of the freedom to innovate, as a basic American freedom. Now that the court of appeals has rendered a decision, I feel it should be upheld and this issue brought to an end, so that the consumer, the people, can get on with their lives. In most fields, automobiles, appliances, etc. the parts of the different manufacturers are not interchangeable, why should they be in computers. This is what drives innovation and invention, so to the better innovator goes the spoils.

Sincerely,
I.C.McLendon M.D.

MTC–00005722

From: Ueli Jucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:55pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT IS PAST THE TIME TO FINISH THIS SETTLEMENT FOR THE HOLE COUNTRY.

UELI JUCKER

MTC–00005723

From: Matt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't want my hard earned tax money wasted any more! Settle this. Microsoft has done more our economy and has virtually created the software industry. We should end this and end it now!

Matt Fangman

MTC–00005724

From: Peter Kraushar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsot Settlement

To DOJ,

I would like to see this Microsoft litigation settled once and for all. I'm in favor of the recent settlement and want no further litigation. Further litigation benifits only a few wealthy people and hurts the US economy. Thank You,

Mike Kraushar (503) 469–0270
Northwest Scape Website Design Inc.
NetBizDomains Inc.
12614 NW Barnes Rd. #4
Portland, OR 97229

MTC–00005725

From: Bill (038) Robin

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the proposed settlement with Microsoft is more than fair and adequate. Microsoft has done nothing to harm me in anyway, and I have never requested any assistance from my elected officials in protecting me from something that I simply do not need protection from. This whole mess is nothing more than a trumped up case by some of Microsoft's competitors because they would rather spend their time and resources fighting Microsoft rather than developing a better ''mouse''! The actions by the states to tag along is simply a carry over from the tobacco cases in hopes of adding a lot of cash to their coffers. I wonder if all this would be taking place if Microsoft were located in Utah? I truly do not understand the concern about integrated software applications. As a software user, I demand integrated applications that are designed to work together which is exactly what Microsoft has produced. Let's get on with the many more important things that our country needs to be worrying about and stop this senseless flow of money to a bunch of high paid lawyers and politicians..it has really been and continues to be stupid!!!!

Thank you,
Bill Johnson

MTC–00005726

From: John Hall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: settlement

Tell Bill to keep fighting and keep a stiff upper lip!

I'm on his side as a small stock holder!
John R. Hall

MTC–00005727

From: Ron Huxtable
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone. They've done more for the U.S. economy that all of their competitors put together, through jobs creation, charitable gifts, formation of new companies 'living' off of the success of Microsoft products due to worldwide consumer acceptance, and on and on. The consumer will only be adversely affected by further government intervention—innovation and prices will go up.

Thank you for your consideration—
Ron Huxtable

MTC–00005728

From: Fritz Turton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Prosecute the guilty, not the successful. The government has extracted its pound of flesh, Clinton is a bad memory, go chase the Arabs!!! Fred Turton

MTC–00005729

From: Eric—Koach@Dell.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

If you are asking for opinions, mine is quite simple. Drop the suit and allow the free enterprise system that founded this country to take care of this situation.

Regards,
Eric Koach
Global Enterprise Account Manager
Dell Computer Corporation
Office 281.361.7384
Mobile 281.352.5121
Mail to eric—koach@dell.com
www.dell.com

MTC–00005730

From: BHall36071@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like my opinion counted. I think the settlement should go through, as it is currently proposed, and not delayed any longer. The only parties benefiting from this continued arguing are the competitors, not the consumers. The consumers are already benefiting from the innovation of Microsoft and don't need any further benefits. The consumers have choices, and Microsoft is not causing the consumers harm by innovating in the industry. We appear to be an ungrateful nation and we appear to try to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Stop this nonsense and let Microsoft continue to innovate, and settle this lawsuit against them. Settle the suit as the settlement negotiations now stand, and put this behind us. It will be best for the nation and the economy.

H. William Hall
1125 N. 26th St.
Tacoma, WA., 98403

MTC–00005731

From: Barton L. Hinkle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly urge acceptance of the Microsoft Settlement as it has been developed, provisions of which have been accepted as fair and reasonable by the Justice Department and which have been agreed to by Microsoft. In my opinion, further haggling about specific items is not in the best interests of consumers.

MTC–00005732

From: Khushcpa@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: waste of money

Your tackling of the microsoft issue is a total waste of money and is tacitly unfair . to tear down the most influential company in the world and the one that has made the united states a poweful country is absurd. spend your time and money doing something constructive instead of destroying the bastion of capitalism.

Khush Bodhan CPA

MTC–00005733

From: Ellen ching
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the reviced proposed Final Judgment is tough but fair. I will definitely like to see this case closed for good. Prolonging this case creates more harm than good; it is a drain to tax payer and the economy.

MTC–00005734

From: ROBERT K RODEN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Representative of the Dept of Justice,

Perhaps Microsoft does have a dominant position in the computer software market place. That is precisely why I invested in that company. The technology and ease of use offered by microsoft and my computer maker is what this market place is looking for.

Microsoft is not a monopoly in the market place. They have competition. (Unlike my local telephone company, cable company, etc. etc.) Computer users and consumers are smart enough to find alternate browser software. I get several discs in the mail (unsolicited as well) from different ISPs that use Netscape, Microsoft, etc. You plug it in and it does the work. Or, the keyword system allows users to find free downloads of about any type that works within my microsoft system and they are not microsoft product.

Now that my government has dragged Microsoft through the mud and they have offered a settlement, I think you should take it and stop wasting the resources of a company that brings more efficiency of technology to the U.S than any other company in the world.

Sincerely,
Robert K. Roden
4281 Heritage Drive
Hudsonville, MI 49426

MTC–00005735

From: Paul
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please don't delay the settlement any longer. Microsoft has been a good company; they provide quality support and have the customer's best interest in mind. Any good businessperson knows the most important rules of how to increase sales. Number one is to have a quality product that you believe in and number two is keep the customer satisfied. Microsoft does both very well.

MTC–00005736

From: Brian L. Dontje
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this case now. You were wrong to have filed it or pursued it.

Brian L. Dontje
President
UDS Green Industry Software, Inc.
brian@udsgis.com

MTC–00005737

From: Sherri Starr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please, please settle this...your attack on Microsoft was unfair and unnecessary to the company and the public. The settlement reached is more than fair and this matter should be put to an end. It is amazing that

you could spend more trying to kill Microsoft than you could spend in getting Bin Laden and his groups. I had hoped that a more reasonable and honest voice had taken over the DOJ.

Sherri Starr
Gleneden Beach, Oregon

MTC–00005738

From: Craig Fischer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi DOJ,

I am an employee of Microsoft Corporation in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Although I believe the lawsuit is based on assertions that were trumped up by our competitors and are baseless, I am in favor of this settlement. This will hopefully get the government monkey off our backs so we can continue to be the best U.S. company ever and the best worldwide!

Sincerely,
Craig J. Fischer

MTC–00005739

From: SFILLPMR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

USDOJ, microsoft has violated no law's—I as a consumer am glad to see this all come to a final resolution. Scott J. Fillmore

MTC–00005740

From: Mike Holmes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen of the DOJ:

As a citizen, taxpayer and voter as well as a small business owner, I am voicing my opinion regarding the Microsoft Case and the Proposed Settlements, etc.

I am a staunch supporter of free enterprise and sound business practices. Moreover, I am also a believer in providing products that are of value to consumers and making an honest profit from such enterprise.

In my opinion, and I consider it an ''informed'' opinion, Microsoft has been wrongly harassed in this entire issue. In addition to developing a business profile that makes a profit by serving the consumer needs as well as investing in providers and competitors, the key executives at Microsoft have followed the American Business Profile in an admirable fashion.

While some in Federal and State Government feel that business should be not-for-profit and service the common good without regard to profitability, I live in the real world. Microsoft has continued to create systems that make it easier for me to work as well as providing a common platform for non-Microsoft programs to run on my computer.

My desire is that the DOJ and various state governments spend time and money pursuing the drug dealers and the child pornographers that are dramatically damaging our country's most valuable resources, our youth. Leave Microsoft alone. Cheer Bill Gates and his execs for generating taxable revenues, providing jobs, giving to charity and helping to make the world of computers easier for us 50 year-old dinosaurs to use in everyday business applications.

If you notice, this e-mail is sent from a non-Microsoft connections, using Netscape as my browser. I use WIndows XP and Office 2000 in my everyday work!

Sincerely,
Michael P. Holmes
12671 West 116th St.
Overland Park, KS 66210
913–498–2626

MTC–00005741

From: Mahalle@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: settlement

Settlement is best for the economy. The downtern started with gonernment action against Microsoft. Experience has shown that breaking up companies is not for the best. Telephone was broken up and then the parts started merging. Competition must not be stifled but creativity should not be punished.

MTC–00005742

From: optimal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do believe that the settlement entered on Nov 6, 2001 is fair and is in the public interest.

Thanks,
Mike Sarieh

MTC–00005743

From: Dr. James F. Gaines
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Ma'am: Drop the case against microsoft. As a comsumer I'm confident that after comparison shopping in the computer stores Microsoft has excellent products at fair prices. Give it up and use my tax dollars for something constructive. The consumers have been trteated fairly by Microsoft.

James F. Gaines, DVM, MS

MTC–00005744

From: belize bound
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm

All govt, states, officials leave microsoft alone!!! govern and leave microsoft alone. thank you,

MTC–00005745

From: ArnoldfS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time that the DOJ accepts a just settelment with Microsoft and concentrates on other more urgent matters affecting our country; ie. war and terrorism.

Microsoft is being used by the AJ's of the nine states to further their private political ambitions—with DOJ's blessings, it seems. ''Cease and desist'' are terms DOJ should be familiar with even when they are addressed to the DOJ itself.

Arnoldfs@aol.com
CC:MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00005746

From: Frank Griffin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am happy to hear there is resolution of this matter at hand. It has been, and is, my belief that Microsoft competitors have used the Federal and State Attorneys General as a tool to attempt to whip up on Microsoft. There are certainly more important matters for the Attorneys General, both state and federal to deal with than this matter. Thank you for bringing this matter to an end.

Frank Griffin

MTC–00005747

From: Robert Cunningham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am greatly concerned that the lawsuit against Microsoft was brought in the first place. Microsoft has brought this nation some of the finest software that can be found resulting in a more efficient, economical use of the computer. This has had a tremendous positive impact on the economy of this country. I agree that Microsoft is a tenacious competitor but strongly disagree that it represents any type of monopoly. Any and all software manufacturers have the right and the opportunity to create software and market it to the public in any manner they desire. To even suggest that Microsoft has PROHIBITED them from doing so is ludicrous.

I believe the terms of the settlement are excessive and should have never reached this state, but in the interests of trying to prevent the continued harrassment by those with less tenacity and to get this economy back on track, the settlement should be accepted and this entire socialistic venture should be closed with embarrassment to all who participated in promoting this undemocratic, unjustified action.

Robert E. Cunningham, Sr.
321 Cypress Street
Destin, FL 32541
cunningham1148@home.com

MTC–00005748

From: J1ws@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:00pm
Subject: (no subject)

I have had the opportunity to review the settlement reached with Microsoft and the department of Justice. There is no question in my mind that this agreement is in the best interest of the consumer and meets the needs of creating a level field of competition. It is apparent that the competition will never be satisfied and will lobby until they simply can no longer succeed. Lets get on with business, Microsoft is being penalized enough as well as the consumer. Jim Smallman

MTC–00005749

From: Jimmy Boyle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

I think it is time to end this ordeal. It has been clear tome that this suit by the Justice department was a political move prompted

by the competition of Microsoft. The settlement assures the completion that they will have a chance to compete with Microsoft. If their products succeed then that will be fine. But if their products do not succeed you will hear from them again saying Microsoft has done some naughty and they want protection and maybe even some money to support their egos.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Boyle

MTC–00005750

From: Linda Simoneau
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to support a settlement of Microsoft. It seems ludicrous at this point in time that we would consider further litigating this matter. I feel that Microsoft should have the authority to innovate their products without fear of litigation. It seems that there are many more important issues in the United States that need legal attention and this is certainly not one of them.

I would urge the legislature to work towards a swift settlement of this matter.

Very Truly Yours,
Linda Simoneau

MTC–00005751

From: W R Hutchison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: MIcrosoft Settlement

Gentlemen—

I am in favor of settling this matter as soon as possible.

W.R. Hutchison

MTC–00005752

From: userln6304@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Innovation has made the US the greatest country in the history of the world.The action in the Microsoft case should be summarily dropped.

Userln6304@aol.com.

MTC–00005753

From: Lien Louis-rp2957
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam

I have been working in the computer related field for twenty years. The competition in this high tech area is very high. Only good quality products with good service can survive in such highly competitive business. Microsoft gained its market share by providing good products to the public. Without good product, Microsoft will not survive. I always believe free innovation and competition is the best way to ensure that consumers will get the benefit of good products and service. There is no need from government to continue wasting tax payers' money in arguing what majority of the people have agreed.

Government should spend its energy in creating better job environment for American people. I believe the Microsoft settlement is good for the consumers, the industry and the American economy. Let's focus on improving our current economy environment that everyone will benefit from it. I support the settlement between Microsoft and federal government and nine states.

Sincerely,
Louis Lien

MTC–00005754

From: Cipolla Art-XTSS05
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I find it annoying that that a few Microsoft competitors are trying to hold up the settlement. These companies such as Sun are thinking about nothing other than themselves. Microsoft and Dell are two of the only companies that want to commoditize the market segments that they serve. They are willing to operate off small margins and make the software or hardware widely available. Most of their competitors talk the standards game but implement nothing but proprietary software and hardware.

The current settlement is more than fair for the competitors. Don't further disrupt the market by considering additional measures driven by Microsoft competitors.

Regards,
Arthur F Cipolla

MTC–00005755

From: James Reilly
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madam or Sirs:

I have been very interested and am very pleased with the Federal Government's Decision to an agreement and settlement with Microsoft Corporation. The interest of our country and our economy are best served by this settlement, and affording both parties to move forward without additional legal hassels.

The importance of integrated software and the attractiveness of packaging this into products that enhance the user's familiarity and productivity is most important. I think these aims are well served by the settlement, also.

James S. Reilly MD
Chairman, Department of Surgery
DuPont Hospital for Children
Nemours Children's Clinic
Willmington, Delaware

MTC–00005756

From: RooRoo469@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi my opinion of the Microsoft Settlement is it is WAY TOO WEAK. Microsoft is a total monopoly and has all the parallels of companies of the robber baron days. They choose companies they feel threaten their monopoly and crush them with ''free'' software giveaways and upgrades. They insert pieces of code to make competitor's software run unpredictably, and do not release API's to competitors in a fair fashion. They set all their own ''standards'' and ignore the rest of the industry. I think a good start would have been splitting Microsoft into at least two parts and imposing some REAL restrictions, not the current restrictions that will do nothing to stop Microsoft's anti-competitive ways. I could go on and on but suffice to say the settlement is far from what is actually needed to preserve free enterprise in the USA. Microsoft's ''Freedom to Innovate'' defense is a farce.

Thank you,
Andrew Fox

MTC–00005757

From: Colin Samuelson II
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to settle the Microsoft Case. The settlement is good the American economy, and the indusry in general. Cease the litigation and let's move on.

MTC–00005758

From: Jay Atherton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/1/02 9:04pm
Subject: settlement

I see no harm about Microsoft and it's performance in the marketplace. Without them, this industry would have been 10 years behind everyone else. I support them completely.

Jay Atherton

MTC–00005759

From: Schott, Jim
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I wholeheartedly support the settlement agreement reached between the DOJ, the nine states and Microsoft. The time has come to bring resolution to this drawn-out affair and stop the squandering of taxpayer dollars. It is blatantly obvious that Microsoft's competitors are pressing a handful of states for continued litigation, not ''injured'' consumers. The reality is that consumers have benefited greatly from Microsoft's innovation and the industry's standardization on Windows as the preferred operating system. The speed and ease of use of personal computers have increased exponentially while the cost to consumers has plummeted. THIS IS A GOOD THING! The remedies proposed in the DOJ settlement are tough but fair to all parties. Please do not allow a few of Microsoft's competitors to misuse the legal system to compensate for what they could not achieve in the free marketplace.

Thank you!
Jim Schott
14921 SE 65th Street
Bellevue, WA 98006

MTC–00005760

From: Fred Infortunio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this and let Microsoft Get Back to Work.

This is a fast moving industry and a quick completion of this matter will serve all.

The restrictions put in place along with the oversight seem to be fair. the continuing

oversight will provide the direction for future fairness. How far do we have to go to hobble one of the greater engines of our society?

Fred Infortunio, MBA, PE
LCMS
Phone: 856–810–9074
Fax: 856–810–9073
E-Mail Address: LCMS@jersey.net
God Bless America

MTC–00005761

From: Raj Jhanwar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft Settlement is good for customers and should be a good foundation for long term.

Raj

MTC–00005762

From: Howard Chu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

RE: The Microsoft case should be settled—the earlier the better

DOJ has / had spent enough. These $$$$$ / time they spent can be used to do something better.

Let MS spend her $$$$$ / time to bring us software. Why on Earth DOJ forces MS to spend her $$$$$ / time just playing around with DOJ?

Let's STOP all these.

Thank you.

B. Rgds.

Howard Chu

–/hc

MTC–00005763

From: Phillip Rubin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This has gone on way too long.

As a consumer and small business owner, Microsoft has made a lot of very good things possible. They take care of their customers better than nearlly every other technology company, and certainly better than the telecommunications companies. The settlement offer is reasonable and the states should not impede it further.

Please get this resolved once and for all.

MTC–00005764

From: Art and terry jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice:

I strongly support your settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case. This settlement is good for the country's economy and also provides sufficient control of Microsoft's corporate behavior. Any further attempt by the 9 remaining states to extend the penalties in this case is not in the best interests of the nation. Instead, these attempts seem to originate with Microsoft's competitors rather than with consumers. I thank you for your hard work in trying to provide a final settlement so we can get on with business as usual. I trust this settlement will allow the U.S. high-tech industry to continue to prosper in the global market.

Sincerely,
Arthur Jones

MTC–00005765

From: Charles Mc Grath
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Justice

To the D.O.J.

Please give microsoft a chance to survive in such a gloomy economy ,and the stock holders a chance to make a profit.

Thank You
Charles Mc Grath

MTC–00005766

From: Robert Alberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement agreement is more than fair for both the States and the consumers.

Bob Alberts

MTC–00005767

From: Patrick Settle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Trial

Greetings,

I have attached my Comments on the Microsoft Anti-trust Trial, to this email in Rich Text Format (RTF). I have also included the text of the document in this email below.

If additional information in is needed please let me know.

Patrick Settle
IT Manager
5221 42nd Street NW Apt. B
Washington, DC 20015
202–321–7370
hyrcan@speakeasy.net (personal email)
psettle@worldwatch.org (work email)

Comments:
Patrick Settle
5221 42nd Street NW Apt. B
Washington, DC 20015
Friday, December 28, 2001

Renata Hesse
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530

Greetings,

As an Information Technology professional, and user of Microsoft products, with over six years of professional experience in the computer industry, I have seen the negative impacts to the computer industry brought upon it by Microsoft. Their unethical business practices which allowed them to evolve into a monopoly, and their current attempts to maintain that monopoly has stifled a great deal of technology innovations, along with damaging business opportunities for other companies.

I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. Microsoft has already been found in violation, and this is the penalty phase of the case, but the settlement contains no penalties and actually advances Microsoft's operating system monopoly.

A just penalty, would at barest minimum include three additional features:

* Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

* The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public, so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of ''hooks'' that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

* Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the Internet.

As the judge has suggested the national interest is at issue here, therefore it is crucial that Microsoft's operating system monopoly not be extended. Allowing Microsoft's Monopoly to stand, and in fact increase, weakens our national security by the creation of an information monoculture. As Paul A Strassmann states, ''Info-terrorists and criminals will continue to take advantage of the ever-growing proliferation of flaws in the gigantic Microsoft system, consisting of hundreds of millions of lines of failure-prone code.'' In closing, the outcome of this case will affect us not only to day but the future of information technology, and the nation. A thorough and though out penalty is far more important to the health of the nation than is a hasty one.

Thank you for you time.

Patrick Settle
5221 42nd Street NW Apt.B
Washington, DC 20015
202–321–7370
hyrcan@speakeasy.net

MTC–00005768

From: GMCSJERRY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I agree that settlement is good for the industry and the American economy. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy Microsoft competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest. Enough is enough!

s/Jerry S. Strunk

649 Rainbow Blvd.
Lady Lake, FL 32159

MTC–00005769

From: Jeff Albers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I understand that the DOJ is required to offer a period of public comment regarding the proposed Microsoft settlement, prior to the final determination of whether or not the settlement is in the ''public interest''. As a U.S. citizen, a consumer, a financial professional, and as a private investor, I wholeheartedly support the proposed settlement of this case. Although I have no affiliation or financial dependence on Microsoft, I believe that this case has been a drag on our U.S. economy and as such has done nothing but exacerbate recessionary pressures. I believe that the people of the United States are anxious to recover and move on from the current economic recession and the events of this past year. The Microsoft settlement would aid in this recovery with the removal of the ''black cloud'' hanging over the technology side of our economy.

I believe that Microsoft has gotten the message regarding their competitive business conduct, and have already paid a very high price. The only benefactors of a continuation of the suit are a few competitors of Microsoft.... Certainly not the general public or the U.S. economy. I hope that the DOJ and the handful of states will not be influenced by a few self serving special interest groups and will finalize this settlement, as it is in the best ''public interest''.

Thank you for your time.
Jeff C. Albers, CFP, CLU, ChFC
ALBERS & COMPANY, INC.
950 Pacific Ave., Suite 620
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone: 253–596–0601
Fax: 253–572–1499
www.alberscompany.com

MTC–00005770

From: CaryBisset@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement terms as described by Microsoft and the US government and the 9 states in accord is the right choice for the consumer and business interests.

Microsoft continues to innovate, commoditize services and support and partners with thousands of software developers, resellers and other small, medium and large businesses which ensures fair competition and enhances each of those businesses bottom line. Microsoft is the best business partner I've ever had.....and as a consumer I am thankful there is a prevalent way to communicate with any person I want via the internet and office applications that Microsoft has built in the last 25 years!

Carol Luber
215–640–0960
1835 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

MTC–00005771

From: Daniel L Christie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: micorsoft settlement

We feel it is vital to thee economy and to the stockholders that the settlement already made be finalized. Micorsoft is an important part of our life savings, we are 88, and 92 years old and have already lost over 20%of our retirement money. We do not wish to lose any more. Further micorsoft is the key leader to rebuilding the economy of not only the U.S. but the entire globle welbeing.

Lets get it over.
Dan Christie & Betty Christie

MTC–00005772

From: LAST
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. lets drop the litigation and let microsoft get back to what it does best.....innovative products and an industry standard.

Dr. Richard Laban
Harrisburg PA

MTC–00005773

From: A415A@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe Microsoft has suffered enought at the expense of the government and its competitors. I believe the US government and State's government should back off and give Microsoft a fair settlement and allow them to go back to providing the public with the good software and services they are known for. In my opinion the government's interferance has already cost us, the general public, a great deal in lost services of Microsoft. Microsoft should be rewarded, not penalized, for the great work and services they have provided us in the past at a very reasonable price

Sincerely yours
George Ellis
Civil Engineer

MTC–00005774

From: Ron B
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel the proposed settlement in the Microsoft action is appropriate as is and should be finalized. I have never felt financially harmed by any of the marketing statagies of Microsoft in the past. It's time to move on and let free enterprise work for our betterment.

Sincerely,
Ron Berich

MTC–00005775

From: Donald Baudrand
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have followed the Microsoft litigation closely. It is time for me to express my opinion: Microsoft has contributed greatly to the technology that makes computers useful, and even essential. I compare their contribution to that of Henry Ford's development of the production line that lead to automation, making the US an international power economically. Microsoft has done as much or more. The people who consider Microsoft a monopoly are primarily its competitors, of which there are many. I have studied constitutional law, history, and present related laws. I believe Microsoft has done little, if anything, wrong, legally or morally. It would be a blow to the advance of technology to find Microsoft guilty of any wrong doing.

Donald W. Baudrand
Consultant

MTC–00005776

From: Ed Largaespada
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think is time to settle this case as proposed by Microsoft to DOJ (and a few States). Microsoft brought to the market an innovative product. It should not be penalized for the economic success and the market dominance that, once again, only reflect the good products introduced to the American and World Market.

Thanks for your attention to this matter and please feel free to contact me:

Ed Largaespada
8261 SW 128 Street, #109
Miami, FL 33156
(305) 259–9345

MTC–00005777

From: mark—hoffman@
notes.teradyne.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Re: Public comment

I am a professional user of computers with little personal interest in the settlement of the Microsoft case. I am not an expert on law or on this case. I do believe that Microsoft is effectively a monopoly and is not serving the general public well. Also, they seem to have not changed their ways since the suit was first brought.

I don't think that the proposed settlement sufficiently addresses the problems that make it difficult for competitors to offer users a choice. As I see it the issues are It should be easier for other companies to integrate their products into the OS. It should be easier to get bugs acknowledged and fixed. Security should be a higher priority and better.

It would be a great help if the application part of Microsoft were split off from the OS part. The application part would be on equal footing with other application companies to get information and bug fixes from the OS part of Microsoft. The companies could negotiate with eachother about what SW parts would be better off in the OS and pay royalties or whether it would be better to just provide the hooks for whatever SW would be inserted. The government might have to help set up a standards committee for this.

The alternative would be for Microsoft to make its code available and to give appropriately timed warnings when it would change. I think that this would be harder to control and slow innovation down.

These comments are mine, personally, and don't represent the views of my employer.
Mark S. Hoffman
Burlington MA

MTC–00005778

From: Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:
Please do not impose any more harm upon Microsoft than was placed upon its customers. That is to say, if you can quantify how much less the consumers should have paid for their Windows software, that should be the damages.
I, for one, would gladly pay again for the use of this software. As the browser was free, as are many updates from Msft, there would be no harm there. I have both Netscape and IE on my computer and I never use Netscape unless I have to.
Mike Stoddard
Tampa, Florida

MTC–00005779

From: Pedro Ferreira
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I consider the settlement correct and fair.
Pedro Chaves Ferreira

MTC–00005780

From: retredmed@cchat.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It seems to me that the government has forgotten that in these United States one is supposed to be able to attain their highest goals. It seems to me that those who have complained about Microsoft are nothing more than entities that envy their position. Its too bad they didn't have the brain power to come up with the innovations that Microsoft has.
I feel that any settlement should never have been. Microsoft has made it possible for the average person to have massive computing power. However, if Microsoft is willing to settle something that should never have been, then I have no problem. From what I can see the settlement is fair to all but Microsoft.
R.E. Lee

MTC–00005781

From: Rebard@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft
Please settle this conflict with Microsoft as quickly as possible. Microsoft has built a much needed base for all computing where many products can work together, in no way has it hurt consumers.
Thank you for your attention.
Barbara V. Rebard,
Redding Calif.

MTC–00005782

From: Josh Moultray
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
A quick response to the Microsoft settlement:
It should finally be over, whatever the resolution. Since the DOJ and Microsoft have agreed I think it is in the best interests of all consumers that the case be finished and that Microsoft again focus its energy on innovation rather than litigation.
If this were a vote, I would cast a Yes, agree to the settlement.
Thanks,
Josh Moultray
Site Technology Coordinator
The Jewish Day School of Metropolitan Seattle
JMoultray@JDS.org
<mailto:JMoultray@JDS.org>
425–460–0235

MTC–00005783

From: Philip Szanto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is vital to our countrys economic well being that a Microsoft Settlement allowing the company the freedom to continue to prosper is concluded. Microsoft is an American success story producing a product consumed by the world. It would be a terrible tragedy if a shortsided decision hurt the company so that leadership in computer software went overseas!!

MTC–00005784

From: Jeff Welbourne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Settle, and let this company continue to provide the technology that has done so much for our country, the world and their industry.

MTC–00005785

From: Tiger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: David Beers
9220 Clarewood No. 1004
Houston, Tx 77036
As regards the Microsoft Settlement, It is in my opinion fair and equitable to all parties.

MTC–00005786

From: janell peyton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I think the case needs to be settled and has been going on for too long.
Janell Peyton

MTC–00005787

From: Sarah Del Degan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is time to bring closure to this nonsense. Too many tax payer dollars have already been spent to support the outcrys of a few competitors that see their future threatened by a more innovative company in Microsoft.
The state of the economy and confidence of the people are in no position to receive more negative news about a company that has literally created the software industry, which has provided tens of thousands of jobs in this country. It's time to move on.
The Del Degans

MTC–00005788

From: Werner Glass
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:13pm
Subject: Settlement
Keep the ability to innovate alive in America. Settle with MS so they can get on with developing better software.
Werner Glass

MTC–00005789

From: Funair, Joe
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir or Madam:
This is to notify you that I am concerned over the potential of the case against Microsoft dragging out and severely retarding the economic recovery underway. Microsoft has become a major constituent part of our economy and directly impacts the economies of many nations throughout the world. The economic problems that were brought about by this unfair and punishing case against Microsoft has done much damage to the world economy. It must be brought to a swift and fair conclusion so we all can move on in a predictable and orderly progression.
Please do not punish Microsoft for being successful—It is Un-American and UnFair!
Joseph D. Funair
Titan Systems Corporation
Systems and Imagery Division
Director, Business Development
321–727–0660 x2244
jfunair@titan.com

MTC–00005790

From: Steve GOODRICH
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Dear Sir or Madam,
I urge you to approve and conclude the pending settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case. The perceived antitrust problems have been addressed, to the extent possible considering the nature of the technology industry, by the settlement agreement. I do not believe that any benefit to consumers (as opposed to lawyers, judges, and Microsoft competitors) will be realized from continuing this case.
Thank you for your time and cooperation.
Steven C. Goodrich
5535 E. Elmwood
Mesa AZ 85205
email: sgoodrich@teramarstaffing.com

MTC–00005791

From: jamesmunro@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please add my name to the list of those who support the proposed settlement and wish to see an end to the litigation which, I believe, has been instrumental in the general business recession that had its beginning in April of 2000. As Microsoft goes so does not go the business of the United

States, but Microsoft is a giant, no worse and perhaps not much better than its critics. Microsoft is big enough to count as a Dow-Jones index component, and bad business in general is made worse when Microsoft flounders. I believe that time is now of the essence whereby the company can begin to concentrate on its business at hand and perhaps lead us to a recovery.

Very truly yours,
/s/James S Munro, Jr.
84 Summer Street
Nahant, MA 01908

MTC–00005792

From: Billy Hurt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:14pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe that further litigation by those refusing to accept the DOJ agreement with Microsoft is in the best interests of the public, the American economy or the investor's in MSFT. We saw state's greed dominate the ''settlement'' of the case against the tobacco companies. Much of the money that went to the states will never see it's way into those avenues that serve the general public's interest. Will we see a similar thing with the states that are now pursuing further punitive measures against Microsoft?

Please accept and enforce the settlement arrived at between the DOJ and Microsoft.

Billy G. Hurt
bghurt1@apex.net

MTC–00005793

From: chuck soyars
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone. We (the consumer) benefit by microsoft's position. If a company ever gets to the point antitrust laws are designed to prevent, in a free market economy, competitors would pop up to challenge their position making antitrust laws unneccessary. I also believe them to be unconstitutional, but thats another argument.

A small business owner
Chuck Soyars

MTC–00005794

From: Martell Lindsay
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

HOW CAN ANY ONE CONTEND THAT THE CONSUMER WAS OVER CHARGED. GOOD GRIEF—JUST LOOK AT THE PRICING. I CONSIDER THE MICROSOFT OPERATING SYSTEM ONE OF THE BEST VALUES I HAVE EVER RECEIVED!

Martell Lindsay
101 Leaview Lane
Chagrin Falls, OH 44022

MTC–00005795

From: Gary Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

This matter needs to be settled. No one but the Attornies are gaining a thing from this suit. Microsoft has done a world of good in creating these operating systems and has done no more wrong than the others would have done to Microsoft if they would have been the leaders. The only thing this is doing for the American people is to make software & hardware prices skyrocket for us consumers. Just as it has done for the price of cigarettes. Put a stop to it.

Thank You.
Gary F. Allen
30741
garya807@mindspring.com

MTC–00005796

From: Maryln Pedgrift
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Gentlemen:

Gentlemen:

My wish for Microsoft is no more litigation. I believe they have concluded it fairly already.

Best wishes for a better year.
Maryln@primeline.com

MTC–00005797

From: Darrell C. Brett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Let's get this settled and get the tech economy moving again—What Microsft has agreed to is more than enough and the justice dept needs to expedite closure to this matter.
Darrell
Brett Portland OR

MTC–00005798

From: Cam Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: MS settlement

Please end this litigation promptly. No further litigation is needed! The settlement reached between the Federal Government and the nine states and Microsoft is tough, reasonable, and fair to all parties involved. It seems most consumers agree the settlement is good for the computer/software industry, the American Economy, and us! So, please end this litigation promptly!

Thank you,
Cam Taylor,
ctaylor@ee.net

MTC–00005799

From: Ruud de Jonge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Please sign the settlement

It's crucial fot the future of competition and the IT industry that this settlement is confirmed.

Regards,
Ruud de Jonge
IT Professional
The Netherlands

MSN Foto's is de eenvoudigste manier om je foto's te delen en af te drukken: http://photos.msn.nl/Support/WorldWide.aspx

MTC–00005800

From: Ben Goodwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been using Microsoft products for the past 15 years. I continue to believe that the value, support, and productivity gains represent a tremendous value proposition to me as a consumer.

My own view is that much of the furor over Microsoft has been generated by their competitors, who having failed to win in the competitive market, look to the judicial system to provide relief. Let the market and the consumers decide on value and when you do—Microsoft wins—hands down. Ben Goodwin

MTC–00005801

From: Barry Woodard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm

The government should settle this case against Microsoft. Enough money has been spent, and I think the settlement will allow all parties to ''get back to business''.

Barry Woodard
San Francisco

MTC–00005802

From: Tinsleyl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want DOJ to know that the whole attempt by the antitrust Judge to attack Microsoft from the bench the way he did when he did not even understand computers and what makes them effecient was a gross miscarriage of justice for a judge to act as that one did.

However, it is time to settle but I do not agree with the few states who want to drag the settlement out. The case needs to be settled now! To drag it out reeks of the same miscarriage of justice that that judge committed and it is certainly not in the best interests of the American public.

Jim Tinsley

MTC–00005803

From: rick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern

I think the Microsoft case should be setteled immediately. The settelement agreed to by the states and the DOJ is reasonable. Any further litigation or other government involvement will simply result in unwise use of both Microsoft and Government resources and contribute to further delay in enabling software to contribute to productivity improvements for the US economy.

Richard Bjorklund

MTC–00005804

From: David Griffith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a software engineer and have operated in many facets of the software and networking world for the past 5 years. Somewhat new to the industry, I came into this with a non-bias opinion and have been able to formulate one based on experience.

I don't see Microsoft as a monopoly. Contrary, I think that most software vendors lack the inoventention of Microsoft due to the lack of vision. Many software vendors are more concerned about producing mass software in a cookie cutter fashion and treat

the software industry like a manufacturing one. The downside, is we are not an assembly line and software produced like it is comes out looking like it.

I respect Microsoft ability to adjust to growing market trends, changes, and expansion. Most companies lack the ability to do that as well. Cisco, Macintosh, producers of Linux and Unix are all guilty of producing products that constantly look and operate the same as their predicessors. I used to own a Mac and I don't see much that has changed over the years, other than the fact that they have tried to simulate what Microsoft has done in order to stay competitive. Linux vendors are just as guilty of copy-catting. On the topic of government involvement, is one issue I have strong oppinions. The consumer is currently getting a better deal with more feature rich applications from every software vender including Microsoft, than ever before. Government intervention on this matter only slows that process and hurts the consumer. Any action government takes to change the way software is delivered will only mean dollars costs to the consumer.

Microsoft does not use competitors technology advancements to advance their own or use their dollars in a way that constitutes unfair competition. They just deliver quality and quantitative software. I hope that my opinion matters and that government will realize the impact of their involvement and resolve this matter completely.

Thanks,
David Griffith

MTC–00005806

From: Roland Pohlman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:17pm
Subject: Leave Micorsoft Alone

Please let micorsoft to inovate and dream. They have helped the world with all of there inovations. Do not punish them because they have helped everyone in so my ways. What would our world be without micorsoft?

Please let micorsoft to inovate and dream. They have helped the world with all of there inovations. Do not punish them because they have helped everyone in so my ways. What would our world be without micorsoft?

MTC–00005807

From: MORGIK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: (no subject)

Gentlemen:

The fact that our country is the beneficiary of a Company like Microsoft who researched, invested to be a leader in the software industry, makes me wonder what interest those belligerent states are pursuing. I have an idea, but I am not certain. I, as an old computer software user hope some reasonable people will do something with those out of touch states.

Thank you.
Mihail

MTC–00005808

From: John Reilly
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I would like to endorse the Microsoft Settlement as a fair compromise. Microsoft is in the position that it is because it provides the products that customers want. While I believe that they did do some inappropriate things, a larger remedy would not be beneficial to anyone. The software/hardware market changes so quickly that companies need to be innovative and fast. Microsoft's competitors only have themselves to blame for the failure of their expensive, proprietary solutions.

Thank you for your consideration of this email.

Regards,
John P. Reilly
President
Dynamic Applications, Inc.

MTC–00005809

From: JeffressR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After reading the documents and having read and followed the lawsuit and judgements thus far we think it is time to finally settel this mess. To take this case further is not productive to Microsoft, the government, the competitors, and especially to the consumers. In this economic climate we need to encourage business and compitition not stiffle it with further law suits and pettiness.

Sincerely,
Bob and Rosalie Jeffress
jeffressr@aol.com

MTC–00005810

From: CHARLANNE DIVITO
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:17pm
Subject: settlement

Please put me down as in favor of the settlement presently on the table for this mess.

Charlanne Divito Valley Village, CA

MTC–00005811

From: Jaking300@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think that Microsoft has done a great deal for the American people as well as for the entire world. They are not perfect, and they have been censored for any infractions they might have committed. However, we like their products—plain and simple. They have spent millions of dollars to make their products conform to our needs—and for the most part they do. Their products have allowed us to have an industry standard that has made all our lives much easier. It's time to stop punishing the company that has made all this possible. They have been given guidelines to follow and are living up to those guidelines, from what I can tell.

If we weaken Microsoft because we are vindictive or greedy, we have weakened our own economy. It's time to wrap this phase of our history up and let Microsoft move on. Secretaries, office managers, and many others will thank you.

Judith King
South Carolina

MTC–00005812

From: Ramerth, Douglas L.
To: 'Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

I want Microsoft to organize and conduct business that benefits America's technological growth. Do not impair Microsoft's ability to develop and market any product, including operating systems, internet software, professional and enterprise development software.

I write software using Microsoft products in the course of my work. I think Microsoft products are far easier to use and far better integrated than any other programming software. As a result, it is much easier to create better software at far less cost. Other companies that utilize the Microsoft development environment, such as Compaq Visual Fortran, enable programmers to quickly expand skills to other programming languages.

I'm a self taught Visual Basic and Visual Fortran programmer. I'm developing a Windows application with Office integration for cooling flow analysis of gas turbine engines. It consists of a customized database, viewers for drawings, drawing annotation of flow circuits, test data reduction, plotting test data and engine performance analysis.

I've developed prototype software and demonstrated a 300 percent productivity improvement over existing software processes. In some instances the productivity improvement approaches 1000 percent. Moreover, I'm writting the sofware in a fraction of the time it would take to create similar engineering software for a Unix workstation.

I'm recommending to my management that Honeywell develop more engineering software using Microsoft development tools. Furthermore, I'm recommending Windows operating system upgrades. I'm an engineer at Honeywell Engines & Systems, a manufacturer of gas turbine engines. Our industry is highly competitive with product development cycles four years long and very costly. We must have higher productivity to stay in business. I solely credit Microsoft for enabling me to achieve high levels of engineering design and analysis productivity.

Thank you for soliciting my opinion,
Doug Ramerth, Dept 93–320, M/S 503–249
Senior Aerospace Engineer
Honeywell Engines and Systems
111 South 34th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034
(602)–231–2057

MTC–00005813

From: KStutz1054@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to wind it up and let them get on with their business.

Ken Stutzman

MTC–00005814

From: Patel, Thakor G., MD
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm

Subject: Microsoft

I believe it is time to stop this charade and let Microsoft be what they are. It is one thing to say that they violated some regulation and another thing to stop the innovation and stifle the progress. I have not heard form the DOJ or others as to what Microsoft has done for the world in terms of simplyfying the life of average, non sophisticated computer users. The competitors and complainers had a chance, but they could not integrate all the software that is there and want to ride the train at Microsoft's expense. It is time to dispense of the case and as far as the States are concerned they are looking for free money on behalf of their states.

Microsoft has been able to simplify the use of computers and add the ability to track appointments, calenders, addresses, Excel, Word, Power Point such that even the secretaries are not needed. If you look at the benefits to the world and Americans in particular, life is simpler because of Microsoft and no other company. Please dispense this case in favor of the people of the United States and do not misrepresent them.

T.G.Patel, MD

MTC–00005815

From: Chicklarge@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: justis dept

I think the settlement is just. Please don't kill the horse because the rider can't ride. Breaking up Ma Bell did not benefit the consumer and more sever punishment of Microsoft will not benefit the consumer.

MTC–00005816

From: BJL1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: Settlement

I, strongly support the Microsoft position and fear if this continued action prevails we will be seeing another AT&T debacle that has created weakness and a large group of floundering companies. I, also believe this just another carryover action of the Clinton Administration that to this date does not understand business, and the benefits resulting for both employees, and supporting Companies.

B.J.O'Bryan

MTC–00005817

From: CohenHM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

enuf already give microsoft a break and let's move on they're innovative and creative don't cramp their style we need their contribution now

MTC–00005818

From: Daniel Ness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To continue using the gun of government to attack a business (Microsoft) that has changed the world and added billions to the economy—at the behest, and benefit, of it's competitors (Sun, Oracle, et al) violates every tenet of our nation. Although the ''settlement'' reached between the government and Microsoft offends my Constitutional senses, it is far better than continuing the unconstitutional abuse of government power that preceded it. Consumers (you know, those folks that anti-trust laws were created to protect) aren't harmed by better and cheaper products, but ARE harmed by competitors that use the courts instead of innovation to defeat their rivals. Cease acting as agents for the competition and start acting as agents for the consumer by ending this attack on Microsoft.

Daniel A. Ness
mailto:daness@monticellosys.com
Monticello Systems
''Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Improvement''
www.monticellosys.com

MTC–00005819

From: Mike LaCon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft Settlement.

I feel the settlement to not break up Microsoft is not only fair, it is the only reasonable settlement that is beneficial to the consumer. Any breakup would cause more harm to the consumer through higher costs and less innovation. Please do not breakup MSFT as this would also be very harmful to the economy and it would send a very anti-capitalism message by communicating to the world that success in this country is will not be rewarded.

Sincerely,
Michael LaCon, R.Ph.
mlacon@gis.net

MTC–00005820

From: Stashuman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

NINE STATES SETTLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DOJ DECISION....THE REMAINDER OF THE STATES ARE HOLDING OUT AND IT IS EVIDENT THAT IT IS NOW A MONEY ISSUE! THIS ACTION WAS REALLY BROUGHT ON BY MICROSOFTS' COMPETITORS, RATHER THAN THE CONSUMER. I STILL WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW ANY OF US WERE HARMED, SINCE WINDOWS USUALLY IS INSTALLED IN THE COMPUTER WHEN PURCHASED. GREED AND ENVY CERTAINLY PLAY A PART OF THIS SETTLEMENT....THE JUDGE SHOULD RULE THAT THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND EQUITABLE AND THAT THE STATES SHOULD NOT BAND TOGETHER (COLLUSION) AGAINST MICROSOFT FOR PERSONAL GAIN.... WHY SHOULD 9 STATES BENEFIT FROM SOMETHING THAT THE OTHER 41 DO NOT?????

IT APPEARS THAT THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION WAS LISTENING TO THE WRONG PEOPLE .....THE CONSUMER WAS NOT HARMED!!!! THANK YOU FOR READING MY THOUGHTS

STAN PRAGER
4860 MT. ROSE WAY
ROSEVILLE, CA. 95747
(STASHUMAN@AOL.COM)

MTC–00005821

From: Mike Rausch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's put this behind us and get on with business. Please settle this.

Mike

MTC–00005822

From: Rhonda Hostetler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am sending this email to voice my support for the Microsoft settlement and to express my desire for the government to end its intervention into Microsoft's business practices as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Rhonda Hostetler
12216 201st Court NE
Woodinville, WA 98072

MTC–00005823

From: tom stephenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get this settlement under way NOW! The states that do not agree should be forced out of their suits by court actions because all they have in mind is cashing in at taxpayer's ultimate expense. You are urged to force these settlements because of an age old truism—Corporations can not pay taxes! They simply pass them along to the consumers in higher prices for the products they sell!

TOM STEPHENSON

MTC–00005824

From: Kenneth Nicholson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are totally opposed to any further litigation against Microsoft. We believe that the current offer by Microsoft is more than fair and equitable, should be accepted and the case closed. This case has gone on long enough causing undue hardship on many by a group of selfish litigants spurred on their own selfish interests! We urgently request that all further litigation be immediately discontinued.

Kenneth B. & Isolde
S. Nicholson
11315 Cloverdale Court, S.W.,
Lakewood, WA 98499–1233

MTC–00005825

From: Hammerslag@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I consider the settlement approved by the DOJ and nine states eminently fair, especially to the consumer.

I'm a user of Microsoft software and over the years found Microsoft's product and service to be excellent and of very reasonable cost.. I could easily switch to a competitor

(like Apple Computer), but my choice is Microsoft.

I think that the charges like ''bundling'' are ridiculous. I have yet to be charged for any of the ''bundled'' products I don't want. Lots of companies, like automobile companies ''bundle'' and the consumer generally benefits. High time we (the US Government and certain state prosecutors) quit harassing innovating companies like Microsoft, who through their inventiveness have done so much for our economy. In the end. I, the consumer, have to pay for all the Government plaintives, court costs, lawyers and the expenses Microsoft has to incur. .

Jake Hammerslag
27011 Calle Esperanza
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
e-mail: hammerslag@aol.com

MTC–00005826

From: Marv W. Mortenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: UnJust Settlement!

The Government should not force any business that is more successful than others and force them to do less than there competitors—i.e.: Coca Cola puts one bottle of Pepsi in each of there six packs—I'm not interested in what is fair but am interested in equitable treatment for all—Bill Gates built an intelligent Corporation with hired Brains that went out and did what most Americans are attempting to do is build a better mouse trap—and you the Government and our Tax Dollars are penalizing success—Microsoft is not America's Enemy—Bill Gates is not a Criminal—Admit you the Government made a mistake and stop this non-sense.

Regards,
Marvin W Mortenson,
Citizen

MTC–00005827

From: CLEEF
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:17pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT IS TIME FOR THIS MIS-GUIDED EFFORT TO BE BROUGHT TO A CLOSE AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL. HAS THE DOJ LEARNED NOTHING FROM THEIR EFFORTS TO EXTORT MONEY FROM LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND THE RESULTANT FAILURE OF ANY REAL EFFORT TO REDRESS THE SUPPOSEDLY INJURED PARTIES. DO NOT LET THE TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION CONTINUE TO LINE THEIR POCKETS AT THE TAXPAYER'S EXPENSE.

MTC–00005828

From: stan guilkey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: DOJ

To Whom It May Concern:

Get the bureaucrats off of Microsoft's back. They have provided a good product at a lower cost over the years. Settle the case and accept what they are offering for the schools in the form of computers.

Sincerely,
Stan Guilkey
765 644–4469

MTC–00005829

From: Paul Larmon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

DOJ,

I am against any additional legal action with Microsoft. You should settle this case right now.

Paul Larmon

MTC–00005830

From: Ike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement

Settlement is fair and equitable—let's move on!!

MTC–00005831

From: SistoKid1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: settle the case now

the best, like cream, will rise to the top. if msft windows was no good the public would have opted for apples system. but for some reason windows was better or at least the marketing was so most of the new pc's have windows. save a percentage of their gross income to support the other systems, give money to the wtc relief fund and settle the case.

MTC–00005832

From: MRourke555@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I hope the US Justice deptmartment will bring the Microsoft ordeal to a speedy end. It seems we have a number of people only interested in lawsuits as opposed to getting rid of barriers to business in our country. Microsoft is providing leadership, employment, innovation, and most of all a committment to America through grant programs. I just had dinner with an incredible young woman who has gone through college and post graduate degrees all with the help of the Gates foundation. Lets not penalize success. It is the American dream.

Mark Rourke
U.S. Citizen

MTC–00005833

From: Gerald Meyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For goodness sake, settle up. There is more than enough anguish in the World without prolonging this fiasco. Surely the Country's patience is at an end, don't you think?

Sincerely,
Gerald Meyer

MTC–00005834

From: Ganesh, C P
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I as a shareholder of Microsoft and as a general public feel strongly that the settlement arrived at should be confirmed by the Department of Justice to allow the company to regain its lost glory and to contribute effectively to the economic development specially after the post September 11, 2001 era. I am sure Bill Gates will achieve this given the right support!

Chatapuram P. Ganesh.

MTC–00005835

From: Gordpenn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

This is to express my concern about the continuing resistance to settlement of the Microsoft case. This has gone on long enough and we need to let Microsoft get back to their business. As a computer user and as a financial investor I believe the Government is correct in its settlement proposal.

Gordon Pennington

MTC–00005836

From: BJPDavis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

A settlement in this case should force Microsoft to desist in its practices which eliminate the competitive nature of our free market system. Instead, the settlement is actually a $1 billion dollar promotion of Microsoft software products targeted at the K-12 education system. Microsoft has been found to engage in monopolistic practices with respect to hardware vendors, discouraging them from allowing the installation of competitive products in systems preloaded with a Microsoft operating system. Microsoft has provided a mediocre product, restricted consumer choice, overcharged for unneed features, and prevented consumers from removing the unwanted portions of the system. I oppose the settlement because it is completely biased toward the introduction of Microsoft software products to our underprivileged K-12 schools, and because it provides for basically no other alternatives than the use of Microsoft software products. This is basically a $400 promotion of Microsoft products. Further analysis of the settlement shows the mismatch between complaint and settlement. Class plaintiffs claimed (among other issues) that consumers had been overcharged for Windows, yet the settlement proposal returns nothing to those consumers and merely entrenches the Microsoft monopoly further.

While we support Microsoft's stated goal of helping underprivileged schools, that goal is best accomplished by giving schools unrestricted grants for use as they need, not ''donations'' biased toward the use of Microsoft products.

Thank you for your consideration.
Barbara J. Davis
6575 Sunburst Drive
Portage MI 49024
616–327–5894
BJPDavis@aol.com
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00005837

From: Bob(u)Dawna Robinson

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

I and the majority of the people in the world, would like for this case to end asap. This has drug out far too long as it is. Send a message to the businesses of the world that the government is not going to punish a company that has produced a better product just so their competition can catch up with them. With the way other countries dominate so many other markets, America should be proud of the success story of Microsoft. But instead we punish MS and do everything in the goverment's power to put road blocks in their way. By interfering with future development of MS products our goverment opens the door for foreign countries to take over this market also. How would the US goverment like it if a Japanese company held the influence MS has on the industry?

The government should get out of this and let the strongest company determine who is successful.

Bob Robinson

MTC–00005838

From: George Thomas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

DOJ:

Please settle the case NOW! Special interests such as AOL are using this for their own special interest purposes. I think that as Microsoft goes the rest of the economy will follow. Lets get the economy back where it belongs.

Thank you
George A Thomas
512 14th st
Bellingham WA

MTC–00005839

From: Ruben Odom jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have my opinion short and sweet: I believe that the view that Microsoft has engaged in anti competitive activity is true only because the computer industry has failed to show any motivation what so ever to compete with Microsoft in any form what so ever. I don't think anything out side of what the has already been ruled on by the supreme court is necessary. But in a desire to see that the playing field be leveled for companies desiring to enter into the OS competition is necessary. I think the current revision allows entry of a company that already has an established reputation—like Sun Micro Systems or AOL–Time Warner. These companies with the improved marketing ability of an operating system can and will pose a significant threat to Microsoft. I sincerely know that it is wrong and in turn illegal to cause MS to be forced to turn over any source code or be forced to develop any software for any platform that already has plenty of proprietary software ported to it (ie. Linux and Corel). I also know that it is illegal to force MS to support any Middleware company that has enough internet presence and advertising ability to market it's own product instead of being carried by MS to undermine its future operations.

In short, I feel that the 9 rouge states are acting in the interest of lazy free software proponents that want to undermine the software industry, its tough quality standards, and ability to reach the masses with innovative technology to fuel an economy. Their communist view of free software equaling greater understanding is equal to communism: a very nice dream. It is a common fact that programmers and end user's prefer to use someone else's hard work instead of being concerned with the details. Another parallel between communism and the free software movement is the fact that they have a demonstrated tendency to keep potential threats of any magnitude from the masses in order to save face and govern over people. This communist open source threat needs to continue to be checked by our present justice system by allowing the current revision, as of the date of this email, to stand and reject the request of the 9 rouge states.

Thanks for hearing me out
Ruben A. Odom Jr.
aron37@msn.com
614–239–8561
2034 Prince George Drive
Apt. G
Columbus, OH 43209

MTC–00005840

From: Doris Justice
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the best interest of consumers like me, the general public, the American economy, and american business ability to innovate, it is my opinion that the Microsoft Settlement should be approved. This case should have never brought originally. Good ole american free enterprise should have prevailed.

Doris H. Justice

MTC–00005841

From: Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is in the best interest of the American people that Microsoft case be settled. DOJ has dragged it on too long to the detriment of costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars and also the millions depleted from the Microsoft Co. THIS IS A FREE ENTERPRISE COUNTRY, I PRAY.

Chuck Peterson,
350 Climbing Way,
Wimberley, TX 78676

MTC–00005842

From: Lloyd Smiley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Settlement Now with Microsoft

Monday, July 02, 2001

Very Much Needed Resolution with Microsoft

The Federal Appeals Court decided against the breakup of Microsoft Corporation into two companies. A breakup would have destroyed the vital and highly valuable synergistic and innovative abilities of Microsoft. I firmly believe that prosecution of Microsoft by the U.S. Department of Justice has caused tremendous damage to our economy and may be ascribed in large measure to our current financial struggle, started in March 2000.

As an independent consultant my work has been involved in computers from the punch card era in the 1950's until now; have been involved with Microsoft software from 1982. My experience with computers includes writing and many presentations, order processing, optimization in logistical systems and operation of distribution centers and levels of employment in manufacturing, rail car and OTR truck fleet management, investments with screens and transactions, operations and financial analyses and controls, engineering, budgets. IBM, Intel and Microsoft have been the most important developers of useful hardware and software in the accelerated progress experienced in this country over the past 20 years.

Antitrust Prosecutor Joel Klein, Attorney David Boies, U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno, Attorney Generals from 18 states and executives from competing firms of Sun, IBM, AOL/Netscape, Apple and Oracle have through their use of biased Judge Penfield Jackson significantly caused the slowdown of this country???s economy, started in March 2000. We trust the Department of Justice Assistant Attorney General Charles James and new judge will continue to use good judgment and common sense in the final phase in fairly and promptly resolving the antitrust problems related to Microsoft.

Microsoft's practices in the market have been aggressive but cannot to my knowledge be described as unfair to customers in developing the Windows operating system and in combination with the Internet Explorer. The development of the software was done in the open in competition with Lotus, Netscape, IBM, AT&T Unix, Sun, Apple and Oracle. These alternative software operating systems and applications have been run by me in parallel on the same computers and have through critical comparisons decided in favor of Microsoft (Unix v. DOS/Windows, Lotus Office Suite v. MS Office, Netscape/Communicator v. Internet Explorer). Price was not an important factor. Obviously, Microsoft has temporarily won the competition in Windows operating systems but has lost the browser competition to the 33 million AOL/Netscape subscribers. Linux and Unix have made recent strides forward with IBM and Sun in competing with Microsoft in operating systems. The latest IBM servers are now delivered with the Linus Operating System and not Microsoft NT or Windows Professional. Why should the Department of Justice and District Court aid and abet Microsoft competitors that do not need help?

I encourage that Microsoft be allowed to continue to compete and innovate, to keep our economy moving forward without oppressive state and federal restrictions and regulations, without further excessive fines and harassment from the attorneys general and eager attorneys looking for ways to perpetuate this litigation. I favor an early settlement to allow Microsoft and this economy to move forward. The settlement

with the federal government needs to include a finality and closure with states attorney generals and all attorneys related to this litigation. This avoidable costly matter should be settled at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Smiley, Management Consultant, MIT 1951

Retired Professional Engineer (10 states)

Retired Certified Statewide General Contractor

4830 East Coventry Drive

Vero Beach, Florida 32967–7301

Telephone 561–564–9825

E-mail: Lloyd_Smiley@Hotmail.com

MTC–00005843

From: Fran Combar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement should be approved as is, let's get this problem resolved so the country can move on! Thanks

George Carlin—Imponderable:

Do infants enjoy infancy as much as adults enjoy adultery?

Fran Combar

Bridgewater, NY

MTC–00005844

From: PNTXJACK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

i overwhelmingly support any reasonable end to the litigation against microsoft. the litigation was an embarrassment when initiated, and it will continue to be an embarrassment until it is terminated. this notwithstanding the findings of the trial court. this is a new age, and a new industry. crybabies and losers do not deserve the support of the federal government in their tantrums. if i had to, i could probably count in months the productivity i have saved by having microsoft as 'the choice' of operating system. rather than having to study, compare, assess, and choose from many, then hope that my choice was competitive if not the best.

jack nissen

MTC–00005845

From: Mary Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsrt Settlement

It is about time to put this behind us as a country. As a consumer, I find this has hurt me more by tecnology waiting in the wings for a settlement to happen. That is not in the best interest of our country. That is the bottom line. This lawsuit has done more to hurt me as a consumer both financially with the tech stocks in such a decline, and with freedom to innitiate and innovate. Finding a way to finish it fast is in my best interest and that of our country. I have personally never been ''hurt'' by microsft anyway, but this court case has hurt me finacially and that is very personal. Do Something soon! We need to support our comapnies that can foster in some new growth and jobs not discourage companies so that they do not srive to become larger and world class leading companies.

Thank you,

Mary Anderson

Gig Harbor, Wa 98332

MTC–00005846

From: Thomas Nugent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm

For my two cents, I recommend that the current settlement with Microsoft be implemented without further inhibitions placed on a company that has added enormous value to the U.S. economy. Why on earth we would penalize a company that gives things away while turning a blind eye to the monopolistic OPEC cartel is beyond me but I think there must be some semblance of reason regarding the Microsoft case. Let's get this darn thing behind America and move on to more important matters.

Tom Nugent

MTC–00005847

From: Wes Harris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to make my viewpoint known concerning the microsoft case. I would like to see this case settled as soon as possible. I do not think ongoing litigation in this case is good for our country. It is only good for the attorneys. Please do not let the special interest groups opposed to a final settlement derail the process. The DOJ and Microsoft have both spent enough time and resources on this issue and it needed to be settled now.

Thank you.

Wes Harris

1014 Bayou Vista Dr

Deer Park, Texas 77536

832–309–8059

MTC–00005848

From: Sam Biggs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I firmly believe that the Microsoft Settlement as currently proposed and agreed upon between Microsoft, the U.S. Government and various consenting states should ratified by the courts without change and finalized. Perpetuating this litigation is a waste of taxpayer dollars and government resources. Additionally, the millions of dollars spent litigating this issue by Microsoft and other parties has benefited (and will benefit) no one other than attorneys.

Those opposed to the Microsoft Settlement include principally Microsoft competitors and a few states, led by California, who apparently are looking for their own personal benefit rather than for the good of the taxpayers and consumers. Opposition by Microsoft competitors should be read for what it is, a strategy to use the courts to gain a competitive advantage which should be restricted to the marketplace. As for California, this state believes it is its own imperial nation and should have everything its own way. I know. I live in this state. California believes, as do many of its residents, that they can sue anybody for anything regardless of the merits and the impact. The governor of this state unilaterally spent the entire state surplus of over $6 billion on purchasing electricity to give away to its residents. This money was spent without approval of the legislature or the voters of the state. Now we are facing a state deficit and tax increases. California should drop this litigation and the additional waste of taxpayer dollars, just as did New York, and get on to better things. I strongly urege the courts to uphold the current settlement and put this matter to bed.

MTC–00005849

From: Fred
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen;

From what I have read I don?t see that Microsoft has committed any crime with its business practices.

Our country was founded on free enterprise and competition. Just because they are the largest and best operating system on the net, I don't feel they should be chastised for protecting their products.

Sincerely

Fred Eastland

1219 Pawnee Trail

Carrollton, Texas 75007

MTC–00005850

From: Gerald Gaumer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen, I was very much upset with the manner in which Microsoft was ''dragged'' down by the prosecutions of the Clinton Administration and his appointed members of the Justice Department.

If one reviews the history of our financial markets, there is a direct correlation between the Federal findings of March, 2000 and the subsequent declines of our publicly held corporations, with special attention to those in the high tech sector. Microsoft, though some of its actions may be interpreted as unfair, also must be viewed as a true innovator, willing and able to make the tremendous investment necessary to radically economize the manners in which we transact business or communicate with each other. Sunn, Oracle and others may cry ''wolf, wolf, wolf ...,'' but there is no small amount of envy mixed in with such cries, as they vie for position in a competitive marketplace. So enough—let's put this matter behind us, let's get on with rebuilding our economy, get on with innovation and move forward in the grandest way possible. If some states wish not to be a part of the proposed settlement, then let that be their fate, stewing about old business as the rest of us venture forth.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Gaumer

ggaumer@earthlink.net

Marietta, GA

MTC–00005851

From: pkedoman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please, guys. The ability to compete and win is what makes the ease with which I sent this e-mail possible. Let's not hamper that

ability in such a way that there is no incentive to do research and development or create new products. Let's end this thing and get on with what's important.

Patrick L. Doman

MTC–00005852

From: Mike McDaniel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is clear to me that Microsoft is being damaged by the government and we the taxpayers and consumers of this great nation are basically being damaged by both. Microsoft must pass the costs of litigation on to the consumers, and the government must collect sufficient taxes to pay for the expensive litigation. In the end, it is the general public that is the most damaged. Microsoft has basically helped the world in many ways and for that I'm grateful. Just because they are on top, there are many that wish to tear them down.

This is wrong.

MTC–00005853

From: rbroberg@[158.188.130.124]@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Publish MS File Formats and Network Specifications

I am writing to you on behalf of computer programmers who write and support software for computer operating systems such as Linux, BSD, Solaris, and other Unix OSes. The difficulty with the MS monopoly is not that they control 95% of the desktop market, but that it is increasingly difficult to develop systems that interoperate with the MS networks. It is this ''lock in'' that perpetuates the MS market share and decreases the ability for third parties to challenge MS in a particular software domain.

I believe that the most effective remedy is not one that addresses past wrong-doings—from a market perspective that damage is done. The most effective remedy is one that increases competition in the future. Microsoft should be required to publish the file formats of its application software and the protocols of its network services. Microsoft has claimed that (due to market share) its software create the ''de facto'' standards. It should now make those standards available to all programmers. This single requirement would greatly increase the ability of software companies to create products that would interoperate and compete with current and future Microsoft offerings.

Thank You
Ronald Broberg
Software Engineer
Lockheed Martin Mission Systems
719–277–4124
ronald.broberg@lmco.com

MTC–00005854

From: Dan Vaughan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am an average small business owner. Please allow Microsoft the opportunity to continue to innovate and build new products for the software industry. I could go on and on with details for this note but I am sure you have many to read.

Thank you.
Dan Vaughan
Knight Products Company, Inc.
www.kpcsupplies.com
(800)262–4116

MTC–00005855

From: michael c putnam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir:

I believe that the Microsoft anti trust settlement should be concluded with the current agreement that is now proposed between the US Government and the majority of States. Microsoft has been bullied enough for political and competitors gain and pleasure. I think that Microsoft is a vital and important US Corporation that should be supported by the US people and US Government and not disassembled or destroyed for self serving gain of a few. Bill Gates is an American Hero and Microsoft Corporation has helped many people and the US economy enormously. No thanks to the US Government is required. Microsoft has done this on there own just like any other Corporation could have or could do it. Unless the Government takes away the incentive or freedom to innovate, which would be a shame! The idea that Microsoft should be ordered to sell or offer a striped version of the Windows Operating System is ridiculous and absurd.

Michael Putnam

MTC–00005856

From: Romano, Joe
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

No further litigation. The company (any company) should have the right to further enhance their product to keep it as competitive as is practical in the free market. One can find many examples of true competition without legislation (rental car companies, retailers in any niche, etc.) The savvy shopper will let competition thrive.

MTC–00005857

From: jackmilazzo@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:00pm
Subject: let's move on

a settlement has been reached. . .let it take effect and let the companies compete in an open market.

MTC–00005858

From: Jeff Waranch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLENMENT

I WANT TO STRONGLY SUPPORT THAT THE STATES SETTLE WITH MICROSOFT. SINCE COMPETITION CAN'T COMPETE WITH MICROSOFT THEY ARE FORCED TO TRY TO GET THE GOVERNMENT TO COMPETE FOR THEM. MICROSOFT IS GREAT AND CONTINUALLY STRIVES TO GIVE THE PUBLIC ''MORE'' AT A FAIR PRICE. WHY SHOULD MICROSOFT BE REQUIRED TO HELP THEIR COMPETITION. IF THE PUBLIC DOESN'T LIKE PART OF MICROSOFT'S PROGRAM, THEY DON'T HAVE TO BUY IT.

MTC–00005859

From: RIOPATTON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: (no subject)

As a senior citizen, former Fortune 500 employee, and Microsoft shareholder I support the recent rulings and believe the future potential litigation should be stopped.

MTC–00005860

From: Cgrow947@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do everything within your power to insure that the US government's antitrust case against Microsoft is settled under the legislation currently proposed. The terms of the proposed settlement appear fair. It is in both Microsoft's customers' and shareholders' best interest to move on at this point. Millions have already been wasted on showy court proceedings. Microsoft's monopoly will be restricted by effective innovations on the part of its competitors. I increasingly have the feeling that Microsoft's competitors are leaning on the government to level what appears to them to be an uneven playing field. This is not the case. Microsoft's products are simply better and very affordable. Microsoft's strongest competitor is currently itself. When this ceases to be true, the apparent monopoly will begin to dissipate. I do not think our capitalistic system has ever seen this phenomena fail. Who would have expected Microsoft to win out over mighty IBM in the operating systems arena 20 years ago?

As a result of the tragic events of September 11, the United States and the Department of Justice have many new opportunities for both its attention and its financial resources. The pursuit of Microsoft is one area in which we need to call a halt. We should divert those funds to help insure the safety of US citizens.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Grow
Keswick, VA

MTC–00005861

From: Bpjd1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Department of Justice
Re: Microsoft Settlement.

I do believe that this settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I also, agree that this settlement is good for the consumers, the industry and the American economy. I really think it's a shame that a few aggressive lobbying groups, plus a few politician has caused such turmoil in the economy over the past few years. I also believe because of this law suit it has hurt the aggresses of Microsoft as far as new product, that would have help the economy of this Country plus the World economy. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair.

Sincerely,

Bruce P. Day
11709 Redwood Dr. E.
Brandywine, MD 20613
Bruce

MTC–00005862

From: Thompson, Margie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:56pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement
Dear Sirs,
I believe the settlement will provide a fair and equitable decision and benefit the consumer. This has gone on long enough.
Sincerely,
Margie Thompson
e-mail address mailto:thompsm@eagle-home.com

MTC–00005863

From: Sean Cope
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern,
I would like to voice my opinion that the Microsoft anti-trust case should not proceed with further litigation. As a consumer and an IT professional, I think that this case should be settled in a swift, decisive manner and should not be prolonged for any reason.
Thank you for taking the times to read my words,
Sean Cope

MTC–00005864

From: Jkueneman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
dear sirs:
please complete the microsoft settlement as soon as possible and get on with more important doj business.
sincerely,
jack kueneman

MTC–00005865

From: Bob Luhrs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I wish to express my opinion that the settlement seems fair to me, and long overdue. The issues are or have been mainly corrected, serious, major market share competitors have emerged in both operating system and office software. The company is in a far different position today with Linux and many other options available to consumers. At this point the choice really is theirs, even free in the case of Linux.
Abuses which have existed have been corrected, and I feel it's time to move on. There are lots of competitors not offering anything better but paying for legal action versus doing their own hard work to create better software. I work here, I know. Most of the resulting software is a labor of love, people even die or have to take early retirement due to burnout. The effort is quite a hard one to get what looks like simple software. Let the others do this and see what they come up with, that would give us real competition.
Thanks,
Bob Luhrs

MTC–00005866

From: Willie Wiginton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: MIcrosoft Settlement
The recent agreement to settle between the Federal Government and nine states is a fair and equitable settlement to all parties involved. It is time to get this issue resolved and for all of us to move on to running our business. I urge you to accept this agreement and let's get on with the critical issues currently at hand and facing this country.
HD Wiginton

MTC–00005867

From: G G
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Settle the case with Microsoft. Let's move on with this and not waste another penny of my tax dollars deliberating it. Microsoft makes good software, and I'm intelligent enought to decide on my own what software I do or do not want to buy, regardless if there is an icon on the screen or not.

MTC–00005868

From: Kim Alexander
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Although I may not agree that the Tunney Act, should move forward, I would agree that this case needs to be resolved. Since Microsoft has shown a willingness to accept this agreement, I would do the same and hope the DOJ does likewise.
Please pass the Tunney Act.
Kim Alexander

MTC–00005869

From: Steve Stephens
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir,
It is in the public interest to let the Tunney Act pass as is.
Regards,
Steve Stephens

MTC–00005870

From: Alex Milman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I demand to stop harassment of the best American company—Microsoft—the pride of the whole world! How is it that the government of the USA is trying to destroy the best we have in this country? With Democrats in administration with their fantastic hatred towards business it was expected. They managed to drive country into recession even during technological revolution. Actually all the fruits of this revolution are gone. The hope is that new Republican administration will turn the country around, despite democratic majority in the Senate, where they are trying to make thing even worse than they are now.
Hold on!!!

MTC–00005871

From: Crsnot@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It's about time that this legal nightmare be put behind us and to allow Microsoft to go on with the business that it does best to create jobs in a time when the national economy is faltering and to generate additional income for its stockholders and for the economy in general.
In my view a protracted litigationn benefits only the voracious legal profession involved in this sordid affair and the hungry for publicity attorneys general of the states that are still holding out.
Charles Notara
A Concerned Citizen

MTC–00005872

From: dl123
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
In the past I used IBM OS2, Mac and LINUX OS systems. None were as easy, cheap or stable as Microsoft. There was always one serious draw-back, whereas Microsoft is the most positive.
The problem with Microsoft products is they are boring; they work almost all the time. That is why I play around with LINUX. but it requires technical expertise. Others must have felt the same or there would be a greater abundance of them.
Dieter Louis
dl123@home.com

MTC–00005873

From: Werner Grob
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
With respect to the settlement you have negotiated, it is my opinion that the settlement, as proposed, is in my best interest.
Thank you
Werner Grob
Key Biscayne, FL

MTC–00005874

From: Anthony W Strano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair and should be implemented. Microsoft has made the PC the effective consumer tool that it is today. The bundling of innovations into its windows operating system is a benefit to the consumer. The whole reason for the suit against Microsoft by other competitors is that they are not good enough to compete, so they enlisted the state and federal governing bodies to try and destroy Microsoft. Years ago, the then Secretary of Defense, Charles Wilson, said what is good for General Motors is good for the country. I believe that is true today for Microsoft. Let's let them get on with their great work in improving the life of consumers.
Anthony Strano

MTC–00005875

From: Larry Enoksen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I use Microsoft Software. I think they have reduced havoc in the industry by standardization and this is a real plus.

However, because they have won a victory over firms competing in the development of products, they now are threatening anyone using their software to be able to prove licensing requirements have been met. Frankly, I believe I am in compliance and I encourage others to be as well, but I am offended by the intimidating letters sent by Microsoft, probably the same tactics used against others.

I believe this is the same tactic they have used on other firms to quash innovation, force competitors to litigate into financial ruin, and has allowed them to usurp technology developed by others.

I can't imagine how many firms will be forced into litigation over licensing issues. How many of those will Microsoft put out of business?

I was previously in favor of the settlement, but now feel the public is having the opportunity to see Microsoft management for the 'government outside of Government' that it has become.

Microsoft should be reorganized to allow a competitive market at all levels including Operating Systems, Software design, and development of new technology.

Have a Great Day!

Larry C Enoksen, EA, Notary

VP Operations, Tax Mam, Inc/Tax Services Group

larry@taxmam.com

http://www.taxmam.com

http://www.cupertino-optimists.org

MTC–00005876

From: Keith(a)redplane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to let you know my thoughts on the Microsoft Settlement. I am strongly opposed to changing the settlement that has been worked out with the Federal Government and nine states. This is a more than fair settlement and will make a difference. The Microsoft competitors that have made so much noise about the settlement and the case should themselves be penalized. They are using this whole issue to make up for their inadequacies—the public doesn't want their products, so they cry to the government about the industry leader's supposed unfair practices.

I am concerned that if the government messes with the proposed settlement, the end result may be that the public will get less. Microsoft has made every effort to work with the government and should not be required to start over just because competitors are not talented enough to come up with successful products that sell.

Thank you.

Keith A. Tobias
P.O. Box 666
La Ca?ada Flintridge, CA 91011
email: ktobias@redplane.com
Tel: (818) 790–6040
Fax: (818) 790–6002

MTC–00005877

From: jhuff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I just want to urge you to accept the Microsoft settlement. The public certainly hasn't been hurt by Microsoft. Have been using computers since 1983 and have found them vastly improved due to Microsoft. I had such faith in Microsoft that I bought its stock. Sold some at a loss.

Can't understand that when a company does well and helps the public, the government wants to penalize that company. I also feel that the technology of computers and other communication devices is changing so rapidly that companies fortunates will ebe and tide with their ability to keep up with changes. These companies shouldn't have to spend their time and treasure defending themselves against the government also. The competition is stiff without that.

I do not work for Microsoft and have no connection with them other than I still own a small of amount of stock. (at a loss which I will sell when I have gains to offset it). I do, however, use their products and find them outstanding, especially Microsoft Publisher. I use it to do my church's newsletter each month and for other purposes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joyce Lofmark
38 Brookhouse Drive
Marblehead, MA 01945

MTC–00005878

From: Paul Wuthrich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The US Government should leave Microsoft alone and focus on the issues that really affect Americans and our security—like foreign and domestic terrorists! Why does the govt. have to destroy a great US company? Janet Reno should have spent our tax money on something that benefited the public. Instead, they tried to dismantle a company that provides great products and improves business.

Microsoft is a great company with a product that enhances business. If the competition had a comparable product, people would buy it! Instead they want the govt. to step in and help them try to compete with Microsoft. Sun Microsystems and the rest of the ilk should be ashamed.

Paul Wuthrich

MTC–00005879

From: Bev and Scott Milne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: MicroSoft Anti-Trust Problem

I thought that Anti-Trust suit is used when its believe the company is hurting the consumer. The Clinton administration (the worst in our history) hurt the consumer by charging Microsoft in the first place. The stock dropped so much that billons of dollars was lost in 401(k)'s, but we don't hear much about that do we. And then that nut case Reno held a press conference stating that consumer will be protected now because of the action they (JD) took. And of course Orin Hatch jumped on the band wagon because Oracle is located in Utah. Along with Reno, Hatch wanted Microsoft to share industrial secrets with Oracle and other companies so that competition will be a on level playing field. That pure BS. If Oracle and others want to be better then MS, invent a better mouse trap. This whole lawsuit, including the states, is a typical democrat approach, in this case redistribute industrial secerts like they do with everyones money to those who don't deserve it.

Sincerely,
A. Scott Milne
1227 143 Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98007

MTC–00005880

From: Ray McCoy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to comment on the proposed Microsoft Settlement. I believe that the Microsoft settlement is fair to consummers and the industry and that we need to move beyond this issue.

It is obvious that Microsoft's competitors are trying to use the Federal and State Attorney's General to unfairly stiffle Microsoft. These companies should expend their efforts on developing software applications that compete with Microsoft rather than using their own and taxpayer dollars to attempt to hurt Microsoft. Let the marketplace decide who's products are best.

Sincerely,
Ray McCoy
Marketing Manager
Infostat Systems, Inc.
916 649 3244 Ext 203
mailto:rmccoy@infostatsystems.com

MTC–00005881

From: Ken Klinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Enough. Let the litigation end. Ken Klinger

MTC–00005882

From: Mark Hester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am in favor of the settlement as it stands for the DOJ V. Microsoft case.

At this point it appears that the interests and states that are fighting the settlement are doing so in an attempt to gain an unmerited windfall for themselves and their business interests. MicroSoft has continued to place resources at risk inorder to create markets and expand their business; neither of which will happen if they do not have the interest of the consumer at heart. The recent XBOX launch is an excellent example. MS has introduced an innovative OPTION for the public. Has SUN had this opportunity? Yes. Has MS's Windows Operating system limited SUN, or NetScape (AOL), in their creation of new products? No. But their focus on MS and this lawsuit has. MicroSoft's dominance in the operating system market is overrated by the opponents of the settlement. The

opportunity to compete is available to all that want to spend their resources on creative solutions instead of wasting the people's time and money trying to gain an unfair windfall.

Let the settlement stand and let's get on with business.

Respectfully,
John Mark Hester
CEO RedRock Solutions, Inc.
Madison, Alabama
256.656.7879

MTC–00005883

From: Stan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case should be settled immediately, as it has been going on too long, and the ultimate cost for it is bourn by the taxpayer. A company should have the right to put what it wants in its products and software.

Why would anyone want to stifle innovation. That is what made this country great and should be allowed to continue. Thank you.

Stanley R. Kneppar
8109 Hibiscus Circle
Tamarac, Florida 33321–2134
(954) 720–0413
kneppar@mediaine.net

MTC–00005884

From: Capt. Ronald L. Pouch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: ms antitrust

This case has become a battle of who's has the best lawyer. It is lawyer welfare. So I paid too much for MS software what else is new. I paid too much for my car , my groceries etc. My goodness settle this case!!! Leave MS alone. Did we sue GM when they started putting their own radios and AC's in their cars instead of making us buy after market from motorola etc. Enough with this case and all the money being wasted by various governments and MS.

MTC–00005885

From: Chris Averkiou
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 2, 2002

Dear Sirs at the DOJ:

The purpose of this email is to provide Tunney Act public comment on the Microsoft Settlement. The parties to the litigation have reached a settlement ending litigation. It is in the public interest to settle the lawsuit and allow the parties to return to work, directing resources on more important matters. Microsoft contributes valuable services to the United States economy as a whole, the public interest is best served by eliminating uncertainty to the software industry caused by pending antitrust litigation. The Court of Appeals has already ruled on the legal issues, settlement based on its decision is a simple matter.

Please include my comments in the public record.

Yours,
Chris Averkiou
7100 Louisiana NE, H204
Albuquerque, NM 87109

MTC–00005886

From: Jeff Leite
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a voting resident of Florida and a software developer I find that the Microsoft settlement has gone far beyond what is fair and reasonable. I think this case has been ridiculous from the start as it hinders my freedom to innovate and create quality applications. Because a couple companies who make unworthy products feel they can't compete with quality Microsoft products we have had to endure this law suit. I personally have informed my Attorney General who is one of the non-technical bureaucrats who are still involving my state in this ridiculous law suit that my votes in the future will be sure to rely on the outcome of this law suit. I respectfully request that you accept Microsoft's offer.

Jeff Leite
Jacksonville, FL

MTC–00005887

From: Andrew Dobson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please finalize the Microsoft settlement (as currently proposed) as quickly as possible and stop pursuing this ill-advised prosecution. While Microsoft clearly has a monopoly on desktop operating systems, I believe such monopolies are both necessary and commonplace in information technologies; that such monopolies will be short-lived; and that the governments' position on this case is detremental to the interests both of consumers and of the country.

Andrew Dobson
Arlington VA

MTC–00005888

From: cm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Microsoft has improved Windows to a point where it is a better value than it ever was. They are not the best at everything. Other companies have been able to compete againt MS in their specific areas. Only then the companies sat on their laurels and got lazy was MS able to make a better product and outsell them.

Isn't that what America is about?
Chris Medley
5509G Langley Way
Bolling AFB, DC 20336

MTC–00005889

From: Priby@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement;

I support the government's case which settled the issue. I do not support further lifigastion, be it by other states or individuals.

Otto Pribram

MTC–00005890

From: John P. Sullivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For nearly four years Microsoft has been beaten up on. The Microsoft case should be settled without further litigation.

The settlement reached is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

John P. Sullivan
2809 Irwin Road
Huntsville, AL 35801

MTC–00005891

From: Stephen Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case! It has been going on too long.

Stephen Quinn
US Taxpayer

MTC–00005892

From: Thorbz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think the settlement is fair and if all penalties in this country are turned into benefits for our school system, what better win/win situation can you ask for?

LT

MTC–00005893

From: JDarrjr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
TO: Dept of Justice

It is high time for the lawsuit again Microsoft to be settled, compensation paid by whatever means is agreed upon. The remaining few states that are disrupting this settlement simply have their own agenda to service, and has little to do with any original complaint, valid or not. Bill Gates and other Microsoft executives have done more for the entire ''world'' by producing the excellent computer systems over the years, and not one of the litigants would have even had a business if it weren't for these wonderful products . . . especially NETSCAPE which most people refuse to use and whose software was probably produced using all the latest Microsoft software.

Settle the damn lawsuit !! America needs to focus it's Justice Department on the prosecution of the criminals being rounded up in our worldwide ''War on Terror''.

Sincerely,
John Darr
4451 Pinyon Tree Ln
Irvine, CA 92612–2215

MTC–00005894

From: JTAPPOUNI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: DOJ Settlement

I am against the government in the Microsoft case.My support is behind Microsoft 100%. Julie Tappouni 1/2/02

MTC–00005895

From: Norm Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that Microsoft is a fine company and has a very good product and is not in violation of any laws.

I believe they should be able to improve on their product as they see fit, i use it all the time and look forward to improvments they make to the browser and email clients.

Thank You
Norman Johnson
1001 Heather Lane
Moore, OK 73160

MTC–00005896

From: George McLennon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Let's get this thing settled once and for all. No matter what legal issues come along there is always some Attorney that will bend, twist and almost break the law just to make a buck. Why don't we settle this as the Fed has already set forth.

It's time to get off Microsoft and get on the back of some of these so called special interest Attorneys whose only special interest is their own wallet.

Respectfully,
George McLennon

MTC–00005897

From: RABaehr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear sirs: I would hope that the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice and the 9 states that signed on will be approved. There was never any evidence of harm to consumers from Microsoft's behavior. The litigation was funded and promoted by Microsoft's competitors- Sun, Oracle, and AOL, among others. I hold stock in stock in several of these companies, as well as Microsoft, and have been upset that this is how these companies chose to compete with Microsoft- through the courts, rather than the marketplace. It is not the government's role to reward whiny competitors. Microsoft is certainly an aggressive competitor, and the terms of the proposed settlement suggest that the company's behavior needs to be monitored given its share of the operating system market. But expanding the capabilities of a software product is in consumers' interest. It is far easier , more efficient, and much cheaper for consumers to buy a broadened Windows, than many pieces of far more expensive software. Competition exists for Windows. Linux was not even a factor when this suit was framed, but now it is growing in importance. Sun's Java also offers a way to bypass Windows, as do internet only computers. This is a rapidly changing dynamic market. It doesn't need the heavy regulatory hand of government to reorder the pieces. Richard Baehr, Chicago, Il. .

MTC–00005898

From: Don Thompson (CDDG-TRAINING (038) CERTIFICATION)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While I think regulation is a necessary tool to ensure fairness and equity in commerce as stated in the Constitution, I feel the governement has succumbed to the interests of several corporations attempting to gain competitive advantage through litigation. When I read the information leading up to the Anti-Trust laws, the predominant theme is ''harm to the consumer''. Further, there is substance to expanding that to include damage to ''the competive nature of business'', however, I cannot see any merit to the claims that the corporations attempting to bring about this lawsuit have been damaged in that sense. Nor can I find ''harm to the consumer'' in any of may daily activities associating with the people the DOJ is attempting to ''protect''.

I urge you to cease the nonsensical litigation against Microsoft and any company for that matter, that would produce substantial harm to the economy. If you continue to pursue the litigation and bring about substantial repression of the companies productivity and innovation, I would then recommend a Anti-trust suit against those who cause the resulting harm to the consumer. . . .

Thank you for your time.
Don Thompson
6703 50th Place NE
Marysville WA 98270

MTC–00005899

From: RLWATSON77@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I hope you will go ahead with the settlement that has been offered to Microsoft. It appears to be practical and fair to all. We do not need more litigation on this matter.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Watson

MTC–00005900

From: Kurt Buecheler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is a world class company that competes vigorously, but no more vigorously than its competitors that are complaining about Microsoft. Microsoft has simply delivered a better consumer value proposition and customers have responded by adopting the product as the best way to enhance their abilities and lives.

For consumers, the PC has delivered a huge platform upon which innovation occurs at a rapid pace and delivers new functions and vastly improve the way we live and work and play. The PC standard embodies AMERICAN VALUES of empowerment and access to information. The PC is a low cost solution that continues to be available to more and more people.

In the process of consumer empowerment, the PC has created a huge market, many wonderful companies, increased productivity and a large tax base. If anything, the federal and state governments of the US should be considering how they can assist MSFT to continue to establish computing standards in the USA rather than somewhere else or under the heavy influence of other super powers such as the EU.

The settlement will be tough on MSFT, but should be accepted by both sides and become a closed issue. The important issue to the American people is the quality of their lives. (strong economy, safety, employment) The PC industry advancing creates employment and a strong economy and may even help with advancing security as a smart device that can greatly enhance the capabilities of security workers.

Please drop further litigation and focus on building the economy and security of the USA.

Sincerely
Kurt Buecheler
Microsoft employee and proud American

MTC–00005901

From: Morris Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern:

While I have not always been pleased with Microsoft's actions, I believe the government should not interfere with their Operating Systems. I have been working in this industry since 1980 and has seen the development of computers, first hand. I do not believe our computer capabilities would be as advanced as they are today, without Microsoft. If you look at what it cost consumers and Microsoft to advance to the computers Operating Systems of today, it is a fraction of what the Government spent with IBM, on their programs. In any case, Microsoft has the right to protect their investment. It shouldn't matter that their product is made up of ''0 and 1's''.

Respectfully,
Morris Allen
Vidcom Center/VidcomNet, Inc.

MTC–00005902

From: Patricia Swift
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Tunney Act seems fair to me. The settlement is in the public interest. It would NOT be in the public interest to drag this out. Let's get it settled, and then everybody can devote themselves to productive work instead of more litigation.

Sincerely,
Patricia Swift
Creswell, Oregon

MTC–00005903

From: Mark Spain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

enough is enough. settle case as soon as possible. It's in the best interest of the majority.

MTC–00005904

From: MASails@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Ladies and

Gentlemen:

I am one taxpayer who would appreciate the Federal District Court's holding to the settlement agreement reached in late 2001 with Microsoft.

The longer this suit is prolonged, the more out-of-date and obsolete become the complaints against the software company.

I'm sure that neither Microsoft nor their lawsuit-armed competitors are operating from selfless motives, but refereeing them at the taxpayers' expense is wasting my money. I also believe that, having redirected Microsoft's behavior somewhat, the courts should leave the business organizations to fight it out in the marketplace.

Marcia Andrews
Pineland, FL

MTC–00005905

From: Joe E. Mayfield
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to go on record as one firmly opposed to the DOJ's action against Microsoft in the first Place.

I believe that it was , pure and simple a witch hunt by the Clinton Administration. I believe that this suit was a major factor in the loss value in the Technology stock market. I has cost thousands of average U.S. citizens hundreds of thousands of dollars much of which was in retirement programs.

The Millions of dollars that it cost taxpayers to bring this suit was a total waste and could have been better spent tracking down and destroying the Terrorists which were attacking Americans and American interests all over the world.

MTC–00005906

From: Phinnt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

This case has dragged on for three (3) plus years and the present settlement should be IT. We and the Justice Dept. have got way more important issues to work on than let special interest groups continue to WASTE taxpayer's money on this beaten down hoss..Period. . .Period. . .Period. . .END OF REPORT

Best of Health and regards,
Phinn W. Townsend

MTC–00005907

From: Chris Worley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir/Ma'am,

I find the proposed Microsoft antitrust settlement to be just short of an apology to Microsoft.

It will do nothing to stop their anticompetitive behavior. It will do nothing to spur competition in the software industry. It gives Microsoft carte blanche to continue to run roughshod over consumers and competition.

The media has well documented that every key provision in this settlement has an ''opt out'' for Microsoft.

The one I'm most concerned with is the ''security'' ''opt out'' in the ''open protocols'' section. . .

''Security'' has become a buzzword associated with terrorist acts, allowing Microsoft to portray competing vendor's software compatibility with authentication software as an act of treason. It's just not so. ''Security through obscurity'' has never stopped hackers with ill intent, it only keeps those being attacked ''in the dark''. It's much like human viri: we want to know what can infect us, how to keep from getting infected, how to detect the infection, and how to stop the infection (even if it can't be stopped). This information is key to our longevity. For example, the recent anthrax terrorist acts have shown that public information is critical to detection and cure, and the lack of information led to unnecessary infection (of postal workers) and panic among the uninfected, and did nothing to stop the perpetrator.

Software viri/worms require the same publicity to protect and inform the population.

I'm afraid Microsoft has negotiated this loophole in the settlement with ill-intent in mind: stopping compatible products from competing under the guise of stopping terrorism.

For example, a software package called ''Samba'' competes with Microsoft NT file servers: file servers compatible with the protocols that provide you with your ''network neighborhood''. If Microsoft can hide the authentication protocol, then the competing file server software can't compete: if you have to have an NT server to authenticate users, then you might as well use that server to serve files and not use Samba at all. For Samba to compete, it must be able to perform all the necessary protocols for Microsoft's network file services. This settlement is a ruse. It's a trap. And, the DOJ seems overly willing to fall for it, to the detriment of competition and consumers.

Chris Worley
Salt Lake City, Utah

MTC–00005908

From: JDurliat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

ladies/gentlemen: please accept this communication as my congratulations on settling the microsoft case. usually these case are instigated by competitors simply wanting a government given advantage. the settlement seems reasonable. please try to get the remaining state to endorse the settlement so everyone can get-on with business.

very truly yours,
jack durliat

MTC–00005909

From: Mike Denholtz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

My opinion:

If the DOJ can settle then it should all be settled. Enough is enough.

Leave MS alone.

Thanks,

Mike

MTC–00005910

From: LSchoenber@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: MIRCOSOFT SETTLEMENT

Hi Sir,

I feel it should be settled now because we have 50 states and only 9 states do not agree. I always believe in majority. Microsoft did great job for deaf while other companies did not recognize the deaf's needs. Dont destroy it. I do not believe that Microsoft is monopoly because Microsoft did not make the customers suffer.

Thank you
Larry Schoenberg

MTC–00005911

From: Marilyn139@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:06pm
Subject: (no subject)

..I BELIEVE THAT A COMPANY LIKE MICROSOFT MUST REALIZE THEIR PROBLEMS (OTHERWISE THEY WOULD NOT BE AS SUCCESSFUL AS IT IS) IT IS TIME FOR ALL THEIR FINANCIAL SETTLEMENTS TO BE ACCEPTED AND LET THEM GET ON WITH THER R&D FROM WHICH THEY BECAME SO SUCCESSFUL

MTC–00005912

From: Robert Wallace
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As the owner of a small business that relies heavily, though certainly not exclusively, on Microsoft products, I want to express my displeasure with the continued harassment of Microsoft by the Justice Department and opportunistic Attorneys General from various states. I don't believe the DOJ claims or the settlement extracted from Microsoft were fair, but the DOJ and the company did agree and I believe the matter should be closed and the blood sucking by the states should be stopped. Robert C. Wallace, Bellevue, WA.

R.C. Wallace, CEO,
Wallace Properties, Inc.,
PO Box 4184,
Bellevue, WA. 98009–4184;
Phone (425) 455 9976; Fax (425) 646 3374;
rwallace@wallaceproperties.com

MTC–00005913

From: John Bradley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing about the settlement that has been reached in the Microsoft anti-trust case. I believe that this settlement is fair to all parties involved and it is a good agreement for consumers. I urge that the settlement be executed by the DOJ.

Sincerely,
John Bradley

MTC–00005914

From: Joseph Chauvin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: To Whom it may Concern,

To Whom it may Concern,

I strongly support the proposed settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft. The settlement more than addresses the concerns brought up at the trial without unduly harming a company that has perhaps done more for the US Economy than any other. This settlement will allow Microsoft to keep innovating, while being sensitive to the needs of competitors and computer makers.

The dissenting nine states proposed alterations to the settlement are punitive in nature, and are primarily designed to help Microsoft competitors at the expense of Microsoft and Microsoft shareholders. They are designed to prevent Microsoft from innovating, and to make Microsoft hand over intellectual property to competitors. Microsoft has shown signs it is very determined to comply with the settlement, by internally appointing compliance officers. Therefore, I believe the states concerns are unfounded.

It is my opinion that if the settlement is approved, and this case is finally closed, that it will help to eliminate uncertainty in the tech sector of the equity markets. This can also help to spur economic recovery. Therefore, I do not feel it is in the best interest of consumers or the country to drag this on further.

Please accept the settlement of United States vs. Microsoft as submitted by the US Justice Department.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Chauvin

MTC–00005915

From: Doc Gibson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

D.O.J.

This note is to let you know that as a consumer I support the current settlement being considered to end the litigation against Microsoft. I have watched as this litigation has unfolded and believe it is time to put a stop to it.

The money and political influence that has been pouted into the issue has for the most part been wasted effort, and has done little or nothing to improve the consumer's ability to access new technology and improvements to computer operating systems.

Please end the litigation and the appeals process as soon as possible. Accept the settlement that is currently on the table.

Sincerely, ''Doc'' Gibson
''Doc'' Gibson, CSAC, CPS, CCGC
CEO/Program Director
New Alternatives for Teens & Families
P.O. Box # 2547, Prescott AZ 86302
(888) 209–8573 Office
(928) 445–4375 FAX
docgibs@mindspring.com

MTC–00005916

From: DonaldSass@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has done more good for the US economy and for keeping US technology in the forefront over the past twenty years than have all of Microsoft's competitors combined.

DOJ should be more concerned with determining how US satellite technology got into Chinese hands during the Clinton administration, and less concerned with determining how Microsoft became the foremost software company in the world. DOJ should use it's resources to investigate Loral's relationships with the

Chinese government during the past ten years.

In other words, DOJ should lay off Microsoft and investigate Loral instead.

Donald Sass

MTC–00005917

From: Pvb959@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally have used Microsoft products since 3/98. I like Microsoft. Their service and support is terrific. I've never had any poor experiences, every question answered, everything to my satisfaction. I need Microsoft. I don't want anything the DOJ may do to effect their business negatively. This country needs Microsoft and all the new good things in the pipeline now, and in the future. I'm of the opinion that the marketplace will decide whats good or bad for this country. We don't need more government interference in our lives. Let's get this settlement overwith and get on with things.

Peter von Blanckensee
2400 E. Baseline Ave. #143
Apache Junction AZ 85219

MTC–00005918

From: ROGER MACON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: MicroSoft

I think you need to leave them alone so they can continue doing exactly what they have been doing which has been a great advancement for the entire world, the techno industry and has forced cohesive integrated growth.

Roger Macon

MTC–00005919

From: David Pharr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

I am a long time Microsoft supporter and would like to express my support for the proposed Microsoft settlement. I believe this proposed settlement provides significant benefit to the general public and is in the best interest of the U.S. economy. This case has dragged on for too long as it currently stands and I would like to see the settlement accepted and the case concluded.

MTC–00005920

From: Bernard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is high time this was over!

Me, a user of computers and much software has not suffered from anything Microsoft has done.

Neither have any of my Companies.

However, all of us have paid and have suffered, over these unnecessary lawsuits, instigated by a few so called competitors. If these so called competitors need our Government to survive in business, they should get out.

Enough is enough.

End it now, please.

Bernard Hollin

MTC–00005921

From: The Campbells
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to approve the Microsoft Settlement. I and all of my family and friends appreciate Microsoft's contribution to the computer world, and can't imagine a world without Windows operating system. And Internet Explorer is much better than Netscape.

So please approve the Microsoft Settlement.

Stephen Campbell
79 Manilla Dr.
Draper, UT 84020
(801) 495–3032
stevec@stevec.org

MTC–00005922

From: FRANKEROUSE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:07pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I am a Microsoft Windows user and have had no problems using other software. I was not in favor of the Microsoft litigation and now that there is an agreement with nine states and the Federal Govt. I can see no good reason to have other selfish interest groups drag this issue on into the future. Surely it won't help the best interests of the American public to drag this on in these times of economic uncertainty, especially if it serves the interests of a few States wherein Microsoft's competitors reside.

Please take action to end this issue immediately.

Frank Rouse
Yakima, WA.

MTC–00005923

From: Schober, Larry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

It is time to settle the Microsoft case and move on to more pressing problems. You are doing the consumer a disservice, and the nation as well, by pursuing this case. Please settle the case promptly.

MTC–00005924

From: Dick Reed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please confirm the proposed Microsoft Settlement. The stock market decline of 2000–2001 started with the Clinton administration attack on Microsoft. It contributed to the current economic recession. It is now long past due to allow the U.S. economy and financial markets to get back to normal. Any further litigation

intended to benefit competitors such as Sun Microsystems, Oracle, and Apple would be inappropriate and counterproductive.

Regards,
Richard A. Reed
319 Robin Way
Richardson, TX 75080
972–231–6689

MTC–00005925

From: Ronald S. Frantz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe that the Microsoft settlement is fair to all parties. I also do not believe that the suit should have been brought by the Justice Department.

Any further delay would be harmful to Microsoft and very unfair.

Sincerely yours,
Ronald S. Frantz
East Aurora, New York

MTC–00005926

From: Joyce Harness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:23pm
Subject: MSFT

Please get this case settled. I believe the settlement that was reached was fair and equitable and the case should end with that.

Thank you.
Joyce Harness
3015 NW 73rd
Seattle, WA 98117
206–784–9126

MTC–00005927

From: Don Harikian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept my comments on the Microsoft Settlement.

I am a business user and consumer of Microsoft products so my comments are from that perspective and are my own opinion. I have been in the business world long enough to see the evolution of many computer software products.

I have always gravitated to the products that provided the most efficiency and reduction in work as possible. I was delighted to install Framework on my computer because it itegrated features that I used most often. I must say that over those years Microsoft products ended up always providing the most efficiency for the price as any other product I have used on my desk top computer. For this reason I have always been confused by the theme of the antitrust case that Microsoft has harmed consumers. It seems that they have harmed competitors only because they provide, as I said, a better product for less cost. Microsoft is not the only software that our company uses, any software that adds value for a reasonable cost is on my desktop.

This brings me to my second point of confusion about the case in that it implies that I do not have a choice, as a consumer/user, about what software I use on my desk top just because Microsoft has an icon on it. I have never had any problem loading other software that adds value to my computer.

My third point is the question about proprietary software. I am not speaking as a lawyer but the company that has the ingenuity and know-how to bring unique products to the market should not be required to allow other companies to pirate and capitalize on that through access to their detailed programs. The DOJ should respect and honor this concept rather than allowing the ''world'' to have access to American ingenuity.

Fourth, I have followed this case since its inception and talked to many others in the business world and also home use consumers and have yet to find one person that said they have been harmed or have paid to much for Microsoft products. All have said that the company provides the best value for the buck. Our data processing people were ecstatic with NT products when they came out. They provided a low cost alternative. I am still wondering who has been harmed. Perhaps competitors with an inferior product at a higher price? Please do not construe my comments as just loyalty to Microsoft because as I said I have many of Microsoft competitor's products on my computer.

In summary, even though I am confused about the basic elements of this case, the settlement should be completed as it stands to get this whole thing behind us. The U.S. economy has suffered because of it and we must get on with innovation. I agree with Microsofts position on their statement of ''Freedom to Innovate''. I urge the dissenting states to end this as quickly as possible, it has already gone to far! I also encourage the DOJ to bring as much influence on those states to end this.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion. That is why America is the greatest!

Regards,
Don Harikian

MTC–00005928

From: howard schiffman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:23pm
Subject: As a small business deeply involved on the Internet

As a small business deeply involved on the Internet since 1996, we have been closely following the Microsoft case in the news reports. We feel confident the governments proposed settlement in this case is fair to all parties concerned. Today, more than ever, we are facing serious economic times. Let's get on with business, and increase our profits and build a much stronger economy!

Sincerely,
Howard Schiffman
Chief Operating Officer

MTC–00005929

From: Linda Heinkel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Tunney Act

Please finalize this situation as soon as possible. It is not in the public's best interest to allow lobbying special interest groups to delay this any longer.

Linda Heinkel
lheinkel@udnet.net

MTC–00005930

From: Pats413@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: end the suit..

The economy needs the case against Microsoft stopped! I am a consumer and a stock holder as are millions of other Americans. This case is continuing to undermine the entire high tech sector. Consumers have recouped their money by the low prices Microsoft charges for their software. States should be satisfied and end their suits.

MTC–00005931

From: Roy Leban
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I work for Microsoft, so you might think I'm biased about the Microsoft suit. I'm not. I thought it was stupid long before I joined Microsoft. Why is it stupid? A few reasons . . .

1. Microsoft has a monopoly on ''Windows operating systems''. Well, of course it does! In fact, it has 100% of the market, by definition. General Motors has a monopoly on Chevrolets, but nobody's complaining. Apple has 100% of the market for Macintosh operating system computers (both hardware and software!).

2. Microsoft has ''bundled'' things into the operating system that were previously available as extra components. Well, of course it does! This is how operating systems and practically all products are developed. Let's take web browsers: The Macintosh OS ships with a browser. Solaris ships with a browser. Linux has a browser. No operating system could ship today without a browser. What would you lose if you couldn't add anything to the operating system that had been available separately? A short list in Windows includes the file manager, long filenames, file search, integrated printer drivers, even ethernet/internet drivers. All those things used to ship as separate products.

If we applied the same rule to cars, your car wouldn't come with a radio, seat belts, cruise control, fuel injection, a center rear brake light or even a roof. Given all the things that have been bundled into cars, it is impossible to start a new car company today—much harder than it is to start a new computer company. You could even say that the car companies have colluded with each other to add those features to block competition (with the help of their accomplices, the DOT and the USTA). Following this logic, we should force all the car companies to unbundle almost everything so that new car companies wouldn't have such a high barrier to entry. Of course, the average car would cost $100,000 this way and consumers would have to basically assemble their own cars, but that's the price you pay for better competition.

3. Internet Explorer is much more than a browser—it's an integration of the web into the OS. Any application can use this feature and many do. Rather than inhibiting competition, the integration of IE encourages it because companies can build web and/or

browser functionality into their applications without having to write it themselves.

4. This suit has never been about monopoly power or what's good for consumers. It's about some jealous competitors who missed the boat for various reasons. But, given that the suit wasn't tossed out and that much of the judiciary and public don't understand enough about the situation, I think the proposed settlement is reasonable. Although some of it will be burdensome for Microsoft, it doesn't prevent Microsoft from doing what it does best—responding to customer needs and building better software.

Thank you for listening.

Roy Leban

RoyLeban@microsoft.com

DISCLAIMER: My opinions are my own, not my employer's

MTC–00005932

From: LnTDevita@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:23pm
Subject: Let's move forward

Please put an end to this litigation. As a concerned citizen and consumer, I would like to move forward in strengethening our economy in the face of global competition and global economic decline. Our country is stronger, smarter and better equipped to address the future because of innnovators like Microsoft. Please build a system where they are able to do what they do best . . . bring quality products to consumers. We the consumers have benefitted by the technology brought to us by Microsoft. Please allow them, and us, to get back to the business at hand: building a stronger America, made up of strong companies and empowered citizens.

Thank you,

Louis deVita,

Sammamish, Washington

MTC–00005933

From: pstaley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please add my name to those who think the Microsoft Settlement is fair.

Perry L.Staley
411 Orchard Street
Ironton, Ohio
45638–1166

MTC–00005934

From: bob fleming
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I WISH TO PROTEST THE DOJ'S HANDLING OF THE ABOVE SUBJECT. YOU HAVE SPENT MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF TAXPAYER FUNDS CHASING AFTER A COMPANY THAT HAS DONE NOTHING MORE THAN TO GIVE ITS CUSTOMERS THE BEST POSSIBLE PRODUCT AND SERVICE! YOU HAVE WASTED ENOUGH OF OUR MONEY,CLOSE THIS CASE!

ROBERT FLEMING

MTC–00005935

From: Manjogthru@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I cannot understant why the settlement with Microsoft cannot be finalized. Let's settle with Microsoft and get on with our lives. In difficult times like this we do not need to waste more time and money fighting a company that has done so much for all of us.

If you must fight someone, then go after the 9 states who are unwilling to settle. We all know why they want Microsoft punished and broken up. Put an end to this entire fiasco.

Carl Hanson
3703 Mc Cormick St. S.E.
Olympia, WA 98501

MTC–00005936

From: RANDMOREILLY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Case Settlement

I add my voice to the many who believe the settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case is fair to all. It is time to close this chapter and move on! In these unsettled times the country can ill afford such continuing litigation. The Microsoft competition should be satisfied at the outcome agreed to by the DOJ and the majority of the states. The opposing states' arguments against approval of this agreement are not persuasive. I earnestly request the settlement approved earlier be upheld. Let us all return to more productive activity.

Sincerely submitted.

Robert W. O'Reilly

MTC–00005937

From: W7326@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to give you my input on the Microsoft situation. This case should never have happened in the first place. It has taken months to try to settle and cost millions of dollars and an enormous amount of time that could have been used better elsewhere. It is time for this to be over. My vote is to settle this case and to do it as quickly as possible. Microsoft has been the leader in software ever since it started and has given the public many different ways to learn, communicate, entertain themselves, and make life easier and more interesting.

Doris Wolfe

MTC–00005938

From: Egarner123@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I am responding to the email that Microsoft sent advising me to let the DOJ know my opinion regarding the settlement. I think the settlement stinks to high heaven. In the past, I have been pro-Microsoft (years ago as an IT professional, I choose MS Windows 3.0 over the Mac, OS2, and UNIX clients—I took a professional blow for being so controversial). Presently, in my opinion, Microsoft is not serving the best needs of the public nor the stockholders.

As I understand the settlement, Microsoft is proposing to push its IT solution upon the upcoming generations through education. This is not a fine but an investment. More stringent punitive judgments need to be assessed. I suggest the following:

—billions should be awarded to alternative operating systems and office suites that promote a more open system—pre Windows XP version source code (client only), should be made available—to the public—Microsoft should lose its Windows trademark, any interested party should be able to license their own version of Windows.

The fact that Microsoft is behaving in a monopolistic manor during this controversial time, is a further indication of the company's contempt for the judicial proceedings and the public's welfare at-large. I urge the DOJ to continue negotiations with the public's interest as its guiding light.

Sincerely,

Edward Garner

IT Professional

MTC–00005939

From: Xue-Ling Han
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's fair and enough. Please have everyone go back to work.

MTC–00005940

From: Trey Bailey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I feel that any legislation that breaks a company, Microsoft or any other, is going beyond the place of government. Please let the agreed settlement continue.

Glynn (Trey) Bailey
Programming Department Manager
Wellsco Inc.
(870) 236–1080

This holiday season, as we laugh and eat and shop and enjoy friends and family, our soldiers are in Afghanistan risking everything for us. Some of them won't come back. The rest will never be the same. Every one of them volunteered. They think we're worth it. Let's prove them right.

Scot Adams (Creator of Dilbert)

MTC–00005941

From: SCHOTTLER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw
Date: 1/2/02 1:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I hope this is worth sending. I do not have much faith that it will be read or added to your files. Our government is not known for getting things right except when we go to war.

THE SETTLEMENT IS TOTALLY FAIR AND PROPER AND SHOULD BE APPROVED A.S.A.P.

James R. Schoettler

MTC–00005942

From: Steve Paylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sir/Madam,

This is to state my opinion concerning the DOJ/Microsoft settlement. First, I believe that the attack on Microsoft by the DOJ was very much politically motivated. I believe that the DOJ, under Janet Reno, was a political tool used by the Clinton administration to ''pay back'' those who did not adequately give support to the DNC or Clinton. Second, I believe that in this case, the DOJ took sides in an ideological struggle between left wing socialists and free market capitalists.

Third, I believe that the case unfairly sided with Microsoft's competitors who are jealous of Microsoft's success. Microsoft should be completely free to include or exclude any and all features in their software products. If that makes it difficult for competitors to compete, that is tough. This is part of the free market system and it is the competitor's problem to solve not the DOJ's.

Finally, I believe that Microsoft did employ some anti-competitive business practices. I believe that the settlement adequately punishes them for that misbehavior and it also provides much social good.

Steve Paylor
San Diego, California

MTC–00005943

From: Jhkober@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ, I think you should settle the Microsoft Case as agreed. States should follow your lead. Lets but this to bed now. Our country needs it's attention on building a strong American Economy. Microsoft is a great company and has made other company great as well because of their standards of competition.

Thank you. James H. Kober 70 E 10th St. New York, New York.

MTC–00005944

From: David Gam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Isn't it time to put an end to the persecution of Microsoft because of their success? Is this what we do to successful American enterprise? Does the economy have to be burdened by the whining of losers? The industry, the country and the world owes a debt to Microsoft for the contributions it has made that is unparalled. It in fact, virtually created the new industry that has brought prosperity beyond imagining. For this, do we penalize American enterprise? Because Microsoft accomplished what none of the whiners could, should we then listen to cries of ''foul''? Let's put an end to this travesty.

Sincerely,
David B. Gam

MTC–00005945

From: Bob Pap
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft Settlement needs to be done as proposed. I believe that it would be in the people of the United States interest that Microsoft put 10% of its R&D into developing a special version of Windows that is bullet proof and not released to anyone but government agencies and contractors. This is vital to the security of our national infrastructure. The people at Sun and Oracle now need to be investigated for their anti-trust activities in the same way as Microsoft. Note: their product is much more expensive and they refuse to license any patents to government contractors for enhanced development. Also, require any files and view of any Americans computer that Microsoft has on file to be deleted from their file if Americans opt out.

I believe that any state that does not want the settlement should be required to have a vote of confidence or no confidence in the law enforcement and prosecuters over the Web by people in the state. This should be published in a web listing. I bet Microsoft would cut costs and save us more money if DOJ had a running talley.

Bob Pap
Accurate Automation
7001 Shallowford Road
Chattanooga, TN 37421
423–894–4646 rmpap@accurate-automation.com

MTC–00005946

From: Les Herrman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs:

After extensively reading over the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case, I feel that the proposal is more than sufficient remedy in the case. Having been a computer user for over 10 years, I feel that no company has done more for the home personal computer industry than Microsoft. The inovations and ease of use of their operating system has made it very easy for new computer users to accomplish complicated tasks using their computers. Also the standardization of Operating System to Windows has helped to make it much easier for companies etc. to train employees to use the computers at their businesses.

I totally abhor the few companies that scream running to the DOJ to fight for them because they can not compete on their own merits. IE Sun, Netscape, AOL, and others mentioned in the Microsoft suit. Just because they can not come up with a compteing product that is as easy to use as Microsoft they go screaming foul and anti-trust and monopoly to the government.

I therefore urge you to settle this case with the current propsed settlement. The continuation of litigation in this case agains Microsoft will do nothing more than hurt the consumer and waste tax dollars that could be better spent somewhere else.

Les Herrman
19008 East 37th Terrace
Independence, Missouri 64057

MTC–00005947

From: Brian K. Rineberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the year's past you have shown no genuine concern for the ''CONSUMER''. This latest settlement further amplifies the general consensus within the DOJ and individual states Attorney General. That is to stifle the consumers actual wants and needs. This latest settlement does nothing to ''HELP'' the consumer, it just gives OEM manufacturers the opportunity to provide an onslaught of advertising to unsuspecting consumers.

I am often called in to ''clean up'' a messy OEM installation of an operating system containing links, icons and registry settings the consumer had no idea was to be included on their new computer. These advertisements are an intrusion and should be disallowed in all cases. If an OEM manufacturer develops a contract with an ISP for example, the ISP can simply provide software in the form distributable media such as a compact disc. This will save the consumer both time and money by allowing them to simply discard the unwanted inclusions. There is just one question needed to be answered. What gives ''ANY'' solution provider the ''RIGHT'' to include anything a consumer does not specifically ask for? The answer is quite simple. They have no right, no matter what licensing agreement they have with the manufacturer of the in question operating system.

I am insulted by the inclusion of the word ''consumer'' interjected into this battle between competitor's. Lawyers and State Attorneys General have no idea what is best for the consumer. They have only the best interest of the competitor or campaign supporter providing the question. When I purchase a corkscrew, I get a corkscrew, nothing more.

Brian Rineberg
San Marcos, CA

MTC–00005948

From: JR
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

Thank you for accepting feedback on the Microsoft case. I am a software developer with 13 years of experience. The most important thing to me is to be able to deliver quality software solutions to my customers in a timely manner. This has been getting easier and easier to do as Microsoft has continued to improve their products. Any effort to inhibit Microsoft will hurt my business, the business of my customers and ultimately it will impact our economy.

Product by product, I know first hand that one guy with one computer can compete with Microsoft. This makes the monopoly charge against them seem silly. Microsoft has been able to aggressively produce great products that people want. I do wish they would price and sell all their products separately. This would disarm those claiming there is a monopoly. However, even under that scenario, Microsoft would still sell more product than anyone else because as a rule their products are easier to use and are more robust than their competition.

I believe the persecution on Microsoft is primarily instigated by those who wish to have the ''monopoly'' for themselves. I have used all the products from those competitors and I can say without hesitation that their products are harder to use and are significantly more costly. Until they improve

their products they do not deserve the market share that Microsoft has. Please let our industry compete. There are thousands of businesses spending millions of dollars in this industry and I can assure you that they are very careful before committing real money on products. The best products have always floated to the top. Please do not try to manage that process.

Thanks—JR

John Richardson

MTC–00005949

From: Gayle Rivera
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

We believe that the Microsoft case should be settled and not continued to drag on.

Sincerely,

Ben & Gayle Rivera
1925 Willow Avenue
West Sacramento, CA 95691

MTC–00005950

From: Loyce Reid
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Tunney Act

I believe the settlement to be fair and we should get this settled and move on. I am a consumer and have no special interests.

Loyce Reid
loycere@earthlink.net

MTC–00005951

From: David Hogan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir:

It is time that the Government stop spending our tax dollars for such a frivolous case against Microsoft. Please settle this case now and move on to problems that are real problems. This case is not one that the American people want to continue with.

Regards:

David Hogan

MTC–00005952

From: bryce holmes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to settle the Microsoft case. The settlement that has been worked out between the federal government and Microsoft is fair. Consumers should be the focus of antitrust cases, rather than competitors. Microsoft has been hobbled long enough.

Bryce Holmes

MTC–00005953

From: Ed Seits
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is way past time to end this litigation. You should not cave to a few wealthy competitors who are trying to stifle innovation by attacking the company that has done more for advancing the use of computer technology by the average consumer than any other enterprise in modern history. Microsoft should be lauded for its contributions to improving our quality of life—rather than being crucified for being successful! You should respond to your responsibility to serve the interests of America's citizens by settling this case NOW!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ed Seits
Carmichael, CA

MTC–00005954

From: Knobler Al M NSSC
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The purpose of this e-mail is to express my desire to settle the microsoft restraint of trade issue under the federal government's comprehensive agreement. There are significantly more pressing matters that require the focus of the federal government than Microsoft's past practices. A recent example would be prosecution of terrorists. Enough already with Microsoft.

Alan Knobler

MTC–00005955

From: Jeff Kehl
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Justice Department,

I am writing to express my support of the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I feel that it is in the best interest of all parties, Microsoft, federal and state governments and individuals. I believe that weakening a corporation such as Microsoft would be a big mistake. It is one of the leading companies in the world and the US Government, and to a slightly lesser extent, the state governments shouldn't attempt to harm this company. The economy needs to have strong companies such as Microsoft to lead the way to a more connected and compatible computing environment.

I would appreciate your doing everything to bring this settlement to fruition and allow Microsoft to be able to concentrate 100% of its energies on producing products and operating systems that increase productivity and benefit all end users.

Cordially,

Jeffrey T. Kehl

MTC–00005956

From: Allen Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ: As a user of Microsoft products for the past eight to ten years I could never really understand the concern for the customer about Microsoft products, their instalation, costs, etc. that have been the emphasis of all the suits against the company. I have found their pricing satisfactory and their service excellent. Obviously the remaining states in the legal proceedings against have a axe to grind in that the companies in their states did not measure up to the expertise of Microsoft and they hope to damage Microsoft by their actions. I am not an attorney but rather a retired banker and can only hope that the Department of Justice will give both sides an equal opportunity to prove their case.

Sincerely,

Allen D. Anderson

MTC–00005957

From: Sam Steinhauser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I have been using Microsoft products for 12 years now in my home and business. The waste of tax dollars to continue pursuing this countries own software company which has set the standard in technology for the world is beyond belief. I'm sure Microsoft's practices may have been questionable, but what major corporation in this country when put under the magnifying glass would be sparkling clean? None!

I started out in 1988 with my first PC made by Apple. I was completely racked over the coals by Apple and their lack of support. Since 1988 I have lost thousands in products I purchased only to be replaced in a few months with newer technology. The technology business is dog eat dog. I paid $80 for a speech recognition program only to find it would not work with a newer computer and operating system in less than a year. Then I realized Microsoft had the same program. Microsoft's program was free and worked with most all systems. Most software companies will not give you phone support anymore. I have spent hours with Microsoft's Technical Representatives for free on numerous occasions.

I wanted to move from a text based internet connection to the current more graphical used interface. I had several choices, Netscape, Eudora, ect. For free I could use Microsoft's Internet Explorer and that's what I choose. Therein lies the problem. Microsoft put a hurt on Netscape, Netscape cried to the government and this mess started. What a waste of tax dollar resources! Why can't we be proud of having the biggest and most innovative software corporation in this country instead of spending millions to stifle them? Would it be better for the US economy to have Microsoft in France or Japan? How many of these people caring the sword for Microsoft spend 150+ hours in front of a PC every month? How many work for a competitor of Microsoft. How many have used Microsoft products for more than a decade. It is an embarrassment for this country to spend this kind of money and time trying to crush one of it's very own companies that sets a world wide standard for technology and offers unparalleled support for it's own products and then drive down a street in one of the Great United State's cities to see homeless people pushing shopping carts and rummaging through garbage cans. Please stop this action against Microsoft now.

Sam Steinhauser
sam@iglou.com

MTC–00005958

From: Sightsaver@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: DOJ settlement

It is high time that we put this case behind us. Clearly the DOJ has better things to do post 9/11 than pursue this politically

motivated witchunt of a great and valuable Amercan co. I think the proposed settlement is very much in the national interest.
Sincerely,
Leslie D. Grosinger MD

MTC–00005959

From: Ohmeryhew@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It seems to me to be a just settlement.Lets not have a small number of states hold this settlement up. Lets put this behind us and get back to much more important things.Such as airport securety,war on terrorism and doing away with UBL.

MTC–00005961

From: Charles Schneider
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I support it

MTC–00005963

From: Gates, Tom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Sir or Madam,
I my humble opinion, Microsoft action should be dismissed. As a consumer who has had a computer since 1983, I have benefited from constantly decreasing prices and increased functionality. I owe a lot of those positive trends to Microsoft. Further, I think you should give the company some kind of AWARD for good corporate citizenship instead of what you are currently trying to do.
Thank you.
Tom Gates
Any message forwarded from a source outside Dain, Goldman or First Boston is the opinion of that source and cannot be guaranteed to be accurate.
Tom Gates
First Vice President
RBC Dain Rauscher, Inc
509–574–5542 or 800–323–8870
409 N 2nd St
PO Box 485 Yakima, WA 98907
thomas.g.gates@rbcdain.com
Fax 509–454–0933

MTC–00005964

From: Larry Glaser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ
Please settle thjs suit ASAP. The current findings are fair.
L. Glaser

MTC–00005965

From: MsLillieB@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Re:MS settlement
I am against the government pursuing this any further and I feel all action should stop at once. Why can't the government stay out of business and let free enterprise survive by it's self? My tax dollars are being ill spent and I would like to see a stop to it.

MTC–00005966

From: Mehta, Prakash
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
My name is Prakash Mehta, I am CFO for Information Management Company located in Fairfax VA, our company has 250 employees and revenue of $ 19.0 million
I am in favor of DOJ & Microsoft settlement, we have to move forward in this economy time instead of fighting, settlement reach by DOJ & other state is fair and its best interest of small company specific to those employed in Information Management industry. Changing new rules hurts Software developer preparing product on based of Microsoft Operating system
Please considered our inputs
Prakash Mehta 703–352–8340

MTC–00005967

From: MesirowEsq@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
The settlement is good for the country. Let progress happen!
John Mesirow

MTC–00005968

From: SBacinoS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: object
Dear Sir:
I object that United States antitrust cases against Microsoft. I support Microsoft settlement.
Sincerely,
Simone Bacino

MTC–00005969

From: Gareth Larsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:
In response to the Government's position with regard to the Tunney Act I would like to add my comments concerning Microsoft. I am appalled at the action taken by the Government with regards to Microsoft.
I have used their products since the time of Windows 3.1. I do not know who has been harmed by Microsoft's practices and actions. I purchase and use a great deal of their software both in my home and in my business. I cannot recall one instance when they have failed to provide excellent product support when I have needed it, almost all of it free of charge. I certainly have never been harmed! I feel that their prices have been extremely fair. Why is the Government trying to destroy one of the most innovative companies in the world?
I strongly urge the Department of Justice to conclude this matter and reach final settlement without further delay.
Respectfully,
Gareth L. Larsen
Senlar Resources
glarsen@senlar.com

MTC–00005970

From: jdahl@pipeline.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir,
While I am not an employee of Microsoft nor a friend of Mr. Gates, I must sincerely urge you to complete the settlement of the Microsoft case as quickly as possible. It appears to me that the current settlement is both fair and just and it is long past time for this issue to be put to bed. Microsoft has certainly given more than it has gotten over its corporate history, and, after all, this country IS all about success. Microsoft is successful, and because they are, we are ALL successful. Please use the resources that you have been using to pursue Microsoft to pursue anyone and everything involved with bin Laden/Al Qaeda /Sept 11, et. al. And put the Microsoft issue to rest!!!
Respectully,
James K. Dahl
3815 South Kalispell Street
Aurora, CO 80013–2703
voice: 303.693.9869
fax: 303.617.0308
email: jdahl@pipeline.com

MTC–00005971

From: Chris McQueeny
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I am writing this email to convey waht I hope will be the opinion of the public on the Microsoft Settlement. While this aggrement is a tough one, it is in the best interest of not only the economy, but the consumer base that it be passed. I feel that protracted litigation will only further hinder the progress Microsoft is making in the modern world. I hope my opinion has helped the Department of Justice settle this case.
Sincerely,
Chris McQueeny

MTC–00005972

From: Lenora Lawrence
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: Dear DOJ,
Dear DOJ,
Enough is enough—Leave Microsoft alone. One of the best run and most sucessful companies in the US and THE GOVERNMENT wants to destroy the company. The United States of America should incourage free interprise not distroy it. A concerned citizen.
Yours,
Lenora Lawrence
elytisranch@hotmail.com

MTC–00005973

From: Jsimsaug@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
I am urging a final settlement on the issues. Litigation is timely and costly and quite frankly a waste of good taxpayers monies. This case has gone on far too long. I urge a final settlement!
Jeanne Sims
GS Consulting Services, Inc.
Phone: 817.430.9520
Fax: 817.430.9507

Cell: 817.999.9887

MTC–00005974

From: flapolecat@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen (and Ladies):

I wish to comment on the settlement. It is in the best interest of the country, the government and in particular small business people such as me, to stop this exercise. There will always be the ''have's and the have not and there will always be some one who feels that they have been wronged. If you, in your infinite wisdom, tell me that I can not innovate because it may offend my neighbor, I will stop, and America will stop.

It is reasonable to rectify a problem once identified but not to make it retroactive to when the problem did not exist. As new things emerge, new problems will be the result. I, personally, did not fully understand the problem. I understand the concern of the competition and the urge to ''protect'' their turf, but a law suit when the only crime was to be smarter than those before us?

Playing this game only hurts the people who work for, invest in, and use Microsoft products. I find they are a very responsible provider of free support and very competitive in their pricing. I recently purchased a Quicken 2002 program. It would not load properly in my machine and the literature said ''there may be a charge of 95 cents a minute for technical advice. I sent the program back. If it were Microsoft, there would be ''fixes'' on the Internet. When you are good there are many who will be jealous but allowing them the use of the ''law'' to satisfy their hurt feelings is dangerous for our country.

I am 66 years old and have worked for private industry and the government (NASA) for most of those years. I am presently retired and find a lot of enjoyment using my computer(s). I use a multitude of programs and usually rate them by the amount of support they offer. Some are good and the rest go by the way side. Please consider all the implications in your decision.

Thank you
Fred Budukiewicz
325 Inlet Ave.
Merritt Island, FL 32953

MTC–00005975

From: Ginny Caughey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a software developer and partner in a small software company located in North Carolina that develops software for municipalities and business all over the US and Canada. I am also a Compuserve subscriber as well as a AOL–Time Warner RoadRunner subscriber for Internet access. As you may imagine, the current legal proceedings against Microsoft interest me professionally as well as personally very much.

I am very satisfied with the terms of the Microsoft settlement, as is my state's attorney general. I do not use some of Microsoft's competitors' products because I find them INFERIOR, not merely because Microsoft provides competing products. I do use some products that compete directly with Microsoft's because I find them better suited for my purposes. And I purchase Microsoft products instead of using free products from other sources when that is the best business choice for my clients. I do not believe that it is in my best interests as a consumer or as a software developer for a minority of state attorneys general to pursue this matter further in hopes of providing an unfair competitive advantage to some of their constituents. If they truly want to help AOL or Sun Microsystems, for example, they could advise them to provide better products and services! Competition is the engine that results in the best products and services for me and my clients, and the current terms of the settltement ensure that competition for all parties is possible. I hope that the Court will agree with me that this matter should be ended with the current settlement.

Sincerely,
Ginny Caughey
Vice President
Carolina Software, Inc.
Wilmington NC

MTC–00005976

From: Arthur Whitson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

The Microsoft Settlement is fair and just. There is no reason for delaying any longer. Free enterprises must continue to be free to compete. If a company wins in the marketplace by consumers buying it's products: The people have the right to choose!!!

I am a resident of Manatee County Florida.
Art Whitson

MTC–00005977

From: Wes Green
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Litigation is the cancer of America that robs from the economy and lines the pockets of opportunists. Microsoft has offered a fair structured settlement to benefit the people and silence its critics. However, a number of states refuse to approve the settlement due to their inability to make a stand in the face of the lobbyists of the self serving technological companies within their own borders. I implore the government to approve the agreement for what it is; a mutual compromise for all involved.

Move forward on stopping the corporate takeovers that have robbed competition from America. Attack the AOL's and Oracle's that use their power and political clout to destroy the American dream. Until the US Government acts equally against all many of the people will just agree that the government is nothing more than a puppet for the lobbyists lining the politicians pockets.

MTC–00005978

From: Mrtea@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Mr. Attorney General Ashcroft:

Please get this case settled and get rid of the 9 renegade states who are prolonging the agony for some political purpose.

Rick Trenkmann
Chicago

MTC–00005979

From: Tony Tidball
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: I feel the settlement re Microsoft is a fair settlement.

I feel the settlement re Microsoft is a fair settlement.

MTC–00005980

From: Sheila Milligan
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello!

I'm a consumer of Microsoft products/ technology. I have to tell you how disappointed I am at the personal vendetta that the DOJ is carrying out against Microsoft for a few insiders in the technology industry.

Seems that the DOJ has nothing better to do with my money as a taxpayer. But they have all the money in the world to spend on a useless lawsuit. Why don't you invest this money in something we can use—like upgrading our education system, rehabilitating real criminals or public education of self responsibility?

You have Chevron and Texaco merging to create yet another monopoly. Of course you wouldn't even consider thinking that taxpayers paying smokers to live like millionaires because of their bad habits are bad. Good to know that our States Attorney Generals prefer smokers to great products in winning state money from you. How blind the DOJ is to real consumer issues and how blind the DOJ is to technology. What a great laugh you provided the entire technology industry with the technology trial by lawyers that know nothing about technology. But now the lawyers know how to turn on a computer—that makes for smart business. Good to know.

Thanks for the vent—I'm so disappointed in the system and yes I only see it from my side—I'm a very happy consumer of Microsoft products. Go Bill—Keep up these great products, programs and support. At least someone thinks about the consumers.

Sheila K. Milligan-Trounson
Owner
Milligan Events
733 North 14th Street
Boise, ID 83702

MTC–00005981

From: Jhilge1032@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement as set forth by the government should be approved. It is time to stop the legal proceedings and let the companies help the public through their innovative developments.

The appeals by other companies who want to be able give the public inferior products at the same or greater cost should be denied.

A. Hilgendorf
Bloomfield, MI

MTC–00005982

From: Marcella Fenske
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: innovate now, get this over with, please.

MTC–00005983

From: Kathurban@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please abide by the court decision and DO NOT allow continued law suites to re try this issue with Microsoft. Microsoft has helped the world in general and our economy does not need to have the same anti trust issues re visited. I believe in the anti-trust laws but this Microsoft issue was decided and should be put to rest.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Urban
Atlanta, GA

MTC–00005984

From: Ingham, Richard
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern at the Justice Dept.:

Please support this settlement and bring an end to this case. Continued litigation benefits only competitors, who should not be able to win in the courtroom what they cannot win in the marketplace.

Sincerely,
Richard Ingham
CIS Development
Mailcode: N03–2A
Phone: 508–549–6357
Fax: 508–549–6698
mail to: ringham@foxboro.com

MTC–00005985

From: Dusza, Michael E
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear USDOJ:

I am pleased with the settlement in the Microsoft case and do not want to see it go any further.

I am also a very modest Microsoft shareholder (100 shares).

I can see no further benefit to the consumers of the world by dragging this case.

Please concentrate your efforts to locate and punish those who would destroy the fabric and being of our wonderful country... including the United States Department of Justice.

Thank you.
Michael W Dusza, Technical Consultant
Mellon Investor Services LLC
105 Challenger Road
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660
(201) 373–7302
mdusza@melloninvestor.com

MTC–00005986

From: Ted Rickel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm

I believe that it has been and still is wrong for the U. S. Dept. of Justice to have any court cases against Microsoft. Microsoft has done nothing wrong. And the U. S. Dept. of Justice should never have brought a suit against Microsoft in the first place. All of this litigation is a waste of my tax dollars. The U. S. Dept. of Justice should use those dollars to fight terrorists and illegal immigration. Thank you.

Ted
01–02–02

MTC–00005988

From: Frank Fujioka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I have used Microsoft products for the past 9 years. I consider them to be an important part of my computer work. Considering the time, money and personnel required to produce the software, I believe that the prices of their products are extremely reasonable.

I have used other competitive products and find them to be inferior and I do not consider Microsoft to be a monopoly. It is simply the best product on the market.

Frank Fujioka
4636 S Rhodie Ln
Freeland, WA 98249

MTC–00005989

From: PMcCombie@Herc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir:

I wanted to voice my opinion of the proposed Microsoft settlement. I feel that it is in my best interest, as a consumer, to allow the current settlement to be approved. Professionally, as an IT support representative for a multinational corporation (Hercules, Inc.), the commonality of Microsoft software has allowed me to provide better support in a more timely fashion to my customers. If the proposed remedies are extended, that will have a severe negative impact on both my professional and personal life.

Sincerely,
Patrick J. McCombie

MTC–00005990

From: MarvinLaw@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

After so many years of litigation, I feel the settlement finally negotiated with Microsoft, the government and several States is, in fact, in the best interests of all concerned parties, as well as the technology industry and the general public who are theoretically the purported beneficiaries of this litigation and settlement.

I feel the Settlement as negotiated, should be approved and the litigation ended. The marketplace, as usual, will then sort out the surviving competitors based upon their products and prices.

Thank you for your consideration.
Marvin Srulowitz, Esq.

MTC–00005991

From: gordon hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

As a spouse, parent, business person and American citizen I am concerned about the fairness with which we are treated. From what I see, I believe the Microsoft settlement is going more in favor of the rich and powerful than toward an equitable resolution. Microsoft has used their position to directly influence this outcome, which is their responsibility to employees, customers and shareholders (I am the latter two); however, I am convinced they also abuse their position through intimidation both direct and indirect.

Their direct bullying can be seen in the restrictive practices they have used in forcing their distributors to favor their products. Their indirect (covert) actions are evidenced by their avoiding adherence to standards they supposedly support by adding features which make the use thereof non compliant with the standard; e.g., their JAVA 'extras'. This is not a plea to punish them, rather one to encourage the Department of Justice to be enthusiastic in encouraging fair play.

Thank you,
Gordon Hill, Explainer
creative explaining services
8620–15th Lane N.,
St. Petersburg, FL 33702
http://www.explainer.com
727.576.4028

MTC–00005992

From: gppatnude@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft Settlement has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars as well as millions in funds from Microsoft as well. While all this was going on, untold illegal copies were made and sold, further undermining the economy of the US and the technological leadership of American high-tech companies. This has only served to increase the cost of software development and protection. This whole process should have been expedited in order to permit Microsoft to get back to ''normal business operations'' years earlier.

Microsoft is the leader in software technology and should not be punished because they are good at what they do. The built their market share based on the ability to deliver solid and reliable technology. In reality, Microsoft is the injured party and should be reimbursed for the legal costs required to defend their position.

MTC–00005993

From: Sam DeNardo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft

Hi,

It is plain to see that Microsoft's Windows operating system has won the race in getting people to use to use it. I know this fact has

not been lost to anyone with common sense. Imagine the mess the DOJ would be in today without a ''universal computer language''. The Judges on the bench use Windows ??? The United States is currently facing a crisis of epic proportions. It would be insane for the DOJ and all other US law enforcement agencies to try and communicate effectively without a ''universal computer language''. Let's face it you would not want our leaders at the DOJ, the Senate, and the Congress speaking in French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Greek on a daily basis to conduct business. Let's slap Microsoft on the wrist for anything they did wrong in getting where they are, but let us get on with declaring an Official ''universal computer language'' like we did with the English Language.

Thank you

Sam

MTC–00005994

From: HLeeW1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Settlement

DOJ,

I think it is time to settle this costly law suit with Microsoft and let every one get on with life. DOJ has made it's point and can still keep a check on Microsoft. We have more important things to get done in America. Settle now and get it over with.

Lee Wallace

MTC–00005995

From: IreneD8454@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please stop wasting government money and finalize the settlement. There are better things to do to protect consumers and to make life better for our citizens than to continue litigation that nobody but special interests seem to desire.

Irene Dowdy

MTC–00005996

From: manuel reyes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:30pm
Subject: DOJ get off Microsofts' Back

To the demos in the Doj, get off the Microsolts' back. Clinton and his lap dogs have blackmail the people of this country.

Manuel D. Reyes
2892 Rockford Falls Drive North
Jacksonville, Florida 32224–4878

MTC–00005997

From: CrisKell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Why doesn't the DOJ quit tormenting Microsoft and move on. The states are claiming that the consumer was 'short-changed' by Microsoft. It seems to me that if the consumer didn't like the Windows OS, they could vote with their feet. You can't make somone buy what they don't want to buy. This is all triggered by whining competitors who can't make the grade on their two feet.

I should think the fact that Microsoft is maintaining its workforce when layoffs in all sectors are a problem would be reason enough to support their success rather than try to stifle it.

Shame on the whiners!! Please stand up for one of our great American Companies—MICROSOFT!!

Christine M. Kellstrom
1 Cromwell Drive
Morristown, NJ 07960
973–898–6751
CrisKell@AOL.com

MTC–00005998

From: ESanmiguel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear sir or Madam: there are other companies that truly have monopolies and provide the worst service to consumers and yet DOJ does not go after them; for intance telephone companies, like sprint. Hence compare to telephone companies microsoft should be let go fordward. As to true monopolies go after them instead.

Thanks.

MTC–00005999

From: Marcella Fenske
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm

let microsoft act like a businness with no further delay, government, take a hike.....

MTC–00006000

From: Maines, Roy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings,

I would like to share my opinion regarding the settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust case. I would like to applaude the efforts of the Justice Department under the Bush Administration. The settlement that has been proposed is reasonable and fair to all parties. It is time to put this case behind us and move on. I believe that it is crucial to the US economy, to settle this case and move on with the business at hand. The never ending stream of lawsuits filed against Microsoft by it's competitors is designed to derail one of our Nations most successful companies. Microsoft is clearly a key player in the US Technology industry as a leader in a number of key areas and as a partner to thousands of smaller companies who depend on Microsoft innovations as the basis of their business.

If your taking count, I am all for the settlement. It's time we move on!

Kind Regards,
Roy Maines
Senior Systems Analyst
Perot Systems Corp.

MTC–00006001

From: Larry Shirley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

It is time to put the Microsoft issue to bed. If the DOJ had spent as much time, money and energy following up on terrorist leads (i.e. the Minnesota debacle; tips from foreign intelligence agencies, etc., etc.) in this country as they have trying to punish an outstanding, innovative company like Microsoft, the national tragedy that occurred on 9–11–01 could have been avoided.

The DOJ and FBI must share a great deal of blame for the failure to detect the long-range planning required to pull off a terrorist attack like this on our country. Shame on those who did not act on information they had months or even years before the attack. Instead of following up on obvious leads/indications, you were out to destroy one of the most beneficial American companies of the last half of the 20th Century.

Sincerely,
Larry D. Shirley
Mountain Home, AR 72653

P.S. Question: What are you going to do about the ENRON debacle?? Where were you when the top brass of this corporation were running it into the ground?? You need to get your priorities straight.

MTC–00006002

From: David Hodgson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I want to express my concern about the settlement with Microsoft. I don't believe that this settlement does anything to fix the problem of the anti-trust practices of Microsoft. It leaves the door wide open for them to continue the same practices and actually makes them legal with a court ruling. It also does nothing to help those companies that have been damaged by Microsoft, nor does it help the consumers that have been overcharged by Microsoft.

Please take another look at what Microsoft has done and at what this settlement will do to fix the problem. I don't think that breaking up the company is the answer (one big Microsoft, or two small Microsofts, it's still the same), but this settlement does not bring justice.

Thank you for your time.
David Hodgson
dhodgson@sacog.org
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00006003

From: Edward Gioffre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom it may concern,

My opinion on this matter is that we shoud move on. Lets end this useless Antitrust litigation, and focus on our economy. This has been a waiste of my tax dollars from the very begining. Those competitors are just jelouse of Microsoft's success, they should try to innovate instead of litigate.

Microsoft Corp., one of the most powerfull software technology companies in the world, and its an American corporation! Lets keep leadership companies here in the states, not overseas.

Ed Gioffre

MTC–00006004

From: Fern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is in the best interest of consumers for the DOJ to act quickly and go ahead with the terms of the comprehensive settlement reached by the federal government and nine states.

Additional litigation is a total waste of the taxpayers' money.

A concerned citizen,
Fern Price
CC:msfin@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006005

From: hwfascher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

It seems that Microsoft is willing to accept the offered settlement, so lets get this behind us so everyone can get on with what they do best. Develop new and better software.

Sincerely,
Harvey

MTC–00006006

From: dale nichols
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm

Dear Attorney-General,

I am writing about the Microsoft anti-trust case and the refusal of some nine states to accept the settlement already accepted by the other states involved.

I was totally shocked by the gloating Ms Reno when she announced that a blow for the consumer had been struck against this evil giant. This blow costs those she was protecting literally millions of dollars in the various retirement funds throughout the country as well as millions to all investors. There is a direct relation between this lawsuit and the tumble of the stock market that followed. I and many others believed that this attack on Microsoft was politically motivated by the Clinton administration and hoped that justice would prevail once a new administration took office. We need to put an end to this economic persecution by what appears to be self-serving interests of the competitors of Microsoft. After the many hours the government and the taxpayer money that has been spent on this politically motivated attack on one of America's most consumer friendly companies. (Microsoft has kept the costs of software at an affordable level.)

And after a hard won settlement has been reached that both sides have agreed to WHY? are a few states trying to continue this attack? It is my opinion that the state of California for one has rejected this settlement because of the pressure the political leaders of that state are feeling from the competitors of Microsoft that are resident in that state. Sort of a warning to outside companies don't be too successful or else.

Giving competitors a foot up by punishing an aggressive hard working company only warns other companies that success doesn't have to come through hard work and new ideas, if you are losing a race blame the winner...its their fault for your lack of progress in the market place. Please set a tone that says we are not fooled by these pretenses that Microsoft is successful because of hard work and that we respect that. Stop the on-going persecution and make the agreed upon settlement the final chapter. Lets all get back to work for a better climate for business in America.

Sincerely,
Dale Nichols

MTC–00006007

From: RoseMHern@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This entire proceeding has been nothing more than a ''witchhunt'' conducted by our government on behalf of PR-powerful corporations. It has done nothing to protect the consumer, nor to advance technology and has only managed to dwindle the hard-earned investments of people like myself who trust the innovations developed at Microsoft. It's time we settle and get it over with—and it is time the DOJ reign in the renegade states who still want to operate in the dark ages.

Rose M. Hern?ndez

MTC–00006008

From: WIrwin5597@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:33pm
Subject: (no subject)

I find the amount of time and money my government (my elected officials) have spent litigating this issue to be totally irresponsible. Accept the settlement and stop any further litigation. Can you imagine a world that did not have Bill Gates and Microsoft??

MTC–00006009

From: Tony P. Krvaric
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Give it a rest already! As an american and a Microsoft shareholder I'd like to see this witch-hunt end once and for all. It saddens me to see that there's actually a limit to how successful a company can become before all the lawyers and politicians start to go after it. Microsoft needs to be able to compete and increase the functionality of their products and services. In my opinion, the company is more vulnerable today than at any other point in time, due to the rapid adoption of the Internet.

New operating systems and software can be spread very quickly and reach mass adoptation if it's the right product. My Microsoft products have been increasing in functionality while prices have stayed the same or decreased. I'd say that's a benefit to all consumers.

In addition, there are enormous cost savings when many individuals and corporations use the same software—imagine if we had 8 operating systems and 16 word processing or spreadsheet programs on the market. It'd be chaos.

In addition, Microsoft's products continually will awards for being great software. That does not mean they're prefect, only that they're the best out there. If someone offers me a better product at the same or lower price, I'd naturally consider it. I am sick and tired of listening to whining babies like Larry Ellison of Oracle and Scott McNealy of Sun Microsystems. They should spend less time on the legal circuit whining and more time hunkering down and coming out with superior products.

As a republican I'm particularly disgusted with Sen. Orrin Hatch's stand on the issue when it's so obvious he's not reflecting the US as a whole, but instead looking to protect Novell from competition—it's unamerican! Thanks for considering my opinion. Warm Regards,

Tony P. Krvaric
San Diego, Calif.

MTC–00006010

From: Perry Herman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear DOJ:

It fascinates me that while corporations like AOL/Time Warner use their economic might to control the Internet Provider Service market and while other media giants continue to increase their monopolistic control over the airwaves/cable/satellite, a handful of state's attorney generals have decided to tirelessly pursue the Microsoft issue. They continue to rally on behalf of Netscape (which, despite its vociferous opposition to huge monopolies, sold out to a huge monopoly) and the billionaires who control Sun and Oracle. In the meantime, middle class share holders like me continue to suffer economic harm. I guess state governments feel it's their duty to continue fighting for a handful of Silicon Valley billionaires.

I want this anti-trust matter resolved now. My retirement depends on it.

Thank you,
Perry Herman

MTC–00006012

From: MPavlow@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 2, 2002

This case has gone on long enough. It is time to settle the Microsoft case for the good of the public and the economy.

Marlene Pavlow

MTC–00006013

From: Ikoti@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement as earlier proposed between the company and the Dept. of Justice. Continued litigation is not in the best interest of the consumer, competition, or free trade. Such action is only in the interest of those companies that are competitors of Microsoft and are not able to compete on a level playing field. They desire the courts to offer them an unfair advantage in the marketplace.

In the best interests of the country, and the consumers in general, settle the case and let's move on. The questions addressed in the original case have long been overcome by events.

John J Higgins
Boise, ID

MTC–00006014

From: jay@bonzi.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has had to endure the wrath of a government lawsuit waged on behalf of its competitors and I call on the Justice Department to put a quick end to this unnecessary and harmful court action. Microsoft has made significant contributions to our nation's economy, to technological innovation and—most importantly—to the quality of life for American consumers. For the past twenty-five years, no company has done more for consumers and our national economy than Microsoft. Microsoft is one of our most globally competitive companies and we should be bolstering its competitive position not poisoning its roots.

The Justice Department has spent millions of dollars on this case and never produced a single consumer who'd been harmed by Microsoft. The Government failed to prove that consumers have been adversely affected by Microsoft's business practices. On the other hand, what we have seen is that the economy and technological innovation have been adversely affected by the government's business practices. It's time for the Bush Administration to move to settle this case and to lift the burden the Department of Justice has placed on the high technology industry.

Look, the antitrust laws were written to deal with industries with high market entry barriers and long-lasting market dominance—i.e. that would use their power to harm consumers. The government and the court have been unable to find a harmed consumer. Besides, in the high tech industry, innovation and its resulting constantly changing marketplace renders any possible market power obsolete.

Can't you seed that this case is one of the most significant factors that will influence the future health of our economy? I am convinced that it is in the best interest of consumers and the U.S. economy for this case to be resolved as quickly as possible. The U.S. economy needs a boost, not continued litigation... and we need the creative team at Microsoft to keep doing their great work.

Jay Bonzi

MTC–00006015

From: Barry Behrman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Nobody has done it better than Microsoft for the individual consumer! ''User Friendly'' Those are the words that matter most and the other jealous nerds are not at all concerned with this. Bill Gates built the better mouse trap and it is entirely up to them to come up with a competitive operating system. It is quite obvious that they can not and that their answer is to screw it up for the rest of us so they can sell inferior products that do not work well with other systems and force us to hire technicians to keep the systems running.

Thank you!

Q-Master Billiards

MTC–00006016

From: WiltonWood@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would recommend settling the case, and get back to business!!

MTC–00006017

From: Tom.Luther@flextronics.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: end the embarrassment of DOJ, quit while you're behind

I'd like to thank the ruling political class for making a mockery of the Constitution, and dragging the DoJ through the mud. So called anti-trust legislation is impossibly broad and famous for the political process used to select victims. Microsoft is only the latest example of what is wrong with the DoJ, DC, and the anti-trust laws that cripple the economy.

Microsoft now pays millions annually in homage to its (now acknowledged) master in DC. The trolls have their pound of flesh, they will crawl beneath their bridges and wait for the next kill. Perhaps it will not be so large or so arrogant as Microsoft. But there are no lack of companies who fail to see the ''success trap'' embedded in our legal system. It doesn't pay to succeed too well in America. And it's particularly poor practice to not even pay lip service, much less direct graft, to the DC mob. Microsoft made all these mistakes.

The ultimate irony of the ''settlement'' is that Microsoft has secured a monopoly on public school children. Institutionalizing a monopoly is a comic and fitting end to the litigation. I suggest that the DoJ quit now, lest the settlement be expanded to ''force'' Microsoft to supply software to all government organizations (possibly to be later expanded to include all government suppliers and contractors) throughout the US.

Tom Luther
411 Cutler Street
Raleigh, NC 27603–1921
919.821.5521
luthert@asme.org

MTC–00006018

From: Ted Rickel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm

I believe that it has been and still is wrong for the U.S. Dept. of Justice to have any court cases against Microsoft, Microsoft has done nothing wrong. And the U.S. Dept. of Justice should never have brought a suit against Microsoft in the first place. All of this litigation is a waste of my tax dollars. The U.S. Dept. of Justice should use those dollars to fight terrorists and illegal immigration.

Thank you
Ted
01–02–02

MTC–00006019

From: Randy (038) Marinelle Szenasy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the Microsoft Settlement go through immediately in its original, without any further disruption from special interest groups individual state governments, who are trying to make money from it.

Consumers across this nation want the settlement to go through as is, and also want this constant attempts to derail it stopped once and for all. Please do this immediately!!!

Thank you,
Marinelle K. Szenasy
Hobbs, New Mexico

MTC–00006020

From: Laura Dodds
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

How can world computer services progress if the MAJOR innovator in the world is continually restricted from giving complete services to the world. I URGE that Microsoft be allowed to continue their outstanding record of innovation without any further legal constraint. Let's make the new century the best in communications with MIcrosoft leading the way for everyone!!!

MTC–00006021

From: Scott McNairy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is important to realize that the remaining 9 states in the DOJ case that are seeking very radical resolutions that lie outside of the scope of what Microsoft has been found guilty of are all homes to competing firms products, ironic isn't it—given that Monopolies don't have competitors. The court should stick to the already harsh resolution that the DOJ has ratified.

Scott McNairy

MTC–00006022

From: Vic and Gigi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

It is my sincere desire the the ''United States Department of Justice'', and/or, the States that have not yet agreed to settle this Microsoft debacle, do so now, without anymore delay and in my opinion, unjustified litigation! Any more delay in an attempt to punish, an already punished Microsoft, would only serve to further weaken an already weakened economy.

Sincerely,
Victor Scaturo

MTC–00006023

From: LYONCLAN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the District Court to accept the above subject...it's fair!

Richard Lyon
600 South The Strand
Oceanside, CA 92054

MTC–00006024

From: Richardson, David M
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle and end the persecution of Microsoft and the free enterprise system.

Thank you,

David Richardson

david.m.richardson@turner.com

MTC–00006025

From: JBATES1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Government Officials

You have wasted enough of puplic monies pursuing this antitrust action. You only hurt our American economy by prolonging this action. You are wrong, get over it , and get going to building our economy!

John Bates,

New York

MTC–00006026

From: Tom Byrne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although I would like to see the Microsoft suit go the US Supreme Court where I am confident that the District Court's verdict would be vacated, the Federal government and Microsoft have finally reached agreement on settling the matter. Therefore, this settlement should be accepted by the court. From its very beginnings this suit was ill conceived, politically motivated, and underwritten by Microsoft competitors. While certain Microsoft contracting practices deserved judicial scrutiny, the essence of the suit missed the underlying technical issue by a country mile. The battle is really about something called a Virtual Machine (VM), an internal part of the operating system that the Internet browser relies on and that an end user never really sees.

The VM is the software component in the browser that allows ''Java'' to work. Java is the much-ballyhooed technology that Sun Microsystems touts as the lingua franca of the Internet that will eliminate the need for robust operating systems. Obviously, the Sun and Netscape folks support this approach and Microsoft does not. Microsoft perceives Java as merely another programming language, albeit well suited to the Internet, and has already ''enhanced and embraced'' it by creating J++ (now C#). Of course, it should also be noted that the entire stable of Microsoft languages are being upgraded to exploit the Internet.

The Microsoft .Net based languages leverage the Windows operating systems (95, 98, NT, 2000, XP) thereby creating performance and functionality advantages that a stand-alone language could never achieve. Herein lies what the battle is really all about. Should Microsoft's be allowed to exploit the operating system advantages that it has spend billions of dollars to develop in order to make the best VM that it can, or should the government create a separate Internet/Java industry by edict? Further, should Microsoft be constrained from further enhancing operating systems functionality? It should be noted that significant technical arguments about specific functionalities being stand-alone, incorporated into an operating system, or leveraged have gone on for decades with each approach having its ebb and flow as technology advances. Java, the mantra from the ''open standards folks'' (i.e., Microsoft competitors), is pursuing the very desirable goal of creating an environment that would allow any program to run on any computer without any modification. This pursuit is not new.

Over the past three decades there have been several attempts to achieve this goal. In fact, about a dozen years ago, some of the folks who are now working on Java also worked on another attempt named ''X Windows''. X Windows attempted to compete with Microsoft Windows and Macintosh Windows, but it failed to gain market share because Microsoft and Apple continually improved their product faster than X Windows could catch up with the functionality of the previous version. This time out, the Federal government—perhaps as an unwitting ally—tried to stop, or at least slow down, Microsoft's progress so that the Java technology could catch up; a very bad move and one which probably contributed to the technology meltdown.

The Federal government's rationale for initiating the suit was its interest in ''leveling the playing field''. However, Sun Microsystems is a major league player in its own right ($18 billion in 2001 revenues). In fact, when one considers the financial and marketing muscle of its partners, and the AOL/Time Warner consortium, these forces actually dwarf Microsoft. The government took sides in a technology battle best left to our free market economy. Now that agreement has been reached, it is time to end this charade.

MTC–00006027

From: OSHAExpert@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I throughly support the Microsoft Settlement. The Justice Dept. should have never brought this suit in the first place. The only thing that has been accomplished by this suit is to slow down the technolgical revolution and advancement in this country. You ought to be ashamed.

Charles Klein
719 Broad Bay Cove
Newport News, Va 23602
757–877–4771

MTC–00006028

From: Jeff Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm writing to express my support for the currently proposed settlement in the Microsoft Antitrust case. As the case progressed, it has been my feeling that many of the central issues that caused this case are not supported by facts.

I purchased my first PC in 1990. At the time, it was a middle of the road system, and cost about $2,500. It did not include any application programs that I needed. I had to purchase Lotus 1–2–3 or Microsoft Excel separately, and the cost for either program was around $600. The PC itself was powered by a 286 CPU, had 1 megabyte of RAM, and a 20 megabyte hard drive.

Today, I can purchase a PC with a Pentium III or 4 CPU, 256 megabytes of RAM, a 20 gigabyte hard drive, and a CD-ROM drive that comes with an application suite like Microsoft Office for less than $1,000. Such a PC would simply dwarf my original PC in terms of computing power and functionality.

This has occurred because Microsoft has led the way in creating an operating system that is the standard for personal computing. The marketplace has chosen Windows because it has drastically lowered all costs associated with PC's. Microsoft has been knocked for bundling functionality into Windows. Doing so has continued the trend of lowering PC costs. And while there is no doubt that such bundling has adversely affected some competitors, in my mind there is no doubt that it has greatly benefited consumers who can now afford computers that were out of reach ten years ago.

In summary, while I think prosecution of this case was unwarranted and any solution is unnecessary, given the current status of this case, the proposed settlement seems the best resolution possible.

Sincerely,

Jeff Miller

Redmond, WA

(not employed by Microsoft or connected with Microsoft in any way)

MTC–00006029

From: Bob O'Rear
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement proposed by Microsoft is more than fair; it is generous, and should be accepted as proposed. Those opposed to this settlement are primarily competitors wishing to use the government rather than their own resources to compete with Microsoft.

I am a former employee of Microsoft (I left 8 years ago) but I still know that Microsoft's intentions are honorable. They achieved their greatness through intelligence and extremely hard work, not unfair competition. They provide great products to end users at fair prices. This settlement is in the best interests of end users everywhere.

Thank You,

Robert O'Rear

9001 NE 26th St.

Clyde Hill, WA 98004

MTC–00006030

From: Prather, David
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

PLEASE DROP THIS CASE. THERE IS NO PURPOSE SERVED TO CONTINUE DRAGGING THIS OUT. I'M SURE MICROSOFT KNOWS THEY WILL BE WATCHED CLOSELY ON FUTURE BUSINESS. I DO NOT BELIEVE THEY DID ANYTHING WRONG ORIGINALLY. I BELIEVE THE BULLY ADMINISTRATION IN OFFICE AT THE TIME THIS STARTED WAS SCARED BY ONE PERSON DEVELOPING AS MUCH POWER AND WEALTH AS HAS OCCURRED, AND WANTED TO WRANGLE CONTROL OF WHAT EVER PART OF IT THEY COULD. I CERTAINLY BELIEVE AND HOPE THAT THE CURRENT

ADMINISTRATION IS OF MUCH WISER UNDERSTANDING ABOUT OUR FREEDOMS AND BUSINESS, AND WOULD ENDORSE DROPPING THIS ALSO.

REGARDS,
DAVID C. PRATHER
706–849–6811

MTC–00006031

From: charles eisner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement is fair and prolonging the litigation will benefit no one with the exception of some attorneys. Special interest groups have had more than sufficient time to be heard.

Charles Eisner
34 Currier Way
Cheshire, CT 06410

MTC–00006032

From: castlepk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen

It is time for both the government & other businesses to get on with life. There is no better way to settle the problem that we as consumers may have with Microsoft than to let us deal with them one on one in the marketplace. There is no amount of laws & legislation that any of you can pass that will do the job that we can do with our checkbooks. IF the other businesses truly have a product that is better than what Microsoft has given us than they should provide it to us. If not they should get out of the way & let the business that does have the product supply it to us.

Rick Blackford
Castle Park Mortgage

MTC–00006033

From: MrGwiz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I support Microsoft and their methods of doing business in the marketplace. I see no advantage to continue this witch-hunt by the DOJ on a solid American company that has shown it can supply the necessary software and competitive prices to the entire world to make it easier for us to communicate. Finalize the settlement and stop wasting taxpayer money on frivolous lawsuits by Microsoft's competitors.

James E. Gwiazdowski
611 Golfview Drive
Ballwin, MO 63011

MTC–00006034

From: Christophe Poncy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Bonjour,

I'm a french developer and i am very happy to give you my opinion; i can speak english very well, but i prefer to continue with my native language to insist on the importance of Microsoft .NET technologies for the future in all over the world; and consequently very good for me, for french economy, and for the world's economic growth... Well, faut il soutenir Microsoft?

Oui, car dans l'utilisation du Framework .NET, donc dans la plateforme de dìveloppement de Microsoft, les gains en terme de temps de dìveloppement et performance sont ìnormes!! Oui, car le Framework nous permet de dìvelopper et de concevoir des applications non pas limitìes ? seulement Windows pour PC, mais ìgalement pour le web, le Wap, les PocketPC... Oui, car nous allons pouvoir dìvelopper des Services Web XML, et relier ainsi les applications, les services et des pìriphìriques de fa?on trAs simple, quels que soient les languages de dìveloppements utilisìs, quels que soit la plate-forme ciblìe. Il me semble qu'il n'y pas de limites ? l'innovation gr?ace ? cette technologie.

Enfin oui, car cette technologie donne un nouveau sens ? ma vie professionnelle. Je suis vraiment enthousiaste! J'ai 30 ans, mais j'ai l'impression de revivre mes 15 ans! Oui, ìgalement pour la richesse que va provoquer l'arrivìe de cette technologie, et pas seulement pour les usa. Je suis sYr que la France, et le este du monde profiteront de cette avancìe technologique pour crìer de la richesse, et poursuivre leur dìveloppement...et par voie de consìquence, maintenir la croissance mondiale!

Regards,
Christophe Poncy, from France.

My adress: 57 rue de la marine, 47520, LE PASSAGE, France.

MTC–00006035

From: Mike Jonson
To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement should be adopted. The complaints of Microsoft's competitors should not drive the governments policies. Anti-trust policy should be based on what is good for the country, not the protection of competitors from competition. I own Microsoft stock, but that does not change my view of the above. It is very destructive to allow businesses such as Sun Microsystems and Oracle use the government to protect their market shares.

MTC–00006036

From: baldeagle1@mcleodusa.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I am from Iowa, one of the States that has been causing many of the problems. I believe that if the public didn't want to purchase Microsoft's products they wouldn't. Microsoft was more inventive than all of their competators, now they want to punish them. I don't understand. They belt a better mouse trap. Somebody will come up with something new, lets not punish people for being innovative.

Sincerely,
David Day
805 Jerome St.
Marshalltown, Ia 50158

MTC–00006037

From: angela Viesse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom this may concern:

Regarding the Microsoft Settlement, I realize that a few special interests are attempting to use the current review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American and the global economies need is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Please don?t let these special interests defeat the public interest, and promptly resolve the settlement.

Regards,
Angela Viesse

MTC–00006038

From: BRIAN RAWSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:39pm
Subject: I believe it is imperative that we honor the existing settlement.

As an IT professional and consumer, I believe it is imperative that we honor the existing settlement. It is fair to all parties and good for the US economy.

Brian Rawson

MTC–00006039

From: Alice Rhea
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair and in the best interest of all concerned. I have used Microsoft products for many years and feel that my life has been enriched by their innovation. The economy of our region has benefited tremendously from having Microsoft located here. I hope the matter can be concluded swiftly, and the US Justice Department resources can be directed at other issues. Neither I nor any member of my family has ever been affiliated with Microsoft.

Respectfully submitted,
Alice Rhea
PO Box 1798
Snoqualmie WA 98065
425–831–6103
amrhea@nwlink.com

MTC–00006040

From: WPLPOWELL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Dear DOJ,

I am not a Microsoft shareholder. I am a Microsoft customer. I believe it is time to get the Microsoft lawsuit behind us and take no further action to reduce the incentive to be creative in the development of new tools. Innovation should be rewarded and not penalized.

Thanks.
J. C. Powell

MTC–00006041

From: DBrandt881@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

it's time to settle....dragging this on any longer is detrimental to the investing public and to the users of microsoft software and other internet software users....common sense and economic sense virtually screams, settle....it's time.

MTC–00006042

From: Rob
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is in the best interest of the United States to settle the Microsoft case immediately. I feel this case has hurt the economy and the millions of retirement accounts that hold Microsoft stock. The country has more important issues then to let this case drag on. In my opinion this legal case and a judge who has little knowledge of the hi tech industry should have been settled months ago. I do find it interesting that the settlement requires Microsoft to give away hundreds of millions of dollars of there products. Isn't this why Microsoft was sued in the first place.

Robert Leiser
2212 Sullivan Trail
Easton Pa
18040–7901

MTC–00006043

From: Fred.A.Underwood@ bankofamerica.com@ inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Department of Justice wants to hear from the Consummer on this ongoing issue. In my view, the world is a much better place because of the advances Microsoft has made over the past few years. Do they profit handsomely from it? Of course, but as critics ignore, these profits are plowed back into research and development for even better progress and products for the future. In fact over the past 12 month period between September 30, 2001 and September 30, 2000, over $4.4 billion was expended on R&D by Microsoft, to make better products to make my life easier. If you want a compare and contrast, how about Drug Companies that have a similar Research & Development and profitability models. Lets take a look at Merck whom has plowed $2.4 billion into R&D over the same 12 month period. Yet for a 1 month supply of 40 mg Zocor (30 tablets), its about the same price as a copy of Windows XP. So Why aren't you going after all the Drug companies that are apparently ''Gouging'' consumers at this rate on a monthly basis? You think there aren't sales reps out there that are pushing Zocor on Doctors becasue of Merck/Medco's clout?

In regards to the proposed settlement to fund R&D for underpriveleged Schools. If the DOJ and states can make this go away with such a common sense solution, than by all means do it! I could care less If I get my $10.00 check in the mail at some undetermined point in the future to repay me for the ''Harm'' and ''Unjust Pricing'' that I have incurred. If you keep listenining to all of Microsoft's competitors that are dragging you down their arcane path, then you are all fools. They have no interest in the consumer, they only have an interest (as would any management team or executive) in their business and to building Shareholder Value. If they can do that with the governments help, than they would be fools for not taking the handout!

MTC–00006044

From: Roy E. Williams, Ph.D.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

SETTLE THE CASE! Let Microsoft and the Government get on with their business (Microsoft: developing more products and Government: protecting us from maniacs like UBL, not people like Bill Gates). Further litigation will only hurt American business, especially entrepreneurs, who are hesitant about getting into a business where the potential for liability lawsuits is SO great (and now, even from our own Government). Government regulation is already bad enough with respect to businesses without us having to worry about additional potential lawsuits.

Sincerely,
Roy E. Williams, Ph.D.
901–53–244

MTC–00006045

From: William R. Cwynar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

January 2, 2002

To Whom it May Concern; It is in the best interest of the economy to settle this case promptly. The economy started to recede about the same time this case was brought forth. Companies need to be free to innovate or our system can't survive. Let us get on with it, and get the greedy government out of Microsoft's pocket.

Thank you,
Ann cwynar

MTC–00006046

From: EnvAudits@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is about time to bring the microsoft case to a conclusion in line with the settlement already agreed to by the presiding judge and Microsoft. This case has cost the government as well as Microsoft millions of dollars to no good purpose. If it were not for Microsoft this country would probably not be the technological leader of the world as we are now. Why try to murder a highly successful American company which has benefited this country so much, in order to please some disgruntled competitors and feed some greedy state Attorneys General who hope to make a pile of money for their state treasuries and a name for themselves personally. Please stick to the agreement that has already been reached and conclude this matter as early as possible.

Thanks.
James A. and Leona C. Hazen
1192 Montevideo Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32216

MTC–00006047

From: davidhenryart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: microsoft statement

Dear Sirs,

I am in favor of a speedy settlement with Microsoft.

MTC–00006048

From: Mark Cody
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Good morning, Please don't penalize Microsoft for giving the people the product they want. I have been a computer user since the early 80's with the Commodore VIC20. As technology advanced and new computers entered the market, compatibility became an issue. UNIX, Commodore, Apple, and DOS didn't talk to each other and their files were not compatible. As time moved forward UNIX and DOS were the only operating systems that remained backwards compatible with their own OS. This was great advantage for business and personal computing.

When you decided you needed to buy a more powerful computer to run your new software, you could still use the old computer for more mundane chores. Now you have 2 computers that can operate together. Commodor and Apple oh the other hand were not backwards compatible, so you had to throw the old one out along with all of the software, or at least have 2 computers independent of each other, unable to share files or printers. Over the years Microsoft has kept it's platform backwards compatible and has allowed users to upgrade software and hardware as they see fit.

This is a significant difference between Apple and Sun. I believe the PEOPLE have selected Microsoft as their Operating System of choice because Microsoft provided the user the features they wanted most, low cost and backwards compatibility. Microsoft has always operated from an open platform, allowing anyone to create hardware to run on their OS, while Sun requires only Sun certified hardware be used in their systems.

Why is Microsoft so popular? Why did the others fail? IBM, Initial deployment of DOS, high cost of hardware. Microsoft, secondary deployment of DOS on low cost IBM clones. Apple, High cost, not backwards compatible. Commodor, not backwards compatible, few business applications. Sun, high cost of hardware, no GUI. IBM, initial deployment of Windows NT as OS2, created a roadblock for second party software development. Sun, Solaris running X-windows and Microsoft office, High cost. Microsoft has consistently given the user the features they wanted at a price they could afford, isn't that what makes America great?

Thank you,
Mark Cody
markwcody@hotmail.com
503–649–9532

MTC–00006049

From: Wyskiel, Matt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ: Stop picking on Microsoft. They make a bunch of great products that work

together well, and they charge a reasonable price for those products. This whole case against them has been an unnecessary waste of time and money. End it ASAP. Signed very satisfied Microsoft consumer.

Matt Wyskiel

MTC–00006050

From: Paul A. Kempf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a US citizen and stockholder of Microsoft I would like to express my support for the comprehensive agreement reached by the federal government and nine states with Microsoft, which addresses the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. Although tough, this settlement seems reasonable and fair to all parties involved. As both a consumer and stockholder I feel the agree that the proposed settlement is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion and concern of this matter.

MTC–00006051

From: Kenn D. Young
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like for ''my'' Federal Gov't to approve the Tunney Act and stop harassing Microsoft. Microsoft competition started all of this because they were unable to compete in a free market place. Accept the settlement and keep our government out of the business sector as much as possible.

Thank you,
Kenneth D. Young

MTC–00006052

From: Smith, Stephen R.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am concerned that Microsoft not be further hampered in settling the antitrust case, by competitors who have an interest in dragging out the proceedings through legal maneuvering. Let's get this case settled and go on with some remedies that will allow innovation and completition to rule the market and not bickering over whodunit.

Stephen R. Smith, M.S. Senior Chemist
TVA Power Service Center G2 Coal Lab
North Side Chickamauga Res
Chattanooga, TN 37415
Phone: (423) 697–4061 Fax: (423) 697–4059
CC:'wsmith(a)microsoft.com'

MTC–00006053

From: Latus, Vincent
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of the settlement. Let's finish this and move on.

Thank you,
H. Vincent Latus
Network Administrator
Nothnagle Realtors
585–442–1800

MTC–00006054

From: Bill Thacker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing you today to voice my strong support for the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice (including the nine consenting States). Needless, ongoing litigation is being proposed by the remaining nine dissenting States and the District of Columbia. Such action would be pointless and would benefit no one with the exception of a few Microsoft competitors, which have been lobbying hard for such action over the last few years. In addition to promoting competition, the proposed settlement is in the best interest of consumers and the economy.

Sincerely,
Bill Thacker

MTC–00006055

From: VanderPyle, Nicholas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has my support!!

Without their certifications, support systems, developer kits, extensive FREE add-ins to windows, beta testing, free email and messaging systems, and MUCH more.. I'd be lost.

There's no way Apple or Linux could ever provide such wide, useful, directed services. I, and thousands of other people would be out of a job if Microsoft is severely punished. Let them settle with GIVING money, products, support, and training to the educational facilities. I bet you're reading this email through Exchange, Outlook, or Internet Explorer.

Nicholas VanderPyle
Systems Analyst
home: (850) 862–7365
work: (850) 302–4553
email: vanderpyle@hotmail.com

MTC–00006056

From: BRIGEBRITE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: Settlement

The 9 remaining states need to listen to the consuming public not Microsofts'whining rivialing competitors.Settle this nonsense now.

MTC–00006057

From: LarrimoreJ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:41pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

This Microsoft suit has been a distraction and an inconvenience for me for more than three years. Enough is enough. The court has proposed a settlement which allows the DOJ to save face while punishing Microsoft. Let's get on with it and then maybe we can return to some semblance of normalcy.

James R. Larrimore
205 Vernon Avenue
Glen Burnie MD 21061
CC:LarrimoreJ@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00006058

From: thebirdsalls
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wrap up this miserable attack on genius and innovation.

Richard Birdsall
1896 Peachtree Ave.
The Villages, FL 32162–7557
352 259 9870
Cheers, richard

MTC–00006059

From: Roy E. Truman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: microsoft settlement.

It is time to get this behind us. finalize the settlement and get on to more important things throughout the United States. Please don't waste any more time on this, and add my comments to the other ones on the way to you. Thanks.

Yours Truly,
Roy E. Truman. PO. Box 70.
Indore, WV 25111

MTC–00006060

From: GolferJim@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is James G. Nussbaum, a retired CPA residing at 23537 East Otero Drive, Aurora, CO 80016 with the e-mail address of golferjim@aol.com I strongly urge you to proceed with settlement of the Microsoft case for the good of the nations economy, as I believe the matter has dragged on for far too long. We need to get on with the welfare of our nations people and not be hung up on the demands of a few outspoken competitors and state attorney generals seeking more than they deserve. Let competition prevail unless there is a clear case of harm to the consumer. I haven't seen one bit of proof that I or my family have been harmed. To the contrary, I believe we have benefited from Microsoft's contribution to the marketplace and the competition that does exist.

Thank you
James G. Nussbaum

MTC–00006061

From: GBauer4966@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft

Leave them alone and quit your efforts to weaken them.

G Bauer

MTC–00006062

From: Howard Woodruff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft

It's time to stop these nonsense actions against Microsoft and get on with important issues. Free enterprise is alive and well, leave it that way.

MTC–00006063

From: Keith Shepard
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Comments

As for me (note I do not now nor have I ever worked for or contracted to Microsoft or it's subsidiaries) I think that this whole lawsuit is frivolous and specifically targeted by greed and jealousy types. Finally, can't we all agree to find a more common enemy rather than defeat each others dreams and aspirations for the future? SO..... lets just settle and get on with life.

MTC–00006064

From: Teisan, George
To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

I cannot tell you how irritating it is to me that we continue to waste time and money in the relentless pursuit of Microsoft. When will the madness end? Microsoft has done this country a great service by making the personal computer easy to use and, along with AOL, brought the internet into millions of homes.

Unfortunately, a few insidious special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. The settlement that federal government and nine states finally reached with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

I overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

Thank You,
George Teisan
Scottsdale, Arizona USA

MTC–00006065

From: Alan Copeland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Finish this case and let a great software company and a great American company get back to business!

MTC–00006066

From: LDellBill2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Court of Appeals:

Go with the agreement which is fair and end the litigation!!!!!

Sincrely,
William A. Hardwicke

MTC–00006067

From: Kathryn Ischinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm

Please leave Microsoft alone. It's a great company that is great for the information age and the economy.

MTC–00006068

From: Donald V Atkinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:42pm

To whom it might concern:

We want to voice our support for Microsoft in the impending decision. This has dragged on long enough. Let's get it over with and let's get on with business.

Don Atkinson

MTC–00006069

From: Nancy W Alexander
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I approve of the settlement!

Nancy Alexander, Administrative Assistant
Presbyterian Campus Ministry at Virginia Tech
305 Washington St., SW
Blacksburg, VA 24060–4745
540/552–2473; 540/552–0119 (fax)
cooperh@bev.net

MTC–00006070

From: BROWN1st@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Settlement

I feel a settlement should be reached immediately- or the charges against MSFT dropped. It is my opinion the case was a mean-spirited liberal attempt for Bill Clinton and Janet Reno to get at Bill Gates for being such a strong contributor to the Republican Party. I think it was unnecessary and unfounded. I am a public educator by profession. I also hold Msft. stock and I think the case cost me money- in the downfall of said stock as well as the entire market.

Lyle F. Hoover
246 Montclair
Tulsa, Ok. 74104

MTC–00006071

From: HUFFTMA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Suit

The Justice Department settlement is as far as this case should go. The States are merely being pawns of other High Tech companies and the State Attorney Generals are playing politics for personal gain.

Tom Huff

MTC–00006072

From: Springer, Martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir, enough with the lawyers. In my opinion Microsoft did nothing wrong to begin with. The federal and state governments need to direct their efforts in an area that would benefit the people, not shake down one of the few honest employers in this country. If you want to do something of value get into health care or frozen retirement plans.

Martin Springer J. D.
Manager, Export Sales
PMI Nutrition International, Inc.
Mulberry, FL 33860
Phone: 1–863–425–5544
Fax: 1–863–425–8959
Email: Martin.Springer@Pmi Nutrition.Com

MTC–00006073

From: Robert Sobon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

189 Old Ashley Loop
Pawleys Island, SC 29585
January 2, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

As a resident of South Carolina, I am concerned about further Capitol Hill involvement in the Microsoft antitrust case. It is clear that Microsoft has agreed to a fair and reasonable settlement; the settlement should be final, and further federal action against the company represents nothing short of anti-business posturing by the government.

As you know, the economy is in a recession. Microsoft is a major contributor to the nation's economy, and it is imperative that the company is allowed to innovate in the software industry. Any further action would be negative for the consumer and the IT industry.

I appreciate your support in ending this legal action, and putting this case behind us.

Sincerely,
Robert Sobon
cc: Senator Strom Thurmond

MTC–00006074

From: Robert Dikman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough! Microsoft should not have been nor certainly should now be continued to be punished for bringing a better product to market. This case needs to be settled now.

MTC–00006075

From: BRUNO13@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is about time we allowed Microsoft to get on with the business they know best. How many hours of time have been wasted by people at Microsoft, defending their position, when they could have been working on ways to make life easier for us in the coming years. It is obvious now that the government, in it's infinite wisdom, knows it should have left AT&T to do it's business. Now after the breakup, we are seeing ''Baby'' bells wanting to merge in order to survive. Is that what the government is looking for here?

Neil Bersin

MTC–00006076

From: ENalebuff@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft is fair and should not be changed.

Do not punish this company which has brought so much to us that use computers.

Edward A. Nalebuff, M.D.
Newton, MA

MTC–00006077

From: lloyd olson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: Fair agreement
Dear sirs,
I think the agreement is fair
Lloyd Olson

MTC–00006078

From: Egmeng@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:44pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Please settle this case and allow the computer industry to move on. The action against microsoft has stalled progress for all of us that depend on technology. Wherever I go in the world, I know that I can find some standard software that works with other software by finding Microsoft products. Otherwise nothing works with anything else. The fact that Microsoft was allowed to put programs together with operating systems is the reason why we consumers were able to use computers as the industry developed, rather than needing programmers to operate unrelated programs.
eric meng

MTC–00006079

From: HEADDAWG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:45pm
Subject: Enough is Enough!
Let's stop all this and get on with our lives. Microsoft did all of us a service. Let it be.
Walter Glenn

MTC–00006080

From: David Fladebo
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Even though this case has been going on for years, I still find it hard to believe that the US Govt. insists on this competitor inspired and left-wing driven vendetta against Microsoft. Supposedly, this action was taken against MS to protect consumers, but I to this day have not been able to figure out how the consumer experienced any net harm. In fact, I believe inovation and competition driven by MS has offered the consumer an overwhelmingly positive benefit. Also, many economists feel that much of the poor performance of the economy in 2001 was caused by the litigation and earlier findings of this action against MS, further harming the consumers that this action was purported to ''protect''. Stop the litigation against Microsoft now!
Further, I would like to also suggest that the court make this settlement binding for all 50 States, in order to free MS (and our economy) from this harmful legal action against Microsoft.
Sincerely,
Dave Fladebo
Clear Lake, MN

MTC–00006081

From: Earl Hackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I have read the settlement documents posted on the internet. Assuming the documentation of the API functions and the communication protocols is sufficiently complete, accurate, and inclusive I find the settlement to be satisfactory.
However, the most common form of communication between computer users is by file exchange. Although the settlement requires the disclosure of all communication protocols, I did not see any mention of disclosure of file format definitions or specifications. The data contained in a document produced in Microsoft Word or Excel should be accessible to programs produced by other software vendors.
As for API documentation, my experience has shown that Microsoft documentation of their system API call and the interface with many of their programming languages is incomplete. Omission of critical details from their documentation often has required many days of research to determine the precise operating characteristics of a command needed to achieve proper system operation. These omissions may be simple oversight on the part of Microsoft, but they have occurred more frequently than in my past experience with systems from IBM, DEC, and others.
Earl T. Hackett, Jr.
Research Associate
Tyvek(R) for Medical Packaging
Phone: 302 999–5031
FAX: 302 999–3788
Mobile: 302 540–9321

MTC–00006082

From: Sachtjen, Robert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please stop wasting our tax dollars and settle the Microsoft case. I have used Microsoft products since the inception of the company and never did I feel that I was gouged on the price of any of their products nor do I think that they took undo advantage of what was clearly a leading edge advantage in the software industry. Shouldn't the Federal Government of the United States be trying to strengthen our companies to compete in a GLOBAL economy instead of hamstring them?
Enough is enough. Aren't there any terrorists for the justice department to go after and prosecute? The justice department did such a great job in the breakup of AT&T, I cry every time I get my phone bills, one from my local carrier, one from my long distance provider, one from my Internet provider. Nice job! Now it only costs me about 10 time for phone service compared to the pre AT&T breakup days. Somebody in the justice department should be doing jail time for that monumental screw up.
You guys should ask for public comments more often, but I suppose your afraid of what you will get back.
Robert A. Sachtjen
Director New Business Development
SunGard Investor Accounting Systems
595 East Swedesford Road—Suite 3000
Wayne, PA 19087
Phone 610–975–3031
Fax 610–975–3231
US Cell Phone 610–804–3479
UK Cell Phone 07946–601372
From the US dial 011–44–7946–601372

MTC–00006083

From: BRUCEGRACE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:45pm
Subject: Settlement
The Microsoft case has been run through and over just about every meaningful scenario possible. In the past five years I am sure that every person or organization has been heard on the subject of Microsoft's business practices. So lets just settle this case by accepting the settlement that has been agreed to by both parties. Waiting any longer just makes the Lawyers on both sides richer and accomplishes nothing when it comes to protecting the consumer. The nine States that have decided to continue this case are only being prodded on by special interest groups and companies within their borders that have lost to a superior marketing organization, and their Attorneys Generals are after votes more than anything. Just for the record I still believe Microsoft has been more of a positive for the new ''E-Commerce'' than a negative, and the fact that they have been as successful has they have been is a testament to our free market system. So please, let our free market system work and settle this now.
Regards
Bruce Jackson

MTC–00006084

From: Aerocenter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I would like to comment on the case as follows: As a consumer, I have not been hurt by Microsoft practices. The standards they have established enable someone who is not an expert to learn procedures quickly and accurately. As a small business owner, I am able to buy affordable programs which allow my business to compete with much larger entities on a level field. We cannot afford secretarial and graphics staff, yet we can appear large and efficient to our customers because we have excellent, affordable software. I acutely remember before Microsoft became central to computing. The programs were not compatable with each other. Printers may or may not work. Nothing was standard.
It is my impression that those companies which did not have the foresight or technical ability to expand are now trying to bring down the major company that did. MS did replace many competitors. That is our free market system. Netscape browser was free the first time I learned about it. Then they got the idea for an IPO. I wondered how a company which gave away their program could justify an IPO. I was told they had some server software and government contracts. Soon they were charging for Netscape Browser. After the IPO was successful, the stock price blossomed, for a time. Then the market discovered they did not have unique technology. The market reacted. Stock price plummeted. Now Netscape wants to lay the blame. In any case, the consumer, represented by me, did not suffer harm. On the contrary, we have

benefited from the greatest technology advance in my lifetime (62 years).

I urge the court to reject the politics of this case, and look at the effect on the consumer. We have not overpaid, we have not been duped, we have been enabled, and Microsoft has done the best job of any company to make sure anyone who has the ambition can learn the programs.

Karen R. Sandberg
Owner
AEROCENTER
Aircraft Supply and Avionics
Pierce County Airport
16923B Meridian East
Puyallup, WA 98375–6224
1–800–331–4375
On-Line Ordering at:
http://www.aerocenter.com
Or send us e-mail at: info@aerocenter.com

MTC–00006085

From: Terry Kahler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

In my opinion, the Microsoft case should be settled now, rather than pursue further litigation. Every time the government tries to help the consumer, they actually do the opposite. Breaking up Ma Bell wasn't the best move in the world. Microsoft is a dominant software company, and they got that way by good business practices. They made a better product, and when a competitor would come up with an innovation, they would buy them out if they could. No one is forcing anyone to use Microsoft products, and if the competitors don't want to be bought out, they shouldn't sell.

Dragging on the litigation process serves no one, except the attorneys. I would urge you to settle this immediately, and as a taxpayer, I would like to think that the government actually cares about my best interests....

Thank you....
Terry Kahler

MTC–00006086

From: Matthew Whitcomb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to complete the process and move forward. The dragging out of the process has hurt the economy and cost the taxpayers too much money, especially in the midst of an economic downturn.

MTC–00006087

From: Sheri
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Isn't it finally time to quit screwing around with the ridiculous intrusion of government into a innovative company????

Please continue with this agreement to settle this litigation.

MTC–00006088

From: A (038) J STEWART
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: MISCROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DEAR SIR/MADAM

THE TIME IS LONG OVERDUE FOR FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS TO GET OFF OF MICROSOFT'S BACK. MICROSOFT HAS IMPROVED THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF ALMOST EVERYONNE ON THIS PLANET. LAWYERS AND BUREAUCRATS SHOULD SPEND THEIR TIME WORKING ON REAL ISSUES LIKE CRIME, DRUGS,AND GOVERNMENT WASTE

THANKS YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

MTC–00006089

From: John Shepherd (038) Joe West
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft's Settlement

Dear Sirs:

The power to innovate is upmost in our culture—Microsoft's present settlement is fair to all concerned!

John Shepherd
Hobbs, New Mexico 88240

MTC–00006090

From: Allin DuBuc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice

My opinion in the ongoing Microsoft Settlement

I have strongly disagreed with the entire case the Department of Justice brought against Microsoft, from the very beginning. I am in favor of ending all litigation as soon as possible with minimal cost to Microsoft. Any continued attempts by the states or Microsoft's competitors to harm Microsoft with penalties or fines is of no value to me.

Please end this as soon as possible, let Microsoft get back to the business of software development, and leave me the power to buy Microsoft products or not, as I wish!

Thank you for hearing my opinion.
Allin DuBuc
Allin DuBuc
Quixotic Design
4976 ROYAL AVE SPC 247
Las Vegas, NV 89103–5008
(702)876–4833
mailto:allindubuc@LVCM.com

MTC–00006091

From: David MacVean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a US Citizen and a Microsoft shareholder. This entire prosecution has been a waste of time and money. As Microsoft has been prosecuted, American Online-Time Warner has certainly represented a more powerful ''monopoly.''

Please facilitate the accepted settlement, and let the market run the economy instead of attornies.

Dave MacVean

For Personal Use Only.The information and data in this report were obtained from sources considered reliable. Their accuracy or completeness is not guaranteed, and the giving of the same is not deemed an offer of solicitation on our part with respect to the sale or purchase of any securities or commodities.

MTC–00006092

From: Phil Kuyper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

End this thing as agreed—-no more bullshit!

Phil Kuyper
phil@ajhanson.com
A.J. Hanson & Co.
PH: 206–763–8550
FX: 206–762–6246

MTC–00006093

From: M Kam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please end this legal disaster. Since April 1, 2000 when settlement talks failed, Microsoft and US economy went on a tail spin impacting the global economy as well. As a consumer, I believe that Microsoft products have had a huge impact on productivity and prosperity. I used to pay thousands for custom software that now Microsoft offers for that $100. It is silly to take a self made and one of the most successful companies in the world and try to break their back just because some incompetent competitors needs government protection. Need not to remind you that Microsoft itself was a small fish in a huge pond. They managed and succeeded. This is not China or Russia it is a free enterprise society. Enough senseless damage to our life savings, pension plans and the national and global economy.

Thank you.

MTC–00006094

From: Brice10273@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The purpose of my email is to let you know that I think the settlement reached with Microsoft is fair to me the consumer and I would like to see it accepted. To prolong the process with further litigation and/or adding more remedies would not be good for me, the taxpayers, or business. I feel we should go with the settlemnt terms as negotiated between Microsoft and the Department of Justice and be done with it.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Barbara Rice

MTC–00006095

From: Kay Barnett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement/Tunney Act

I understand the justice department is still reviewing the Microsoft settlement and wished to express my opinion. I think Microsoft probably did abuse their positioning in the software industry, but they also were the major contributor to the fact that a software industry even exists. The Tunney Act seems logical and appropriate, and I think it should stand as the final resolution to this entire situation. Our country is struggling to emerge from a recession and from the devastation of

September 11th. Let's put our focus, our energies and our resources to work addressing these problems instead of the continuation of an issue that has already been resolved. Further litigation can only benefit a select few, and will cost extensive tax dollars that can certainly be better utilized to benefit the majority of our citizens and our country.

Kay L. Barnett
13704—117th Ave NE
Kirkland WA 98034

MTC–00006096

From: James O'Brien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The continued opposition of nine States' attorneys general to the Microsoft settlement is irrational. The notion that companies such as IBM, Oracle, Sun Microsystems, Intel, Computer Associates, Hewlett-Packard, Dell, Compaq, etc. cannot compete with Microsoft without further government protection is absurd. Microsoft makes great products that work well, and they are very affordable, especially for a small business such as my own. Frankly, I think the inflated egos of individuals such as the CEO's of Oracle and Sun Microsystems are part of the problem. Microsoft is one of the bright spots in our sick economy, exactly because it is innovative and competitive, which always benefits consumers.

Sincerely,
James E. O'Brien
770 Brookside Road
Maitland, FL 32751
January 2, 2002

MTC–00006097

From: Jeff Ronne/The Boaphile
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case would you?
Thank you,
Jeff
Jeff Ronne
The Boaphile
PO Box 394
Cannon Falls, MN 55009
(507) 263–2621
Email: The—Boaphile@theboaphile.com
Web Sites!!!
http://www.boaphileplastics.com
http://www.theboaphile.com
http://www.theratcafe.com
http://www.bengalshak.com

MTC–00006098

From: Elmer Houghten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir/Madam:

My comment regarding the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case is that it does appear to be a fair agreement based on the facts and considering the costs and time of further litigation. I therefor highly recommend the settlement be accepted.

Elmer Houghten
CPA 5962 E. Viewmont Circle,
Mesa, AZ.

MTC–00006099

From: JKVINCE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Gentlemen:

I believe the Microsoft Settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties. This Settlement should not be allowed to become derailed. It is not in the best interests of all Americans to allow litigation to be prolonged, using more of the American public's tax dollars. I want our national resources and energies to be better spent for current and future purposes than for continuance of litigation that has been reasonably settled.

Yours truly,
Janet K. Vincent
1446 N. W. Springdale Pl.
Shoreline, WA 98177

MTC–00006100

From: Karlyn Eckman
To: Microsoft ATR,RFC-822=www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-s...
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft products

Re: Comments from a Consumer Concerning Microsoft Products I have just purchased my ninth computer, containing the Windows XP operating system. I did this reluctantly, because I dislike Microsoft products and resent the dominance that Microsoft commands on consumer and professional computing.

I am an independent consultant, but am forced to purchase Microsoft systems because it is used within the United Nations system (my primary contractor). Microsoft software does not easily allow a user to utilise files or software written in Apple, Linux or other formats. Microsoft's dominance means that I, as a professional and a home computer user, have very little choice in which operating sytem or software I can purchase. I personally find Microsoft to be manipulative, greedy and unresponsive to the wide-ranging needs of the average American and even international computer user. What arrogance for Microsoft to think that it can produce software for the masses, regardless of need, preference and priority!?!

Dr. Karlyn Eckman
Consultant in International Forestry.

MTC–00006101

From: CHARLES PEACOCK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: MICOROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I FOR ONE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS SETTLED IN FAVOR OF MICROSOFT. I HAVE NEVER HAD PROBLEMS WITH MICROSOFT'S COMPETITOR'S PROGRAM SOFTWARE DUE TO THE MICROSOFT OPERATING SYSTEM. IN FACT THIS OS ENHANCES PROGRAM SOFTWARE. I DON'T THINK IT REDUCES COMPETITION, JUST MAKES SOFTWARE COMPANIES BE SURE THAT THEIR SOFTWARE IS COMPATIBLE WITH MS OS. IT WOULD BE A REAL MESS IF EACH PROGRAM SOFTWARE PURCHASED NEEDED IT'S OWN OPERATING SYSTEM.

CHARLES PEACOCK
9817 BRINGIER CT.
GRANBURY, TX 76049
TEL 817–573–7029
EMAIL CDPEAK52@ITEXAS.NET

MTC–00006102

From: downtown denise
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Honorable Members of the Department of Justice:

As a citizen of the United States, I request that you fully and comprehensively settle all antitrust actions against Microsoft Corporation as quickly as possible, and close this matter immediately. Continued litigation catering to a few special interests prolongs litigation and derails any general settlement agreement. This is not in the best interest of citizens of the United States.

As a technical consumer, Microsoft has not damaged me in any manner. I was not ''forced'' to purchase any of their products. I gladly purchsed their products for superior performance—as is my right as a consumer—to stay on the leading edge technology wise. Please do not delay settling this matter. In light of today's global situation, we must focus on coming together cohesively as a nation, even if it means overriding a few special interests. Catering to special interests plays directly in to Osama Bin Laden's dictate to strike at America's economic heart. We simply cannot let this happen, but more particularly, WE CANNOT DO THIS TO OURSELVES!!!

We cannot afford to cater to the few at the expense of the many. The majority of Americans like Microsoft products and appreciate the fact that this company has rocketed us into the 21st century both hardware and software capability in caparison to any other nation at this time. Do an accounting of the nations that bootleg this US technology illegally! If it were not quality, they wouldn't be stealing it!

Please do not prohibit or limit companies that create benefit (jobs) for America. Please settle this litigation quickly, close the matter, so we may focus (and allow Microsoft to focus) on the important things affecting our consumers, and our nation.

Best Regards,
Denise Rickard
Dallas, Texas, USA
214–508–5004

MTC–00006103

From: Annfucci@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Justice Department Ruling

The Justice Department has made a ruling, which in my opinion has been very fair to all parties concerned.....The complaints by the remaining States are very bias. Competitors are the ones pushing for more punishment....not the consumers. I truly believe the competitors are trying to break Microsoft, so that their own Companies can become more successful!!!! Enough is enough, and I think that the Justice Department has made a fair ruling and so let it stand!!!

MTC–00006104

From: Glenn Leedy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:18pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement Agreement

Dear sirs:

Please make your judgments are based on whether the customer is damaged and not the MicroSoft's competition. There is no clear argument for such damages by MicroSoft. I bring over 30 years of experience in the computer industry and as the owner of much intellectual property I say without hesitation that MicroSoft has brought more benefits in terms of low cost widely available computer products than would remotely possible without them.

MicroSoft has been attached by the SUNs of the industry simply because they have been very effective competitors, but MicroSoft has served the best interest of the consumer and industrial user. I know this to be true from personal experience. I encourage you to let the settlement stand. We need to clear the uncertainty from the air.

Best regards,
Glenn Leedy
President
Elm Technology Corporation

MTC–00006105

From: William E. Endelman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the Department of Justice to implement the Microsoft settlement. The objections I believe comes from other special interests, and not as a result of the customer interests. As a user of Microsoft products, I receive high value from excellent products. There are choices available that are fully compatible, some of which I use for database work, photo editing and other things.

I could provide a long list of other industries an companies that truly act as monopolies, ignoring customer service, competition, and fair pricing for their services/ products. Microsoft is not on my list! Please stop wasting my tax dollars and putting a cloud on the economy.

Respectfully,
William E. Endelman, AIA, Principal
Endelman & Associates PLLC
Accessibility Consulting / ADA—FHA Compliance
901 E. Denny Way,
Suite 201,
Seattle, WA 98122
mailto:bill@endelman.com—http://www.endelman.com
(206) 324–6462—Fax: (206)324–6469

MTC–00006106

From: VHSchiller@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please don't get in the way of companies that try to foster innovation. Keep you hands off Microsoft. Without the standards they have introduced and maintained at a reasonable costs to consumers the computer market would be a fragmented mess.

Also... When the government goes after companies that take risks to innovate it scares me. Why should I make investments in technologies and innovations in my company when there is a threat that the Government will just pull the rug out someday?

Keep America a technology leader. Hopefully you can undo the damage you've already done.

MTC–00006107

From: Patty Mackne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the resolution of the Microsoft case the government has negiotiated with the them. There has been too much money and time spent on this situation to the detriment of our economy, when so many other important matters are present in our nation.

Patricia Mackne
8923 Turkey Hill Rd.
La Plata, MD 20646

MTC–00006108

From: Robert B. Heenan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement is fair to customers, competitors & Microsoft. Let's get on with it & stop spending tax payers money.

R.B.Heenan
1111 Pine Lake Drive,
Hartsville, SC 29550

MTC–00006109

From: Al Hillman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement should end this business once and for all. It is a shame that a company is accused of being terrible in business just because they are successful. I purchase and use Microsoft products and am reasonably satisfied. If another vendor offers better products at lower cost I will not hesitate to try them.

Today Microsoft is on top, however, they will remain there only if they invest in development for products that will be needed in the future. There is nothing from stopping any other company from building better products. I have always thought that this is the American way.

Thank you,
Al Hillman

MTC–00006110

From: Sirvaco@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is incumbent upon you to finalize the Microsoft settlement as it now stands. It is time to let this matter alone so Microsoft can give full attention to doing the fine works it is noted for and help in getting the economy headed in the right directioin.

I also believe the only reason these suits are continuing is for the sole reason of getting Microsoft to part with it reserve of assets and cash. Only the lawyers will benefit from further pursuit of litigation. Certainly not the American buying public.

W.E. Sirvatka
CC:RFC-822=Finflash1–2–02.UM.A.1154.142@commpartners....

MTC–00006111

From: The Mikester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

If one looks closely at the complaints against Microsoft, one sees poor competition using the unfair influence of government to control the legitimate competition and allow them to market inferior products. Looking at the Senate, the government is an extremely poor judge of what fairness is. They are quite good at pointing out the actions of the Complaint Filers in the Government Lawsuit. I use mostly Microsoft Programs simply because they work the best. Where the Microsoft Programs do not perform the way I want, I use programs that do. So, not to date myself, but ''where's the beef''?

Michael H. Ohl
508 Hilldale Drive
Bath, PA 18014
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006112

From: Curtforslund@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a retired attorney and a former chief deputy state attorney general (with no connections to any party involved) I have followed this litigation closely. The settlement that has been reached is appropriate for all. The staste attorneys general never had any business becoming involved in this lititgation in the first place, and I have no doubt that for most of them, the motivation was solely political. From the outset the states were bit players, hanging on at the fringe, and for a few of them to now try to block this settlement is not in the public interest.

Curtis D. Forslund

MTC–00006113

From: Daniel Wolbert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Dear Sirs,

I find that any continued government involvement with Microsoft will result in the consumer paying the price. The price will be a reduction of services available to the average consumer and also higher prices for services. It looks like the government would have learned its lesson from the tobacco settlements—not one penny, of the settlements, has come from any tobacco grower or cigarette manufacturer it is paid by the consumer and the same thing will happen if Microsoft is ordered to pay any settlement no matter what amount.

The whole thing comes down to greed and jealousy. Microsoft is a pie everyone would like to have a piece of, so the government allows competing companies and states to sue to get a piece of it for nothing. There is absolutely no doubt that Microsoft has done more to further the availability of computers and software for the average consumer than all the others combined. I guess that is the core issue here, Microsoft has always provided a vastly superior product at a

completive price, and the competitors would rather cry foul than get to work and develop a suitable product themselves.

As a long time computer user I salute Microsoft and their ability to provide software that works and actually anticipates my needs before I do. They also provide totally free support and updates for their products—all the others might or might not, usually not. I would purchase Microsoft products at any cost. Microsoft could charge more for their products, but they have always made their products available to the average consumer.

The final point is that this country was built on innovation and hard work, and to penalize Microsoft for working harder and being better at their job than the others is ridiculous. Let the ones filing the law suits get to work and get out of the courtroom.

Thank you.

MTC–00006114

From: Burden, Douglas
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

Bottom line—enough already! While Microsoft wouldn't be confused for a band of Franciscan monks, the current settlement seems a sufficient chastening. Let's stop the whining and move forward.

Doug Burden

MTC–00006115

From: GHarris160@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

During this period of public comment on the Microsoft Settlement, I would like to have my voice heard. It is absolutely ridiculous to continue to pursue this matter any further. The economy and the stock market are in enough trouble without any additional litigation on this matter. Microsoft has served the public extremely well with its technology and its products. The public should not have to suffer the expense and trouble of further litigation. The states who have not gotten onboard with this settlement should be ashamed of themselves. This includes my own state of California, who I am ashamed of for not joining the settlement.

Sincerely,
George Harris

MTC–00006116

From: Edward Enders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:50pm
Subject: microsoft Settlement

I would just like to say that I think that the government gets nervous when a company get's as big as Microsoft. I also think you guy's at DOJ have went about this all wrong. You should have worked with Microsoft and used there position to your advantage, not just go after them in court. Microsoft is a good company and has done alot of good with it's wealth as opposed to many other companies similar in size. You guys should stop wasting the tax payers' money and get back to work on more important issues.

MTC–00006117

From: Jpf251@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This action should be concluded as is and let MS continue to innovate. MS is the best thing that has happened to the industry since its inception.

Thank you
John

MTC–00006118

From: sstrzelec@tycoint.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to voice my displeasure with the way competitors of Microsoft are using US government to achieve their goal of destroying one of the most successful and enormously beneficial to consumer company. These competing companies over long years were not able to deliver better product, product which for me an average customer would provide compelling evidence to use it. Microsoft through its effort do deliver ready to use package of different application, provided me with an easy to use and cost effecting product. Through its relentless effort to provide product that customer can use easily, Microsoft became leading provider of operating system which become the standard. Having this standard provided enormous saving in software production and training for others companies which in turn provided customers with big savings. I consider effort of Federal and State officials to punish Microsoft as ill guided and should be stopped to prevent further waste of taxpayers money and to prevent some bureaucratic fixes that will cause software compatibility problems and eventually lead to more expensive products. Standard is critical and it can be established either by government (which will not happen in my lifetime) or strong leading company as Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Stanley Strzelec
sstrzelec@tycoint.com

MTC–00006119

From: Srsusa@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:51pm
Subject: (no subject)

DOJ

Please leave Microsoft alone and don't penalize their success; this is America. More than enough taxpayer money has been spent on this case. The high technology landscape will look completely different in the next 5 to 7 years.

Sincerely,
Regis L. Roderick

MTC–00006120

From: SUSAN.ROBERTS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do whatever it takes to get this issue settled ASAP. Why do you allow special interest groups to continue to hold up these efforts. Thank you for you impending actions.

Susan Roberts
Prudential Locations Projects Dept

MTC–00006121

From: RCNIPP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:52pm
Subject: (no subject)

PLEASE DON'T MAKE ANOTHER MISTAKE WITH MICROSOFT LIKE YOU DID WITH AT&T.

THANK YOU.
R.C.NIPP

MTC–00006122

From: Kimberly Bowen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please support passage of the Tunney Act. It's time to settle this expensive investigation fairly, which I believe the Tunney Act will do. As a Microsoft shareholder and Washington State resident, I feel that prolonged persecution of Microsoft will hurt the economy of my state as well as my personal financial well-being and that of my community. Thank you.

Kimberly Bowen
Bowen Consulting
bowen@raincity.com
CC:Kimberly Bowen

MTC–00006123

From: Joyce Cuyar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello

I think the Microsft settlement is fair and in the best interest of the consumer as well as our country. Too much time and money has been spent on this already by all sides involved. This time and money could be put to better use in reviving the economy and getting the USA back up on it's feet. Enough is enough. Let's get this issue behind us and move on.

Joyce Cuyar . Owner
Pro-Search Prof. Recruiting
PO Box 372 . Jackson Center. PA . 16133
Email: cuyar@staffing.net
http://www.pro-search.net

MTC–00006124

From: Paul Deignan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's put an end to this litagation now. This has dragged on long enough.

MTC–00006125

From: rmontemorra@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft

Microsoft has been punished enough. They have seen the stock price slip nearly 50%, which in turn has punished the public that the Gov't wants to protect. I believe that you can tie the fall in the Nasdaq to the fall in Microsofts price and the ruling by Judge Jackson. Neither the DOJ or the States are

doing the public any favors. Let the settlement happen and lets move on.

MTC–00006126

From: Grace D VerHoeven
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:52pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I believe the settlement proposed in the above issue is fair and reasonable, and that further litigation in this matter should be stopped. Let's stop the nitpicking because some firms are jealous of Microsoft's ingenuity and success and concentrate our funds on issues more important to our nation's security.

MTC–00006127

From: Bradford Augustine
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle this case. I am tired of my taxpayer dollars spent on this matter. I believe that the settlement agreement while not perfect is sufficient to protect consumers as well as not stifle advances in technology. Please settle this matter now.

Sincerely,
Bradford G. Augustine
MadronaReal Estate Services, LLC
500 Union Street Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101–4052
www.MadronaRealEstate.com

MTC–00006128

From: Kent Fiedor
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am For the settlement of the Microsoft Case. I never agreed that is should have happened in the first place. The government spent too much money trying to punish a successful company whose products have reinvented and improved the office.

Kent Fiedor
Business Analyst
iCorp.com
KentFiedor@icorptech.com

MTC–00006129

From: Burke, Mr. Brian (Computer Research Supp)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in support of the Microsoft/Justice Department Settlement. Please end this wasteful litigation and help the country's recovery and move on.

Thanks
Brian Burke
Purdue Pharma—444 Saw Mill River Rd, Ardsley, NY, 10502
burkebr1@pharma.com

MTC–00006130

From: Doreen Power
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly support the settlement of the anti-trust suite against Microsoft. It is way beyond time to settle this dispute and invest our taxpayer dollars in more worthy causes such as the sagging economy and anti-terrorism efforts.

Thank you,
Doreen Power
Sammamish, WA

MTC–00006131

From: sdbjla@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are completely in favor of the settlement. This case should be ended.

Sincerely,
S. Bragin

MTC–00006132

From: James Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Dept of Justice,

I personally know that I have never been overcharged or harmed by Microsoft. I have benefited immensely by their products because of there ease of use and the conformity all there products have with one another. This conformity has increased my ability to compete in the market place because I am able to learn different application programs more quickly than by using competing software. As a consumer, I have always had alternatives to using Microsoft products. I could have purchased an Apple computer or product using a Unix based system. There is competition out there. I chose Microsoft because it was the superior product. If that should change in the future, I will gravitate to the better product. I personally feel that Microsoft is being unjustly punished. The harm that is talked about is perceived harm, not actual harm. You are going to punish a company on my behalf for the harm they caused me? No harm has come to me, only benefit.

Has anyone ever calculated the benefit to our economy that has been gained because Microsoft software is easy to learn and be productive with? I can easily train people at my company to use a PC, and access the internet, because of the user friendly features of Microsoft's products. When I compare the time required to train employees on our old computer system, verses the time required to train someone on a Windows based PC, I find that I can train someone to use windows in about a quarter of the time. This time adds up to considerable savings to our company because employees become productive more quickly. This increase in production and savings in training is solely do to the Microsoft corporation. What other American corporation has had such a positively huge impact on our economy. Don't punish a corporation for doing what we do best in this capitalist economy: being innovative, making money and positively benefiting our economy and standard of living.

Thank you Microsoft!
Sincerely,
James M. Robinson
5153 W. Wikieup Ln.
Glendale, AZ 85308

MTC–00006133

From: Bradford West
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is fair. It recognizes that Microsoft was wrong and it requires Microsoft to pay damages. Microsoft's ability to add features to its products should not be restricted, and Microsoft should not be broken up into multiple operating units, unless financial market forces (unrelated to government intervention) so dictate. The quality of the product and its ability to multitask and integrate with other products should be dictated by the consumer and not by any government. I require a fully-integrated product to run my business. I believe that Microsoft products have enabled me to be more productive year over year, and my productivity increases as the functionality and integration of features increases. A government break-up or restriction on Microsoft's ability to provide better, more fully-integrated products would be harmful to me and to the productivity of the workforce in America and beyond.

Microsoft's products or marketing should not impede the ability of its competitors to innovate and provide consumers with quality choices. Additionally, Microsoft should provide enough information to competitors to allow competitors to make products that function within the Windows environment. To the extent Microsoft did not in the past comply with those requirements, the settlement fairly punishes Microsoft for its non-compliance. Microsoft competes fairly in the cases of which I am aware. I use several products that compete with Microsoft products, such as Quicken, which competes with Money, and I judge Microsoft against its competition in each purchase I make. The key is that I, not the government, chose the product I want to use. Any government restriction on my choice, or my ability to choose as a result of a break-up of Microsoft or restriction on innovation, is wrong. Such a restriction is anti-capitalist, anti-free market, and anti-American.

Bradford D. West, PLC
731 Via Lombardy
Winter Park, FL 32789
bradfordwest@cfl.rr.com
http://www.lawyers.com/westplc

MTC–00006134

From: Ollie Fick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to settle this case according to the terms already worked out with Microsoft. I and millions of other citizens are owners of Microsoft stock and are tired of the drag this case has put on the company's stock. Any benefits that may have resulted from this case have already been written into the agreement. Further delay of the settlement cannot possibly result in significant additional benefits.

Thank you.

MTC–00006135

From: janrog@home.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe it is of extreme importance to dispense with any continuing litigation with regard to the alleged anti-trust practices being made against the Microsoft Corporation. In view of the fact that Microsoft has agreed to a settlement to end this case I strongly state that this settlement should be accepted and put into place. Our economy does not need any further negative events and the conclusion of this case will be viewed as a positive influence and will help the US and World economies to begin a rebound from current depressed levels. I believe that those not in support of this agreement use only self centered, selfish reasons and that their reasons are directly contrary to what is just and correct for the American economy. This is America which has been built upon free enterprise and we cannot allow continuing efforts to stifle the strengths we have in this country.

Sincerely,
Roger L. Nauta
janrog@home.com

MTC–00006136

From: Bob Balke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a consumer, I appreciate the greater usability of Microsoft software. If I don't want to use Explorer, I'll get Netscape. But I appreciate the fact that I don't have to get Netscape or Real Network in order to have a PC that performs the tasks that I want to accomplish. For some reason, Microsoft is being penalized for building a great product and then making the product better over the years. For my money, the consumer is the largest beneficiary of Microsoft's upgrades. But if you have sufficient manpower, please focus on an industry that openly fixes prices, provides the worst customer service and blames all of its problems on others. Of course I'm referring to the airline industry.

Sincerely,
Robert J. Balke

MTC–00006137

From: Ceebar612@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: (no subject)

Personally, I think it ridiculous to keep this up with a company which has contributed so much. It reminds me of oil and the Rockefellers (I am 80 and a half) and what good did that do. Stop the action. It is costly and un-American. Like the Rockefellers, the Gates give back to their country.

Sincerely,
Caroline B. Taylor

MTC–00006138

From: Betty Sherman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why are these ''holdouts'' holding out for more? The DOJ has spent more on going after this one man, who has done so much good for so many people, than they had spent, prior to Sept. 11, going after one man who has perpetrated so much evil in the world. Do these individual Atty Gen'ls of those holdout states set themselves up to know more than the U.S. DOJ? Get this thing settled and get on with other matters.

Thank you.
Betty Sherman retired RDH
1932 Mahan Avenue
Richland, WA 99352

MTC–00006139

From: JOE ROSENTHAL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft Settlement as offered by MIcrosoft is fair and should be accepted.

Joe Rosenthal
4712 Meadowview Blvd.
Sarasota, FL 34233

MTC–00006140

From: Texpop@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft AntiTrust Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

This AntiTrust Action by the government has gone on too long already; let's close this action and carry on with progress. I am disturbed that some litigants in this case want to prolong the legal process.

Microsoft did indeed overstep the bounds of fair competition in some of their agreements with hardware suppliers, but the solution to that problem could have been resolved many years ago by addressing the unfair practices and stopping them. Instead the competitors enlisted the government to resolve their grievances at no cost to them. These competitors had legal recourse of their own in the court system if they wanted to pursue it.

The complaint about bundling software was and remains specious and against the benefits to the consumer. For example, Netscape's programs could run on Windows. How is that possible? It is because Microsoft gave them all the information needed to program their software to run on Windows. That is not the action of a company trying to deny use of their system. I have yet to hear anyone complain about the cost of Windows and other Microsoft products, so where has the consumer been hurt? The bundling of software is one of the profound advances in system operating systems. This is one of the profound improvements in computer software developments.

I do not understand what the States (and their lawyers) have to gain by rejecting this settlement. Are they more interested in a large financial settlement or a resumption of the economic growth of the technical industry? I think it is the former!

MTC–00006141

From: BMarrow630@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I favor the microsoft settlement to which the Justice Dept and MS have agreed.

Robert Marrow
56 Rye Rd.
Rye NY 10580
bmarrow630@aol.com

MTC–00006142

From: Hoffman, Matt
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

please get it done already. more than enough money has been wasted on this suit that never should have been brought. Suits like this impair our freedom.

MTC–00006143

From: john zimmerman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Pls settle this issue asap according to the terms released several months ago. The lawsuit against Microsoft was ill-conceived from the very beginning. In any other country, Microsoft would be considered a national treasure and Bill Gates' birthday would be a holiday. As a serious computer user, I would like to see as much functionality as possible bundled into the Windows operating system. I do not enjoy spending serious money on poorly functioning ancillary software like firewalls, virus protection, cd burning, faxing, music, etc. Usually, the functions within windows are good enough for me; they work reliably; and they have no incremental cost. Those who want enhanced functions and complexity are always free to buy them. The universality of Windows is also a great asset. I can currently use almost any desktop computer in the world without spending a day or more learning a new software system. Again, please divert your resources from the irrelevant Microsoft case to issues that are much more important to America-security and terrorism.

John E. Zimmerman
6417 Deerings Lane
Norcross, GA 30092

MTC–00006144

From: JDay31932@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I believe that the US government & Microsoft need to complete the settlement of this case without further litigation. The agreement reached by the parties is equitable to all involved. I cringe when I think what our computer and cyberspace landscape would look like if it wasn't for Microsoft's forward thinking and marketing strategies. The PC environment is quite manageable because of Microsoft.

Respectfully,
John Day

MTC–00006145

From: Sasan Nikoomanesh
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern;

First of all, thank you for soliciting and taking into consideration public opinion regarding the above settlement. It makes me proud to live and be part of the best democracy in the world.

To maintain a true democracy, government needs to act as an independent moderator

and enforce the law to protect its citizens. In my opinion, this case has been drag for so long that it has lost its purpose. Millions of dollars of taxes have been spent prosecuting a business, and millions more have been spent by Microsoft defending its business practices. This money on both sides can be put to better use.

I believe that the current penalties levied by the court are fair and should be executed promptly. The sooner this case is settling, the sooner the consumer and the government can focus on more important matters.

Respectfully,
Sasan Nikoomanesh
A concerned citizen 310–575–7046

MTC–00006146

From: Charles Fisher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:56pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DOJ,

You have your settlement now it's time to get off their backs. I am sick and tired of hearing about people and companies being punished because they thought of something first. I don't know Bill Gates or anyone else at Microsoft. It won't matter a thing to me if they make another billion or lose all they have. They earned all they have by their brains and brawn. . . . Get off their backs. . . .

Charles Fisher
Tampa, Fl.

MTC–00006147

From: USSSLATER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get off Microsoft's back and let them get back to doing what they do best—making jobs for a lot of people and making life better for even more people.

Gordon Lattey
ussslater@aol.com

MTC–00006148

From: Jim Holland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:55pm

To whom it may concern:
Get off Microsofts' back. Now.
Jim Holland

MTC–00006149

From: Erickson, John
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Regarding the proposed Microsoft settlement, I believe it is fair. We are seeing a few state attorney general and lobbyists trying to make a name for themselves (or the companies they represent). The software environment has changed so dramatically since this case was brought to trial, that many of the issues are not relevant.

Regards,
John A. Erickson
30601 Harristown Road
Grand Rapids, MN. 55744

MTC–00006150

From: Gene Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case as proposed. I, as a consumer, have never felt harmed by Microsoft's practices. In fact, I couldn't even begin to run my business without Microsoft's products. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Best regards,
Guy E. Robinson,
Lincoln, Nebraska

MTC–00006151

From: Geoffrey Feldman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:56pm
Subject: I favor a settlement that is as favorable to Microsoft as possible.

I am a professional software engineer who has never believed the Microsoft anti-trust prosecution should have even begun. I have followed this case, including its technical merits and I find it chilling that the government ever interfered.

I believe that Microsoft's competitors failed through their own incompetence. By this, I mean specific technical mistakes and product quality failures which lead me away from Microsofts' competitors in recommending products to my consulting clients. Microsofts' actions and behaviors have benefited me as a consumer of software and as someone who profits from enhancing and developing software. The action of the government has caused me harm by interfering with a process that was never illegal. The actions of Microsoft are no more anti-competitive than similar actions undertaken by Sun Micrososystems, Compaq, Apple, IBM, AOL and Netscape.

I think the government should settle this case and do so in a way as favorable as possible to Microsoft. I think the government should avoid similar cases in the future and allow the marketplace to make these decisions in the future. Please do not interfere with the operations of Microsoft, you only interfere with legitimate commerce and my way of earning a living as a computer programming consultant. I have no direct interest in Microsoft. I am not an employee nor even a shareholder.

Geoffrey Feldman
geoff@seabasecns.com
617–429–8966
1541 Middlesex St. #8
Lowell, MA 01851

MTC–00006152

From: David Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

The action against Microsoft has in no way and will in no way benefit those persons who use the Microsoft products and any settlement the negatively impacts the company will only worsen the situation.

I am a periodontist and have used computers in my office since 1983. In the past I was forced to deal with those companies that are responsible for bringing this suite against Microsoft. The cost of using their software compared to Microsoft's is easily three to four times greater. I don't view Microsoft as some monopolistic giant, but more as a friend who has made in possible for to have the hardware and software for the systems we have today at an affordable price, whereas before I felt I was being robbed by the likes of Apple and Sun.

In my view, there should have been no judgement against Microsoft and they should be left to do business as usual.

Sincerely,
David S. Williams DDS,MSD

MTC–00006153

From: Byron Stavrou
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:57pm
Subject: Settlement

Gentlemen:

I thought this was pretty much settled! While I believe Microsoft could be faulted for some of its practices, the extent to which this is being prosecuted is unconscionable. The recalcitrant States and the vestiges of of vindictiveness within the DOJ, and more squarely in the Senate, are the height of malicious prosecution.

You are allowing the above self-interested parties, (to some extent driven by the states which are competitors of Microsoft), to tamper with a company who is one of the main engines of this economy. We are in enough of an economic downturn right now. Let us not penalize a company that can help us out of our economic rut. Please stop the further pursuit of this case.

Byron Stavrou
Prudential, DeHOFF REALTORS
821 South Main Street
North Canton, OH 44720
E-Mail <mailto:: ByronG@msn.com>
mailto:: ByronG@msn.com

MTC–00006154

From: HBra42731@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to lend my support to the Tunney act, for the final settlement of issues related to Microsoft. It is high time that the government stops harrassing Microsoft, a company responsible for thousands of jobs and technical inovation benefiting millions.'To delay further is a total waste of time.

Herbert A. Brauner
110 Sleepy Hollow Dr.
San Anselmo, CA 94960

MTC–00006155

From: CRL0@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a long time user of Microsoft products and believe the settlement should be in favor of Microsoft. I am a retired Federal employee and currently have a home based business, using many of Microsoft products. I do not see a need for other companies of lesser quality products to have a say in what is good for me. I may be reached at this E-mail address of CRLO@aol.com@inetgw

Creola Loyd

MTC–00006156

From: Tlpcook57@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: Some testimony

I would like to see my government stop wasting taxpayer money going after Microsoft. Let free enterprise work. My new (then) computer came with the Microsoft search engine along with AOL. Netscape, Msn, Yahoo and several others all bundled on the machine. Hooray I had a choice. Quit persecuting MSFT and use the money to go after Bin Laden and Sadam Hussein.

MTC–00006157

From: Bernie Friedenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Congratulations on a prompt, fair and equitable settlement! The case has been a burden on the computer industry, the economy, and the whole country.

Bernard Friedenson

MTC–00006158

From: nacpa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the proposed settlement with Microsoft as it now stands. I am confident that the marketplace for innovation and competition is healthy and needs no further action by the government to protect the public's interests.

I believe those opposing the current settlement are doing so to try and effect changes that will serve their own, not the public's, interests.

Thank you,
Cynthia Wallace Liss
PO Box 753
McLean, VA 22101
nacpa@cox.rr.com

MTC–00006159

From: Lou(038)Anne Salem
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I think the agreement for the microsoft settlement is fair to all parties involved.

Thank You
L J Salem Jr.

MTC–00006160

From: James D. Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Attorney General:

As a consumer I find it difficult to understand why a few states and special interest groups can continue to keep this settlement agreement form completion. The Federal Government must put this to rest immediately. We've all suffered financially as the result of this competitor led suit and it's time it stopped. This is a country where the majority rules and that's exactly what needs to happen here. Tell those who want to continue this for their own selfish interests to get in line and stop holding this up and let's get on with it.

James D. Miller.

MTC–00006161

From: Warren Dewar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand, under the Tunney Act, there is a period of time within which the public is allowed to comment to the District Court regarding the proposed settlement of the antitrust case against Microsoft Corporation. I wish to express my strong support for the proposed settlement. In my opinion, this case was ill-advised from the start, and was an obvious attempt by Microsoft's competitors to strengthen their position at the expense of the world's most innovative company.

Microsoft is clearly committed to a nonproprietary Internet, as opposed to the nation's cable companies, which can design their broadband networks to control what kind of content and applications may be carried. There is little reason to vilify a company with a strong and powerful interest in a strategy that may well reinforce competition on the Internet, especially when few of Microsoft's competitors have adopted such a similarly pro-Internet strategy. Thus, rather than adopting a remedy that is focused exclusively on the 'last war,' a proper remedy to the current antitrust case should be sufficient to steer Microsoft towards its benign strategy, while assuring an adequate response if it fails to follow this pro-competitive lead.

Sincerely,
Warren L. Dewar II
137 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

MTC–00006162

From: Brian Olson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:58pm
Subject: Hurt Microsoft, hurt the country.

If you insist on a witch hunt why are you not going after Steve Case from AOL?

AOL blocks photos coming from other E Mail sources. AOL stands in the way of Instent messages to all ESPs, MSFT does not.

This is about money for other companies not the people of our Country. Apple price for price is a computer I, as a Computer teacher feels like running for the door when I see one.

It has the worse mouse, lousy graphics, is difficult to navigate. I find it difficult to believe the people against MST have ever used a home computer.

The Government must have determined that the American People are stupid, that they buy Windows because Bill Gates secret organization of Storm Troupers sneaks into homes and forces prospective buyers to purchase Windows.

Forget the Hype that Apple Computers do not hang up. In 10 years of teaching computers, I have seen Jobs little miracle hang up three times to every once for Windows.

I hate to think this, but is the case against Gates fueled by his lack of bribing legislators, or is it just that legislators and judges are a lot less inteligent then I ever thought they were.

BRIAN
PS Who designed the Graphics for Apple!

MTC–00006163

From: Frank Scott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe the DOJ should proceed with its proposed setllement of the Microsoft case.

Frank Scott
Scott American Corporation
Box 88
West Redding CT 06896–0088 USA
Phone and fax: 203 938 2955
e-mail: frank@scottamerican.com
website: www.scottamerican.com

MTC–00006164

From: DChick7070@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft case should be settled post haste. The economy is not good and another company going down the drain is not what we need. I also believe in the old American way that who ever builds the best mouse trap wins.

D.R. Chick

MTC–00006165

From: Captain Brett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madam/Sir:

I think Microsoft Corp. has acted in good faith and given up many of its legal rights in order to bring to an end the anti-innovation anti-trust suit brought by the Justice Department and some states on behalf of special corporate interests. The settlement reached by Microsoft and Justice appears to be in the second best interest of the public—the first would have been to leave Microsoft alone and allow them to continue to develop great software and give American consumers free computer tools—and as a computer user I hope the Justice Department will second this settlement in earnest.

Happy New Year.
Brett Jiu
711 W 171st St Apt 8
New York, NY 10032

MTC–00006166

From: Richard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With the terrible events of 9/11 still at the forefront of our collective minds, please do whatever is necessary to bring ALL parties on board for a comprehensive settlement of the microsoft case. It is terribly distracting to have a sterling domestic company dogged by years of litigation. The Federal government's settlement is more than fair to all parties; please do something to bring the states who have opted to continue litigating into the fold. We need to put this behind us. America needs you to resolve this matter. We are all ready to move on, to get back to work, to keep America at the leading edge of technological supremacy.

Richard Hetherington

MTC–00006167

From: C.M. HOOPER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has contributed greatly to information technology and our new economy. Microsoft has been and is endorsed each time an individual or organization purchases its products and services. These are voluntary transactions and, as an individual, I believe Microsoft has given me full value for the price of its products that I use. Microsoft's competitors are cry babies and the state attorneys general who have sued Microsoft are no better than the worst of tort lawyers. It's time to let Microsoft get back to developing new information technology. Although unfair to Microsoft, it's time to settle the case now before the federal government.

Clay Hooper
HC 63 Box 19
Hamilton TX 76531

MTC–00006168

From: Robert/Shirley Girard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We wish to be counted among those who vehemently are against further litigation, with regard to Microsoft, which is costly and time consuming and unnecessary. Please settle this issue as expeditiously as possible. There are many more crucial situations in our world today. We thank you!!!!!!!

Shirley & Robert GIrard
Kingston, WA

MTC–00006169

From: Ray Petrone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Congratulations on the long-awaited settlement with Microsoft. It was long overdue. It is most unfortunate that nine states continue to waste far more time on this matter than can possibly be justified. With situations like the one at Enron commonplace they would be wise to spread their attention in places where millions of people are likely to benefit more from the outcome. Enough is enough. Please move forward with the settlement as agreed to by Microsoft.

Although as a shareholder in Microsoft I think that even that settlement goes too far I am willing to lend my voice to the voices of compromise in order to move to far more important matters for our economy, our nation and the general welfare of the people of this country.

Respectfully,
Raymond Petrone, P.E.

MTC–00006170

From: Toney Herlevic
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear DOJ,

Please settle this case against Microsoft as soon as possible. This case should never have occurred. It should not be the purview of Government to protect stupid people. I am an average computer user and somehow have managed to put four browsers on my desktop with no help from the Government. The government should stay out of this marketplace and let the marketplace settle these disputes. Please accept the settlements as soon as possible and get off Microsoft's back!

Toney Herlevic
El Cajon, CA

MTC–00006171

From: Funds, Karl—Karl
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Any case against Microsoft has become way to muddied to make any clear sense of the issues involved. Fine them and let's get this over with. Too many have a personal stake in the case for any real resolution, so just end it quickly.

Karl Funds
Funds Hays Graphic Design
2901 W. Busch Blvd., Suite 406
Tampa Florida 33618
kfunds@fundshays.com
www.fundshays.com

MTC–00006172

From: CMSEH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:59pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Department of Justice,

The Microsoft Case must be settled! It is only correct that the case should be settled because it will improve the economy and as a user of Microsoft since 1976 in my work in the public schools of Milwaukee, I have found it the best of all worlds.

Sincerely,
Carol M. Schaeve; Retired Reading Specialist from Milw. Ghettos;

I retired at 72½. Now I am 76 and still using Microsoft 2000 in writing the genealogy of my four ancestors who came to America in 1845 and 1854. Hurrah for this country; keep it sound and settle Microsoft.

MTC–00006173

From: Kar Ip
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For nearly four years, the public's voice and interests have been instrumental in the debate over the freedom to innovate. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens have communicated to their public officials about whether the Microsoft case should be settled or further litigated. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached an agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling.

My opinion is that this agreement is comprehensive and tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. As a consumer, I overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for the consumers, the industry and the American economy. Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. I will not let these special interests defeat the public interest.

Sincerely
Kar W Ip
Private Citizen
80–55 Bell Blvd,
Queens Village, NY 11427

MTC–00006174

From: Ellen Page
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If you have the interest of the consumer, and not special interest groups, in mind, then you will settle the Microsoft issue now.

It confounds me that the Department of Justice would practice Draconian justice with a company that has so improved the quality of life for Americans. Sure, it is big. Sure, it is successful. Do you want to discourage growth and innovation in the entrepreneurial sector? It also provides jobs for thousands, who in turn spend money and enhance the economy.

I do part company with Bill Gates when he uses his influence to change immigration laws. We have home grown talent to fill the jobs made available by the hi-tech industry.

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Page

MTC–00006175

From: MoonDoctor@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern

Even though I feel that the Microsoft Corporation is being penalized more than I think is reasonable, I realize that it's not going to get much better under current conditions. For this reason, I strongly recommend that the existing terms of the settlement be set up and enacted as a final solution.

Jack Haug
PO Box 1104
Sanford, NC 27331

MTC–00006176

From: William P. Crumpacker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Settlement

Let us ''move on'' and judiciously allow the settlemet to proceed. If the opponents desire to harm Microsoft, let them attempt to do so in the marketplace, NOT the courts.

Sincerely,
William P. Crumpacker
1654 Hanson St.
Ft. Myers FL 33901

MTC–00006177

From: Mac Goelst
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

L.S.,

It is my opinion that it is in the best interest of all concerned if the lawsuit against Microsoft is settled ASAP, because:

—In spite of the anti competitive behaviors Microsoft engaged in according to the court rulings issued so far, we as a company feel that we have only benefited from Microsoft's strength and dominant position by getting more software for ever lower prices. This in turn has benefited our customers (such as you, since we are a UNICOR partner), because it has allowed us to keep our pricing stable.
—Software innovation by Microsoft and others drives a lot of growth, and the sooner we get back and focus on that the better off we'll all be.
—The remedies proposed are fair, and any further tinkering, especially in the direction of a breakup of Microsoft will be tremendously hurtful.

Sincerely,
Mac A. Goelst
President/ CEO
Goelst USA, LLC
915 Bridge Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
email: mgoelst@goelst.net

MTC–00006178

From: Bernard Rohde
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the proposed settlement is fair to all parties and the general public at large. Lets get the deal done and move on with re-building our economy. Surely the Justice Department has better things to do with its time like chasing terrorists instead of hampering the free enterprise system.

Bernard Rohde
430 Martel Lane
Coppell, TX 75019

MTC–00006179

From: Robert Gadd, III
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

In my judgment the whole market. particularly NASDAQ crashed after the Department of Justice and some states went after Microsoft. The domino effect took it from there.

My request is for you all to back off and drop all proceedings.

Robert F. Gadd, III

MTC–00006180

From: JAdams314@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Let's get on with the business of business and that is to let the economy function as it always has, and not be heavy-handed in regulating, or micromanaging every situation. The government settled, the states should settle and get on with it. No one would want to think that with Europe united and creating a formidable economic threat to the rest of the world and with China getting its act together finally, that we need very strong companies to handle the world business climate. Microsoft is a leader.

Sincerely yours,
John Adams

MTC–00006181

From: michael bricker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:00pm
Subject: I hope you will use some sense in the Microsoft case.

I hope you will use some sense in the Microsoft case. They have invented a new language for all computer users to use. And have offered it to the public for a fair price. What if Japan or some one elle had invented this item. How maney dollars would we be exporting to them???

MTC–00006182

From: cewagner@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

The current Microsoft settle seems to be fair. Please don't let the Microsoft competitiors do more unfair damage to a company that has been the industry leader for the last decade.

Charles E. Wagner Jr.
25 Newberry St.
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

MTC–00006183

From: YLPATH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir, I believe that Microsoft settlement is good for the economy of USA

Sincerely,
Yat-sun Leung

MTC–00006184

From: flora@businessaspects.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Dept. of Justice,

As a very concerned citizen, kindly allow me to voice my opinion that is is time to settle fully with Microsoft and let this company and our great nation get on with fulfilling our needs for advanced technology, which Microsoft has shown, countless times, does so ably.

Let's get on with a bright future, shall we? Settle with Microsoft now.

Thanks for your time.
Flora Gabriel, BSL, JD
flora@businessaspects.com

MTC–00006185

From: MFGRANDE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear USDOJ:

I think it is preposterous that the US Government has continued it's attack against free enterprise and Microsoft. Didn't the government learn anything from Ken Stars and that waste of our tax dollars? Call off the attack dogs and let capitalism live.

Time to move on to more pressing issues facing us today and let the lawyers find other revenue streams.

Mario Grande
mfgrande@aol.com

MTC–00006186

From: Simon Litvak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I would like to express my opinion on Microsoft case. Microsoft case should be settled without any further delays. Continuation of this case is harmful to industry, American economy and American consumers. Statements that Microsoft harmed consumers by building a lot of features inside Windows OS, not to mention overcharging them (we are really undercharged by Oracle and Sun, aren't we?) are ridiculous. When I need small software utility to do my job, I have to pay 25%—100% of what MS Windows OS cost. What do you think consumers would say if they have to pay for browser, e-mail and a bunch of utilities and accessories which are provided as a part of MS Windows?

As a USA Federal and CA state taxpayer I see my money used in this case against my will. Last statement is also correct for millions and millions Americans.

Thanks,
Simon Litvak
Programmer/Analyst
UC Berkeley

MTC–00006187

From: Robert A. Hicks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For the record, my wife and I are small stockholders in Microsoft, but we were not supportive of the government's position from day one. Please accept Microsoft's settlement offer, cut your losses, and go after real violators. =====

Robert A. Hicks, Executive Director
Tallahassee Comets, Inc.
2001 TWO-TIME TEAM CAMP USA CHAMPIONS
WWW.COMETSGET.NET

MTC–00006188

From: Dave Garvie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled.

Please end these court proceedings and let Microsoft get on with their business.

Thank you,
Dave GARVIE.

MTC–00006189

From: Everett Joline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir

I would like to voice my support for the settlement that MS and the DOJ have agreed to. Naturally there are competitors that would like to shoot down this agreement to stifle MS competition in their product areas, however, it is definitely to the benefit of consumers to put this dispute behind us and get on with getting the economy back on track.

Thanks for your attention,

Everett S. Joline

MTC–00006190

From: jdcoussens@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlment

I agree that the case against Microsoft is bogus, Microsoft is a giant because it's serving its customer better than the others, other products that are better will eventually rise to the top, without the government's involvment.

Jerry Coussens
4440 Cheyenne Ave
Davenport, Iowa

MTC–00006191

From: Bjoart519@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

My feeling is that the proposed settlement in the Microsoft problem, is more than fair, and Microsoft should not be penalized further. Though an octogenerian, having the whole computer revolution occur in my lifetime, and being no expert, I do feel that the Microsoft organization has been a large factor in my being able to use and enjoy my computer, and all the things I can do with it.

Sincerely,
Arthur W. Powell
1304 Monarch Circle
Naples, FL 34116

MTC–00006192

From: Wade Wilken
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please record me as in favor of the proposed settlement for the Microsoft case.

Thanks and regards,
Wade Wilken Jr.

MTC–00006193

From: JLPWINGS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Micrsoft Settlement

If the goverment and various states are so eager to be involved in private business may a suggest a better target than Microsoft? Try the baseball industry. The state of Minnesota should look for ways of keeping baseball rather than prolong litigation against Microsoft.

The settlement as of this date is fair. The litigation has hurt more people than it has helped. Let the settlement stand and let's move on.

James L. Peterson
Microsoft User and Stockholder

MTC–00006194

From: Masciovecchio, Philip (P.J.)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is truly a shame that our Government is still trying to penalize Microsoft. There are obviously other issues that I feel are more important than the one on hand. Mi

crosoft is a company that started with virtually nothing and has reached (deserved) the opportunity to capitalize on its achievements. I wonder if all those other companies that are competitors of Microsoft's were in the same position, would they feel like they were monopolizing the market. I doubt very much.

Microsoft should use it resources on making this world a better place through its current business, instead of spending it trying to defend itself in court, due to a few competitors who cannot meet what Microsoft has achieved.

I for one, would like to see this case put to rest once and for all. It is a shame our government is wasting so much time, resources, energy, and my taxes trying to penalize a company that should not even have to defend itself.

Regards,
Philip J. Masciovecchio
e-mail pmasciov@visteon.com

MTC–00006195

From: FoxxMulderr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please move ahead with the current settlement that has been reached. Let's move on and let the company continue it's innovation to the technology industry.

David Rabinowitz

MTC–00006196

From: Betty Gotuaco
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I feel that the US Department of Justice has done enough to prosecute Microsoft about the anti-trust concerns of the government. Please leave them alone. Microsoft is doing this great country a service, not like the Department of Justice Anti-Trust Group.

Thank You,
Betty Liang Gotuaco

MTC–00006197

From: Becke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I support Microsoft and urge the DOJ to follow through on the settlement as reasonable and fair to all parties. The dissenting states have business' making their homes in those states that would be helped if you were to disallow this settlement to go through.

I use a Windows product starting only 3 years ago... This system has allowed me to become computer efficient and I now use Microsoft Windows in my small business.

I completely support Microsoft and wish the previous administration and justice department had spent as much time on terrorism as they did attacking Microsoft.

B. Elliot
Texas

MTC–00006198

From: Larry Seltzer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have disapproved of the case against Microsoft from the beginning, and would prefer that it be dropped completely. But as the settlement agreement eliminates the most stupid provisions of the original judgment, I urge its adoption so that the industry and the nation can move on and put this episode behind us.

Larry Seltzer
127 Parker Ave
Maplewood, NJ 07040
larry@larryseltzer.com

MTC–00006199

From: Doug Brennan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle now. This has gone on to long and consumer's freedoms or pocketbooks are not being effected.

Thanks,
Doug

MTC–00006200

From: RMKM8818@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We want the case settled as agreed and no further action taken.

MTC–00006201

From: CMDOC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please try to get this settled and let the company move forward with innovation and improvements to their product. The additions they have made over the years to the various Windows operating systems have been phenomenal and have given us (the consumers and users) much greater value for our money along with greater ease of use. Most of the objections are from competitors who would have us all buying separate products by the dozens to do the things that Microsoft has included with each new upgrade of their software. Thank Goodness for Microsoft and the foresight and innovation they have had in the past.

C. M. House, MD,
Captain MC USN

MTC–00006202

From: LORETTES2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Settlement

For justice's sake: Settle this case. Stop the litigation. Way too much time and taxpayers' money has been spent on this.

Lorette Schneider
A concerned taxpayer

MTC–00006203

From: Alcornwd@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement is FAIR.

Dear Sir:

I strongly believe the Microsoft settlement is fair. Other wealthy competitors (i.e., Sun Microsystems) are trying to torpedo the settlement for their grudges and monetary gains. Please don't let the settlement be

decided by big businesses (competitors) that have an ''agenda.'' As a consumer, I think Microsoft's many contributions have been good for the general public.

Warren D. Alcorn
Sausalito, CA

MTC–00006204

From: Scott Harrison
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear elected officials and lawmakers,

Please settle the Microsoft DOJ case, do not delay you are not acting on behalf of the consumer if you do not accept the settlement and move on. The proposed remedies are more than fair. The proposed DOJ settlement is the route that is most expedient and fair for all involved.

Microsoft is not a bad company, they are being punished for being successful and giving us consumers what we ask for, much of this suit is being driven by their competition not consumers. Microsoft is one of the very few companies that actually listens to the average consumers feedback. They may not get it right the first time but they listen and keep on trying until it is what we ask them to create. What we have now with Windows is want consumers have asked them to produce. Software companies should be forced to compete on the technical merit of their products as voted on by consumer dollars not via the Justice system and litigation.

The individual states should not be free to peruse additional remedies and measures, this seems wrong and also like double jeopardy. This is wrong that the individual states can choose to continue this matter on their own. If the case has been settled why does litigation continue, by any party?

The consumer is paying for this litigation, even in the end if Microsoft were to pay all legal bills—Microsoft should not have to pay for the government legal bills—the states and federal govenrment has still wasted time and money on this rather than putting those same resources to better use. This entire matter is a huge waste and gross misallocation of resources.

Please listen to consumers not competitors. I as a consumer want you to take the settlement, stop further persecution of Microsoft, restrict the states from being able to peruse this matter further, and stop wasting time and money on this.

It is terrible that we have spent more money tracking down and persecuting Microsoft than we have tracking the worst United States public enemies. Respectfully submitted to microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov on 1/2/2002

Scott Harrison
410 Forest Place SW,
Issaquah, WA. 98027

MTC–00006205

From: Herke, Mark
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the proposed Microsoft settlement is fair. If it fails and Microsoft is broken up, this would affect the quality of their products since there would be less integration between the operating system and office software. I believe Microsoft should have an equal right to create software that runs on their operating system. I use Microsoft products extensively in my job and would not like to see my job become more difficult with the break-up of Microsoft.

Thank you,
Mark Herke

MTC–00006206

From: Thomas Branley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case. It would be good for the economy and the American people. Four years is long enough.

MTC–00006207

From: PoppaOR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft settlement

It is my opinion that the US governments settlement with Microsoft is a reasonable agreement. When each of the worlds infrastructures where began; such as the railroads, telephones, air transportation, etc., it was done with the gov. support, by just a few competitors. This makes the large capital outlay potentially profitable for the infant industry innovators and creates a standard that is easily understood and used by the public.

The difference between an academian and a entrepreneur is: The academian basks in his understanding of ideas and ideals. The entrepreneur takes his understanding and creates a product that the public will use.

US citizen and entrepreneur for 35 years,
GERALD VEENKER

MTC–00006208

From: Andersen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a part time administrator of computer systems for the past 20 years in a small Construction company (2001 sales of $80 million) I am appalled by the suit against Microsoft. I say part time because we do not have a full time IT staff and computers are a small part of my involvement here. Nobody seems to remember what data processing was like in the pre-PC days but I can assure you that our business has benefitted greatly from companies like Microsoft and the open architecture of the PC. We could not maintain our systems no a part time basis without Microsoft.

We spent many dollars during the days of mainframes and minis for systems that didn't work well, required a lot of maintenance and left us vulnerable to gouging on both the hardware and software sides of computing. Microsoft has delivered a more stable platform for a fraction of what our previous systems cost.

It wasn't that many years ago that the cost of word processing software was offered to my company for $50,000. (single user, 1982), adding a dumb terminal (workstation) cost $20,000 and adding 28megs to my hard drive cost $25,000 (this was a terrible scam because the space actually existed on the drive that I owned but it had to be software enabled).

In the early days of PCs, we spent countless thousands on software that didn't work well from Microsoft's competitors and eventually migrated to Microsoft's Office products because they were feature rich and did work better than their competition's.

We do not exclusively use Microsoft products—our network product is provided by Novell as is our e-mail. Our accounting software is from Timberline and the interface issues between these products and MS has been minimal.

Do not hold to the belief that you are championing my cause by pursuing an action against Microsoft but rather please understand that you are probably going to negatively impact my business by your ignorance of reality. If the DOJ wants to go after somebody, they should look at companies like Apple who, to their own peril, has kept their architecture closed or for the countless failed software companies that never delivered on their promises.

This is not to say that we never have issues with Microsoft software but rather to say that they are manageable without Government intervention. A good analogy would be the United States Government. It is not without issues but considering the competition, where else would you go.

Tom Andersen
tea@bbeinc.com

MTC–00006209

From: Terry Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly support the Microsoft settlement! It is time to move forward and not add additional burden to our National economy. Any additional action negating this settlement would only serve special interests (wealthy special interests) and not be of any benefit to the general public. Why do we attempt to tear apart the very structure of our economy when it is the very worst time to do so? As a member of the ''very common general public'' I gain nothing from this fiasco. I don't see where any of this lawsuit benefits me as the public.

I don't view Microsoft as any different then any other ''large corporate giant'' such as General Electric monopoly or any of the telephone monopolies. Just look what happened when the telephone companies were broken up. Not only did the cost of service escalate, but new long distance services were created adding to the cost, and now where are they headed? Why, they are being reacquired by the very companies the government broke up, recreating the very same so called ''monopoly'' situation as before the breakups. The caveat, however, is that the ''very common general public'' is now paying significantly more for telephone service. Who benefited? Why BIG BUSINESS of course; with the governments assistance!

Let's get on with what life's problems we're suffering through right now. Examine the events of 9/11, the economy in the pits, costs escalating everywhere, unemployment, and so much more. Settle this thing with Microsoft and move forward with handling

the ''real problems'' in this Country—Employment & Economy!!!

MTC–00006210

From: Tom Field
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
ENOUGH IS ENOUGH; GET IT OVER WITH. NO MORE LITIGATION. The settlement is fair for all parties. Tom Field,
Marlboro, NJ

MTC–00006211

From: Bill Rigby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
In my opinion, the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ is appropriate and is in the public's interest.The changes proposed by the disagreeing states are Draconian and are being offered at the urging of Microsoft's competitors who are trying to do through the legal system what the they cannot do through competitive action.
Bill Rigby
wfr760@mindspring.com

MTC–00006212

From: John Vittone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Gentlemen,
Gentlemen, Enough is enough!!! I vehemently oppose any further litigation in this matter. Please settle the case as approved by the court. I want this matter settled now without further litigation.
John F. Vittone
1503 Seagate Ln
Houston, TX 77062

MTC–00006213

From: Michael Banyacki
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement / 1–02–02 / 10:58AM—PST
Dear Sir and or Madam:
I feel Microsoft has been raked over the coals by companies that just were not smart enough to see the big picture. Myself and thousands of other Consumers did not see the wrong that MicroSoft was accused of, yet they were gracious enough to try and be amicable for the failures of others.
I say, Enough is Enough and should stand for settlement, but there are those greedy, inconsiderate States, like California that just don't care about the Consumer, but cater to the interest of political donors!
What Microsoft had done was to be smarter in their approach than other companies and gave the Consumer the best of all the world software by integrating their software. Microsoft and its leader Bill Gates, is a prince among consumers because he and they try to give the public what it really wants in terms of coordinated software, making it easier for the consumer to understand the software and easing business and personal functions that are conducive to a working environment.
My VOTE is for MICROSOFT 100% percent and for staying on track with the settlement that other states have already accepted.....
CW4 Michael E. Banyacki (Ret.)
24992 Spadra Lane
Mission Viejo, CA 92691
E-mail: meb-1@worldnet.att.net

MTC–00006214

From: Kelly, Michael (Alexandria DJ 705)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
it is clearly in the interest of the people of the U.S. to block further litigation against microsoft. Microsoft, our most impotant innovator of technology has been in the penalty box too long. If this persists we will forfeit our most important lead in what will surely be a technical world. Without microsoft leading the way, we will slip further into a mediocre-albeit politically correct-future.

MTC–00006215

From: Bill Stortz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It's fair, so settle the action!!

MTC–00006216

From: GfWeis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
First let me say that I don't really believe that Microsoft has a monopoly—anyone (including Sun or Oracle) is free to build a competing product—if it's better, people will use it—if it isn't, they wont. A perfect example is Netscape—while it was better, I used it—when it became inferior, I switched.
Maybe the DOJ should spend a little more time going after the real criminals—just look at the millions that MS has added to the US Treasury in terms of taxes—not only in what it pays, but also in terms of what their employees (and no I'm not a MS employee) pay.
Just my thoughts...
Gordon F. Weis
http://yyyZ.Net
mailto:Gfw@yyyZ.Net

MTC–00006217

From: HLW125@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlemenrt
It's a good finish to what should not have happened. Just a bunch of states turning into ambulance chasers. It does show the power that (thank goodness he is gone) Mr. Clinton had.
HLW

MTC–00006218

From: Hay2lee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Will you please move on with this—Microsoft has done more good than harm. I am tired of you wasting tax money for the other whiny companies that won't use their money to take Microsoft to court.
Finish this already and let Microsoft provide the public with the software they need!
Sue Argumedo
Tucson Arizona

MTC–00006219

From: KERMITFL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs:
I've been following this case since it started several years ago. Now that it is nearing the end, I'm all in favor of settling the matter as presently proposed. It's past time to move ahead instead of clogging up the progress of innovation and imagination in the arena of developing software. The few should abide by the wishes of the many!
Most Sincerely,
George B Moore
3350 1st Ave No Ste 117
St Petersburg FL 33713

MTC–00006220

From: virginia ladda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Dear Sirs,
I believe that everything that can be done to expediate the settlement with microsoft should be done. It is my belief and the belief of several friends that the problems with microsoft is doing nothing but hurting the technology sector and therefore the economy.
Sincerely,
Virginia Napier Ladda

MTC–00006221

From: Anderson, Ken
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
My company is a long time software developer and user. We wrote and sold our first programs in 1981 under the company name of Tecnomics. Initially they were written in TRS–DOS for Radio Shack hardware. Later we spent many of thousands to rewrite it using Pascal which was supposed to have been a universal language. We finally wrote it for MS DOS which was a standard for a good long period and saved us from having to constantly rewrite our programs. I was delighted that this happened and have been very happy with Microsoft's efforts to provide a standard by being the biggest and the best. I think having a standard develop in this way rather than by government decree is best.
I would like for Microsoft to continue to be able to strive to be the biggest and the best. That is what all of us in business try to do. I do not think they should be punished for this. I understand the concern about monopoly but I don't think the situation in the volatile software business is anything at all like the conditions that existing when the law was written.
I think they are being punished for being successful and because some states see them as a big source of funds. I really don't think anyone can show damages. In fact, I could personally show you some advantages that have accrued to my company from the

constant improvement in functionality that MS has brought about. We continually strive for improved efficiency and most MS programs have helped us do this. I would be glad to testify to this point.

Ken Anderson, President
Anderson & Associates, Inc.
100 Ardmore St.
Blacksburg, VA 24060
anderson@andassoc.com
http://www.andassoc.com

MTC–00006222

From: Jerry Howard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please accept the current settlement and let everyone get on with their work. Microsoft should be left alone.

Regards,
Jerry D. Howard

MTC–00006223

From: Doug
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft suit should be settled quickly and with terms favorable to Microsoft. With out the technology that they have provided the PC would not be where it is today. They did not, in my opinion, act as a monopoly.

Sincerely,
Douglas Gilmore

MTC–00006224

From: Tony
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to settle in favor of Microsoft for all the wonderful and innovative techniques developed that have moved our nation and the world forward. They (Microsoft) deserves our thanks and appreciation for their contribution towards the advancement of mankind. One of their competitors (Netscape) has openly criticized Microsoft while they themselves were guilty of infringing on Microsoft's browser. Please allow Microsoft to proceed with their innovation in our free and competitive market.

MTC–00006225

From: Don Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just a word to weigh in with my view of the MS settlement. I am surprised that MS was willing to pay anything. I suggest USDOJ and the states take the offer and run. It is not good that we project the impression that we punish success in this country. We have the premier technology company in the world whose accomplishments and contributions to the tech leadership of the US is unquestioned, and what do we do. . . it would appear that we wanted to destroy it!!!!

MTC–00006226

From: J (038) S Pinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please settle the Microsoft harassment. I believe the whole thing came about because of some jealous competitors—let them go out & compete. Competition is the American way, it's healthy. What a bunch of cry babies!

Sincerely,
Shelah Pinson
jpin@dslextreme.com
Anza, CA 92539

MTC–00006227

From: James Prevallet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved. As a consumer, I agree that settlement is good for me, the industry and the American economy. Please don't lot special interest groups defeat the public interest.

Best of,
James Prevallet
http://www.mp3.cm/JamesPrevallet

MTC–00006228

From: Bev
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Lawsuit

In my opinion this very costly litigation, for not only Microsoft, but for we the taxpayers of this country appears to be almost a vendetta. When one considers the huge impact Microsoft has made on the economic development of this country, the thousands and thousands of jobs (and most are high paying jobs) this company has created, it makes me wish there were more entrepreneurs like Mr. Gates to establish even larger and more successful enterprises in this country. It seems envy and jealousy over Mr. Gates' success is in large part responsible for the millions being spent on litigation. In my opinion, the Government should just plain ''lay off''!!!!!!!

MTC–00006229

From: Tom Wolf (Adelphia)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To DOJ:

You need to settle your differences with Microsoft, and the settlement, which we were led to believe was made, should be ratified. We users need to have Microsoft get on with giving us innovative new programs and services. There's plenty of competition out there. I use Netscape as well as Explorer; I use Word Perfect even though I have Word. Your drawn-out litigation and your many delays have cost us taxpayers millions, Microsoft stockholders billions, and users inconvenience and delay in receiving new product from Microsoft. Get on with it!

Thomas P. Wolf
33 Spring Trail
Fairfield, PA 17320

MTC–00006230

From: Scottie Gound
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

Get off Microsoft's back. We computer users want, need Microsoft and her products. We have a decent settlement now. Enough is enough. Drop this lawsuit and tell the states and the money hunting cooperations to leave it be.

A Windows XP user
Scottie Gound

MTC–00006231

From: Hi There
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:09pm
Subject: Settle!

This matter should have been resolved a long time ago! Too much money has been wasted paying attorneys congress-folks, etc. to prolong this matter when in the long run I don't see a more fair settlement to all parties!

MTC–00006232

From: Liz Gjersee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This lawsuit needs to end. I am not even a shareholder of this company but to continue to drag this thing out is ridiculous. The courts have ruled and the states should abide by the settlement. My guess the main reason for the nine states not to settle is to protect business interests in their own states.

Thanks,
Brian Gjersee,
Arlington WA 98223

MTC–00006233

From: Madelyne Duncan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:10pm

Settle the case. The economy was hurt when the government began to interfere with Microsoft.

M. Duncan

MTC–00006234

From: Joyce Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Settlement agreed to by the Federal government is fair to all, including the public.

Joyce Smith,
Citizen

MTC–00006235

From: hugh gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

We have followed this folly far too long, everyone in our retired group agrees.!!! Microsoft should be set free to innovate and bring new products to the market.!!! this country owes a great deal to mr. gates and microsoft for moving us from the stone age.. . . the small minded few, with a political agenda I suspect, are holding up progress, the cost to us, the american tax payer, is huge. the cost to our nation in tax revenue, both foreign and domestic is huge. I see others, like AOL-time warner, getting away with far worse, however they are politically correct and therefore above the law, apparently.

thank-you,
H. Gardner,
4917 n. vista drive
bonneylake, wa 98390
hgbj@hotmail.com

MTC–00006236

From: JacHovis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement. I feel that the government was wrong in indicting Microsoft in the first place. It was just a vendetta against big business by the Clinton administration. Microsoft never hurt anyone. Most computer users want it on their computers. I know I do!! What hurt the public was the Justice Depts' indictment of Microsoft which caused the stock price to drop, costing the consumer BILLIONS of dollars. This also helped to start the stock market's downfall, costing the consumer TRILLIONS of dollars.

Now tell me, who hurt who!! Let's get behind our great corporations, & support them, rather than trying to legislate their destruction. GOD BLESS AMERICA.

Jack Hovis

MTC–00006237

From: Supersams@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This issue has gone on long enough. The settlement needs to be implemented with haste and get moving. Microsoft has not necessarily been perfect but this has gone on as a vendetta by Microsoft's competitors as a way to bite the hand that has fed them. Microsoft has been instrumental in the development of the computer industry. Good for consumers and good for industry. In a free enterprise environment each company has the same opportunity to develop products. Obviously, the first to market have an edge over later entries. While Apple was squabbling amongst themselves Microsoft continued to produce a product which has become a standard.

Over half of the original states have settled. The rest need to as well. What happens if all the remaining, except one, settle. Does this continue? Let's move along.

Sam Weirbach

MTC–00006238

From: Gil Roundy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:06pm
Subject: Settlement

It is in the public interest to get this behind us pleawse approve the agreement and let us get going again

Gil & Shurlene Roundy

MTC–00006239

From: doug bergenske
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs,

I think that this settlement should be adopted and be the last of the Gov. harassment of Microsoft!!

Doug Bergenske

MTC–00006240

From: John Chamness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:11pm
Subject: Settlement

As consumers and user of various software products we fel the settlement offer between the U.S. Government and Microsoft is fair to all parties involved, especially the consumer. Please finalize the settlement.

John and Dawn Chamness

MTC–00006241

From: GCoen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

Dear USDOJ,

It's time to focus on matters of greater importance to all Americans. Settle the Microsoft matter, please, so we can all ''get on with getting on''. The prosecution of Microsoft, in my opinion, was a politically motivated matter, and not one that benefited any one, including consumers. Say what you will, but Microsoft has done more to facilitate positive economic and communicative momentum in the world than any of it's competitors. That Microsoft was able to be creative and build market share should be commended, not condemned.

Settle the blasted suit!

Donna Coen
559 Old Squaw Pass Road
Evergreen, CO 80439

MTC–00006242

From: Jon Honhart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:11pm
Subject: DO nothing

Leave MS alone, they have done nothing wrong, should really look into AOL, Oracle, and Sun.

Jon

MTC–00006243

From: Clayton Harrington
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Settlement should be affirmed. I think the litigation should be terminated. I think it is time for both DOJ and Microsoft to move on with their other respective business requirements.

MTC–00006244

From: James Rhoads
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my considered judgment that a very few individuals, companies and/or states, for personal gain, are trying to remove Microsoft from the software field by arguing against the settlement of the governments law suit. Because of this fact and others I strongly support the settlement of this matter without delay.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to express my opinion regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
James Rhoads
Oldham County Road Y
Box 42
Channing, Texas 79018
(806) 534–2398

MTC–00006245

From: Larry Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs,

The proposed settlement is more than fair to the plaintiffs. The settlement should stand as is. I am a user, reseller, and educator and can honestly state I have never seen any of the abuses cited by competitors. I do not feel their voice (despite many thousands in campaign cash) should have any stronger input than mine. I believe this settlement is fair to all parties involved, and needs to be finished. The sooner the better.

Larry Thompson

MTC–00006246

From: Andy Howe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I just wanted to send a quick note to share my views on the proposed Microsoft settlement.

I believe that the settlement is fair to the consumers. They will have more choice in how their operating systems are configured, and the OEMs will be on equal footing when it comes to getting the best prices on Windows licenses from Microsoft.

It is my belief that the remaining states are simply opposing the deal because a) they want to drag this out and continue to try to put Microsoft in a bad light, and b) they want to help Microsoft's competitors. As I understand them, the antitrust laws are not here to protect your competitors, they are here to protect the consumers. Most consumers do not care if Microsoft has 8 different versions of Windows, they just want one, and they want it to have a lot of good features in it. The settlement will ensure that there will be more versions available for those who do care. It is time to end this case and let the high tech industry get back to business. I implore you to accept this settlement for the good of the consumers as well as the good of the high tech industry.

Thank you,
Andy Howe

MTC–00006247

From: ATignanell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DEAR SIRS/M'S:

I URGE THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO GO FORWARD WITH THE PROPOSED MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT. THE SETTLEMENT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF CONSUMERS AND BUSINESS PEOPLE SUCH AS ME. I RECENTLY PURCHASED A NEW DESKTOP COMPUTER AND IT CAME WITH MICROSOFT XP. MICROSOFT PRODUCTS ARE USER FRIENDLY AND ARE REASONABLY PRICED. THERE DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ANY ADVANTAGE EXCEPT TO POSSIBLY MICROSOFTS COMPETITORS TO DERAIL THE

SETTLEMENT. HAVEN'T THE TRIAL LAWYERS MADE ENOUGH???
VERY TRULY YOURS
A. ANDREW TIGNANELLI
ATTORNEY AT LAW
131 SURREY LANE
HARLEYSVILLE, PA 19438

MTC–00006248

From: Earl Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I think the battle against Microsoft has been carried much to far for too long. I think an immediate settlement is in the best interests of the country.
Sincerely,
Earl Johnston

MTC–00006249

From: Javier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:12pm
Subject: Free commerce
My opinion about the Microsoft case:
I believe that Microsoft should be left alone. Microsoft happens to be a Company with lots of ideas for the consumer to use, so what if they are bigger than others , let them do business other companies do their own little things to have a larger market share, so MS does to just in a larger scale they are committed to do better and better. Bottom line the consumer wins. So what if Bill Gates is the richest man, somebody is going to be and what the DOJ is going to sued him or her because is doing good? This is what USA is about, FREE ENTERPRISE.
From a citizen of the USA
Javier Arana.

MTC–00006250

From: Mark Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:13pm
Subject: Settlement
The microsoft settlement as currently defined is adequate. Please turn all efforts, energies and resources used in pursuing Microsoft to the War on Terrorism.

MTC–00006251

From: Alvina A. Ballinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
I have from day one, believed that this is an unjust action by the Department of Justice in pursuing Microsoft. I believe Janet Reno did irreparable harm to the company and to the stock holders over a trumped up suit. I also believe if Bill Gates would have contributed heavily to the DNC it wouldn't happened!
I respectfully add my voices to those who have asked you to drop the government suit against Microsoft.
You're are doing a great job in your office, keep it up!
Alvina A. Ballinger
Bremerton, WA

MTC–00006252

From: Robert Einhorn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please drop any and all litigation against the Microsoft Corporation. It only serves to further drag the already slow economy and the charges are baseless to begin with. We live in a free economy and the government should not interfere in business unless a clear monopoly is apparent, which is not the case in this instance.
Thank You,
Robert Einhorn
1546 Willow Lane
Crete, IL 60417

MTC–00006253

From: Brad Rush
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Get it over with. Settle! The suit never should have been filed. Let it go. Get back to governing—let free enterprise get back to growing.
Thanks.
Brad Rush

MTC–00006254

From: Andrew Chadick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:14pm
Subject: Microsoft and DOJ
This is a post I placed on the MSNBC website and my feelings on the issue haven't changed. Please read through the full post. Note, there are responses to my post included.
Subject:From:Host:Date:
Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)
Andrew Chadick
ip85.c207.blkl.bel.nwlink.com
Wed Nov 10 13:32:28
Microsoft entered the market place as a company with a desire to grow and be number one. This much has never been in question. Microsoft developed a piece of software that allows other programs to run with in the same program. This again has never been in question. Who owns the OS? The company that wrote it? The American People? Our Government? Who gets to say what is and can be run on an OS? The answer is simple. Microsoft created a program which has been purchased by millions of people. The program, whether flawed, perfect, or usable, is not even a question to be asked, the only thing in play here is ownership. Microsoft owns the rights to the OS they wrote. Period. What runs in the software is completely up to Microsoft, and if a person does not like that attitude, they should purchase something else. No one has forced the Microsoft product to become the standard by which all others are measured. And there are many options when choosing a platform to run software. Netscape created a program. Its compatibility with another program is not Microsoft's concern. Netscape should create their own OS if they are not happy running as a parasite on Microsoft's program. That is what ''FREE? enterprise is all about! You create something, market it, and if it is purchased... GREAT, if not, go back to the drawing board and start over. The United States is great because of some rudimentary principals, and our justice department needs to revise the word ''justice'' in their title. People choose. That's freedom. Microsoft is a vendor, if no one buys the product they will go under just like any other company, if you like the software, buy it, and support the company, if not, buy something else and support it, and if neither option is to your liking make something of your own. End of Story. Microsoft made it to where they are because of a simple transaction, people bought the program. Microsoft made the product great by making it expandable, making it allow other programs to run on it. Microsoft in this way is gracious to those of us who program and create programs, and in general, we are grateful to be supported by this company. If we don't like it, we can go else where. I speak for myself when I say this, but I know there are many that believe as I do.
Message thread: u Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Andrew Chadick Wed Nov 10 13:32:28 u Amen. Count me in. Microsoft earned #1.—Don't like it? Build something better! Wed Nov 10 13:55:41 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—MICORSOFT SUPORTER Wed Nov 10 14:04:13 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Vinny Tafuro Wed Nov 10 17:07:37
subject:From:Host:Date: Amen. Count me in. Microsoft earned #1.Don't like it? Build something better! proxy.uoeap.ucsb.eduWed Nov 10 13:55:41
I too can't believe the socialist (?) tendencies of the self-appointed Injustice Department. They are complete airheads regarding technology and the American marketplace. The last thing I want to see is the federal government determining what kind of operating system I can buy. The fact is that all these whiners can strip their machines of everything with Microsoft on it, and replace it with their darling little ''boutique geek'' software (Linux, etc.). The reason most of us don't is that we PREFER and WILL PAY FOR a well integrated OS/Office Suite/Browser package at the REASONABLE PRICES Microsoft charges. In case everyone has forgotten, we already had an era where there was an abundance of incompatible system software tools. The general public wasn't buying then and they sure as hell wouldn't buy it now! So lay off of Microsoft. I LOVE what they have done for the average Joe. On Wed Nov 10 13:32:28, Andrew Chadick wrote:
Microsoft entered the market place as a company with a desire to grow and be number one. This much has never been in question. Microsoft developed a piece of software that allows other programs to run with in the same program. This again has never been in question. Who owns the OS? The company that wrote it? The American People? Our Government? Who gets to say what is and can be run on an OS? The answer is simple. Microsoft created a program which has been purchased by millions of people. The program, whether flawed, perfect, or usable, is not even a question to be asked, the only thing in play here is ownership. Microsoft owns the rights to the OS they wrote. Period. What runs in the software is completely up to Microsoft, and if a person does not like that attitude, they should purchase something else. No one has forced

the Microsoft product to become the standard by which all others are measured. And there are many options when choosing a platform to run software. Netscape created a program. Its compatibility with another program is not Mic roSoft's concern. Netscape should create their own OS if they are not happy running as a parasite on Microsoft's program. That is what ''FREE''enterprise is all about! You create something, market it, and if it is purchased... GREAT, if not, go back to the drawing board and start over. The United States is great because of some rudimentary principals, and our justice department needs to revise the word ''justice'' in their title. People choose. That's freedom. Microsoft is a vendor, if no one buys the product they will go under just like any other company, if you like the software, buy it, and support the company, if not, buy something else and support it, and if neither option is to your liking make something of your own. End of Story. Microsoft made it to where they are because of a simple transaction, people bought the program. Microsoft made the product great by making expandable, making it allow other programs to run on it. Microsoft in this way is gracious to those of us who program and create programs, and in general, we are grateful to be supported by this company. If we don't like it, we can go else where. I speak for myself when I say this, but I know there are many that believe as I do.

Message thread: u Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Andrew Chadick Wed Nov 10 13:32:28 u Amen. Count me in. Microsoft earned #1. Don't like it? Build something better! Wed Nov 10 13:55:41 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—MICORSOFT SUPORTER Wed Nov 10 14:04:13 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Vinny Tafuro Wed Nov 10 17:07:37
Subject:From:Host:Date: Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)Vinny Tafuro 242836hfc121.tampabay.rr.comWed Nov 10 17:07:37

Microsoft made the product great by making expandable, making it allow other programs to run on it. Microsoft in this way is gracious to those of us who program and create programs, and in general, we are grateful to be supported by this company. If we don't like it, we can go else where. I speak for myself when I say this, but I know there are many that believe as I do. There are many others like you out there. I for one was an avid Netscape user until 1996. The year that Microsoft & Netscape released their newest and finest browsers. I remember this like it was yesterday and it is the biggest reason I am a Microsoft supporter. In a 2 day period (at that time I was still using a modem) I downloaded Netscape Communicator 4.0 and Internet explorer 4.0, in that order. The first night was Netscape (my favorite browser at the time). It was great (new features etc) . The next night I downloaded IE 4.0 and rebooted my PC .... I haven't used Netscape for my own pleasure since! Now for those who think I haven't looked back, you are wrong, I am a web developer and am constantly using Netscape to make sure my pages look right in both browsers. I even have the latest version, and the truth is that Netscape has not added anything new since 96, Microsoft is the company that has pushed with all their effort to better their browser not Netscape.Netscape has watched their market share drop from their own lack of a innovation, not because Microsoft is a monopoly. Microsoft has plenty to worry about when it comes to competition and have this lawsuit over them is detrimental to all of the other companies that think this will help them. Competition is very alive .... What if Adobe sat back and stopped innovating after creating PhotoShop 3.0? Microsoft today would be the leader there too (this is just an example). But Adobe hasn't .... Microsoft and Adobe both have graphics suits yet everyone knows that Adobe's is the preferred program (even myself). This is only because Adobe INNOVATES, they are adding features to keep ahead of the game just like Microsoft. A fundamental problem with the situation is the lack of innovation by both Netscape & its parent company AOL, now with AOL's business concept behind Netscape we are now seeing problems. AOL I will agree is the absolute BEST way to get a beginner on the internet (and that is how they built their business), however they have a fundamental problem with their model... there is no room to grow! AOL is now paying the price for this by losing customers who have learned over time (imagine that) that the internet is much more than AOL. AOL's problem comes from that fact that they themselves haven't given their users a way to grow, AOL is AOL is AOL .... weather you are a beginner, novice or advanced user, and that is NOT how you keep customers. The other companies out there that are backing the Government in this case are doing so simply to avoid innovation.

Message thread: u Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Andrew Chadick Wed Nov 10 13:32:28 u Amen. Count me in. Microsoft earned #1.—Don't like it? Build something better! Wed Nov 10 13:55:41 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—MICORSOFT SUPORTER Wed Nov 10 14:04:13 u Re: Microsoft Monopoly?! (NOT)—Vinny Tafuro Wed Nov 10 17:07:37
Subject:From:Host:Date: Very Good ReadingTed lcust5.tnt2.birmingham.al.da.uu.netWed Nov 10 17:34:50

You should repost this at top every day. Imagine the progress that has been lost tring to settle this, and many other wastfull 'Justice Probes'

Subject:From:Host:Date: Re: Monopoly?!Meebert 208.7.142.140Thu Nov 11 08:09:24

Absolutely right.just because we don't LIKE Bill Gates, or just because Hhis competitors have no chance is not enough reason to steal his life's work out from under him and pass it around like yesterday's bread. If this all happens, Americans are far more stupid than I had thought. Why not dig your own grave? You do it to MS, next it will happen to you. To you, the simple owner of the corner store. If it happens to me, I'm moving to another country where at least even though the truth sucks, it's still the truth. Bert

Subject:From:Host:Date: the whole thing is ridiculous.Meebert 208.7.142.140Thu Nov 11 08:04:45

Take a large company, tear it down and cut it up and give it to the vultures of it's competitors because it has the best product. Windows is not bug free, but last I've seen, neither is CDE or Linux, or Xwindows or Solaris. MS is on top because they made a product that was not only easy to use, but functional and backward compatible. This is a huge undertaking, and none of their competitors even remotely compared. Giving away windows source code is unbelieably stupid and unfair. MS spent billions in research, over 15 years of work, time and effort to create what we all use. and now, because they are a ''huge'' company, they are being punished, all their wok being taken away, by a government that just loves to push people around. This whole fight is about Sun and Netscape whining about MS putting out a superior product. Netscape Navigator was better. But MS has more coders, better coders, and in the end, they won. I'm a web developer, I used to love Netscape, until I noticed that Netscape could not do half of what IE can do. Now I use IE because Netscape cannot function as a viable web browser, not to mention it is far far more buggy. This is very typical of our current society. If we don't like what we see, we cry, we sue, we whine, and kick our feet like children, and Big daddy government will come and save us from the evil money makers.This is incentive for anyone out here to know that you better not be successful, if you are successful too much, your success will be confiscated. Bert

Subject:From:Host:Date: Is MS a Monopoly? Yes, but...Roy Wells pixsv159.isi.comThu Nov 11 08:48:28

Microsoft holds monopoly power. However, how has the company used it? Because of DOS, then Windows, computers are cheaper, software is cheaper and alternatives in hardware and applications are all cheaper. So who has the Microsoft Monopoly hurt? Netscape? Last I checked, the reason Netscape is not doing so well is that MS had a superior product that was cheaper (free) so Netscape went to the courts.Who else? Novell? So Novell went to Sen. Hatch. SO, let's break up Microsoft. Computers can then increase in price, the loss of a standard OS will mean fewer option available under applications (since not everyone will want to port their applications to all the different OS platforms) and hardware (same problem) and so. Breaking up the Monopoly will success—at a cost to the user.

Message thread: u Is MS a Monopoly? Yes, but...—Roy Wells Thu Nov 11 08:48:28
Subject:From:Host:Date: True AmericanTed exch.paragon-eng.netThu Nov 11 09:05:13

So many times when I here how the 'Justice' dept. is mistreating a true American that climbed up from just a suitcase .... I would tell them were to get off, shut down and move out. The 'Justice' dept. is killing the 'American Spirit'

Subject:
From:Host:
Date: Re: Monopoly?!User 12.24.246.81Thu Nov 11 09:05:39

If this all happens, Americans are far more stupid than I had thought. Well, it's not really Joe Q. Public that's prosecuting Microsoft. It's a combination or blood-thirsty lawyers and a government that decided it's

time to push their weight around again. That's not to say there aren't a lot of people that are leeching onto the anti-MS bandwagon. These people are:1) Cronic whiners and complainersand/or2) Lemings

Message thread: u Monopoly?!—Andrew Chadick Thu Nov 11 08:04:28 Re: Monopoly?!—Meebert Thu Nov 11 08:09:24 u True American—Ted Thu Nov 11 09:05:13 u Re: Monopoly?!—User Thu Nov 11 09:05:39

MTC–00006255

From: Wachs, James S.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:16pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I FULLY AND COMPLETELY SUPPORT THE SETTLEMENT OF THE ANTITRUST PROCEEDINGS AGAINST MICROSOFT. TOO PROLONG THIS CONTROVERSY MAY BENEFIT CERTAIN SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, BUT IT WILL NOT HELP A SAGGING ECONOMY, THE STOCK MARKET DOWNTURN, OR, THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL.

JAMES S. WACHS, ESQ.

NOTICE: The information contained in this electronic mail transmission is intended by Frost Brown Todd LLC for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or otherwise confidential. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named addressee). It should not be copied or forwarded to any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by reply email or by calling Frost Brown Todd LLC at (513) 651–6800 (collect), so that our address record can be corrected.

MTC–00006256

From: harperj@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ back off. Technology is global, moves rapidly and chances of the DOJ ability to make a timely decision with full indication of future ramifications are as likely as catching sunlight in a bottle.

1. Your IBM decision was ill-advised and unforseen results.

2. Your ATT decision led to unforseen results. The global market will reward the quickest and the fastest. If Microsoft gets too rich or too monopolistic, it will not remain that way for long. The global technology market will crush a fat microsoft faster than the DOJ can.

MTC–00006257

From: KKH1296@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:15pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I support the microsoft settlement. I feel it is reasonable and fair to all involved and also in the best interest of the public.

Kathleen Huey
Spring Mills, PA

MTC–00006258

From: hmcarim@mmm.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:16pm
Subject: microsoft settlement.

I agree that Microsoft's terms of the settlement reached with certain states should be accepted by all the others as well. States that continue to hold out and want further litigation are holding back innovation and depriving the public of needed new products . Eventually the consumer pays for the protracted litigation.

Microsoft has accepted a fair settlement that rectifies the alleged wrongs and should now be free to pursue innovative new product introductions.

Hatim Carim

MTC–00006259

From: MJBorza@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please exercise good judgement and release Microsoft from all pending law suits. Our country is stronger because of their innovative efforts. You should not have been involved. Please investigate the money trail of the politicians/lawyers who were advocates of the lawsuit to expose their true motives!

Michael Jay Borza

MTC–00006260

From: AJ Chwick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:13pm
Subject: Microsoft's Settlement

As one who is involved in the computer industry, I feel that the Microsoft Proposed Settlement serves only Microsoft's goals and gains. To have Microsoft give free software to schools, etc. entrenches their poorly designed software further into the fabric of our systems. Simply put, the proposed settlement fixes nothing and it gives Microsoft a better footing in the industry, while hurting all of their competitors.

Sincerely,
Alan Chwick, CFO
TCM Integrated Systems, Inc.
365 S Bayview Avenue, Suite # 202
Freeport, NY 11520–5316
(516)–868–7820

MTC–00006261

From: Mark Orzech
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:20pm
Subject: Settlement with Microsoft Corp

Please continue forward with the current settlement that has been negotiated with the Microsoft Corporation! These proceedings have already wasted vast amounts of public funds and caused considerable damage to the nation's economy, especially the technology sector, by excessively restricting a great company's freedom to sell its own products. I urge you to stop catering to Microsoft's weaker competitors, who have misused government power to drag down their stronger rival rather than improving the quality and marketing of their own products.

Thank you for your attention.

Mark Orzech
739 Henson Court
Marina, CA 93933

MTC–00006262

From: Alina G. Silvestre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

US DOJ,

We support the proposed settlement to the above case and encourage the close of this case as quickly as you deem possible. Microsoft is good for us, the consumers, who want ease of use and access to tecknology to use in our every day lives. It is good for the USA and for jobs.

Please do not delay and put an end to the embarassing government interference over the last few years.

Thank you
Alina & Raul Silvestre
Wesrlake Village, Ca.

MTC–00006263

From: Stuart Brace
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Justice Department

The time to settle is now. When the Justice Department spent more to persecute Microsoft than it did to stop terrorism under eight years of Bill Clinton you can see what happened on 9/11/2001. The waste of tax payer money must come to an end. Supply our soldiers with money for better equipment not feed federal judges ego with more days in court. Settle now!

Stuart Brace
CC:Pryce.Oh15@mail.house.gov@inetgw

MTC–00006264

From: Peenbeen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not allow the special interests of a few wealthy competitors derail the Microsoft settlement any longer. This is not in the best interest of the Public who owe a great deal to Microsoft and the many innovations it has brought to our society.

MTC–00006265

From: Pfbarth@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:

Please don't let the special interests defeat the public interest in concluding the Microsoft case. The settlement is fair, just and equitable and will serve the United States in the very best way providing for the needs of both parties. I fully support the settlement and pray the Judge will proceed to finalize the case based on the settlement terms Microsoft and the Federal Government have agreed to. Any other finding may well jeopardize the stock market and cause further harm to the investing public for no added gain for anyone. It would seem that our Country has suffered enough without any further negative action against Microsoft.

I again plead that the settlement be finalized as earlier agreed to by the Government and Microsoft.

Thank you for considering my view and position on this critical matter.

Very Sincerely,
Paul F. Barth, PE
2505 Townhill Dr.
Troy, MI 48084
248–644–1411
pfbarth@aol.com

MTC–00006266

From: John Nez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Case / Investigate the Macintosh consumer injustice

John Nez
5209 36th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98105
nez@jps.net

re: Microsoft Case / Investigate Macintosh consumer injustice

Dear Sirs,

Concerning the ongoing Microsoft case... I1d like to add an insight of my own which I have yet to find voiced anywhere else in this long painful case.

I am dependent on using a Macintosh computer system with a Macintosh OS for my work. I am more or less forced to use this platform by the fact that the majority of the graphic arts publishing profession uses the Macintosh platform, of which I am a member.

Without getting too technical, I must point out to you that the Macintosh OS one has no included utilities to run disk defragging, disk cleaning, disk maintenance and disk reconfigurement.

Please note that without these extra disk utilities, my Macintosh OS and computer would soon become INOPERABLE! I, as a consumer, am forced to spend another $90 to purchase the Norton Disk Utility... just to keep the Macintosh OS working. Otherwise it would be permanently inoperable!

The Microsoft Windows operating systems all come with these crucial utilities included at NO EXTRA COST! In reality, the Macintosh OS in fact costs the consumer almost twice what the Microsoft OS costs! Also, the Macintosh computer itself is more than twice the cost of equivalent windows based hardware.

So you tell me which company is harming the consumer! Why not launch an investigation into the true harm which I am forced to pay by using a Macintosh system!

Microsoft should be thanked for inventing America1s computer revolution which has changed the world and given our economy a new vision for the next century.

I suppose that the government feels compelled to reward companies that fail, like Chrysler with billions in bailouts... but punishes hard work, innovation and success in the case of Microsoft! Get real!

Best,
John Nez

MTC–00006267

From: JBSpires@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:21pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

This settlement is in the public interest. Pleas approve it! Don't let a few special interests use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Regards,
Jeremiah B Spires
1105 Voight St
Houston, TX 77009

MTC–00006268

From: beverly wakeland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft Settlement:

It is time the Government and the nine states stop the nonsense and settle. THIS COUNTRY HAS THE FREEDOM TO INNOVATE Only competitors are delaying the settlement.

MTC–00006269

From: Robert B. Ardis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer who has used Microsoft software products for at least the last ten years, I have no problem with the anti-trust settlement. When I have used Microsoft products, I have used them because they served my needs better than anything offered by Microsoft competitors and I have never found Microsoft's retail prices to be anything other than fair. What business state attorney generals have attempting to pursue this litigation further completely escapes me. Certainly they are not doing so in response to any demands received from members of the consuming public.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert B. Ardis
25 Young Court
Chester, NJ 07930
rbardis@worldnet.att.net

MTC–00006270

From: michael govern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm

Why did the States pay (taxpayers money) a witness $500,000 to testify against Microsoft?

MTC–00006271

From: CEG1934@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an MS stockholder & user, must agree with the dissenting States that the penalties are inadequate in relationship to Microsoft's past practices. Why the company was not split between Operating System (DOS/Windows) software & User Productivity (Word, Excel, etc.) software is incomprehsible to me. In the absence of corrective action on that magnitude, suggest the penalty include:

1) explicit ban on ''exclusivity'' as OpSys provided by hardware vendors

2) release of new OpSys specs to outside/3rd-party software suppliers & ''in-house'' User Productivity @ the same time

3) cash penalties (no ''software/hardware donations'') to be used by school districts to expand computer facilities MS tries to characterize its past practices as the natural cocomitant of ''innovation''. Except for a few pioneers, all software developers have been innovative & derivative & MS is no exception. NOT all software developers went to restrictive MARKETING techniques to accomplish their goals. MS has been a major contributor to the realm of personal computing. Certainly no penalty should jeopardize the basic ability of MS to continue that contribution. Alternately, they should not be let off lightly for past transgressions, nor be allowed to finesse a penalty with their plan to ''seed'' computers to school districts.

Thanks for allowing an opportunity to contribute on this issue.

Carl E. Gallagher
35 Galilee Lane #4
San Francisco, CA 94115
415/567–7978
CEG1934@aol.com

MTC–00006272

From: John Cook
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Department of Justice: I favor the Microsoft settlement proposed by the DOJ. John L. Cook Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile device: Click Here

MTC–00006273

From: James E. Hinsch Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Justice Department has done a terrible thing in bringing suit against Microsoft. This never served the public interest (certainly not mine). The current settlement is unfair to Microsoft. They have already had to pay heavy legal fees. Let business conduct business and let consumers vote with their wallets.

MTC–00006274

From: Ziad Elias
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough litigation. Support the proposed settlement. Microsoft competitors are trying to take unfair advantage.

MTC–00006275

From: JLShatto@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm
Subject: (no subject)

As a US citizen I feel that the settlement with Microsoft I a good and honorable thing for all parties concerned. Its time that we put all this to rest and go on with our business. Those few that want to challenge the settlement are just looking for more ways to line their pockets and do not have the best interest of the citizens in mind. Lets get it done and put to rest, Microsolf has done alot for all of us and I think that they need to be recognized and given a chance to continue with their excellant work.

John Shatto
13526 68th Dr SE
Snohomish, Wa. 98296

MTC–00006276

From: Scott Payne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I think this much publicized case has been an extreme waste of taxpayers' money and should end as soon as possible (years ago).

Noone even remembers why Jim Barksdale felt compelled to drag the government into an attack on Microsoft's ability to develop integrated products that consumers typically prefer.

Most consumers never had (or will ever have) an interest in installing and connecting different pieces of software together onto their PCs. This is a ridiculous approach to ensuring products work seemlessly—relying on the consumer to become a software integration product specialist.

People are not expected to buy cars with separate parts they can put together themselves to ensure they get the best price on every component. They simply buy a car with an engine, air conditioning, radio, computer(s), etc that all work together. In the event something breaks, they take the car to one location to have it repaired. The same holds true for PCs and software.

Consumers like to know they can obtain support from a single source, versus having some ''hobbiest'' tell them they need to download a patch off the Internet to resolve a software compatibility problem or bug. Most PC users don't know or care how to fix software problems—just make it work together!

Bottom line... Let Microsoft integrate all my software needs into a single source solution. I can assure you there are millions of PC and Internet users out there who really have no desire to become Linux gurus or web developers... They simply want to e-mail friends and send videos of the kids to relatives...

Regards,
Scott Payne
Germantown, TN

MTC–00006277

From: David Lake
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement should stand as negotiated, and Justice should do everything possible to force the other nine recalcitrant states to also accept it. The point has been made; Microsoft will make amends, and will not repeat the behavior that led to the lawsuit. Neither the public nor the whiney competitors have been harmed, other than by their own inability to innovate and prosper. Microsoft offers a good product at a reasonable price.

David Lake

MTC–00006278

From: Dale Stoughton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:23pm

Settle the Microsoft problem and lets get along with business.

Dale Stoughton
Wake Forest, NC

MTC–00006279

From: Iris Berman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm
Subject: Micrsoft Settlement

I feel that this is a just settlement and would like to see it done.

irisberman@yahoo.com

MTC–00006280

From: Marcus P. Hogue
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement:

DOJ:

As a citizen of many years now (76) including 4 of my youth growing up in battlefield conditions (17 to 21) as a sailor almost around the world twice, I thought this question had been recently resolved. As a tax payer, I see it as a battle to punish the winner by the unhappy losers with little benefit to the taxpayers.

When we shot at the enemy with our best aim and 16'' explosive projectiles and missed, it did not mean we had done enough. Let it go.

M. P. Hogue

MTC–00006281

From: OCONNORTM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is the time for the DOJ to implement the fair and just aggreement negotiated with the parties. Act now.

Tim O'Connor

MTC–00006282

From: Bob Long
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:

I am completely in favor of the settlement reached with Microsoft. I believe that this Microsoft settlement is in the public interest. I do not support further litigation on the Microsoft Antitrust case. STOP WASTING TAXPAYER MONEY.

Sincerely,
Robert Longariello
Taxpayer and Citizen
Laguna Niguel, California
blongari@home.com

MTC–00006283

From: Bruce W Worthel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:23am
Subject: The Microsoft Monoply

To Whom It May Concern

I must protest your you action in regards to the ''Guilty'' verdict handed down to Microsoft.

It seems that your view of guilty means that Microsoft gets government help to increase their monopoly, not losen it. What gives? Worse than doing nothing in regards of their business habits, you have actually gone out of your way to injure the same companies that Microsoft was trying to drive out of business.

You need to adjust your view of right and wrong.

Sincerely,
Bruce Worthel

MTC–00006284

From: Arthur Sorensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I think the settlement should focus on the new operating system. In particular, does that system effectively cut out competitors such as Real Networks. The new MS system includes a default audio and video capability that is functionally the same as Real Networks. Every time you turn on the computer you get the MS audio system, even if you had switched over to Real only yesterday. Enough people will take the default to eventually kill Real.

I like competition, but that's killer competition.

Arthur Sorensen
98 First Avenue
Atlantic Highlands, NJ 07716

MTC–00006285

From: Beverley Dawson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement with Microsoft is as fair as can be reached under the circumstances. The competitors just need to understand totally what capitalism means. Microsoft should never have been in court in the first place. I am not a Microsoft stock holder, but I do believe that have helped our nation as much as any single corporation can. It's time to get on with life and forget about the suing Microsoft.

Thank you,
Beverley Nichols-Dawson
Houston, Texas

MTC–00006286

From: DON SHERRILL
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm
Subject: consider this

From 1990 to 2000, this country had what many consider it's greatest decade of technological advance. As in my previous e-mail to House Rep. Sue Myrick of N.C., one should look at these gains in technology and productivity, and realize that Microsoft's products had more to do with this than any other entity (except possibly the internet itself, which may or may not be an entity?).

Please leave this company alone and let the free hand of economics take care of the issues of which you are concerned. Given time to work under the laws of free trade, Microsoft and Intel will eventually be replaced by other dominant companies, just as U.S. Steel and Bethlehem Steel, Ford and GM., Exxon and Mobil, IBM and Digital Equipment, etc. were replaced in dominance by others, and by the developing trends of our global economy.

Besides, this country needs all the employment taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, and income taxes that Microsoft pays. There are too many other companies posting losses (no taxes) with poor products in bad markets.

Don Sherrill
Executive VP
SteelFab Inc.

MTC–00006287

From: clandres@mindspring.
com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Trial—Comment

Microsoft has had a profound effect on our businesses and our lives. There are few people who don't use Microsoft products, and for the most part those products are innovative and useful. The company is to be commended for the good it has done.

One of the problems with the industry is that there are extremely severe barriers to entry in the largest segment of the computer industry, PC's. Microsoft has taken effective steps toward keeping consumers faced with only one choice for PC operating system, Windows. One choice-robbing step Microsoft has taken is that PC's are shipped with Windows pre-installed. The pre-installation of Windows, while a convenience to the purchaser, has the effect of eliminating choice when a consumer purchases a computer. Pre-installation has also given Microsoft enormous power over the computer manufacturers to the effect that the manufacturers do almost anything Microsoft wants because if even a well known manufacurer, like IBM or Gateway were to ship machines without Windows they would be at a competitive disadvantage with consumers and distributors. In fact, in 1998 I was attempting to install a competitor to windows (OS/2) on a Gateway computer and the technicians at Gateway weren't! even allowed to discuss it with me for fear of losing favor with Microsoft!

Some of the manufacturers now ship server type computers with Linux when requested, but that doesn't remove the barrier to entry that pre-installation has created.

I'd like to see Microsoft required to terminate agreements that result in Windows Operating System pre-installed on computers and not allowed to enter into new pre-installation agreements. It seems to me that if we had to choose the operating system when we buy the machine the barrier that exists from pre-installation would go away. I suspect that most people would still choose Windows, but there would be knowledge of what it costs and alternative operating systems would then have a chance. Since it is now pre-installed and the price of the computer includes the price for Windows, the consumer has no way of knowing how much is being paid for Windows and how much for the computer.

Chuck Landress
2664 James Road
Douglasville GA 30135

MTC–00006288

From: MARLEINED@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I would like to have my voice and opinion heard in the Microsoft Settlement case.

I think all that has been settled now is fair. We do not need any more litigation in this case, it needs to end now.

Marleine Dunn.

MTC–00006289

From: Dana Beck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a web designer with a small business, I call myself part of the ''public,'' and I have only one request of the Justice Department: please leave Microsoft alone.

I find it ironic that the justice Department is investigating Microsoft, since, in my opinion, theirs is one of the increasinlgy few companies that seems to give a hoot about producing quality products for the end user. They could, no doubt, put out sorry rotten software and still get it to sell, but they don't; on the contrary, their products are always top notch. Let it be said that they do a great job of serving a population with a wide diversity of needs.

I might also mention that Microsoft is the only company whose Tech Support has been able to answer any question I have posed in the over 30 years I have been in computing. I call that exceptional service in the ''public interest.''

Dana L. Beck
www.becktechwebs.com

MTC–00006290

From: James McHale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I Think the settlement is just and this should end.

James McHale
208–05 39th Ave.
Bayside, NY 1361

MTC–00006291

From: Doug Penny
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

dragging this ridiculous lawsuit on and on is bad for the economy and worse for your already tarnished badly tarnished image.

Settle this mess!
DC Penny
Englewood, Ohio

MTC–00006292

From: Sharon Stokes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I personally do not approve of the government interferance with microsoft...in my opinion this company has done nothing but inprove the lives of consumers worldwide..we have the right to compete in this country and be inovative..but with the government stepping into the market place and destroying the competion between companies...how do we expect to remain world leaders in anything if we smother ourselves and don't incourage companies to compete amoung themselves to provide better products how do we expect to remain on top and to encourage our gererations comming up to to have the desire to be winners....thank you sharon stokes

MTC–00006293

From: Kyle L. Patton
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:18pm
Subject: Microsft Settlement

The proposed settlement in the anti-trust case against Microsoft should be accepted despite the fact that the lawsuit should have never been filed in the firstplace. It is time to move forward. Persecuting a business for developing better products than their competitors is not a practice the Government should engage in.

Kyle L. Patton
Monroe Shine
502–423–0311
502–339–7103 Fax

MTC–00006294

From: Stan Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do whatever you can to finalize the DOJ settlement with Microsoft. It seems very fair to all parties concerned and we need to get on with the business of the nation and drastically reduce the continual urge to litigate.

Sincerely,
Stanford Smith
3204 W. Joliet Ct.
Mequon, WI 53092

MTC–00006295

From: BECK, JOHN
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm writing for the first time to you on this. It is time to finalize the proposed settlement and let Microsoft get on with business. I remember when a word processing , graphics presentation, and spreadsheet software came from three different companies. You had to learn each with their own idiosyncrasies. Microsoft put everything into one suite and made software easy to use and cheaper for the layman.

Additionally, I am embarrassed that my own government chose to penalize a company for being successful. Anti- trust laws are meant to protect the consumer, not competitors. What Microsoft gave the consumer was more workable and cheaper software than what was available. To say that giving a free browser hurt the consumer is quite a stretch.

Settle!
John F. Beck

MTC–00006296

From: Dorothy A Boothe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Our thoughts are shared by EVERYONE we talk to about the Microsoft Lawsuit. . It is not right for the Federal Government to interfere in any private industry unless it is harmful to the consumers. Isn't it interesting that the consumer is not suing Microsoft!! The companies that are suing Microsoft are trying to steal their business and the states that are suing Microsoft are trying to steal Microsoft's money, thereby weakening their ability to operate. Let's stop this persecution and let the brains at Microsoft get back on track and create new products for the consumers at a reasonable price. Quit fogging up their brains with lawsuits. All of this has cost them over

a billion dollars. Isn't that more than enough??

A lot of companies in this country are merging, creating monopolies: IE - the railroads and nobody seems to care, especially the Government! This is not being impartial. Judge Jackson who did represent the Government didn't even have the decency to go through these proceedings without name calling.

For the sake of our economy stop these proceedings now! This Microsoft lawsuit tipped the stock market into a recession. Check the stock market records. This hurt all of us!!

RONALD & DOROTHY BOOTHE

MTC–00006297

From: steve(u)silesky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: Msft

This is a good settlement. Let us finish this thing and get the economy going again.

Steve Silesky

MTC–00006298

From: George R Hardesty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please allow the existing proposed settlement be the final settlement. Our Country should be and should have been prosecuting real enemies instead of the corporation that has contributed so much to our greatness.

George Hardesty

MTC–00006299

From: Joe (038) Micki Wilder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:24pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

The settlement is fair to all consumers. There are only a few special interest groups(the nine States) that are not looking out for all the people in the United States. These nine states have been against any proposed settlement only to drag down the economy and the good that this administration is trying to accomplish.The delays only hold the economy, business and the people down. It is time to let this great Microsoft Company lead this nation out of this recession and restore trust in our free enterprise system and our Justice Dept.

Sincerely

Mr. & Mrs. A.J. Wilder of Boca Raton, Florida

MTC–00006300

From: Wilma Edgin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I would like to comment on the proposed settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case.

I feel that this settlement should be taken and this put to rest. It has been a long drawn out affair trying to put down a company that has developed and distributed many helpful aspects of the internet world and they shoould be able to continue with this without further delays and penalties. Freedom inovate is the American way and should not be punished.

Wilma Edgin

MTC–00006301

From: Gary A. Bartholomew
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: microsoft problem

This article from Mr. Mossberg says everything.

Consumers lose in proposed Justice Department settlement with Microsoft Posted on December 31, 2001

By WALTER S. MOSSBERG

It has been a terrific year for Microsoft, but average consumers of its products haven't fared so well.

Microsoft made major progress in its goal of using its Windows operating system to push its other products and services at the expense of its competitors. Consumers are the losers. software giant was under the breakup, having been found judge of violating antitrust threw out the breakup order lower-court judge, although his findings. The seven unanimously that Microsoft was the antitrust laws by into its Windows to freeze out other the court said Microsoft Windows in a way that ability of users to companies' products it was OK to add features weren't added mainly to

When 2001 started, the threat of a court-ordered guilty by a federal district laws in multiple ways. In June, an appeals court and harshly criticized the it upheld the legal core of appeals judges ruled a monopoly that had violated integrating its Web browser operating system in an effort browsers.

Expressed in plain English, shouldn't be allowed to design limits consumer choice—the discover and easily use other and services. The court said to Windows, as long as they maintain Microsoft's monopoly.

company went on to launch Windows XP—that into the operating crucial to extending next battleground: it added these features

allows users to easily authenticate their to order prints of photos features work only with Internet services, or that pay Microsoft for Competing services, better-established or

more popular integrated into Windows XP in are less likely to turn more breathtaking online competition. It Windows XP a feature whereby automatically add across the Web, without the These Microsoft-imposed Tags, would have led those of its partners. feature only after it was sparked a massive right to try again.

behavior, you'd expect the adversely. Instead, it has antitrust case in a way that conduct unfettered.

Despite this decision, the a new version of Windows continued to integrate tightly system new features that are Microsoft's monopoly onto the Internet-based services. And in a way that hinders consumer choice. For instance, Windows XP perform instant messaging, to identities across the Web and on their hard disks. But these Microsoft's own proprietary services owned by companies inclusion in Windows XP. including those than Microsoft's, aren't the same smooth way, so users to them.

Microsoft attempted an even attack on consumer choice and tried to integrate into the built-in Web browser would links to millions of sites permission of the owners. links, called browser Smart users to Microsoft's sites and

The company dropped the discussed in this column and outcry. But it reserved the Given this unrepentant Justice Department to react proposed to settle the would leave this sort of October, now pending judge, does bar some But much of it pertains with the hapless makers of position to defy Microsoft. It except indirectly; it's Microsoft's competitors or the past, not the future

It doesn't touch the

Windows XP to extend its

building new features or Windows? Nothing, per se. I who assert that feature that other separately. A more useful The problem is the

Windows XP contains a instant messaging. But that about which service a use the America Online the built-in Windows do so, just as I can use e-mail program with Instead, Microsoft has wired

it common in a free one of their products to AOL use its online made by its Warner Wall Street Journal run publications and Web

The settlement reached in before yet another federal offensive Microsoft behavior. to the company's relations PCs, which aren't in any isn't about consumer choice, more about placating partners. And it's all about battle in Internet services. company's ability to use monopoly to these new areas. What's wrong with Microsoft gateways to services into have never agreed with critics

Windows shouldn't contain any companies want to sell Windows is good for consumers. way these features are designed. It's great, for example, that built-in interface for doing interface should be neutral consumer wants. If I prefer to instant-messaging service with interface, I should be able to the built-in browser and non-Microsoft services. the interface to its own service. So what, some might ask? Isn't market for companies to use cross-promote another? Doesn't service to boost the movies Brothers studios? Doesn't The ads and plugs for its sister

other companies aren't and when you're a different rules, as the

Justice Department bad for consumers. It isn't consumer choice. It nettlesome case out of shouldn't try to destroy or require the software choice in its dominant Unfortunately, in 2001, that's not

Gary A. Bartholomew
Bartholomew Photography Inc.
433 E. Golf Road.
DesPlaines IL. 60016
Voice 847 635 0799
Fax 847 824 8473

sites?

The difference is that these court-certified monopolies, monopoly, you have to follow appeals court said.

So, in my view, the proposed settlement with Microsoft is about preserving or enhancing seems to be about getting the the government's hair.

Our government and courts run Microsoft. But they should monopoly to expand consumer operating system. what happened.

MTC–00006302

From: lee sulander
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The people have spoken. The nine states and the DOJ have agreed to a fair, responsible settlement. Do not let the dissenting states ruin a ''good'' responsible company like Microsoft. They are practicing class envy and are looking out for their own selfish interests and ignoring the good for everyone decision.

Yours sincerely,
L. Sulander

MTC–00006303

From: D3FUZZY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:27pm
Subject: Settlement For Microsoft

I have been watching the proceedings of continuous litigation involving the Microsoft case over the past several years and I now believe that settlement is in the best interests of the consumers, as well as, the country.

Debra Masnik,
Springfield, VA

MTC–00006304

From: Donald Nelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time that the government stop and settle this ill-conceived law suit against microsoft. The beneficiaries of Microsoft are Microsoft but mostly the computer using public. If companies better financed etc, than Microsoft were unable to compete then that is their problem NOT Microsofts'.

In my opinion this hi-tech lawsuit did much to lead to the collapse of the hi-tech industry. This effort was conceived on political grounds to protect other hi-tech operations from competition.

STOP the lawsuits!!!!! This is only enriching trial attorneys.

Donald Nelson

MTC–00006305

From: Don Sackman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Department Of Justice:

It is in the interest of the economy and jobs that this issue be settled immediately. Dragging it out with further litigation serves only a select few. It is high time that the country and industry get back to furthering our future through Technological Development and Innovation.

Don Sackman

MTC–00006306

From: Steve Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

While I am no particular fan of Microsoft and some of the techniques they have used, I do not believe that most of their actions are illegal. You have successfully focused on a few that are and I believe have come up with a fair compromise.

In my job, that of an independent consultant, I work with technology and Microsoft products daily. Competition is good and it is there now. Let the market make the bigger adjustments. If Microsoft does not clean up their products, and improve their service and support, the public will start to move elsewhere. In fact, I believe this has already started. This is heart of the free market or free enterprise system. Once government gets too involved, the economy, the consumer, and everyone starts to pay big time! So push this agreement through! It is good and it is fair! And none of the rest of it should ever have been a consideration. Because it has been, our economy—particularly the technology industry, as reflected in the NASDAQ—has already paid enough!!!

Thanks!
Steve Parker
rsparker@ameritech.net

MTC–00006307

From: Donnie Wilemon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This entire thing has gotten totally out of control. Too many people are trying to make careers out of attacking this fine company at every turn. I am sickened by the number of people and competitors who choose to abuse the legal system rather than competing in the market place.

Everyone has grown weary of this—no one cares anymore but Sun, Oracle, Apple and certain state's Attorneys General who smell another tobacco settlement cash horde (regardless of the true facts of the case). Microsoft should not be forced to fund the state's 'general fund', nor should, for instance, Apple's poor marketing and product plans be paid-for with Microsoft's hard-earned profits.

Microsoft has made some concessions and very generous offers for settlement. Let's be reasonable—tell the professional litigators and unethical competitors to find another company to abuse and move on with their lives.

Enough damage has been done—accept the settlement now.

Donnie Wilemon
dbwilemon@hotmail.com

MTC–00006308

From: pig lut
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: re: Microsoft

i feel you should drop the case and focus on bigger issues: world terrorism and internal terrorism.

many people are out for bill gates and this is a waste of your time as well as mine and taxpayer dollars. if gates' competitors have a problem with him, let them settle it between themselves, not the US settling it for them.

thank you.
happy holidays!
noel

MTC–00006309

From: Howard Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just finish the case with the agreed settlement and let Microsoft get back to its prime focus on making great software at reasonable prices for the masses.

As a consumer, I make choices with my wallet and I make them carefully. As a consultant in the technology industry I have exposure to many operating systems and software applications and therefore am very familiar with the offerings from Microsoft's competitors. Using my knowledge and my wallet I chose to purchase Microsoft products for my own and my family's use. I have never felt overcharged... on the contrary, I feel that the products offer far superior value compared with other offerings. For some reason my all-knowing government chooses to call this phenomenon a monopoly and has wasted years and countless taxpayer $ on pursuing that folly. Then Microsoft has the misfortune to have Judge Jackson head the proceedings—a man whom I'm sure is very intelligent on certain matters but who has absolutely no clue about the technology industry and what is or isn't good for consumers. The entire process was a farce and an insult to the intelligence of the American people. For Microsoft to have to make any retribution for past business practices is nothing more than an extortion crime perpetrated by the US government and the attorneys general for the states that chose to be involved. Our government is supposed to protect and serve the American people. The lawsuit did neither although seemed to derive from the misguided impression that Americans needed to be protected from Microsoft. If Americans felt that way they would not have bought the products and would have accomplished what the DOJ had no business trying to do in the first place. Apparently the judicial branch of our government no longer believes in capitalism and feels that they need to interfere with an otherwise very efficient process. Leave the interfering for companies and industries that are price fixing and inflating prices and truly hurting consumers—the energy industry is a great example—as our nation was going into recession the energy producers were recording record profits and consumers were paying record prices at the pumps and to heat their homes. Now there is an industry that should be forced to pay something back. Leave Microsoft alone!

Howard Jones
Simsbury, CT

MTC–00006310

From: Vito Corcia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

Please settle this matter now. There never has been any problem dealing with MicroSoft in the past.

MicroSoft products function best in computers. Both of the terminals in this office contain fully licensed MicroSoft products and there has never been a crash in the last seven years.

VEETZ...
http://home.earthlink.net/veetz

MTC–00006311

From: Michael Hale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:27pm

Subject: MS SETTLEMENT Dear Sir:

I do not believe that the resourcefulness, ingenuity, creativity, that Microsoft has brought to our world in the services and products they have provided should be rewarded by punishing them.

Do you think this will encourage more inventions? Do you think they will care more about what the market wants?

I think you should stop going after the people who are doing good for us.

Michael Hale

MTC–00006312

From: TXBILL37@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Most Americans that use the Microsoft windows never agreed with the Government Lawsuit. It was only a long term Clinton, Gore and Reno diversion from other daily problems they caused. The lawsuit and settlement should have never taken place. Without Microsoft windows, America and the governments would still be in the dark ages on the Internet. The complete lawsuit should be dropped, but the settlement we Americans must agree to and accept for the sake of the Democrats.

CC:TXBILL37@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00006313

From: FORTIERSLS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

For being learned people, you don't seem to be able to stop stumbling over your own words. Why don't you just grow up and get this pain in the derriere done and over with?

Thank you

MTC–00006314

From: Evelyn M Taris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The Justice department should disregard the remaining 9 states that seek free settlement from microsoft. Our economy has hit bottom now. We need to rebuild our economy not keep taking away. I say let the settlement be final and if the additional 9 states including Florida, where I live, cannot settle then disregard them . They are just looking for additonal funds for themselves and hurting the economy, which has been hit very hard this past two years. We all need to start building our lives again not taking away, we had enough of taking for the past two years. Microsoft has been hit hard enough for the past four years, let there be peace so our economy can start to grow as it should

Evelyn Taris

MTC–00006315

From: Bernard Segebade
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think enough time has been spent on this case. with our country & our economy in the shape its in, its time to settle this issue & get on with our every day business of getting our country back on solid ground.

MTC–00006316

From: Ron arky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:32pm
Subject: Lawsuit

AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED THE SETTLEMENT SHOULD STAND, LETS GET THE NATION AND THE STOCK MARKET MOVING FORWARD AGAIN.

Respectfully
Ron Keller

MTC–00006317

From: RCarey312@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:29pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I AM WRITING YOU IN REGARDS TO THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT. IN MY OPINION THEIR SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN A LAWSUIT TO BEGIN WITH. IT SEEMS THAT THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION [JANET RENO] WOULD DO ANY THING TO OBTAIN MONEY.

THIS TO ME IS GOVERNMENT EXTORTION.

WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF A RECESSION COMING ON, FURTHER LITIGATION AGAINST MICROSOFT IS THE LAST THING OUR ECONOMY NEEDS.

IF IT CONTINUES , WHAT INDUSTRIES IS THE NEXT TARGET? IF YOU HAVE NONE MAY I SUGGEST THE THE LEGAL INGUSTRIES.

REGARDS .
RAYMOND A. CAREY

MTC–00006318

From: Donald A. Fife
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:32pm
Subject: Microsoft statment

I think the whole thing has been going on far to long. That it should be settled now. And in the manner the government and the nine states agreed on.

Thank you
Donald A. Fife

MTC–00006319

From: McKay and Linda Snow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I haven't offered my comments on this settlement before but I want to go on record as stating that were it not for Microsoft and their innovative creations in Computers and the Internet, I dare to say that America and the world would not be using computers to the extent they are and I personally would not be able to understand and facilitate the abilities and usability of my computer if it did not have the integrated software that Microsoft has made and marketed. I am grateful for their advances in computer software. It has opened up the world. If I had to deal with many software protocols and programs that may or may not work together, I doubt I would use this instrument. Microsoft is to be commended, not punished for their critical progress in this field. It is plain to me that those that have continued to press for more monetary awards and punitive measures against Microsoft are doing so out of pure greed and jealousy. For them to say, 'give us all your software programs because we deserve them and you don't; and by the way, make sure that we are successful in using them and jeopardize and minimize your own business in the process' seems to fly directly in the face of American ingenuity and independent capitalism. I am extremely disgusted with this protracted DOJ punishment of a company that has built America in ways no one else could have done.

Sincerely,
Linda P. Snow
Bellevue, Washington

MTC–00006320

From: John Peters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:31pm

MTC–00006321

From: John Hughes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am not a microsoft stock holder, but do use their product on my computer. I have no complaints with the way they market their programs. I have been using various spread sheets, word processing and other programs of both microsoft and others. I do not write computer programs, but certainly enjoy the user friendly programs that microsoft has provided.

It would be better if the law suit were settled and allow microsoft to continue to improve the product that they make for the public.

John Hughes
3303 Nottingham St.
Houston, Texas 77005
Ph. 713–667–1666
Mob. 713–248–9417
e-mail jahughes00@msn.com
alt e johnh@sabinegas.com

MTC–00006322

From: Jim Logan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I firmly believe that any continuation of the lawsuits against Microsoft will have an adverse affect on our nation's economic recovery. The settlement that has been reached is fair. It is time to accept the proposed settlement, move forward and resolve this issue without further litigation.

Jim Logan
Logan Productions, Inc.
8035 N. Port Washington Road
Fox Point, Wisconsin 53217
Phone: 414–352–9691
Facsimile: 414–352–4993
<mailto:jim@loganproductions.com>
mailto:jim@loganproductions.com
<http://www.loganproductions.com/>
http://www.loganproductions.com/

MTC–00006323

From: Huey Guo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir/Madam,

Please free the general public from Microsoft's monopoly! Besides the government, there is no one to stop Microsoft from their immoral (though legally, only after their attorneys' twisting of law interpretations) manipulation of the computer world. Indeed, there may be competitors lobbying for a fairer market. Yet, there is simply no one powerful enough to stop Microsoft from their wrongdoings, except the Department of Justice, our only and last hope. This is an example of my freedom to choose being violated: I have been receiving propaganda e-mails from the so-called ''Freedom to Innovate Network'' (MSFin@Microsoft.Com) for years (not by my own free will, though). Even though I tried many times to ''unsubscribe'' from their web site (at http://www.freetoinnovate.com/—utilities/unsubscribe.asp), they never let me unsubscribe. Microsoft has organized an e-mail/fax compaign to influence what DOJ hears against those forceless individuals like me. I am not with any party in the letigation nor have any stake in the law suit. My only hope is for DOJ to hear my opinion.

Sincerely,

Huey Guo

PS. I am not an Apple user. I have been using PC's for the last 15+ years and have sufferred a lot from using Microsoft products, because I have no alternative.

MTC–00006324

From: Bob McDermott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please get the government off microsoft's back!!!!!!!!!

MTC–00006325

From: Nick Dolyak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:32pm
Subject: MICROSOFT CASE

Let's get this case behind us and move on to more important things. Enough is enough.

NICHOLAS P DOLYAK
nickdolyak@earthlink.net

MTC–00006326

From: Ron Beck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:29pm
Subject: ''Microsoft Setlement''

Gentlemen,

Please settle the Microsoft case. It has gone on too long and the current settlement is more than adequate. Prolonging it any longer is not good for the entire industry.

Thank you.

Ronald Beck
reallibra25@hotmail.com

MTC–00006327

From: Plefka, Bob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 1:36pm
Subject: Mircrosoft Settlement

It is my sincere hope that the settlement with Microsoft be moved forward quickly. As a consumer (both personal and business user) I feel that Microsoft has been acting appropriately and in the interest of the Consumer and Economy. I have not witnessed any concern of anti-trust or monopolistic behaviors and feel that I can choose other vendors than Microsoft for key applications should I choose.

I support Microsoft's settlement and hope the matters are resolved quickly to allow us all to get back to important work needing efforts.

Robert R. Plefka
1375 Jasper Drive
Ambler, Pa 19002

MTC–00006328

From: mortgagelender@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings:

As a consumer, I would like to see more competition with other browsers and software choices. The grip Microsoft has is anti competitive as its software is frought with errors. Its philosophy is to ''shove it out the door'' and handle complaints afterwards. This is the result of a Monopoly and a manufacturers arrogance with consumers having no recourse, ''Let them Eat Cake''. Nuff' said.

M. Morrow

MTC–00006329

From: John Richeson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs,

I am the owner of a business in Tampa, FL called Bay Area Window Cleaning, Inc. I started out by myself and today have over 45 employees and clean some of the areas tallest buildings. As a user of Microsoft products for over 15 years, I can speak from experience as a day to day small business user as to the effect this company has had on our business. I can honestly say that our business has reached the success it has today because of the usage of some of the great products that Microsoft has implemented and continues to improve upon. This is not to mention the prosperity that we have gained due to ownership of Microsoft stock via mutual funds and other investments.

The government needs to keep its hands out of this company as much as possible. Do not stifle this company's progress. It has benefited not only America but the entire world. For example, think about where our military would be today if they did not have the benefit of Windows and all its associated products. I am continually amazed that Windows XP cost less that $200. It is an amazing product that I think is worth $2,000. and for which I would gladly pay that amount.

Microsoft simply makes a great product. If they do not, then we use another competing product. For example, I use Intuit's QuickBooks because Microsoft Money is just not as good yet. But Microsoft continues to improve Money. Soon I think it will be better than QuickBooks. Then I will immediately switch. I am looking forward to that day because Intuit does not seem to care about simple user issues they have had for years. Let me put it this way....Intuit is stifling our business because their QuickBooks products is weak in certain areas. Microsoft, on the other hand, has the resources and R & D to improve a product tremendously. We all need this.

Please settle these frivolous and wasteful lawsuits and allow them to do what they do best. It is very beneficial to the end consumer. It will continue to help America remain the worlds leaders in technology and efficiency.

John Richeson
President

MTC–00006330

From: Qpbay@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:34pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement

I would expect that the Judicial Department will proceed with the current agreement on the Microsoft lawsuit and accept what has already been agreed upon.

In addition, I would hope our legal system will maintain and be a major stimulus to support our free enterprise that exists in this nation. The government should support the free enterprise efforts that have been so important to make this a sound and prosperous nation on this issue.

Where would we, consumers and our nation, be today without the Microsoft organization's important products that we select to purchase and use?

Thank you.

Clifford E. Rowden
Bay Village, OH 44140

MTC–00006331

From: GrampsNorm@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would hope this case can be settled, it would be one step toward getting our economy back on track.

Norm Thomassen

MTC–00006332

From: Tutuandpal@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:34pm
Subject: Lay off.

Don't you think it's about time you guys laid off of Microsoft? I think the Clinton DOJ with Janet Reno were part of a terrorist organization, and you are just carrying on where they left off.

Why would a government attack one of its own most successful companies? Name another country that would do that. This is equivalent to using an American airline to attack the WTC. Why would 'Justice' be so unjust? Is this the first salvo whereby the trial lawyers, like a sinister pack of roving hyenas will attempt to lay waste the great industries of the USA, for their own personal monetary gain? Is this not terrorism in one form? What is more un-American than this?

None of you seem to know what the hell you're talking about since I've not found a clear and concise explanation for what Microsoft has done wrong. All that bundling gobbledygook on which you fervently frown is nothing but horseshit. Now really!... If I went to the local market and bought butter, and the management had agreed to give everyone who bought butter, a loaf of bread to go with the butter.....That would be

wrong?..... Where does this hurt the consumer?

Call off your dogs. Do something constructive, rather than destructive like the OSBL Taliban.

Sincerely,

Earle J. Baird

MTC–00006333

From: Korry Pearl
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy. Settle Now. It time to move forward. Settle this now.

Sincerely,
Korry I. Pearl
Senior Accountant
SigmaTek Corporation

MTC–00006334

From: GERRY WEST
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept current proposed settlement. Over time, MicroSoft products, while a virtual monopoly, have provided standardized technology which is time-efficient for multiple users. And, at mass retailing, prices even for a monopoly, are more affordable.

Regards,
Gerry West
gwest@njwresearch.com

MTC–00006335

From: Craig McClure
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a member of the software development community, I have seen Microsoft emerge as a huge force in shaping the quality of software products produced over the last twenty years. To say that they engage in unfair competitive practices is to say that excellence is an unfair advantage. They have managed to capture the greatest market share in mature areas of the software industry: operating systems, networking, word processing and spreadsheets. These were markets dominated by other companies who seemed to have a stranglehold on their market segment, but in each case, Microsoft prevailed with a superior product.

To punish this brilliance is to destroy the last vestige of free enterprise in our society.

Craig McClure
CreativeWare, Inc.

MTC–00006336

From: J C and Betty Choate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

According to the best that I can figure, the stock market started going down very shortly after the litigation was begun against Microsoft. I think the entire country has paid a huge price for this messy business.

I well remember the frustration I used to experience, trying to learn new and different programs, and trying to get programs to work together, BEFORE WINDOWS WAS PUT ON THE MARKET. Microsoft has done a tremendous thing for the world by removing some of these major problems from the computer scene. I think the harrassment the company has undergone has been a poor way to express appreciation for all that has been done.

Personally, I think the settlement that has been made should stand, and let Microsoft and the country go back to life before litigation. It was much more productive.

Betty Choate
708 Burton Drive
Winona, MS 38967

MTC–00006337

From: Howard Haworth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:35pm
Subject: Tunney Act

Settle the Microsoft case. We have had enough foolishness already!

MTC–00006338

From: PolPrncsVel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe the microsoft settlement is fair & just & should be implemented.

It is time to move on to other matters.

Sincerely,
Velora H. Upstone
Rockford, Il 61114

MTC–00006339

From: Jim Hanke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it may concern,

There are a few vocal anti-Microsoft groups that are the key players in the whole controversy.

If we could turn back the hands of time. Back to before Microsoft, before IBM and a young kid named Bill Gates started talking in 1974, how would this world be? There are a hundred thousand companies of various sizes that would not even exist. Our world would be very different. We take things for granted that we have in our lives. Things we can't live without now. All of these would either not exist or would be so large they would not be practical. The advent of the home PC drove the market to make faster CPU's and faster RAM and smaller components. These components are used in everything in our lives today. Cell phones, microwaves, Digital TV, DVD players for our TV's, all the nifty electronics in our cars; all of this because the personal computer was a technology so many people loved.

Microsoft made the PC practical. We should thank Microsoft for helping make us all more productive and creating secondary and tertiary companies. Most all of these companies are happy to have Microsoft be the driving force behind the advances in the PC industry.

Yes, there are a few folks out there that are anti-Microsoft. They are very vocal. The silent majority are going to be the ones that really end up paying the price.

I feel Microsoft has learned a lesson about how it markets its products. Microsoft has spent a lot of money and time defending itself and I believe their marketing strategy has changed significantly. Make sure Microsoft keeps the market open as you have already. Stop spending billions of dollars to fight Microsoft. There are a lot of other places our tax dollars, yours and mine, can be better spent. Use the money to buy computers for schools. Teach them Unix if you like. Spend money on child welfare, better schools, anti-drug campaigns, stop smoking campaigns, fix our roads, improve airport security, the list is endless. With the money you could save by just accepting the proposal by Microsoft that is currently in process (I don't know what it is, but I am sure it is reasonable at this point) you could give every person that died in the World Trade Center tragedy thousands and thousands of dollars.

Find a better way to spend our tax dollars and your time than fighting an entrepreneur that has done more for this country than anyone since Henry Ford.

Thank you for reading and taking time to take my letter to heart.

James (Jim) Hanke
11405—146th Ave SE
Renton, WA 98059

MTC–00006340

From: William Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a teacher who uses a lot of software in teaching and research, I am satisfied that the settlement reached between the government and Microsoft is in my best interest as a consumer of software.

William Allen
wallen@astate.edu
http://www.clt.astate.edu/wallen

MTC–00006341

From: JRSONPETER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:35pm
Subject: Cosumer Comment

Microsoft:

Without Microsoft, computer operations would still be in the dark ages and millions of users would not be able to take advantage of this powerful tool.

James R. Peterson

MTC–00006342

From: don blades
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

This has been too long and drawn out and has cost us, (we the people) too many tax dollars chasing a dead horse. Settle the d—- thing.

MTC–00006343

From: JnJRanch
To: Microsoft Corpordation
Date: 1/2/02 2:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Micrsoft settlement NOW. The DOJ has interferred too long

Jeanne Jacobs

762 Sandstone Ln.
Camano Is. WA 98282

MTC–00006344

From: Rojji@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:36pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

My view is that the settlement of this case is in the public interest; Let us move on. If MSFT is a monopoly, so be it, just as so many other companies in the world of business.

MTC–00006345

From: Hiperfprof@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have over 30 years experience in the Information Technology industry and have been upset by the government's actions against Microsoft since the beginning. If Microsoft had not brought some sanity to the entire personal computing industry, we would have had chaos. Their leadership has been a tremendous asset for our industry and our country.

I would be most pleased if I never heard another word about the government trying to penalize or breakup Microsoft.

R. L. Adams

MTC–00006346

From: Thomas J. Fabish
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:36pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Sir,

My opinion on the entire Microsoft prosecution is that no positive historical grounds exit supporting the antitrust action against Microsoft. My argument consists of the single observation that no previous antitrust action has benefited the public interest including Standard Oil, IBM, AT&T and most recently, Microsoft. That is, the price of the goods or services offered by the accused invariably increased following government antitrust action. Moreover, the continuing action by individual States against Microsoft following the high court's decision to end prosecution seems based upon transparent motives of simple greed for settlement dollars, the acquisition of individual fame, or a crude attempt to aid local business that may compete with Microsoft in a product line.

I conclude that prolonged litigation against Microsoft Corporation benefits only selected groups with goals not at all determined by perceived good for the general consumer. Hence, I hope to see the legal crusade ended and so enable the considerable ongoing expenditure of public and private funds to find more useful applications.

Thank you for your consideration,
Dr. Thomas J. Fabish
e-mail; tjfabish@adelphia.net or tjfabish@earthlink.net

MTC–00006347

From: Wayne/Eileen Grove
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:37pm
Subject: Microsoft

It is time to get this litigation behind us.
Wayne & Eileen Grove

MTC–00006348

From: GMbah
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ needs to settle this matter now. Slap Microsoft in the wrist if it must and let's move on. Personally I think Microsoft has done a lot of good and in my view has not harmed the public.

Thank you,
Godfrey

MTC–00006349

From: MarlDuffin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is important to settle this lawsuit in the best interests of all the parties involved. The Department of Justice has worked out a settlement with Microsoft and that should be the basis to decide the law suit and end the case.

Marlene Quayle Duffin
21241 Canyon View Dr.
Saratoga, CA 95070

MTC–00006350

From: Thomas Garson
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov,
attorney.general(a)po.st...
Date: 1/2/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust settlement

Dear Representative of the Public Interest,

I believe the settlement that the U.S. Justice Department and Microsoft have concocted is a travesty of justice. As an information technology professional for over 20 years, I am quite familiar with the monopolistic, and often illegal, machinations perpetrated by Microsoft in order to achieve their current position of ascendancy, often while offering an inferior product. I wholely support the findings of Judge Jackson as being more than reasonable. If anyone in the judicial system has gained a true insight into the modus operandi of Microsoft, it is Judge Jackson. In light of the contempt that Microsoft openly displayed of that court, Judge Jackson was remarkedly restrained.

Any lesser penalties imposed on Microsoft, or any other company showing such contempt for the rule of law, must be considered a complete abdication by the government of its responsibility to enforce the right of the people of the United States to a fair and open marketplace.

Sincerely,
Thomas Garson,
Owner,
Aural Technology, Ashland, Or.
tgarson@auraltek.com

MTC–00006351

From: Richard Barnes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: TUNNEY ACT

Microsoft settlement: I doubt that any business (competitors or otherwise) could endure the kind of scrutiny that Microsoft has had to endure. In the big picture is this kind of stuff good for America? I do not believe it is! I for one want all this to be over and finished. As Americans we have much bigger problems and we need not only the Microsoft but all those that would be Microsofts.

Please stop the bleeding and move on!
One very disgruntled American.
Remember 911!!!

MTC–00006352

From: E. STANFIELD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We all hope you all will use your heads and get this settlement approved and end the competetors' bickering and attempting to feather their own nests by keeping out competition so that they can make more money the easy way!

MTC–00006353

From: Buzz Marsh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a constant user of computers and needed software I feel enough is enough. Microsoft has done nothing that successful business has not done during U.S. history and because they have done a better job it is not reasonable they should be punished at all, let alone still more.

The goverment sometimes mixes in where they have no business. This is one of those times.

Freeman A. Marsh

MTC–00006354

From: Davidfreed@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

to whom it may concern:
please settle this case ASAP. there should be no split-up of Microsoft.
david freed
3055 washington street
miami, fl 33133

MTC–00006355

From: Bradley Bobbs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: leave Microsoft alone already!

Please stop harassing Microsoft finally and stop wasting taxpayers' money on this nonsense. Please go after some criminals, instead of companies running a perfectly legal business!

Sincerely,
Dr. Bradley Bobbs
6862 Hayvenhurst Ave.
van Nuys, CA 91406

MTC–00006356

From: DaveRaab@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This has been going on for to long and FAR to much money spent on this. Many more companies have benefited from Microsoft then been hurt by them. The United States economy and business needs to be done with this case and move on!!

I DO NOT WANT MY TAX DOLLARS SPENT PROLONGING THIS CASE!

MTC–00006357

From: Sample, Michael
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

Get on with it! I am sick of competitors using the DOJ to get a successful company that they themselves can't defeat in the market place. Secondly, I am sick of publicity-seeking state AGs doing the same thing either on behalf of those competitors or simply for their own political enrichment. The settlement is reasonable and there is no reason to continue to drag out

this process.

Michael Sample
Houston, Texas

MTC–00006358

From: Dle0312@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I commend the Department of Justice for their decision to settle with Microsoft. It makes sense, as the government should not be curtailing advancements in technology, nor disciplining a company who has found a better mouse trap. It would seem to me that these other companies who challenged Microsoft should try to make a better product, rather than ask that the proprietary knowledge be deseminated to them so that they can use it against Microsoft. I would hope that the DOJ would be able to settle down the states remaining who have decided not to accept the judge- ment between Microsoft and the DOJ.

Donald L. Ensenbach
10601 South 41st Place
Phoenix, AZ. 85044–1331

MTC–00006359

From: NeilHaas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:40pm
Subject: MICROSOFT

Microsoft has been damaged enough, let the present agreement be enough. The states need to get out of the business of killing off businesses.

I've been in business over 38 yrs and don't want the government causing me to lose just because Oracle and Netscape want to use the government for their own gain.

Neil G. Haas

MTC–00006360

From: JnJRanch
To: Microsoft Corpordation
Date: 1/2/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement reached btween the Federal government, nine states and Microsoft. Further arguing can only hurt the nation, and the economy as a whole.

Jeanne Jacobs
762 Sandstone Ln.
Camano Is. WA 98282

MTC–00006361

From: Mccartyml@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case should never have been filed. However at this juncture the proposed settlement is the best of a bad bargain and DOJ should wrap this up ASAP under the settlement proposed.

M.L. McCarty
1911 E. Pole Star Pl.
Tucson, AZ 85737

MTC–00006362

From: BeausBoss2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:43pm
Subject: re: Settlement

Dear Justice Department:

Please allow the MicroSoft Company the ability to conduct their business and their affairs by stimulating our economy. Allow them to be a competitor that will help stimulate other companies to grow and thrive. Allow the court settlement to be OVER, and allow MicroSoft to move forward. Enough is enough. Let 2002 be a new year for MicroSoft, for the American people, and for the business community.

Sincerely yours,
Elyse Reitzin
beausboss2@aol.com

MTC–00006363

From: RPainley@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We wish to support the current settlement plans regarding the Microsoft case. Please give this your best attention.

Raymond and Merle Painley

MTC–00006364

From: John Garrison, Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Request further action in the subject case be discontinued. The last thing the economy needs is more failing competitors to use government to stifle a creative American corporation. A corporation that bet the farm to innovate while competitors tagged along until they found they were falling further and further behind. Then they turned to government to save them. Definitely not what made this country great.

Respectfully:
John Garrison, Sr.
mailto:johng@sun-usa.com

MTC–00006365

From: Ted Pierce
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It Concerns:

I am 100% FOR the litigation against Microsoft to be finalized. In my opinion the suit should never have been brought in the first place. We as tax payers foot the bill for the litigation. We as consumers foot the bill when any settlement is imposed. Any thinking person knows that ''the cost of doing business'' is passed directly to the consumer, the investor or both. The worst case is that a company goes out of business because of Government tyranny.

So, settle with Microsoft and let them get on with life, so we consumers and taxpayers can see an end to money being wasted (by Government) and so we can continue to get the fine flow of products we have become accustomed to. The fact that we are in a recession should mean that government gets off everyone's back, not further complicate and harass business.

Ted Pierce
Folsom, CA 95630

MTC–00006366

From: James Hawley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft litigation has taken a number of years and not it seems that there is a potential settlement. Derailing this settlement now would benefit no one except for attorney fee genereated. If that is the goal of the Justice Department then this case should by all means continue. I believe, however, that is not the Justice Department's goal to increase revenue for attormey fees. The climate has changed considerably in the last few years and all the issues originally being contested are not even an issue any longer. The last thing this country needs at this time is to draw cases such as this one into more legal rambling to no one's benefit. Penalizing one of the Major success stories of the 20th century for the benefit of a few should make no sense. I see this as a ''revenue enhancement'' program for the states and a few companys with no real issues left to resolve.

We have much bigger and important issues that have a signifigant impact on the American Society. This case should have never even been brought to this point in the first place.

Jim Hawley

MTC–00006367

From: Richard Stevenson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

Please settle this litigation now. What has been agreed to is fair for all parties.

Sincerely
Richard Stevenson

MTC–00006368

From: RJBKKKID@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may Concern,

Isn't it high time we put this litigation to rest and move on. It would appear that a few of the more vocal die hard Microsoft competitors (and their lobbyists) continue to beat this to death. Would be interesting to know if they would welcome equal scrutiny?

Enough already!
Russ Jones

MTC–00006369

From: Ray Garland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

I am a Microsoft shareholder and a consumer who uses their products. I urge the

Federal government to resolve this case as promptly as possible by settling on the result already reached by the court. The nine states which are withholding approval of the settlement and who want to expand the reach of the case are wrong. So much of the reasons for the initial suit are so outmoded and irrelevant today that delaying a conclusion to this matter risks harming not only a good company but further damaging the US economy.

Ray Garland

MTC–00006370

From: Bounderdon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the proposed settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft is reasonable and fair. To pursue this witch hunt further will serve no useful purpose and will only contribute further to our weakened economy. Let's get on with it and get this matter behind us.

Donald R. Low
216 Derecho Way
Tracy, CA 95376

MTC–00006371

From: AVespa8911@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Enough is enough...I do not think for one minute our economy was ever hurt by any action Microsoft took. Their competitors are cry babies...they should have concentrated on making a better mouse trap than MS had. LET IT GO...In the best interest of all concerned. It's just a bunch of sour grapes with states trying to add to their coffers in a very spurious way. A.A. Vespa

MTC–00006372

From: Michael Greene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:47pm
Subject: Case Settlement

Dear Sir:

This case has gone on long enough. Let's settle this case NOW, for the good of the country!

Michael J. Greene

MTC–00006373

From: Mike Doyle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Department of Justice Official,

The Microsoft case has gone way too long and has not been positive for technology, innovation, our economy or consumers. I am a consumer and I have never been harmed by Microsoft in any way. Quite the contrary, Microsoft's products allow me to do things never before possible. Please accept the settlement and end this process so American and global firms can compete based on technology and acceptance of their products in the marketplace. The government's role in technology and innovation must never impact personal choice in any way. Hi Tech business moves too fast for government intervention. Let businesses compete without government involvement and we will all be better off. When Microsoft products stop being the best I can buy I will stop buying them and I don't need you telling me when this dynamic occurs.

Mike Doyle

MTC–00006374

From: D.J.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:47pm
Subject: settlement

I would let competition take its own course. Microsoft should be completely freed from all recourse and certainly have no remediation. The Linus's of the world will either win or loose. Sun Micro, should not cry over their spilt milk. Any Attys Gen should stick to investigating physical crimes against us, the general public and forget business. If they were shrewd in business, they would not be Attys Gen, but be Bill Gates

MTC–00006376

From: Arthur Laube
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It seems to me that Bill Gates did us—i.e., those who use computers—a great service by encouraging or even demanding that several programs be packaged together with the MS Windows program.

Most of us do not want to buy a computer and then have to install several programs inorder to get started. Anymore than we would want to buy an automobile and then have to but and install four tires. It is obvious that Bill Clinton/Janet Reno's Department of Justice decided that Bill Gates was too big for his britches and needed to be taken down a peg or two. And since he had not paid his dues to them they attempted to make an example of him. Get off his back.

Arthur H. Laube
23 Clover Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

MTC–00006377

From: Swank, Jeff
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I, for one, am still attempting to understand the issues. The government should allow the marketplace decide the fate of MS or any other company. The software today is less expensive and provides more functionality then ever before. Please allow the free enterprise system to work. This is just the IBM case of old, by the time all of the appeals are processed, the case will not matter.

Thanks
Jeff Swank
Vice President
TMI Systems Design Corp
50 South Third Ave West
Dickinson ND 58601
jswank@tmisystems.com

MTC–00006378

From: Perfilio@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:46pm
Subject: (no subject)

The settlement reached by DOJ and 9 states is fair. Get off Microsoft's back already.

MTC–00006379

From: GinnyAKK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I am writing this letter in hopes that my opinion regarding the lengthy prosecution/persecution of Microsoft be regarded and that it be ended as quickly as possible without further penalties and unreasonable costs to Microsoft. We are an entrepreneurial and competitive society and Microsoft, among others, has been persecuted for behaving in this spirit.

Very truly yours,
Virginia Koplowitz
Atlanta, Georgia

MTC–00006380

From: Luther Moon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice,

This letter is to talk to you about and to express my feelings of the Government's involvement with, and the handling of, the Antitrust case against Microsoft Corporation.

To begin with, I do not feel that this action is being levied against Microsoft on behalf of the American consumer. Fact is, it was then, and is now, the consumer that decided what or which product they wanted and liked best. It was this very freedom of choice by the consumer, and freedom of enterprise for American Businesses, which has made Microsoft? and America, the great company and the great country they are today.

It has been the great innovators like the John Rockefellers, JP Morgans, Andrew Carnegies, Henry Fords, and the Bill Gates of our time that has made this Country the great success it enjoys today and, it was this freedom to innovate, that encouraged them to get up every morning and forge ahead with their ideas and ideals. What might happen to this nation, and its great Corporations, if this freedom to express and freedom to innovate continues to get trampled on?

It appears to me that the consumer can only be hurt and made to suffer the consequence of higher prices and less quality of product should the Government begin the dictatorial regulation of and dictating to a company what it can or cannot supply to, or for the benefit of, the consumer. Is it possible that the American Consumer is smarter than he or she is being given credit for?

It has been due to this freedom of innovation from Microsoft that every American consumer, can today, afford to have a computer in their home. It is also a computer in every home that has spurred an economic growth in this country unparalleled by any nation in the world, until the Government decided to intervene.

It wasn't until the dictatorial intervention of our Government into the innovative business of one of this Nations greatest Companies that this Country's economy, overnight, started a downslide into economic collapse, unparalleled in the history of this great country. The economic destruction of resources that has ensued has been devastating to the American people. What,

with all this ''Consumer protection'' levied against the consumer in the guise of protecting the consumer, I'm just not sure I can afford, or surely don't need, anymore of this kind of consumer protection. I feel that I have received far better value and protection from Microsoft than I have in the protectionist interference from our Government (I don't know about you, but there is no longer any retirement left in my retirement funds).

This should be the business of business and not the interference of Government to dictate to the consumer what he or she can or cannot have and at what price we must pay for it. As a consumer and a Citizen of this Great Land, I feel that I, and I alone, should decide what is served on my plate and how it is prepared.

I have Windows on my computer, not because someone else decided for me what I should use and not because Microsoft decided for me what I should use. I decided which was best for me from the many choices that were, and still are, available on the market today. And yes, there are choices out there. I'm sorry, but I am being made to feel that because of the wishes of a mere handful, it is the masses that must pay? and this is just not right. It must not be right.

In closing, I would like to say I am a small-business owner and I depend on Microsoft to keep things running for me, for which they obviously have done quite well. If the Federal government pursues three more years of litigation in this matter, it would not only hurt Microsoft, but millions of home computer users and businesses across the country. I urge you to please put these lawsuits to rest before our economy deteriorates any further. By intervening in business, you would only be discouraging competition by creating fear on the part of other companies wanting to enter the market. Bill Gates made some excellent business decisions, and he, along with the American Consumer, is now being punished for it. His company has done so much for the economy, and now the government is just wasting more of our money picking on this company.

Respectfully,
Luther Moon

MTC–00006381

From: Leonard BRADLEY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement by Microsoft is fair and adequate.!!!

Sincerely,
Leonard G Bradley
60402 N 435 PR., N.E.
Benton City, WA 99320

MTC–00006382

From: Bernard D. Dunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The suit against Microsoft was unfair as well as unjust. It was a prefabrication of the Clinton Administration. Microsoft should be absolved of all wrong doing and allowed to operate as before.

What the suit has done is send a message to all forward looking companies that progress is frowned upon. Without the progress made in computer by Bill Gates and Microsoft home computers would be as yet unheard of and I would not be sitting here sending this E-mail Clinton and Reno should be put on trial for interfering with private enterprise and industrial initiative. This is just another example of the Clinton administration being vindictive because they did not get the support they wanted from Bill Gates and Microsoft.

B. D. Dunn

MTC–00006383

From: Vogel, Alan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to see the Microsoft case settled as soon as possible. The settlement should be consistent across all states and it should be based within the same rules applied to the nine states that have already signed off. The need to accomplish this is even more urgent during this time of worldwide economic and political turmoil. It has taken us nearly four years to get to this point and to drag it on further is unacceptable.

Respectfully
Alan J. Vogel

MTC–00006384

From: David W. Workman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

The Microsoft antitrust case should never have been started. Please, please accept the current settlement offer and get this thing finished. You are just in the way. Market forces, in the case of software, are fully capable of ruining any company that gets too far from the user's needs. Government may have a legitimate antitrust roll in some industries, but software is not one of them. We the users can put anyone, including Microsoft, out of business before a government agency can write all the reports defining what might be the problem. I am a long-time software developer and have seen the mighty come and go with no government intervention. Government only makes things worse. If we need you, we'll call you. Stop listening to Microsoft's competitors who spend their time whining to government agencies rather than building superior products. And, ignore those state government agencies that only see this as a possible revenue source. This isn't tobacco. Stop government extortion.

Thank you,
David W. Workman
Thomasville, NC
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006385

From: Jim Peebles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just adding my own thoughts, but isn't enough enough yet? With the global economy in such precarious position, why are we wasting such time and resources on continuing this litigation? We ALL need to get back to work! Let's just settle the thing, close the books on this entire thing, and get back to doing what America does best... innovating and creating jobs!!

Thanks,
Jim

MTC–00006386

From: Art Hicks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to call a halt to the senseless litigation in the Microsoft case. The longer it goes on the more consumers lose. Let the hold-out states outlaw Microsoft products in their states if they want to and see how long their consumers will put up with them.

Arthur Hicks
Lancaster, Virginia

MTC–00006387

From: Kealele@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Please free Microsoft's hands so that the incredible innovation they offer may proceed. To single out this one company for prosecution/persecution is ludicrous in light of what goes on on a daily basis with a great many powerful and well-entrenched American businesses. Especially in light of the new terrorist attacks which have been unleashed upon the world in recent months, it would seem sensible for America to support her technology companies in their endeavors now more than ever before.

Sincerely,
Lyn Gianni,
Santa Barbara, California

MTC–00006388

From: Joan Amino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think the government should let Microsoft get on with business and quit this litigation that is just making the public upset with the court system. I would not buy any other product BUT MICROSOFT no matter how cheap the competitor is just because of this litigation. LET MICROSOFT GET BACK TO BUSINESS!!!

Joan Amino
1642 Los Molinos Way
Sacramento CA 95864
jacatmom@onemain.com

MTC–00006389

From: Ted Palfini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Get on with it. The settlement should be completed as soon as possible. Although Microsoft is aggressive they do provide a quality product at a reasonable price to the consumer. The lawyers are the only ones winning in this if the case is not settled quickly. I am tired of the lawyers always winning. The resources of Microsoft and the competitors should be focused on better products and product development not

defense and attack in the courtroom/legal system.

Ted Palfini

MTC–00006390

From: DANP2011@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an individual American, I never totally understood why the government filed an action against Microsoft. I'm sure somewhere there is some small violation as there would be with any business if you also really pried into their business or had competitor's cry foul because something made by Microsoft was better than what they had available.

Technology and other business areas have changed rapidly over the past years. Everyone was able to grow and expand due to technological advances. Microsoft was one of them and was also the provider of software that made the changes happen.

So as I see it, the creator of the Microsoft software made it better for everyone else and improved their produce at the same time to make it again better the everyone. This is how our society works, isn't it? Did the government file an antitrust action against refrigerator makers when they ''bundled'' the freezer with their product? Can you now buy a refrigerator without a freezer? Or how about all the ADD-ONS with automobiles! Maybe I don't want a battery, wanting to hand crank the car to start. I use Microsoft software! Do you? Did the government in any way use Microsoft software to prepare the action filed against them?

Basically, I don't think it is right to impede with Microsoft and their developments. Without their developments over the years, where would we be? Without their developments in the future, where will we be? Leave innovation alone and be thankful someone developed it and will continue to develop more in the future.

Dan Pierron
901 Howard Lane
Vandalia, Ohio 45377

MTC–00006391

From: Rowe261@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe that the current settlement, signed by nine states, is fair and equitable to all parties concerned. More importantly, a continuation of litigation only lines the pockets of lawyers, and tends to reduce innovation and entrepreurship, which helps to drive our economy. Let's settle it NOW!

Sincerely,
William N. Rowe

MTC–00006392

From: peter sabean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the Microsoft settlement that is being reviewed. I strongly believe the recent settlement reached between Microsoft, the Justice Department and nine States is absolutely in the public interest. It is evident that the remaining states are motivated either by home-state relationships with Microsoft competitors or by an ''attack the deep pockets'' attitude.

Peter Sabean
Sabean Design

MTC–00006393

From: Roger Bultot
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let the Microsoft settlement stay as is. Enough is enough.

Roger A. Bultot
440 Undercliff Ave.
Edgewater, NJ 07020

MTC–00006394

From: Popedo711@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Settlement

It is hoped that those people in official capacity positions realize that our economy started slipping around the time President Clinton's jealous liberal Government paid team members first attacked Microsoft. Damage is felt by every voter and tax payer in our United States. Let the current settlement stand and get back to free enterprise practices that built our great nation in the first place.

Thank you in advance for listening to one little self employed renovation contractor in Macon, Georgia USA.

Howard A Wilcox, Jr.

Voter, tax payer, Christian, husband, parent, step parent, grandparent.

MTC–00006395

From: JoeZiem@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why is it the people who have been using Microsoft programs successfully for many years have to suffer because the DOJ and some Big-cash companies want to punish a creative and efficient organization?

Certainly Clinton and his cronies seem to have benefited from this chaos in the form of surreptitious contributions. But the average guy wanting to use MS products in the future is going to pay more. Maybe only a few bucks, but more nevertheless. Microsoft's Competition? They're getting a free ride instead of making better products users would prefer.

The Red Cross and the United Fund appear to have robbed money from contributors to the 911 disaster and are pocketing vast administrative fees from their gifts, but DOJ also appears to be on vacation in this regard.

It would be nice if you were concerned about the People of America instead of all the special interests that slide gifts to everybody they can to help their clients.

Don't punish Microsoft!

J. Ziemian

MTC–00006396

From: Gay Abarbanell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:51pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I applaud the settlement. Let Microsoft get back to doing what it does so well. As a long time computer user I think the compatibility that Microsoft has brought to the industry is a Godsend.

Sincerely,
Gay Abarbanell, CFP?
National Planning Corp.
5625 Green Valley Cir. #103,
Culver City, CA 90230
gay.abarbanell@natplan.com

MTC–00006397

From: Ron Towers
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to make some comments regarding the harassment Microsoft has to endure due to the fact a few competitors have not been able to compete. Our country is great because of free enterprise and competition in the market place. Microsoft, in my opinion, has never hurt the consumer!!! only helped the industry as a whole. I cannot believe that because they (Microsoft) can produce better products than there competitors that this is against the law. Maybe if the others spent more time working hard in development and marketing instead of attacking their competitors they would far better in the marketplace. I too have many competitors to contend with. However I never take them to court about how they beat me out on this job or that. I just think that if our government condones these types of cases by awarding settlements, let alone letting these types of case even get this far is very sad. Too many attorneys needing work that is why everyone is suing everyone these days. So sad

Respectfully,
Ron Towers

MTC–00006398

From: Verlon Bradley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to get off Microsoft's back. The competitive enterprise system will sort out the market.

I am a ''consumer'' user of many Microsoft products and do not feel that I have been overcharged or damaged in any way by Microsoft and their business practices. The notion that they should not have included the Explorer with Windows is stupid. I would not have wanted an ''incomplete'' operating system without and internet explorer. If Microsoft had not developed Windows and The Internet Explorer and made it available at a reasonable price, the internet would not have developed into the powerful tool it is today. If Netscape didn't like the way they bundled it, they could invent their own operating system. Nobody was forced to buy Microsoft products. Give them freedom to innovate and allow them to profit from their hard work and ingenuity!

Surely the Justice Department has better things to do than harass the Microsoft company. Talk about strong-arm tactics—take a look at Jessie Jackson's protection racket as he coerces companies to contribute to the Rainbow Push Coalition which should

not be tax exempt. By intimidating Toyota into a $250,000,000 donation, the consumer will have to pay higher prices for autos. Just one of many examples of heavy handed dealing with an organization which is wrongfully afforded tax exempt status.—Much greater wrong than anything Microsoft may have done!

Stop listening to Microsoft's competitors. Tell them to just go back to the shop and work harder. Tell the liberal leaning states to get on board and lets get back to letting the competitive enterprise system enable the USA to continue to lead the industrialized world!

Thank You for Your Consideration,
Henry V. Bradley
Orange, TX 77630

MTC–00006399

From: JDomani@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:52pm
Subject: Litigation Settlement

As an interested citizen I believe it is time to end this continuing saga by finalizing the proposed settlement that is on the table. I cannot think either party can come up with a new issue to be considered. The continuing uncertainty is not in the best interest of a public who is trying very hard to support the recovery of the economy. Microsoft has been a key innovative player and driver of the economy in the past and it is almost certain they will continue to be so in the future. There are too many other serious concerns facing our society in the business arena as well as our private lives to continue to debate this issue.

Thanks for the opportunity to comments.
Best Regards,
Jim Lindsey

MTC–00006400

From: Silvio Krvaric / CIR
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

This letter is to express my APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT with Microsoft. Though I am not an antitrust lawyer, I studied the subject extensively in law school and considered going into antitrust practice. From my reading of the law and Microsoft's alleged violations, this settlement is already too harsh on Microsoft and too generous to the government. I suggest that DOJ and the court accept the settlement and allow Microsoft to continue the stellar innovation in the computer industry that it has exhibited over the last couple of decades. I have no concerns about its competitors, and would accept penalties on Microsoft only if there was some consumer harm alleged (which there was manifestly not).

In sum, I approve of the settlement and urge the court to accept it.

Sincerely,
Silvio Krvaric
Associate Counsel
CIR
1233 20th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036

MTC–00006401

From: Boomport Inc.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern.

Microsoft has done all of us a great favor. I can write programs that run on 90% of all the desktops in the world. Microsoft doesn't always have the best idea's but they usually do it better then anyone else. I stopped using netscape when Microsoft released version 3. Microsofts was already better at all the things I wanted it to do. Stop trying to say they are hurting me! At least admit that you guys are sueing on behalf of Microsoft haters like Sun, Netscape, Novell. Anyone of those guys would do worse if they had the chance. I never saw a Novell server that made it easier to expand and modify it than NT does. Isn't it true that the more software that can be developed on a platform the better it is for people? Thats why windows are on most of the desktops. I have used unix and is sucks. Why don't a pay 3 times the price and run a Sun computer with hardly any software. I personally love it when they add things to the OS. I just can't see how I am being hurt in any of this!!!!!! Since of course you are only filing this lawsuit to protect me the consumer RIGHT.

Jerrald Nelson. Software developer for 10 years.

MTC–00006402

From: Delmolino@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We agree with the settlement offered Microsoft from the DOJ. Please settle this issue with Microsoft. We feel we as a people have benefited greatly from Microsoft and their innovations. We back Microsoft and hope they can get on with business soon. Thank you.

C. M. Delmolino

MTC–00006403

From: Thom Cook
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a member of the computer industry for 20 years, with experience in using both Microsoft and non-Microsoft products. Microsoft has done GOOD THINGS for the computer world, and because their products are good, they have won a large (but not monopolistic) share of design ''wins''. With no difficulty at all, any of the competing operating systems can be installed on any PC. These competitors aren't inconsequential: IBM and Sun (to name only the behemoths) aren't small companies with limited resources.

It is a pity that the DOJ saw fit to pursue this 'witchhunt' in the first place. I doubt that other industries in the U.S. are subjected to such arbitrary harassment. It is time to end this horrific example of unwarranted government meddling (with no imperative from the people of the country).

If special interests can cause the DOJ to prosecute a case, perhaps Microsoft could convince the DOJ to protect Microsoft's copyrights from the millions and millions of software pirates both here and abroad that regularly disregard U.S. and international copyright laws by copying and reselling Microsoft products without permission or payment.

Please serve the people.
Thom Cook
Buffalo Computer Graphics
Buffalo, New York

MTC–00006404

From: ray@ec.rockwell.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

All,

I think the settlement is more than fair, as many states have found. This matter should be put to rest quickly. Many people feel that Microsoft is being singled out and taken to task for what all its competitor's do. This is hardly a position I can support, because of improvements in productivity that Microsoft has brought about and the countless jobs it has helped create. In another vain, if Colgate started packaging a promotional mouthwash along with its toothpaste, would that constitute unfair competition against Scope? I think not. So why single out packaging Microsoft Browser with Windows as unfair competition? Of course, the issue here is ''settlement'', which is different from finding who is at fault. If Microsoft is broken up into pieces as settlement, I doubt if that will help Sun or Oracle or AOL to flourish. All these companies are limited by their power of innovation.

Sincerely
Debes Ray

MTC–00006405

From: CMSarge@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to get on with business. Nine states plus the DOJ have come to an agreement, which will allow the American economy to move forward. Most consumers and businesses would benefit by looking ahead instead of back. Let's not allow special interests to defeat the settlement. This has taken almost four years, clearly, enough is enough!

MTC–00006406

From: Jeff Paulin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ,

We are comfortable with the current settlement regarding Microsoft. We do not feel any further delays or litigation is in anyone's best interest. Please do all you can to bring this case to a timely close.

Thank you
Jeff & Tracie Paulin
Laguna Niguel, Ca.
(949) 365–9092

MTC–00006407

From: Charlie Hyde
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:57pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It is about time! I'm pleased to hear that there is finally a settlement in sight!

I never thought that Microsoft should be penalized for making a better product than its competitors nor for selling its superior products at a lower cost.

Let's get this over with so that we can all move forward!

Charles Hyde
3202 Armagosa Way
Jamul, CA 91935

MTC–00006408

From: Skillgerry@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US Government:

This is all much too much ado about nothing much. This is America where success is supposed to be rewarded, not throttled. Why don't you concentrate on the real bad guys in our society rather than attempting to disrupt foundations of our capitalism. Microsoft is tough and likely deserves a strong slap or two, but get it settled without destroying them. Remember, there is little liberty and justice without a strong economic America. Our real secret to freedom is our great economic success; without successes our liberties are incredibly threatened.

Success is often despised by those not as capable or fortunate enough to step up to the bar. There is not reason enough for government to impinge on Microsoft's successes, other than where they have clearly exceeded legal, ethical and moral grounds.

Sincerely,
Gerry Weinberg
Kennesaw, Georgia

MTC–00006409

From: ACOU@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:56pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I support the settlement proposed by the Appeals Court. Let's get on with things that are far more important. We should not be looking to punish successful companies who have moved our country ahead.

A.L. Course
119 Tuscany Way
Danville CA 94506

MTC–00006410

From: Bryan Sapp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement agreed to by Microsoft, the DOJ and some states is fair to both sides and in the best interest of the public. Please, don't allow special interests to destroy what has been accomplished.

Bryan Sapp

MTC–00006411

From: ScubaNark@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest.

MTC–00006412

From: Carolyn Mustin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned taxpayer and American citizen, my husband and I strongly urge you to settle the Microsoft case. The settlement that has been proposed seems strong, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. In my opinion, putting this case behind us will be in the best interest of all Americans, and is vital to a healthy future for our economy.

Thank you very much,
Carolyn & Tom Mustin
16 Fawnwood Court
Greensboro, NC 27407
(336) 852—4643
carolynmustin@mindspring.com

MTC–00006413

From: Nadine Heppell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:54pm
Subject: Enough Already

My concern as a taxpayer and consumer let things stand and go on to bigger and better fish such as terrorism abroad and at home'

Reg & Nadine Heppell.

MTC–00006414

From: JERRY M MARTIN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:55pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

this country of ours needs this case finished. ever since the money hungry states went after microsoft our country, our markets, and our economy has been going downhill. we have had enough. get your new found money somewhere else and let's all tend to our own business. shall we next sue walmart, citibank, the new york yankees, etc. etc. etc. for being the dominant force in their fields? this case needs a settlement now.

thank you.
jerry martin
21 edgewater alley
isle of palms, s.c. 29451

MTC–00006415

From: Robert Gibson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The settlement has drawn on too long and is destabilizing to an industry that is already suffering economic hardship due in part to this intervention into the industry by the government. The arduous delays and inability to find a remedy makes it painfully clear that the government is way out of it's depth and doesn't really know what it is doing. Justice cannot possibly ''be seen to be done'' when the government resorts to asking for a remedy from direct competitors of Microsoft, where competitors indulge in spending Microsoft's money only to expanding there own market space. Such a precedent would permit a judge to fine a Pastor for speeding by ordering him to by beer for all at the local saloon. If a crime has been committed against the state then the state should receive compensation and like everyone else Microsoft's competitors must seek there own damages in a civil court themselves. Any attempt to do otherwise breaks the most fundamental tenants of the judicial system.

But isn't it true that one of Microsoft competitors, one instituted by the government, cannot seek such damages as they first set the precedent of giving software away for free to gain a clear monopoly 90% of the browser market and when Microsoft responded with similar tactics, the government then, declared these same tactics illegal.

Robert John Gibson
Senior Systems Eng, B Eng, NNCDE
Network Engineering
Ph 919 905 4915 ESN 355

MTC–00006416

From: User735515@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:55pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I feel the microsoft product has allowed me to stay competitive in business. I am glad someone initiated this software and continues to improve it. we have been in business for ourselves 47 years as a small family business. These innovations have allowed us to be competitive at reasonable prices. In addition as we get older the software allows us to produce with less effort. I have already written my states attorney asking him not to sue but I was ignored.

Thank you for your consideration
DON HOLMES
Acme Signs Inc.
728 Baltimore Pike unit 132
Bel Air MD.

MTC–00006417

From: Richard Montgomery
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The economy needs a settlement of this case. Work this out and get on to more important issues like getting people back to work!!!!!!!! The stock market is also suffering from your continued inability to settle this case. Get it done!!

Tax payer

MTC–00006418

From: Alex—Young@paramount.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

This email is to endorse the DOJ's proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. I believe that it is in the public's interest to see this case come to a quick and appropriate resolution as soon as possible. While Microsoft may have been exceedingly aggressive in its practices at times, they are a shining example of how an American company can position itself as a world leader. Let's settle this case once and for all.

Thank you,
Alexander Young

MTC–00006419

From: Coldrod32@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US Government:

Its about time to settle this microsoft case. It seems to me, after reviewing the settlement, that this is harsh enough. Competitors are just trying to do the same thing Microsoft is accused of doing. Let them meet in the marketplace and we all will be better off. That does sound like the American way. State government does not have a place in this dispute.

Best Wishes for a speedy settlement

Ronald O. Daly

MTC–00006420

From: rbwall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

I truly believe that the suit against Microsoft should never have been filed! Just think where this world would be without the software from this great company. I am almost 67 years old and I think computers are wonderful as long as they have Microsoft Office in them. I have used Microsoft for years now and would not change. Microsoft is so user friendly and compatible for all my needs. I think consideration should be given to a company that has been foremost in bringing the computer to everyone.

Please do not make more charges against them. Leave them free to develop more programs for us, the public. With out Microsoft we would still be in the dark ages!

Betty W. Wall

Educational Diagnostician

MTC–00006421

From: Vance Holloway
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing this in regards the Microsoft anti-trust suit and impending settlement.

This case has never been about consumers. There probably has never been a company in the history of the United States that has done more for consumers than has Microsoft. Twenty years ago there were a few thousand people who had access to a computer and could use one. Today there are hundreds of millions of people with computers that can operate not only theirs, but 90% of the other computers they are exposed to. This came about due to the vision of Microsoft.

Twenty five years ago the lowest cost computer cost tens of thousands of dollars, today the lowest cost computer cost less than $500. This came about due to the vision of Microsoft and Intel.

No, this case is, and always has been about Microsofts competitors. They did not have the vision to do what Microsoft has done, even though they were on the same playing field as Microsoft. Now, since Microsoft was successful, these competitors want the government to step in and bring Microsoft down to their level. This would be very harmful to consumers.

MTC–00006422

From: JoelMagyar@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It's time to settle this case on the terms agreed to by Microsoft and the US Gov't.!!! Forget thr nine states.

Joel Magyar
2115 SW 53rd Ter
Cape Coral, FL 33914

MTC–00006423

From: Gerald Hamilton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Accept The Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Enough is enough! Please accept the DOJ settlement in total so that the high tech portion of the economy can begin to rebound. Few if any are winning from this legal entanglement. Among those few with the loudest voices, the competitors and the attorneys seem to be the only parties who will gain from a prolonged argument. The losers, however, continue to be the American people and the continued loss of our hard-earned investments in the markets. Microsoft has been a standard bearer with its consistent growth in revenues and profits. Its stock has been the gold standard in the industry. Please simply cease the bickering and end this mess by accepting the settlement.

God Bless America.

MTC–00006424

From: Theeinigs@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement reached between the Justice Department, nine states and Microsoft should move forward. This is a fair settlement and further litigation will only prolong an already overdue agreement. I do NOT favor further action on the part of the Justice Department.

Thank you,

Richard G. Einig

MTC–00006425

From: Samuel Soh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Regarding to Microsoft

Dea Sirs,

Thanks for Microsoft to bring the computer to user friendly atmosphere, without Microsoft Windows—Our hightech will not be here as of today! coparing the benefit that Windows brought to all of us at the cost less than a lousy movie (Annualize)!

Only the jealous eye and stupidity of the greedy beings will ever think of panelize the giver of the modern high tech.

God Bless America that we have Microsoft in this country, it make the comuter so easy to use! It transfer the computer power to all ordinary people, the benefit to the whole human beings and the society will be judged by the history.

We really do not want to see, thirty years from now, the history state : '' Some people through their personal hate of success, some how use the name of ''FOR THE PEOPLE'' to manupilated American legal system and destroied one of the best company that attributes so much in the modernization to our current civilization achievement.''

Why we want to kill the best running company in America or better in the whole World? Is this that we American suppose to do? I do not get it!

Sam

MTC–00006426

From: Fixedintime@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this long sad story of attract on one of the nations key firms.

The United States and the world are better today, because of the innovations of Microsoft—people are enriched in both their knowledge base and in their bank accounts because of this company.

In a world that moves fast, the rewards go to the most creative and fastest, Microsoft wins. Those people and companies who don't like Microsoft or their products, there are other choices available.

Let those who have a better ideal, come forth. It is not the business of the United States to hinder, stop or interfere with a productive, creative and great world class company that offers and continues to offer better, faster, and lower cost programing for consumers who want to purchase such items. Get this action in the past, close the book on this sorry effort to interfere with a good company doing their job—and in turn, improve the completeness of the nation.

Legal statements aside, this is another example of the law going down a wrong way, and hurting the nation and people involved.

Sincerely,

John J. Overleese

425 822 3643

MTC–00006427

From: Frank A. Nemia
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Micrsoft settlement

Gentlemen/Madam....It is certainly in the ''public interest'' of all to end this unfortunate litigation in accordane with the settlement proposed...To continue this litigation during these uncertain times layers insecurity and negativeizes the marketplace to everyones' detriment...Frank Nemia

Frank Nemia
Coughlin & Gerhart, L.L.P.
(607)723–9511

MTC–00006428

From: Chris Wilkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Continued pursuit of Microsoft and it's business practicies hurts me as a network administrator and my career and a computer professional. They've made compromises while companies like Sun and AOL/Time continue similar practices without punishment. This is not a valuable use of my tax dollar and I would like you to stop. Microsoft is good for the world and especially this country. We should be thankful they are not based out of Moscow.

Sincerely,

Chris Wilkins

MTC–00006429

From: Clayton Murphy
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Gentlemen:

Gentlemen:

I am opposed to the break up of Microsoft. They have introduced a number of very fine products for both consumer and business use. What was done to AT&T has hurt the communications field and this should not be allowed to happen to Microsoft. However, I do not feel that the proposed partnership with AOL is in our best interest. Having previously used the services of both groups, I have not been pleased with their services.

Clayton Murphy

MTC–00006430

From: Rlstockman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this suit NOW Stop jerking MS around, drop it and leave them alone. What you are doing is not in my interest or in the interest of computer users, any where. This is a political mess instituted by the Clinton jerkoffs. DROP IT and Move On.....Go after Tyson Foods if you feel compelled to justify your existance.

Robert L. Stockman
75 Simpson Dr.
Kennesaw GA 30144

a long time computer user (1956) and an independent voter.....

MTC–00006431

From: lbstuart@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I think it would be in the best interest of everyone that this item be settled. In an economic time as this No more ''dragging your feet'' on this issue. Would you feel that people who work hard give up their knowledge to those who want to ride the '' coattails'' of others.

NO MORE LAW SUITS! End this thing!

Sincerely,
LB Stuart & family

MTC–00006432

From: PRMahan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft has been a significant contributor to the technology innovation that has propelled the American economy forward in recent years. Yes, Microsoft has been a very good competitor and has managed to outperform some of it's competition. As a result Microsoft and it's stockholders have been able to make a profit on their at risk investments. Isn't that what a free market economy is all about? Why should Microsoft be punished so severely simply because it has been successful? Does the Department Of Justice want to handicap all successful Companies like a horse race so that their success is reduced to the lowest common denominator, i.e., the speed of the slowest horse in the race? What does this do for the US economy? Slow it down so that the US economy cannot even compete in the world economy? Doesn't this undermine the basis of competition and free enterprise? Does this mean that the making of a profit is a dirty word?

Microsoft may have abused it's leadership at some levels, although I seriously doubt that its abusive conduct has been any greater than most of its competition. Nevertheless an agreement has been reached with Microsoft that significantly reduces and handicaps its competitive advantage. The agreement is more than fair—lets move and see what Microsoft's competitors can do to improve their competitiveness now that the weight has been added to the leading horse.

Sincerely,
Patrick R. Mahan

MTC–00006433

From: Dick Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already! Stop the litigation. The companies run by Larry Ellison and Scott McNealy can't compete with the quality of Microsoft's products.

The various states that still want to litigate don't have a case. Does anyone think that any money they manage to squeeze out of Microsoft will make it into the pockets of the consumers they profess to represent?

The U.S. economy needs all the help that it can get and so do I.

MTC–00006434

From: Mark Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

As a citizen and active taxpayer I would like to express my opinion regarding the antitrust settlement currently being considered. I am very glad that the DOJ has finally reached a settlement with Microsoft—I would have honestly preferred the case dropped altogether but since that does not appear to be an option I will take what I can get. Please do not let this settlement get derailed—it is critical in a country such as ours with the economy the way it is that successful companies be helped—not hindered by our government.

Mark Miller

MTC–00006435

From: Bob Waggoner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:53pm
Subject: microsoftsettlement

To whom it may concern at the dept. of justice;

Why in the hell don't you leave microsoft alone and let them run their business the way they want to. This company has done nothing but GOOD for the computer industry. I think it all boils down to the fact that the companies that brought suit against microsoft can't run their companies as effecient as microsoft can, so they concocted this bullshit case to try to take down microsoft. Just leave bill gates alone. I get tired of the govt always putting their nose where it doesn't belong. Please consider this when making your decision, just leave the man alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!.

Thank You,
Robert Waggoner
rwaggoner@plix.com
GO GET THEM, BILL

MTC–00006436

From: randall wright
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Dear Sirs:

Dear Sirs:

It seems there are a few people and companies that don't like success. I believed from the beginning that the federal government had absolutely no buisiness in the lawsuit with Microsoft. The settlement has already gone too far in what it is asking from Microsoft and still other competitors and special interest groups won't let go of the bone. Please let this end. I respect the Bush administration's prompt action on this matter and I trust that Microsoft will now be allowed to carry out its generous penalty and get on with business. The company has had enough and so has our country.

Thank you,
Randall and Margueritte Wright
1913 VanDyk Rd
Everson, WA 98247

MTC–00006437

From: Mark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Enough against Microsoft!

The litigation against Microsoft has been promoted long enough by competitors of Microsoft who want an unfair crutch in selling their own products. Windows was the overwhelming choice of the people because it is an OPEN ARCHITECTURE SYSTEM (unlike MAC OS); and is no more of a monopoly than JVC is for having developed VHS. Please top interfering with free competition. To do so ALWAYS does more harm than good.

Sincerely,
Mark Olson
markeao@yahoo.com
San Francisco

MTC–00006438

From: Efdpvb@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

LET'S GET THIS OVER WITH.THERE ARE LOTS MORE CRITICAL ISSUES FACING OUR GOVERNMENT THAN THE MICROSOFT CASE. TIME AND TECHNOLOGY ADVANCES WILL RESOLVE ANY ALLEGED COMPETITVE DIFFERENCES

EUGENE F.DUNN

MTC–00006439

From: Walter Stoewe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Microsoft is the most ingenious and generous business in the nation. We MS users are fed up with the continuing pursuit of this great company!

If you were really serious about going after large monopolies you would have busted the DeBeers Diamond empire a long time ago.

This is not about monopolies, this is about outright greed of the less successful

competitors and the trial lawyers smelling blood.

Let the billion dollar Microsoft settlement stand, as it is the best deal for our kids' education !!!

Walter Stoewe
Powhatan, VA 23139

MTC–00006440

From: MICGOETZ@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Government should not have to bail out companies because they cannot make it. That is not what government is all about. If we continue this way, socialism is just around the corner.

Companies like Microsoft that have a competetive edge, talent and technical expertise should not be held liable for being industrious, inventive and innovative.

Companies that feel their business was hurt, should not have gone into the business in the 1st place if they could not keep up.

MTC–00006441

From: John Wagenseil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:00pm
Subject: Re: My opinion

Dear Sirs,

Leave Mr. Gates alone.

It is all sour grapes. If I wanted to compete with Ford or Chevy, would I have a chance? No. Can I get another local phone company, or cable company? No. But I don't hear a lot of people complaining about these ''monopolies''. Bill's on top and everybody is jealous.

Not one of Mr. Gates distracters care about me, the buyer. They just want to beat Bill in some ''I am as good as you are'' frenzy, or the various States just want the business on there home turf.

I have a friend who owns a Microbrew, and he has to use Distributors to get his beer to market. Now these guys have a monopoly. They sometimes just tell him flat they are not paying him. But I don't see a lot of the States jumping on these guys, or the building permit business, and on and on. But boy, the old States jumped on old evil Bill. Get real. I don't care which of these guys has more billions, I just want everything to be compatible. With the way things were, everything had to be compatible with one standard. I am afraid that soon you will have to be worrying about whether the Software you buy runs on your machine or not. I don't care which system is the main one as a user, but they should be compatible. Gates wouldn't be where he is if Apple had gone for compatibility. Gates say OK, you wouldn't settle on a standard, then I will make a standard. It's all sour grapes.

The Netscape leader was on a PBS show one time where he avowed he wanted to bury Mr. Gates. Come on, the guy was worth some 20 Billion at the time and he was mad at Gates, grow up. They all want to be Bill, to beat Bill, cause after all, they are better than Bill. Come on, grow up.

J P Morgan couldn't have gone down on the foundry floor and done anything in the Steel mill, but he sure knew how to tell the Bessemer process was a money maker (sounds like DOS to me), and that the guy he hired from Europe was the best in the business. They were mad at Morgan for his money and position too. It is all sour grapes.

I am 59 years old, male, in the US Merchant Marine, and not a real good computer person.

Leave Bill alone.

Respectfully,

Jww

MTC–00006442

From: Chuck Bell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has its market share because they offer the best product for a very fair price. If Microsoft had been prevented from competing with Novell when Microsoft integrated networking software into the operating system, we would still be paying Novell $2,000 per computer for networking software. The high cost of the networking software would still be holding the market beck, not allowing the hardware prices to drop also. If Microsoft had been prevented from competing with Novell we would not have a public internet today because small companies and individuals could not afford local area networks. Yes, it is true Microsoft's competition hurt Novell's and other company's profit margin. But it is not true that Microsoft's competition has ever harmed consumers.

Despite the fact that harm to the consumer was never adequately addressed in the lawsuit Microsoft is willing to make concessions. They can do this because they can compete on the value of their products.

Microsoft was the driving force in the super charged economy of the 90?s. The inexpensive products, packed with new features, they brought to consumers and businesses allowed an explosion in productivity.

For the sake of consumers worldwide and the U.S. economy, stop pandering to the existing monopolies and allow Microsoft to compete with them!

Thank you for hearing my comments.

Chuck Bell
Duvall, Washington
bellchuck@hotmail.com

MTC–00006443

From: Rosalinda S. Castiglioni
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:59pm
Subject: Mcirosoft Settlement

I believe that it is in the public's best interest to settle the case against Microsoft. The public is well aware of the fact that Microsoft has greatly contributed to the growth of our economy not only nationally but globally as well. To prolong the litigation process is only counterproductive. It is time Microsoft should be left to continue making innovations and move forward to achieve even greater heights and consequently contributing to our worldwide economy.

Rosalinda S. Castilgioni, PhD

MTC–00006444

From: Walden A. Lange
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:01pm
Subject: End the Microsoft Investigations

January 2, 2002

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The U.S. Government and the Justice Department have had ample time to take whatever actions it deemed necessary with regard to its lengthy investigation of Microsoft Corporation's business practices. It is now time to end all ongoing procedures, declare all investigations closed and final, and let Microsoft lead the United States out of it's two year economic slump. In my view the slump started with the initial Government lawsuit and it should now be ended. ''Let's Roll'' with the economy and go find some other corporation to investigate. I strongly suggest ENRON CORPORATION!!! Thank you.

Sincerely,

Walden A. Lange

MTC–00006445

From: John U. McDole, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The U.S. Department of Justice

''Enough already'' is my comment to the attempt to beat Microsoft into the dirt. I don't care for Microsoft or Bill Gates but in this country every one has the right to make money. Perhaps the means were not totally honorable but what big corporation is? Trying to break up this company is nothing short of 'sour grapes' by its competitors. Let this 'witch hunt' die, here and now. Too much of the publics funds have been wasted in this attempt to stifle this successful enterprise. This is about as useful to our country as the Bill Clinton debacle that wasted more money than anyone will ever know. Spending public funds in futile attempts at grandstanding is just playing politics at its worst.

John McDole
Birmingham, Alabama

MTC–00006446

From: Jean Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

I think it is time to let this rest. Let the settlement stand as it is to everyone's benefit that we have this thing settled now.Thankyou for listening to me.

Sincerely
Jean N. Smith

MTC–00006447

From: timewarpp@earthlink.net
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/2/02 3:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I wanted express my opinon on the microsoft settlement. I use Microsoft products and do not feel cheated by the company. I do however feel cheated by me goverment. I am sick of the politics!!!!!!!!!Get it setted without putting Microsoft through more litigation.

MTC–00006448

From: Loney3@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:02pm

Subject: Settlement Of Microsoft Lawsuit

I am in agreement with the proposals in the current settlement to the Microsoft Lawsuit.

Thomas H. Loney

MTC–00006449

From: David J. Gilman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case was ridiculous from the start. It was a move (brilliant one might say) by Microsoft competitors to leverage a Microsoft weakness (hubris) since they couldn't compete with them in the marketplace. This case should be settled, sealed and put to rest quickly so that the hindsight of history can begin to show how ludicrous and ill-conceived the case always was. The DOJ, and associated states, have been victims of a massive confidence ''game'' perpetuated by Microsoft's competitors. Consumers were never harmed. Corporate customers were never harmed. Egos were harmed.

djg

MTC–00006450

From: Mark Consuegra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am writing you to encourage your department to settle the existing antitrust action with Microsoft. I believe the case was already politically and competitively driven, rather than by the best interests of business and consumer customers of Microsoft.

As the CEO of an independent software ISV that needs to work with Microsoft, I hope my comments have particular relevance. I have worked with many large corporate partners and believe that Microsoft competes fairly and effectively.

More importantly, I believe the emergence of a strong platform for the PC industry has created a tremendous amount of value, jobs and productivity for our country, and for me, over the past 15 years. This has been engendered by Microsoft's contributions to the industry.

I hope your efforts and the court will consider a speedy resolution of this case, especially at a time where many of us would like to see growth and leadership in our industry—one we hope our country will remain the leader in.

Respectfully,
Mark Consuegra
CEO, Wonderhorse Inc.
551 N 34th Street
Seattle, WA 98103

MTC–00006451

From: Tommy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is about time that this issue be settled once and for all. It is my opinion that the law suits to date have been frivolous and without true standing as far as I am concerned. Without Microsoft, I, and many many others, would have no idea how to use a computer with a degree of expertise. Their products are for the betterment of this nation, as well as others. The case needs to be settled now and to the benefit of Microsoft. Why are they being spotlighted any ways? Go away and fight for what is truly meaningful in this life we live.

SETTLE!!! NOW!!! NO PENALTIES EITHER!!!!

Thomas S. Czop

MTC–00006452

From: ErnieLevy@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to end this Microsoft issue. At this point I think the issue has changed to who is going to win and how much. This is at great expense to tax payers and stockholders. Enough is enough let's get on with American competition the way it was intended to be not with all this government intervention. If the corporations doing all the crying would apply those resources to product development and marketing they might be able to improve market share. They won't do it in the courts they will only hurt taxpayers and stockholders.

Where would the PC be today if not for Microsoft? One thing is for sure we can't count on justice and fair play not after what we saw from the Supreme Court a year ago in the decision for Bush!

Ernie Levy
64209 E Greenbelt Lane
Tucson AZ 85739
520 825 9629

MTC–00006453

From: Richard Shouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I favor the current Microsoft Settlement. Please, leave Microsoft alone, and let us get on with the work.

MTC–00006454

From: SCraig4420@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this case should be settled as agreed between Microsoft and the DOJ. All the states should be required to accept said settlement and not be allowed to continue their suits.

Sonny Craig

MTC–00006455

From: Goers, Ronald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ Folks,

I cannot believe that this silly case has gotten as far as it has. Janet Reno should be hog-tied and whipped with wet spaghetti for her part in the gross mishandling of this case. If the complaint had been brought on by consumers, I might think differently, but let's face it; this case was concocted by Microsoft's competitors. Unfortunately, the folks at SUN Microsystems, and the rest of those who complained are a whiney lot. Too bad they have inferior platforms and software that prevent them from effectively competing in a free marketplace. I wonder why they blame their inadequacies on Microsoft? Maybe instead of wasting money on slick lawyers, they could be spending their time and money inventing something people will want to buy and use. It strikes me as odd that on one hand Microsoft is said to be a monopoly, but on the other hand Time Warner isn't... doesn't that seem strange to you also??? (Think ''having your cake, and eating it too'') And, why isn't Apple under fire? They have both a hardware and software monopoly going!

This case reminds me of a recent Nature program I was watching. The setting was an Alaskan river, where there were several grizzly bears fishing for king salmon. There was one big old male bear who filled his belly by stealing fish from all the other bears. The narrator of the program noted that this particular bear had used this method of ''fishing'' for many years. Those who would have Microsoft punished for advancing technology in a way no other company has been able to do should be ashamed of themselves. I assure you had the shoe been on the other foot, those who brought this suit to the DOJ would have failed to see any wrongdoing in their own practices. And rightly so, since there is no law against creating technology (in this case, an OS) which drove our economy to levels of prosperity never before imagined. Take away Microsoft, and hundreds of thousands of jobs would not exist—and that just from those who write software and build hardware based on MS innovation. Add to that, those who rely on computers running a Microsoft OS to run a business... and to that those who actually work for Microsoft... and those who run MS computers at home... and Palm devices which rely on MS platforms for synchronizing... and it's not hard to see the negative impact it would have on our economy. The Microsoft Operating Systems are one of the key reasons this country has seen such great prosperity in recent years.

Lastly, lest anyone gets the idea I work for (or draw any sort of income) from Microsoft—I don't. In fact, I don't even like their browser! I regularly use—believe it or not—Netscape 4.7!!! Still, I can't support throwing the baby out with the bath water. Even though I don't particularly like the MS browser, nor the way it gets packaged with their OS—I accept it as part of the package. If I don't want to use the browser, I simply don't use it, and install another one in it's place. Simple, isn't it? No suit, no jumping up and down crying ''monopoly'', no sweat!

In summary; My advise on this whole issue is to drop it completely and stop wasting taxpayer's money. If that is not an option, then I would like to see Time Warner sued by the DOJ for refusing to run cable the extra 2 miles down my street to connect it to my house. Maybe they're under the delusion that I would be using Microsoft's browser on their Time Warner ''RoadRunner'' network...

Warmest regards,
ron
Ronald L. Goers
Associate Engineer
SP/SIPT/ISET/IQ Engineering
800 Phillips Road, MS: 0111–30N,
Webster, NY 14580
(585) 422–5331 (Intelnet: 8*222–5331)
Http://photo.scan.mc.xerox.com/ (Xerox Internal Only)
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw,Adam Stein

MTC–00006456

From: Jon Lane
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:03pm
Subject: Micorsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

The goal to limit the monopolistic practices of Microsoft has been met with this settlement. Competitors now have the opportunity to compete and earn their share of the market by offering products that perform better or are priced better than Microsoft's. To dilute the settlement, which seems to be the goal of Microsoft's detractors, would provide market share welfare to their competitors where it is not warranted. The Justice Department has created an atmosphere that fosters competition, let's retain that ruling.

J. W. Lane

MTC–00006457

From: PKreh4933@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I would like to express my approval of the settlement which has been made with Microsoft. Please rule in favor of it as it will be in the best interests of the public, and this debate and hassle has gone on long enough. Microsoft has done so much for all of us—let them be done with all this confusion and get on with making computers and programs that will further benefit us!

Sincerely,
Phyllis Krehbiel
2015 N. 71st
K.C., KS 66109

MTC–00006458

From: JBerset@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:07pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe it is time to settle the Microsoft case now. We have enough problems with the economy and others, we do not need to continue this case any longer.

Thank you.
Jacqueline H. Balthaser

MTC–00006459

From: JXCOONS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft /DOJ/ States disagreement has gone on long enough. The points that were part of the original issue are history and I thought were resolved in the trial and subsequent appeal ruling, it is time to move on. As a consumer of Microsoft products, I think the settlement agreement reached between the DOJ and Microsoft is fair. I want to see accessory products bundled. It is confusing for a layman to sort through various software products that are available. I like to have the starting software provided. Occasionally when I find a product that I like better than one supplied by Microsoft, I simply replace the Microsoft project.

I would urge the DOJ and the court to let the settlement stand and move ahead.

Thank you,
James C. Coons

MTC–00006460

From: RAY NEUBAUER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:05pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I BELIEVE THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD DO ALL POSSIBLE TO CONCLUDE THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT. AS A CONSUMER AND USER OF MICROSOFT SOFTWARE AND MSN I BELIEVE I AND ALL OTHERS LIKE ME WOULD BE BEST SERVED BY ENDING THIS SITUATION. I BELIEVE MICROSOFT HAS BEEN MORE THAN GENEROUS AND COMPLIANT IN ACCEPTING THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT.

A.R. NEUBAUER JR.
93 CARAVAN PLACE
SAN RAMON CA 94583

MTC–00006461

From: WilbrettRE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is more than fair, it is time to put this to bed and get it out of the courts. It should have never gotten to this point in the first place. You are stiffiling the very thing that has made this country great and a leader in technolgy.

MTC–00006462

From: Uebe, Joanne
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For nearly four years the Microsoft case has been going on and on and on, and despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of its competitors, the Federal Government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. I think this settlement is tough enough, but reasonable and fair to all parties concerned. Please settle this case once and for all— for the good of everyone—consumers and Country alike. I don't think the nine states who are opposing this settlement should be given more consideration than those nine states who agree with the settlement.

Again, nearly four years of these hearings is ENOUGH! Settlement is needed for the good of all of us!

MTC–00006463

From: BJA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I feel that the settlement that has been proposed for the Microsoft case is a fair one. To continue litigation in this matter would, I think, cause unnecessary and prolonged unrest in the technology industry, especially during these uncertain economic times. I hope the Justice Department can let this matter be settled and discontinue any further costly litigation.

Thank You.
Beverly Arnold
St. Louis, MO 63042
arnoldbj@yahoo.com

MTC–00006464

From: GGEJE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion the Tunney Act and the agreed upon settlement are in the public interest and that it is now time for this matter to pass into history.

Thank you,
George G. Edwards, MD

MTC–00006465

From: B(038)B Cody
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:06pm
Subject: microsoft

I don't agree that Microsoft is a monoply. If you want to chastise monoply then I suggest you look to the biggest monoply of all—the Washington government. Why not break up that? All Microsoft is guilty of is being successful. Hurting them hurts the whole economy and we don't need that now or anytime.

Sincerely
R Cody

MTC–00006466

From: stanley t leung
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm

To Whom It May Concern:

Settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case would be good for the national economy, but also restore a sense of fairness to the American markets.

Stanley T. Leung, JD, MBA
Medical Scholars Program
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
506 South Mathews Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Email: stl4@columbia.edu
Ph#: (217) 352–1133 Pager#: 800–702–3646

MTC–00006467

From: Ken Abeles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Sir,

I believe that the settlement is fair to all parties and that it is not in the government's interest to delay this decision. I use Microsoft products and will continue to use them. Let them innovate so as to best serve the public.

Regards,
Kenneth Abeles

MTC–00006468

From: William Franklin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

According to our Constitution—Justice should be fair and prompt. Prolonging litigation would not apply to being prompt. As it appears our present Tax system needs to be fair and correction should be prompt. Abolish the I. R. S. and promptly give us a fair Tax.

MTC–00006469

From: Mokhtar Hamada
To: Microsoft ATR,lobna gaber
Date: 1/2/02 3:04pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ,
I support Microsoft on the settlement with the U.S. DOJ as approved by federal court. Please stop certain state Attorneys General from making mockery of the federal court's decision. Microsoft has been doing a good, honest business all along. As a consumer, I find Microsoft to be innovative and worthy of my support.
Mokhtar Hamada, D.Sc.
Retired Chem Engineer
St. Louis County, MO 63011
Keep Safe, be Cool, have Fun !

MTC–00006470

From: Edward Klements
To: Microsoft ATR,KlementsSr. ed
Date: 1/2/02 3:05pm
Subject: Justice
To: United States Dept. Of Justice,
Please stop wasting the taxpayers money on this Microsoft suit. I have been buying their products since 1996 and have always obtained an excellent product at a fair price. In my opinion a company is not a threat or a monopoly when it behaves like Microsoft.
If the DOJ wants to do some good for the american public, then take the drug companies to task. They affect me adversely to the tune of $350 a month, if you want to make an example of monopolistic abuse, you've got it with the ''DRUGGIES''.
Edward Klements
Homosassa Fl.
34446

MTC–00006471

From: Michelle Galaz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 2, 2002
Your Honor:
My hope is that the courts will settle this law suit between Microsoft the the Justice Department. Microsoft has been a leader in the software industry for years through hard work, dedicated employees, excellent marketing skills, brilliant leaders, and hugh risks. They were lucky that the risks paid off and rewarded.
Please don't punish Microsoft because they happen to be the first and best in this new age of technology. The recent rash of dot.com businesses showed that this entire field is still evolving. Unfortunately many dot.coms failed. These failed businesses did not make it for various reasons, inexperienced management, inability to turn a profit, obscure ideas, risky ventures, and many other reasons. Microsoft took many of these same risks in the beginning. They also could have failed but a little bit of luck along with briliance not a violation of the Sherman act made them suceed.
As Darwin proved in his theories with nature only the strongest survive. Microsoft has become the strongest and they have survived not through illegal practices but through hard work and risk.
I do not work for Microsoft nor do any of my immediate relatives. I do not say these things for an immediate financial payoff. I say these things because Microsoft is good for Washington State and good for the Nation. I believe that our Nations current financial crisis can be linked directly to the original court ruling Spring 1999.
Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinions.
Sincerely,
Michelle Galaz
9608 Dekoven Dr SW
Lakewood Washington
253–589–1580
Michelle Galaz
galmila@yahoo.com

MTC–00006472

From: Eastmeyr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I think it is time to conclude the litigation in reference to
E. Steinmeyer

MTC–00006473

From: RAYDOTMAN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is our opinion that the government would do well to keep out of Microsoft's affairs. In fact the government should keep out of business affairs as much as is possible. The government has better things to do than to persecute Microsoft which offers excellent products. I recall with chagrin the breakup of AT&T. Telephone service has not been the same since. Please add our voices to this protest. We want Microsoft left alone!!
Sincerely,
Helen and Ray Richard

MTC–00006474

From: chris.jensen@gm.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern,
It is my opinion that this case against Microsoft should be settled. The American economy is literaly under attack! We need to help American companies such as Microsoft—not hurt them because their competitors are sore loosers. Microsoft has an continues to offer consumers and business a great product at a fair market price. The American consumers do not need any action taken against them.
Chris Jensen
ePD Web Team
General Motors

MTC–00006475

From: Spragens, Joy (WASHINGTON—WK OFFICE WK 749)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement. In fact I believe the suit was ill-founded as no consumer has been hurt by Microsoft; to the contrary; Microsoft has helped the consumer both technologically and financially. Computers and peripherals are now compatible and speak to each other. I believe we owe much of the economic prosperity of the last decade to Microsoft and its innovations which have allowed for higher productivity and made computers easy for the layman to use (including my 72 year old mother). I want to see the US remain open to innovation and not stifle it. I do not want to see innovative people and companies move abroad seeking that freedom if it is threatened here. Our antitrust laws as I understand them were drawn to protect the consumer not the competitor. The laws in Europe are the other way around and we can easily see how much it has stifled innovation there.
Sincerely,
Joy Fowler Spragens

MTC–00006476

From: MJT4148@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Anti Trust Settlement
PLEASE ACCEPT THE PENDING SETTLEMENT
Marvin J. Tibbetts
3900 Rosehill Ave.
Apt. 402A
Cincinnati, Ohio

MTC–00006477

From: Wsicketc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The US economy has enjoyed the past ten years' successes mostly because Microsoft has bourght unprecedented economies to ALL Americans—private and public. The original lawsuit by the Government was obviously undertaken because Bill Gates refused to contribute heavily to Mr. Clinton.
Enough of chasing successful people. Settle as it now is proposed.
William L. Sickenberger
Reston, VA

MTC–00006478

From: RichDenney@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:08pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE GET THIS WITCH HUNT OVER. MICROSOFT HAS PROBABLY DONE MORE TOWARDS MAKING THE PC BOTH AFFORDABLE AND USABLE TO TO YOUR AVERAGE AMERICAN. THAN ANY OTHER ENTITY.
IF YOU WANT TO HELP US CONSUMERS THEN GET AFTER THE OIL COS. THE UTILITIES AND ESPECIALLY THE NATURAL GAS COMPANIES. THEY RAPED ALL OF LAST WINTER AND CONSIDERING THE CURRENT COLD SNAP OVER THE SOUTH WE ARE PROBABLY IN FOR ANOTHER RAPE THIS WINTER.
THANK YOU
RICHARD I DENNEY
881 DEBONAIR DR
MOBILE AL 36695
(251) 633–5088

MTC–00006479

From: The1stBA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Let this just be SETTLED without further ado, thank you.
Barbara Ann Wilcoxson, a shareholder.

MTC–00006480

From: Carolyn Braswell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please encourage the states to settle this ASAP. This has been one of the reasons for economic recession and we do not need any more of it!
Eddie & Carolyn Braswell

MTC–00006481

From: KTyler5757@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Your Honor I think the ''settlement'' reached by the various States involved is only a slap on the wrist. Bill Gates is very happy with it, because he knows Microsoft got off almost scott free. Microsoft is a bully and will continue to be unless the Court does something to stop it. Please put some teeth into this case and prevent Microsoft from running over the top of everyone.
Kent G. Tyler

MTC–00006482

From: RGRANT9@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please settle this case. No further litigation. We need this to end now! I have a cable company, telephone company and garbage company that are more of a monopoly than Microsoft.
Rob Grant
Mukiteo, WA

MTC–00006483

From: The Fennertys
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please recommend approval of the Microsoft Settlement. I believe it to be in the best interests of the consumer as well as bsiness. We need to be actively developing new products in order to be competitive in this extraordinary global economy. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Francis E. Fennerty
Tucson, Arizona
fennerty@the river.com

MTC–00006484

From: Hlbry@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The DO settlement is fair even if a bit severe. Please say NO to those states that are looking for more. Thanks
Harry Bryant
Riddle Village
511 Arlington
Media, PA 19063–6007
Tel. 610–565–2057

MTC–00006485

From: Dorothy Lau
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I strongly urge that the Microsoft Settlement remain intact as agreed upon by the federal government and the nine states in the Court of Appeals ruling.
The nation needs to attend to the fiscal problems that now exist with the economy. There is nothing to be gained by prolonging the Microsoft Settlement.
Dorothy D. Lau

MTC–00006486

From: Raelbrook@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
I SUPPORT THE RECENT SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND MICROSOFT.
I FEEL IT IS TIME THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LOOKED INTO THE EFFECT THAT ITS ATTACK ON MICROSOFT WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGING THE WHOLE HI-TECH INDUSTRY LEADING TO AN OVERALL DECLINE IN THE US ECONOMY. HAD MICROSOFT BEEN A JAPAN BASED ENTITY I BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SO TARGETED.
RESPECTFULLY,
GRAHAM RAEL-BROOK

MTC–00006487

From: Peter Ahking
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:13pm
Subject: microsoft Settlement
Dear sir/Madame:
I beleive the agreement is just and fair
I strongly urge that the dept of Justice settle the anti-trust case with Microsoft.
Regards,
Peter Ahking

MTC–00006488

From: FBrand1433@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: (no subject)
Leave Microsoft alone. End the settlement now. Where would you be without Bill Gates anyway
Bill and Fran Brandenburg

MTC–00006489

From: Farrelljr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please recommend approval of the current settlement agreement with Microsoft. I think the proposed settlement is fair for me as a consumer and fair to the Government's position.
Thank you.
Sincerely yours,
John L. Farrell, Jr.
Tulsa, Oklahoma
farrelljr@aol.com

MTC–00006490

From: BILL DAVIDSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft case
If 9 states and the Appeals Court have approved Microsoft's generous settlement offer, then I would urge the DOJ to persuade the dissenting states to drop their suits.
Microsoft is the epitome of the ''American Dream''. It appears that many of the objecting states are catering to local constituents that are either jealous of Microsoft's accomplishments or do not have the ability to create a better operating system and package of products for consumers.
Microsoft and the Gates Foundation are among industries most generous contributors to many humanitarian and educational causes.
Please make every effort to stop these jealous attacks on one of America's great companies. Their energies are better spent creating new and exciting products rather than defending frivolous lawsuits.
Yours very truly,
Jean and Bill Davidson

MTC–00006491

From: seung lyu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:11pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
I believe that the Microsoft anti-trust settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved.
Sk

MTC–00006492

From: ronald t moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Please settle this witch hunt. Bill Gates has done more for this country in the form of charity than many who are in his position of power. If the money were spent to fight terrorism during the Clinton administration instead of trying to take it to Microsoft, September 11th, might not have the significance that it does. Close the chapter on this disgraceful injustice and move on to important matters.
Ronald Moore
Indianola WA.
CC:microsoft@msn.com@inetgw

MTC–00006493

From: JOANZICHT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement
I feel strongly that the proposed settlement is in the best interest of consumers, the economy and the industry. Let's get it settled and get on with our lives.
Joan Zicht

MTC–00006494

From: sanderson@lvdi.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
I believe it's in the best interest of all parties to settle this issue as is.
J.W. Sanderson

MTC–00006495

From: Bob Ulmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT!
I am in total favor of the Microsoft Settlement! The Microsoft Corp. has been a good company for and to America! I ask where would America be today without Microsoft? The only reason the Department of Justice is in litigation now with Microsoft is greed and jealousy of other competitors! I

say the American way is to let the competitors build a better product if they want more market share! What happened to the free market place that is supposed to exist in America? What does Microsoft bring to the table for America? Jobs, High wages, Philanthropy, A quality product, High customer satisfaction, Innovation,It creates a large tax base for the government of America! Why cut off the nose of America to spite her face!

MICROSOFT IS GOOD FOR AMERICA!
Bob Ulmer
3959 Normandy Drive
Owensboro, KY 42303

MTC–00006496

From: Richard Horlacher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Keep the current settlement terms as they now are. Do not change them.
Richard D. Horlacher

MTC–00006497

From: joseph davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MTC–00006498

From: Joe Weber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In regards to the proposed settlement of the litigation by the Government vs. Microsoft—it is time (it has been for some time now) to get on with the settlement without further delay! The compromises reached over the course of the year appear to be reasonable for all concerned, not least of whom are the U.S. citizens, who want to see fairness applied to the entrepreneurial spirit which drives our free economic society.

Enough is enough! It's time to get on with the further economic development of this great country, not take a giant step backward in our private enterprise system. Let's continue to reward innovation, not stifle it!

Allow the proposed settlement to happen, and quickly!
Joe Weber
web.vu@pdq.net

MTC–00006499

From: B. Newman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:13pm
Subject: Microsoft

I think it is about time that this is settled. Time to get off Microsoft's back and let them do their job.

You are playing with innocent people's lives! After all isn't the biggest monoply in the world the U.S. government??? What happened to free enterprise and the American dream?
Brenda K. Newman
Sequim, WA 98382

MTC–00006500

From: Robert Gibson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The best remedy would be to limit copyright on software to 5 years and then enforce making that code public. Technology is changing at a far more rapid pace today than when copyright laws were first written but those laws have not been updated to reflect this. Today five years spans a software technologies life cycle providing sufficient time gain the vast majority of potential profit. Making code public at the end of 5 years would ensure that significant new development would have to be produced to maintain a competitive position. I would be surprised if Bill Gates would oppose such a move as he has always advocated a fast moving innovative industry, whereas his opponents have advocated open code which they would gain after 5 years. This remedy serves both interests without threatening either to the advantage of the public and the industry while aligning copyright laws with contemporary times.

Thank you
Robert John Gibson
Senior Systems Eng, B Eng, NNCDE
Network Engineering
Ph 919 905 4915 ESN 355

MTC–00006501

From: jlcharlton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Both Jack and I were dismayed and infuriated at the amusement and smiles on their faces when we saw Janet Reno and the lead prosecutor in the antitrust case against Microsoft on television announcing that they had won a case that should never have been filed. It is a given that any one of us who has computing experience knew the moment the lawsuit was filed that the technology had moved far beyond what was the subject of the litigation. The DOJ needs to settle the case now and let this country move on and continue to be innovative and successful in business. The companies whining over a loss of business should get busy and work at winning as Microsoft did and continues to do.

Thanks for letting our opinion be expressed.
Linda and Jack Charlton

MTC–00006502

From: JOHN (038) Mary McLauchlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

The fight with Microsoft has been going on much too long. Let's somehow get it settled and over with. In doing so, the one thing that should never happen is for Microsoft to be forced to reveal their secrets to anyone. As for Judge Jackson who ruled on his bias, I and many of my friends do not understand why he is still in office.

John McLauchlin
91 Apple Blossom Ln.
Sequim, WA 98382

MTC–00006503

From: DugEaglEye@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I agree with the tentative settlement. As far as I am concerned the US Dept. of Justice got more of a settlement than the Government should have. Even government bureaucrats should be able to figure out that if you put Microsoft out of business, then Japanese computer companies will fill the void, and US companies will loose yet another industry. We once had a steel industry, didn't we?

MTC–00006504

From: Carter Cherry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement between DOJ and Microsoft is a fair solution in the interest of all consumers. Prompt settlement with the proposed DOJ-Microsoft agreed upon terms should be sought by all parties.

Cordially,
Carter M. Cherry
11665 Walnut Spring Court
Cupertino, CA 95014

MTC–00006505

From: H. William Koster, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Microsoft settlement is fair as it now stands; any further action byu the DOJ or the States would be unjust.

MTC–00006506

From: frank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Greetings: I wish to go on record as a user of Microsoft products and an independent Microsoft shareholder that ENOUGH IS ENOUGH !!! It is time to get this un-warranted and frivolous,stupid attack on America's business ended. You all know the reasons behind this litigation so I need not rehash them here. It is in the best interests of the United States to end the un-warranted attack, so please do so immediately.

Frank Wills
8258 Level hill Rd.
Junction, IL 62954
P.S. Possible strongly letter to follow!!!

MTC–00006507

From: tanis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Subject: Here's a profound question. Can you answer?

Fw: Question from Philly radio call-in show.....

Without Casting Stones, It is a legit. question.

Two men, both billionaires.

One develops relatively cheap software and gives hundreds of millions of dollars to charity.

The other sponsors terrorism.

That being the case, why is it that the US government has spent more money chasing down Bill Gates over the past ten years than Osama bin Laden?

MTC–00006508

From: Jack Reece
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If there has ever been a time when the Department of Justice needed to make a judgment for the benefit of the the consumer, the technology industry, and the country as a whole, it is now. A judgment that is more than fair has been agreed to by Microsoft and most of the plaintiff states. And yet, there are specific states, companies and individuals who are seeking further action for selfish reasons.

This country, more than ever, needs an immediate resolution to this problem. Let's not be held hostage any longer by self-serving individuals.

Jack D. Reece
419 Chesterwoods Court
High Point, NC 27262
336–841–7810

MTC–00006509

From: Panchanadam Swaminathan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello:

I am very anxious to see that the case against is settled as announced. It is time that we all get on with exciting and interesting new technology development which Microsoft has been doing during the past decade. It is highly detrimental to the progress of technology to stop Microsoft from developing new and exciting technology affordable to common people.

I look forward to seeing the case settled as son as possible.

P. swaminathan, Ph.D.
Technical Manager

MTC–00006510

From: BudPorter@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 2, 2002

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a consumer and avid user of a PC. I feel that Microsoft over the years has provided me with valuable bundled tools to surf the Internet and do other tasks on the PC. I used the Internet before the Worldwide Web became popular. We would not have or continue to have the convenience of using the WWW with innovations that can be used by the average American if the American government continues its attack on Microsoft! Microsoft products have always been a bargain both in cost and utilitarian value! If litigation continues, the only winners will be LAWYERS AND PRIVATE INTERESTS. An example is the ludicrous tobacco settlement!!! It is a cash cow for lawyers and state treasuries. I feel that the current recession started with Clinton's attack on Microsoft years ago! Remember that the CONSUMER COMES FIRST! THAT IS ME!!!! TOO MUCH OF OUR GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT IS BEING WASTED ON LITIGATION...CLASS ACTION SUITS ONLY BENEFIT THE LAWYERS AND OTHER PRIVATE INTERESTS. MONETARY REWARDS ARE ONLY PEANUTS TO THE AVERAGE CONSUMER LIKE ME!

(UNLESS YOU SPILL A CUP OF MCDONALDS COFFEE ON YOUR CROTCH!!! AND FIND A CROOKED LAWYER AND SYMPATHETIC JURY!) SETTLE WITH MICROSOFT NOW!!!!

Let American business get back on track!

LLOYD PORTER

MTC–00006511

From: Whelkids@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:18pm
Subject: Micrdsoft Settlement

Rather than have this matter tied up in the courts and the resultant uncertainty, I believe that the settlement should be approved. Let's get it settled—Move ON!

John W. Whelan

MTC–00006512

From: christopher fish
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a software developer who has worked with microsoft products for the last 7 years. Either in supporting users or in creating software. I strongly support the break up of microsoft and wanted to go down on record as doing so.

I also wanted to know if you have addressed these two issues yet.

1) Microsoft's design of the Visual C++ compiler and it's wizards makes it very difficult to create C++ code that can be compiled to run on more then one operating system. This design flaw has the effect of eliminating competing operating systems, because if you want to get inter-operability under windows the best compiler to use (and one of the only two) is Microsoft's visual C++. The problem is that the compilers wizards create projects that don't even have the C++ standard ''main'' operator in them. This makes it impossible to change compilers and since Microsoft's compiler does not readily support compilations for other operating systems it makes compiling your application for other operating systems extremely difficult, thus effectively punishing developers who what to try and write code that can run on more then one operating system.

2) Microsoft's implementation of unicode is off in some of it's higher numbers so as to cause corruption in languages that use characters above and including Russian. This would seem to be something that was very intentionally done as it is the type of mistake that would be hard to make and not notice. It certainly has the effect of requiring anyone who does not use Internet explorer to have to download special components (which of coarse had to be written at the coast of Microsoft's competitors) so that you can view web pages that were created with Microsoft outlook.

MTC–00006513

From: Brian Craze
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To whom it may concern,

Concerning the proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft, I believe it is in the best interest to accept this settlement and move on. The settlement appears to be fair, reasonable and good for the consumer.

Regards,
Brian Craze
Manager, Electronic Imaging Division (EID)
A.G. Heinze, Inc.
Voice: 480–813–7786 Fax: 480–813–7237
E-mail: brianc@agh.com Web: www.AGHeinze.com

MTC–00006514

From: Kevin Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:18pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft

2 January 2002

Leave Microsoft alone. This is a company that innovates and though they ''dominate'' their segment of the computer industry, they have helped all of the world progress to the point that computers are usable and affordable for all people.

Kevin Williams

MTC–00006515

From: Sesusainc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Freedom

I am concerned that hold out States are more interested in money than settlement. What would happen if Microsoft stated that no shipment or sale of Windows, etc., would be sold in these States until situation is cleared? Customers in these States would really put up quite a howl I am sure. They should remember, one doesn't buy because they are forced to, they buy because of value they get for the money.

My opinion only,
Alan L. MacLachlan
S.E.S.USA INC.
6527NE 192nd PL
Kenmore, WA 98028–3457
Tel: (425) 485–3801
FAX: (425) 486–1626
E-mail: sesusainc@AOL.com

MTC–00006516

From: Dr. Tucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly urge that the Settlement proposed be allowed to go forward. I believe it is in the best interest of all concerned and further litigation would be self-serving to the legal profession only. They (legal profession) have already had their ''pound of flesh'':

Respectfully,
GRT

MTC–00006517

From: Dave Foshee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This issue should be resolved now.

If there is to be a settlement (and I feel that this case should never have been brought in the first place) let it happen now.

Dave Foshee
General Manager
Adelphia—Carlsbad

5720 El Camino Real
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760–438–7741 Ext 604
760–438–8461 Fax
619–890–4088 Mobile
dave.foshee@adelphia.com

MTC–00006518

From: Barbara Kellogg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs

Let's settle this thing and quit wasting time and money dragging this thing out longer while the remaining states see if they can get just a little more.

Sincerely
Barbara J. Kellogg

MTC–00006519

From: Don650@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a user of Microsoft software in business and at home, I have found there products, pricing and availability to be very satisfactory to me and I urge the doj to leave them alone and instead, concentrate on protecting our homeland against real dangers. Microsoft is not one of them. Thank you

Donald F. Tomisak

MTC–00006520

From: Henry Spie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The time has come to finish this case. I personally thought that the suit filed by the government was wrong to start off with. I feel that the whole case was a waste of taxpayers(of which I am one), money.

My first computer was a256 processor with 20 mgz speed Packard bell computer. It had about 60 megs of memory and 1 meg for the mother board for about 2400 dollars. Now I have a cpu which has 1gig for speed and 40 gigs for memory and it cost less than 1700 dollars. I basically went from a yugo type computer to a Cadillac type for less money. Monopolies work the opposite way. (Less for more).The case should be settled once and for all.

Henry Spiechowicz
Chesterfield Michigan
henry002@ameritech.net

MTC–00006521

From: Jerry Herr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think that the revised final judgement should be accepted by all parties..and the states that are holding out should be stoped from any further action against Microsoft....

Thanks for asking....
Jerry Herr,
Park Ridge, IL 60068 ...
email ....gvhparkridge@yahoo.com

MTC–00006522

From: JIM TIERNAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is way past time to settle something that should not have been investegated in the first place. Microsoft's competiters are trying to get the gov. to do something they couldn't do. Drive them out of business. We the consumer, are just fine with microsoft. If Microsoft wants to give me somthing for free in their softwar bundle then I am all for it.

The settlement that was negotiated was MORE than fair. As a matter a fact it was to harsh and never should have been in the first place. The states are always crying that they don't have enough money in their budgets, well try spending it for something worth while. They have spect along with the feduarl gov. more money than we spent getting Binladen. That is a shame. Bill gates is not the bad guy here. It is hard for me to express my anger with all governments on this subjetct in an e-mail. Feel free to call mae at 1–870–258–3557.

Jim Teiernan
Owner
Springhill Industries, Inc.

MTC–00006523

From: Steve Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

Our company sells software and computer systems and networks to banks in 32 states. Our software will run on a variety of platforms. We use a combination of Windows and Unix. We can now add Linux to the mix—it is an OPEN market.

The original intent behind the government watching out for monopolies has been turned into the current relentless persecution of Microsoft trying to retro ancient laws into a newer economy. We choose to use Microsoft operating systems because they have the best value and functionality. The bundling of products make life easier for every single user and systems administrator on the planet. As soon as a company can create a better operating system for under $200.00, we will buy it. Microsoft DOES NOT have a true monopoly.

Microsoft software is DIRT CHEAP. Anyone who says differently has never created software themselves, or they are just jealous. STOP listening to these whining competitors of Microsoft. Let them INNOVATE. Microsoft has done nothing but create jobs and create new businesses and create excellent software for the money. Please admit when you are wrong and get onto a new project. You are causing the taxpayers millions of dollars for what? Did you ever try to make computer speakers and scanners work with Windows Version 3.1? If you did, then you would not try so hard to make Microsoft change their bundling of software. The real joke is when you tried to break them up. What a nightmare that would have been for every computer user in the country.

PLEASE move on with your lives and let Microsoft do the same.

Sincerely,
Steve Anderson
President & CEO
SPARAK Financial Systems, LLC
2701 12th Ave SW
Fargo, ND 58104
Sales: 800.659.9121
Phone: 701.293.7198
Fax: 701.293.9654
www.sparak.com
steve@sparak.com

MTC–00006524

From: Catherine Sasso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe Microsoft's proposed settlement is acceptable. I don't want to see any more litigation by anyone because I believe it would only be beneficial to Microsoft's competitors and that being an unfair way for the competitors to gain market share. I personally am delighted with Microsoft's products; thought them fairly priced. Without the innovations produced by Microsoft, I'd still be struggling to learn how to use a computer. They certainly should be encouraged to invent more, so all our computing would be easier for all.
sassocat@hotmail.com

Very truly yours,
Catherine Sasso

MTC–00006525

From: LGa1582997@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:17pm
Subject: DOJ

The attack on Microsoft was akin to the deregulation of the Bell System, that one took us back at least twenty years and I don't believe we've caught up as of now. Without Microsoft I don't believe I could have afforded to purchase the PC I did back in 1992, nor could I have up graded three times since then. Back in 92 I wanted to start writing about my WW II experiences with the 1st Marine Division and would not have started had I not been able to write my memories one at a time and then with the computer bring them all together into a comprehensive story.

Thanks Microsoft keep up the good fight for affordable soft ware and PC's

Leo Garcia
938 Lurline Drive
Foster City, Ca. 94404
e-mail LGa1582997@aol.com

MTC–00006526

From: bill lakenan jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:20pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

please accept the settlement in place and move forward. i believe the setlement is fair. thanx for your time

bill lakenan
ARC, Incorporated
PO Box 10161
Knoxville, TN 37939
office) 865.584.3044
fax) 520.447.7873

MTC–00006527

From: Jim Turcott
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Settlement Review Board Members,

This registered voter strongly opposes further litigation of the Microsoft company lawsuit. The MSFT organization has already been unjustly punished considering the enormous positive contributions they have provided to this country and the world at large. I can't begin to imagine where our business would be today without their software tools .

Most of my business friends and associates agree (with me) that anything less than a quick closure on the settlement would be a further travesty of justice, and a complete waste of taxpayers' dollars.

We truly appreciate the opportunity to voice an opinion on this matter. It's as American as the right for companies like Microsoft to develop and build upon their innovations without government intervention stifling their progress.

Respectfully Yours,
James L. Turcott
Vice President Engineering
PDS ENGINEERING
Ph: (206) 767–2773
Fax: (206) 763–4128
E-m: jturcott@pdstech.com
http://www.pdseng.com

MTC–00006528

From: Jeff Erwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:21pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Concerning the ongoing Microsoft anti-trust negotiations, I am finding it harder and harder to watch Microsoft competitors use nine State District Attorneys seeking publicity and glory to get the courts to beat Microsoft to death. It is appalling that our system can be used this way, and I hope the system can react to the obvious and reshape the anti-trust laws so they can't be used as a competitive weapon in the future.

The latest 'negotiations' by the nine objecting States shows clearly that they have no interest in the case itself, they are only interested in appeasing the competition located in their states and continuing to keep themselves in the public spotlight. The fact that they are now demanding that the Microsoft Office suite of applications be ported to non-Windows operating systems shows that they have little understanding of the markets, and no concern for anti-trust laws. The application side of Microsoft's business has never been an issue in this case, including it now as a part of the remedies shows their true colors. Their demand that Microsoft offer a stripped-down version of Windows shows that the nine States have no understanding of the market, the developer issues and the consumer. If there are several different versions of the same Windows release out in the market, the increased burden on companies supplying software to the Windows market is huge. The test issues become much larger, the development tradeoffs impact the levels of functionality the consumer ultimately gets, and all of this will result in higher product costs to the consumer to pay for the additional development and testing needed to make sure an application works on all the different stripped versions.

Please stop this lunacy. Make decisions based on the consumer, not the competition. Do not let the court system be used and abused in this way. Do not let this country's greatest business success story be torn apart by the greedy needs of a few. While Microsoft has been found guilty of monopolistic behavior, it does not deserve this treatment.

Jeff Erwin

MTC–00006529

From: Carol Stephenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement should go forward as quickly as possible. This country needs to be engaging in positive economic activities; prolonging this settlement is clearly a negative. Let's get this behind us.

Carol Stephenson
Grosse Pointe, MI

MTC–00006530

From: APress1932@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is now time to bring the Microsoft Settlement to closure. Do not, repeat, do not string this uncalled for suit out any longer.

Judge, tell the lawyers to go home, and do some public service work and stop trying to ruin an outstanding company and the livelihood of those working for it.

Ancil R Pressley
523 Valhalla Dr
Columbia, SC 29229–3320

MTC–00006531

From: Rick Moe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

Your settlement with Microsoft is just. Thank you. It is now essential that you help Microsoft get back to work. The economy was hurt by this case. It is crucial that the computer industry stop laboring under a cloud of doubt. Planners need to know that the rug will not be pulled from under them as they begin major software projects. Since the DOJ case started, the industry has been damaged. I am very hopeful that this low productivity epoch is now over.

Thank you. Again, please help with the healing.

Richard N. Moe
Software Developer
3077 Lydia Court
Roseville MN 55113

MTC–00006532

From: JMcg654550@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:23pm
Subject: Anti-trust settlement

I urge you to close out once and for all the attack on Microsoft. I am an older consumer and I can tell you unequivocally that I have benefited enormously from the products put out by Microsoft. My first computer cost more that $4500 and was difficult to use. Although I would be considered ''computer illiterate'' I can tell you that there is a lot I can do on my PC thanks to Microsoft's Windows and other innovations. Incidentally, my son uses an Apple at home and at his business so there is plenty of competition. There is also rival operating systems and software that is quite simple to download.

Sincerely,
Jim McGrath

MTC–00006533

From: Jean and Warren Doremus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs/madams:

One of the better pieces of news of the year just past was the announcement that the US Department of Justice and nine states' attorneys-general had reached a settlement in the long, drawn out Microsoft case. The fact that other states which had been suing the software maker decided not to join in the settlement was both disappointing and deplorable.

We believe millions of Americans join us in the belief that the agreement reached by the federal government and the nine states was fair, just, equitable, reasonable, sensible and in the best interests of all parties concerned. There comes a time when common sense should take precedence over endless and mindless miss-use of the legal system. The remaining plaintiffs in what is now clearly an unjustified battle against corporate preeminence appear to be more interested in demonstrating clout in the public arena than in serving the public interest.

These opposing states have had their day in court, at the same time the other plaintiffs did. They are now becoming a renegade minority, clearly out of step with the vast majority of the American populace.

Cannot some court step in here and put an end to this so that the nation's economy has a chance to improve without this cloud hanging over it? We think so. We urge the U S Attorney-General's office take whatever legal steps are necessary and to use its full powers of persuasion to make it happen.

Sincerely,
Warren & Jean Doremus

MTC–00006534

From: the ole trapper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have firmly believed all along, that these detractors of Microsoft in the settlement phase of this action, have no right to deny anyone of building a better mousetrap. Look as the past history of many of our industries, and you will find that someone was ahead of the competition all along. I say ''Enough is enough'' and let Microsoft continue with their innovations.

Nelson Cross
36 Key Lime Dr.
Jensen Beach, FL 34957
''the ole trapper'' aka NELSON CROSS

MTC–00006535

From: Johanna Seth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the currently proposed settlement is a fair and just decision. I do not

want this settlement to go back to court for further argument. Microsoft's penalties are fair and will benefit consumers. Further argument, prolonging the settlement, is a threat to our national economy and should not be undertaken.

Johanna Seth
14860–16 Summerlin Woods
Fort Myers, FL 33919.

MTC–00006536

From: bfoertsch@omninow.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has been a powerful influence on American technology. As the CEO of a previous software company that failed due to too many operating systems to support I applaud MSFT's continued support of the burgeoning industry. The justice department should spend our tax dollars chasing the Chinese and other pirating nations who steal our technology and our revenues rather than belittle a company who provides America with a tremendous technological advantage.

Sincerely
Bryan Foertsch

MTC–00006538

From: MikeMayer1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

We are a user and developer of applications for the MS Windows Operation Systems (OS). We are concerned that our business may be damaged by a judgement that may restrict MS ability to develop state of the art applications and operation systems and to price their products competitively. Any judgement should not be centered around any damage settlement based on the consumer because the consumer has not be injured by MS. The states and the consumers should not be given any cash. MS has provided lower cost products that have saved us and the consumer money. This may not be appreciated by their competitors, but that is just tough (this is a free country).

In our opinion, the judgement should centered around making the MS operating systems more open so that all developers and users have an equal opportunity to develop applications for the MS operation systems and use their existing applications. Not to restrict what features or applications MS can bundle with their operating systems.

Also, the judgement should require MS to allow users to use and purchase the older MS operation systems for eternity or at least 10 years. Upgrading to new MS operating systems should not be required when a new computer is purchased.

Thank you,
Mike Mayer, President
Sima Engineering, Inc.

MTC–00006540

From: santilli
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoftr settlement hearing 01–28–02

I agree that Microsoft settlement is good for states, the industry and the American economy. Get this settlement done!!!

R.E. Santillie
736 Skyview Rd.
Mount Shasta, CA 96067
530–926–4328
santilli@snowcrest.net

MTC–00006541

From: Alyrpal@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:25pm
Subject: It's time to stop trying to destroy Microsoft Co.

Please stop this abusive use of the judicial system to destroy a free enterprise company. The states that will not accept the settlement are not working in the public interest in my opinion. I ask you as a citizen and computer user to put an end to this costly and time consuming process and proceed to new areas of public monopoly. Thank you for listening to me on this subject.

Albert S. Greenberg
617 Cliff Drive
Aptos CA. 95003
831–684–2430 Ph.
831–684–2436 Fax

MTC–00006542

From: Nancy Reid
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:25pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I urge Congressional support of the Tunney Act.

MTC–00006543

From: Lowell Dunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:00pm
Subject: MSFT settlement.

Dear Sirs;

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions and thoughts. Please settle this case and lets take all the time and the money that this case has taken from the United States, the people , the company and go on with our lives. The terms of the settlement are very just and fair and in the end there will be good taken out of this. Microsoft will be watched and will not be allowed to practice unfair business practices.

Please do not allow nine states to cost our government, people and the future any more time and money. Living in the Northeast during these trying times there are more important things in life to worry about.

Thank you,
Kathleen Dunn.
20 Henderson Court
Pompton Lakes, New Jersey 07442

MTC–00006544

From: Robert Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!!

As a long term citizen and one who is concerned about the future of my country, I would like to take this time to congratulate you in the DOJ for your decision to settle the subject case. However I would also like to inform you that based on the technical understanding of the ''software'' world, there should never have been a case in the first place. Only a Janet Reno under pressure from the Massachusetts political fascist from that state would yield to such idiocy. Let this be a lesson to the slope head people in Washington that there is nothing to be gained by picking sides in a technical economic fight, we are all losers when that occurs.

Sincerely;
Robert E. Smith
1850 Hillyard Drive
Clarkston, WA 99403–3034

MTC–00006545

From: LGALLISON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree that a settlement as soon as possible is in the best interest for the state's economy and the public interest. As one of Washington State's recently unemployed, I can see the economic uncertainty first hand. The number of jobs, particularly in the high tech area has shrunken considerably.

I am concerned about my investments, as well.

Leanne Gallison
lgallison@aol.com

MTC–00006546

From: Onalee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a business person and US citizen, I feel the whole idea of Microsoft charged in this matter is ABSURD—I think that Bill Gates should stop selling all Microsoft products in the USA for while and see what happens to business and industry—I'll bet a settelement much better (for Microsoft) would be reached by the DOJ in a BIG HURRY! Settle this—it is a huge waste of taxpayers money and time!!!

Onalee Israel
226a Benes Road
Brooksville, FL 34604
onalee@aol.com

MTC–00006547

From: MCPHERS@Nationwide.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For years Microsoft has set the standard for the rest of the technology industry to follow. Their sustained excellence has created opportunities for consumers, of all economic strata, to access and leverage PC technology as well as the internet. As a result of this excellence, consumers and American business have embraced Microsoft products as the industry standard. It seems the only factions reluctant to do so are Microsoft's direct competitors, as well as legislators beholden to these special interest groups.

The U.S. Department of Justice has agreed to a settlement, that, by all accounts, will further extend technological benefits to groups that were heretofore somewhat limited in their ability to access these benefits. It's my understanding the settlement also requires Microsoft release ''trade secrets'' to its' competitors. Still, there are those who feel that the settlement is inequitable. My feeling is that those opposed will not be satisfied until the company is

broken up. Only under such conditions will these underperformers be able to compete in the marketplace and that, of course, is their ultimate goal, to turn a profit. Since they can't do it under the American system of business, they will try to do so by crying ''foul''.

Make no mistake, those in support of extending this action have only their own self-interests at heart and they are asking taxpayers to foot the bill for their attempts to realize these interests. I for one am tired of it. This ''suit'' has gone on long enough. The cost to the parties involved far exceeds any benefit consumers will ever receive. I urge you to put an end to these proceedings as well as this pattern of catering to the lowest common denominator. Your failure to do so runs contra to everything our country was founded on.

The above commentary is personal in nature and in no way represents the views of Nationwide Insurance or any of it's affiliates.

Sincerely,

Scott J. McPherson

MTC–00006548

From: Tom Dunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Public Comment:

While I do not consider myself any friend of Microsoft or their predatory business practices that have often run counter to consumer interests, I also do not consider myself an advocate of our increasingly litigious society. Particularly regarding the obscenely inflated legal fees that both sides charge. The consumer is invariably the loser and the lawyers the hands down winners.

In regard to Microsoft, as this email alleges, this complex settlement is tough on the company, but acceptable, and favorable to Microsoft's continuing service to their customers. This seems fair to all concerned. Especially if the Tunney Act will bring an end to expensive litigation. My question is will the settlement involve some sort of Consent Decree that will permit oversight of the companies operations over a period of time? Merely as a form of insurance for consumer interest. I recently came across a letter to the editor I wrote several years ago about Microsoft's suing a small used bookstore in this area for selling unauthorized software. In that letter, I mentioned seeing originally packaged software for resale there, which was perfectly legal. I also mentioned how all previous versions of a Microsoft mysteriously disappeared simultaneously from all area stores. Manufacturer buy back was the only explanation, probably at a better retailer rate of return than previous versions would command. While there may not be anything technically illegal about such practices, they certainly favor Microsoft's bottom line over public consumer interest. I would like to see such practices (among others) discouraged by the settlement with at least as much vehemence as the company would pursue it's interests.

Thank you,

Thomas F. Dunn Jr.
1993 S. Buena Vista Drive
Apache Junction, Arizona 85220–7567
email: tdunnsprint@earthlink.net
(480) 982–5640

MTC–00006549

From: FORETEN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am in agreement with Microsoft. It's time to settle this lawsuit. It's starting to look like the IBM suite that took over ten years.

Michael J. Bonfield

MTC–00006550

From: CJGX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:27pm
Subject: MSN Settlement

The technology area is changing so quickly that the original charges are not relevant today. Drop the case and stop spending our tax $$$. There is plenty of competition.

Chuck

MTC–00006551

From: Bob (038) Lucy Andre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I have been a user of personal computers since they became popular in the 1980's. During this time I have witnessed the progression of the software from my time in the Air Force and also from working in the U.S. Govt.

I have followed the case against Microsoft since its beginning and feel that the current settlement is fair to me as a consumer of software products.

Please settle this case as soon as possible in order that we can get this behind us for the consumers good, the good of the industry and for the good of the United States as a Country.

Thank You,
Robert B. Andre,
2920 Cedarwood Lane,
Dunkirk Md. 20754

MTC–00006552

From: GREGRUFFA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:29pm
Subject: MicroSoft Comment

To whom it may concern at the DOJ,

We are small group of users of Microsoft products for more than 15 years. We have been reading many recent newspaper accounts regarding the case against Microsoft. Although the competition is purple with rage because they can't come up with better products, they are green with envy at the continued march forward into technology advancements that Microsoft has made for the world to use.

Of course, factor of fairness is always important, but they were not fair when they hired government officials to pose the exaggerated charges to block their successes. While many of those very same companies benefit from the new markets and innovative ideas, they want to use the Microsoft ideas in their markets against them. When they fail, they cry.

Microsoft has had products and software stolen, pirated and then slandered. Yes, I think Microsoft should be given a clean slate with the warnings regarding their marketing strategies. Monopoly? I would look closer at AOL.

Thank You,
Gregory Ruffa

MTC–00006553

From: Steven Groubert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the interest of fair play, please allow the settlement to proceed as agreed.

All the best,
Steven Groubert

MTC–00006554

From: Paul McConnell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I understand that the proposed settlement of the Microsoft litigation is now in a public comment period as required by the Tunney Act. As a taxpayer, I strongly urge you to settle this absurd lawsuit as soon as possible and quit wasting the public's money. In my opinion, the suit was originally brought as a political payoff to Microsoft's competitors. I use Microsoft products everyday and could not be near as productive as I am without them. As a consumer of their products, I certainly do not feel in any way abused by their alleged ''predatory practices''.

The courts should also shut down the grandstanding state attorney generals that had to stick their nose into something they had no business pursuing. Why don't they just stick with tobacco litigation and other forms of legal extortion.

Paul McConnell
(407) 876–7249
Paul@McConnellCompany.com

MTC–00006555

From: Manny Bellmore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a resident of the State of Maryland and a US citizen. I depend on computers to earn a living and run a small business. I am an interested citizen with respect to the proposed settlement between Microsoft, the Department of Justice and several of the states.

In my opinion, the proposed settlement is in the best interest of myself and many other consumers. I am delighted that the State of Maryland (my home state) is one of the states that support the proposed settlement.

Thank you for taking public comment into consideration.

Sincerely,
Mandell Bellmore
3609 Woodvalley Drive
Baltimore, MD 212081733
Phone (410) 486–1092
E-Mail bmb600@home.com

MTC–00006556

From: Norman Pawlan
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We are of the opinion that Microsoft has offered a satisfactory settlement.

We expressed the same opinion by Email to the Calif. Attorney General, but he evidently felt that it was to his POLITICAL advantage to pursue Microsoft.

We are non professional computer users. We have received several Microsoft items at no charge, or postage only, or full rebate. How bad is that? Monopoly?

I am a volunteer reader/tutor at a poor school in a tough neighborhood of Los Angeles. Microsoft's offer of computers and equipment to schools such as the one where I work would be a WONDERFUL tool in helping these deprived children to ''catch up'' with the rest of Los Angeles.

Most of the classrooms have ONE old computer for 20 to 30 students.

Norman Pawlan
June Pawlan
2222 Avenue of Stars
Los Angeles, CA. 90067–5655

MTC–00006557

From: Kit Welsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DOJ,

PLEASE STOP PROSECUTING MICROSOFT AND START PROSECUTING THE REAL MONOPOLISTS, OPEC.

WE SHOULD INITIATE THE FORMATION OF THE ORGANIZATION OF PETROLEUM IMPORTING STATES (OPIC) TO DENY GOODS TO OPEC COUNTRIES. THIS WOULD MAKE A BIGGER DIFFERENCE TO THE CONSUMER AND THE ECONOMY THAN PURSUING MICROSOFT.

I CREDIT MICROSOFT FOR MUCH OF THE BOOM TIMES OF THE 90'S BECAUSE THEY, MORE THAN ANYONE ELSE, CAUSED AN OVERALL INCREASE IN PRODUCTIVITY. OIL PRICE DECLINES ALSO CONTRIBUTED MUCH TO THE LOW INFLATION.

THE SAME COULD BE TRUE AGAIN IF WE COULD BUST UP OPEC, NOT MICROSOFT. LEAVE THEM ALONE AND THEY WILL DISCOVER NEW WAYS TO INCREASE OUR PRODUCTIVITY.

I, FOR ONE, BUY MICROSOFT PRODUCTS BECAUSE I KNOW THEY WILL WORK TOGETHER.

PLEASE DON'T BREAK THEM UP SO THEIR PRODUCTS WILL NO LONGER WORK TOGETHER.

SINCERELY,
HARRY W. WELSCH, JR.
(KIT WELSCH)
BOX 1820
ANNA MARIA, FL 34216
941–778–5230 VOICE
941–778–7229 FAX

MTC–00006558

From: Bob Deneen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Quit and Fair Settlement
To: US Department of Justice
Re: Microsoft
Date: 1/02/02

This entire case has been a sham and a black eye on American justice, let alone the concept of free enterprise. When the courts attempt to solve business issues between competitors—without consideration of consumers—our country is in serious trouble.

I am a computer user since 1980—before Windows and PCs and before Microsoft solved the major obstacle to easier and user-friendly operation of personal computers. IBM was smart to incorporate it as a universal operating system. Microsoft later enhanced the value and benefits to users with Windows—and with Internet Explorer to mimic Windows. Why would a user not want these systems to be compatible and user-friendly?

If the Justice Department finds Microsoft guilty, will this mean that I can demand that Ford put a General Motors engine in my next car? Why can't I demand different raisins in my cereal? Yet, with Microsoft, the user always has the option to remove or change or ignore features or additions? I don't understand your reasoning?

Please explain to the public exactly what Microsoft did wrong. Other than enrage its competitors with its arrogant attitude, consumers have not been harmed. If arrogance is a crime, when will law suits be brought against attorneys, judges, and politicians?

No system has improved or challenged Windows or Internet Explorer as being better! Exactly how did Microsoft's harm consumers? Answer: Not at all

What prevented competitors from countering with better solutions? Answer: Nothing.

How did this evolve? Answer: Political influence and money.

Why are the state attorneys general making claims? Answer: Pure greed.

Historians will link this case to the start of the current recession. The ''terrorism'' within our justice system is a greater than any threat from outside of our nation. The only settlement that will do our country and consumers good is to throw this case out of court.

Sincerely,
Robert N. Deneen
Independent and private citizen, unaffiliated with any organization.
(I hope it is not now a crime to speak freely?)

MTC–00006559

From: heroldra@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I strongly support the proposed settlement as is. Enough is enough. Too much money and resources have already been wasted on this ilconceived effort to stifle true competition in the marketplace. Litigation aids only trial attournies and seldom if ever benefits the buying public.

MTC–00006560

From: Joe Cerrato
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Alright already! Settle this case regarding Microsoft. Your efforts to prosecute this company for trying to do what business does, to wit: make money is getting ridiculous. Furthermore it has put a damper on the stock market. As Microsoft goes, so goes the market.

Joe Cerrato
Texarkana, Texas

MTC–00006561

From: Lewis Stepp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
2477 Fairgrove Court
Cincinnati, OH 45244
January 2, 2002
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530–0001

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am writing you to submit comments about the antitrust settlement against Microsoft (United States v. Microsoft Corp., Civil No. 98–1232) pursuant to the Tunney Act. I am a retired US citizen and a software user whose only links with Microsoft are 400 shares of stock in my IRA retirement account. Before retirement, I was an information technology consultant for Computer Sciences Corporation and Spherion Corporation.

I appreciate the excellent operating system and office software that Microsoft has created and how their products have contribution to jobs in the information technology sector and to increased efficiency throughout the business sector. Microsoft was not known as a monopolist when they introduced the Windows operating system. Indeed, they had some formidable competitors and they ''bet the company'' on development and marketing of an innovative new operating system and other office software. They won the market because they offered ''world class'' software at an affordable price with consumer benefits and features that no one else matched. For several years, I was a subscriber to the Microsoft Developer Network (MSDN) which, as a systems consultant, provided me with lower cost software and better training than was available from any other software vendor.

Microsoft customers and stockholders have been the beneficiaries of Microsoft's success. Microsoft competitors and some of their customers may have suffered, but that is the nature of our enterprise system. It is not something for which Microsoft should now be punished. Indeed, Microsoft is deserving of public respect for developing and providing a low cost ''standard'' operating system that has enabled large numbers of software developers to bring significant networking and productivity improvements to our lives and to our economy.

In a recent meeting of the Senate Judicial Committee, the court rulings were interpreted to say that Microsoft ''did in fact violate anti-trust laws and did hurt the market place''. It may be true that Microsoft was an ''overzealous competitor'' who, in a very competitive situation, did harm its competitors to an extent that violated some laws, but it is obvious to most software users

that they did not hurt the software market place. Indeed, Microsoft's development of an advanced and broadly accepted PC operating system brought swift changes to the software market and grew the market. The improvements that they brought to PC operating systems are remarkable compared to the much less friendly and text oriented PC operating systems previously introduced by IBM and others. As a result, almost everyone today is able to be a computer and software user.

Based on a misguided interpretation of the court rulings, a member of the Senate Judicial Committee stated that Microsoft actions resulted in the effective destruction of Netscape and Java. Yet Netscape was sold to AOL for billions of dollars and Java is still a popular programming language supported by many major vendors such as Borland and Sun. A version of the Netscape browser was always available for free. In its formation years, Netscape developed many competitors who also offered their products for free. Every operating system eventually included a free browser. It is reasonable for the court and public to question if there ever was a true browser market. The district judge in the Microsoft case said that there was no evidence that Java would be successful as an alternative ''platform'' to the Windows operating system. Indeed, time may prove that Java was a flawed concept. The prophecy of competitors should not be considered fact. The Judicial Committee questioned if the settlement was in the public interest. Certainly the public wants to see this case settled. The current district judge asked the parties to work night and day to reach a settlement. Mr. James, from the Justice department, has indicated that the settlement goes beyond the court rulings to include other restraints on Microsoft that would not prevail in a court decision since they were not considered in the trial. These include restraints on server operating systems for which Microsoft does not possess monopoly power. Only Microsoft competitors, not the public, want more.

The Justice Department and Microsoft have reached a fair settlement in this case. Microsoft needs to move forward and to continue serving its customers and stockholders. There is no justification for the courts to continue to investigate and punish Microsoft when there are other companies and market place problems that need greater attention in our legal system, such as the Enron debacle.

The court made a wise decision not to dismantle Microsoft. According to a recent Wall Street Journal article, the U.S. Postal Service revenues are more than those of Microsoft, McDonald's and Coca Cola combined. No one wants to dismantle the U.S. Postal Service simply because it operates as a monopoly or protects its monopoly. We need a universal standard operating system for our computers in much the same way that we need a universal standard mail service for our homes and business. I hope that this case can conclude without destruction of one of the most innovative and successful American companies. We only wish that the US Postal Service was equally innovative and efficient.

Sincerely,
Lewis Stepp
CC:senator—dewine_dewine.senate.gov@inetgw

MTC–00006562

From: Bgallusa@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

In my opinion de current basically agreed settlement is already more harsh than Microsoft deserves. As a long term Microsoft customer I think that the computer industry would have been in a poor shape without their standardizing and market domination effort. All de main Microsoft competitors that lobbyed for this lawsuit had or have in their marketing strategy as the main goal to dominate the market. All have failed because of poor products, greed and poor marketing. Only Microsoft has delivered a good product for a rather low price and that's the main reason of their succes.

I like to request you to get this bad (for the development of the IT market) and painful (the enormous amounts for this legal case and the waste of time of all involved) situation resolved and to accept Microsoft's settlement.

Sincerely,
Ben Gall
900 Warrior Road
Malvern, PA 19355
tel. 610–889–0244

MTC–00006563

From: doczell@prodigy.net
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/2/02 3:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To: Department of Justice

Recommend that settlement be concluded with Microsoft Corp. in accordance with existing terms. This process has gone on long enough. Microsoft is one to the premier companies in the land and should be congratulated for their achievements rather that being condemned.It is in the public interest public interest to settle the litigation as soon as possible so that American can keep ''on rolling''.

MTC–00006564

From: TJohn66242@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Settlemeant

The settlement is fair and prolonging it only helps trial lawyers and not the American people or U.S.A.

Sincerely,
John E. Traber

MTC–00006565

From: THIESENTO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:32pm
Subject: Settlement

Gentlemen,

As a retired teacher I've been very interested in the progress of the trial and I believe the settlement which has been reached will benefit all the children of the United States. I hope that you agree and bring this trial to a speedy and equitable solution.

Sincerely,
Tom Thiesen

MTC–00006566

From: Glenord77@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer of computers and computer softwear, I wish to comment on the Microsoft issue. I have never had any problem obtaining the computer or softwear that I wished to purchase. Regardless of brand name, I have had no problem buying the products that best serve my purposes in the computer field.

I suggest to anyone who does have difficulties in this area to shop around a bit and he/she will readily find the product needed to do the best job for them.

I strongly believe that 99.99% of the alledged problems with Microsoft is politically and financially motivated rather than a problem with the marketing of a product itself. Therefore, in my opinion, settlement hearing is unnecessary and the whole case should be dismissed so that everyone can get back to the business of making better things for us consumers to buy.

Stop wasting our money and enriching the lawyer hawks hovering about this issue.

Ed Arnold
2820 Boulder Ave.
Billings Mt 59102

MTC–00006567

From: James Scheil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case as is and as soon as possible.

Thank You,
Ken & Charline Scheil

MTC–00006568

From: ELCEL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: (no subject)

I am in favor of Microsoft in the settlement. Why stand in the way of innovation and creativity. Other companies have the same opportunity as Microsoft—why should they be penalized?

MTC–00006569

From: rketover1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I belive the settlement currently on the table is fair and reasonable to all parties. While no one will walk away ''pain free'', the settlement should be accepted by the the invovled litigants.

Richard Ketover
Boca Raton, FL

MTC–00006570

From: Jim Rejzek
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Setlement

To whom it may concern,

It is time to close this litigation against Microsoft. The settlement reached appears

fair, although I have concerns as to why the government would even take on Microsoft to begin with, but that is now another story. The events of 9 11 should put this case into perspective as to where our interests (the peoples) and efforts should lay. Thank you.

J.G.Rejzek
San Antonio

MTC–00006571

From: Bob Ballard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to stop this constant pounding of Microsoft. This is my first appeal to the government to conclude it's participation in a troubling national debate about one of the most successful technologies we Americans lead the world with Microsoft, IBM and many other USA companies. I'm a Microsoft home user after retiring from forty years and many different companies in the computer industry. I never worked for Microsoft, but I've been a user of their software in business and at home for twenty years.

Sure it's been tough migrating Microsoft Operating Systems through the years, but it's been tough with IBM also. I was with a computer company which was a direct competitor of IBM in the 1960's. After all the complaining, litigations and negative national attention IBM came out on top. I never worked for IBM either, but they succeeded because they served their customers well with the best products and services money can buy and they are still the world leader. Good for us Americans. As far as us Microsoft's customers like me who just bought a new Dell PC and laptop with Microsoft's new XP Home OS preinstalled, we're on a ''roll'' with Microsoft and many other company products which came with my new PC purchases. Good for us Americans again.

Bob Ballard

MTC–00006572

From: Fred Boyd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I wish to express my support for the proposed settlement agreement in the Microsoft case. Prompt resolution of this case is in the best interest of the consumers of Microsoft products.

Fred Boyd

MTC–00006573

From: DOWGUY99@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I think the Microsoft suit should be settled asap. It has gone on long enough. Fine the company for past actions and lets get this behind us. The current recession, war, and mass layoffs are clear indicators that the government needs to take every action possible to help get the economy moving again. A quick settlement would be good for the economy and the stock market.

CC:upham@us.ibm.com@inetgw

MTC–00006574

From: Mike Fisher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

Just who has Microsoft harmed? Certainly not the personal computer using public. Microsoft is the guiding software operating system that enabled the affordable personal computer worldwide to even exist. I believe the Anti-trust case that was brought by the Justice Depart- ment during the Clinton Administration that was influenced by Microsoft competitors close to Bill Clinton who was repaying campaign contributors. And at the same time ''shaking down'' Microsoft for donations.

This should never happen in the United States.

Regards,
Mike Fisher
P.O. Box 216395
Sacramento, CA 95821

MTC–00006575

From: Gwd96@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:34pm
Subject: Mirosoft Settlement

I have been asked to voice my opinion on the above subject.....

I guess I don't understand why our government (the DOJ) wants to stick their nose into a company that is not only one of the most successful in the history of business but also a company whose products and services have changed the world—FOR THE BETTER!

Why doesn't the DOJ go out and locate all the drug dealers, murderers and other criminals in the US and stay out of the way of innovative companies like Mircosoft!

MTC–00006576

From: jim pauline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Come on, enough is enough. The states think they can get another win fall like they did with tabaco, but let's face it, mMicrosoft has done more for the economy in the last 10 years than any other american company. Let's get the settlement over.

Thank You,
jim pauline

MTC–00006577

From: joseph bria
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:34pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Enough is Enough. I dont believe the Market would have held up the way it did if it not were for Microsolf. This settlement is more then fair and should be settled as soon as possible.

MTC–00006578

From: Turnbull
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case! Further legal battles are helping only the attorneys and doing nothing for the consumer and costing the taxpayers money. SETTLE!!!

D. L. Turnbull

MTC–00006579

From: Don (038) Mary Felice
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a recently retired Software Engineer who has been in the computer industry since 1960. I am amazed at the fact that the government has continued with this suit against Microsoft. MS has not harmed users. Competitors have a problem with MS because they have not built ''a better mousetrap''. MS has introduced standards that make the user's life so much easier. Does anyone remember how difficult it was to install a product pre MS? MS came from behind with a Word Processor and then made better innovations so that they outstripped WordPerfect just as WordPerfect had outstripped Word Star previously. This is the American way. MS did not have the first Internet Browser but they built a better product. Why are they being penalized for that? Can you even begin to calculate how the economy has advanced because of MS? Can you even begin to calculate how many new jobs there in the entire computer industry because of MS. Would there be such a proliferation of PCs in homes and offices if MS had not been in the game.

The government's job is to protect consumers not competitors. Let Sun, AOL and they rest of them make a better product. Then they will not have to worry about MS. It should not be the government's job to help the competition.

Mary Felice
mrif44@peganet.com

MTC–00006580

From: WendReil@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to express my belief that the Justice Department should allow Microsoft to proceed with the settlement as currently arranged. Capitalism depends upon the government intervening as little as possible in the affairs of American business, it needs to protect workers, the environment and our nation. These are not the issues with the settlement. The settlement should proceed. American businesses should be encouraged to innovate.

I have no affiliation to Microsoft.

Thank you,
Wendy Reilly
wendreil@aol.com

MTC–00006581

From: Sean Butler-Lee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sir/madam,

I'm contacting you to express my opinion on the proposed settlement relating to the ongoing antitrust case against Microsoft.

I feel that the proposed settlement is both fair and just, and allows Microsoft to continue to drive the computing market forward into new technologies without

restricting OEM partners and suchlike to limiting and excessive licensing contracts. It also allows third-party developers the opportunity to create products with extensive interaction with the Windows operating system and the functionality of said, without having to work out for themselves the complex and confusing code structures of the protocols and standards employed by Windows. It also avoids forcing Microsoft into a situation where they are no longer able to develop products which integrate fully with Windows by giving the end user full control over what they install, together with allowing the end user to disable any functionality which they find unnecessary or excessive.

In all, I feel this settlement is fair to both parties concerned.

Yours faithfully,
Sean Butler-Lee

MTC–00006582

From: Ed Hepner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft dragging on litigation

Please wind up this misidrected anti-trust lawsuit against Microsoft. The consumer has benefitted from Microsoft Innovation through lower prices and greater choices. I am one of them.

Ed Hepner,
Newport Beach, California

MTC–00006583

From: CAROL J. TODD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Troubles

Just get over it. Let Microsoft alone. The government has greater worries now.

Carol Todd
cjtodd@juno.com

MTC–00006584

From: Michel Laureano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Yo he cre?do en la tecnolog?a de Microsoft, sus productos me han brindado trabajo, conocimientos, superaci?n profesional y personal; A mi familia y a mi sociedad le hacen falta compa??as como Microsoft, en todo el mundo es un ejemplo de alta calidad.

A nuestras escuelas, estudiantes y empresas las ha apoyado.

Es el momento de apoyar y ayudar para que Microsoft Corporation sea la Compa??a de todos en el mundo entero.

Si otras compa??as siguen el ejemplo de mi familia y mi sociedad que son apoyados por las tecnolog?as de Microsoft Corporation, entonces tendremos un mundo diferente e inteligente.

Gracias.
Atentamente,
Michel Hamlet Laureano Luna
Ciudad de Mĭ≤xico, Mĭ≤xico.
Tel. 52763819

MTC–00006585

From: Jack Ray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen and Ladies of Congress.

Enough is enough is enough.

The settlement that has been rendered between all parties, except for a few states, is fair and reasonable.

When the Justice Department got the Judicial System to impose penalties on Microsoft, it commenced the recession that the country is now experiencing. It provided and changed the ''wheels of justice'' to what has become a ''vindictive wheel of destruction''. This event coupled with the simultaneous actions of Mr. Greenspan raising the economies interest rates at the same time to head off an ''Imaginary Inflation Rate''. He said he was doing this so the country's economy will come in for a ''So Called Soft Landing'', however created the ''window of destruction'' for the economy, jobs for people, and havoc among Americans whose life savings disappeared and industries laying off hundreds of thousands of people.

What a Christmas present the American People got as the country moved into the CY2000, still continued into CY 2001, and it is still upon us in CY 2002. Partisan elected people of Congress are not affected but the lower and middle class of Americans are suffering while you are bickering. I recommend the punishment stop against Microsoft and be initiated against the oil companies who manage to control monopolize and control gas and diesel prices at the pumps every time a middle eastern country burps.

Now that is Monopolistic. Settle this case and let us get the country back on the road of innovation Freedom without corruption. The American People can make their choice at the ballot box or at the Cash Registers. Get people back to work or the economy is going to ''tank''.

Jack Ray
hawkmsl@earthlink.net
Huntsville Alabama

MTC–00006586

From: Michael Shaw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

When one hears politicians speak of 'public interest' one wonders whether or not we are speaking of the same 'public.' It seems that some regard the only public as those who reside in the government supplied housing within the beltways. Another view is that the 'interest' means the money paid on principal...or in the case of many in Congress, the money paid for 'principle.'

Regardless, the continued barrage of litigation directed toward Microsoft is an affront to me and anyone who has really thought this issue through. Microsoft has done more to propel the economy of the USA than any company in history. The fact that Mr. Gate, et al, have built a better mousetrap and that the PEOPLE of the USA buy their product as opposed to other products, is part of what we like to think is the 'Free Enterprise System.'

Please stop spending our tax dollars on a process penalizing a company for excellence and achievement.

By the way, I don't own any stock in Microsoft, I am not employed by Microsoft, nor have I ever received any monetary benefit from Microsoft. But like millions of people Worldwide, I have benefited from their products immeasurably and I am grateful for their continued dedication on the cutting edge of our collective futures. Keep up the great work Microsoft.

Respectfully
Michael Shaw
mshaw6@gte.net

MTC–00006587

From: Sandi Boston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:37pm
Subject: Settle with Microsoft

Please settle with Microsoft so we have no more litigation. I think the economy has been hurt enough by the DOJ's suit against Microsoft. Enough is enough....

Sandra M. Boston
A registered voter from Ohio

MTC–00006588

From: Buecheler, Eric
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough....Get on with the settlement—the last thing we at this time in our country's history is to prolong this case any longer. Get it over with and start focusing on all the other problems this country has since Sept 11.

Thank you
Eric Buecheler
Navigation Technologies
408–617–5059

MTC–00006589

From: JWongCCIM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

The proposed settlement with Microsoft is fair and should be accepted. It is time for America and the software-tech industry to get back to business.

Thank you.
Jason Wong, CCIM
Crestline Properties, L.C.
3441 E. Speedway Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85716
520–326–3151 Telephone
520–795–3411 Fax

MTC–00006590

From: Cole Rowland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I urge you approve the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case. I am an individual who uses Microsoft products and while they occasionally have a bug, I think that the company does a fine job. In this very uncertain economic time, it is very important to settle this case and allow one of the few strong companies in the computer industry to get on with its business.

Cole Rowland
711 Mariner
Austin, TX 78734

MTC–00006591

From: Earl Faylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my very strong opinion that the Microsoft case has had very little to do with the consumer. The consumer has enjoyed the wonderful accomplishments and innovations from Microsoft, and the computing world owes this company a great deal of thanks and praise. I want this to be settled now; I want this to end now; I want Microsoft to be free to continue developing all of its products because it is a great benefit to me, the consumer. I have not been harmed; I have benefitted greatly. Microsoft's competitors are the problem. They have cried and whined to every politician that would listen, and it is time for that to stop. Please leave this amazing company alone. Yes, place your curbs and restrictions on them, and then let them do what they do best. Get them out of court and back into the laboratory of research and development.

Competitors may have been harmed because they lost the competition for certain products. That is the nature of competition. Some win and some lose. The consumer has not been hurt by Microsoft; the consumer has been hurt by the anti-trust proceedings. Stop, stop, stop. I want to think about computing and the next steps that Microsoft will lead us to take for the best interests of computing. I do not want to think about the next sour grapes complaint by the competition. The sour grapes is because Microsoft is better at competing and producing great products. This is not to be regulated by the government. This is regulated by me the consumer that buys the better products. This is the regulation that governs business, and it works if everyone simply continues competing. I have been buying the better products, and that is what I will keep doing. I am the consumer, and I have not been hurt. Let me repeat this one final time: I am the consumer and I have not been hurt.

Yours truly,
Earl Faylor
4604 South 170th Street
SeaTac, WA 98188
206–248–8870

MTC–00006592

From: Paul Fieberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop wasting our money and your credibility by continuing to attack a profitable company that provides jobs, useful technology and makes a meaningful difference in the way we live. Haven't you been listening to what the people want? Move on to the important things, please.

Continued Success,
Paul H. Fieberg

MTC–00006593

From: MOLITUO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I want to say so much, perhaps too much! Instead I shall offer a number of sentences, keeping them as brief as possible:

(1) As a consumer, I want all manufacturers of the products I purchase to enjoy the freedom to make those products better for me, without the jeopardy of Big Brother Interference!

(2) As a reader of multiple articles on this endless government harassment of Microsoft, I have concluded simply that a number of companies [all of whom share some specific monopolistic piece of the pie] turned to Government Officials to hamper and hammer Microsoft when this cadre of companies decided they could not defeat Microsoft in a marketplace controlled by the long-standing principles of the American Economic System! Like a child who decides not to slug it out with his nasty classmate; but to go home to summon his ''big'' brother to do the fighting for him!

(3) As a past student of some psychology courses, I think that Jealousy has had too much to do with this legal pursuit of a premier company. The multibillionaires in control of the ''offended corporations'' are envious of the astounding success of the richest! Even the Federal and State Governments fall prey to the venom of jealousy seeing what a well-organized and truly innovative Corporation can achieve; while these governmental entities prove largely feckless to their tasks and reckless with taxpayers' money in the process!

(4) In view of Judge Jackson's relentless pursuit of Microsoft and his self-declared antagonism for its officers, it bedazzles me that the Court of Appeals would uphold his Findings as unprejudiced and valid! The fact that he may have declared his belligerence toward Microsoft only subsequent to Court Proceedings cannot distract a thoughtful individual from the fact that those belligerent statements revealed his mindset and opinion throughout the entire course of this legal saga!

(5) By upholding the Jackson Findings, the Court of Appeals covered the ''behind'' of the Judiciary System; but, in its attempt to protect the Honor of that System, it failed to do true Justice! Could the Judges not see -or did they see but pretend not to see- that hostile statements made by Judges against Principals in their Courts display for the world not a ''new prejudice'' against a defendant just now judged to be guilty? Simple chronology cannot be invoked to defend a long-standing, vindictive attitude and mindset that dishonor the very Judiciary System the Court of Appeals tried so hard to protect. Despite obvious partiality on the part of the Trial Judge -obvious at least to ordinary laypeople—virtually all his condemnatory Findings were upheld!

(6) The slap on Judge Jackson's hand did not achieve Justice! The Jackson Findings were mortally flawed through and through by the prejudices of a judge who is paid to be unprejudiced! The rejection of a split-up of Microsoft as a remedy was too obvious, really, even to have taken up the Appeal Court's time! Judge Jackson had wrongly escalated his proceedings far beyond the scope of the suit itself. As a matter of fact, the essence of the case against Microsoft, ie. the bundling, was found by the Court of Appeals in Microsoft's favor! How can a man accused of murder be declared guilty of murder if he is shown to be an adulterer? How can a company accused of illegal bundling -and the finding of illegal bundling is subsequently overruled- be required to pay damages because it had bad business manners?

(7) We are faced now with a New World of Commerce! Competition is no longer valued as the arbiter of corporate success or failure. Now Government and the Judiciary are to be given carte-blanche to police and to punish those corporations that have the temerity to be TOO SUCCESSFUL FOR THEIR COMPETITORS' LIKING!

Thank you.
Nicholas S. Molinari
31 Whitman Street
Brick, NJ 08724–2448
732–458–8485
molituo@aol.com

MTC–00006594

From: jpagency
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough, accept the settlement and let us all get along with our jobs and businesses. Frankly, without Microsoft we could not run our business.

Thank you.
Joel Polin

MTC–00006595

From: AndyLolos1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:40pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think that the settlement is more than enough, when really no harm was done to the consumers.

Andy Lolos

MTC–00006596

From: Pat Huber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

i believe we should resolve this debate by accepting this settlement and moving forward. too many people, including political leaders, are spending way too much time rehashing these issues. let's mvoe forward, and start trying to resolve more important issues, such as tax reduction stimulus package, finding bin laden and friends, and reviving the economy.

sincerely,
pat huber

MTC–00006597

From: GSta227586@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle case now and stop the wasting of any more money....

Gordon Stanley

MTC–00006598

From: TERRY READER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:43pm
Subject: Stop the Lawyer's extortion Salary

DOJ,

It' time to put the Microsoft suit to bed. This is another one of the '' make Lawyers rich schemes'' with no real justification for punishing a solid company that produces a product that people want and competitors are not able to compete with technically or in the open market. Call a halt to this stupid suit. Save me money, I'm tired of seeing my hard earned tax money going to some greedy lawyer.

Charles T. Reader, Jr.
Scottsdale, Arizona
480–951–3267

MTC–00006599

From: SuKramer@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that it is vital that the Microsoft settlement is in the public interest and continued litigation is not only extravagant but only in the interest in some competitors. Microsoft has been instrumental in leading the world into the future. Let them continue to lead us there.

Delores S. Kramer

MTC–00006600

From: melvin johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:43pm
Subject: settlement

i think the settlement is fine. keep the gov. out of company affairs.

thank you
melvin

MTC–00006601

From: Mandy Aguilar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it may concern:

I'm for the settlement.

Thanks,
Armando Aguilar

MTC–00006602

From: HalTwotubbs@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:43pm
Subject: microsoftsettlement

let them alone. msft has done more to simplify doing business on the pc than any other tech co. could ever dream possible. A lot of sore losermen here just looking to gore people to perhaps make the cliton adm. look like they did something worthwhile. damn i think i mispelled clinton. o well

MTC–00006603

From: Jim (038) Diana Brager
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

The time has come to end the case against Microsoft. I have been using Microsoft products for years now, and for the life of me, I can not see one single area where I, as a consumer, have been injured by the practices undertaken by Microsoft over the many years. Your suit leaders say I have been, but you are WRONG! Microsoft has met the needs I have had when it comes to all of their products. From games to business software products.

Further more, it is so obvious that the national economy went into the tank at the exact time the DOJ undertook the case against Microsoft, on behalf of Microsoft's competitors. This economy must be allowed to go forward, and DOJ's repeated attempts to harm Microsoft must end.

DOJ's Clinton era antics of helping AOL, et al, should have ended when Clinton left office. Cease the case and let's get back to allowing the American people get back to what's important .... moving forward!

James Brager
6502 W Wahalla Ln
Glendale, AZ 85308

MTC–00006604

From: GStier@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I would like you to settle this lawsuit now. NO MORE ONGOING LITIGATION. Lets move on.

Gary S

MTC–00006605

From: TREAGE1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement reached between the Fed. Government and Microsoft. We should not be subject to a group of competitors who haven't been able to come up with a better operating system, or we'd be using it. Tearing down the strong for improvement of the weak is not the right direction.

At the same time I support the settlement, I don't want to be denied the use of a superior software product to that of Microsoft. If that means a ruling, or law, requiring openness by Microsoft to their codes, so be it. If Microsoft, at some future date, has violated this openness, that is the time to put their feet to the fire, by order, after hearings and findings that don't drag out forever. We need to have the greatest flexibility in using our computers to enhance communications and knowledge.

Thomas R. Eggert

MTC–00006606

From: JHill47733@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:45pm
Subject: (no subject)

Please settle the Microsoft case now as agreed to. Thanks for your attention to this.

Jack Hill
phone 262–827–0206.

MTC–00006607

From: JCWJHW@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Dept.,

This litigation with you and Microsoft has gone a way too long and it's time to settle and move on as our country suffers economically. You cannot allow a few GREEDY companies and some states to drag this case only to benefit them. I believe the settlement for Microsoft to help with our kids education is the best option. Please settle this and move on. I am tired of hearing this case and paying my tax dollars for it. Our country needs to move on!

Sincerely,
Joy Ward

MTC–00006608

From: Ntreonis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

A final settlement and putting and end to the ongoing litigation should be done as soon as possible.....

Nathalie Treonis

MTC–00006609

From: bleak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Ok, enough is enough. I am retired off of MSFT stock not gvt. welfare. Lets get this state and federal suit over with. Look at what this has done to the economy.

Robert L. Bleakley

MTC–00006610

From: FAN1957
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am sending this email to voice my opinion concerning the lawsuit against the Microsoft company. I think that is high time that this suit be settled in a fair way. Certainly our Justice Dept and all the states which are climbing aboard this frivols lawsuit have a better way of spending their time. This is costing our Country way too much of the taxpayers money and should have been settled many months ago. Stop wasting more and more of my tax dollars. There are certainly more deserving criminals out there where you should be spending more of your time.

MTC–00006611

From: Ed Lehan
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,

I feel that it is important to get the Microsoft litigation behind us here in the USA. I for one want the proposed settlement to be accepted so that progress will not be stymied any longer. It is in our best interest to begin focusing on growth and not on the interests of a small group in penalizing success.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,
Ed

Edward A. Lehan, Jr., CLU, ChFC
Executive Vice President and Profit Center Manager
Brown & Brown of Connecticut, Inc.
Tel. No. 860 665 8402
Fax. No. 860 667 6560
E-mail elehan@bbhartford.com

MTC–00006612

From: Galehnhard@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am in total agreement with the Microsoft Settlement I feel it is now time to accept things as they are and get down to business. Enough of the courts, lawyers and arguments.

George Lehnhard
galehnhard@aol.com

MTC–00006613

From: VETTE8693@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sir's;

If it hadn't been for microsoft I wouldn't be a computer user.

John C. Meskimen
2221 University St.
Gautier Miss 39 39553

MTC–00006614

From: Paul W. Ogle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement

I wish to comment on the proposed Microsoft Settlement.

I have been involved in computer technology all my adult life. I wrote my first computer program in 1963, and subsequently started two successful computer ''OEM'' companies. Now I am retired, but I still maintain daily interest in the industry.

I believe strongly that the proposed settlement should be adopted by the court. It is a fair, balanced and forward-looking solution to the myriad of issues that have been explored by the lawsuits. Further, it seems clear to me that those who seek to obstruct this settlement have competitive or other special interests that drive their actions, and they do not, at all, seek the broad best interest.

The parties have agreed. I urge the Court to accept their agreement.

Sincerely,
Paul Ogle
13445 South Baird Road,
Conifer, CO 80433

MTC–00006615

From: Curtis E. Granberry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle this dispute and quit feeding the trial attorneys. Accept this settlement and get on with more important business.

MTC–00006616

From: Shiaw Su
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a taxpayer and citizen, I want to express my strongest displeasure and disappointment of State government effort in trying to destroy the MOST SUCCESSFUL company in the world. Microsoft is the envy of the high-tech industry, especially in the software area, worldwide. The existence of Microsoft in the last 26 years is the reason that USA is able to maintain its superior competitive age in the high-tech industry of world market.

In any country, a company like Microsoft would be treated as national symbol that every citizen can be proud of. According to the public polls, majority of citizens like me, opposes the government action which is abusing the public trust and wasting the taxpayer money. I am very disturbed and puzzled by the actions taken by some State Attorney Generals. The only conclusion I can make is either those Attorney Generals are very naive and don't understand the latest fast-moving new technology at all, or they are simply pursuing a political solution for special interest groups. However, they should be reminded that their actions may be AGAINST OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS and only benefiting the special interest groups.

Please also pay a special attention to any potentially adverse impact to our overall national economy if their ill-advised plans are ever taken place. Thanks for your listening.

Sincerely yours,
Shiaw Y. Su

MTC–00006617

From: Mark Dale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Litigation

To whom it may concern:

Leave Microsoft intact. The present economic conditions do not merit discipline at this time.

Warm Regards,
Mark

MTC–00006618

From: Dave Conger
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to voice my support for the decision to settle the Microsoft anti-trust case. To litigate the issue further, in my opinion, only benefits Microsoft's competitors...not the public as a whole. Further litigation will only add to the economic uncertainty of the technology sector and please the leadership of the companies that are lobbying so aggressively against the Microsoft settlement.

I have been amazed at the power that Microsoft's competitors seem to have over the state Attorney's General. I honestly believe this has been an abuse of our legal system by these companies that are simply trying to get a competitive edge over Microsoft. As a member of the information technology profession, I feel I have some credibility on the subject. While Microsoft certainly has some quirks and problems with some of their products, they have still done more for the growth of technology in our country than any other company, without question. The tools they provide to professionals like myself, for a fraction of the cost that is demanded by their competitors, help professionals to move their employers forward technologically. Microsoft provides many resources, tools, and libraries of technical information for free or at a minimal cost. For example, their database and email servers are priced lower than the competition, and under most circumstances outperform the competition's products. Microsoft has succeeded because they provide good products at prices the public can afford.

Please don't listen to the relentless efforts of Microsoft's competition to prolong litigation on the anti-trust case. They are simply out to destroy Microsoft to benefit themselves financially. If the DOJ wants to protect consumers, focus on correcting any wrongs Microsoft has made, and let the free market (not the court room) determine which company has the best products.

Regards,
Dave Conger
13720 117th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98034
425–821–3250

MTC–00006619

From: George C. Tunis III
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft case

This email is to communicate my opinion on the Microsoft case. I am a small business owner that, simply put, could not exist without the products Microsoft makes. I love the fact that the products are well integrated and all work together. I don't have a systems department, so I rely on the seamless integration of the Microsoft products to get me through.

I was appalled by the governments action to try to break up Microsoft. The products are great and getting better, and they work. For what you get, the idea that somehow you could get more for less is ridiculous. I buy plenty of non Microsoft software and what I have found is that the average price of a ''function'' is about $149. If you broke up Microsoft, and then made me buy all the functionality from other vendors....my cost would be like $2000 as compared to the low price for the integrated products from Microsoft. From my view point, all the government has done is to try to reduce what I get from Microsoft....which only hurts me.

Please just leave well enough alone. Our nation needs to pull together, stop the stupid bickering and get on with business. Please settle the case ASAP and get to more important matters. From My perspective Microsoft is doing a great job at a fair price....believe me when I feel ''harmed'' I will let you know.

George C. Tunis III
Tunis Works, LLC
5711 Waterside dr.
Berlin, MD 21811
voice (410) 641 1601
fax (410) 641 1983
tunisworks@msn.com

MTC–00006620

From: BUZZ WHITTLE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:47pm
Subject: Leave this alone.

Competition has removed the need for any more action against Microsoft. Everyone should get over it and move on. Any move at this time to ''change the world'' will only cause problems in the computer world. I

cannot imagine the world without a complete Microsoft

MTC–00006621

From: Lynn Lockler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the proposed settlement. I also believe the remaining stated should accept the settlement agreed to by the US Department of Justice and the other states.

L. S. Lockler
4729 Redstart
Houston, TX 77035

MTC–00006622

From: John Dominick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:48pm
Subject: settlement

Settle this matter and let the economy start moving forward again.

MTC–00006623

From: Yosh Shimono
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern:

This is stupid! At a time when the nation has suffered the worst homeland attack of its existence; when the economy has seen the largest monetary decline in history; and when ALL Americans, including corporate America, should be thinking of how they can contribute to the mediation of this crisis; we find only the individual ''small citizen'' actually doing something positive in that regard. Corporate America, local government, including those who run them, and those who owe their wealth to the ''small citizen'', are thinking only of how to benefit themselves from this crisis regardless of the cost to the common citizenry. One such mercenary scavenging crime is in regards to the Microsoft Settlement. Let the settlement stand! Let us go forward with all diligence and put all our energies on recovery, and prove to the world that we are not the Great Ogre that seems to be the consensus in third world nations, but rather the best nation that humanity has ever produced!

Yosh Shimono
Small citizen

MTC–00006624

From: Avers, Christine E.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Enough is enough! I want to see this over with. Microsoft has been a positive force not only in our economy but also in innovation and exploitation of computer usage and the internet. The company has given much to it's employees and this country. Let's not destroy that! Let's not destroy the potential for better things to come as a result of the settlement.

Chris Avers
Supply Planning Manager
Specialty Panels
(770) 221–2568
ceavers@gapac.com

MTC–00006625

From: HDubrow@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:49pm
Subject: States not agreeing with settlement

Don't like the result? Sue again. This seems to be the attitude of the states not willing to go along with the settlement accepted by the DOJ and the remainder of the states. I suspect that most of the public is just tired of hearing about this lawsuit and the way it has progressed. Let it be over and have microsoft contribute to the education of children in the computer age as agreed.

MTC–00006626

From: Doug Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This has gone on long enough! Please get this settled for once and for all. It is time for all of us to get on with the rest of our lives. I believe that the agreed upon settlement is fair and just and should be implemented ASAP.

MTC–00006627

From: GEORGE PORZUC
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement comment

To whom it may concern,

The settlement with Microsoft is in the public interest. The American economy needs this settlement. (It should not have been brought in the first place) We do not need more litigation. This would only stifles innovation.

Please don???t let special interests defeat the public interest.

Sincerely,
George Porzuc
5951 Price Road
Milford, Ohio 45150
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006628

From: Doug Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle it now! Lest get on with the rest of our lives.

MTC–00006629

From: John Fris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My comments regarding the Microsoft settlement go against having had to settle anything to begin with. I still feel that this whole case was put forward by unhappy competitors who should have put their time and effort into coming out with new and improved products. If anyone looks at Microsoft's track record of innovation, it is hard to believe that there could be many gripes about pricing or unfair competition. In my business and virtually all others, innovation and pricing are what put companies on top. To limit this natural occurance would make no sense. Please don't give in to unhappy competitors in this or any other case and stop the American free enterprise system. Thank you.

John Fris
Fris Office Outfitters, Inc.
616–396–2341

MTC–00006630

From: Carnes Chapin P GS-13 AFOTEC/TSS
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle the case now. Stop listening to the competitors who are unable to win in the market place and therefore want the government to protect them. No marketplace is as open as the software marketplace—as witnessed by the fact that the consumer is paying less every year for products that continually improve. Only a bureaucrat who has no concept of how business works would believe that Microsoft has a monopoly in the software marketplace.

Patrick Carnes
Software Consumer

MTC–00006631

From: BDAYCPA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Justice Department,

I highly recomend that you settle the Microsoft case as was propsed several months ago.

As the economy has changed, the technology field evolves, palm pilots and digital phones prices are very alluring, there is ample competititors to Palm Pilot.

Look no further than what happened to the Office Depot & Staples merger that the government said would reduce competition. Office Depot is only a portion of it's old self, Office Max is teetering on bankruptcy, and the market value of all three have decreased by billions of dollars!

Let the market determine who they prefer.

Please quickly settle this matter and let's move on.

Sincerely
Brian Day

MTC–00006632

From: wimlang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the case as planned and do not allow AOL, Sun Microsystems and Oracle to throw up more dust. Fair is fair.

W.G Langenberg.

MTC–00006633

From: lekasper@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Thank you for fielding feedback on the unfortunate MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT matter.

The contribution alone achieving the computerized advancements made possible by MSFT is self explanatory. We have better and quicker access to accomplishments from the performance this technology makes possible. Where is MSFT competition coming from when they try to stifle the industry that nurtured their existence? The cliche, ''one hand washes the other and they both wash the face'', is an understandable example of cooperative team-work led by a leader that has proven, continuous progress and

profitable accomplishments. The world has benefitted from the more advanced society that computerization has brought about. Why is competition interfereing with lawsuits, and costs that will slow future progress. The future volume cost benefits that will reduce prices for increased availability is the American Way.

Whining and crying is not the answer. When the going gets tough, persistence toward improvement should be applied to try to catch up with the leader. That's what competition is, the motivator to offer a better mouse trap.

This greed, envy or ego should be put away because it has already gone too far. This is a race which encourages the leader to try harder, and, should also encourage the lesser to work harder and smarter. Who else has made the investment MSFT continues to plow back into the industry? Please bring this interruption to a halt by settling the batteling waste of time and expense. It is long overdue this settlement be finalized and buried.

Thank you and good luck in bringing

MTC–00006634

From: Brad Newell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: settlement

Let's get on with life. Let the market place take care of itself. Seems to me that the big crunch in hi-tech started with the assinine assault by the US government on Microsoft. How much damage has been done to the various retirement funds in the country? Enough!!

Brad Newell
141 Jackson Lane
Port Ludlow, WA 98365
(360) 437–9151
wendigo@olympus.net

MTC–00006635

From: smouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:53pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I believe that the settlement is fair and just and that there should not be any further litigation. Leave Microsoft alone and let the company and the industry get on with its business.

Sincerely,
Sandy Adler
Safram Sphynx
www.bestweb.net/smouse

MTC–00006636

From: Adda Gogoris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: (no subject)

pls let the settlement stand and let's go on with things that matter like killing America's enemies.

MTC–00006637

From: ALFAZUBER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

THIS WAS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE.THE MARKET SHOULD HANDLE THEIR OPPRESSIVE TACTICS. THE COMPETITORS SHOULD BE ABLE TO FIGHT THIS OUT WITHOUT THE GOVERNMENT HOLDING THEIR HANDS.

WF ZUBER M.D.

MTC–00006638

From: W A Fahrbach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To me, the settlement appears fair and just. In todays technical environment why should the courts crush a leader?

William A. Fahrbach
P.O. Box 128
Troutville, VA 24175

MTC–00006639

From: Robert Holladay
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT STOP CATERING TO MICROSOFT'S COMPETITORS AND GET THIS CASE SETTLED !!!!!

DR. BOB HOLLADAY
NAPLES, FL 34108

MTC–00006640

From: HARRY A DINGWALL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We feel that it is in the best interests of both our country and its economy for all parties involved to accept the terms which have been agreed upon by the majority of the complainants.

Donna E. and Harry A. Dingwall, D.V.M.

MTC–00006641

From: Pat Monahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:53pm
Subject: Micrtosoft Settlement

I am not a Microsoft supporter but I find it utterly ridiculous that this case has gone on and on and on. Just when I think the DOJ already judged on the subject another month or years is added to the case. It seems to me that the Microsoft competitors are complaining the loudest and expect the government to help them out when they should be out there competing. The sooner this case is closed the better off we and the econmy will be. You must see that the competitors of MIcrosoft are trying to discredit your decesion. Don't let them do it. If you alter your decision, what will the american public think of the judicial system? If I were MIcrosoft, I'd move to Canada or some other country. They would more than welcome me.

MTC–00006643

From: SACKFAMILY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I strongly support the settlement reached between the Justice Department and Microsort. It seems fair and allows both parties to get on to other more pressing business.The states that have not agreed with this settlement have very narrow vested interests and are motivated by interests other then fair play.Every time I see Attorney General Blumenthal I think he needs to be investigated for his interests in this matter. Do the right thing for this economy and move on.

MTC–00006644

From: MReese6232@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

We find the terms of the settlement announced by the US Government and Microsoft to be just and fair. Whatever unjust policies were perpetuated by Microsoft in the past are well addressed in the settlement so as not to be repeated. We feel any further judicial proceedings against Microsoft will only cost the public as a whole in the long run.

Sincerely,
Mark and Barbara Reese

MTC–00006645

From: Robert Lee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this now as agreed to by Microsoft and DOJ. The hell with the individual states injecting their own agenda to drag this out. I'm still convinced that the public did not benefit in this anti trust case; just a bunch of lawyers screwing up the system to increase their billable hours.

Robert Lee

MTC–00006646

From: Carl Classen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Folks—

I hope that the Department of Justice and the States will settle the antitrust litigation with Microsoft. The lenght of this process, especilly after such a problematic trial with a judge who was proven to be less than fair, casts a pall over the potential economic rebound America needs and the software advantage we need to maintain. Linus is a good alternative to Microsoft and AOL Time Warner is certainly a worthy competitor in content and access.

Thank you for consdiering my comments.

Sincerely,

Carl Classen personal: carl—classen@hotmail.com
work: cclassen@ecamden.cc

MTC–00006647

From: Apollo12pe@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This situation is, in my opinion, much to do about nothing except an attempt by a few to get the Government to help their business because they can't offer products that are in any way superior to those of Microsoft. The buying public is not stupid as the Justice Department would have us believe. If there are products out there that are superior to those of Microsoft, the buying public will respond by buying them. I chose to buy AOL because I like their product and have found

it soperior, in my opinion, to MSN. Yes, I have tried both.

Our progress and great economy of the past few years is much more due to Microsoft and their products than it is of any action of Government !!!!!!!!!!

Richaard L. Hanscom, Jr.
Lt. Col., USAF
239 Maravilla Drive
Riverside, CA 92507

MTC–00006648

From: Tom (038) Wilma Llewellyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with proposed settlement of the Department of Justice vs. Microsoft Lawsuit.

Thomas D. Llewellyn
593 Vintage Dr.
Elkton, OR 97436

MTC–00006649

From: Jerry Gonzalez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

MSFT has done plenty so.....
Get off their back!

MTC–00006650

From: Milo D. Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this litigation. It would appear that the antagonists that remain are competitors and not consumers. It also appears that the states within which the competitors reside are the remaining dissenters. I operate a small consulting business. My computers run the windows operating system; use Internet Explorer and Microsoft Office Professional. As a user, I am perfectly happy. My clients, across a broad spectrum of industry, all use the same software tools. In fact, most of the attorneys with whom I do business have gone from Word Perfect to Microsoft Office because it is necessary to better communicate and move documents across the Internet to clients.

In my view the remaining dissenters are millionaires, not Microsoft millionaires, who cannot stand the heat of competition. Any settlement greater than that proposed for Microsoft should be equally imposed upon the competition. Everyone will have the same code; innovation will disappear, but everyone will be equal. We will all lose, especially us consumers.

Thank you,
Milo D. Smith

Milo D. Smith, President—M. D. Smith & Associates, Inc.

18011 Third Avenue S. W., Normandy Park, WA 98166–3733

Telephone: 206.242.1932—Facsimile: 206.242.3172

Mobile: 206–972–6552

Email: Milo-MDSI@msn.com

MTC–00006651

From: Robert A. Weller
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj@inetgw
Date: 1/2/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly/Settlement

To the Department of Justice:

I believe that the Tunney Act of 1974 provides that citizens can comment on anti-trust cases.

As a technical professional, I assert that it is beyond any doubt that Microsoft wields effective monopoly control over several classes of computer software crucial to our country's economic security. It is equally evident that this is not in the public's or the government's best interest.

Everyone's interests, including those of Microsoft shareholders, will be best served in the long run if the government breaks this monopoly by subdividing Microsoft into companies that will have to compete in their respective markets on the basis of price and performance. The current settlement proposed by Microsoft is an arrogant act of defiance of the Court's finding that, if approved, will simply serve to extend the company's monopoly into one of the last market niches were its dominance is not total.

I urge you, for the good of all citizens and for the security of the country, to end the total dependence of our economy upon this one company, whose past performance leaves little doubt as to the likelihood of true reform from within.

Robert A. Weller
1008 Green Hill Cove
Brentwood, TN 37027
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00006652

From: RAHaley9@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I've been a computer user since it first started. I took class on wiring the main board to do what you wanted it to do, with key punch cards. That's back in 1967,1968.

So I've been using computers for a while. Every since Windows 98 took over our computers it turned them into a piece of junk. All they do now is crash. When you buy a brand new computer and with in an hour of having it, it crashes something's wrong. I'd love to see other programmers build software. It has to run better than what he's doing. This is America and Bill Gates doesn't have the right to be the only one to sell the main software for our computers. They were in such a big hurry to get it on the market, Bill Gates and his company didn't care if it worked. He just wanted it out there by the first of the year. Trash or not. I say give every man who thinks they can a chance to build software for our computers and let us be the judge if we want to buy it. We deserve the right of choice.

Thank You
Roseann Haley from Indiana

MTC–00006653

From: Albert Silverberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that the settlement with Microsoft as is presently proposed is fair & equitable to all parties. Further litigation [by the 9 states] can only delay the recovery of our depressed economy & will be of no benefit to anyone

Albert H. Silverberg M.D.

MTC–00006654

From: Jrsantucci@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this settlement should happen as soon as possible for the best interest of the public.

Joan Santucci

MTC–00006655

From: BHelling@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to settle the Microsoft case. We are happy with Microsoft and all it offers. Please don't take that away from us.

Bonnie Helling
Bhelling@aol.com

MTC–00006657

From: BESPORT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:57pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To Whom It May Concern:

The ridiculous lawsuit against Microsoft is just another idiotic attack on America's free enterprise system and the sooner we drop it, the better. I thought once we got a real President again that our Department of Justice would become interested in justice again...not prosecuting honest law-abiding citizens.

Just look where we've gotten spending more money prosecuting Bill Gates than we have Osama bin Laden! (At least before 9/11). My advice to you is to stop this ascinine lawsuit and tell the high paid lawyers who are trying to destory the very free enterprise system that makes them—and the politicians—the highest paid in the world, to get a life. Leave Bill Gates and Microsoft alone and all the other businesses that make America work—cause if they don't—you won't be working either!

Sincerely,
Bill Edwards
Hacked-off American

MTC–00006658

From: Skipper50@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs and Madams:

Enough already of this assault on our economy and endless litigation. Ratify the proposed settlement agreement with Microsoft over the antitrust charges and get on with it.

Sincerely,
David Siegel
1704 Bohland
St. Paul, MN 55116

MTC–00006659

From: TWAGGX5@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it was a complete and total waste of our time and money to sue Microsoft. We are not socialists, or communist. When one

person starts a huge business and employs thousands of people, they should be respected and valued for their contributions to society. Instead, Bill Gates was hounded and chased. For what purpose? What did you accomplish? How much of my tax money did you spend on chasing an upstanding business man? It is ridiculous. Find something useful to do with your time and my money. Chase the real criminals!

Theresa Waggoner
Gulf Breeze, FL

MTC–00006660

From: Joel Brazil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

It pains me to know that in these uncertain economic times a few special interests are attempting to derail the Microsoft settlement and prolong the litigation. The last thing America needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy Microsoft competitors and stifles innovation.

Please resolve as soon as possible.

Joel Brazil

MTC–00006661

From: Independentlease@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:59pm
Subject: We all owe a debt of gratitude to Microsoft.

I have been following the anti-trust suit diligently since it first started. I think it is time for all Americans to stand up and PRAISE Microsoft for being the front runner in opening the World to everyone with their Windows operating system. I think of the Millions of Americans in my age group (50+) with no prior PC skills, and how Bill Gates has changed our lives forever. He made everything come alive for us and even the most stupid people on the planet can now operate a computer with very little difficulty. After watching all this company has endured with this frivolous lawsuit, if I were Bill Gates, I would pack up and take the company to a ''friendly nation'', and tell America to ''kiss my ass''. God Bless you Microsoft and I am singing your praises.

Rosanne Wilson
Beaverton, OR

MTC–00006662

From: Jack Sperry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft and the Government's representatives have worked long and hard to reach an equitable settlement agreement that is fair and in the best interests of consumers and citizens. I want to see that settlement agreement stand and not be overturned, or redirected, to further the interests of Microsoft's competitors. Let's put this dispute to rest ASAP so everyone can move on.

Jack Sperry

MTC–00006663

From: Rik Temmink
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir, Madam,

With this message, I would like to voice my support for the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and several States and Microsoft Corporation.

Despite the concerns voiced by Microsoft's competitors and certain pressure groups, I believe the proposed settlement provides enough substance to correct Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior, while allowing all parties concerned to continue their regular activities.

I believe closure is critical to the success of the US economy, and would therefore like the Department of Justice to support the proposed settlement.

Rik Temmink
7045 34th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

MTC–00006664

From: Russell Johnson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 3:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets settle this problem!! To continue is a Threat to the Private Enterprise System. The settlement is fair....and should not become Unfair!!

MTC–00006665

From: Vincil C. Bishop, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Don't let these special interests defeat the public interests.

Sincerely,
Vincil C. Bishop, Jr

MTC–00006666

From: Debbie .
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

Please, please, please try to settle the Microsoft case ASAP! I firmly believe that once this case comes to a close, people will start to view things better, and the economy will start to improve. It may start small, with improvements in the stock market, or people buying computers, but it will get better. Just look at what happens when rumors circulate that a settlement is in the works!

This has gone on way too long!!! Please do your best to help everyone reach an agreement so we can put this behind us!

Thanks.

Debbie

MTC–00006667

From: David D. Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let us get beyond this. The Government as well as other parties involved have stated a willingness to settle this once and for all. This case has been in litigation to long and the country and the people have more pressing needs. Settle this case and move on.

David Doyt Miller
03029 Dowty Rd.
St. Marys, Ohio. 45885

MTC–00006668

From: Sean Callahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is in the best interest of the general public to just settle this court case. It is in no one's interest except the lawyers to continue to drag this case on. Can the Federal Government please decide on the appropriate punishment, implement it, and move on. This is just one man's view. Thank you for your time.

Sean Callahan
Gilbert, Arizona

MTC–00006669

From: WJLONE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:02pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Enough , Microsoft is responsible for grat progress in the Real World. Let us end this case the way the compromise specifies.

Cordially,
WJ Leeder

MTC–00006670

From: wmbryant@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement will affect some changes within Microsoft, but the remedies are frankly too little too late. Had these same actions taken place 2–3 years ago I would whole-heartedly agree with them. Now, however, it does little good to force MS to allow someone to easily remove an MS-specific icon when practically the whole world is already using MS products. Who will remove those products now?

Sincerely,
Mike Bryant
mike—bryant@mindspring.com

MTC–00006671

From: SOBILL1933@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Settlement

It appears to me that all charges should be dropped, Microsoft has agreed to do what is required, no further action should be taken. It also should be required that all states drop their charges. All the remaining states are after is the money!!!!! As usual the money grubbing lawyers see is more big money as in the tobacco settlements. No one has benefitted from that buy the lawyers.

Please consider the present settlement as final, eliminate further law suits by the federal government and all states.

C.W. O'Neal
10570 Meadow Glen Way East
Escondido, Ca 92026

MTC–00006672

From: Don Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the case alleging that Microsoft is a monopoly and is harming consumers is without merit. I don't see any way at all that Microsoft has harmed anyone other than its competitors. Microsoft's competitors seem to be the ones who are complaining most loudly.

In fact, DOJ is ultimately harming consumers by penalizing Microsoft. DOJ's actions undermine the legitimate operation of a free economy by injecting personal politics into the market. This type of action ultimately will lead to cronyism which mars so many other nation's economies and truly does harm consumers.

Microsoft may have hurt its competitors using legal and illegal means. If there is some instance where its actions with regard to a specific competitor is illegal, then let them be punished for that if it can be proved.

Also, if Microsoft has in fact harmed consumers, then why aren't I getting remunerated? You can't have it both ways!

Sincerely,
Don R. Brown, Ph.D.
CEO, PartNET
www.part.net
don.brown@part.net 801–581–1118

MTC–00006673

From: Ken Larsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Department of Justice should stop punishing Microsoft. They provide excellent products at a low cost and continually advance the state of the software art. Microsoft should not be punished for innovation and development of quality products.

Kenneth Larsen

MTC–00006674

From: Scott R. Springman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

I am a concerned, voting citizen who feels that the interests of the nation would be ill-served by any delay in settlement of the Microsoft issue. I have both Intel and Apple (Motorola) based computer systems. I believe that further litigation against Microsoft is fruitless, wasteful, and counterproductive. Please do not bow to political pressure from special interests. Please settle now.

Sincerely;
Scott R. Springman, MD
Professor of Anesthesiology and Surgery
University of Wisconsin Medical School
Anesthesiology Department
600 Highland Ave.
Madison, WI 53792
email: srspring@facstaff.wisc.edu
Phone: 608–262–2186
Fax: 608–263–0575
UW Anesthesiology Preoperative Clinic Web Site:
http://www.anesthesia.wisc.edu/Clinic/Index.htm

MTC–00006675

From: Jim Holden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel very strongly that the settlement reached between the DOJ/states and Microsoft is fair to all parties involved and that further litigation is counter-productive for both the US economy and consumers. I am a retired IT professional having worked in both hardware and software design using Microsoft products and services. I have always found Microsoft to provide superior products and excellent support. As a consumer, I have never felt that I have been harmed in any way by their monopoly of the OS market.

Although I know that the DOJ has the best interests of the consumer in mind, I feel that they and the dissenting states are bending to pressure being brought by Microsoft's competitors. If you consider the number of hours of development and testing time that goes into the release of an operating system like any of the MS Windows versions, the selling price is ridiculously low. If they were really abusing their monopoly powers, they could be charging consumers much more. As for embedding features in the operating system, I think the consumer only benefits from this practice. I do not know of anyone who is complaining that their operating system has too many features!

In the interest of fair disclosure, I should point out that I have been a Microsoft stockholder for nearly ten years. However, I invested in Microsoft because I believe they are producing superior products and not because I would want them to take advantage of their OS monopoly in any way.

Please end the litigation and let the development community get on with the business of producing better and more innovative products for all consumers.

Sincerely,
James R. Holden
146 Brookhaven Ct
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
(630) 466–0895

MTC–00006676

From: rose sulistio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
308 College creek Drive
Denison,Texas 75020
January 2, 2001
Renata B. Hesse
Antiiitrust Division
US Deparmnt of Justice
601 D St., NW, suite 1200
Washington DC 20530–0001

Dear madam;

This is in reference to the settlement of Microsoft. The government has spent so much of the tax payer's dollars on this case and got no where. The only people making money on this case are big time lawyers.

Please put this case behind us and close it immediately. Let us move on our lives and encourage competition through better products which the public demands. it is without a doubt that Microsoft produces better products than it's competitors and the government should be happy for that.

Lastly, I asked for your consideration in acknowledging that we wasted so much money in pursuing this case when there are other important issues that the government have to give priority on.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Rose Sulistio

MTC–00006677

From: Delmolino@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

GENTLEMEN

Why anyone would continue to pursue MIicrosoft's settlement any further is beyond me.Please stop wasting taxpayers money against a company that built too good a mousetrap. Please settle this negotiation as soon as possible.

A CONCERNED TAXPAYER
M.F.DELMOLINO

MTC–00006678

From: gigi broad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: Final Settlement

The matter before the courts is long over due to be settled and let Microsoft go forward in there business. It does no one any good to continue to hammmer at the company. Its time the country focuses on other things and puts this mattter behind us.

Yours Truly
Virginia Wallace [FIN]

MTC–00006679

From: GailPratt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 2, 2002. To whom it may convern at the Department of Justice. From Evelyn Gail Pratt, 6155 Plumas Street, #160, Reno, NV 89509 USA, (775) 824–4551, a consumer of Microsoft products. ''I believe that the settlement found in the Court of Appeals ruling regarding Microsoft is reasonable and fair to all parties involved''. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely, (gailpratt@AOL.com)

MTC–00006680

From: Susan V. Barba
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to urge you to please settle the Microsoft case without further delay and litigation. As an American consumer, I believe the settlement is fair and is to the benefit of the American public. Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,
Susan V. Barba

MTC–00006681

From: David Brandt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings,
I have not supported any of the actions against Microsoft Corporation. I work in the computer industry and see plenty opportunities for companies to compete with their own products if they decide to do so instead of competing through the courts. As for the settlement, I am in favor of it versus more actions being proposed by the 9 States and Microsoft's competitors (Sun Microsystems, AOL, Nokia, etc).
Thank you for listening.
David Brandt
5257 E. 130th Way
Thornton, CO 80241.

MTC–00006682

From: Carman B. Bahr, MD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
My personal opinion is that settlement of the Tunney Act is in the ''public interest''. I do believe that Microsoft has contributed much to making the personal computer both usable for the common people and business purposes. Prolonging the litigation is not in the best interest of the public.
Carman B. Bahr, MD,
Emeritus Professor of Medicine
cbb2@home.com

MTC–00006683

From: Fred Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:04pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
In a very few words!
Settle this mess!
The American consumer is not complaining here, competitors are! If their products were so good they wouldn?t be afraid to compete head to head with Microsoft. End this waste of time and money!
Fred
Fred Smith
Fax (805) 647–3439
fred@smithshome.com
sharon@smithshome.com
Sharon's Mary Kay website is www.marykay.com/ssmith6
Corys website is www.kruseman.com

MTC–00006684

From: RENATADE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Settlement is good for consumers and in the public's interest. While I don't necessarily agree with everything MS does, I don't believe further litigation against them is a necessary, or even a good thing for the American public, especially at this time.
Renata De Angelis

MTC–00006685

From: P Huff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
After many years of litigation against Microsoft on Antitrust charges, a reasonable settlement has been reached that shows that Microsoft is working hard to address the concerns of the department of justice and the many states that have filed suit against Microsoft. Please take this opportunity to settle—continuing the suit is bad for the US economy because it hurts the best performing NASDAQ stock of 2001 and many companies that rely on Microsoft to make their businesses operate, and it's expensive for the people of the United States to continue to pay for ongoing litigation. I beg you, please settle this matter.
Polita Huff
Kirkland, Wa

MTC–00006686

From: Johnaker@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
It is hard for me to see why the settlement should be postponed. I think it is already too far against Microsoft. Let the markets compete for product ownership instead of making Microsoft pay extra for its product success.

MTC–00006687

From: BELLEVUMEL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07pm
Subject: MICROSOFT
SETTLEMENT IT IS TIME TO GET A SETLEMENT FOR MICROSOFT AND MOVE ON. THIS LAWSUIT HAS DRUG ON TOO LONG . THIS LAWSUIT AHS HURT MANY, MANY AMERICANS IN THEIR RETIREMENT PROGRAMS, INVESTMENTS AND HAS HANDCUFFED MICROSOFT WHILE THE DOJ WAS TRYING TO HELP ITS COMPETITORS TO NO AVAIL.
SETTLE AND GET IT OVER.
MELVIN R MELIN
56 158TH PL NE
BELLEVUE, WA 98008

MTC–00006688

From: Joe Krantz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I believe it is in the best interests of the US Government, the consumer and the marketplace if the proposed settlement between the DOJ, the states and Microsoft is accepted. This matter has been under review for a very long time and it is time to move forward in the intersts of all.
Joe Krantz
7N085 Plymouth Court
St. Charles, IL 60175

MTC–00006689

From: Steve.Skinner@
mail.sprint.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The federal government and nine states reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling.
This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved.
Thanks
Steve Skinner (Consumer)

MTC–00006690

From: Bernard Gouss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
AS A HOME COMPUTER USER,I WAS VERY HAPPY TO SEE A REASONABLE SETTLEMENT MADE BETWEEN OUR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND MICROSOFT.LETS END IT NOW!!IF IT WAS GOOD ENOUGH FOR OUR GOVERMENT ,WHO REPRESENTS THE PEOPLE OF OUR GREAT COUNTRY,IT CERTAINLY SHOULD NOT BE DELAYED BY A FEW ''SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS''.LETS END LITIGATION, AND START SENDING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK .
RESPECTFULLY
BERNARD GOUSS

MTC–00006691

From: LWydock@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ Officials:
As a former and retired government employee, It behooves me that the proposed settlement with Microsoft has not been implemented. Languishing the implementation of the proposed settlement is impeding our economy and playing into the hands of those who want to destroy our great country's economy. Innovation is not a dirty word. Those State Attorney Generals who are dragging their feet are trying to make a name for themselves and spotlight themselves at the expense of those who are willing to arbitrate.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this issue.
Lawrence R. Wydock

MTC–00006692

From: LOroake@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
In my opinion as a concerned citizen, the Microsoft case should be settled. I disagree with the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors.
The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. I personally feel that without Microsoft I would not be enjoying the many benefits that have come from that company. I am 72 years of age, and Microsoft, in my opinion, has given me the means by which I am enjoying my computer. Please do the right thing and end this litigation.
Sincerely,
Louise O'Roake, Private Citizen

MTC–00006693

From: Geoff Saunders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I wish to voice my opinion of the Microsoft settlement during the public comment

period, as provided for under the Tunney Act.

I support the proposed settlement that the DOJ and Microsoft have negotiated—it is a tough but fair compromise by both parties, and it will achieve the government's aim of protecting software consumers.

After nearly four years this litigation should end with the settlement, as negotiated. The litigation has been disruptive to the industry, bad for the economy, expensive to taxpayers, damaging to investors, and it has hobbled one of America's—in fact, one of the world's—great companies.

It is very unfortunate that Microsoft's competitors are aggressively lobbying for sanctions against Microsoft that go beyond the settlement and are in the interests only of these competitors, not the general public. I urge the DOJ to dismiss this self-serving lobbying, and to ratify the settlement as it stands.

Thank you.
Geoff Saunders
Sammamish, WA 98074

MTC–00006694

From: Donald F. Moran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

In the interest of fairness and consumer interests I think it would be in everyones benefit to go ahead with the agreement reached by Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I think it has gone on long enough and it is time to come to a conclusion.

Sincerely,
Donald F. Moran

MTC–00006695

From: gigi broad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The matter before the courts needs to be settled its long over due .Taking time from other important issues .Microsoft is a good company and it serves no one to continue hammering at this issue . I am glad Henry Ford did not have to face this or we would still be using horse and buggies.

thank you,
virgina wallace

MTC–00006696

From: Pctrojans@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft needs the ability to innovate. It is not in our best interest to punish success. Please settle this quickly and fairly.

Billie Johnson

MTC–00006697

From: Bill Snell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a small business owner who depends on the use software from Microsoft and other vendors for the efficient operation of my business. I support the proposed settlement currently pending before the District Court, which imposes tough conditions but is in the best interests of the consuming public and the economy.

MTC–00006699

From: TOM (038) SUE PONTIUS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft litigation NOW. prolonging this case is much too expensive and unfair. The consumer is being hurt each day it continues. Please.

Tom and Sue Pontius,
Mariemont, Ohio

MTC–00006700

From: Carolyn Waldo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let the innovators innovate! Let the cry babies whine all they want!

MTC–00006701

From: Nicholas Page
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

It's time to end this ridiculous witch hunt against Microsoft. Some states Attorneys General, and some state governments, will stop at nothing to make a name for themselves and fill their state coffers with undeserved money. While most states and the federal government are happy with the settlements, the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsofts competitors are also to blame for prolonging this unreasonable witch hunt. These competitors are trying to gain from additional damage inflicted upon Microsoft.

Let's end this debacle now, as the settlement is tough enough, while being reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Thanks,
Nicholas Page
PO Box 76
Middleton, MA 01949

MTC–00006702

From: Sally Jacobsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Do not delay this litigation with Microsoft any longer. The settlement terms are fair. The only ones who will win with further litigation will be the lawyers . . . not the American people. Enough is enough!

Sarah E. ''Sally'' Jacobsen
sally@efn.com

MTC–00006703

From: Dean Stelow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I own a small software development company and have intimate knowledge of the software market. I believe the proposed settlement is MORE than adequate given the current state of the market. (In fact, I believe the settlement goes too far in trying to restrict software publishers from designing their products however they see fit). There are alternatives to Microsoft products and there always have been. If an alternative is not available, a new one can be created with NO physical investment (unlike a true monopoly like electricity/oil, in which case I can not go out and create new petroleum fields).

Please, let it end already. If you, or any of the other folks with sour grapes over Microsoft's success don't like Windows, load Linux, BSD, etc., etc. and don't use their products. Its as simple as that.

I won't get into all of the benefits computer users have seen over the last 10 years thanks to a Microsoft ''standard''. I can say this . . . if not for Windows, my parents and millions of other folks out there would not be computing today.

Thanks,
Dean Stelow
Nordev Inc.
dstelow@hotmail.com
920.490.0608

MTC–00006704

From: HenriPowel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settltment

To the Honorary Members of The Department of Justice,

We respectably submit to you our wholehearted support for the settlement reached in the Microsoft case. We feel it would harm our economy further by allowing this case to be extended any longer. In our opinion it is a fair, but firm decision by the Court.

Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Powell
15631 Issaquah-Hobart Rd.
Issaquah, WA. 98027

MTC–00006705

From: Richard Hubbell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Those trying to oppose the proposed settlement are using the judicial system for political purpose. This is particularly true in the case of the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Thomas Reilly. He is the worst attorney general we have had in the 47 years I have been able to vote. His record as a consumer advocate has been terrible. I find it disgraceful that he is arguing that the current settlement is not in the consumers best interests when his real purpose is raise campaign funds from Microsoft's competitors in Massachusetts such as IBM (Lotus). Reilly is notorious for his involvement in only high visibility cases which promote his political career. The best current evidence of this are the Microsoft settlement and the sale of the Boston Red Sox. He is appealing to local business interest who can contribute to his campaign for governor.

I am a Mac user who has been involved in the technology industry all my career. While Microsoft is aggressive in the marketplace, the consumer has benefitted from increased performance at lower prices whether a PC or Mac customer. Competitors such as IBM(Lotus) and AOL(Netscape) are not

suffering from competition but from poor management or governmental meddling. Hundreds of software companies have prospered as a result of Micosoft operating systems and applications. The original case was a personal vendetta by young lawyers in the DOJ trying to make a name for themselves, not public servants looking to protect the consumer. The best case in point is Klein. Do you think he ever would have gotten his current position with out the visibility of the Microsoft case.

Most antitrust cases brought by the DOJ have resulted in damage to the consumer and the industry. Just look at the IBM and ATT cases. IBM faltered as a result of energies drained by its prolonged battle with the DOJ with no winner and gross damage to stockholders and innovation in the industry. The ATT settlement was long held up as an example of how the government can successfully restructure an industry but not now. Within a very short period of time we have seen a long distance market in shambles with companies losing billions and a reconsolidation of the local business into a few, soon to be two, regional monopolies. Prices for service particularly in the local loop have sky rocketted and service has declined. So much for the example the DOJ has used for years.

It is time to move on. Industry is what makes the US economy grow not government and certainly not our judicial system. Most people are alarmed at how justice in the US has been bought. Don't let the lobbyists buy you through their support of nine politically motivated attorneys general. Leave the settlement as is and in 20 years it will be merely a footnote in the history books.

Thank you,
Richard L. Hubbell
P.O Box 759
East Dennis, MA 02641
508 385–8876
dhubbs@medione.net

MTC–00006706

From: Tpondel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Settle

I wish to make my opinion known that the DOJ and various states should settle the case NOW.

You've wasted enough of my tax money on a baseless case. Settle now. Move on.

Tony Pondel
729 Junior Terrace
Chicago, IL 60613

MTC–00006707

From: Wang, Bill
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the Microsoft settlement is reasonable and justifiable. It is for the public interest.

B. Wang

MTC–00006708

From: Ncmediagoddess@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that what is being done to Microsoft is a travesty and that the government should ned this ASAP. I think that this case is responsible for the drop in technology stocks and the stock market as a whole.

Edwina Lee Lindsay

MTC–00006709

From: Calvin Drown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

No more Enough is enough. The states are looking to make a money grab like they did with Philip Morris.

Calvin Drown
cdrown@catskill.net

MTC–00006710

From: milo ness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of a settlement. I think it will help the economy to improve.

Milo D. Ness

MTC–00006711

From: Dick Wolff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Friends,

In my view, we have spent enough time and money on the Microsoft issue. Let the market decide whether the company is good for us or not by where and how we spend our money. Settle this thing and let America's consumers get on with their business. If you feel the justice department has too much money, why not look into AOL and its predatory policies?

Truth is, just stay out of our business.

Sincerely yours,
Dick Wolff
922 W. Cedar St.
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864–1952

MTC–00006712

From: Wiitalaw@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel Microsoft Settlement should take place immediately and ALL LITIGATION stopped immediately.

Sincerely,
Wilma J. Wiitala

MTC–00006713

From: Randall K. Wright
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please complete these actions without any further damage to Microsoft. I am a retired business owner, all of my manufacturing businesses needed to be competitive not controlled. This is America home of free enterprise, we have to deal with the World on a global basis and please don't get into places not needing attention.

Government intervention has not worked in the past and won't work now. Let's remember the phone company, which now is rebuilding what was broken apart. My phone bills are three to four times as high as they were. What did we gain? Look at the Airline industry, even before 9,11 they were in financial trouble. Now the power company, after one year of meddling, my power bills are not understandable and up twenty percent.

You should be worrying about gas stations which raise their gas price $ .50 on news (Not facts) about OPEC raising prices that could not hit that pump for months.

How about some Tort reform?

If you need to control someone, how about the Lobbies?

How about insurance companies which only provide service to the high profit areas in States and let the rest of the State suffer?

In closing I think there is plenty of work for you folks to do that will really benefit The United States Of America and its people.

God Bless
Randy

MTC–00006714

From: Jim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement with Microsoft is fair and is in the pubics best interest. Why prolong this issue? Let's get back to doing business. There are more important issues, not more litigation that will only benefit special interest.

MTC–00006715

From: Thomas Henn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sir,

I'd like voice my thoughts on the MS Settlement that now has been going on for sometime. I respect and appreciate what the various states have done to protect the public from MS. At the same time we as a nation need to move on from this. I believe MS has punished and the original settlement on the table is fair and just. As a tax payer, I'm not happy that we are wasting good tax dollars at this point. The only people benefiting are the legal personnel.

Cordially,
Thomas J. Henn
17365 Caribou Dr
Monument, CO 80132
CC:'Henn, Thomas'

MTC–00006716

From: Joe Guarraci
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a stockholder can we get a refund for legal costs by this unfair lawsuite from the government ??

Joe Guarraci

MTC–00006717

From: Tom Lakin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

Just to let you know about how I feel about the DOJ settlement with Microsoft Corp. (MS).

First of all, I do not believe MS should have been sued. If they created a program that another software company could not get into, that's fine. Take a REAL CLOSE look at Intuit's Quickbooks programs. Now, there is a real rip-off of the public. MS provides programs that really help us at a fair price. Not Quickbooks!!!! Quickbooks has their system set-up so that people are forced to buy their upgrades every year, or sooner, at more than $300.00 EACH. I just purchased to MS equivalent MS Money upgrade for $79.00. GO AFTER INTUIT.

I do NOT believe MS was treated fairly. MS should not be required to give schools, or any else, free computers. Or anything else free. Although I can't see your computers, I am sure they have MS products loaded on them. MS set the industry standards for PC's. They should, in fact, be rewarded!!!!

Thank you,

Tom Lakin, EA, MBA

MTC–00006718

From: Jim Alekson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in agreement with the terms of the proposed Microsoft Settlement.

As a consumer of computer hardware and software products, I applaud Microsoft for what they have done for the world wide computer industry throughout their growth. Without Microsoft, the world would not be nearly as progressively connected as it currently is. I look forward to continued growth in the industry and see Microsoft as a leader in that growth.

Jim Alekson
Vice President
Milliken Development Corporation
Telephone: (604) 925–2019
Fax Line: (604) 925–4283
Cellphone: (604) 603–8160
Email: jalekson@milliken developments.com

MTC–00006719

From: Pastorino, Ray
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 4:15pm
Subject: Tunney Act—Feedback on Settlement

The proposed settlement should be adopted and we should move on with our lives. The amount of waste that goes into the legal mechanations is incredible. If this were the oil industry we were talking about the Governments posture would I believe be different. It has amazed me for several years now how the price of oil can drop by 50% and the drop at the consumers pump drops by only 5%. There is a certain sort of selectivity here that the government might better attend to. Ray Pastorino This message is intended for the sole use of the individual to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete this message.

MTC–00006720

From: Patrick Conlan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Hi, I wanted to take a couple of minutes to message you with my take on the DOJ/Microsoft settlement. Although I'm currently a Microsoft employee my opinions are my own and not those of my employer. Summary: I'm broadly in favor of the settlement, although I worry that it might be used by those who despise the value of home-grown intellectual capital to attack the assets of Microsoft, both to obtain information ''for free'' and to prevent future innovation.

Before joining Microsoft I worked in Europe for a large pharmaceutical company—we were large Microsoft customers as well as customers of Sun, Oracle, IBM, Hyperion & DEC. In my experience dealing with Microsoft was far far easier that dealing with these alternative vendors who seemed to regard any request for information as an opportunity to charge extortionate consulting fees, wheras Microsoft:

1/ Published all of its bug fixes & advice on an open and free web site

2/ Published detailed code samples & api documentation on an open and free web site

3/ Built a foodchain of cheaper consultancies and provided certification to help us choose quality suppliers

4/ Had extremely professional product support who did not try to sell us anything

5/ Gave us appropriate volume discounts making the price of their products compelling

It was for these resaons that we moved from IBM's OS/2, DEC's Pathworks and from Novell's Netware to the Microsoft platform—not any underhand behaviour, and not any forced technical decision—they were just an easier company to deal with, more professional and open than our other suppliers.

I think that this should be born in mind when considering the remedy to correct behaviour that existed for a short period in time around 1995....

Thank you for your consideration

Patrick Conlan
Microsoft SQL Server Development Team
Redmond, WA
+1(425)705 7817

MTC–00006721

From: Richard Yochum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Based on all I have read about proposed actions relative to this case, it seems that the States that have not agreed to a settlement are being unduly influenced by Microsoft competitors.

I believe Microsoft has helped to keep prices at a reasonable level. It seems the States and competitors want to arrange for a ''playing field'' that favors their products.

The states should bow to the lead of the Federal gov't and make an effort to be profitable in their businesses without blaming their lack of success or difficulties on Microsoft. In today's competittive business world, success should be determined in the marketplace, not the courtroom!

MTC–00006722

From: Tom Doran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:15pm
Subject: law suit and settlement

The last time the government got into the picture and deregulated and broke up companies that were efficient and profitable the whole industry has gone to hell in a hand basket. The telephone break up turned into more dollars for the consumer to pay and LESS GOOD SERVICE received by the consumer. Plus now if you need service and repair you need a degree to find the correct number to call and hope that you will within a half days time get to the correct party that can be of any assistance. The telephone bill is 20 pages and you need to spend a hour to figure out who is doing or better yet NOT DOING WHAT. The airlines are in the red and costing taxpayers billions because of the government deregulation. The trucking industry has lost good reliable companies that went out of business after the government involvement and deregulation. The electric utilities are the next industry to get screwed up. Just look at what happened in California and God help everyone else if they keep deregulating the power companies. We will all be sitting in the dark and freezing our kesters off. IN CASE YOU HAVE NOT FIGURED IT OUT, THERE IS AN OLD SAYING IF IT AIN'T BROKE DON'T FIX IT. CAUSE EVERYTHING THE GOVERNMENT STARTS TO FIX THAT AIN'T BROKE ROYALLY GETS SCREWED UP. So my advice and sentiment about Microsoft. LEAVE THEM THE HELL ALONE. THEY AIN'T BROKE AND THEY DON'T NEED NO FIXING. The company has been innovative, a leader in its field and a good solid investment for those who so choose. They will have to deal with competition as every other company does in the market place. All I see from this whole exercise in futility is that a bunch of DAM LAWYERS have gotten rich on legal fees. And a bunch of idiot bureaucrats have spent a great deal of my hard earned tax dollars justifying their existence and job. The Government could save millions by getting rid of the whole bunch of paper pushers who have been involved in all this litigation. FOR THOSE WHO HAVE DIFFICULTY READING, THE SHORT MESSAGE IS DROP THE LAW SUIT AND LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. KAPISH.

MTC–00006723

From: William A Horan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:16pm
Subject: MICROSOFT Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am a both an investor, and a career-long (30+ years) Information Systems Developer/Manager/Executive.

There is absolutely no question that the enormous contributions made by MICROSOFT to the area of PC operating systems and applications development have revolutionized the computer and information processing industries. No other company

could have (nor evidenced enough initiative to have) approached the significance of innovation produced through the persistence and singular efforts of Bill Gates and his crew.

As an investor, I can only applaud the tremendous stimulus Microsoft's growth record provided to the stock market boom of the nineties. Witness the dampening effects that commenced coincident with Reno's assanine assault on one of the true symbols of successful American capitalism. Sad to see that ''victim mentality'' has now gained such Federal sympathy in compromising America's competitive spirit.

I believe that the entire case was a liberal travesty, perpetrated to pull the plug on a booming investment climate, by a bunch of ne'er-do-well Clinton bureaucrats supporting Greenstein's compulsions to wreck the market... and a select few of America's business champions.

Drop the B.S. and let's get America back to the truly competitive style tyhat made us a once-great nation.

Sincerely,
William A. Horan
(former) President I.S.I./ MARS Inc.
Montville, NJ 07047

MTC–00006724

From: LuckyQuads8@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:16pm
Subject: microsoft settlement to whom it may concern,

i think it's a shame that the doj should have a say on how microsoft runs its business. they did nothing illegal. drop the case immediately. you should be putting all your time into protecting the innocent citizen from terrorist attacts, instead of trying to make a name for yourself.

look what you guys are doing to medicine by not allowing them to collectivly bargan.

Sincerely,
michael gentile

MTC–00006725

From: HaroldW174@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:16pm
Subject: microsoft

settle the law suit . it is fair and let people go back to work on new systems

HAROLD E.WAKE

MTC–00006726

From: Bshall@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it's terrible that Microsoft was involved in this case in the first place. It's a free country, supposedly, and they were smart enough to take advantage of the freedoms we have. Why should they be penalized. The other companies would have done the same thing if they had been smart enough to do it.

Betty Hall
Temecula, CA

MTC–00006727

From: Robert Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement..

USGOV. DOJ:

Don't you think it is about time you settled this case once and for all? This case ''SHOULD NEVER HAVE STARTED'', but the politians in the Senate (in particular) insisted that you procede with this ''INJUSTICE to MICROSOFT'', and you caved in. Look it has gone on long enough, the economy is faltering due to mistrust and fear on part of the general public. Why don't you do the right thing and settle this so we can move on in America? The last settlement I heard sounded pretty good for everybody but Apple Computer (they did not want to lose their stranglehold on the education systems use of computors. The heck with them, ''Settle this oin the basis of the court last reccommendation, so we can start renewing our lives here in America.

Sincerely,
Robert M. Taylor
866 Geneva Ave.
Toledo OH. 43609–3038

MTC–00006728

From: Andy Elvey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: I also support the views put forward by Ganesh Prasad

Dear Sirs,

I would like to add my voice to that of Ganesh Prasad (whose submission you may have seen— if not, it is at this link— *http://www.linuxtoday.com/news—story.php3?ltsn=2002–01–02–002–20-OP-MS*

I believe that he has put forward a very good case for stronger remedies in the case of Department of Justice vs Microsoft. I am particularly frustrated with the so-called ''bootloader clause'' , in which Microsoft has had secret agreements with OEMs that prevent them from offering consumers the choice of which operating system to boot when they start up their computers. Now *that* sounds suspicious .....

I know that I am only one voice among millions, and I'm not an American citizen (though I —am— half-Canadian!) . I can only ask that the views put forward by Ganesh are treated with the seriousness that they deserve. I believe he has made a very eloquent and persuasive case for strong remedies.

Very many thanks for your time and consideration! (And have a good 2002!)

Andy

MTC–00006729

From: Pete Rodriguez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I just want to express my opinion as to what I see as a needless persecution of Microsoft Corporation in the last 5 years. Most of the arguments in regards to Microsoft's browser integration with the operating system as Microsoft's way of closing the system to competition is incorrect. In light of the recent viruses and DDOS attacks, this integration and openess have actually allowed Microsoft's Windows and email system to be more vulnerable. There are enough documented APIs out there that more rogue software can be developed. In my opinion allowing unrestricted access to all source code will make Microsoft more vulnerable to future attacks on its Windows Operating System. As to JAVA and other middleware for the browser and server environment, they too are susceptible to these attacks. A new way needs to be develop to open up the Internet and develop applications difficult to hack and launch DDOS attacks. Narrowly focusing on the IE Browser and Windows as the way Microsoft will dominate the Internet is already proven more a liability to being hacked than a Microsoft advantage. Please let Microsoft improved and fixed their vulnerabilities unhampered with more litigation whose main argument have been proven false more than 5 years after this antitrust cases were filed. The argument that Browser and Internet integration gives Microsoft an upperhand against other application developers does not hold water. We now know its a double-edge sword. It actually created more jobs and companies whose main product is to prevent or contain these virus attacks. It gave Microsoft a black-eye because machines were going down because of IE and Outlook launched viruses. Please allow Microsoft freedom to innovate, fixed and improve its products.

Respectfully,
Pete Rodriguez
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006730

From: Stuart Powell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case asap. And if this settlement does not include the holdout States, please encourage them to join in the settlement and let's put this behind us.

MTC–00006731

From: Peter A. Weller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please be informed that I firmly support the current settlement with Microsoft that has been proposed and agreed upon

Sincerely yours
Peter A. Weller
1398 Edgewood Dr.
Holland, MI 49424

MTC–00006732

From: SandyFane@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:18pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir,

Please settle the Microsoft case and move on. It has been long enough.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Mrs. Fane

MTC–00006733

From: Thomas A Wade
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:20pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Mr. Ashcroft

I do not beleive that our federal government should ever have brought an antitrust lawsuit against the Microsoft Company for controlling a large portion of the market because of their product superiority. It does not appear to me or anyone else I have talked to, to be a monoply. Where wood this country be in the hi-tech world without Microsoft. It seems really unfair to me to punish them for being so successful in their bussiness. Because of the down turn in the bussiness cycle, I also beleive, the sooner we can put this nonsense behind us and give credit where credit is do the better we all will be.

Thank You

Sincerely

Thomas A WadeGet

MTC–00006734

From: Jeff Erwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:19pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

According to Tom Reilly, one of the 10 state attorneys general who have broken with the Justice Department to offer their own remedies in the antitrust case of the decade, their proposed fix is designed to ''end Microsoft's stranglehold on innovation and competition in the personal computer industry.''

If you actually read the proposals, though, a very different message comes through loud and clear: The state AGs want to turn Microsoft into a regulated public utility, with about as much freedom to innovate as the Minsk Post Office. Indeed, the proposal looks like something Oracle, Sun Microsystems and AOL Time Warner dreamed up to do to Microsoft—something none of them have managed in the marketplace. Thomas Penfield Jackson, the judge in the antitrust trial, was inclined to break up Microsoft and scatter the pieces to the wind. What Microsoft haters love to forget is that the federal appeals court reviewing the verdict came to very different conclusions. It jettisoned two out of three of Judge Jackson's findings of liability and trimmed the third substantially.

Justice Department litigators, anxious to hold as much turf as they could but realistic about the import of the unanimous appeals court decision, subsequently negotiated a settlement that addressed every element of liability—and then some.

But half the state AGs, who had piggybacked on the Justice Department case and grown fond of their self-appointed role as David to Bill Gates' Goliath, apparently saw no problem in pretending that Judge Jackson's verdict stood.

You think I'm exaggerating? Consider what the AGs have proposed. They want Microsoft to strip Windows down to its skivvies and then sell the operating system in every possible state of dress: with browser or without, with media player or without, with e-mail functionality or without, and so forth. And they want to set the prices Microsoft charges for this OS according to somebody's reckoning of how much the company spent to create each feature.

All this in spite of the fact that the appeals court explicitly stated that the burden of proof was on the government to show that the costs of integrating new features into the operating system, as measured by a reduction in competition, exceeded the benefits to consumers in terms of improved functionality.

The plan would effectively Balkanize Windows, making it impossible for independent software developers to use any of the newly optional features in the operating system without incurring the wrath of customers who inadvertently bought the wrong version of Windows. Remember Microsoft's dispute with Sun over the purity of Microsoft's version of Java? Microsoft settled a private suit with Sun in January 2001 by agreeing to stop the development of its own versions of Java. Yet the states would require Microsoft to include Java with every copy of Windows, effectively making it a common carrier for Sun on the order of a pipeline that must deliver other companies' oil.

Then there's the small matter of disclosing trade secrets. The antitrust case, of course, was about operating systems—Microsoft's applications software was barely mentioned. Yet the states are demanding that Microsoft license three other companies to produce versions of its Office applications suite for competing platforms. Microsoft would have to provide the Office source code to licensees, and much of the Windows source code as well, since Office needs Windows APIs.

Did I mention oversight? The Justice Department proposal would create a technical committee with authority to advise the court on enforcement issues. The states want to create a special master, who would effectively have veto power over Microsoft's design and marketing decisions.

The chances are excellent that the state AG's horror show will never make it to Broadway. The new judge in the case—Judge Jackson, you'll recall—was fired for ethical lapses.

But thanks to the states' initiative, the case will drag on, and the state AGs will earn more brownie points from Microsoft's competitors. Who, apart from consumers of software and believers in a prudent, consumer-oriented antitrust policy, could ask for anything more? Leonard Orland is a professor at the University of Connecticut Law School. This was an article he wrote on December 21st which succinctly addressed the real issues in this case.

Jeff Erwin
General Manager
Network Management Group
Management Business Group
Microsoft Corporation
(425) 705–9400

MTC–00006735

From: Margo Jenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Once and for all leave the most important business in United States, Microsoft corportion alone. It is about time they can conduct their/our business that benefits the US as well as all the rest of the world without somone constantly trying to beat them down. WE AS CUSTOMERS HAVE HAD ENOUGH GET OFF THEIR CASE !!!!!!

Until somone can build a better mouse trap they better shut up!

Margo Jenson
Anacortes, WA

MTC–00006736

From: Robert S. (Bob) Duggan, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

Let's get past the Microsoft dialogue and finalize the settlement. Further delay is of no benefit to anyone, and it further delays the upturn in the national economy.

Yours for a better economy.

Robert S. (Bob) Duggan, Jr.
r.duggan@ieee.org
1112 Mason Woods Drive
Atlanta, GA 30329
[home page] http://pages.prodigy.net/r.duggan
[genealogy] http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/duggan

MTC–00006737

From: ClioKoutz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Please settle with Microsoft and do not allow litigation to continue any longer. The consumer will be harmed if litigation continues. I would hate to see further delays of the shipping of free computers to the inner city schools.

Sincerely,

Clio Koutzoumis

MTC–00006738

From: ISavliwala@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe for the good of the people and the economy, this matter should be settled without further ado.

I believe further prolongation would only hurt the economy. Microsoft has been instrumental in propelling our country forward and I don't think this is the time to reverse the trend.

Mustafa N. Savliwala

MTC–00006739

From: paul—schmidt@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentleman:

I strongly believe the government should do everything possible to settle with Microsoft. Microsoft's contribution to industry has been outstanding. To punish Microsoft is unthinkable. It's easy to compete with Microsoft. It's called superior technology. Anybody can do it. For sure it isn't the legal system.

Thank you for hearing my thoughts.

Paul Schmidt, Jr.
paul_schmidt@msn.com

MTC–00006740

From: Georgene Majors

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the settlement agreed to by Microsoft and DOJ is more than fair to all parties. I would like to see us move on, it would benefit the end consumer and the industry and the economy to put this behind us. Further litigation, in my opinion, serves no useful purpose.

Respectfully
Georgene Majors

MTC–00006741

From: RYBARCZYKT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my feeling that the government has put Microsoft through a legal proceeding that has unfairly penalized them for acting properly in our capitalistic society. The main instigators of this proceeding were Microsoft's competitors. I guess they figured that if they could not beat Microsoft in the business arena maybe they could do it in court. It is now time to drop the litigation and accept the settlement offer that has been agreed to by both Microsoft and the Federal Government.

MTC–00006742

From: paul—mindrup@
standardandpoors.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attention: Department of Justice,

Regarding the recent Microsoft Settlement, I would like to state publicly that the settlement is fair and serves the public interest.

Considering all of the facts, this settlement is tough but is also reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

I beleive that this settlement is good for the consumer and that opposition to this settlement comes mainly from the competitors of Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Paul Mindrup

MTC–00006743

From: Poppy1230@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Once and for all, I think it's time the governments, federal and state, get off the back of Microsoft and let them continue to do what they are best at doing and that is innovating and coming up with new products. I frankly don't see them as a threat to the consumers. It's not that they're the only show in town. There are too many cry babies in Silicon Valley.

Virgil Nerli,
Flushing, New York

MTC–00006744

From: MikeKirk1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am against the settlement. Frankly, I don't think Microsoft should be punished. They have created a product which has enabled this computer/technology revolution to occur. For years we had microchips, computers etc. but it was not until Microsoft build their windows software and explorer software that everything was able to come together in one workable platform. Please don't kill the goose that laid the golden egg!!!!

Regards,
Michael Kirk
201–678–1941

MTC–00006745

From: Eldon Loewe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I urge you to settle the Microsoft case in its present form; no further litigation please.

Eldon Loewe
916 NW 115th Circle
Vancouver, WA 98685
nicpapa@teleport.com

MTC–00006746

From: EVERETT WILLIAMS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have had a computer since 1983 and like almost everyone else have used Microsoft windows. I have always had a choice of browsers, all I had to do was download whatever I wanted. I feel that the fact that Microsoft offered their browser as part of the windows operating system caused a far greater and rapid use of e-mail, everyone gained. Enough already.

E.H. Williams

MTC–00006747

From: Ernie Valenzuela
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: microsoft settlement:

Re: settlement:

I still think the government should leave Microsoft alone,let you continue inovating new programs and systems.

All others can do the same on their own, I am tired of bickering and government interference. They should look into the failure of Congress to pass the very important bill, on relief for the economy before we go down like Japan.

The Stimullus package, should have been addressed , and not the microsoft affair. Is this a free country,? then let the other companies do their own research, I am happy with Microsoft as it is.

Stay Well
Ernesto Valenzuela, Captain USN Retired

MTC–00006748

From: Barry Kentrup
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:23pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ Representative,

The Microsoft settlement is needed for the American economy to return. This suit was a political action from the start and now is the time to correct this error. I recommend the following action:

1.) Throw the entire suit out!!!

2.) If #1 is not possible, make the decision as fast and soft as possible.

Microsoft is a company which has done wonders for our country, It is time to repay them with your confidence vote.

Barry Kentrup
Orange, CA

Disclaimer: I own no Microsoft stock and am in no other way affiliated with this company. I am an honest self-respecting law-abiding citizen who knows the difference between right and wrong.

MTC–00006749

From: Warren Uppling
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

The ''settlement'' seems to be the best for the consumer, whom I represent. I think it is time to get back to business. Thanks for your time and consideration.

jwu

MTC–00006750

From: Richard Latimer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

I am pleased with the tentative settlement reached with Microsoft corporation as stands. I would like to get this matter behind us as soon as possible so not to hinder future breakthroughs in the world of computer electronics.

Cordially,
Mr. Richard K. Latimer

MTC–00006751

From: Chuck Brouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:16pm
Subject: MS Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement. I for one, being a consumer and an IT professional, enjoy and benefit from using Microsoft products. This settlement isn't exactly timely, but nevertheless will end a disagreement between the government and Microsoft that I personally have seen as ridiculous and a waste of the tax payers money.

Chuck Brouse
CEB Information Systems, Inc.
9050 Iron Horse Lane, Suite 108
Baltimore, MD 21208
Bus: 410.580.9080
Fax: 410.580.9082
www.cebis.com
cbrouse@cebis.com

MTC–00006752

From: Jennie Jast
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

As a concerned citizen and a consumer, I strongly support the settlement of US. vs. Microsoft. Please stop special interests group from derailing the settlement and wasting taxpayers money. Settle the case NOW and tell the 9 state attorneys to stop putting their personal ambitions above the people of their states!

Let the free market decide Microsoft's fate.
Jennie Jastrzembski
Newport News, VA

MTC–00006753

From: Rices21@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

People under free economic systems prosper, people under government controlled systems struggle to survive. Government intervention in the market place serves corruption, not productivity. It is the tax supported government that is too powerful, not comsumer supported Microsoft. The entire government case against Microsoft should be dismissed.
Houston W. Rice
rices21@aol.com

MTC–00006754

From: Donald E. Olsby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why don't you get off there case ?? Give them some more time. Having to waste so much energy looking for UNCLE SAM and now the states has to be a drain on production. You must realize the longer it takes the more money they will have. They can't even come close to filling XBOX orders let alone the other software products that are in such demand. My son attends a local community college and he says without the help and gifts from Microsoft they would be up creek in the information tech side of the school and here they are gifting and UNCLE is undercutting. You make no sense you can't take their brains away—-THANK GOD !!// Don & Carol Olsby
Donald E.Olsby
CC:David Olsby

MTC–00006755

From: JWesley4X@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am in favor of settling the case against Microsoft. The proposed settlement is fair to all parties concerned and should move forward.
Sincerely,
Jonathan Beck

MTC–00006756

From: florence howe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs,

Enough is enough, End This Legal Manovering and get on to somthing that will benifit the masses rather than just a few.
Glenn R Howe
5137 SE Oakland Ave
Milwaukie, OR 97267

MTC–00006757

From: Deb Dub
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

This case has drug on for WAY TOO LONG! Please make sure this reaches a settlement soon so we can all move on. And hopefully, the economy will be the better for it as well. (Have you noticed that things go better whenever a rumored settlement is being discussed?)

And remind the states on where personal computer technology would be if it wasn't for Microsoft. I've used Unix systems and would NEVER want something like that at home. It's not user friendly at all!!!

Thanks for getting this taken care of in a timely fashion.
Sincerely,
Debbie Wilcox

MTC–00006758

From: Art Paquette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:25pm

Please stop stifling the innovation which benefits our country's economy and serves only to dampen the recovery . . .

Settle this suit with Microsoft and let's get on with business . . .

A Concerned Citizen and Taxpayer . . .
Art Paquette

MTC–00006759

From: Gordon Knight
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

As an entrepreneur I believe in the freedom to conduct business in a manner consistent with civilized practice and the laws of the State and Country.

I consider that Microsoft has done this, yes there may be some sour grapes from others not so smart or not so fast, their loss will encourage them to try harder and move faster in future that's free enterprise. Its very easy to get overly combative in the heat of battle maybe Microsoft is guilty of that but no more. Thanks to Microsoft products my business runs much more efficiently today than 10 years ago. I suggest that the Government busy themselves with criminals, tax evaders, terrorists and suchlike and leave entrepreneurs and business men to do what they are best at even if its highly competitive.
Sincerely
Gordon B. Knight

MTC–00006760

From: OBJECTIVE1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle with Microsoft. The DOJ was wrong in attacking Microsoft in the first place. Microsoft did not do anything wrong. They did not initiate force against others. They did not commit fraud. They were being pursued for offering a product (Internet Explorer) to their customers for free. Why is that a crime?

They were being pursued for negotiating with their customers a agreement whereby their software would be included on newly produced computers. Why is that a crime?

Bill Gates was targeted because he was too successful for Washington bureaucrats. Antitrust law is an abomination and should be abolished. It punishes innovation and success and makes the world less competitive not more. It makes products more expensive not less.

You should spend your time pursuing Bin Laden not Bill Gates!
Logan Darrow

MTC–00006761

From: Alan Goldberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:25pm
Subject: It's time to settle and move on

I think it is time for all parties involved in the Microsoft case to accept the DOJ settlement and move on. The consumer has not been harmed and it is only the lawyers and weak competitors who stand to benefit from continuing this case. History has proven that the marketplace does more to correct these problems then the courts.
Alan Goldberg
Kings Point, NY

MTC–00006762

From: w—engstrom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs, Instead of being harassed by the U. S. Government, Microsoft should be considered as a National Treasure. Its exported products help our economy and expand our capabilities. I think that the court case against Microsoft was totally unfounded. Whatever concessions that Microsoft makes are more than adequate, and in my opinion should not even be necessary. While there are those people (mainly Microsoft's competitors) who want to suppress Microsoft, we believe that Microsoft provides great products and follows up with great support for those products.

Microsoft's products are sometimes released with ''bugs.'' However, Microsoft readily provides fixes via the Internet as soon as they realize there is a problem. Their customer support is outstanding. As an engineer, I recognize that few products that hit the marketplace can be perfect, and that it is impossible to foresee everything that can go wrong, no matter how well you plan. In spite of this, Microsoft does a great job and has provided significant support to the technology and economic health of the industry and our country.
William Engstrom
3110 181 Avenue NE
Redmond, WA 98052–5934

PS, I haven't seen Janet Reno or Joel Klein producing any software or anything else of value to the country lately. Thank God they are no longer with the Government. The main thing that can be said of Joel Klein is that he successfully used the Microsoft suit as a stepping stone to a better-paying job. But he left a wake of destruction behind him.

MTC–00006763

From: Rich Wray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have a small real estate investment and management business in Southern California, and I have been a satisfied user of Microsoft products in my business since 1995. I also own a small amount of their stock. During the past several years I have followed closely

the anti-trust trial, and, frankly, I cannot understand the governments position against Microsoft, their products and their business practices. In my opinion, the only plausible explanation is politics. It is the ugly side of our system of government where competitors use political contributions to gain access to holders of public office and judges in order to gain an advantage against a business competitor. For me it is particularly disapointing that the primary example of this ugly part of politics is occuring in my home state, where Oracle and Sun Microsystems have teamed up with Attorney General Bill Lockler for their respective personal gain.

I know that Microsoft products have been greatly responsible for the increase in productivity of individuals and business, especially during the past seven years, because in my business we are able to accomplish with 3 people what required 6 or more people in the 1980's and early 1990's. The difference is profitability for myself and better pay for my employees. We are not technical people, so we would not be able to take advantage of computers and the internet without the software provided by Microsoft. Also, as Microsoft has incorporated more into their operating system, we have been able to take even greater advantage of technology. We now regularly use the internet in our business to communicate, purchase goods and services, and to access information, all without the need to know how it works. I for one do not want to revert to a world where these capabilities are available only to the technologically advantaged.

My son is an electrical engineer and, prior to his graduation from college, he was not a fan of Microsoft. Like most technology people, he prided himself in the ability to use linux and other software programs that a technically-challenged person such as myself could not use without a great deal of training. Now that he is in the business world, he appreciates Microsoft products because he now understands the necessity for all people to communicate on the internet and to use the power of computers, which non-tecnical people would not be able to do without Microsoft or similar software. Sun Micro, Oracle, AOL and others could have chosen to develop competing technologies to challenge Microsoft's growing dominance, but, instead they have chosen to use their vast resources to fund a political challenge instead.

My understanding of anti-trust law is limited, but I thought that the over-riding intent was to protect the consumer. How is the consumer protected by restricting his ability to access the internet and other technologies by limiting the extent to which such abilities can be incorporated into the operating system of their computer? Also, how has the consumer been harmed? Anyone who has purchased software knows that Microsoft products are not expensive, certainly not when compared to other operating systems and business software. As for Microsoft's business practices, most of what I have heard has centered on things like volume discounting and controlling ''shelf space'', that is access to the desk top. In my opinion, these are normal business practices.

If Microsoft has a monopoly in operating systems and even business applications, then it is a de-facto monopoly. The consumer has selected Microsoft products overwhelmingly for their performance, not for lack of alternatives. The same can be siad for AOL. What is the point of the never-ending legal onslaught against Microsoft other than for the personal gain of individuals in the Federal Justice Department (especially under Clinton), the State's Attorney Generals, the aforementioned Oracle, Sun Microsystems and AOL, and every class-action lawyer in the United States anxiously awaiting their turn to profit from this legal war on Microsoft. For the consumer, what might the award be, some discount coupon on their next Microsoft product? Obviously, this legal war on Microsoft is not about the consumer at all. Its about politics.

I do not believe that Microsoft owes anything to anyone for their success. However, if Microsoft gives software and re-conditioned computers to schools, the schools and the children are winners. Of course, Microsoft might also be a winner if this means that more schools in the future buy Microsoft instead of Apple, or more children and their families do the same. The only way to avoid this result is to deprive the schools and the children of the Microsoft products, or for Apple to improve upon their product. Let's bring this legal warfare to an end. Accept the Microsoft settlement. For those tates that choose not to do so, let them continue their battle on their own. Maybe the citizens of their states will become as disgusted with the costs and the process as am I.

Thank you.

Rich Wray

MTC–00006764

From: Kenneth Jennings
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I feel strongly that Microsoft has not done damage to other companies. Microsoft has been innovative and should not be penalized for that. It is time to get this case settled which will also be a big help to the economy.

Sincerely, Verna Jean Jennings, consumer.

MTC–00006765

From: C.W. Schumacher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:28pm
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I feel strongly that the proposed litigation settlement with Microsoft should be finalized as presented.

We've had enough litigation.

Respectfully,

Carl W. Schumacher
5655 Lynbrook
Houston, TX 77056
Email: cschumacher88@hotmail.com

MTC–00006766

From: Mrothberg@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get the show on the road and implement the settlement. MS is a pioneering entrepreneurial company that has only done great things for the Information Technology industry. Let's not play around anymore with those who want to penalize MS for their vision and and intelligence.

.....Remember the 11th of September.....

Michael Rothberg
APPLIED NETWORK SOLUTIONS INC
PO Box 6380
Somerset NJ 08875–6380
(Cell) (732) 208–7323
(V) (877) 247–0377
(V) (732) 247–0377
(F) (732) 247–0139
E-mail: Mrothberg@AOL.com

MTC–00006767

From: Jim STARNES
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The Department of Justice Officials:

I feel that Microsoft Corporation has worked hard at reaching a fair settlement over the last year, and all parties should be commended on their efforts. However, when you deal in the type of businesses that Microsoft does, there are many competitors that may not have fairness in mind. I hope that the Department of Justice feels confident in the present settlement, and does not allow those with ''special interests'' to derail an agreement that is in the public's best interest.

Sincerely,

James W Starnes
jim_starnes@pgn.com

MTC–00006768

From: C Zellmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:28pm
Subject: Micrsoft Settlement

Lets close the Microsoft case. It should be settled for the good of the country and the good of the Consumers. Thanks ,

C. Duane Zellmer
6061 Dundee Drive
Huntington Beach, Ca.
92647

MTC–00006769

From: Paul Sanusi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:22pm
Subject: Setle the Case with Microsoft Once and for all

I will like to see the problem with Microsoft resolved finally. This case is dragging the whole economy down. I will like to see Microsoft freed , because unnecessary time and energy is being wasted. Microsoft could have done more innovations where it not for this case. The nation needs better technological innovations . This can not be achieved by holding the gun at Microsoft's head. I am suprised that the state of California is not the other states willing to resolve this case. California is suppose to be an innovative state.

MTC–00006770

From: DrLehon@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:29pm
Subject: (no subject)

I feel the settlement between the federal govenment and Microsoft is sufficient. I do not believe it is in the public interest for the

States to make additonal demands upon Microsoft.
Thank You
Lester Lehon

MTC–00006771

From: Charles Chambers Sr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
When will the government get out of the way of progress. I feel that the governments persuit of Microsoft has inhibited progress and has contributed to the economic decline in the technology area and the economy in general. Please move over and get out of the way.
Charles R. Chambers

MTC–00006772

From: daley advertising
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen/Ladies,
Please do not throw any more monkey wrenches in this action. Lets get it settled as it stands.
Everyone seems to forget that this man (Gates) and the Microsoft company have been largely responsible for the development of a system that has benefited the world and business for the past 15 years. Before windows, it was impossible to get one piece of software to be compatible with another. With the developments of windows operating system, the WORLD has benefited greatly.
He has invented a better mouse trap and the cry babies that oppose him and his company will bring the entire industry back to the stone age if you allow them to screw up a good thing. Let the opposition be as creative and as inventive as Microsoft and let them compete that way.....not by having politicians getting involved in something they know nothing about.
Yours truly,
George F. Daley

MTC–00006773

From: SCZECINSKI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:30pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE—THEY HAVEN'T DONE ANYTHING WRONG.
PLEASE LET'S GET THIS OVER WITH.
SINCERELY,
MONIQUE SZCZECINSKI

MTC–00006774

From: Elaine Ehrhardt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
This comment is directed to the Department of Justice. This is to let you know that I feel that it is in the best interest of all concerned that the Department of Justice goes through with the settlement that it has reached with Microsoft.
Thank you for your taking the time to read this message.
Sincerely,
Elaine Mirone Ehrhardt

MTC–00006775

From: HENRY KIENZLE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I believe that the Microsoft settlement should proceed as it now stands. Further litigation merely hampers progress in the computer industry, and allows more unscrupulous litigates to further enrich themselves at the expense of the public taxpayers.
This case has already dragged on far too long, and should be brought to a swift, fair conclusion.

MTC–00006776

From: Richard T Schroeder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The Microsoft Settlement is fair and further litigation is a total waste of money. We taxpayers are sick and tired of the continued playing around and are appalled at how much money has been wasted in the past years on this activity. Kindly close the book and stop the waste. I for one have worked hard to earn my money and the Government throwing it away on this unnecessary pursuit is simply grandstanding. It is not the United States money that is being wasted, it is mine and the other millions of taxpayers. Stop this continued abuse!
R.T. Schroeder

MTC–00006777

From: Tom Collins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs,
From the outset of the suit I have felt that the charges were more political than fact based and as a user of many of Microsoft's programs I have felt that the software and services were fairly priced and technical support was available when ever needed. As far as a competitor's viewpoint sour grapes appear to be obvious. I hope the settlement can go forward and allow the competitors to built a better mousetrap as opposed to destroying a well founded Capitalistic American company.
Sincerely,
Thomas F. Collins

MTC–00006778

From: eclaggett@tt-ec.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
United States of America
Department of Justice
To Whom It May Concern
I strongly believe that the comprehensive agreement reached between the federal government and nine states with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling is fair and equitable.
I strongly believe that the settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved, and once finalized could provide a small but much needed boost to the current economy.
I believe any further actions against Microsoft would simply be for punitive measures by Microsoft competitors.
The more quickly this can be settled, the better for all parties involved!
Eric Claggett
Vice President of Operations
Tinnerman Palnut Engineered Products M assillon, Ohio
Phone: 330.830.7521
Fax: 330.830.7505
E-Mail: eclaggett@tinnerman.com

MTC–00006779

From: Hank Flynn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:
As a longtime developer of software products for engineers I feel that the DOJ anti trust suits have harmed Microsoft and the marketplace. Let's end this countrproductive litigation and let the market place do what it does well, sort out winners from losers, without political interference.
Best Regards,
Hank Flynn

MTC–00006780

From: TESSTAUG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
As a concerned consumer, I consider the Microsoft settlement fair and reasonable. It's time to bring this litigation to a close. Put a stop to the efforts of the special interest groups, who apparently are unable to compete effectively in the market place without government assistance, and the ego trips of the nine State Attorneys General who are trying to extend the litigation and waste more of the tax payer's money.
Travis Smith
66 Old Hickory Trail
Hendersonville, NC 28739

MTC–00006781

From: Steve(u)Lieberman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:
I am a proponent of the settlement reached between Microsoft and the DOJ. Please end this economically debilitating litigation. I firmly believe that to continue the litigation will unnecessarily punish Microsoft, provide unjustifiable benefits to Microsoft competitors and leave the consumer with less product choice priced more expensively. In short, I see no benefits to consumers like myself with any further litigation against Microsoft. Please settle immediately.
Steve Lieberman
Oceanside, CA

MTC–00006782

From: Jeff Stucky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
This antitrust suit was not started by consumers and it has done an untold amount of damage to our economy. The Microsoft settlement is more than fair and needs to be made final.
Thank You,
Jeff Stucky

MTC–00006783

From: Jon Houghton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Microsoft settlement is both fair and just. Let's get on to more important issues. It's been tough enough for Microsoft to be as innovative as I know they can be with all the actions taken against them. DOJ, how about spending more time and money on wiping out the criminal drug traffic!

Jon Houghton
Pinecrest, FL

MTC–00006784

From: Ernie and Louise
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: microsft judgement

Please leave the Microsoft settlement as is. It is fair.

Ernest M. Wallent

MTC–00006785

From: FSubjack@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:34pm
Subject: Be fair to America—the Microsoft settlement is more than fair

Let's have an end to the badgering of a successful Company. Yes, they are aggressive and successful but that is what America is about and that is exactly what makes us successful.

Respectfully submitted.
Frank Scott
Journeys End Lane
Princeton, NJ

MTC–00006786

From: Dale Wierman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:34pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The politically motivated litigation against Microsoft was initially not appropriate in my personal judgment, but that is no longer the issue. Severe damage to the National economy, and to the investment portfolios of countless citizens, has been a direct consequence of this morass initiated by statutes not appropriate to the technology of this era.

Our National government has a very definitive role to combat terrorism, without continuing action to dismantle an industrial leader of the free world. The process and expense of the proposed settlement action is much more than appropriate, but should be approved to end the endless expenditure of both public and private time and effort. Further, it would be most appropriate to penalize any State that does not agree to the terms of settlement extended by DOJ and Microsoft, and attempts to continue the litigation. There are significant issues of National security that need the entire focus and effort of the free world without the USA dismantling our economic structure internally!

Thank you for considering our view.
Dale L. and Jane C. Wierman

MTC–00006787

From: jackbarr@postoffice.pacbell.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: settlement

I believe Microsoft has a responsibility to society to play fair and not intimidate its competitors and potential partners. Microsoft should have been divided into two companies. Their attitude has not changed and they will be even more powerful in the years to come.

John Barry

MTC–00006788

From: Neil Bergman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:29pm

The country has wasted enuff money on this matter. the only ones who may be hurt by this settlement are microsoft's competitors. get it done with. the settlement is fair.

MTC–00006789

From: KJGERWELL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:34pm
Subject: (no subject)

Microsoft is an American treasure. Sure they are big, but I thought capitalism allowed for competition and not restrictions based on the fact that others are not as competetive or successful. Microsoft has given back an enormous amount to this country in technology, charity and good will, so I believe that they should be allowed to operate as they were. Creating restrictions will only hamper their development and research.

MTC–00006790

From: DBrandt881@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

settle...period...for msft users, msft investors, and other internet software users' well being....settle....

MTC–00006791

From: Bbkosty@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let it be. Let it be. There's no point in harassing the company that has been the most innovative in the computer industry. I am content with the settlement as are so many millions of Microsoft sympathizers. Since when is success a sin???

Yours truly,
Barbara Kosty
1133 Lagoon View Ct.
Cardiff, CA 92007

MTC–00006792

From: RBlum10036@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Stop those few from playing games! accept that just settlement, considered judgement and wisdom, from my generation that too often today is ignored.

History, sometimes doesn't get thru to the youngsters, until too late.

God Bless

Bob Blum

MTC–00006793

From: Thomas Thon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: MS LAWSUITS

Drop the case and move on..Japan would have given MS a medal of honor for accomplishing what they have...The microsoft action was politically motivated to get MS to start giving money to polliticians..Blackmail, pure and Simple..Now MS is giving money to politicians..

MTC–00006794

From: Ron Large
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:36pm

Please settle the Microsoft suit under the terms agreed to by various attorneys general and Microsoft.

Microsoft's ''monopoly'' has enabled millions of CONSUMERS to exchange files, share data, etc. Plus, anyone who wants to can always buy a Mac and not use Microsoft products. Or they can use their existing PC but use Linux (free) and not even install Microsoft Windows or any other Microsoft product. I believe the suit was not in the consumers' interest at all. Big companies (not as big as Microsoft) wanted this suit. They couldn't win in the marketplace, but they devised a way to win in court.

I do not now nor have I ever worked for Microsoft or any software or computer company nor have I ever owned Microsoft stock. I simply use a computer several hours each day running my own small business.

Ronald J Large
Large Profits Fund Raising
400 Susana Avenue
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

MTC–00006795

From: TEX10101@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The above company has the knowledge and ability to continue to impact the progress of communications in our country in the future as it has in the past and at this time, there should be concern of stifling our national progress thru inordinate restrictions that can act as a detriment to that development.

The public welfare extends to that future development more than the public welfare in either penalizing Microsoft too harshly in sharing information with competitors or in monetary penalties at this time. Overall the public has little support for harsh penalties and feel the major proponents are simply those companies who are in the ''me too'' welfare line to attempt to share in the profit of the research and development success of Microsoft. Forsightness on the impact of severe control Vs future US technology potential should be the true measurement of any legal decision

MTC–00006796

From: Dennis Aulenbacher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:39pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,
I am in complete support of the settlement that has been reached between the US Government and Microsoft Corporation. All further actions should be completely disallowed. The settlement is FAIR.
Dennis Aulenbacher
cai@htc.net

MTC–00006797

From: UWISSHH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:38pm
Subject: (no subject)
This is a fair settlement the goverment should move on , don t they have anything else to do ?????? They should move on . Stop picking on microsoft. !!!!!!

MTC–00006798

From: Robert Dunlap
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelement
I encourage the Department of Justice to finalize its settlement agreement with Microsoft as expeditiously as possible. The failure to finalize the settlement has and will continue to hang over the market and will limit the innovation that is required to further expand the use of technology throughout the world's economy.
Sincerely,
Robert M. Dunlap
18655 West Bernardo Drive, #286
San Diego, CA 92127

MTC–00006799

From: George Tinker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir or Madam;
This lawsuit was a travesty of justice and a waste of our short taxpayer funds. Who is to gain by this? Certainly not software and computer users like me, who are looking for easier, faster, less troublesome connections.
Have I received more than I expected? Who are the small parties that have been injured, that small outfit that had an extra $1 BILLION in cash to give to the UN, AOL Time Warner (CNN, Netscape, etc.)? I'm sure they're laughing all the way to the bank (hey, we just got the Government, at Taxpayers' expense, to kill our largest competitor.)
This was a bad lawsuit, a clever way for AOL and Sun to kill a major competitor, it chews up precious resources, and has harmed consumers through stifling of creative thought. Drop or settle. There is no more excuse!
Regards,
George Tinker
georgewtinker@hotmail.com

MTC–00006800

From: Jacques Guenette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Enough litigation !
Jacques (Jag) GuÏ≤nette
jacques.guenette@dlgl.com
jguen99@aol.com

MTC–00006801

From: Marty Christensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please stop the litigation against Microsoft and leave them alone. There is no reason for the lawsuit to be extended in way, shape or manner. This should now be a dead issue. Too much governmental money has already been wasted on this and no more should be spent.
Marty Christensen
Listen, Inc.
312–277–4236
312–207–0102 (fax)

MTC–00006802

From: Grieve, Jim
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice:
Please add my name to the list of 200,000,000 or so United States citizens who are or should be tired of the unfair treatment which has been rendered against Microsoft. The company has led the way in ensuring that our great country is counted as the most technically advanced nation on the face of the earth. It may be true that they cut a few corners along the way, making it seem that they were not good corporate citizens. But whatever sins they committed pale in comparison with the benefits that have accrued to all of us. At this point, Microsoft is attempting to make honest restitution for those sins in terms of the proposed settlement. Since they are comfortable with the settlement, I suggest that it be ratified so they can get back to business.
Sincerely,
James W. Grieve
441 North Ashbury Avenue
Bolingbrook, Illinois 60440

MTC–00006804

From: Peter B. Moss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The latest roadblock set up by these dissident states is just another money grab a la the tobacco settlement. These states would still be wallowing in 19th century technology,but for Mr. Gates & Co. As a consumer and taxpayer, I think the original settlement is fair and just. Lets move on and leave the whiny competitors and greedy Attorneys General to fight some other battle.
Sincerely,
Peter B. Moss

MTC–00006805

From: Sueysch30@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
I want to express my opinion that the REVISED PROPOSED SETTLEMENT with Microsoft should stand.

MTC–00006806

From: John Beasley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is more than fair. Resolve this matter now. The consumer needs this matter over.
John Beasley
1524 So. 51st Kansas City Ks 66106

MTC–00006807

From: louemma@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:40pm
Subject: Settlement!
Don't you think it time to settle this agreement? There are so many of us, the older generation, who know, use and like Microsoft as it is; why change it to something that we cannot use?
It's time that we got this settled and settled in the best interest of the most of it's user's, not just a few dissidents! Let's leave it alone now as it is!
Louemma Jensen
louemma@juno.com

MTC–00006808

From: Bill Creighton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:
Microsoft has paid its penalties. It is no longer in my interest to furthur pursue this matter or indeed the public's.
Every business in America would like to suceed like Microsoft
Bill Creighton

MTC–00006809

From: Charles Treadwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:
I believe the Microsoft/DOJ settlement is a fair one and feel the case should be completed.
Thank you,
Charles H. Treadwell, Jr
2057 Bordeaux Lane
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019–1432

MTC–00006810

From: Applestinx@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: come on!
Look at who's going after Microsoft! Apple, who's guilty of almost everything they accuse Microsoft of. If Apple or those companies busy designing the Linux operating system don't have the same market penetration as Microsoft, its because these other companies make stuff that the market doesn't like.
No one is stopping anyone from using products from Microsoft's competitors. Most people choose Microsoft for many reasons. Why should folks like Apple, who can't compete, now be subsidized by Microsoft, a company that still has original ideas? Why do all these second-rate companies think they should get a share of what Microsoft has innovated?
I paid $11.50 (w/ shipping) to get the Linux operating system. Its so clunky & lousy, I won't even use it. Did Microsoft cause this Linux OS to be crummy? NO. I can't even begin to tell you how horrible the Apple computer is. Apple makes their own

hardware & software, they have total control. Yet they make junk, & charge more than Microsoft does for new operating systems.

Let's have a level playing field. Let's investigate all the other hardware & software companies, too. Its politically correct to slam Microsoft. Apple, the dirtiest little company that ever was, points to Microsoft and cries foul. Let's take a good look at the whole industry before one company unfairly gets beaten up.

MTC–00006811

From: Andrew Amicon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

Isn't enough, enough. Get the states off of Microsoft's back and let them get back to running their business. The taxpayers and Microsoft have spent enormous amounts of money NOT TO MENTION MANAGMENT TIME in getting through this DOJ witch hunt. It's time to move on so Microsoft can innovate again and make the world more productive! Throw the 8 state cases out of court and force the settlement on them!

Sincerely,
Andrew R. Amicon
CEO
Medical Technology Resources, LLC

MTC–00006812

From: Jack Pike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs

Please get this thing settled, I am from California, but its obvious that the government authorities here are not listening except to those with money to donate to their campaigns. I have no connection with Microsoft except to be a long time user of their software. If it were not for Microsoft I would hate to think where we would be in the computing world. It would be as it was 15 years ago with those yuppies in the Silicon Valley in charge, every thing to expensive for the common man to afford. Settle as soon as possible and use your influence to get the states that are so hungry for money to settle also. They do not care about anything but money.

Jack H Pike

MTC–00006813

From: Jeanne and Joe
To: Microsoft ATR, Lawrence A. Julian
Date: 1/2/02 4:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings:

We feel that the Microsoft case has been in courts much more time than necessary. There are so many more important things to work on now. Basically it appears that the majority of the groups opposed to a settlement consists of business competitors who are jealous of Microsoft's success. They want to control Microsoft and be involved in any new procedures that Microsoft will be initiating. It is not in the best interest of the public to put such strict controls on any company Microsoft has produced many new and useful computer programs and it appears that their competitors are very jealous and are attempting to tie up the company and prevent normal honest competition.

Sincerely,
Joseph and Janette Giubbini

MTC–00006814

From: KKHR50A@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough, lets get on with other things. The settlement is adequate.

Ed Butler
4272 NW 54 St.
Coconut Creek FL 33073

MTC–00006815

From: Dave Janne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: I think the time has come to put this behind us, and move on. I think the proposed settlement with Microsoft is fair, and just.

Thank you
L. David Janne
President
Steuben Electronics Inc.

MTC–00006816

From: LDavis3770@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please move forward with the proposed settlement! The country needs this to come to an end!

MTC–00006817

From: Susan Steele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to say that I am pleased with the settlement and find it fair for all. In my opinion, this long, and costly, litigation should never have happened to begin with.

I am very displeased to see that a few are still trying to derail this settlement. This is a terrible waste of time and money and could be a direct loss to consumers (who depend on Microsoft for the best) and can only result in more negativity that will help to cause a further decline of our United States economy. All of this, in my opinion, has resulted because of a few people/companies that have been jealous of a man who happened to be intelligent, innovative, successful and gave back to his country and the world with superior products AND donations of HUGE magnitude. And, who, by the way, has HELPED our economy. The public, I feel, has had far more than enough, the companies and ''complainers'' have had far more than their chance...it's time to move on!

Susan Steele
email:susannsteele@hotmail.com

MTC–00006818

From: John Farr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlepeople:

I urge you to wrap up and close this case with Microsoft. For many of us, they have been the engine that America has run on for the last decade. The individual states are just trying to make political hay and reap a windfall from a big company. This does not help the economy or the small business that is just trying to go about their business and survive.

I do not work for MS now or ever. I was in the insurance business for years and am now a newspaper columnist and community activist.

Thank you.
John D. Farr
J. D. Farr ''Johnbbq''
Box 490 525 Pinon Ridge
Ranchos de Taos, NM 87557
NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS:
Johnbbq@msn.com

MTC–00006819

From: rishimo@attglobal.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Finalize the settlement as soon as possible as my opnion is that the US govt should not have involved itself in this whole mess to begin with, just to satisfy. This does not look good on the image of a free enterprise oriented govt.

regards
a tax paying citizen

MTC–00006820

From: r(u)hodg Hodgson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have written to you before about the Microsoft Settlement. I said that I felt that it was a good offer and that I felt that the court should except it and put an end to this business. I will take this opportune moment to say-so again. We don't need people causing problems right now with the what is going on in this world right now.

Respectfully yours,
Robert Hodgson

MTC–00006821

From: Wendy Sullivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings:

I am writing my opinion to request that the Microsoft case be settled without further litigation. This case has gone on long enough and I believe a fair resolution has already been reached by the Court of Appeals. The ruling is good for consumers and the sooner this settlement can be resolved the sooner companies can return to innovating rather than fighting in court. Our economy (which could use a boost) would benefit by new technology.

Sincerely,
Wendy J. Sullivan
5640 Timson Lane
Alpharetta, GA 30022

MTC–00006822

From: PvHSr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Decisions

Leave Microsoft alone. We have gotten past bad Clinton politics except for a few Clinton (Democratic) followers like Connecticut's AG Blumenthal.

Paul W. von Hardenberg
Southbury, CT

MTC–00006823

From: rdm13d
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:45pm
Subject: Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Please get off MSN's back. If you damage industry leaders you damage the USA.

Robert Mitchell

MTC–00006824

From: William Lenheim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DOJ, agreement with Microsoft although hard, should stand. Any additional changes to the settlement via States, DOJ, or other sources should be avoided at all cost. Microsoft may not be perfect, but they have great products and are on the cutting edge of Software development.

Microsoft is a widely held stock and further harm could be accrued by the smaller stock holders should the company be broken up or changed in any way. The best way to sum up the matter is ''Leave Microsoft Alone''!

By the way I would think that AOL/Time Warner, is more of a monopoly than Microsoft ever was.

Mr. William Lenheim
lenheimw@msn.com

MTC–00006825

From: Dr. Kathi Antolak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir/Ms,

I have found Microsoft's products to be excellent over the years—and would favor allowing them to advance the field of computing without government interference. Please stop using my tax dollars against this company that has helped to change the world in a positive manner. Please cease and desist from further legal actions against Microsoft. I believe it has had a deletory effect not only on the computing world but also on our US economy.

You have my vote. Please get this settled and allow the company to continue it's innovations.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Antolak MD
2137 NW Cascade View Drive
Bend, OR 97701

MTC–00006826

From: DGuyton@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Err... would you guys like get over it already, and leave Microsoft alone? I know they are the Dark Side, and a megalo-monopolistic bastard, but you know what? So are you! (i.e. the Fed Govt).

So, just leave them alone and let the public market sort things out. At least there is a choice in who's / what software people buy. Microsoft got to be big via the free market system. Let that system sort out their future, not legislation.

Thanks.
David Guyton
dguyton@aol.com

MTC–00006827

From: Padmaraju@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I like to add my voice to encourage you to proceed with the proposed Microsoft settlement, without further litigation. This will be in the interest of not just Microsoft but in the interest of the country as a whole, by reducing the cost of further litigation. There already is plenty of competition in the software industry. There are new companies being founded by smart people all the time.

As a not very sophisticated computer user, perhaps one of a large majority, I definitely like the idea of buying one product that will allow me to navigate seemlessly through multiple applications. A complete unbundling of the applications will be definitely challenging and expensive.

Thanks for reading.
Padma Raju, M.D.
Topeka, KS 60004

MTC–00006828

From: Susan Holden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I have been following the Microsoft litigation for years and am delighted to hear that you are settling this case. I think the settlement sounds very fair. And now is not the time to drag our greatest American company through the mud. They need to get back to business.

Susan Holden
Executive Producer and Chief Financial Officer
Curious Pictures
http://www.curiouspictures.com

MTC–00006829

From: Steve Franke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:47pm
Subject: Microsoft

The continued litigation of Microsoft is ridiculous. The States Attorneys General who are not satisfied with the verdict in the case are nothing more than showboating, and trying to collect revenue for their states. Enough is enough !!

Steve Franke
s.franke@gte.net

MTC–00006830

From: FMeyer9254@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:47pm
Subject: Settlement

I taught English in Madagascar in Aug of 2000 and fielded many questions about the United States. One of the oddest series of questions that were asked pertained to whether Bill Gates was going to prison for what he had done at Microsoft.

It took awhile to explain the difference between civil and criminal law and I did my best.

To the people in Madagascar , if they know of the situation with Microsoft, the general belief is that he must be a criminal. While this may not be of great moment to the justice department I believe that it is unfortunate that the several state justice departments wish to prosecute one of America's great entrepreneurs and that the US Justice Dept. took up the case in the first place. It makes the US look vindictive and small.

Bill Gates is not a hero like we have seen in the last few months but he is someone whose influence has been of benefit for our country.

Fred Meyer
2101 E. Bethany Home Rd.
Phoenix, Az. 85016
fmeyer9254@aol.com

MTC–00006831

From: greg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:47pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

D.O.J

Let's get this settled and move on. The only people that prolonging this ordeal serves, are the politicians and the lawyers. The representatives of the nine states are not concerned about the consumer. If they deny this, then make them explain how I, the consumer, will benefit from any settlement. Competition and pricing are addressed daily . Faster, more efficient computers are sold each day at prices lower than the day before!

Where were these people that are so concerned for Joe Public, when Microsoft was perpetrating their only true offense, that being the sales and marketing of an inferior product that was able garner an approximate 96% share of the market ? NOW THAT'S AMERICAN INGENUITY AT ITS CORPORATE BEST!

Rein in Microsoft and make them play by the rules. But don't penalize them for innovation, or to satisfy the whining wishes of the Suns, Oracles, and AOL's .

Thank You,
Greg

MTC–00006832

From: Dean E. Lybyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Microsoft is trying to adhere to all of the Government's stipulations, is it not time for all of these other states to stop whining and crying foul and accept a fair settlement. I think so.

Dean E. Lybyer
(lybyerdean@hotmail.com)

MTC–00006833

From: Effie Robbins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case has gone on long enough and must be settled now.

By the long delays and Judge Jackson discussing this settlement while still in litigation should have thrown the whole case out as it doesn't seem to me there was a case anyway. It is apparent to me that other companies wanted a free ride on the Microsoft programs instead of going out and building their own. There must be a fine line in defining the two words ''De-regulation and Antitrust''. We went through the de-regulation with two major companies Pacific Gas and Electric and American Telephone and Telegraph and life has been a complete hassle for the consumer ever since.

I think Microsoft should have the right to protect and build their own programs and they have done an exemplary job of building a simplified program that even we seniors can use. It is my opinion the Justice Department is concerned for the big money companies instead of we, the people. It seems to me that all you have accomplished is to destroy the peoples confidence in you and the entire stock market because we do not know who these suits will strike next. It is my hope this suit needs to be dropped now. Let the other companies build their own programs and, if it is better, I am sure the public will buy it.

I have written to the Honorable Bill Lockyer about this case and it seems apparent that he is not listening to the consumer. While the Department of Justice needs to represent other companies, they also need to listen to the consumer as he is the one who is purchasing these programs and wants the protection and security that has been provided by the Microsoft Corporation.

Sincerely,

Effie Robbins

MTC–00006834

From: Bob Day
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is just fine, and my suggestion would be to impose it also on the nine states that have so far not accepted it.

1. Microsoft is guilty, at the most, of being a big company that was still acting like a small company.

2. Microsoft's competitors are guilty, at the least, of trying to accomplish in court what they could not accomplish by competition in the marketplace. They are, and always have been, totally free to develop their own operating systems, but have generally chosen not to because of the high cost of entry, and have instead chosen to ride on the back of Microsoft, and then complain when they didn't like the ride.

3. Microsoft did not harm consumers. Compaq's VMS operating system, for example, costs many times what Windows XP does. And, Microsoft by making its software development tools (Visual Basic, Visual C++ and so on) available to third party software developers at reasonable prices, has done more than any other company to encourage and promote development of software by third parties. On the other hand, Apple, for example, by limiting the availability of it's development tools and discouraging the manufacture of clones of its hardware, has done much to prevent development of Apple-compatible software by independent software development companies. Offhand, I would say that without Bill Gates and Microsoft, there's a good chance you (yes you, who is reading this email) would not have a computer on your desk—they would still be too expensive for the average person or the average worker.

Except as a happy user of Microsoft software, I have no association whatsoever with Microsoft.

Bob Day
Portsmouth, NH
bobday@mediaone.net

MTC–00006835

From: Dorothy Winick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlememnt

I think this settlement should be made for the good of the public.

Dorothy Winick

MTC–00006836

From: Don Cross
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom It May Concern:

While it is my strong opinion that Microsoft takes liberties that it would not have the luxury of taking in a completely competitive environment, it is also my opinion that competitors like Sun and Apple have had their chance and do nothing with it. Hence to do more than the proposed agreement to affect the Microsoft business model would hinder the interoperability of computers and their software and in my opinion create a more expensive business model for all consumers. So leave the settlement as agreed and go ask SUN and Apple why they don't ''get competitive''.

Donald D. Cross
6704 NW Monticello Terrace
Parkville, MO 64152

MTC–00006837

From: Lisa Matchette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

At this time when our country is struggling to recover from the events of September 11 and the current economic recession, it would be wise to get this case settled and move on toward regaining a strong economic footing. There is no doubt that Microsoft is a very important company in this country and that like many of our business and industry leaders, it plays a critical role in our economy's strength.

But that alone is no reason to turn a blind eye to any company's business practices. So, for the past several years the DOJ has raised issues that have made Microsoft acutely aware that its business dealings with OEMs and other vendors is under intense scrutiny. All of this, I believe, has not been taken lightly by Microsoft.

The proposed settlement appears to be reasonable and just. I believe that it serves the interests of the public, while still upholding the ideals of the free market upon which our capitalist system is based.

At some point, the government needs to bring a fair and measured end to this case, and I believe that point is now. The measures outlined in the proposed settlement will provide the necessary safeguards and guidelines to protect the public interests while allowing one of our country's most successful companies to continue contributing to the overall well-being of the economy. Allowing this case to drag on is hurting consumers far more than anything Microsoft could have done.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

MTC–00006838

From: Stephen Land
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please record me as strongly supporting the Microsoft Settlement reached by the Company and the DOJ. The opposition of a few states and some members of Congress is politically driven by competitors of Microsoft.

Stephen Land
http://www.divorceland.com <http://www.divorceland.com/>

MTC–00006839

From: FourmileMan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:51pm
Subject: Microsoft is still a preditor!

To the US Dept. of Justice,

Curiously, Microsoft asked me to contact you in it's settlement in the Tunney Act. I really think Microsoft is a predator and will use any and all a means to eliminate or dearly hurt any and all Competitors. They have done this for many years. I know.

I started using Computers in 1980 with Apple Computers. Then as the Companies I worked for opted for PC's and Microsoft S/W, I chose PC's and Microsoft Windows for my Home Computer so that the working S/W would be compatible. I soon found out that Netscape was much easier and better than Internet Explorer from Microsoft. However, having I.E and Netscape on my Computer caused problems and it was always due to the Software in Windows and I.E. that was deliberately causing problems on Netscape.

Now (2001 and 2002) Microsoft Windows XP is even more restrictive and eliminates many Software programs. It also requires that I register my Computers characteristics (identifies my hardware and some Software) as a way of preventing owners of Win XP from using it on other Computers that they own.

In the Past, most Software Manufactures would allow a customer to use their S/W on two computers if they were not used at the same time. Example: I have a Desktop and a Laptop which I want to be compatible, and which I do not use at the same time. The only other person in my home and Business (Consulting) is my Wife and she hates computers and will not use them. I use my laptop mostly while I am traveling. The exception to this is when I transfer data (not Software) via Laplink from my laptop to my Desktop for backup and storage reasons.

This latest Monopolistic and intrusive action by Microsoft once again proves their

intent to control their customers and to eliminate any other Software and Hardware that they do not control.

I think your committee should reconsider the Settlement with Government Controls on their behavior for at least five years.

Sincerely,

John R. Adams

A knowledgeable Microsoft User and Customer, and a Consultant in Electronic Equipment and Hardware.

JADA Consulting

E-mail: j.r.adams@ieee.org

MTC–00006840

From: Edward A. Morris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that the Microsoft Corporation has not broken any laws by the design of any of their software and it appears that their competitors are the ones guilty of a crime. Please bring about a timely and fair judgement that will settle this suit once and for all.

Thank You,

Edward A. Morris

MTC–00006841

From: Milian, SCMD, SCSM, Rudolph E.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In 1999 and last year I communicated to public officials about the Microsoft antitrust case and its negative impact on the advancement of technology that improves efficiency in our daily life. For the most part, I received a sympathetic response from them and I want to reiterate to you that the case should be settled and not further litigated. The settlement that has been agreed to by Microsoft, the Federal government and nine states is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I agree that this settlement is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy.

This is my personal opinion and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the company I work for but I am expediting communiqui to you through this e-mail to register my opinion.

Rudolph E. Milian, SCMD, SCSM

Woodcliff Lake, NJ

MTC–00006842

From: dewittclinton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer I applaud the U.S. Court's proposed settlement of our goverment's case against Microsoft.

It seems to me to be fair to all. I expect the Department of Justice will so inform the District Court.

For the sake of consumers, business(world-wide) and our country I urge the District Court to recommend accepting this settlement.

Sincerely,

DeWitt Clinton Baker

MTC–00006843

From: andremalin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Please let Microsoft do what it does best: writing software.

The settlement is fair to all parties and should be finalized without further delay.

It is time to move on and for the ''poor'' competitors to do the same: work harder.

Thank you,

Andre Malin

MTC–00006844

From: Rick Day
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Prolonging the litigation further really only benefits the lawyers, as usual. Let market forces rule; Microsoft has done right by this country. Kenrick L. Day, High School Physics teacher in Fort Smith, AR

MTC–00006845

From: designdecor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:54pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

AS A CEO OF A MAJOR CORPORATION, I AND MANY OF MY EMPLOYEES HAVE BEEN WATCHING THE MICROSOFT ANTI-TRUST CASE UNFOLD. AS THIS JUNCTURE, I FEEL THAT IT IS IMPERATIVE TO BRING THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS TO A SWIFT AND SPEEDY CONCLUSION. HENCEFORTH, AS A CONCERNED CITIZEN AND BUSINESS PERSON, I WISH TO EXPRESS THE FACT THAT OUR ECONOMY AND ALL UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES NEED TO GET ON WITH GROWING. THE SETTLEMENT THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED SHOULD BE EXECUTED WITH ABSOLUTELY NO FURTHER LITIGATION.

SINCERELY,

MARY JANE LUNDSGAARD

MTC–00006846

From: Eric Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft should never have been put through this legal ordeal in the first place, as they don't, and never have had, a ''monopoly'' in any real, economic sense of the term. However, a corrupt Department of Justice, in collusion with several special interests in the computer world, saw fit to punish Microsoft for the made-up crime of innovation.

Since it has come this far, and the only choice remaining is between settlement and further litigation, which would only cost Microsoft and the American economy greatly, it is clear that settlement is the lesser of the two evils.

Settle now, and end this legal travesty.

Eric Johnson

1825 W. Berteau Ave., #2

Chicago, IL 60613

MTC–00006847

From: John K. Mielke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to voice my opinion, and recommend that the DOJ accept the Microsoft settlement. In fact the whole action against Microsoft was a flagrant abuse of government action against a company that was and still is a positive force on the US economy. The agressive efforts by Microsoft competitors should tell you who started the action.

MTC–00006848

From: ROZJER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:55pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

IT IS VITAL THAT THE SETTLLEMENT ALREADY REACHED IS THE ONE TO ABIDE BY.

MTC–00006849

From: DSWHIH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement addresses any prevoius excesses in an equitable way.

It has been forged by adversaries over a long period of time. Any litigation to prevent implementation of this settlement will serve only to advance the interests of Microsoft's competitors in an unfair way.

The nation needs a strong software industry, including a strong Microsoft.

The settlement should be put into effect withut further delay.

Sincerely,

David S. Wachsman

MTC–00006850

From: Steve Patchen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

An immediate settlement in the publilc interest is absolutely valid in this prolonged and terribly unjust case brought against one of our strongest companies. We should be doing everything we can to support this innovating company, and its businesses around the world.

For whatever my comments are worth, you now have them. I hope they will be heeded.

Thank you.

Steve Patchen

1930 E. Las Tunas Rd.

Santa Barbara, CA 93103–1746

805.560.6004

MTC–00006851

From: Asluis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:55pm
Subject: MS settlement

DOJ: For the good of our country and the economy please recognize all that the accomplishments of Microsoft have done for everyone who uses a computer.

It is past time that we recognize the decision of the courts and let Microsoft get back to the business of making our computers even more efficient. Don't let a few overzealous DA's use this case to feather their political nests.

ADAM SLUIS

asluis@AOL.com

MTC–00006852

From: PMConnaugh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I expect the settlement already agreed upon, will be adequate to make the point with MS, without further damaging the company and consequently the industry, which is so important to the recovery of our country's economic health. There is a direct correlation between the iniation of the Attorneys General (in not even the majority of the US)suit and the commencement of the sharp decline of the Stock Markets. And that includes the negative impacts on many more companies than just MS. Hence, the Recession...in a global scope.

For MS is Global.

I agree, if it were just MS that was impacted, I might see a slight merit in their claims. But in truth, MS has been the cataylst for tremendous growth in Productivity throughout the US and in many other parts of the world.

I, for one appreciate the ubiquity of the Windows capabilities and adaptabilities. So many use this as the standard for communication between clients and customers, as well as internally. The MS software automatically contained in the Operations Systems on most computers allows for ready use and training employees to be productive in having the time to create solutions to problems rather than spend so much time creating tons of paper and doing the many manipulations on incompatable software were it not for the ''magic'' of the MS-based software availability.

MS software is there, imbedded, but one doesn't have to use it if there is another OS that is determined to be more fitting to provide the necessary outputs/calculations. Linus, for example.MS is not preventing one from selecting other software for software OS optimization.

Then there's the fantastic waste of our tax dollars being expended by both sides to litigate this case. That is counter-productive. Only ones rewared with this litigation are the Lawyers.

Let's settle this equitably and now!

Phillip M.Connaught
1409 Chancellor Circle
Bensalem, PA 19020–3676
E-Mail—pmconnaugh@aol.com

MTC–00006853

From: Guy Avey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please! Lets get of this ridiculous waste of taxpayers money and let Microsoft get on with their ability to develop new products. All companies have the freedom to compete with MS if they have the products to compete. Being the best at what you do is not a crime!!!!!!!!

Lets Roll!

Guy R. Avey
110 Longcroft Road
Winchester, VA 22602–4438

MTC–00006854

From: KevinIP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a longtime personal computer user, with experience with Apple and IBM-Compatable PC operating systems, and the Internet. As such, I've used Microsoft's products as well as products from many other software companies.

Without reservation, I can assure you that I have personally experienced no ill effects from purported anticompetitive behavior from Microsoft. Quite the contrary, I feel that the company's products have significantly improved my computing experience at a fair economic cost.

I also have been a longtime investor in technology companies and have seen several ''generations'' of computing technologies come and go. I have personally seen no ill effects from purported anticompetitive behavior from Microsoft on other technology companies. Again, to the contrary, I have seen a lot of evidence that Microsoft's technological innovation coupled with their customer focus have driven new technologies to the consumer—along the way, creating economic opportunities for many competitors of Microsoft.

Because the company's actions have always been driven more by good business sense, rather than just a focus on cool technology, many of the industry pundits have been long-critical that Microsoft stifles innovation. This is completely backwards: because the company chooses to deliver new products to the consumer only as fast as they can be consumed, the overall penetration of personal computing technology has been improved, not harmed.

Overall, I see the current settlement as a fair way for both side to get on with more productive matters and let the market place—consumers and businesses—drive competition in the technology industry.

Sincerely,

Kevin Patrick
Home:
1717 30th Avenue W.
Seattle, WA 98199
(206) 281–9113
kevinip@aol.com

This contact information should not be used for marketing purposes.

MTC–00006855

From: Joseph Mannix
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sir,

I think the proposed settlement is in the best interest of all concerned parties.

It is time to stop bickering and move on!

Yours truly,

Joseph R. Mannix

MTC–00006856

From: GOPALLWAY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Active Listeners:

This email is in support of Microsoft. Microsoft has been a fair and open competitor since the start. It has as many competitiors and struggles as every other company out there. COmpanies such as Sun Microsystems and Oracle are only looking for less competition to allow there companies to grow faster and further. Although I feel no agreement should have been made, due to the fact that Microsoft is completely innocent of any wrong dueings, I see that Microsoft Is being a fair company and at least willing to sacrafise alittle to end an unfair conflict upon them. I support Microsoft and say that this compromise should be allowed through, and if anything, Microsoft she be unchained and allowed to be free on the market again, not allowing the greedy competitiors to act like an Inquisition upon Microsoft.

Microsoft has helped out many companies not only to grow but has also helped many other companies to be started.

James Gusman
CEO/Owner Gettachat & Companies
www.gettachat.com

MTC–00006857

From: EJB2010@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: SETTLEMENT

IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THIS LITIGATION IS SETTLED ASAP. OUR ENCONOMY IS DEPENDENT UPON IT. I THINK THE INTEREST THAT AGAINST IT ARE JUST AS MUCH AT FAULT AS BEN LADEN-THEY ARE TERRORIST. THEY ARE MORE CONCERNED ABOUT THEIR OWN INTERESTS. MAKE A BETTER MOUSE TRAP AND PEOPLE WILL BUY IT.

PLEASE SETTLE THIS ASAP. THANKING YOU AND BEST REGARDS.

EJB2010@AOL.COM

MTC–00006858

From: George W. Surline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

1–2–02

Gentlemen

I have reviewed the proposed settlement and am satisfied with it in it's present form.

I feel that any additional penalties or restrictions imposed on the Microsoft Corporation would be counter productive and not in the best interests of the consumers nor the stockholders at this time.

Very truly yours,

George W. Surline

MTC–00006859

From: Dick Koch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft

It is an outrage what Microsoft has been put through the last 4 years. They make the best software and that is the bottom line. The special interest groups are just attempting to make up in litigation what they can not do via their products. It's a shame that it has cost so many so much. Why do the best get punished for being the best?

Dick Koch
Bank of America
Dir: 301 571 1480
Fax: 301 571 1490

MTC–00006860

From: Jack Keilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

ladies and gentlemen, lets get on with our lives. settle this...

MTC–00006861

From: Ed Fitzgerald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir:

I strongly support the current Microsoft settlement agreement. I do not think it is in the consumer's interest to further delay resolution of this case.

Edward M Fitzgerald
1357 Opal Street
San Diego CA 92109–1912
(858) 488–1187 voice
(858) 488–2336 fax
fitzgerald@msn.com

MTC–00006862

From: DotHilton@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With the problems we have in this nation at this time for heaven sake we don't need more litigation where about the only true winners are the lawyers who charge large fees.

Please accept this settlement as fair to all parties and end this horrendously long case.

Thank you,
Dorothy Hilton
Springfield, Missouri

MTC–00006863

From: Brock Luno
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear persons,

I do not think that an Operating System (O/S) needs to do anything other than run a computer and its sub-systems. All else is applications and should be marketed and installed as such. I believe that Microsoft has convinced the majortity that it must bundle its products. I do not agree.

I specifically wish that the O/S and all applications be seperated permanently. If tis requires a split in the Microsoft organization, so be it. I'm sick and tired of trying to fix fellow workers P/Cs with glitches caused by one Microsoft application (Outlook, Word, Excel, etc.) stepping on the O/S and crashing the machine(s). I can't get or load alternatives because the market has dried up and there are none to speak of. the best has not won my business, the biggest has—out of shear dominance on the street. I do not have viable choices.

B. Luno
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC–00006864

From: CutshawD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I always believed that the government's lawsuit against Microsoft was politically motivated. There wasn't (could never be) any evidence that consumers were harmed, only competitors.

MS through its leadership (market share) actually set the standards for the industry. I have observed that excessive competition does not necessarily benefit the consumer. For example, the airline industry. I remember when service was courteous, on-time and a passenger didn't have to wonder if they got a fair price.

I think that the government should abandon its lawsuit entirely. It has been noticed that the attack on MS destroyed millions in wealth and was the beginning of the bear market.

In God we Trust, United We Stand!
Best Regards,
Dianne Cutshaw
Cutshaw Enterprises
PO Box 297
Florence, AL35631
Tel: 1 256 767–8483
Fax: 1 256 767–8482
Mobile: 1 256 412–1080
Email: CutshawD@aol.com

MTC–00006865

From: James H. Copenhaver
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer professional, I am convinced that the sooner the case with Microsoft is resolved, the better it will be for all of us. I thought the basis for the case was weak to begin with and I am really convinced that the Clinton administration just couldn't stand to see anyone or anything be as successful as Microsoft was. They wanted a chunk of it's money and went after it. In a major way, I think that this case helped fuel the crash of the economy and it's severity in the high tech sector by introducing doubt in investor's minds.

I'm not going to say that Microsoft was in line, but I think that enough is enough. Prohibit the behaviors they were guilty of performing, fine them and get on with life. The DOJ needs to worry more about Insurance Fraud, Medicare/Medicaid Fraud, Government Corruption and a host of other things that have a more negative impact on our daily lives than this.

Thanks
Jim Copenhaver
4765 Banner Elk Drive
Stone Mountain, GA 30083

MTC–00006866

From: Louis Grossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:59pm
Subject: The feelings of a Retiree, towards the unjust, incredibly stupid actions toward the Microsoft miracles...

At my age of 88 6/12's years—a 13 year World War 2 veteran volunteer—never having asked for any benefits, handouts, goodies—I resent very much what I consider unwise decisions of the Justice Department of the USA, and of the various States who are still blindly, and unjustly clamouring and seeking punishments to the Miracle-making-company MICROSOFT.

Looking at the progress of these, our glorious United States of America—without the genious, pioneering research and development of this company—which is ALSO the mostest of the mostest in giving of their wealth to humanity in the form of charitable funds—and to which we should be GRATEFUL , rather than CRITICAL, for the new forms of communicatioins and benefits that these miserably money-grubbing States Governments are USING and punishing.... how blind and ungrateul they are ! ! ! I for one, feel VERY GRATEFUL for all the communications benefits that we (unto my generation and beyond) have been given by this tremendously pioneering company, MICROSOFT—without whom we would still be in the ''DARKness'' of the era prior to my volunteering of the year 1940 for the security of our U.S.A.

I say—''DESIST this travesty of good sense and of shouldl-be-gratitude!

Let these backward STATE Governments go back to GOVERNING and minding their own jobs!

Let's be FAIR.''

Louis P. and Blanche Grossman

MTC–00006867

From: Fred Stacey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is a shame to continue the Clinton-Gore policy and punish a company for its work.

The federal goverment should investiagate Teddy Kennedy, Tommy Dashell (current ''leader'' against progress) in the Senate and the Democrat Party for all their activities—especially for killing babies.

Thank you,
Fred Stacey
Louisville, KY 40242
fs77@bellsouth.net

MTC–00006868

From: Joe Reardon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to bring this case to a close. The government and Microsoft have come to an agreement.

That agreement should prevail over all states that were a part of the initial class action suit. Individual states should not be allowed to disavow the settlement and relitigate.

Technological advances have left the initial actions and complaints so far behind as to render them totally irrelevant in today's environment. Furthermore, it becomes increasingly evident that those competitors who were never able to match Microsoft's capabilities, and therefore Microsoft's market domination, are continuing to use the government to aid them in obtaining market advantage against the company that earned it through innovation and marketing expertise. The CEO of Sun Microsystems best refocus his energies on his own company to save it before total collapse. He is responsible to the stockholders.

It is also obvious that competitors are using their state governments to proceed with further litigation. The connections are clear.

Finally, AOL is using the litigation to prevent Microsoft's increasing surge into the

internet market were they presently dominate their competition (and customers) more than Microsoft ever did.

I urge you to end all litigation, enact the agreed upon settlement, and cease providing Microsoft competitors with an unfair advantage in our free enterprise system.

Thank you.

Joe Reardon

MTC–00006869

From: Frank McDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:58pm
Subject: MSFT suit

Gentlemen:

To continue the law suit against Microsoft would be a travesty of justice. MSFT is a crown jewel, and most countries would love to have this firm's HQ. The US cannot afford to continue this law suit.

Please drop it at once.

Frank McDonald

MTC–00006870

From: JOSEPHW290@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe the settlement was fair and that the states that want to carry this further in the court system should look back on what prompted the action in the first place—Microsoft was unjustly tried for being a monopoly when if I remember correctly , a monopoly was a firm that providing a service or product and was stopping all other firms from providing that product or service—in this case nowhere did I see where Microsoft was stopping anyone from producing a computer—or anything—as for the software, the other companies were not smart enough to design the same software and wanted to get in on the act without having to face the competition of men who had become design experts such as the Microsoft team. The only way the special interest group can compete with microsoft is to destroy the company by breaking it up. Let these other companies come up with software as good as that which is now being produced and the people who have computers will use that product.

MTC–00006871

From: herb cohen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:59pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I have had the good fortune to be told how to let you know how I feel about the courts decision regarding Microsoft's competitive behaviour in the marketplace. It is my strong belief that lesser capable competitors have attempted to use the courts to cheat this great inovator of its rightly earned markets and customers. The decision of the court is more than fair and just to microsofts competitors. In my view the court has been too liberal and has punished microsoft for being too successful! This company with its investment in research has made computers and all that goes with this tool more useful and increasingly less expensive to the general public and is probably more responsible for the ''new economy'' than any other force in the marketplace. Huge numbers of jobs have been created because of this company's success nad to do further harm to it would not serve the public interest at al!

Sincerely yours,

Herbert L. Cohen

MTC–00006872

From: cgong@prodigy.net
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/2/02 4:59pm
Subject: Dear Officials,

Dear Officials,

Lets setttle the Microsoft case, so that we can go on with business. This is taking way too long and costing loads of $$$$$$. Also I do not believe that Microsoft should reveal their source code to competitors in that this should be protected under the patent law. However, I do see a need for companies to work together instead of compete with one another. This will be a big challenge...what do you think?

Carolyn Gong

MTC–00006873

From: Monica Laugee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement should stand. No more litigation.

Monica

MTC–00006874

From: Dale Mabe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would ask the settlement as recently handed down and be finalized rather than embarking on further litigation .Its in the best interest of consumers as well as the national economy to stop further litigation on the case.

Thank you
Dale Mabe
POB 1327
Montreat NC 28757

MTC–00006875

From: Yates6391@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:00pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think the government came up with a fair settlement for both the competitors and Microsoft. The States that don't want to settle: it is not the people it is only the attorneys that want to drag this on through the courts.

Our country is going through tough times, so lets settle this and get on with the important things, as we all know that Microsoft has helped the economy and many charities, throughout the life of the company. We need more people like Bill Gates.

Fred Yates
5526 Salish Road
Blaine Wa. 98230

MTC–00006876

From: Margaret Lindsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Yellow StationeryThis proposed settlement is more than fair. The public interest will best be served by ending the litigation now. I am an ordinary citizen and consumer, and Microsoft has my support.

Margie Lindsey
9176 Rocky Cannon Road
Cordova, Tennessee 38018

MTC–00006877

From: Stephen Wyman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: microsoft-tunney commentary

microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

Renata B. Hesse,

Quick intro:

I've been a PC tech (desk side & Help Desk/telephone), PC installer & user since 1986. So, I've accumulated some technical expertise about PCs.

In 1998 I shopped around for a home PC. No PC OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer) would sell me a PC without an Operating System (OS). No PC OEM would sell me a PC with the LINUX OS installed. The only OS that I could get installed on any new PC was one of the latest versions of Microsoft Windows (NT or 95). My wife and I both used Windows NT at work, so that was the option we chose.

My wife is a veteran of Microsoft's OSs and would not even consider buying an Apple computer using the MAC OS. I could not convince my wife that all the blood, sweat & tears she spent learning Microsoft's OSs wouldn't be wasted. She wouldn't even go down to KINKOs and lease the use of a MAC for an hour to see how easy an Apple computer was to own & operate (Summa Cum Laude from Rice University and an MBA from UT; she's quite astute normally).

Finally we selected Gateway as the OEM, and purchased a PC. The PC could only be ordered with Microsoft's Internet Explorer (IE) as the Web browser, so that's what we ordered. When the PC was installed at the house I used it to go to Gateway's web site and used the link (provided on Gateway's web site) to go to Netscape's web site for the purpose of downloading, then installing Netscape's web browser.

Successfully linked to Netscape's site and downloaded the browser, twice. Each time I installed the new browser PC system errors started to happen and escalated till finally the 'blue screen of death' appeared. I had to do a low level format (wipe out all the software installed on the PC's fixed disk drive), and reload all the PCs original software to recover the computer to operational status. I now access the World Wide Web via IE exclusively, because it isn't worth the hassle to do otherwise.

Recently my wife tried to get an upgrade to the OSs Service Pack, so that we could get the 128-bit encryption option used for PC banking via the Internet. Three times my wife ordered the software upgrade (prepaid by credit card each time), but the upgrade never came (it was never billed or shipped by Microsoft).

Microsoft was only a few months from shipping it's new OS (Windows XP) and couldn't be bothered to sell an upgrade to Windows NT 4.0's Service Pack. The first release of anything 'new' from Microsoft is always a technical nightmare of discovering

errors that should have been fixed before the software was brought to market. Therefore, we quickly went to a local retail outlet and purchased the Windows 2000 OS. '2000' had been on the market long enough to get most of the 'bugs' worked out, and had the 128-bit encryption we sought.

To sum things up:

(1) The Microsoft monopoly has been an enormous pain in the backside to this household of PC consumers.

(2) To have the Department of Justice, and some of the 19 state's Attorneys General, win their anti-trust case against Microsoft then just roll over and settle for no real punishment is disappointing and seriously aggravating!

(3) If excepted as proposed the Consent Decree almost guarantees the anti-trust suit will start again.

Sincerely,
Stephen Wyman
Network Specialist
TxDOT
swyman@dot.state.tx.us

MTC–00006878

From: BOBHURLEY2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:00pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Gentlemen:

I am familiar with settlement terms worked out between Microsoft, the Government, the nine states ratifying. I think the settlement terms are fair and in the public interest.

Thank You:
Robert B. Hurley
11 Chapin Circle
Myrtle Beach, SC 29572

MTC–00006879

From: ChemCraft@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

ALTHOUGH I WILL TRY TO RESPOND WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE SHERMAN ANTI TRUST ACT OF 1932—I FEAR THAT A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE PROBLEM IS THAT EVERYTHING ORIGINATED IN 1932—THE YEAR OF MY BIRTH—IS AGING AND RUSTING LIKE ME AND NEEDS TO BE REFURBISHED. IN 1932 MUCH OF THE U.S. SENTIMENT WAS ISOLATIONIST AND BUSINESSES COULD EXPECT SOME PROTECTION FROM THE GOVERNMENT. IN THE FREE TRADE ECONOMY PROMOTED BY THE U.S.—OUR INDUSTRY MUST COMPETE WITH STATE SPONSORED INDUSTRIES OF OUR MAJOR ECONOMIC COMPETITORS. WHEN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SPENDS FORTUNES FEEDING THE EGOS OF U,S, COMPETITORS OF MICROSOFT—TO THE EXTENT THAT TWENTY GREED INSPIRED ATTORNIES GENERAL. SOUGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN A FRIVOLOUS LAWSUIT AND 9 HAVE REJECTED A PAINFULLY CONSTRUCTED SETTLEMENT—THEY ALSO SUPPLY AMMUNITIION TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES WITH TOTALLY SELF INTERESTED MOTIVES. IF THE SHERMAN ACT ANYWHERE DEFINES THE CONSUMER AS THE AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL USER—THE OWNER OF A PC OR THE EMPLOYEE WHO USES A P/C ON HIS/HER JOB—I DEFY ANYONE TO PROVE THAT MICROSOFT HURT THEM IN ANY WAY. IN FACT, I BELIEVE THE MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES OF MICROSOFT WERE BENEFICIAL TO THE U.S.ECONOMY AND THE INDIVIDUAL USERS.

IF YOU READ THE COMMENTS ON INTERNET SITES, MICROSOFT CRITICS ARE COMPETITORS OR TECHNOCRATS WITH UNSATISFIED EGOS BECAUSE FOR REASONS CLEARLY STATED AS FACTS IN THE SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT—THROUGH MUCH OF THE WORLD WIDE GROWTH OF THE COMPUTER INDUSTRY ANY SERIOUS THREAT TO THE MICROSOFT FOUNDATIONAL MONOPOLY WOULD HAVE GREATLY CONSTRICTED INDUSTRY GROWTH BY INCREASING THE RISK OF PERIPHERAL DEVELOPMENT FOR AN UNCERTAIN MARKETPLACE.

IF YOU COULD ACCDURATELY MEASURE THE DOLLAR SIGNIFICANCE OF MICROSOFT'S MONOPOLISTIC LEADERSHIP N THE INDUSTRY—I QUESTION WHETHER ANY COMPETITOR ACTUALLY SUSTAINED ANY DAMAGE FROM MICROSOFT CONDUCT. WHAT I CLAIM IS THAT MICROSOFT MAXIMIZED THE GROWTH OF THE INDUSTRY TO THE POINT THAT ALMOST EVERY PARTICIPANT DID BETTER THAN THEY WOULD HAVE HAD MICROSOFT BEEN SLUGGING IT OUT WITH SUN AND NETSCAPE.

FRANKLY THE PACE OF DEVELOPMENT WAS LIMITED BY THE SKILL AND BUDGET OF USERS—NOT THE CHOICE AND INGENUITY OF OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED. HAD THERE BEEN A CORNOCOPIA OF CHOICES, A LARGE PART OF THE MARKETPLACE WOULD HAVE DRIED UP AND DISAPPEARED UE TO UNCERTAINTY ABOUT THE RELIABILITY OF ALTERNATIVES AND THE ABILITY OF PEOPLE TO ADJUST TO EXCESSIVE CHANGE.

IF THE WORLD HAD NOT STANDARDIZED ON DOS AND WINDOWS—THEN MICROSOFT OFFICE—THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPUTERIZED OPERATIONS IN BUSINESS WOULD BE MUCH LESS THAN IT IS— AND DRAMATICALLY SO OUTSIDE THE U.S. IF THE NETSCAPE BATTLE WITH WINDOWS EXPLORER HAD CONTINUED—THE NUMBER OF INTERNET USERS WOULD BE DRAMATICALLY REDUCED TODAY AND EVERYONE INVOLVED IN E BUSINESS AND .COM WOUL;D HAVE MADE A LO5T LESS MONEY.

THE RULES OF FAIR PLAY CODIFIED IN 1932 SIMPLY DON'T PROTECT THE CONSUMER IN 2002—EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY. EVEN YOUR PROPOSED REMEDY COULD CAUSE A LOT OF TROUBLE AND TURMOIL. MILLIONS OF AMERICANS LEARN TO USE COMPUTERS IN THEIR JOBS AND THEN BUY ONE FOR THEIR HOME AND FAMILY CONVENIENCE. IF YOU FORCE MICROSOFT TO HELP MIDDLEWEAR DEVELOPERS—YOU MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR EMPLOYEES TO ADD MIDDLEWEAR TO CORPORATE COMPUTERS THAT EVENTUALLY IF NOT IMMEDIATELY WILL BECOME SECURITY, OPERATIONAL AND LABOR PROBLEMS.

THINK ABOUT WHO WILL BE THE BIGGEST VICTIM—THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER FOOTING THE BILL FOR ALL THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES CREATING CHAOS ON GOVERNMENT NETWORKS SPREADING COMPETITION ON PUBLIC PROPERTY.

SOME TECHNICAL AREAS ARE BECOMING SO COMPLEX THAT THEY ALMOST DEFY CONTROL AND DIRECTION FROM PEOPLE NOT SKILLED IN THE PARTICULAR SCIENCE.. I SUSPECT IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO GRANT THEM JUDGEMENT BY THEIR PEERS.

HOWEVER, IN THE CASE OF MICROSOFT, I SUSPECT THE REAL USER OF A PERSONAL COMPUITER AND THE AVERAGE SMALL BUSINESS USER CONSIDERS MICROSOFT A HERO AND HAS LITTLE OR NO INTEREST IN THE WHINING OF SUN OR NETSCAPE. AS LONG AS MICROSOFT HAS ACCEPTED THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, I SEE NO VIRTUE OR REWARD IN REOPENING A CAN OF WORMS THE GOVERNMENT REALLY IS NOT EQUIPPED OR,CAPABLE OF RESOLVING. IF WHAT WAS GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS ,WAS EVER GOOD FOR THE NATION, THE SENTIMENT APPLIES IN SPADES TO BILL GATES AND MICROSOFT.

MTC–00006880

From: Fitzgerald, Dan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: comments on trial

The nine states are asking for the correct remedy. MS has stalled enough (3 years) on this case and damaged enough businesses and consumers. Impose the remedies the states are currently asking for. Resources must be put in place to scrutinize the company's behaviour.

Daniel Fitzgerald
dan.fitzgerald@justice.gc.ca

MTC–00006882

From: Robert Neely
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the proposed settlement is more than adequate. I am unaware of ANY proof that even one consumer has been damaged by MS business practices. The entire charge is brought by jealous competitors who gained the attention of congressmen.

MTC–00006883

From: Bert Rathkamp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can not understand why in the first place the US government went after Microsoft. What has Microsoft done for the user and our country? Given us a good product that is upgradeable. Given us a good product at a reasonable price. Given us a product that has stability. Given us good support. Given us the leading role in computers world wide. Given

us a offset in world wide trade balance. Given us many new jobs for US citizens.

If some one really had a better product then everyone would use it. Seem funny the foreign cars makers with the help of the US government invaded our shores and sent lots of money back home with you blessing. Look what happened to the US automobile companies over the years under more federal laws and law suits. Yes, DOJ you are out to kill another industry to make sure the USA can finish second or worse.

Just leave Microsoft alone, you have done enough damage.

Henry Rathkamp
12 Hickory View Lane
Milford, Ohio 45150

MTC–00006884

From: Nedgam@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Prolonging this litigation will be harmful to the economy, unfair to Microsoft, and boring to the public. Settle now!

MTC–00006885

From: Schlag8445@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:04pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Being a small stock owner, we wish this suit to be settled immediately. The states that are still sueing should rethink what they are doing to the economy. It is not the time to be making more problems. Let the company do its job, and get on with business. This has been a wonderful company for the economy, and to its shareholders.

MTC–00006886

From: Iyaz Ahmed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi

I just wanted to send my opnion in this case. I think its high time that all the states sign off on the deal struck between DOJ and MS. This is the time to bring our country back to its glory days and stop it from moving further down the recession road. I think the 9 other states are trying to settle more of their private squabbles with MS . I really doubt that they have any interest in the consumer who actually gain a lot from the deal with DOJ and MS.

Hope my voice would be heard. Thanks a lot.

iyaz

MTC–00006887

From: alan malnak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern.

I have been following the litigation involving Microsoft since the inception of the legal action.

The Government and nine states have come to an agreement to resolve the case.

It is not difficult to see why several states object to the settlement. These states are acting on behalf of Microsoft competitors. It is ridiculous to assume that a Company would be forced to turn over to its competitors source material that could, in effect, emasculate the company. Would someone suggest that this happen to Coca Cola. If they gave out the recipe for its product they would have to go out of business.

It would not be appropriate to order a company that has spent millions of dollars to improve the entire computer industry to turn over to its competitors the information.

It is interesting to note that each time a legal action is taken against Microsoft the effect is felt on the entire stock market. The litigation has hurt many retired persons who have pensions that are invested in Microsoft stock to some degree.

Despite the fact that the Court found that Microsoft had been guilty of something, is the consumer complaining ? I have been using Microsoft programs for many years and I do not want any money. I feel that I have the advantage of a superior company providing me with superior products. I am old enough to remember when the cry was to break up the telephone company. I ask, has your telephone service gotten any better ? Has your telephone service gotten any cheaper.

The final thought that I have is that I read that Senator Lahey recently made the statement that he wanted to review the Microsoft settlement with the Judge. It seems to me that here is something called the separation of branches of the government. What right does a Senator have to interfere with a Court ? It would seem that the good Senator has forgotten the branch of government he participates in. But again, who knows what goes on in Washington.

MTC–00006888

From: Vernon Schulthes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to get this case settled as was proposed by the Justice Department recently. It would seem to me that the nine states who are opposed to the settlement should be told that the case must be settled.

The case has had a big impact on many companies and with the eventual settlement being implemented it would help stabilize the high tech market.

As a user of Microsoft products and many other computer software I would like to see this cased settled for the betterment of the United States markets.

Sincerely yours,
Vernon F. Schulthes
P.O. Box 3 Eureka, IL 61530–0003
Phone 309–467–4890
e-mail vern@mtco.com

MTC–00006889

From: Bill Michel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

I am opposed to the proposed settlement of the Anti- Trust Suit against Microsoft. I don't believe it goes far enough, and I don't believe that it can be adequately enforced.

Microsoft is a tremendous monopoly, and its power, not only in the software arena, but in the media arena are immense. I don't think that Microsoft's track record lend it any credibility when it comes to believing that they will be faithful to the terms of the settlement. I believe that a structural solution, such as the separation of the operating system and application development components of Microsoft Corp. makes more sense.

Yours truly,
Bill Michel
131 Ortega Ave.
Mountain View, CA
94040
CC:bmichel@alum.pomona.edu@inetgw

MTC–00006890

From: FORMLETT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:05pm
Subject: (no subject)

It would seem that the present presented judgement is fair and should be used to close this case. I donot agree with the laxity of judgements where attorneys continually attempt to further thei fees by prolonging a case.

W. E. Formwalt
One Jingle Shell Lane
Hilton Head Island, S.C. 29926–1958
843 681 2218

MTC–00006891

From: Bill Yerkes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice,

I am an engineer, not a lawyer, but it seems to me that it is a great day, as a Microsoft product consumer, to finally see the GOVERNMENT settling this case. It is finally time to let the market players compete, and some will win and some will lose. I just did a count of my software, and I use Word Perfect instead of MS Word. However, I like the Microsoft browser better than my two others I have bought and used. I still use Lotus for my spread sheets although I have Excel and others. I do not agree with the idea that Microsoft eliminates other options. What you have here is a bunch of lawyers out to make big money like the OJ Simpson bunch. Time to stop.

Agree and get on with life.
Bill Yerkes
912 Olive St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
email: billy443@silcom.com

MTC–00006892

From: HARCONW@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

We are at a critical time since September 11, 2001. We must go forward to show the world that we are about building our country up and not tearing it down. I fully agree with President Bush that the DOJ should settle with Microsoft. I understand that some competing company's would find it in their interests to punish Microsoft further than it has been punished, but I truely feel that this is a time for unity, and a time to settle and go forward.

Thank you,

Harold Weisberg
From the desk of Harold W.

MTC–00006893

From: Elliot Shell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to go on record as strongly opposing severe sanctions against Microsoft. I believe, as do many of my colleagues and business associates, that most of Microsoft's problems stem from its success and creativity.

Microsoft's long history (more than two decades is a long time in the computer industry) of recruiting the best and the brightest has paid significant dividends. The inability of Microsoft's competitors to effectively compete in the marketplace largely resulted in the call for government help in the form of the antitrust actions.

While I do understand that Microsoft has undoubtedly been guilty of technical violation of certain antitrust rules, I believe that the proposed sanctions go far beyond what is fair and appropriate. Especially in these times of serious economic challenges, it would be unbecoming of the United States to unduly punish one of our most successful and innovative businesses.

I think we should instead be encouraging and applauding such attributes.

Elliot Shell

MTC–00006894

From: rod taber, Ph.D.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ

My main concern re the Microsoft case is that Microsoft be prohibited from:

1. Installing dubious or extraneous software that is impossible or difficult to remove from a computer system. This includes medallions that advertise or entice the purchaser to buy or try subscriptions to services not wanted. It very irritating to spend hours removing third party entreaties to CNN, Disney, etc. If I want to subscribe to something I should make an active effort. NO PUSH ADVERTISING!

2. Microsoft should be prohibited from searching a user's computer for information, serial numbers, etc. What is on my machine is mine. Microsoft has no business combing my machine.

I request that if these provisions are not in the settlement that they be added. For example, the settlement should read: Microsoft agrees to place any entreaties not relevant to every user on an accessory CD so that a user can choose to install them or not to install them.

Microsoft also agrees to stop investigating user machines for information relevant to software installed on said machine.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. These issues are of the utmost importance to keep Microsoft from determining every single aspect of our machines' usage.

best regards,
rod taber, Ph.D. (computer science)
la vale, md 301.722.0818

MTC–00006895

From: Edward P Fischer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

As a concerned, tax paying, voting citizen I submit my recommendation that the settlement between the Department of Justice, the nine States and Microsoft be endorsed and the case brought to a conclusion.

I believe closure to be in the public interest, speaking as a student of history and a member of the 'public' .

Sincerely,
Edward Preston Fischer M.D.
900 Sunbrook Drive
Duncansville, PA 16635
email: acowboy@Charter.net

MTC–00006896

From: Benetta129@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madam

After having read as much as possible of the litigation reports in the newspapers and observing news reports on TV, it is my clear opinion that the settlement now proposed is fair, reasonable and should be confirmed by the Federal Court.

We are disappointed that the State of Kansas (our home state) has elected out of the settlement agreement, and feel that their actions are not in the best interest of the public. Microsoft has done an outstanding service in developing its various programs, and, because of their operating platform program for the computer, we all have computers that can talk to each other, and our work is mobile from one computer to another. For one who, as I am, basically ignorant of computer functions, but use a computer daily to perform work in my profession, Microsoft was the lifesaver and I will be forever grateful to them for having a product that allowed me to do my work, and be able to communicate and share work product with others in my profession. In the early days you could not do that with the systems then in operation, and I specifically refer to Apple computers where you had to buy only from them, and you could not comunicate with any other brand of computer. Talk about a monolopy! They had one, but lost it to Microsoft. Wonder why they are now complaining.

In any event, we believe that this litigation should be over. As a consumer, I feel my rights have been protected to the extreme in this instance. We hope the court approves the settlement, and urge you to support that position.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

Sincerely
Benjamin and Etta Farney
8597 Hauser Ct.
Lenexa, Kansas 66215

MTC–00006897

From: Loyd Corwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

In my opinion the pending Microsoft Settlement is fair and in the public interest.

Respectfully,
Loyd Corwin

MTC–00006898

From: Donna Mae Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:07pm
Subject: microsoft settlemnent

Donna Mae Johnson
Maple Knoll Farm
340 County Road 19
Maple Plain, MN 55359–9654
(763)479–1727

Please let us small people be heard. settle the Microsoft suit now. No more delays and further court action. !!!!!!!

Donna Mae Johnson

MTC–00006899

From: Harry Summers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough litigation! You have a settlement. Implement it.

MTC–00006900

From: John
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Look!! I see the score as 41–9. Even Daschle would put this to a vote in the Senate and end it. This fiasco needs to be put to bed and let the DOJ get on to more serious work. It's time to allow this great company to continue innovating and keep the U.S.A #1 in the world.

MTC–00006901

From: LelaOmta@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:08pm
Subject: My input

I think it is absolutely ridicules the Government & a few of the states are draging this out. They ought to be dealling with the war instead of handicapping ligament progress in the USA.

Lela Omta

MTC–00006902

From: Laurie Mitchell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:16pm
Subject: Accept the settlement

This has gone on long enough. I supported Microsoft in the hearing phase and I still do. It is not wrong to make a profit and to create software faster and better than the competition. Those that whine that life is not fair, need to put their energies to developing software that people actually care about. I as a taxpayer do not care to support their cry baby status another day. Perhaps the DOJ should sue all of us who have a unique product and actually make a profit doing a great service?

Laurie Mitchell, Director
EventForce, Inc.

MTC–00006903

From: RHReece@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time the US government and states close the suit now in progress. Our economy is taking a beating and our tax money can be better utilized than harasing a company that is doing a reasonable job. Richard Reece (rhreece@aol.com)

MTC–00006904

From: George C.Glasemann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!!!

I hope that the US Government has taken enough out of the hide of Microsoft. Without their years of research, I doubt I would be able to contact you in this method.

The settlement that I have read about seems to be ''enough already''. Lets put our Government's money and time into fighting FOREIGN terrorists and not our locally and publically owned companies.

Thank you for your attention.

George C Glasemann

MTC–00006905

From: Robert Lantz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement!

MTC–00006906

From: frank morello
To: Microsoft ATR,MSFN@microsoft.com@inetgw
Date: 1/2/02 5:09pm
Subject: Miocrosoft Settlement

As a Microsoft user and shareholder I feel that the proposed settlement should proceed without delay. You have attempted to derail a thriving business at a time in our countries history where we need more thriving businesses, not less. Sure Microsoft's competitors are going to want them punished..why?? Because they deliver quality products that are customer friendly at a very competitive price, and the competition cannot come close to matching them!!! So why not look at the companies that charge $500–2,000 for their programs and get off Microsoft's case!!!

Protect the consumer, not the competitors,

Frank Morello

MTC–00006907

From: Dan Kathan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly urge a rapid settlement to this issue. I believe it is the best interest of the consumer and our economy.

Sincerely,

Dan kathan

MTC–00006908

From: Donna Longton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the travesty of the actions against Microsoft. The settlement that has been reached should be punitive enough for the most vindictive of Microsoft's competitors. This whole fiasco, from start to finish, has never been in the best interests of the industry, the economy, or the consumer. Rather, it has been about the best interests of the aforementioned competitors. They would like the Federal government to fight their battles for them, rather than compete on an even playing field.

MTC–00006909

From: Mudit Kumar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam

I have been in the technology field for over twenty years. If I look back, we have come a LONG way in terms of what I, as a consumer, am able to do and use the technology for. Microsoft has a big part in this success for our daily quality of life. I am sure other consumers feels the same.

It is my belief that technologies companies must be left alone, and this settlement with states provides proper coverage for any potential abuse. Let the market, the consumers and the quality of products developed by the companies be the real judge of true competition and the technology innovations.

Cheers!

Mudit Kumar
Phone: (972)221–6351 (Home)
Email: muditkumar@hotmail.com
Dallas, Texas

MTC–00006910

From: art bowles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:12pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please, lets appaud Microsoft for providing consumers with soft ware that made computer use easy for the average person using a computer. I believe that the settlement has extended to far away from the consumer and now we are trying to help the competitor. Let them(the competitors) design and make a better product and the consumer will reward them..

Pauline Bowles

MTC–00006911

From: BARONTROLL@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

DOJ:

STOP THE LITIGATION, THE ''BUSINESS OF AMERICA IS BUSINESS''

MICHAEL WOLKOW

MTC–00006912

From: Barb Ekiss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am a consumer PC user. I have depended on Microsoft products for years. I urge you to bring this case to a close now. The additional remedies requested by the dissenting states represent a ''wish list'' put together by disgruntled and unsuccessful competitors of Microsoft. These companies represent their own special interests. They do not represent consumers loke me.

Thank you.

MTC–00006913

From: HARRYCROWS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

GENTLEMEN:

MY OPINION IS TO LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. I THINK THIS TRIAL IS A WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY.

HARRY CROWS

MTC–00006914

From: bojr1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

Do not delay or change the settlement of the Micorsoft Case. Microsoft has had to put up with the likes of the original judge (Pennel?) and his antics. He was a discrace with his public outbursts against Microsoft—it was very obvious early on in the case that he should have been removed because of his public statements that were indicative of his prijudice. He was also a discrace to the judicial process as well to all other judges.

Let's not muck up the economy any more, now. Did anyone notice that the economy began declining with the chilling effect becoming more apparent in the Government's proscecution of Micorsoft? When the original judgement came down, the economy took a nosedive, worsened only by the events of September 11, 2001.

Let's put the Microsoft people back to work where they can continue to contribute to our tomorrow—a prosperous tomorrow led by Microsoft—and say 'to hell with you, Osam bin Laden'.

Sincerely,

george umbright, Jr.

MTC–00006915

From: JOANLOWELL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle the Microsoft case and stop penalizing an innovative company who personifies Capitalism and the inventive and creative genius and spirit that made, and continues to make, the United States a great nation.

MTC–00006916

From: Heimlinn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why can't concerned interests leave good enough ALONE? Years ago, Microsoft had an idea. They invested money and time to make the idea work. It works so well that almost all computers use it. It is the standard of the industry. I'd rather pay the fee for the program than have a system that doesn't work.

It's no bargain if it's cheap but doesn't work.

The American economic and entiprenurel system works to reward hard work and innovation.

I do not think that Microsoft should be crippled any further. LEAVE IT ALONE!

Yours truly,

Ernst H. Linnemann

MTC–00006917

From: SCHIMKEA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

MICROSOFT HAS PRESENTED TO A GROUP OF PEOPLE LIKE MYSELF THE OPPORTUNITY TO USE A COMPUTER WITHOUT A LOT OF EFFORT OR KNOWLEDGE OR VERY EXPENSIVE LESSONS THAT I FEEL THEIR COMPETITORS ARE INTERESTED IN PROMOTING. WHY WOULD YOU EVER WANT TO STOP THE QUALITY OF THEIR PRODUCTS & SERVICE? MICROSOFT MAKES A GOOD PRODUCT THAT A PERSON LIKE MY SELF (62 YEARS OLD) CAN TURN ON, AND OPERATE.

TRY DOING THAT WITH SOME OF THE OTHER COMPUTER PRODUCTS. PLEASE DO NOT DO ANYTHING TO CHANGE THE THINGS MICROSOFT MADE POSSIBLE. I DON'T CARE IF THEIRS PRODUCT CONTROLS THE MARKET. IT WORKS, IS CHEAP AND MAKES MY LIFE MUCH MORE SIMPLER. I REALLY WONDER HOW WE EVER GOT ALONG WITHOUT THEM.

WHY WOULD I USE ANYTHING ELSE? THEIR PRODUCTS ARE EASY TO UNDERSTAND AND THEY WORK RIGHT OUT OF THE BOX.

BEST REGARDS,
JAMES. F. SCHIMKE
SCHIMKEA@AOL.COM
206–546–4454

MTC–00006918

From: T. R. MADISON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:14pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Wednesday, 2 January, 2002 @ 5:06PM EST

Dear Sir/Madam:

I wish to comment on the litigation now wending its way through the Department of Justice.

I agree that Microsoft might be considered a monopoly, but I believe they became such by having the best products and best customer service available. If it hadn't been for Microsoft, Microsoft Windows, and the Microsoft Internet Explorer browser, I doubt that I would have ever become a user of a computer nor have had access to the Internet.

When I got my first computer it came prepackaged with the Netscape browser and I found that just about impossible to master. I then learned that I could download Microsoft's Internet Explorer browser... which I did.

Finding it so much better than Netscape, I made Microsoft's IE my default browser. That was my choice; no one forced me to do so! When Windows 98 was released I upgraded to that system and was delighted to find that Microsoft's Internet Explorer was included. Had I wanted to have Netscape, I could have downloaded that of my own free will (I did not) and Windows 98 could operate with that as the default browser. Microsoft did not prevent me from using Netscape with their Windows 98 OS if I had so chosen.

As a retired person and one who is not to be considered wealthy, I do have an investment in Microsoft through the ownership of shares. To say I have been financially hurt by this litigation would be putting it mildly.

I sincerely hope that the Department of Justice will find for Microsoft and absolve them of wrongdoing. I don't see that they have done anything wrong; they are simply following the capitalist system....which I thought the United States espoused to the fullest.

I hope you will consider my thoughts as this litigation progresses. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. Toby R. Madison
7502 NW 47th Way
Gainesville, Florida 32653–1176
Telephone: (352) 337–9460
Email: tobers@prodigy.net or tobers29@msn.com
CC:T R Madison

MTC–00006919

From: Tony Berejka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

The extensive use of computer technology demands that all systems communicate with each other.

Having been around when all we had was Fortran and only corporate IBM 360's, Microsoft should have been praised for bringing forth a common computer language and systems that benefit the user, the consumer. Without Microsoft's efforts, there would have been no evolution into the widespread use of PC's and other small systems. The DOJ suit should have never been launched in the first place and is anti-technology and against the societal benefits of computer networking.

Tony Berejka

MTC–00006920

From: Cavalier Service
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

In my opinion, Microsoft has done no wrong. Microsoft is a successful, innovative and aggressive company. The liberal politics and policies of the Clinton Administration are gone. Our government needs to leave good, solid companies like Microsoft work their magic. The settlement is fair to the public and the company. Let Microsoft get back to the business they know best, and quit annoying them with unjustified legal proceedings.

Daniel C. Lesseg
General Manager
Cavalier Ford, Inc.

MTC–00006921

From: BPo9194728@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Setttlement

I feel the settlement already reached by the Justice Department is adequate.

Request your favorable considerations.

Billy Powell

MTC–00006922

From: Larry Moe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I hope the law suit against microsoft will soon be settled. The economy will suffer more if it isnt. We have been punished enough through all of this, if you look back a couple of years ago the ecomomy started to go south the same time that the DOJ went after them. Lets get it over with and on with the recovery. thank you,

Larry Moe

MTC–00006923

From: Andrew Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Mr./Ms. Representative of the Department of Justice;

I would like to see the Microsoft Corporation settle it's time in court close on the Tunney Act. My decision is not based on the fact that I am shareholder of MSFT, but because I have used computers for years. Both at home & at work. This is costing our economy & country time & money. Plus companies are afraid to update operating systems over irrelevent discussions.

Thank you
Andrew Paul Thompson
Chicago, Illinois

MTC–00006924

From: DulaCarol@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:15pm
Subject: Gates Settlement

It is about time this comes to an end. Bill Gates is doing the right thing in settling this dispute. Give the guy a break—those that are still trying to drag this on—I say to them—Get Real! They are just jealous—let them work their buns off like Gates and stop being crybabies! Thanks for listening.

MTC–00006925

From: Edward-Keller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Recently a friend copied me on a memo he sent to you about how ''American'' and ''Right'' the Microsoft Corp. activities have been in the past. To help set the record straight, I was forced to deal with Microsoft while they were squelching all their competition in the software industry during my working years in the electronics industry. I found them to be arrogant totally insensitive to complaints regarding their products or practices.

Unfortunately, the fruits of their labors were more than evident at the last Comdex show in Las Vegas (whoops, excuse me... The Microsoft Show!). Only sw vendors developing products compatible with Microsoft were present... and others seeking to be bought out by Microsoft. It is unfortunate that the Justice Dept. and several states attorneys did not get them convicted of monopolistic practices sooner. American industry freedom is one thing...Microsoft activities are quite another... Consider this

email a vote in support of your continued pressure on this overzealous industry giant.
Ed Keller

MTC–00006926

From: ED NOSKOWSKI
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:
It is time to settle the case against Microsoft. Enough Tax payer money has been wasted. Please bring accept the Tunney Act Agreement and settle this case finally.
Thank you,
Ed Noskowski

MTC–00006927

From: Pdj5123@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Let's get this case settled and move on with more pressing issues at hand.
Thanks for your consideration
Phil de Jong

MTC–00006928

From: Al Hentges
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please bring this matter to a conclusion without further delay and waste of taxpayer money. Enough is enough. This has gone on far too long and should never have been an anti trust issue in the first place. It is time to do the right thing, ignore Microsofts competetors, and think about the good of our country.
Al J. Hentges
A Fed up Taxpayer

MTC–00006929

From: Louis Grossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I, 88 6/12's years of age, 13 of which were spent volunteering in the world war 2 comflict, 1940–53—feel adamantly that the past and present injustice given to a tremendously great company, Microsoft, by the dept. of Justice, and presently by those few relentlessly ungrateful States—WHY? How could ANYONE feel other than GRATITUDE for the fine pioneering and creatful job done by Microsoft in this brand new field of Communications???? Would the harrassing officials now still seeking punishment to these ''Pioneers'' rather go back to the ERA w/out Internet, EMails that THEY gladly use, and would they rather go back to the 1940 days???
No, they are USING the benefits, and are ABUSING the creators. WHY?? I, my wife, all my friends (users gladly of the benefits from the computers and programs created by Microsoft,) feel that the Dept of Justice, and of the ''still suiing unsatisfied States Govts.'' should CEASE AND DESIST''—and let this fine company alone, and allow them to continue their pioneering and creating. I have NO personal connections to the company, except that I use, and enjoy, the fruits of their creativeness—the Internet is beyond my Aged Mental Capacity, but I do use and enjoy their EMAIL benefits. These oipinions of mine, my wife, and my friends are Sincerely and completely person.
Thank you
I hope you are listening????????
Louis P. and Blanche GROSSMAN

MTC–00006930

From: EES724@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:17pm
Subject: anti trust
after 5 years its time to stop this nonsense. a deal is done now lets get on with life.

MTC–00006931

From: Michael J. Schroeder
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It would appear that some of the states, emboldened by their win over the tobacco industry and the huge cash this brought them, see Microsoft's $ 36 billion in cash reserves as a potentially similar windfall. The differences, of course, couldn't be more stark.
Micosoft and other technology companies should be viewed more like pharmaceutical companies, all of which spend billions on research and development of new cures, treatments, drugs and other products that neither individuals nor governments could or should develop on their own. The risks taken by the shareholders of these companies must be weighed fairly in relation to the benefits received by consumers as a whole. Technology companies, particularly those that are successful in developing new, widely applicable products, should not be penalized to the point of discouraging new R&D spending and creating fear that the benefits of that R&D will accrue, many times unfairly, to their competitors.
Antitrust laws should protect the consumer and not weak, poorly managed competitors. Moreover, such laws should never be used as a means for political shenanigans by intransigent state lawmakers and regulators.
It's time to move forward. Let's settle this once and for all, now.
Michael J. Schroeder
Microsoft Shareholder

MTC–00006932

From: Clyde and Jean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:17pm
In april of 2000 the talks between and MS and the government fell through and MS's stock price fell and kept on falling. The rest of the market went along and the economy followed. If further restrictions are placed on MS is doesn't take much imagination to predict what it will eventually do to the economy.
Something about this whole thing reminds me of the old story about the goose and the golden eggs.
Clyde Dahlin
dahlin+AEA-olynet.com

MTC–00006933

From: Doris J. Lafferty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is a fair settlement and time to get on with business.

MTC–00006934

From: John R. Newell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I was happy to see the settlement reached. We don't need our ecomomy's engines under attact by the governments.
Because the settlement with Microsoft was reached between consenting parties, and the economy needs some certainty, please let the agreement stand and don't help the greedy state attornies general that want to derail it.
John Newell

MTC–00006935

From: Giuseppe Del Vecchio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:16pm
Subject: Microsoft
To whom it may concern:
Let it be known that Microsoft is not a trust. The company works in a way that is best for the innovation of science and technologies, as I understand it—it is not a male monopoly. Rather, the said company those all it can do to buoy innovation. This would constitute it being a valid scientific company.
Thank you for time and prudence in the laws relating to trusts.
Respectively yours,
Giuseppe Del Vecchio

MTC–00006936

From: jorge godoy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Dear Sir or Madam,
I'm writing to you in these critical times for all of us. Just a few days ago I sold my last fifty shares of a dot com company that I bought at more than $30.00 a share. (sold at $1.60).
I can complaint much; I have my health, my family and my job. But I failed to understand why a company that has done so much, not only for the American economy but, for individuals. Is being penalized for innovation and give us good products like Microsoft.
Please settle this case with Microsoft, and find something more productive to do with your time. America deserves it!
Jorge Godoy.

MTC–00006937

From: Eileen R McGuire
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:18pm
Subject: Stop Harassing Microsoft
USA needs innovative businesses that make a difference to us regular citizens in a way that we can afford to be productive people.
Eileen McGuire

MTC–00006938

From: GOrn521735@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

Microsoft should be left alone.

Microsoft should be able to recover its' economic damages that government officials have inflicted upon the corporation.

I am ashamed that our government has wasted taxpayer dollars to prosecute Microsoft.

Jerry Orn
North Canton, Ohio

MTC–00006939

From: SKIPDOCK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Thank goodness the Microsoft case is settled. Please do not litigate any further.

I am pleased with settlement as a consumer.

Harriet G. Dockstader
328 West 77th St, Apt 4
New York, NY 10024–6833

MTC–00006940

From: Gracie Abraldes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:20pm
Subject: Settlement opinion

** Confidential **

The government should have never been involved in this lawsuit. It is shame that the government can be directed by individual interests. The United States Government is the only government in the world to penalize you for being successful.

This settlement is the best thing of a wrong situation. Since this lawsuit should have never brought forward, at least this settlement will end it all.

Do nothing else, this lawsuit should finish now.

Grace Abraldes
gracie@abraldes.com

PS: As a consumer I have never felt that Microsoft was taking advantage of me, they were very easy to deal when I call them and they always listen to what I wanted in the new programs. That is more than I can say about other companies of which the government is doing nothing about.

Have a wonderful day
Grace

MTC–00006942

From: R. Cannefax
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My understanding is that a agreement had been reached to between Microsoft the Federal Government and a number of individual States. It appears the settlement was a fair means to resolve a problem which I and many other still do not clearly understand. A big portion of the computer users throughout the world are Microsoft software users. Microsoft developed and continues to enhance and improve on the basic operating system used in PCs and in most laptops.

Why they have a competitive edge is tied to the risk they took at the very onset of their venture and further tied to continuous improvement of their product, exceptional marketing and arrangements with manufacturers to put their software on many new PCs. Has competition been stifled? I think not. Those who desire to compete can find ways to do so effectively. Those who don't should be allowed to quietly go out of business. As an operator of a small search engine, I could begin trying to make a case with my elected officials that AOL or Yahoo! had a competitive advantage and one of them may be operating as a monopoly, forcing me to not be able to compete effectively in an open market case. Sure, I could make that case as could a number of other smaller search engines, but I do not feel that such an issue is in the best interest of the general public. The AOL product is inferior and problem fraught, yet they have the majority of the Internet business in respect to search engines services, ISP services and e-mail.

All that said, I would like to make the point that I am opposed to the Microsoft case being reopened and drug through the courts. We are in a time of national, if not global financial unrest and I do not think such action is to the benefit of the general public. I believe the special interest groups need to take a back seat to the current economic conditions and let Microsoft move forward. Realistically, could we deal with another 500,000 or more layoffs? Could it be those who are pushing for reopening the Microsoft case are just trying to hang on to their positions in order to avoid what's taking place across the US and globally, a general reduction in force.

I propose we let Microsoft move forward, use their talented, highly paid staff to produce software solutions that will make computers even easier for my wife and her friends to use and lets keep the cost of this battle in check.

Please feel free to reply to this e-mail should you have any questions, concerns or comments.

Thank you,
Raymond Cannefax
President & COO
eCom Only, Inc.

MTC–00006943

From: lillian ingram
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sincerely hope that this affair with Microsoft can be completed as pending. The whole thing amounts to the competition wanting Microsoft to share their Research and Development advances with Netscape, AOL and the rest of the Free Riders. Not surprising that we had more than enough sleazy lawyers ready to milk the cow.

Thanks for listening,
Ralph and Lillian Ingram,
E-mail leirmi@msn.com.

MTC–00006944

From: Light12ray@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:22pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The states and individual competitors of Microsoft are wasting my taxpayer dollars looking out for their own special interests. Please go ahead with the settlement and stop the needless dollars being spent on attorney bills rehashing once again the interests of those individual companies and states surrporting those companies.

Ray Osman

MTC–00006945

From: Vic Shackelford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:22pm
Subject: microsoft setttlement

all bill gates did for me was to give me an operating system i could understand and afford. when one of his competitors comes along with a better mousetrap i'll buy it.till then leave americas number one entrepreneur alone. let his competitors shut him down not the us goverment.

vic shackelford

MTC–00006946

From: Zikria Syed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General,

Just wanted to share some thoughts on the proposed Microsoft Settlement between the company and the US Government. I believe that it is a great step in the right direction and attempts to put meaningful constraints on the company without attempting to destroy it. Your current policy is consistent with the principles of free economy and entrepreneur spirit of the United States. Microsoft is a source of pride and stregth for the US and a symbol of American leadership worldwide. It is one of the most successful companies of the current generation and has done an unbelievable amount of good to the american and global economy.

In conclusion, I fully sport the settlement effort between DOJ and Microsoft.

Best Regards,
Zikria Syed
999 S. Wisteria Dr.,
Malvern, PA 19355

MTC–00006947

From: Sumner Kibbe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Secretary Ashcroft,

As one who spent five decades working in American industry and now a retiree who was fortunate enough to settle on the coast of Maine, I urge your support of the agreement reached between the United States Government, a majority of the contesting States and Microsoft Corporation. Prolonging this silly and incredibly expensive litigation can only continue to harm our Country's economy and further suppress future Bill Gates from creating new jobs and a stronger economic climate. It is indeed time to turn our Government's priority to punishing our enemies and not those who practice free enterprise. Let's turn off the trial lawyers ''feeding frenzy''. I request that you forward my comments to the District Court considering this case.

Respectfully yours,
Sumner E. Kibbe
43 Horn Cove Road
Southport, Maine 04576

cc: Senator Susan M Collins Citizens for a Sound Economy
CC:CSE Capitol Connect website

MTC–00006948

From: Dick Humphrey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just wanted to express my concerns on special interest groups attempting to disrupt the settlement of the on-going law suit that Microsoft is going through. It is time to wrap this up and get on with it. Microsoft makes a very good product with lots of support services that are benefiting many personal and business lives to make efficiencies in our lives. They should not be stifled by preventing them from being creative and implementing new improvements into their software systems that will make things easier for the general public. Other companies bundle services, why should Microsoft be prevented from doing it.

I am asking for your support to get on with this law suit and get it settled so we can get some positive movement in the software/computer industry.

Dick Humphrey
Littleton, CO 80122

MTC–00006949

From: JOYCE GRAUMAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I would like, as a interested citizen to see this issue end. I think that Microsoft has made amends and will honor their agreement. The country cannot afford to waste time. Microsoft is the glue of the internet stocks on the market. It will hurt all of the market, as it already has, if it is allowed to continue. The Democrats are determined to hold back the economy to win elections and I am tired of lawyers trying to make a killing and dragging this thing out. Microsoft, when the lawsuit began, was not considered a monopoly. Since then, instead of destroying their good work these other states are going to have to get over it. They are trying for the deep pocket to balance their budgets. How many of the states going after Microsoft are Republicans.? I think Orin Hatch is disgusting. I have heard that he has a son who is a lawyer working in his state and is involved in making a name for himself as well. Orin Hatch needs to go. I have again said my piece. I vote to END the states beef! I vote independent, however this is a big issue to me and many people....I have been a Republican. I am pleased with George Bush and the Justice Dept. so far. We are Watching!!!!!!!!

Joyce Grauman

MTC–00006950

From: JEastin4@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am not sure what is settlement is actually. I just know for sure it is an unfair charge made in the first place. The government is on the wrong track in trying to break up Microsoft. Ma Bell suffered under the same mentality and we know how bad that was. Microsoft is no more a monopoly that many of the large companies in this country today. It is a good company and they sell their products fair value. Leave them alone.

JEastin4@AOL.com

MTC–00006951

From: BunBunjr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

Please stop the litigation and let the economy get on with itself.

Jim Landfield
Tel 703–734–0840
FAX 703–790–9049

MTC–00006952

From: wally rasmussen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let us end this prolonged litigation prompted by Micosoft's competitors and not in the best interest of the consumer NOW.....

Thank you,
Wally Rasmussen
14531 Cascade DR SE
Snohomish, WA 98296

MTC–00006953

From: Chris Hall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:25pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I am sending this to make my opinions known regarding the antitrust settlement regarding Microsoft. I personally feel that the current settlement is just and fair to all parties. I also feel that the continuation of this only hurts not only the participants but the economy as a whole. When you have a trial of this magnitude unresolved it effects the economy by the fact that no decision is finally rendered. I personally agree taht there has been some wrong doing by Microsoft and that the current resolution is appropriate. To further delay this case and to prolong it will only add more uncertainty. My other comment is that if they had the marketshare and capacity to do so would they not have also bundled their respective web browsers in their software. In the free enterprise system I believe that the strong should survive and not be penalized for ingenuity and innovation. The free market should determine who can and will survive.

Thank you,
Mr. Chris R Hall
1310 Packerland Dr Apt A7
Green Bay, WI 54304

MTC–00006954

From: BeepaY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to let you know how I feel about the Microsoft antitrust case. Nine states have already negotiated a settlement with Microsoft and the Federal Government should follow suit. There is no need to continue spending money that could be better spent in getting our economy back in order. Put simply, letting Microsoft do their business will help the technology industry and the entire economy. Microsoft has done so much for our country and pursuing futher litigation will onlly punish their efforts.

I am retired and use computers very regularly. Like so many Americans, I would be lost without Microsoft. Their products are very easy to learn and use and they've brought technology into the hands of everyday people. Bill Gates created a virtually new industry back in the 1980's and today I think we owe it to him for making the technology industry what it is today. He and his company made some very smart business solutions and other companies are just jealous of their success. I urge you to please stop this charade and allow Microsoft to concentrate on their business. Please don't draw this suit out further by holding a Judiciary hearing to investigate. Let Microsoft get back to business and everyone else get on with their lives.

Sincerely
Russell C. Yannello

MTC–00006955

From: Lon Warneke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept my request to settle in this matter according to the Court of Appeals ruling. I trust you will determine it is extremely fair and thus in the ''public interest.'' The time is right for the consumer to realize benefit and begin to move forward.

Thank You.

MTC–00006956

From: Clayton B'Hymer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sirs,

The litigation against the Microsoft company is unwarranted and an abuse of the United States legal system. Microsoft became the leading software manufacturer not because of monopolistic tendencies, but from offering a superior product and meeting the customers needs. If anyone wanted to use an alternative operating system for a personal computer, they could and can choose from Linux, IBM's ill conceived OS2, or Apple. Microsoft got to the point were they are because their operating system is superior, less prone to crashes and meets the needs of the consumer. The other products listed do not meet the higher standards of Microsoft. I am a computer contract worker; I have used the products listed above and Microsoft's Windows, although not perfect, is better. Microsoft's internet explorer was always more stable and rugged than Netscape's products.

I am angry that my tax dollars are being abused and wasted prosecuting a company that gained success in the market place from a superior product. I see this as nothing more than an extortion attempt by lawyers, and the state and federal government.

The settlement agreement, itself, is another disgrace of the abuse of the law. If Microsoft had truly been abusive to its customers, overcharged, or exhibited Monolopolistic behavior, then computer owner's suffered the lost. Instead, the state governments and the federal government is extorting Microsoft to provide computers and software to the public schools. This in nothing but socialism/

communism, not Justice! Since when did redistribution of wealth enter into compensation of a separate class of non-litigants.

That is my opinion. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Clayton B'Hymer

MTC–00006957

From: CataloniElectric@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft

pleaser let microsoft alone this is a good company and need the free to work right and you people do not know how to run a company like Microsoft. way do you people wake up and see the real world . and the world that you think is right. it take money to do that . i do not think any for the people that are to bring microsoft down can not do it in the free marker so there want to do it with the law . i think you lawer are the lone one make money on this so the more in go on the more money you make. Microsoft is a good company and is the back bone for the new world and need to run right.

MTC–00006958

From: Peter (038) Dolly van Hengel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe it is ludricous that we have to go thru all this litigation that will benefit no one other than some complainers. the economy requires quick action and settlement to do away with the uncertainty. Also the consumer wants to move on. there is not much choice anyway and so far nobody has been harmed.

pls move on and stop the litigation nonsence: it is costly and will bring no long term benefit.

peter van hengel

MTC–00006959

From: rabhill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:28pm
Subject: MSFT Settlement

RE: DOJ Settlement with Microsoft.

I, as a long term user(1980) of Apple and PC machines with all types of software, fully support the recent DOJ settlement.

During my latter part of career years from 1985 ish until 1995 my company favored the use of Apple and I used same for my personal computing. In 1998 I switched to PC's and windows. With this background I can emphatically say that the Windows systems (Software+Hardware) are vastly superior to Apple system in Cost, Reliability and general performance.

I categorically challenge anyone to show me where the world would be better off without Microsoft and their products. In the early 80's I recall what the world was like when there were 10 different Word processors, Database managers, and Spreadsheet software, and the difficulties with incompatible packages. The PC has thrived because of Microsoft not in spite of them. I was also an internet and AOL user in the early 90's and recall trying to get a decent browser. AOL did not and still does not provides a competitive service. As a taxpayer it would be in my interests to spend some DOJ time seriously

reviewing how AOL/Netscape attempt to prevent competition.

Respectfully,

Richard Hill

33601 Capstan Drive

Dana Point, CA 92629

949–443–2349

rabhill@earthlink.net

MTC–00006960

From: LSeib14844@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:28pm
Subject: get it over with now and move on to something else

leave microsoft alone and let them make our lives fast and easier when doing business and living our lives.

there must be something else the governement can be doing or do you guys like to send our money the wrong way

MTC–00006961

From: Wolf—Bock@emainc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:29pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

Sirs:

I think the settlement exonerating MicroSoft from wrongdoing was long overdue. In my opinion, the Department of Justice action was never more than a witch hunt instigated in collusion with MicroSoft competitors who also happened to be prominent contributors to the previous Clinton Administration (what a surprise). I am glad that the Bush Administration has recognized the impropriety of the previous regime's actions, and has decided to close this frivolous suit as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Wolf Bock

22373 Enoch Road

Leonardtown, MD 20650

MTC–00006962

From: geaves
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:28pm

It is past the time for those who brought this ill-considered suit to consider their folly and end it for once and for all. It is a judicial embarrassment, beginning with over-aggressive government prosecutors to a wholly biased judge. In these critical times for our country, the Microsoft case stands out as one of the most biased litigations in the 1990's. That was some decade—a President who flaunted the Constitution to Atty. Gen. Reno who lost her moorings (if, indeed, she ever had any).

J. Beales

MTC–00006963

From: Michael Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is in the best interest of all concerned that the charges against Microsoft be dropped immeadiately.

MA

MTC–00006964

From: phylliska@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I respectfully suggest that it is time for the Government to settle the Microsoft Issue along the lines that have been outlined by the DOJ and accepted by Microsoft. This settlement provides much heretofor private Microsoft information to competitors and others while permitting continued innovation by Microsoft.

Microsoft's products allow all of us—whether technology-oriented or gray-haired grammies—to access the wonder provided by the company's technology made simple for public use. The fact that so many prefer Microsoft software means that we all are able to communicate with each other without having to have special connections, etc. This is a Benefit which all of us are able to enjoy.

I live in Microsoft country [not too far from its Redmond facilities]. The State of Washington is suffering one of the highest levels of unemployment in the United States. We need the stability of a healthy Microsoft. And our Counry and around the World, millions of ordinary citizens need the products Microsoft has developed so that we may enjoy instant communication, run our businesses from our homes and visit education and other sites on the internet.

We'd all like to be First and Best but always, there is someone or some company that is. Bringing down the First and Best doesn't provide any glory to those trying so hard to prove that they should have been first and best—but weren't and aren't. Let's get this long-running case finished so everyone can go back to getting our Country out of its malais. That takes every hand and every thinker and innovater wherever they may be in the United States.

Thank you for listening.

Phyllis Bergsman,

Kirkland, WA

CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00006965

From: jimsue199
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:28pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We need Microsoft—request that DOJ play fair with the settlement—don't destroy Microsoft.

Thank you

JIM BENSON

CC:Microsoft ATR

MTC–00006966

From: Patricia Schlinkmann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:23pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

PLEASE SETTLE THE MICROSOFT DISPUTE IN FAVOR OF MICROSOFT. IT IS MY OPINION THEY BUILT A ''BETTER MOUSETRAP'' AND BECAUSE OF THAT SHOULD BE FREE TO MARKET AS THEY SEE FIT. THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD STAY OUT OF FREE ENTERPRISE. I SEE NO MONOPOLY.....

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

PATRICIA H. SCHLINKMAN

3401 HIGHWAY 90 EAST,

SCHULENBURG, TX. 78956

MTC–00006967

From: Owen Paulus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case. Continued litigation is not a benefit to the country in the current economic climate. The settlement appears to be fair, and should allow the company and its competitors to settle their differences in the marketplace—instead of the courts.

Thank you,
Owen Paulus

MTC–00006968

From: Michael Brothers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the time has come for the long litigation against Microsoft to end.

Companies that have delivered as much innovation as Microsoft are an asset to our country and our economy .

Thank you,
Mike Brothers
CC:mwbrothers@webtv.net@inetgw

MTC–00006969

From: FOXAERO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:31pm
Subject: Goverment interfearance

Less government will fix almost anything.
Frank Fox, Wilton

MTC–00006970

From: Larry Weidner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:32pm

I think the Microsoft case should be settled without any further litigation.

L. Weidner, Consumer

MTC–00006971

From: hcmcdonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a 73 year old man, and my wife and I depend upon my computer to connect with the world—the whole world. I am in touch with my old workmates, my children and my grandchildren. Also, I can find out everything I want to know through MSN.com. I know there are lots of smart people that can do everything with computers, but if it weren't for Microsoft and Windows, I would just be lost and not in touch with anyone or anything. I feel empowered by my computer, and I don't feel that I paid too much for anything. I love the simple world of Microsoft. Everything works, and I don't have to experience the stress of installing a new program. If something would not work on install, I don't know what I would do, as I can't understand complicated instructions. I have many friends that feel the same way, although some of my friends have kids that can do everything on computers, but they are the luck ones.

Please, don't put Microsoft out of business, because some of the other companies are mad at them.

Regards, Henry

MTC–00006972

From: Jim Crofoot
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:32pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

I understand that you are taking public comments concerning this subject. The following are mine.

During the past fifteen years I have been closely involved with five different companies that were introducing technology to agriculture for the benefit of producers and the environment. Two of these companies were developing software for this market. Both our market surveys and the customer proved to us that in computer software you need to have a dominant operating system.

The consumer will chose the dominant system because it is dominant and means the best compatibility with those that they want to connect. Developers must choose the dominant system so that their product is compatible to the greatest possible market. In our opinion the rapid increase of technology during the late 80' and 90's would not have been achieved if during that time we had three or five companies with similar operating systems and market share as Windows.

As both a consumer, user and developer I appreciate the role of the Dept. of Justice. However I believe most markets unless completely regulated by government will be driven by the products and their value. Those completely regulated have shown little or no innovation. From what I have read about this case, it seems that MicroSoft requirement for hardware maufactures to install Windows for a better price may harmful but if this was done though the contract as a part of volume pricing I would say that it is beneficial.

My main comment is SETTLE THIS CASE. The industry, the US and the world are not being served by endless litigation.

As far as I can tell the only parties that have or will gain from this case have been the attorneys. Even MicroSoft competitors have been hurt by the uncertainty of this case and what the future holds. I have yet to hear how the states that are parties to this case have been damaged. I live to west of Iowa and work with producers in both IA and NE. I can't see that residents of IA have been damaged by MicroSoft. The motive for their action appears to be something other than advancing technology.

Thanks for your time, you know how to reach me if you wish.

MTC–00006973

From: Lois Bailey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement as agreed to is a good settlement.

No further litigation is necessary or needed. No need to prolong this any longer. This is good for the consumer and the company even though the company might want it better.

Thank you
L. Bailey

MTC–00006974

From: fran symms
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To follow freedom in America, please dismiss the case against Microsoft...Our government should NOT punish success.

Fran Symms

MTC–00006975

From: JAMES PHELAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:34pm
Subject: Continued harrasment of Microsoft

I would stronly recommend that the civil actions suggested by the 9 holdout states be terminated and Microsoft Corporation be allowed to continue to inovate and add to our countries prosperity and defense.

The Federal actions taken to date against this company are a sufficient remedy for any past corporate transgressions.

James D. Phelan
3060 6th Ave. # 30
San Diego, Calif. 92103–5854

MTC–00006976

From: RichardLCa@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Its such a shame that nine of the states and the Federal Government have reached an agreement on how to proceed but nine greedy states even want more. It's like looting a business after they have already been broken into.

Microsoft has done so much for the consumer. They have built the best product. It's called competition. If competition is unfair then we are nothing but a socialistic country.

Please advise the holdout states to compete with their products and back off attacking (looting) Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Richard L. Carlson

MTC–00006977

From: carefree-cowboy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 3, 2002

Dear Sirs:

The last thing our American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest and derail the settlement. The Microsoft case needs to be settled NOW!

Sincerely,
Dennis Thompson
P.O. Box 5135
Carefree, AZ 85377

MTC–00006978

From: Wfrank38
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Affair

It is time to leave Microsoft alone. The settlement seems fair to me and many of my neighbors.

Thanks,
William M Franklin
124 Arrowhead
Comanche, TX. 76442
wfrank38@cctc.net

MTC–00006979

From: Edward J. Murphy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Why is it that the DOJ has agreed to the settlement but now certain states do not like it? Have those statescontributed money for the prosecution of the cases or was it all funded by the Federal Government. Iwould also guess that the states that are holding out have a large present of Microsoft competitorsin their states.In addition, the competitors appear to be looking for the states to make it easier for them to compete—what happened to the FREE MARKET?

Let's get this over with before we have another MA BELL fiasco!

Edward J. Murphy

MTC–00006980

From: Ronald Soussa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please end the litigation and accept the settlement that the Federal Government has already reached with Microsoft.

Thank you.

Ronald S. Soussa, SIOR
Delaware Hudson Realty Group, Inc.
239 New Road, Building A
Parsippany, NJ 07054–4294
Phone (973) 575–6080, Fax (973) 575–4590
rsoussa@delawarehudson.com
www.delawarehudson.com

MTC–00006981

From: JENALO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Suit

To My Elected Officials:

I favor the reasonable settlement of the DOJ and states lawsuits against the Microsoft Corporation that does not breakup the company, that allows them to continue their innovative ideas and production of software and does not restrict their marketing concepts.

Thank you for your favorable actions concerning this issue.

A Concerned Voting Citizen,
Lawrence Aloian

MTC–00006982

From: WIN B ENDERS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is more than fair and should finally put this litigation to an end. Its about time that Microsoft competitors compete in the marketplace and not in the courtrooms.

win enders
seabeck, wa.

MTC–00006983

From: Roy Knecht
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: Micrsoft Settlement

The settlement is overdue. Please proceed with it.

Roy Knecht
403 san Jose Drive
Winter Haven, Florida 33884

MTC–00006984

From: Martha.Schroeder@
TJGroup.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern at the DOJ

Please settle the Microsoft suite quickly. We consumers do not need further litigation that stifles innovation.

It is no coincidence that the downward spiral to the technical stockmarket came in the wake of the decision to break up Microsoft. Thousands of retirees pension funds and charitable funds have suffered terrible losses due to this decision.

Settle quickly and let innovation and competition work freely.

Sincerely yours,
Martha Schroeder
TJ Group Americas, Inc.
15770 North Dallas Parkway Suite 403
Dallas, TX 75248
Phone: (972) 980–8032 x4474
Fax: (972) 980–-4574
martha.schroeder@tjgroup.com

MTC–00006985

From: FJAltomari@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I would like to express my opinion about the Department of Justice and Microsoft.

I feel that it is our government's job to see that innovative companies suchas Microsoft, which has done so much for our country and its people, be ableto continue its efforts and not be burdened by frivolous law suits.

Frank J. Altomari
5810 Spinnaker Loop
Lady Lake, FL 32159
352–750–1111

MTC–00006986

From: Jacquelyn A. Frink
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Brian & Jacquelyn Frink

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am writing to voice my support of the Department of Justice settlement ofthe Microsoft matter. The settlement is fair and reasonable for allparties. As a consumer and taxpayer I applaud the settlement decision.

Jacquelyn A. Frink
16 Premier Ct.
Chico, CA 95928

MTC–00006987

From: Janet L. Grummitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Who It May Concern:

Let this settlement stand. Let's get on with the business of making better computer products. Microsoft can help the US remain #1 in 2002.

Sincerely,
Janet and David Grummitt

MTC–00006988

From: Hoffman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:38pm
Subject: Settlement

Relaxed Mickey

Simply put, it was one of four policies of the Clinton administration that killed the spirit of free enterprise during a productove period.

Bill Hoffman

MTC–00006989

From: Keith Nealy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement with Microsoft only furthers their monopoly by enabling them, as a ''punishment,'' to enter and dominate the educational market, which is pretty much the only one left that they don't control. This is a complete surrender to Microsoft and is far from the public interest. Their past behavior proves that without strict enforcement and breakup they will continue to bully and coerce competitors.

I can't imagine many alternatives that would be more favorable to Microsoft. Far from punishing them for their practices, it ensures their continuance.

I strongly object to it and consider the government to have failed in its regulatory responsibility in this matter.

Sincerely,
Keith Nealy
1540 Linden Street
Alameda, CA 94501–3264

MTC–00006990

From: chris tarr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 4:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

I feel that the nine State's currently suing Micrososft should abandone their case for the best interests of our country and free enterprise.

This lawsuit has been a setback for innovation and technology markets. I further believe it was one of the factors leading to us to the recession we are in now.

Do not penalize a business for being successful.

Chris Tarr
1111 Stone Church Rd
Waterloo, NY 13165

MTC–00006991

From: Sharon Solheim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing about the Microsoft Settlement.

Years ago, when Microsoft stole the Norton Speed Disk utility (renamed Defrag), and settled out of court I thought they got what they deserved. This settlement is another case where they'll be getting what they deserve.

Ironically I think Microsoft products, as a whole, are the foundation of business computing and I use them often. That does not mean that their business practices are best for everyone.

Sincerely,
Joe Regester
610 Wallis Ave.
Delavan WI 53115
262–728–0249

MTC–00006992

From: VEstaba@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement reached by the federal government and nine states regarding the long litigation with Microsoft is fair and will benefit not only Microsoft but The United States and the whole world . Any country would be proud with an industry which has elevated the name og the United States for the oustanding achievement on a field of primary importance for the progress of all industies probably without exception.

Respectfully,
Carmen Estaba and Victor Estaba, M.D.

MTC–00006993

From: terry benshoof
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:36pm
Subject: <no subject>

TO MY GOVERNMENT, WHILE I APPRECIATE LOOKING OUT FOR MY BEST INTERESTS, I DO NOT LIKE OTHERS TO WASTE MY MONEY. MICROSOFT'S COMPETITORS HAVE NOT SHOWN THEIR ABILITY TO COMPETE ON A LARGER SCALE. THEY HAVE DO HAVE THE ABILITY TO USE OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY FOR THEIR BENEFIT. BRING THIS TO A CONCLUSION.

TERRY BENSHOOF

MTC–00006994

From: Ed Litizzette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

We are sick and tired of the ongoing litigation between the Justice Department and Microsoft.

Forget about it!!!! Get over it!!! I think the taxpayers have shelled out enough of my tax money.

Ed and Sharon Litizzette
windamer@inreach.com
www.windamere.com

MTC–00006995

From: jaymedin Medin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is the American way to be the best you can be.This country has wasted enough money on this.If other companies can't compete because their products aren't as good then so be it.It's common business practice to surround yourself with the best people you can to do the job and this is what Microsoft has done.I think this country had best start paying more attention to what is really important like the whole country is on the brink of financial fallout and no one wants to admit it.Put this to rest and start taking care of the important issues.

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail.
http://www.hotmail.com

MTC–00006996

From: Michael Schwartz
To: Microsoft ATR,bfoer@antitrustinstitute.org@inetgw
Date: 1/2/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello Mr. Foer,

Please fwd this email to Mr. Hawker.

I just read an article at the following link:
http://www.eweek.com/article/0%2C3658%2Cs%253D701%2526a%253D20391%2C00.asp and noticed the following quote (in-line with paragraph) by Norman Hawker: From the perspective of tough-remedy advocates, however, restoring competition to the marketplace necessarily means examining the position of competitors. ''Right now, we have one single institution that's directing what will happen in the future, and that's Microsoft,'' AAI's Hawker said. ''Antitrust law is about protecting and promoting competition, and you cannot have competition without competitors.

That is an absolutely pathetic claim. This only drives a self-fulfilling prophecy that is aimed at ''settling on mediocrity.'' Hawker's statement does nothing but enstill a ''bandwagon type of fear (i.e., hysteria)'' into the average consumer. If his statement is true, why didn't the MS X-Box put Sony Playstation and Nintendo Game Cube out of business. The introduction of the X-Box will only make the other game companies strive to make better products. To claim that MS will stifle future, yet-to-be-developed technologies is so lame. Norman would say something like ''MS can't deploy a VOIP network because they might succeed at it and take away business from other companies doing the same thing.'' Norman seemingly advocates a perspective that my parents worked to enstill when raising my brother and I, namely ''Don't compare yourself with those who don't excel just so that you look better. Raise the bar and compare youself with the top students in your classes.'' Limiting Microsoft's future technology endeavors by some force of law will only remove the incentive for other companies to make high-quality products in the concerened technology.

If the AAI puts their money where their advocations lie, then: 1. AAI supporters never use any Windows OS. They only use Macs or Linux or Solaris or some other non-ubiquitous OS. 2. AAI supporters never use MSIE for surfing the web; rather they use Opera or Netscape Navigator (which is now junk since AOL took over; why don't you sue AOL for the crap they generate and the IE-based browser they deploy), 3. AAI supporters never use MS Office, rather they only use Lotus Suite, WordPerfect, or Star Office. 4. AAI supporters never use HotMail or MSN; I don't even dare list the endless ''other'' competing options available on free email and portal web sites. If any of the above (1,2, or 3) are ''false'' from an AAI perspective, then the AAI advocates are solely in the witch hunt against MS for personal gain, such as receiving AAI contributions from any number of plaintiff companies or states.

I am confident MS will prevail in the long run. Although some of thier software is buggy, at least the average consumer doesn't need a computer science degree to use it effectively and it usually always works as expected.

Regards,
Mike Schwartz

MTC–00006997

From: Paul Kapler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:39pm
Subject: Miceosoft Settlement

Please settle this action immediately.

Paul and Sharon Kapler

MTC–00006998

From: LConey5352@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:39pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I, AS HUNDRED OF THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS ARE OUTRAGED AT THE CONDUCT OF THE CLINTON/DOJ CONDUCT ON THIS MSFT ISSUE. I AM A STOCK HOLDER OF MANY HIGH TECH STOCKS AND FEEL MSFT IS BEING UNDULY CHARGED AS A RESULT OF CLINTON ERA POLITICS. KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK BILL GATES AND CO. WE ARE BEHIND YOU.

LYNN S. CONEY
ARLINGTON, WA.

MTC–00006999

From: Bill Eaton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern (and it should concern all of us): Please let the settlement agreed upon by the Justice Department and the nine states stand without further litigation. While Microsoft may have had some questionable practices, those have been recognized and dealt with. It concerns me greatly that competitors who have not been as innovative continue to try and use the judicial system to replace and/or augment their own marketing efforts. I have tremendous faith in the American free-enterprise system and it's ability to police itself on most matters. This is not the time in our history to be stifling creativity and innovation in the name of a ''level playing field''. Business rarely is that, and we cannot afford to suppress our strongest companies for the sake of a few. By the way, for the record, I hold stock in some of Microsoft's competitors, and still feel strongly that ''enough is enough''.

Thank you.
William L. Eaton

MTC–00007000

From: DmarkBill@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to see the Microsoft case settled.The proposed agreement seems fair enough....and we all have plenty of other

things to do these days.The people against the agreement seem to be vindictive... enough is enough.....

W.F. Highland

MTC–00007001

From: Frank Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a thirty-year veteran of the information technology industry I know how difficult it is produce great software with broad vision and scope that works well with the products of thousands of hardware and software vendors. Microsoft has done this far better than any other vendor. No one else is close. That is clearly terrific for consumers, and for thousands of other vendors, though perhaps not for Sun, Oracle, et al. It seems to me that the Justice Department settlement is tough but fair, and I am delighted as a citizen of Illinois that my Attorney General is for the settlement, just as I was pleased that he did not support the breakup. I am amazed that the attorneys general of the other states believe that their proposal will be a benefit to consumers. Confiscating Microsoft's intellectual property and disincenting it will in no way to lead to consumer benefit.

Frank Smith
770 Rosewood Avenue
Winnetka, IL 60093

MTC–00007002

From: WES HAGER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:41pm
Subject: Please leave Microsoft alone.

Please leave Microsoft alone.

MTC–00007003

From: LindaDNA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:41pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I don't think it's in the public's interest to continue litigation of the lawsuit against Microsoft Corporation. Microsoft Corporation has been, and will continue to be an innovator in technology if it is allowed to continue its business without spending undo revenue in its defense from a few disgruntled competitors. The public's interest would be better served by allowing businesses to survive in the old free market fashion, i.e., innovation, development and marketing. The best product wins, remember?

Linda Wiley

MTC–00007004

From: DrNNat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to bring the Microsoft settlement to an end. Finalize the settlement so users like myself can benefit from new software from Microsoft. They have created a user world where everyone can talk to each other and software can be used by all. My business can communicate with customers who use Microsoft spreadsheets and databases because of the compatibility Microsoft has provided.

Having spent 40 years in the computer industry I have been appalled at the actions taken by our government to impede the progress brought to that industry by Microsoft. Clearly directed by its arch enemies, the imposed policies are not intended to benefit the computer users but rather to enhance the fortunes of the few other very large software companies that have tried to compete with Microsoft and failed. Before Micrposoft the industry was a mixture of hardware and software with no interchangeability between either. Software from an IBM system didnt run on a machine made by Digital Equipment, and vice-versa. Microsoft brought software compatibility to the PC world and in doing so enabled muli-millions of users access to all PC's. This promoted an avalanche of applications which can run on any PC because of the Operating System flexibility provided by Microsoft.

Historically, Sun Microsystems destroyed its major competitor, Apollo Systems, with predatory pricing policies, so that HP had to rescue Apollo with a takeover. Now Mr. McNealy arrogantly uses our government as a surrogate to try to destroy Microsoft because he cant touch them in fair competition. The law suit has gone too far already. Finalize the settlement agreement and let the industry go forward so users like myself can get back to business and get the best benefit possible from Microsoft's ingenuity and determination.

I realize this is a long message, but one final thought. If Microsoft were located in California the suit would never had happened because the Silicon Valley $$ and political pressures would have killed it long ago. They are all jealous of Gates. They hate him because of his success, yes, and his drive to be the best and the richest. And thats what this country is supposed to be about. They just havent had his drive or his intelligence.

MTC–00007005

From: Dennis Vetica
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:43pm
Subject: leave them alone

you guys spent more money trying get bill gates then bin laden. two guys start a company and do good things, create jobs, and make it so that even I can get on a computer. You know not that long ago, the computer industry started, and we were #1. Then Japan took over, and it looked pretty bad for us. Then some companies like intel, microsoft, came alive, and we are #1 again. I guess if you want to give up our computer business to foreign countries like almost every other industy, like cars, shoes, t.v.s, radios, stereos, dvd, vhs, cassette, hand tools, you can even find american flags that say, made in china.....sad, sad day you guys should be ashamed of yourselves. Leave our companies alone, if you would have spent that money on economic stimulus, instead of chasing bill gates, just think how much revenue would have been created.thanks, dennis vetica

MTC–00007006

From: earl vanderwalker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:43pm
Subject: Fair Settlement

Its time this has been put to rest. Only the greedy and self serving want to see this continue. Enough is enough!!!

MTC–00007007

From: Wayne Tanaka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please settle immediately and let the free enterprise system dictate the economic systems and keep litigation to a minimum.

Wayne Tanaka
201 Merchant St. Suite 2200
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813–2929
808–537–4591 ext. 208
808–537–6696 (fax)
Registered representative of and securities offered through MML Investors Services, Inc.
Supervisory Office:
1414 Main St.
Springfield, MA 01144–1013.
(413) 737–8400

MTC–00007008

From: JAlotis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I belive that the settlement should ''stand'' and no further litigation be allowed. From what I have read, the settlement is a fair one and further litigation would only benefit the many lawyers in- volved fighting this settlement.

Barbara Brandeis Alotis
613 Fearrington Post
Pittsboro, NC 27312
jalotis@aol.co,

MTC–00007009

From: Fred Apperson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft and Govt.

I have been using the Netscape browser until about a year ago. I still do not know why the trouble between whoever and Microsoft. Please why not get on with life and leave them alone. I had the choice of using what I wanted. For years I used Netscape. I chose someone else.

Thank You
Fred Apperson

MTC–00007010

From: 73543.2341
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

Please finalize the settlement you have reached with Microsoft. It's fair and good for consumers and the economy. Any additional litigation is a complete waste of $$ and resources and will not benefit consumers in any way.

Thanks very much for your consideration,
Scott Schneider

MTC–00007011

From: NexToNe000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I just want to have my input in regard to the settlement between Microsoft Vs USDOJ. Sure Microsoft is a Monopoly but it is a good monopoly. They make computing easy and give us access to the Internet. The ones that are against Microsoft are companies that cannot compete with them. Every software on my computer is made by Microsoft. Why Microsoft? Because they offer software that are better than other companies. There are options that other consumers can choose. I use AOL for my Internet provider not MSN even though their icon is on the computer. I use Quickens instead of Microsoft Money, etc. Like I say there are other products that consumers can choose. If you really want to pick a fight, I think the US government should try a Monopoly case against the cable industry. There are no competition there and the rates are just getting to outrageous.

MTC–00007012

From: PIPEJOHN01@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern

The original case was about browsers. Browsers have come and gone. In this fast moving world , it seems if you are wasting time and tax payer's money. Get this over with and quit looking for something that is not there.

John Harris
6234 Kingshire Rd
Grand Blanc, MI 48439
Pipejohn01@aol.com

MTC–00007013

From: Frostbayne@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I dont consider Microsoft a monopoly. I am against the antitrust lawsuits.

This is just another example of a company jealous of the success of another.

William L Ross
Omaha, NE

MTC–00007014

From: Norm Swent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:46pm
Subject: MIROSOFT SETTLEMENT

lET'S ALL GET ON WITH IT! A SETTLEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED AND AGREED TO! THIS SUIT HAS COST THE AMERICAN PUBLIC MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, BOTH IN ACTUAL COSTS AND IN ITS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY. AS A TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER/USER OF COMPUTER SOFTWARE PRODUCTS, I AM OK WITH THE AGREEMENT. SIGN OFF ON IT AND MOVE ON!

NORM SWENT

MTC–00007015

From: Anthony C. Cherby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the insanity. Settle the Microsoft case. As an IT professional, and a taxpayer, it really aggravates me to think of all the money the Clinton Justice Department wasted. The moral of the story to my way of thinking is this: a world-class corporation would be wiser to locate in some other country.

State attorneys general are attorneys—soak the plaintiff regardless of the facts. Money talks, and makes the district safe for reelection.

Is Microsoft an innocent victim? Of course not. They merely are better at doing the business of America—business.

Save the moral nonsense. Certain governmental civil servants went after Microsoft in order to make the reputations of certain governmental civil servants—themselves—apparatchiks like Joel Klein. People like him are good at using other peoples' money to screw the general public. Add David Boies to the mixture and you have solved the mystery concerning why we have so many lawyer jokes. Of course, other cast members like Janet Reno and Judge Pinhead Jackson make the people at Microsoft look like geniuses and saints.

And then there's Netscape. Tell you what. Sit down at a computer and use both Netscape and Internet Explorer to complete the same tasks on the Internet. Then compare the results in terms of ease of use, speed, accuracy, etc., etc. Conclusion: Netscape is now and forever has been an inferior product. That is not Gates's fault. Yet the US Government took sides with Netscape and other minor players, and swallowed the nonsense that MS in some way harmed them. How about some old fashioned capitalism?

In my opinion, the settlement is unfair to Microsoft. They should merely have been fined heavily. Break them up? Sophomoric nonsense. So, please —- for the sake of all of us who know better —-

Settle now!

Anthony C. Cherby
Medford, New Jersey

MTC–00007016

From: Dominick Lembo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:45pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT IS NOT ONLY FAIR BUT VERY GENEROUS OF MICROSOFT. THIS IS A COMPANY WHO HAS BEEN A VICTIM OF A CONSPIRACY AMONG SOME COMPETITORS WHO ALSO MADE GENEROUS CONTRIBUTIONS TO CERTAIN ELECTED OFFICE HOLDERS TO INFLUENCE THEIR THINKING AND ACTIONS. THIS TYPE OF BEHAVIOR IS WRONG AND MICROSOFT HAS BEEN A VICTIM OF A HORRIBLE CRIME.

I STRONGLY URGE THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO DROP ALL CHARGES AGAINST MICROSOFT. IF THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE, THEN, AT THE VERY LEAST, THEY SHOULD PUSH STRONGLY TO GET THIS SETTLEMENT THROUGH THE COURTS. THE COURTS SHOULD ALSO BE EMBARRASSED BY A JUDGE WHO DISPLAYED SUCH OBVIOUS BIAS HE NORMALLY WOULD BE FIRED (IF HE WORKED IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR). ONCE AGAIN, THIS SETTLEMENT IS A VERY FAIR OFFER FROM MICROSOFT AND SHOULD BE ACCEPTED.

MTC–00007017

From: Sharrie Dyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone. I am a senior citizen who needs a job and am worried about the economy; meanwhile, you seem consumed by harassing Microsoft. At my age I realize what matters and what doesn't. The economy matters—harassing Microsoft does not.

MTC–00007018

From: Paul Castle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madame:

I believe it in the best interests of the United States to finalize the Microsoft Settlement. I believe that the sanctions and costs placed upon Microsoft are fair and just. It appears that a few individuals or companies wish for the case to go on for purely selfish reasons that are not of benefit to Microsoft product users. Microsoft has developed products and fairly marketed them in my opinion for over 20 years. I have seem my own efficiency increase tremendously since using Microsoft software for business and personal purposes. The cost is affordable, and the the company is constantly striving to offer better products. Microsoft is in an incredibly competitive business. The company has tried entry into several areas where it just has not been successful because of stronger competition. I believe that much of this litigation is caused by companies that are afraid of competing with Microsoft, and cause harm to Microsoft product users by keeping the company distracted from product development that helps literally everybody in the United States.

MTC–00007019

From: JAMAW19@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft has been punished enough. I think it is time to ''move on''. Using one of my son's (a U.S. Marine) favorite lines—''Just Deal with it.''

John Weis

MTC–00007020

From: LMSUR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear DOJ

I favor the current settlement with Microsoft and don't think the states that are still protesting should hold up the settlement. I like Microsoft's position. What a great way to help our children learn.

Larry Sur

MTC–00007021

From: Karen Wass
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:03pm
Subject: Microsoft

Re: The anti-trust case.....Please let the market determine the success or failure of Microsoft and it's competition.

We as a economic world do not have enough information on how all of this will shake out. The world of computer platform design systems and function are still in the R&D stage. Microsoft, or any other company, should not be restricted from developing or forced to compete with any other like company at this time

MTC–00007022

From: Wood79T@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

SETTLE THE MICROSOFT CASE NOW!!!! WHAT ARE YOU PEOPLE THINKING OF?

ANTHONY GUADAGNO
STATEN ISLAND NY

MTC–00007023

From: Michael Schwartz
To: Microsoft ATR,bfoer@antitrustinstitute.org@inetgw,...
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello Mr. Foer of AAI, et. al.,

NOTE TO ALL: This is a repeat sending to for two reasons: (1) Added ''DOES NOT'' in the second paragraph. (2) Added the author of the article to the recipient list, (3) Added ''of AAI, et. al.'' in salutation. Please fwd this email to Mr. Hawker of AAI.

I just read an article at the following link: http://www.eweek.com/article/0%2C3658%2Cs%253D701%2526a%253D20391%2C00.asp and noticed the following quote (in-line with paragraph) by Norman Hawker: From the perspective of tough-remedy advocates, however, restoring competition to the marketplace necessarily means examining the position of competitors. ''Right now, we have one single institution that's directing what will happen in the future, and that's Microsoft,'' AAI's Hawker said. ''Antitrust law is about protecting and promoting competition, and you cannot have competition without competitors.

That is an absolutely pathetic claim. This only drives a self-fulfilling prophecy that is aimed at ''settling on mediocrity.'' Hawker's statement does nothing but enstill a ''bandwagon type of fear (i.e., hysteria)'' into the average consumer. If his statement is true, why didn't the MS X-Box put Sony Playstation and Nintendo Game Cube out of business. The introduction of the X-Box will only make the other game companies strive to make better products. To claim that MS will stifle future, yet-to-be-developed technologies is so lame. Norman would say something like ''MS can't deploy a VOIP network because they might succeed at it and take away business from other companies doing the same thing.'' Norman seemingly DOES NOT advocate a perspective that my parents worked to enstill when raising my brother and I, namely ''Don't compare yourself with those who don't excel just so that you look better. Raise the bar and compare youself with the top students in your classes.'' Limiting Microsoft's future technology endeavors by some force of law will only remove the incentive for other companies to make high-quality products in the concerened technology. If the AAI puts their money where their advocations lie, then: 1. AAI supporters never use any Windows OS. They only use Macs or Linux or Solaris or some other non-ubiquitous OS. 2. AAI supporters never use MSIE for surfing the web; rather they use Opera or Netscape Navigator (which is now junk since AOL took over; why don't you sue AOL for the crap they generate and the IE-based browser they deploy), 3. AAI supporters never use MS Office, rather they only use Lotus Suite, WordPerfect, or Star Office. 4. AAI supporters never use HotMail or MSN; I don't even dare list the endless ''other'' competing options available on free email and portal web sites. If any of the above (1,2, or 3) are ''false'' from an AAI perspective, then the AAI advocates are solely in the witch hunt against MS for personal gain, such as receiving AAI contributions from any number of plaintiff companies or states.

I am confident MS will prevail in the long run. Although some of thier software is buggy, at least the average consumer doesn't need a computer science degree to use it effectively and it usually always works as expected.

Regards,
Mike Schwartz

MTC–00007024

From: rockas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the 9 states that are objecting to the settlement should accept what the justice department has proposed.

Thank you

MTC–00007025

From: William Hickey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In our opinion Microsoft has been pursued by the Clinton DOJ at the behest of AOL and Netscape, et al, and has suffered from restraint of legal trade. Enough is enough. The Tunney Act settlement now proposed should be implemented and Microsoft allowed to come out from under the legal cloud resume business.

The pros and cons of learned legal debate have been given, examined and considered to death and are no further interest to us. Get on with it, let Microsoft get on with it and let our country get on with it while we still have a business where we have a lead over the world.

William G. Hickey. Ph.D.
Joyce V. Hickey.

MTC–00007026

From: Nancy George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

I am a self-employed developer implementing IBM and Microsoft applications. I find the prospect of punishing Microsoft's success the chilling result of a politically motivated witch-hunt, spurred on by competitors who won't release their own products to open systems standards. Windows is not the only PC operating system. IBM used to offer OS2; it was not widely adopted because it was over-priced, IBM spent $0 introducing OS2 to developers, and consumers choose not to buy it. There is the MAC and Linux. And much of the new software being developed is WEB based.

Windows popularity is due to the fact that it is what people want. People choose Windows. To a great extent, the acceptance and implementation of computers and the resulting productivity gains our economy has enjoyed, are a direct result of Microsoft products. When the first PCs were introduced, IBM did not want them to compete with IBM business computers. So they priced PCs out of reach of the average person. Microsoft's vision was to make them affordable and drive down the cost of computing so everyone would have a PC. IBM is still 8 times the size of Microsoft and could have competed in the PC market. They choose not to.

Microsoft drives innovation. I remember a few years ago, my project was held-up for 18 months because IBM and other vendors wouldn't participate in open standards definition. Finally Microsoft got fed up, and released a standard with the understanding that if the broader community ever got their act together, Microsoft would rework Windows to conform to the open standard. The idea of not bundling new features into Windows is completely ridiculous. When I started my career, multiplication and division were SEPARATE PRODUCTS not included in the operating system. Applying the no bundling standard would mean the Windows operating system could not include multiplication and division because a third party offered the product. And what about graphics, e-mailing from Word, embedding or linking documents, launching a WEB page from a document ... the list could be pages long!

Instead of vilifying Microsoft for improving their products, why don't you charge Sun Microsystems for refusing to release Java to an open standards board? Why not go after AOL for refusing to allow access to their brand of messaging ... a condition of the merger with CNN? Why not recognize that the lawyers fighting Microsoft are provided by those very same competitors who want to over-price and under-develop their own offerings? Why not chastise IBM for spending 1/50th of what Microsoft budgets for developer training? Settle this matter with as little impact to Microsoft software as possible. The remedy should affect business practices only.

Regards
Nancy George

MTC–00007027

From: Tom Riley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are very much in favor of the settlement reached be finalized so that all parties can move on.

Tom Riley, Cindy Riley, Jeff Allen
16 Central Way
Kirkland, Wa 98033

MTC–00007028

From: L Kasden

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For God sake, please settle this case and move on. The economy stinks, we are at war, and nobody cares about this case except for Microsoft's competitors who could not beat them fair and square in the market. Please remember, the stock markets started crashing as soon as Judged Jackson announced his ill advised verdict.

Thank you.

Lowell Kasden

MTC–00007029

From: Flora Donivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have never quite understood how Microsoft hurt consumers even before the DOJ brought suit against the company. No matter what programs were bundled with Windows consumers got a bargain. I have used Windows as long as the OS has been around and it has been an easy and dependable one. Windows and Microsoft programs have brough millions if not billions of dollars into the US to offset our balance of payments. When the decision was announced by the DOJ that the case was decided against Microsoft, the entire stock market crashed. That ought to be some sort of indicator of how important the computer industry and Microsoft are to our economy.

I urge settlement of this longstanding and disruptive lawsuit.

Flora L. Donivan

MTC–00007030

From: Dan Larkin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:51pm

I've tried to cancel this spam for several months. You indicate that you don't recognize my e-mail address, (funny !) it's the same one that you send the stuff on. Please cancal my subscription.

DAN LARKIN

MTC–00007031

From: RMBNielsen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is long since time to put this travesty of justice behind us. This case is nothing more than a money grab by the government, the attorneys, and Microsoft's competitors! End it. Dismiss what's left, or throw out the whole case!

Richard K. Nielsen
4135 Meadow Wood Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

MTC–00007032

From: jolene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't know the details of the settlement, but I do know that MS has a quality product that I have enjoyed using for years. Obviously I want to continue using this product at a fair consumer price. I have yet to find an example of how the government has helped the consumer with litigation. Please do not turn this into another mess like was created when AT&T was forced to break up. Our telephone system hasn't been the same since. Keep it simple and beneficial to the average person.

Thank You,

Jolene N. Cazzola

MTC–00007033

From: Greg McGuinness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please put an end to the madness of this case. It is very clear to me that the Attorney Generals for the states that have not yet settled are doing so for political reasons. They are enjoying their time in the sun and are trying to get a ''tobacco'' settlement fee from Microsoft to justify to their constituents that they are working hard. It's also clear that they must not be spending much time in their own state since they're constantly on television from Washington, DC This is just a ploy by the State AG's to stay in the limelight long enough to get free publicity for their run for governor.

I've yet to hear any plausible or measurable way that consumers have been harmed except quotes from competitors (Oracle, Sun, AOL, and IBM) that things would have been so much better. Well, it seems better for the competitors, not consumers. Microsoft has done a great job bringing a quality product that consumers want at a reasonable price. Having worked in Information Technology for almost 20 years, I remember the days when IBM charged $495 for DOS, Lotus charged $495 for 1–2–3, and Word Perfect charged $495 for it's product. I can now get a great machine, preloaded with Windows, a Word Processor, some games, AOL, and a slew of other things from companies other than Microsoft, for under $1000. Please don't punish a company for giving consumers what they want and don't listen to the whiners who complain about Microsoft's tactics. They play fair and square and have negotiated a fair settlement for everyone.Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : http://explorer.msn.com

MTC–00007034

From: Kevin N
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:52pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think the DOJ should settle and move as our nation has more serious problems (ie. Terrorism), the settlement is fair and should be implemented quickly.

thanks

Steve Chan

MTC–00007035

From: Henriette Goldstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the settlement agreed upon by the United States and Microsoft is a very fair settlement and we do not need more litigation. . It is a very good settlement for the United States and Microsoft and everyone involved. I am sure this settlement will help the economy and the consumers.

Sincerely,

Henriette Goldstein

MTC–00007036

From: John Knutson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Regarding the current Microsoft settlement : This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. We agree that this settlement is good for us, the industry and the American economy.

Please allow this settlement to be inacted, unaltered, thus allowing business and consumers to resume building and buying America's great leading edge technology.

Sincerely,

John Knutson and Marcia Koehler
1895 N. Placita El Zacate
Tucson, AZ 85749

(We are consumers and stockholders of Microsoft and Sun Microsystems, among many other technologies)

CC:John R Knutson

MTC–00007037

From: nmmr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:52pm
Subject: Court

Please stop the harrassment and continued stupid suits against innovation...which the Microsoft case is. Let the unsuccessful businesses fail and let those with innovation and new things which benefit all of us continue. There are much more important issues to be worked on than that. It is getting to the place that if one is successful, they need to be punished. That is not how America has worked in the past.

N.M. Rademacher
nmmr@mymailstation.com

MTC–00007038

From: frank cobb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:45pm
Subject: Micosoft Settlement

This should not have ever gone to court. Micosoft, has done nothing wrong. If they had given money to Clintons run then he (Clinton) would not have gone after Bill Gates. Sorry state that hard working people like Bill Gates, has to go through this.....

Frank & Debbie Cobb

MTC–00007039

From: Swilson347@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I firmly believe the time for settlement of this litigation is NOW. Agreement is fair and acceptable to MS and nine states. Finish this litigation and let innovation move on to bigger and more useful products at reasonable prices. Continued litigation only benefits the lawyers and is detrimental to consumers.

Scott Wilson
6227 Greeley Blvd
Springfield, VA 22152

MTC–00007040

From: Aaron Messing
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:53pm
Subject: Microsoft litigation

To whom it may concern:

I believe the anti-trust actions against Microsoft are the most ill-advised, ill-conceived, waste of government resources. The litigation is against the best interests of the general public which have benefited from the products directly and indirectly from the contributions to efficiency of our economy brought about by the desktop computer.

Millions and millions of citizens have suffered great financial hardships directly and indirectly from the government attacks on Microsoft. Not only losses in the values of pension plans and other investments but in a great loss of momentum in our economy in the retardation of new products. For every single vendor that claims injury from Microsoft there are hundreds that owe a debt of gratitude for its open architecture and willingness to provide opportunities for other businesses to compliment Microsoft's products and run applications on their operating systems. Microsoft has been most successful because of its open architecture and the contrast with Apple and IBM who tried to keep it all for themselves is very startling.

The consumers of the world voted for Microsoft with their dollars spent purchasing the products. That is economic democracy. The litigation by the government is a reversal of that process.

Very truly yours,
Aaron Messing
West Orange, NJ

MTC–00007041

From: William R. Hahn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: Approve the settlement with Microsoft Gentlemen:

I fully approve the settlement between the Federal Government, the attorney generals of 9 states and Microsoft. Let's close this case once and for all. It has gone on long enough and there is nothing further to be gained by continued litigation.

Sincerely,
William R. Hahn
Ph. 310 442–9923
FAX 310 442–6422
Mobile 310 600–6239

MTC–00007042

From: JSondhi@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am glad the DJ settled with Microsoft. Microsoft is a good, innovative company and needs to put this litigation behind it and march forward. I am disappointed that there are nine other states that have not yet settled.

Jay Sondhi

MTC–00007043

From: Robert Chrusciel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't believe MSFT should have to pay any settlement. If the company (Msft) came up with the ideas & the knowhow, why should we penalize them for that. If another company came up with a similiar program than pure competition would handle any price problems. It is no different if I invented a substitute for oil & wanted to charge a high price. However, since a settlement has been reached, I think it is VERY FAIR.

R S Chrusciel
Retired Texaco Employee (37 yrs)
13618 Lesota Ct
Cypress Tx 77429–6396
281–655–5553

MTC–00007044

From: CFSchaffstall@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

please let microsoft use their resources to create more advancements which will aid the users to create more jobs.this is what the bureaucrates talk about but actually prevent the efficient use of resources.accept the settlement and ''lets roll''—thanks—charles schaffstall

MTC–00007045

From: PRice1396@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing as a concerned consumer who feels that once again the Government has gotten involved in something that has nothing to do with them. We hear of monopoly on the part of Microsoft,yet I am confused as to when it became monoploy instead of competition between like businesses. If other companies fail to compete on the same level as Microsoft because they don't have the funds or the management in place to do so it is not a monopoly.It is smart business! I use to own a heating company that was not the largest in the area and certainly was not the smallest however did it mean the companies who were larger had a monopoly over us and we over the smaller companies. I think this whole thing is ridiculous. Why don't you go after Qwest,after all they are the phone carrier for my area and I cannot choose anyone else to provide me service because of this.There service is horrible and I spend 2 or 3 days every other month without phone service because they just cannot seem to find a permanent repair to fix the problem. How about A T & T Broadband who provides my cable. They are the only company in my area therefore I am stuck with them because no one else is allowed to provide me coverage. That is my idea of a monopoly pure and simple.

It is time to settle this ridiculous lawsuit that the Clinton Administration started,stop wasting the tax payers money and be done with it. I recommend the Courts agree with the settlement that has been proposed.

Thank You
Patricia Rice
P.O. Box 70212
Bellevue, Wa. 98007

MTC–00007046

From: Harlene or Ernest Weiss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:56pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I firmly believe that it is in the public interest to settle the Microsoft Case as it is presently structured. Any further delays would benefit neither the Government, States, or the general public.

Thank you for your kind attention.
Very truly yours,
Harlene R. Weiss
2616 Fairway Drive
York, PA 17402

MTC–00007047

From: jimc@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is imperative that the settlement of this case be one that actually benefits consumers. We have lived for so long with Microsft piously describing everything that benefits them as good for all of us, everything that damamges them as bad for us that many many people seem to equate Microsoft's success with America's. But they are not the same. I have heard many people say no one was harmed by Microsoft's anti-trust actions, and today's computers are wonderful, and many other glowing pro-MS comments. But how can we measure what might have been, but is not? How can we know what has never seen the light of day because one company has effectively squelched all competitors?

Well, we can know a little, or at least imagine and extrapolate. I am a user of WordPerfect. Have been and will continue to be until the company is finally and completely crushed by Microsoft. It is, in my opinion, a far more innovative, more useful, and more intelligently designed product. It has many loyal users, who revere its flexibility and its ''Reveal Codes''. I suspect there are currently other products like it all over, which can barely see the light of day because no one will use them, or other products that did once exist but do no more as they could not get out of Microsoft's illegal wrestling hold. It is impossible to know what history would have been like without the competition-strangling behaviors of Microsoft. But I can't help but believe we have lost a lot of innovation, a lot of unusual ideas, a lot of surprises. WordPerfect, a superior product, has been crushed by Microsoft's illegal behavior. But there is another issue as well....I have few WordPerfect resources available to me, e.g. training, user guides, etc. There is no market. I'd like more info, more tools, more options, but if I choose to use an alternate product, I'm on my own. AT&T was a monopoly, the owner of the finest phone system in the world. The monoloply withered, and there are hundreds of new products, prices unimaginable in 1983, and services AT&T would never have needed to offer. They are the perfect example of why monopolies—even apparently ''good'' ones—are not allowed. No one knew about the many products developed since divestiture, but who is sorry that AT&T was broken up? Not a single consumer...though they may pine for the easy days of one phone bill, they all love the cheaper rates and better services, the multiple choices, the array of options.

I write HTML for a living, and think about good pages that download quickly. I have seen a few lines of text and a few small images turned into a thirty MB HTML page

by Miscrosoft Word. 30 MB that must be stored on some server, shipped through the Internet, downloaded across a phone line and opened in my browser. But as Word is the standard HTML writing tool in many environments, I have been punished by pages that take 100 times as long as they should to download. This wastes everyone's time and resources. No matter how cheap storage, backup, and bandwidth become, they are not free. Nor is the extra time required to download these products.

The computer companies, bullied, coerced, threatened, and punished by Microsoft, ship mediocre tools and dare anyone to use anyting else. They will not help you if you attempt an unstandard installation. They will not help you if try a different OS. To get support, you stay with what they ship. And to do that, you forego alternatives and become hooked into the Microsoft talons. We have all suffered as those with different ideas have had no place to release them, it is as if the libraries were owned by one publisher. That is wrong in any system, and doubly wrong when that publisher has done their best, as documented in the record, to prevent anyone else from being allowed into the library. The PC may replace the library in some vital ways; do we really want to force all publishers to kowtow to one? That is in the interest of no citizen.

James C. Clark
14500 E 37 St
Independence, Mo 64055

MTC–00007048

From: Wstew1924@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I really get tired of goofy law suits. I think it's time for all this to get settled and go on with business. How much do people and States want anyway?

MTC–00007049

From: Robert Bass
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft

DOJ,

As I watch all the crybabies and the dumb states that's out to make Microsoft a so called Monopoly. I would think you let the people of USA make a vote on this. I like Bill Gates, I love his software and 97% of us all used it, as I am useding it as I type this email, as you will receive this email with Microsoft help somewhere on somebody's mail server. I own a Chevrolet and nobody made me buy it, if I wanted a Ford, I have it. Same as Software, I want Microsoft and don't want Linux. The other day I was in a OfficeMax and did not see the first software add on for Linux.

If the DOJ would start paying people to write software for Linux for free, Microsoft will not make it, and look at all the Tax dollars that go out the Window for the Irs Take my Vote and leave Microsoft to US we the American People we will make then are brake them.

Thanks
Robert Bass

MTC–00007050

From: PSHSR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle with Microsoft as soon as possible. It is my feeling that the Justice Dept should never have gone after Microsoft in the first place. I have always felt that Judge was wrong to find Micrsoft guilty of anything.

It's a hell of a note when superior brain power is persecuted and prosecuted by the US government.

Peter S Hanson

MTC–00007051

From: Tom Schifanella
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time the Microsoft issue be settled as per the recent agreement among all the parties. The country needs a healthy Microsoft but some of their more strident competitors would rather drag a settlement dispute out for as long as possible wanting the courts to solve problems of their own making. Please let us settle the issue so Microsoft can continue to give the public exciting new products.

Tom Schifanella

MTC–00007052

From: Samuel Lewis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel very strongly that the Tunney Act is fair and in the public interest. It is my opinion that any more litigation on the Microsoft Settlement would be a waste of taxpayers' money and damaging to the spirit of free enterprise and innovation, which is vital to the health of the USA.

Samuel Lewis
lewissw@earthlink.net
EarthLink: It's your Internet.

MTC–00007053

From: rick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Janesville, WI January 2, 2002

Dear Sirs,

I am an American citizen with about 30 years in the computer industry. What happens in the US vs. Microsoft antitrust case affects me professionally as well as personally, since I am a fairly heavy user of computer software and technology. I would like to comment on the settlement jointly proposed by the Department of Justice and Microsoft. To be blunt, I believe the proposal is a dishonest one that sells out the public interest. I will explain why, and offer some guidelines for a fairer remedy. While the following comments were originally written and forwarded to you by Ganesh Prasad, an Australian citizen, I feel Mr. Prasad's views are so important that they should be heard. As an American citizen, I am asking you to hear them.

* 1. Microsoft's main crime (not bundling, but the /prevention/ of bundling) has had lasting anti-competitive effects that the settlement should address but doesn't *

The argument that has most often been used against Microsoft is the ''bundling'' one, the allegation that Microsoft bundled its browser (and now its media player and instant messaging software) with its operating system. By doing so, it leveraged its monopoly in operating systems to enter other markets. Though this is a classic antitrust argument, people who believe in a free market are not convinced because the remedy does not sound right from the standpoint of the consumer interest. Consumers enjoy greater convenience, not less, when extra software is bundled with the operating system they buy. That is why the harsher remedy proposed by some of the states is also wrong. Forcing Microsoft to unbundle such software needlessly inconveniences the consumer. It also takes away from Microsoft's legitimate right to decide what goes into its products and puts the courts in the avoidable position of having to define the scope of technologies such as operating systems when they are not technically qualified to do so. The only parties that are benefitted by such a remedy are competitors. Doesn't this add credibility to Microsoft's claim that its competitors are inefficient and require government intervention to survive?

However, the prosecution has failed from the start to argue this point with the right emphasis. What Microsoft did that seriously disadvantaged the consumer was not so much bundling /its own/ browser with its operating system, but preventing computer resellers (OEMs) from offering consumers a choice by bundling /competing/ browsers such as Netscape Navigator. Microsoft threatened OEMs such as Compaq with the withdrawal of their Windows 95 license if they dared to bundle Netscape Navigator with the PCs they sold. Given the overwhelming dominance of Windows 95 in the operating system market at that time, a withdrawal of that license could have bankrupted even an OEM as large as Compaq. The threat was credible and secured the compliance of all OEMs. So certainly, Microsoft did leverage its monopoly in operating systems to gain entry into the browser market, and it did so both through the relatively benign means of bundling its own browser, and by the decidedly illegal means of preventing consumers from sampling the wares of its competitors. Any free market advocate can readily see the consumer harm in this latter action of Microsoft's, but the prosecution has damaged its own case by not emphasising this enough.

Microsoft has also had secret agreements with OEMs that prevent them from offering consumers the choice of which operating system to boot when they start up their computers. This is often known as the ''bootloader clause'' Microsoft abused its monopoly in operating systems by threatening OEMs and blocking, /at the source/, the entry of other operating systems into the market. Consumers have had no opportunity to know about or sample competing operating systems. In other words, Microsoft abused its operating system monopoly to maintain that monopoly, which is another violation of antitrust law. The fact that no OEM except IBM dared to testify against Microsoft during the trial is itself

proof of Microsoft's terror tactics. Their silence speaks louder than any testimony.

Microsoft's history is full of such anti-competition and anti-consumer actions. Bristol Technology won a case against Microsoft (over Microsoft's sudden withdrawal of support for their Unix interoperation software Wind/U) but was awarded a laughably poor compensation of one dollar. Caldera had a strong case against Microsoft (over the illegal way in which Microsoft used Windows 3.1 to force consumers to buy MS-DOS rather than Caldera's DR-DOS) but its silence was bought through an out-of-court settlement. The consumer has been the ultimate loser in all these cases because Microsoft's actions removed competitive choice and interoperation options.

The DoJ's proposed settlement shows an awareness of these abuses and aims to prevent their recurrence, but it needs to be far stronger and bolder. The damage to the industry has been done systematically, over more than a decade, and significant /network externalities/ have been created that work to perpetuate the Microsoft monopoly. How can this damage be reversed by a mere forward-looking arrangement? Consumers and Microsoft's competitors now face nearly insurmountable /market/ hurdles to creating a viable alternative computing environment, even though /technically/ good alternatives are available. Even if Microsoft's abuses are halted, the structural and systemic forces they have created over the past decade will continue to work in their favour. At a time when consumers look to the government to right these historical wrongs, the settlement that the government proposes is inexplicably defeatist. It resigns consumers to the status quo! One would imagine that a prosecution that has had its argument upheld by two courts would have the momentum, confidence and real power to broker a deal that restores genuine choice to the consumer, not step lightly around an entrenched monopoly that was the problem to start with.

* 2. A criminal should not be allowed to keep his ill-gotten gains * Microsoft's monopoly profits are the direct result of these and other illegally anti-competitive tactics.

The antitrust case established that the absence of competition emboldened Microsoft into charging $89 for Windows instead of $49. In other words, consumers paid extra merely because of a monopoly that was being illegally maintained. Four eminent economists filed an /amicus curiae/ brief during the remedies phase of the trial in which they showed that Microsoft's rate of return on invested capital was 88%, while the average in other industries was about 13%! [See www.econ.yale.edu/nordhaus/homepage/Final%20microsoft%20brief.pdf <http://www.econ.yale.edu/%7Enordhaus/homepage/Final%20microsoft%20brief.pdf>] Microsoft could never have made such huge profits without its illegal maintenance and extension of its monopoly, and therefore a major part of its current wealth is /illegally earned/. There is absolutely nothing in the proposed settlement that addresses the issue of these ill-gotten gains, or how these will be reimbursed to the public from whose pockets they came. This simple omission easily amounts to billions of dollars, and by itself makes the settlement a sellout of the public interest, even without an assessment of its other shortcomings.

* 3. Ill-gotten gains should not be allowed to influence the outcome of this case * It is disturbing to read that many states are settling because they are running out of funds to pursue the case further as they would like to. Meanwhile, Microsoft, with its multi-billion dollar war chest, has no such constraints. They can outlast all their opponents. The world is learning the cynical lesson that the American justice system is a mere extension of the free market—you get as much justice as you can afford to pay for. What happened to the principle (so successfully applied in the A1 Capone case) that criminals should not be able to use their ill-gotten gains to pay for their legal defence? Wouldn't a scrupulous application of that principle prevent the distortion we see here? If a convicted abusive monopolist has more funds than its prosecutors,-and that fact is forcing them to settle, can't the monopolist's funds be frozen, or can it not be made to pay the legal costs of its prosecutors? A simple ruling along those lines might see Microsoft scrambling to agree to a fairer settlement, one that will better safeguard the freedom of the consumer.

* 4. There is no attempt at punishment for wrongdoing * Though it has been established that Microsoft has repeatedly broken the law, the settlement only defines mechanisms to prevent future wrongdoing. What about punishment for past wrongdoing? Are murderers let off scot free with mere provisions to prevent future murders? What kind of example does this set? And what confidence does this inspire in the American justice system? Any remedy must include appropriate punishment.

* 5. The economy is being used as a bogeyman to prevent punishment * It is being argued that in the current difficult economic climate, Microsoft should not be broken up or otherwise punished, because that will in turn affect the rest of the economy (through a fall in the stockmarket index, a delay in the recovery of hardware sales, more unemployment and hardship, etc.). On the contrary, the lessons of Economics are that monopolies are always bad. They reduce efficiency, innovation and economic activity. In other words, Microsoft's monopoly has /already/ affected the economy adversely. An end to the Microsoft monopoly may result in some churn, but that churn will be the ferment of genuine innovation from the rest of the industry. The impact on the stockmarket from a fall in Microsoft's share price will be more than offset by the rising stocks of independent software companies that can operate without fear of a monopolist's wrath. A decisive curbing of Microsoft's stifling influence will create more confidence in the rule of law, generate more jobs and help the economy. Therefore, it is dishonest and self-serving on the part of the DoJ to suggest that this settlement proposal is the best one from the viewpoint of the economy. Moreover, the state of the economy should not determine whether or not a crime should be punished. It takes a statesmanlike judge to see beyond the petty posturing and to do the right and wise thing.

* Guidelines for a fair remedy: *

Any remedy in a case that has been so clear-cut in its findings must be more assertive in its defence of consumer interests. Regardless of specifics, such a remedy must address the following:

1. *Recurrence:* Microsoft must not be able to continue to abuse its monopoly the way it has in the past.

2. *Reimbursement:* Microsoft has no right to retain the excess profits it has earned as a result of its illegal actions. This money should be repaid to the consumer.

3. *Reparations:* As Microsoft is responsible for the current uncompetitive market in operating systems and related applications, it must underwrite efforts to restore competition and consumer choice. The rest of the market should not have to pay to recover from Microsoft's abuses.

4. *Reference:* Microsoft must pay punitive damages over and above its reimbursement and reparations obligations, to serve as a warning to deter future monopolists. The remedy must in no case send out a signal that a large enough violator can get off lightly. Future tax dollars can be saved by discouraging abuses instead of having to prosecute them. The DoJ is supposed to be acting on behalf of the consumer, and they must pursue a remedy that addresses all the above issues.

For example, a remedy that required Microsoft, among other things, to only sell through channels that offer at least one other operating system, could address the reparations issue and break the structural forces perpetuating their monopoly (If an OEM requires training to support another operating system, Microsoft may be forced to subsidise such training). The proposed settlement goes partway towards addressing the issue of recurrence, but does so only half-heartedly because it creates significant exceptions and loopholes for Microsoft to take advantage of. It completely ignores the other three issues. An impression is created that the DoJ is more sensitive to Microsoft's interests than to the interests of consumers who have been systematically robbed of both their choices and their money. Therefore this proposed settlement must be rejected as not being in the public interest. * History will be the judge *

After the immediate tumult over this case dies down, there will be a dispassionate analysis of all aspects of the Microsoft phenomenon in the computer industry, and the roles of all players will be dissected. It seems fairly certain that the Department of Justice will be likened to a champion boxer who was paid to throw his fight. Judge Jackson will probably be faulted for his many indiscretions, but it may be remembered that his analysis was on the mark, and his verdict fearless. The appeals court will probably be remembered as being fair though it started with a reputation for being consistently lenient towards Microsoft. What will Judge Kollar-Kotelly be remembered for? Will she be known as the one who meekly accepted an agreement that sold out the public interest, because it was politically expedient to do so? Or will she be remembered as the

person who braved the prevailing political winds to do the right thing and restore balance to a corrupted system?

The world is watching to see what she will do.

Regards,

Richard H. Phillips rickphil@hotpop.com

Inspired and Created from website posting at

http://linuxtoday.com/news—story.php3?ltsn=2002–01–02–002–20-OP-MS by: Ganesh Prasad sashi@easy.com.au <mailto:sashi@easy.com.au>

Copyright (c) 2002 Ganesh Prasad.

Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License, Version 1.1 or any later version published by the Free Software Foundation; with no Invariant Sections, no Front-Cover Texts and no Back-Cover Texts.

A copy of the license is available at http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/fdl.html.

MTC–00007054

From: Paul Ermerins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this senseless court case against Microsoft. The nine dissenting states need to accept the agreement that Microsoft and the DOJ have hammered out. It is plain to see when reading news from a variety of sources that these states are being pushed on by Microsoft's competition. If this case is about how Microsoft has supposedly harmed the consumer, then Microsoft's competition has no place in this lawsuit. Please quickly end this mockery of court proceedings and allow the economy to rebound and Microsoft to do what they do best—produce software that has not only pushed the economy and technology-based business to prosperity, but has also given the consumer decent operating systems and applications.

Paul Ermerins
profpt@mindspring.com

MTC–00007055

From: jwwestlund
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

I strongly oppose any further litigation of Microsoft. Please let the ruling stand as it is at present and do not pursue further litigation.

Thank you.
J. Westlund
Eureka, CA

MTC–00007056

From: Brad Borland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madame,

I am strongly in support of the DOJ and states settlement with MSFT, and hope that it will be advanced with that conclusion in mind. This settlement will benefit every American, whether he be a consumer, investor or beneficiary of a profit sharing or pension plan. Lets move ahead on this one.

Brad Borland
Seattle

MTC–00007057

From: Richard Dekany
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

The proposed DOJ settlement of the antitrust case against Microsoft, Inc. is, in my opinion, not in the public interest. By allowing the fundamental tool of monopoly power to remain intact and under Microsoft's control, namely the ability to unfairly exchange privileged information between it's operating system and productivity software units, no real competition will be possible. I strongly suggest that the proposed DOJ settlement be dismissed and that Judge Kollar-Kotelly direct the DOJ to pursue more substantive remedy for the illegal monopolistist actions of Microsoft, Inc.

Sincerely,
Richard Dekany

Notice: The opinions expressed herein are entirely my own and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of my employer.

MTC–00007058

From: RBinzley@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The punishment of microsoft for its alleged ''monopoly'' on certain softwear should NOT be further exercised and the governmental powers in charge of this so-called prosecution should turn about and proclaim microsoft absolved of any further blame or any further prosecution for alleged ''monopoly'' and an end to the entire incident should be proclaimed by the governmental agencies involved. Other firms who claim that their rights have been impinged on should proceed forward with their own attempts at computer softwear innovations and get on with their own lives. The American way is to innovate and compete. Having Big Brother intercede is no more than mere whining to what some consider to be authority and usurption of other peoples' work in the innovative area of computers.

MTC–00007059

From: AllenFromTN@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:02pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen and consumer, interested in the current condition of our U. S. economy, I would like to see the proposed Microsoft Settlement be finalized at the up coming hearing as being in the best interest of our country. Then the USDOJ can get on with more important matters.

I also very much resent the fact that the recent Clinton Administration and the DOJ spent more of our US tax dollars on the pursuit of Bill Gates than they did on the pursuit of ben-Laden.

After all, what Mr. Gates and Microsoft did was add billions to our economy and millions of American jobs, while ben-Laden was blowing up American Embassies and US Ships.

Come on now, Justice Department, don't you have more important things to do? I urge you to make the settlement with Microsoft final now...

Regards,
Allen D. Rich
CC:LarRich12@aol.com@inetgw,allenfromtn@webtv.net@ine...

MTC–00007060

From: ECAANTIQUE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:03pm
Subject: Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

Enough already with this antitrust movement. Bill Gates has put America back on top of race for power and given probably over 2 million jobs to people in this country, and all the come latelys are crying. This needs to end and the government needs to find other places to use the money toward the greater good not the enhancement of a few not so good men.

Thanks for the sound board.
Eleanor Agnelli

MTC–00007061

From: customer service
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Dept. of Justice,

I have read about the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case. I think it is fair and should be allowed to proceed. It would have an extremely deleterious effect on the economy to break up Microsoft or to otherwise penalize the firm. It is not coincidence that the collapse of the stock market started when the government started its ill-conceived case against Microsoft and that the stock market started to pick up when the DOJ announced a settlement. What has been really strange in the government's treatment of this case is that while claiming Microsoft is a monopoly, the government continued to use Windows and other Microsoft products in almost all government offices. There are alternatives and all the government would need to do to reduce Microsoft's part of the market is for all government offices to start using Apple operating systems or Lynux.

Thank you for finally ending the ill-conceived law suite against Microsoft.

Peter Christ
Crystal Records Inc.
28818 NE Hancock Rd
Camas, WA 98607
phone 360–834–7022, fax 360–834–9680
email: peter@crystalrecords.com

MTC–00007062

From: JYudin4487@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:03pm
Subject: (no subject)

I believe the government should close the lawsuit against Microsoft. I would like the government to tell me what company in these United States has done more for industry and the public then Microsoft. Any one with any brains knows that Microsoft's competition are nothing but cry babies. If the shoe was on the other foot they would be drowning in their own water. As a tax payer enough is enough.

Julian H. Yudin

MTC–00007063

From: Kenneth(Ken) Dean Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:03pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
I support this!
Kenneth Dean Parker, PROBE SCIENTIFIC,
2109 Pinehurst Court,
El Cerrito, CA 94530–1879
01/02/2002.

MTC–00007064

From: Bryan Hoots
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:
I wish to voice my opinion that the final judgment shall stand in the anti-trust case against Microsoft. While I believe that this judgment crushes the principal of capitalism and deflates ones desire to innovate and achieve in business, its is easier to digest that many other settlements that have previously been offered.
Sincerely,
Bryan R. Hoots

MTC–00007065

From: Richard Stastny
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
I am of the opinion that the settlement between Microsoft Corp. and the DOJ is fair and just. I believe that it is the best interest of the consumer and industry to get on with business and put this issue to rest.
Respectfully,
Richard Stastny
7109 Colada Ct.
Dallas, TX 75248
972–233–6466
rstastny@swbell.net

MTC–00007066

From: Imaxxx@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I have read that there is an uncertainty about the appropriateness of the terms of the settlement with Microsoft and that public feedback is desired. Although, I think the company misbehaved, I am fully satisfied that the settlement reached is an equitable one and I, for one, am hopeful that is now concluded and things can proceed accordingly.
I am not a Microsoft employee nor am I affiliated with the company in any way.

MTC–00007067

From: NORSKPOLE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The provisions that the hold-out states, including my own state of California, are not directed toward a fair and reasonable settlement of the case against Microsoft. Instead, they blatantly provide unfair advantages to software companies in their own states. A review of the provisions these states wants against the product offering of the companies they favor, will reveal that the bulk of the provisions have nothing to do with the Windows or Office programs which are the core for any statement that Microsoft has a monopoly which and that they have unfairly taken advantage of that monopoly.
I am not a stockholder nor am I an employee of Microsoft. My position against further punishment of Microsoft is that I firmly believe that the ability of business to communicate using standard programs has been a major contributor to the major growth that occurred during the 1980's and 1990's. Microsoft Office was chosen by most businesses as a standard, against a competition that was fragmented, with one company providing text programs, another providing spreadsheets, another providing presentations. Although the competitor's had very good products, they were not integrated. Microsoft had the vision to do the job right, but is now being punished. It is my view that the case against Microsoft has been for political gain, and that the merits of the case against Microsoft are weak. It has already been established that the initial case against Microsoft was highly prejudiced. Further prejudice against this great contributor to American business is not justified.
Bernard E. Nelson
1469 Blake St.
Orange, CA, 92867

MTC–00007068

From: Mike(u)Haucke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Department of Justice
From: Michael J. Haucke
I am very pleased with the (proposed) settlement in the Microsoft lawsuit. I believe that the public interest is best served to finalize the settlement AS IS. We need to move on and let competitors compete for our business.
Sincerely,
Michael J. Haucke
7601 CTH O
Two Rivers WI 54241–9039
(920) 793–8809

MTC–00007069

From: DockHouse@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen and Ladies:
Not knowing who is in charge of all the particulars having to do with the Microsoft Settlement, I cannot direct this email to one particular person. I feel that I should state my feelings having to do with Microsoft and the settlement they have made with the justice department. It is a shame on the judicial system, that they would allow special interest groups to supersede what the government has already agreed to. What does the group want other then money, most of the suing companies, and states are in need of financial aid, due to the economy, and their own greed? They feel Microsoft has made to much money, and has profited by their products. As a Microsoft user, and stock holder, and American citizen, I am proud to be an owner of Microsoft.
They employ many people and they take care of their employees. Some employees are unhappy, so they are suing, did they not make good wage's when employed? How long will the government allow all these people to keep Microsoft in bondage of law suits? They have made proposals to settle, but to no avail. Our country has suffered a terrible blow to our citizens and to the economy, by settling with Microsoft and looking ahead, you can get on with the more important issues of the country. This has been going on long enough. With the lawyers being the only winners in this suit. Thanking you for allowing me to express my opinion.
Sincerely,
Carole Hudson

MTC–00007070

From: Dave Hoff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Settle as negotiated—Microsoft has been inappropriately penalized already—Don't reopen this thing!!!!!!!!!!
Dave Hoff, Owner
Hoffco Inc.
Wood Lake, MN.

MTC–00007071

From: William Northrup Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:06pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Please leave the current microsoft settlement in place. I don't believe any purpose is served by any further interference in private enterprise in this matter.
Thank you.
William H. Northrup Jr
120 Whitehall Road
Hooksett NH 03106
billnorthrupjr@mediaone.net
603 625–8621

MTC–00007072

From: murphyjf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: DOJ
A few ''special interests'' are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a ''few wealthy competitors'' and ''stifles'' innovation.
I as a consumer overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy. Please get the Microsoft Settlement completed ASAP.
For your consideration.
John F. Murphy
2201 168th AVE. NE
Bellevue, WA 98008–2432

MTC–00007073

From: Ted Freeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please do not stop innovation in America. I support the freedom to innovate!!!!

Ted Freeman

MTC–00007074

From: Dino Carubia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Microsoft has the moral and legal right to dispose of its property as it sees fit as long as it does not commit fraud or physically harm anyone. Absolutely nobody is forced to buy Microsoft products. People are free to also buy OS/2, Macintosh or even obtain a free operating system (Linux) if they wish. IBM had OS/2 as a multitasking operating system at least 1 year prior to the release of Windows95 and Windows NT. Microsoft should not be punished for IBM's incompetence in marketing OS/2 to the general public or to other businesses. Apple also had a competitive advantage in being first to market in the personal computer market in the late 70's and not only did they fail in their marketing they also charge much higher prices and insist that you must also buy their hardware as well as their software.

The anti-trust laws are IMMORAL because they are not objective. If the same standards inherent in anti-trust were to be applied to individuals (as opposed to corporations) we would effectively be living in a totalitarian society where anyone could be dragged into court for the crime of being successful.

Perhaps your time in the Justice Department would be better served catching terrorists and real criminals instead of harassing corporations that provide consumers with value and thousands of Americans with jobs.

Regards,
Dino Carubia
Regards,
Dino Carubia

MTC–00007075

From: Step Ol(00E9) Williamson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Citizens:

I am kept informed by Microsoft Company of the developments in their case. They tell me that a settlement, a fair if tough settlement could be imminent if the people of this Great Country voice their opinions in sufficient numbers. I have been benefiting for years from the great software this Company has invented. Some of it is timeless and all of it is innovative. I have many friends who use AOL. I personally use Lotus SmartSuite. But my all time boon has been The Microsoft Bookshelf. I still have and use the 1992 edition. Remarkable what they have done. Please! Let's get this settlement passed and working for concerned citizens. Yes I own stock in Microsoft. I am not writing for that reason alone. I want AOL and Lotus and Microsoft to prosper and for all of them to be able to innovate to the max. When Microsoft tells me the proposed settlement is fair, then I believe them for the same reason I believe the material in the various editions of the Microsoft Bookshelf—they (the people at Microsoft) are dedicated to the truth. Thank you for your ears and eyes and good luck with your decision.

Step Ol Williamson stepo@erols.com

MTC–00007076

From: Matthew M
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I can only talk from my own experience of Microsoft software. I have found that in general it is of poor quality compared with the alternatives, yet the company insists on pushing through incompatible standards which the rest of the world is forced to adopt; this reduces variety and choice in the marketplace, and is certainly NOT in the interests of consumers. While I respect that Microsoft is a commercial entity, with the purpose of generating profit, it still seems to be harmful for consumers. A recent example is Microsoft disallowing foreign browsers from accessing their Hotmail web-based email service. Microsoft Windows fails to adhere to many standards, which tends to cause problems in real environments. And yet thier products are branded as ''Standard'', ''Stable'' and ''Secure''? Especially secure. Since a discovery of a fatal flaw in the security of thier ''Most Secure Windows Yet'' this should be taken with a pinch of salt. At very least, this is a trade description violation.

Regards,
Matthew MacLeod

MTC–00007078

From: siN.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am not sure any pair of eyes will ever scan over this email, but I believe helping Microsoft in any way I can is imperative. I am 17 years of age, a senior in High School, and a computer user—a Windows user, an Intellieye User, an Xbox owner, Office User, Natural Keyboard owner, and sidewinder force feedback user. I am dialing up to the internet with MSN. It may seem like they dominate the market by my actually owning these products, yet I actually choose to use these products. I purchased all of the above, despite having 98 already installed on my computer I now use ME, yet my other system has XP installed. Without these innovative products being released to the general public there would be no change, or dynamics in the world of computing. You cannot rely on other manufacturers producing an operating system *half* as reliable or for lack of the use of the word—GOOD. Microsoft buyer for life here..keep 'em together! I am willing to testify at will, or at any account do most things to support Microsoft.

Contact Info is below:
Many Thanks, regards
Aidan Gray
27901 Altamont Circle
Los Altos Hills
CA, 94022
(650) 823–1294/(650) 559–9457

MTC–00007079

From: BOBDIXIEPEARCE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Congressman

In the interest of a sounder economy PLEASE accept the newest terms to settle this case.

Sincerely,
Robert e Pearce
5404 Via Maria,
Yorba Linda Ca. 92886
Bobdixiepearce@aol.com

MTC–00007080

From: Haymaker59@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

It is important that during this period of slow economic growth, that government focus its energy in a positive manner and stop spending tax payer money to continue its overzealous attack of Microsoft. The public watches congresses special interest treatment of professional baseball and fails to understand the legal monopoly that congress has continued to allow to thrive. Conversely, my family and friends, as well as many stock holders and Microsoft product users, view your treatment of Microsoft as an unjustly prejudiced and a targeted sham. Any validity of the original case has long since past, as Microsoft has updated and advanced its systems and software. Please take this opportunity to settle this case without any additional penalty or damage to Microsoft, the company is a true US success story.

Sincerely,
Stuart A. Hayman, MS
28 Macy Road
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510
(914) 923–6119

MTC–00007081

From: PollKay85@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The Department of Justice:

Speaking for myself as a user of software provided by Microsoft, I am angry that time and money has been spent pursuing punishment of a company that has done so much for the advance of technology in this country. STOP spending time and money trying to allow competitors of MSFT to have an advantage. We would still be in the dark ages if we had waited on the people who want to punish MSFT to develop useable software. Let us send commendations for service to our country in sales in the USA and for the export dollars they bring to America. Allow MSFT to continue to grow wealth for our nation, and to make progress more easy for the rest of us.

Professionally,
Franklin J. Kay, PhD

MTC–00007082

From: Rick Lauder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Let Microsoft do it's business without intervention.

MTC–00007083

From: Suite805@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I believe that the settlement the DOJ has reached with Microsoft is a fair one. My feelings are: enough is enough. Leave Microsoft alone now. The DOJ has more important things to be doing in light of the terrorism activities. I have not been hurt by Microsoft, and I don't think you would find a consumer who thinks they have been hurt. The only ones that feel hurt are the competitors. Let them make a better product and the consumers will flock to them, as they should.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Carol Cicero

MTC–00007084

From: Larry Guzik
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:12pm
Subject: My opinion

I have been using Microsoft products for the last 20 years. At no time have ever felt that I was being ripped off by them. In fact if anything I have felt the opposite. Considering all the functionality you can get with a $100 investment in W2K (upgrade) for example anybody would be crazy not to buy it. The only people that are complaining are Microsoft competitors and people that have always gotten everything for free and do not want to pay for anything. I personally think that Microsoft has paid a heck of a lot in unnecessary legal expenses on this issue so far and they should not incur any more charges of any kind.

This is my opinion.

Thank you for reading this.

Larry Guzik

Spring, Texas 77379

MTC–00007085

From: Andre Gous
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This email is sent by a concerned citizen re the proposed settlement. I am in favor of it, but please read on. Without reading every word, I have reviewed the document at http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm with special focus on the ominous phrases of ''Microsoft shall not retaliate against'' and ''Microsoft shall not enter into any agreement with:'' As a businessman, software developer, US citizen, and capitalist, I believe that we need a strong, limited government to protect the citizens' rights. Of course, a government can fail to do so by shirking its tasks, but (ironically) also by overstepping its bounds and being overzealous. It is my opinion, based on my observations and my political principles, as well as some excellent arguments which I've read in that regard, that the Antitrust portion of the DOJ has done exactly that, and then some ... inflicting injustice, in the name of justice, a.k.a. destroying capitalism in the name of capitalism. As such, I find it hard to support the proposed settlement, since I have a problem with it on principle .... but I will support it on the sole basis that Microsoft Corporation considers this to be preferable to more litigation yet. I gather that Microsoft is faced with a ''lesser of two evils'' option, and on that basis, I support them in their decision to go with the settlement. For that reason, I also urge you to go along with it.

The remainder of this email presumes that you're acting merely on behalf of US citizens which are pushing you to constrict Microsoft, and that you don't have a personal ax to grind. If the latter is the case, you're acting inappropriately. To the extent that you're faced with a complaint-driven democracy, please consider my email as one complaint-vote in the other direction, meaning I am pushing for a situation where people and companies are free to negotiate conditions for the sale of the products which they own (e.g., by having created them.) I understand that my objection strikes at the very root of your premises in the Microsoft case, and that is indeed my intent.

I concede that anti-trust has a legitimate function in government, but only to the extent that it seeks out and destroys inappropriate monopolies and unfair competition, where the definition of ''inappropriate'' is not based on a howl of complaints, but on non-socialistic economic theory, For example, I live in a county where there's a county-owned phone system. The county has instituted a public transportation system which I am taxed to fund, and which competes with private transportation businesses. I drive on a nationalized roads system. My wife is a travel agent who sees first-hand the complacency which comes from the welfare mentality generated by government funding for organizations like Amtrak.

If I saw you dismantling government-supported or government-mandated unfair competition, at the city, county, state and federal level, then I'd be cheering you on, and would consider you champions for justice, fairness and freedom, in an exact sense. Presumably, you chose this line of work because you thought you could make the world a better place. However, many of the worst injustices in history started with that intent. You have a grave responsibility to look far beyond the obvious, and to seek out valid principles of good government. (If you tell me the address to choose, I will mail you a complimentary copy of Ayn Rand's ''Capitalism—the unknown ideal''.) From every action I've seen you take, you're headed in the wrong direction. You're demonizing Microsoft, who should instead be left alone or commended for all the valuable products they've created.

I consider your direction as fundamentally misguided, and I look forward to the day when your charter limits you to dismantle only socialist constructs, and when the next group of ''I'm whining for conditions which I'm too lame to achieve in negotiation'' constituents knock on your door, I want you to be empowered enough to be able to tell them to get lost, to take responsibility for their position in the market, and to leave you alone, since you have more important things to do ... the greatest country in the history of mankind needs you. You should be protecting its core values, not dismantling them.

Sincerely,

Andre Gous

CC:msfin@microsoft.com@inetgw,Pat Newton,Sue Gous,bkk...

MTC–00007086

From: Allan B. Wilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement as proposed.

Thanks

Allan B. Wilson

MTC–00007088

From: Linda Quick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft has done more for the United States economy and families in the last 20 years than any other company I know not to mention their goodwill endowments. I am in favor of a special recognition award for the company myself. Computers can ''talk'' to each other, the software makes it easy for end users and the company produces great products that are competitively priced. Hooray for Microsoft! I vote for no penalty.

Thank you.

Linda Quick, Connecticut

MTC–00007089

From: Woody Miraglia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sir or Madam:

As an IT manager at a medium-sized company, I wanted to express my incredible unhappiness at the proposed settlement against Microsoft. It is amazing that my government's concern about economic recovery is allowed to take precedence over the obviously illegal actions of this arrogant organization. When I was growing up and made a mistake, my mom would give me a warning first before punishing me. If I made the same mistake again, then I would get grounded. Well, the United States has already given Microsoft more than its fair share of chances, and Microsoft has laughed them off then continued on its merry way. And why shouldn't they? How did they get the perpetual ''get-out-of-jail-free-card?'' Oh... that's right, it must be about money.

I am very disappointed in the Justice Department and the Attorneys General. I can only hold out hope that my state, California, won't capitulate too.

A disappointed citizen,

Woody Miraglia

San Francisco, CA.

MTC–00007090

From: Mary Jo Marrese
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:14pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT SHOULD BE PUT TO BED. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. MICROSOFT IS CAPABLE OF BIGGER AND BETTER AND SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO MOVE FORWARD.

MJMARRESE

MTC–00007091

From: BSau712@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
1/02/02

Department of Justice:

Give Microsoft a break and get on to other business. We have heard enough and the settlement is more than adequate.

Bill Sautter
CC:BSau712@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00007092

From: edward clucas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Sirs: please do not further reduce my retirement funds by acting negativly towards microsoft in the coming decision. I remain a loyal american and am a firm believer in the fair market system .I am a college educated 53 year old that works in a boat yard as a mechanic , excuse me to be politicly correct a technition. I am very well read an am fully aware of the case before justice.I do belive that the effort expended on this case may have been utilized. I remain respectfully,

Edward W. Clucas

MTC–00007093

From: Roger Barbo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

I feel that the settlement for Microsoft is fair to all parties, and should settle this matter. I don't feel that after nearly four years in working toward a solution that further litigation is warranted. Additional court efforts would prove more costly, be adverse to the industry, and possibly have negative effects on the American economy. My feeling is to get this matter over with. I believe it is healthy to promote innovation by companies, which can result in advances that may not result otherwise. Microsoft has always been innovative, and has given us much to be thankful for in the tech industry. Unfortunately, others, including some of their competition do not agree.

Thank you for allowing my input.

Roger E. Barbo

MTC–00007094

From: BESTEDARO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I WISH TO GIVE MY COMPLETE SUPPORT TO THE PROPOSED MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT UNDER CONSIDERATION, AND BELIEVE THAT IT IS FAIR AND IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CONSUMER AND THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE.

R. O. BESTEDA

MTC–00007095

From: Louise Stanley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is in the ''public interest.'' Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest. The argument that says consumers need a choice is utterly without merit. For those few people who don't wish to use Microsoft products, they are free to remove them and install something else. The fact that I no longer need to be a 'mechanic' to assemble and use my computer means that I can do more and enjoy it...

Louise Stanley
5933 Pennyroyal Drive
Pollock Pines, CA 95726–9006
530–647–9047
lstanley@bottomlinechannel.com

MTC–00007096

From: Lenore Stamper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am an individual software consumer. I am disgusted by those who continue to hound Microsoft. I don't own any of their stock so I have no other interest than fairness. The settlement worked out is just fine.

To me states are trying to profit at MY EXPENSE.

Sincerely,
Lenore Stamper
10016 Regal Park Lane, #121
Dallas, TX 75230–5528

MTC–00007097

From: Elfiemon@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement. It is time to bring this case to a close. The proposed settlement is fair.

Elfie Monroe,
735 N 94 th St,
Seattle WA 98103

MTC–00007098

From: Larry Butler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement—Hang em High!

I have followed this public issue rather closely for a number of years, being an ''IT Professional'' for a Fortune 500 company. In my opinion, the settlement lets them off entirely too easily given the clearly established willful transgressions of law at the time.

Reply-To: ''Finflash1–2–02'' Finflash1–2–02.UM.A.1154.142@commpartners.unitymail.net ''MSFIN@ Microsoft.com'' MSFIN@Microsoft.com ''larrybutler@boatnerd.com'' larrybutler@boatnerd.com

DOJ wants to hear from you on MS settlement.

A FINFlash Alert: The DOJ wants to hear from YOU!

To cancel your subscription to this newsletter, read the directions at the bottom of this message.

For nearly four years, your voice has been instrumental in the debate over the freedom to innovate. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens have communicated to their public officials about whether the Microsoft case should be settled or further litigated. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the Federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

However, this settlement is not guaranteed, and your voice is more important than ever.

The law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the ''public interest.'' Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest.

Between now and January 28th, it is critical that the Department of Justice hears from you about the Microsoft settlement. The Department of Justice will then take all public comments and viewpoints and include them in the public record for the District Court to consider. Please send your comments directly to the Department of Justice via email or fax no later than January 28th. Whatever your view of the settlement, it is critical that the government hears directly from consumers. Please take action today to ensure your voice is heard.

Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov . In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.

Fax: 1–202–307–1454 or 1–202–616–9937

To find out more about the settlement and the Tunney Act comment period, go to the Department of Justice Website at: http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm.

Thanks for taking the time to make a difference.

To cancel your subscription to this newsletter, please go to the following website: http://www.freetoinnovate.com/—utilities/unsubscribe.asp

MTC–00007099

From: Sam Ungle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get off Microsoft's back. Theirs is the best, easiest to use and most competitively priced software on the market—so what's the problem? Why don't you focus on something that matters—like the war on terrorism or the economy.

MTC–00007100

From: Carlos Treyes

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:16pm
Subject: micros0ft case

I think it should be settled once and for all since nine states have already agreed to improve the economy this new year.

carlos treyes
Shelton, WA

MTC–00007101

From: Henry M Watanabe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:18pm
Subject: Microsolft Settlement

This has gone on long enough. Please settle this case as you have indicated.

MTC–00007102

From: Ilze T.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:17pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Comments on Microsoft Settlement:

The DOJ should leave Microsoft and other great innovative companies alone. Where would we be today if Bill Gates had not configured the Basic computer language. Only a small elite group would work with computers.

Why should Gates and other people/companies with brains, guts, and innovative ideas be punished just because their competition did not come up with the idea first. Microsoft has made it possible for me and my child to be computer literate at an affordable price. What has SunMicro done for me? I have no idea.

If the DOJ smashes Gates and company, why should anyone want to take a chance and create something innovative? (Look at Sweden) Let's keep the American free enterprise system just that—free.

Microsoft has not harmed the general public. Its competitors might have been harmed because they did not come up with (Microsoft's) idea first. This whole situation sounds like the competitors are sore losers looking for a way to get Microsoft's brain. Let the competitors create their own brain child, that the general public wants. If you make something the public wants, they will buy it. If SunMicro can't come up with new innovative products for the public, tough.

If Microsoft wants to give poor schools computers and software, go for it. How else will these kids get to be computer literate. I don't see SunMicro giving any schools anything.

Sincerely,
Ilze Tomsevics

MTC–00007103

From: Freddiwash@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

Please, no more litigation. Settle this case now. The people have had enough of this case. In view of what happened on September 11th, we Have ''Bigger Fish to Fry.'' Microsoft has been thru enough, and in actuality, these litigators and lobbyist are stopping the tech industry from moving forward.

Concerned Citizen

MTC–00007104

From: TPapandrea@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have read the stip.

Settle the case. The US Govt has WASTED enough time energy and money already. I would not like to think of what and how my computer would be without ''Windows''.

DOJ—go catch some criminals.

MTC–00007105

From: Jack Leary
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the DOJ and Microsoft sat down and negotiated a settlement that was amenable to not only both sides of the lawsuit and that would also ensure that no harm would come to consumers, but that also appoints a neutral third party to monitor Microsoft's business practices. Now it is time to let Microsoft, the government, and the country get on with the rest of their business. It is irresponsible to drag this out any further than it already has. Let's close this chapter and get on with life.

MTC–00007106

From: ELIZABETH WIGGINS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We should be thanking Microsoft, not punishing.

Elizabeth B. Wiggins, CPA/ABV (Beth)
BKD-Houston
1360 Post Oak Blvd, Suite 1900
Houston, TX 77056

MTC–00007107

From: ANNA BELLE AMBROSEN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I want to add my voice to the thousands who feel that the settlement reached with Microsoft should stand. I use their services on my home computer and the system I have access to at work, is Windows-based.

Microsoft has been singled out, in my opinion, for undue litigation. They are one of the reasons Americans are the most productive workers in the world. We should recognize the outstanding contribution they have made to our success in recent years.

Anna Belle Ambrosen
18102 Shiloh Church Road
Beaverdam, VA 23015
abambrosen@mindspring.com

MTC–00007108

From: Fred Benson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

Dear Sirs:

In my opinion the Tunney Act covering the Microsoft settlement is fair, equitable and in the public's best interest. I think this law should stand, all the litigators should go chase other fire engines and our country should get back to building up our economy instead of tearing it down.

We should not attack corporations based on the fact that they have been successful and others can't compete. We should let the best continue to innovate and, unshackled, push the frontiers of technology for the betterment of all people.

Thank you very much.
Sincerely yours,
Fred C. Benson

MTC–00007109

From: Gerald Mohlenbrok
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsaft Settlement

It is my understanding that the DOJ vs Microsoft case will soon be settled and finalized. I believe it to be a fair and equitable settlement and I urge you to take every measure to ensure that it is finalized in a timely fashion, and without any further delay tactics instigated by Microsoft competitors and their expensive legal teams. In these uncertain economic times, any further delay would be costly to the nation as a whole, and would certainly not benefit anyone other than a select few.

Thank you for considering my views.
Sincerely,
Gerald Mohlenbrok

MTC–00007110

From: James M. Brumley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Just wanted to make my two cents heard on the Microsoft case. It seems so un-American to attack an entity for being better than the competition and winning. I thought we were a nation of winners not whiners. The government has been bamboozled by special interest groups that I beleive have caused much of the recent Tech recession. Let's get on with life and get the economy running strong once again.

Thank you,
James Brumley,
Captain, Medical Service Corps
Commanding

MTC–00007111

From: ryan atchison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone. P.S. Microsoft is the best software maker. And that is why everyone buys it. That does not make them a monopoly.

MTC–00007112

From: Ray Paul
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:21pm
Subject: DOJ Settlement

It is the opinion of this voting household that enough of the tax payer's money has been spent in litigation of the anti-trust suit against Microsoft Corp. We therefore urge you to accept the settlement of one of the most wasteful witchhunts of our time and let us get on to better times. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Ray Paul

MTC–00007113

From: Elson Bettner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement is good for all, fair for all. Let life move ahead. I believe this whole thing has been a waste of taxpayers' money from day one. Greed and jealousy have been the plaintiffs' motivators, they couldn't stand to see one man/company do so well doing what the USA was/is/will be built on: initiative, hard work, and FREEDOM TO SUCCEED.

Sincerely
Elson Bettner

MTC–00007114

From: Robert W Nelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft

Sirs:

I am an American veteran and served my country during early 60's. I wore the colors of my Country proudly. I am a life member of the VFW. I am presently retired from the Department of Defense. I am also employed as a School bus driver.

As I have observed the actions of our Federal Government over the past several months in the anti-trust suit against Microsoft many thoughts come to mind: Why not go after some real Monopolys such as the NEA and Federal school system, to name just one?

This action by our Justice Department leaves me with the feeling of ''Being very glad to be an American, but I'm not so proud of it.''

Microsoft has contributed more to our country's economy and well being than all the opponents put together. Why are we attacking them??

Sincerely,
Robert W. Nelson

MTC–00007115

From: studioelvis@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Judgment

It's too bad that in the United States of America someone in the government thinks that a private company has too much power and takes it upon themselves to quell the success of a forward moving inventive people helping companies such as Microsoft.

I am a 58 year old veteran, been married to the same lady for 35 years and my adult children love me as I do them. Life hasn't been all that good to me. I was a beaten battered unloved child, and everything comes very hard to me. I've been unemployed since August 01 and am a two time cancer survivor.

BUT. . . . If I were Bill Gates and some little person trying to show power tried to stop my company. I would have taken the billions of dollars, shut down the program and said ''You figure it out''!

One thing for certain. Success attracts whiners and people calling unfair and foul. If everyone in this country were given one million dollars, half of the people would complain about it. . . . Please let Microsoft continue doing what they do best. . Allowing people like myself to at least use a computer and keep up with the times.

Thank you,
Sincerely Cary A. Johnson
Federal Way, WA.

MTC–00007116

From: REBLOTT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

The Microsoft settlement is fair. I support its adoption.

Rich Blott

MTC–00007117

From: hlpowell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft Settlement in an excellent compromise in my opinion. I have been concerned for some time with the politics of what appears an attempt to punish success and reward both competitors and politicians by splitting the spoils of a broken Microsoft. I worked with a competitor of Microsoft for 30 years and was always impressed with their willingness and ability to consistently improve their products and invest in innovative development while my company and many others would bail out instead of competing with Microsoft products. I personally give Microsoft much of the credit for the affordable personal systems that exist today. I know for my 30 years in the industry, that the same competitors that want to punish Microsoft for making things functional and affordable, making them cuts their big markups to compete, are the greedy companies that would have kept the price of personal systems out of range for most of the consumers that have benefited from the aggressive development, investment and pricing that Microsoft brought to the industry.

Microsoft has provided a personal system that no other of the greedy companies who were mad because Microsoft was successful with using the leverage of volume to provide rich affordable personal systems that their competitors had to sacrifice some margins to compete with and many of them simple hold grudges for the challenges they did not meet well. I know that my employer was one of them. Without Microsoft we would still be using command oriented systems that the home market couldn?t use well or afford.

Please do not punish success through innovative, usable and affordable products brought to us by Microsoft.

Thanks,
Harry L. Powell

MTC–00007118

From: Robert Teisch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:29pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

i think that microsoft settlement was reasonable and proper and should be done-and-overwith and let the company go on without being badgered, as there progress is important to the economy and free enterprise (simply put)

Thank you,
Dr. Robert Teisch

MTC–00007119

From: Bob Holert
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I would like to encourage you to finalize the Microsoft Settlement as agreed to by the nine states and the Federal government. Additonal time and expense seeking other remedies is not in the best interests of the public, the states involved, the Federal government or consumers. Those parties who seek to continue this litigation do not have any of the the aforementioned entities in mind but continue to seek remedies which are not fair to all parties.

This litigation has come at considerable expense to the government and the economy. The cost to US world-wide technology leadership continues to escalate, again not in the best interests of technology US based leaders, employees of those companies or our economy. Those states who choose to continue the fight should do so at their own risk and expense since most have business bias or politics as the basis for their battle, not economic fairness and reality. I hope you would agree this country has far more important issues to address.

I appreciate your consideration of the opinion I have voiced and implore you to finalize this settlement.

Best Wishes,
Bob Holert
President
Houser Martin Morris
110 110th Ave NE, Suite 503
Bellevue, WA 98004

MTC–00007120

From: RBRrat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a veteran, patriot, taxpayer, and an American. My family all votes and is involved in caucus work and efforts to improve our homes, communities and our nation. I must recommend that you accept the Microsoft settlement as is.

Do it immediately. The settlement will be a benefit to the nation, it will place dollars where they help the most, in the hands of the people. In short it will result in people helping people. Our nation was doing great until those greedy companies decided to sue Microsoft. Why? Because they thought like communists or socialists of the past that Microsoft had too much money and they should be forced to give to those who had less. Those companies and the states that joined them in the lawsuits should have gotten nothing. If they want to earn more money, let them earn it the old fashioned way, work for it or invent a better mouse trap.

The companies and states that refused to accept the settlement offer should get nothing, the rest of America should refuse to patronize their states and they should be classed as un-American, not for trying to beg

for a buck but because of all the damage to the American economy this past year as their efforts resulted in devastation of the entire computer industry because of the apparent fear of what would happen to Microsoft.

Then when the companies and states had a chance to help America and settle, their greed would not let them settle. Now they want more time, more of our dollars paying legal costs, while the real America waits for a good pay check and a job like they had before the lawsuits in the first place.

Do your job, help America, enforce the settlement.

Thanks,
Richard B. Radke
12432 Juanita Dr
NE Kirkland, WA 98034
RBRrat@aol.com

MTC–00007121

From: Lizzardden@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: Enough is enough. The Microsoft case has drug on for over four years, and now nine states want to prolong matters. As a computer user, I have been helped by Microsoft's inovation and creation of a standard platform. It seems one of the few U.S. industries that is on top of its game and not in the hopper (must I remind you of the US auto industry, big steel, the railroads, Boeing, etc., etc., etc.). Let's get on with the settlement that DOJ and Microsoft agreed to and stop these idiot states from trying to remedy an issue that simply does not exist.

Yours truly,
David Hendricks
Lizzardden@AOL.com

MTC–00007122

From: Denoy, David
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:33pm
Subject: Let the Settlement Stand

As an IT professional who has willingly embraced the MS paradigm BECAUSE of the interoperability it affords me, I want this nightmare of persecution to end! It makes for a difficult planning/assessment and deployment of MS technology when we don't know if the products are going to be gutted and if we'll have to uninstall versions in order to appease a small bunch of unsuccessful competitors who wish to retain their high priced market shares (Sun and Oracle). In case no one has noticed, there are a number of market niches that MS has wisely stayed out of, allowing other technologies. If the world is so afflicted by the dominance of MS, why haven't there been massive shifts over to Linux, if cost is a consideration? O/S was touted as having several superior features and yet developers never produced the applications necessary to make that O/S a success. We select the products we need based on how they serve our needs, not by publisher. When I buy a book by a favorite author, I am not at all concerned with who the publisher is . . . I read the book because of the author!

MTC–00007123

From: PMounsey@markwest.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:27pm
Subject: comments on settlement

I am in favor of the settlement, and the court should approve it as presented.

While the Court has no authority to modify the setttlement, I am concerned that the Court may be attempting to do just that by suggesting that it will not approve it unless Microsoft agrees to pay the $1 billion education amount in cash. The $1 billion payment—in the form of computing materials provided to schools—will be a signficant leg up for many poorer schools across the country; thus, the settlement will benefit the ''public'' directly in a very real way I doubt that requiring the $1 billion to be paid in cash would end up having the same public interest benefit.

Settlement is also in the public interest because the Microsoft litigation has been a drag on the U.S. economy since the case was filed. Certainly there have been other factors at play since the litigation was filed, but the continuing litigation and the uncertainty that it has created throughout the technology sector have clearly been important factors in the country's continuing recession. It is important to ensure that Microsoft plays by the rules, but it is also important that the rules be written at some point in time, which is what this settlement does. Unfortunately, because some states have chosen to continue litigating against Microsoft, it is likely the drag of the Microsoft litigation on the economy will continue, although one would hope to a lesser extent.

Peter Mounsey,
Denver, CO

MTC–00007124

From: Jerry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs:

Please LEAVE Microsoft Alone!. I have used their products for years, and I am totally satisfied with them, and the assistance they provide regarding their products when I ask for it. I truly appreciate you looking out for me as a consumer, but I must tell you that Microsoft has done nothing but good things for me, and I see no reason why another software company could not be competitive with them if they so choose to, other than the fact that they have been left in the dust!

Thank you,
Gerald T. Cox
Traverse City, MI

MTC–00007125

From: Ndsieg@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

Now that the Justice Department has spent untold millions of taxpayer dollars harassing Microsoft and has finally reached a settlement it is time to move on. It appears to me that the Justice Department would have better things to do with its time and money, like fighting terrorists who want to destroy America, than attempting to destroy an innovative company like Microsoft that has contributed mightily to the American economic engine over the past decade.

Sincerely,
Nolan Sieg
ndsieg@aol.com

MTC–00007126

From: Flo Bradley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In regards to subject litigation, I have never agreed that Microsoft owed anybody anything. Microsoft does exactly what ever other software giant does. They try to get you to use their products. AOL does exactly that. They have such a monopoly on accessing the internet it is ridiculous. You can't even get to an internet site without having to go to an AOL site first. They put their software in vendors packages and when you install software, AOL gets installed whether you want it or not. This is true of many companies. It's called, marketing. I think whatever happens with this litigation against Microsoft that it is minor. They are what made tech America what it is today. From DOS to windows, it's the American Way.

Florence Bradley

MTC–00007127

From: Richard(038)Lois Chandler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Justice Dept. With the world in a recession and the local economy here in the Seattle area tanked, the last thing we need is more lidigation against MS so the trial lawyers make a ton of money and a few states can hope to get some free money for their treasurers. Lets remember that the consumers have never had a problem with MS products. This legal suit was never about the publics complaint with MS. They have just been too sucsessfull for some of their compeditors. . . . Lets get it over and start to improve the tech sector now. . . .

R.A. Chandler
Admark1@msn.com

MTC–00007128

From: Hubert1834@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please go ahead with the goverment settlement as soon as possible.

MTC–00007130

From: JCofoid@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle and let Microsoft get back to what it does best—stimulating the economy!

Jody Cofoid

MTC–00007131

From: Linda N. Chiappetta
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the settlement should be done as soon as possible. I believe it would be good for the economy. I think it was no coincidence between the decline in the stock market and the DOJ battle last year. I think it would hurt the consumer not to settle. I

think Microsoft should have been praised for being one of the first software companies. Bill Gates is a genius in my eyes and deserves credit for his contribution.

L. Chiappetta
6629 Raleigh St.
Hollywood, FL 33024

MTC–00007132

From: Jrutter44@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I am happy with the settlement that has been reached with Microsoft. I think the public would be far worse off if there were too many operating systems. The choice of software would be too limited.

Thank you,
John Rutter
64 W Jeffrey Lane
Des Plaines, IL 60018

MTC–00007133

From: John Yuh-Chung Wang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is really good for public. Microsoft can focus again to improve its products, which eventually benefit majority of the public. I also foresee Microsoft's Windows product will continue to dominant in the PC arena. It's good to put some monitoring systems in place that Microsoft will be reminded its obligations and responsibilities. This will greatly benefit the public. Overall, I support the settlement and appraise the steps taken by the department of justice.

Please note the new office phone number below

Tks ! JW
(425) 706–8556 (o)
(425) 785–8891 (c)
http://www.microsoft.com/MSpress

MTC–00007134

From: Ross Hunter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is quite reasonable and the rest of the crazy states should get on board and stop beating up on an American icon.

Ross Hunter
8208 Overlake Drive W
Medina, WA 98039

MTC–00007135

From: Dan Dunaway
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear wealth re-distributors in the Department of Justice and in rogue states, I do not know the details of the decisions which have gone against MicroSoft. Nor do I understand why you and your ilk have attempted to punish the high-tech industry created by Microsoft with never-ending (and limitless) litigation (paid for by the tax payers) which destroys rather than builds.

I do not need to know those details to recognize criminal extortion by the Federal Government. It is shameful that an enterprise such as Microsoft and a businessman such as Bill Gates, et al are being punished for their hard work and vision, presumably so you can loot their coffers for the benefit of society's dregs and non-contributors. Do you think we can't see what you are doing?

You people should read Ayn Rand's novel ''Atlas Shrugged''. Your actions are merely a cheap replay of her brilliant scenario which truly depicts the brilliance of giants like Bill Gates and the mean-spirited thievery by government bureaucrats disguised as ''social justice.'' Your actions disgust me!

Sincerely,
Daniel H. Dunaway
St. Louis, Missouri 63146

MTC–00007136

From: Shirley Adams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:31pm
Subject: Litigation

Didn't understand whether to send this to you & you would forward to Rep. Kay Granger Texas or what. I do not have her email to info. Are they back in session? They take more time off than schools & should use time to help our USA hungry children than keep up the litigation time against You.

If they helped less fortunate Americans, like you do, it would benefit us all U.S. citizens.

If more info needed let me know. Thanks for your ear.

Sincerely,
Shirley Adams

MTC–00007137

From: Epbowman1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please go ahead with the settlement. The government has spent far more money of this case than is reasonable. The other companies just want Microsoft broken up so they can have more of the pie. They don't deserve it. Spend the money on the security of this country and to help NYC get as far back to normal as they can.

MTC–00007138

From: William D. Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a home computer user, I was appalled when Microsoft was initially directed to split. Whatever the policies of Microwave were, they did not hurt the consumer. In a period of great inovative expansion, the competition was very intense. Many companies did well, some failed, but Microsoft continued to offer new solutions at afforadble prices. Isn't that what ''free enterprise is supposed to do?''

Therefore I was pleased to see a final settlement that required certain chages in the Microsoft Company poicies, but allowed the company to continue in a way that will provide new invations in the future.

William D. Peterson

MTC–00007139

From: CEJr48@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:34pm
Subject: (no subject)

This is a trivial issue since it only affects people who buy a computer once every 3 or 4 years. The largest monopoly in the history of our country that costs everyone in the US every day of every year is the health care business.

DO SOMETHING!

MTC–00007140

From: zigory@columbia.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I believe the Microsoft Settlement should be accepted. This company, which has enriched stockholders and raised the productive capacity of this country and the world, should not be punished for its success. Ideally the whole case should be dismissed, but at the very least I urge the acceptance of the settlement and dropping the harassment of a company that does so much good. Its competitors are seeking unfair advantage by having the government force their limitations on Microsoft, while Microsoft has never had any power to, nor tried to, forcibly keep its competitors from succeeding.

Sincerely,
Greg Zeigerson
216 Walnut Street
Garwood, NJ 07027
(908) 654–3496
CC:zigory@columbia.edu@inetgw

MTC–00007141

From: bernie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly the proposed mcrosoft settlement as it was made. The A. G's from the states that dont agree want a ''freebie'' like the anti-smokers. I've had and used Microsoft products for many years and believe that the competitors that want to smash it have no complaints because anything that they offered wasn't what the users wanted.

Sincerely yours
Bernard Borow @ bernie@quiknet.com

MTC–00007142

From: Richman, David
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft

It is a shame that our Government wastes so much time, energy and money on such frivolous matters as this. Microsoft has created for our citizenry, both directly and through a trickle-down effect, a virtually immeasurable amount of wealth, productivity, employment and cause to pursue entrepreneurial aspirations. Limiting Microsoft's pursuit of providing shareholders—and for that matter the public at large, the full effect of the Company's best efforts is at best poor government. I feel that our society should remain one that is both Capitalistic and Democratic to its core. This means that sometimes the labors of some give them advantages over others. To take away Microsoft's ability to labor to its fullest muddles the core of our society. We will look back someday and realize it was a mistake.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if those that so vocally call upon the Constitution as justification for twisted action held those unbendable words in higher esteem?

David Richman
d.richman@verizon.net

MTC–00007143

From: Addison Hawley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I understand that comments on the proposed settlement of the Department of Justice vs Microsoft lawsuit are in order. This being the case—Please believe that those of us trying to get the best value out of our computers on a daily basis for both business and personal benefit are in wholeharted support of bring this legal action to a close. A solution is long over due abd even if the proposed settlement is not in the best interest of all (Meaning each individual) it certainly is a compromise that is in the best interest of the ''Total Community of Operating System Users''. Continued delay will only add to the untimate cost of the settlement which in the end result will then at some point be paid by the USERS. Enough is enough, let's get both the government (DOJ) and Microsoft back to work on productive activity aimed at the future.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,
Addison Hawley
arhawley@msn.com

MTC–00007144

From: gene schnelz
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I heartily concur with the settlement as proposed. It is a must for our economy!

MTC–00007145

From: YANKRERE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:36pm
Subject: (no subject)

I believe the settlement should be honored.

Yours Truly,
Jack Naparstek
yankrere@aol.com

MTC–00007146

From: LELAND C DAVIS, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:37pm
Subject: Settlement-Microsoft

To Whom it May Concern: I certainly hope that the agreement on the the above issue that has tentatively been agreed upon comes to fruition. As far as I'm concerned the matter has been debated in full and now must be finalized. The American public deserves and desires to end this confrontation.

LELAND ''LEE'' DAVIS. Jr.

MTC–00007147

From: ALEDTHEBO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:39pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The ''current'' Court of Appeals Ruling is reasonable and fair to all parties involved and should stand.

Edward & Alice Thebo
2 Fen Court
Savannah, GA 31411
CC:ALEDTHEBO@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00007148

From: John Carter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To further chastize the innovative goose[Microsoft] that has laid so many golden eggs,instigated and promulgated by a few worthy and not so worthy competitors and their lobbyists,legal and otherwise,would be,in my opinion, tantamount to a national disaster of our cherished environment of creativity.

John R. Carter,M.D.Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : http://explorer.msn.com

MTC–00007149

From: DGabay1043@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello.

I feel that it is time for the Government to patch things up with Microsoft. This problem that the Government created and then put the blame on Microsoft has done nothing but make my stocks go under the door mat. Please accept this settlement and lets move forward in 2002.

Joe Bowyer

MTC–00007150

From: Larry J.Schexnaydre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm of firm belief that the settlement of the litigation against Microsoft was fair and equitable to all parties involved any more litigation would be very harmful to the economy and our Country .

Larry J. Schexnaydre
160 Murray Hill Dr.
Destrehan,La.70047

MTC–00007151

From: David Felske
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: MS settlement

I agree that settlement now is best for consumers, industry and our economy. Please end this litigation.

Sincerely,
David E. Felske
22532 N Sonora Lane
Sun City West,AZ 85375

MTC–00007152

From: Richard Saul
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: settle with Microsoft

MTC–00007153

From: Hazel (038) Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Just a note to say that as taxpayers we hope that the suit against Microsoft can be settled quickly and expeditiously. It would help not only investor confidence in the markets, but would send a clear message that entrepreneurs should feel free to continue to take business risks in this country and not offshore.

Some states will hold out forever if it puts more $$ in their coffers. Please lets get this problem off our backs and get on with being free in America.

Mike and Hazel Pearce
Silverdale WA. 98383

MTC–00007154

From: Chris Schwarz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel your should go very easy on Microsoft and settle this case. Any further litigation/punitive damages toward Microsoft would only slow down the technology growth sector and would further slow down the world as a whole. They have been instrumental in creating technology innovations and developing the use of the internet.

AOL would not be where it is today if Microsoft had not been around.

There would not be millions of computer users.

Libraries would not have internet resources.

We are at a turning point in history and only you can do the right thing. Chris

MTC–00007155

From: Wesley Lum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I think this issue has dragged on for too long. I hope that you are considering the current marketplace, and view practices of other companies such as AOL Time Warner, in the same light—in fact, I'm more worried about their domination of the Media industry than Microsoft. Please allow the settlement to go through, in today's EXTREMELY competetive marketplace, this trial has already hurt Microsoft a lot. Let's bring a close to events from 2001.

wesley c. lum
wlum@hawaii.edu
http://www2.hawaii.edu/wlum

MTC–00007156

From: Bruno Sartirana
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I found the Microsoft Settlement fair and in the best interest of both consumers and the computer industry. I hope that the States that have not agreed yet will settle on the same terms and stop wasting public money to the sole benefit of special interest groups. I speak as both a consumer and a service provider that appreciates the innovation and low prices only offered by Microsoft.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bruno Sartirana
President
Apogeo, Inc.
Software Consulting
19925 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
Tel: 408–725–7504
Fax: 408–734–1657
Web: www.apogeo.com
Mail: info@apogeo.com

MTC–00007157

From: RMorris550@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:41pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I think the settlement agreed on by the justice department and nine of the states is fair . I also think it would be good to go ahead and settle this and move on.

Cebron R. Morris

MTC–00007158

From: JoeSapman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs/Madams;

Please note that I support Microsoft's position in the antitrust case.

Joseph Sapienza
Park Ridge, IL

MTC–00007159

From: William Storey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:40pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement

TWIMC:

Having watched this case for years, I thought you should know that I support the settlement, and oppose all efforts by the states, particularly the AG's from Connecticut and California (my home state), to levy additional penalties on Microsoft.

I think the case was a farce from the start, and nothing more than an attempt by Sun Microsystems and others to get the government to defeat a company they could not beat in the free market. The sooner this case is ended, the better.

Sincerely,
William L. Storey

MTC–00007160

From: Larry Pitts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to cast my vote for the recommended settlement of the Microsoft company and I personally do recommend any further litigation. Forward March.

L Pitts

MTC–00007161

From: Bridgetb@bridgetb.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

A reasonable settlement has finally been found. After all the time and money put towards this effort, I believe we are all at a place where we need to settle this case and start focusing on building a strong and safe America for the future.

I applaud the intense push for settlement. When pushed hard enough, it's amazing what both sides can do together.

Thank You,
Bridget Bakken

MTC–00007162

From: J. Cashwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom this Concerns,

My personal opinion of the suit against Microsoft is that it should have never happened! As a consumer I have a choice to buy or not to buy a company's product. I have a lot of Microsoft software and until another company can prove to me that their software is superior to Microsoft's and easier to integrate and use, I will continue to use Microsoft products. Microsoft has an overwhelming following and thus market share because they produce and support a superior product. I have tried the ''competitions'' software and was not impressed when compared to Microsoft software. If a company wants a hefty chunk of the market and has to compete with an industry leader then they better make a product that is far superior and more affordable than the industry leader's product until they have unseated the leader and afterwards they had better keep the standards up. The ''bundled'' software did not force me to use anything I didn't want to use. I could install and run another companies software if I felt the need. If anything, the bundled software was more convenient to me as a consumer. I believe there are a few bottoms that need spanking for starting this mess to begin with and Microsoft is not one of them. It reminds me of the spoiled kid on the playground running to Mom crying because little Johnny is faster and smarter when playing tag. In this case, Mom (the government) should have never gotten involved and should have left it up to the kids (the companies) and their friends (the consumers) to work it out on the playground. This country was built to support free enterprise and now we have a major step towards the government having too much control where it doesn't belong. Give the consumer credit! If we don't like something, we aren't going to support/buy the company's products. I won't even get into the fact that there have been so many technological advancements since this suit started. I'm in favor of no action against Microsoft, but since that is an unrealistic expectation, I'm in favor of extreme leniency in terms of a settlement with Microsoft and therefore consider what is tabled to be the strongest action that should be exercised against Microsoft.

Respectfully,
Judy Cashwell

MTC–00007163

From: Malik Nash
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

The terms of the proposed settlement as they currently exist are far too lenient to provide an effective remedy to monopolistic practices by Microsoft. It completely fails to address the most egregious abuses committed by Microsoft. It leaves intact the most serious liabilities that competitors face when confronted with the Microsoft monopoly:

1. The inability of PC makers to fully customize the default appearance of the Windows ''desktop'' as well as the configuration of so-called ''middleware'' components.

2. The inability of independent software developers to obtain information on Microsoft APIs in a timely manner, and without entering into licensing agreements that would make it financially infeasible to develop products that are compatible with Windows.

3. The inability of small developers to feature their products on the Windows desktop. In sum, Microsoft has exercised monopoly power not through the configuration of its own operating system, but rather through the domination of distribution channels, by using a combination of licensing arrangements, pricing schemes and discounts that are explicitly designed to prevent competing products from coming to market. Now, the Justice Department proposes to become complicit in Microsoft's abusive practices and perpetuate the company's ability to obfuscate and evade the law, leaving consumers and businesses with no reasonable prospect of seeing choice restored to the marketplace. Acceptance of the proposed settlement would be an unconscionable capitulation to unrestrained greed. I urge the Justice Department to uphold it's trust, and create an effective solution that will restore fair competition.

Sincerely,
Otha M. Nash
Columbia, SC

MTC–00007164

From: Ruth Lorenz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

For the good of our country and the economy, I believe it is time to move forward and approve the settlement agreed upon by all parties. Let us not drag this on any longer in the courts. We need to concentrate on building up the economy and strengthening our country for the future of our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,
R. Lorenz

MTC–00007165

From: Tony Sabbadini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear United States Department of Justice,

Thank you for showing concern for the American consumer with regard to the Microsoft Anti-trust case. As a consumer, however, I feel that by opposing the recent settlement between Microsoft and the US DOJ, one lengthens an already costly trial and

casts more uncertainty over our economy. The settlement addresses the most important issue that originally brought about the anti-trust case: Microsoft's bullying of the original equipment manufacturers (OEMs). Under the proposed settlement, Microsoft can no longer punish (by raising prices) the OEMs for offering competing software vendors' products on the Windows Desktop. To make sure Microsoft acquiesces, three on-site compliance agents will monitor the company closely. These steps have a net effect of offering the consumer more choice. Thankfully, the settlement does not place any bundling restrictions on Microsoft. Although many criticize this Microsoft practice (primarily competitors...), bundling gives the software customer seamless integration and a lower total cost of ownership. If Microsoft has done anything to benefit the software customer, it has created a platform universally available across the world at a relatively low price. I urge the adoption of the settlement.

Thank you,
Tony Sabbadini
(650) 345–9551

MTC–00007166

From: David Sanders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen, The lawsuit was initiated far too early in the life of a new company-Microsoft. The company has grown rapidly and has gained substantial marketshare but at the same time it created vast numbers of job and enterprise opportunities for others. And competition was beginning to rise up against Microsoft. If the company had been left alone natural competitive forces probably arisen evened the playing field. In any event enough damage has now been done to Microsoft and to the economy. Lets put it behind us and wind up the affair.

David L. Samders
davidlsanders@msn.com

MTC–00007167

From: JELowell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the Microsoft antitrust suit should be settled in its present form. We were told the break up of Microsoft would increase competition and improve the prospects of other companies in the tech area. It is interesting to note that, based on the stock market, it has had absolutely the opposite effect. Judge Jackson's decision, when announced, caused the market to go down not up. Let's conclude this matter now. It will help the economy recover.

Jim Lowell

MTC–00007168

From: Patrick Halstead
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have reviewed the documents related to the settlement, and would like to comment that I strongly favor a settlement in the Microsoft case.

Sincerely,
Patrick Halstead
Kirkland, WA 98033
425 739 9447

MTC–00007169

From: Gregory Markow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gregory Markow
114 Giffords Lane
Staten Island, New York 10308
631–831–6438

To whom it may concern:

I have been employed in the Information Technology industry for just over two decades. Prior to Microsoft Windows and Office becoming popular, the industry was dominated by another company who delivered excellent products and services. It was a company that epitomized the ???Made in America??? slogan even before it became fashionable. That company was and still is a great company. It was also the subject of an antitrust suit before such suits were seen as sources of income and revenue by litigants and their representatives. That company is named IBM and it agreed to operate under a consent decree for its good and the good of America.

I am also a Microsoft shareholder. I am an expert in the industry and elected to purchase Microsoft shares because I saw in Microsoft a company that embodied the spirit of American innovation and business leadership. I admire the companies??? leadership and their commitment to constantly providing more product capabilities at a good value-for-dollar.

Microsoft???s products became predominant in the industry not because of an abuse of market share but because Microsoft provided the best products. I personally worked with almost all of the IBM mainframe operating systems and products. I also personally worked with almost all the various Unix and PC operating systems, development tools and desktop products. Microsoft consistently provided products that met or exceeded industry expectations.

I believe that the States are being motivated by the possibility of large settlements similar to those of the Tobacco industry. The Microsoft competitors who are trying to extract a harsher penalty are those who cannot compete in the market and therefore must resort to the government and the courts. I was a Unix systems programmer and I must tell you that Windows was always and is today far easier to work with and configure than any Sun configuration; take a look at the cost difference between Sun administrators and Windows 2000 administrators. You will find that everything in the Sun Solaris market space to be more expensive. I was also an Oracle database designer. We used to joke about Oracle. We said that Oracle ran on everything but did not run well on anything. Oracle gained market share because it had little competition in its market space. I would offer that the companies who are lobbying against a Microsoft settlement are all suffering from Gates envy. The CEO???s of Sun and Oracle disgust me by their petty words and actions; I am also an Oracle shareholder. Microsoft is a great company and it is also a monopoly. The DOJ should apply restrictions and monitor the company so that it cannot use its monopoly position to gain unfair advantage. Microsoft does have the right to compete aggressively. This is after all, America.

It is also interesting to note that because Microsoft is the current legal target of the aforementioned competitors that they and the DOJ are neglecting another monopoly company; IBM. IBM has no competition in the mainframe market space. Such competition ended with the demise of Amdahl. I would offer that both Sun and Oracle are beginning to take note of IBM because of the inroads that it is making into their market share. I would also suggest that they will shortly come crying to the DOJ and stating that IBM is competing unfairly.

Truthfully, these are all great American companies. It shames me to watch them fight like children and then call their parents, the Government, when they fairly loose.

Microsoft deserves this settlement. America deserves this settlement. We need to maintain our preeminent position in the Global marketplace.

Thank you all for your hard work and perseverance. You have made me proud, once again, to be an American!

Gregory Markow

MTC–00007170

From: Doug Tilden—MTC Corp
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As user of Microsoft enterprise products, a shareholder in Microsoft and an American who is very concerned with the directions that this case has taken, I urge that the settlement of this case be accomplished.

MTC–00007171

From: Don Farrand
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs & Madams,

As a teacher trying to help others benefit from the use of the computer I was very frustrated in the 60s, 70s and 80s by the many different languages and programs. Each was useful in its own way—but it was extremely difficult to pass information from one language or program to another.

To compound the issue, each computer manufacturer tried to differentiate itself by issuing its own combination of default software. It was as if each private college tried to differentiate itself by teaching in it's own unique language. Each college could produce useful work within its own people but the useful work would not benefit many because of the difficulty sharing with those beyond a limited confine.

I am most impressed with Microsoft's attemps to provide a wide set of software that can pass information between its parts. I also understand how useful it is for Microsoft to impress on computer manufacturers a set of software standards if that manufacturer is going to include Microsoft software.

For the good of computer users I hope that the current antitrust case can be settled in

such a way that Microsoft can continue its work of making software and computers compatible.

Don Farrand DVFarrand@Prodigy.Net
CC:Don Farrand

MTC–00007172

From: Robert Irvine
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ

I have been a customer of Microsoft products since 1995. If it were not for their software and help in that was given me, I could not have started and maintained my home business. It is time to settle this case and do something more productive.

Sincerely,
Robert H Irvine
1014 Centre School Way
West Chester, PA 19382–7659
Phone: 610–696–7486
E—mail: Robhirvine@aol.com

MTC–00007173

From: Ron Sargent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs,

Please settle this outrageous Microsoft lawsuit as soon as possible! Microsoft is one of the best companys that has ever been created in the history of the world and has been responsible for more wealth in the hands of the working man than any other. We in the Pacific Northwest love our company and want to see it proceed with new and innovative products without any more interference from Government! If government is so worried about monopolys dominating the Free Market Place then I suggest you take a closer look at the U.S. Post Office or the Department of Education and clean up their acts before you attack a successful company such as Microsoft. Long live Bill Gates! He is my hero!

Ron Sargent
sargent@techline.com
P.O. Box 1397
Elma, Wa. 98541–1397
1–360–482–6305

MTC–00007174

From: Robert Furry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

As a concerned citizen and head of a small company computerized Information System, I feel that a settlement with Microsoft would be in the best interests of the consumer. We use Microsoft products, as well as others, to handle our day-to-day operations. It seems that as long as the litigation stretches out, we are at a standstill for better and better software products.

It will cost us not only valuable time not spent on development, but also increased tax dollars to litigate as well as increased costs for future Microsoft products. We, as consumers, are in a no win situation faced with additional costs from both ends.

To a large extent, the federal government has standardized on Microsoft's Software as the choice for word processing, operating systems, spreadsheet applications, etc. used in conducting its business. The decisions formulated by government purchasing departments to buy Microsoft products were based on performance and price. Now, to say Microsoft has caused harm by providing better and cheaper products sounds more political than pragmatic. Thank you for considering my views.

Robert W. Furry
470 Leventry Road
Johnstown, PA 15904

MTC–00007175

From: Charles E. Rothera
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a teacher, taxpayer and member of the USAR for 15+ years, I am not happy with the way the Microsoft suit has been handled. I also am sure this problem has had a negative effect on the value of our young daughter's stock in Microsoft. This court battle must end and it seems to me after reading many pages of the complaint, that a few jelous companies have been trying to destroy the innovative leader that Microsoft has been to the detriment of stockholders and consumers like us.

Thank you for your time,
Charles Rothera

MTC–00007176

From: jabien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:47pm
Subject: I appreciate the chance to voice my opinion on the Microsoft case.

My feeling is that we have come t I appreciate the chance to voice my opinion on the Microsoft case. My feeling is that we have come to a sad affair in this country when a few companies in California can influence congress and the justice department of Clinton administration. What that was all about anyway besides saying if you can not compete on your own merit go and collect flavors from local politicians. So here we are 3+years down the road, we are still going over the same old tired ground. The cartoon that showed the boys from California running to big government to solve they short coming, had it right. Personally I was never forced into using any part of a Microsoft product I did no want to used. I can down load any system from the net, that I please. I know enough about my computer that I can delete any object on it that I find objectable. I am certainly no computer expert. So if I can do it, anyone can. I also find it highly laughable that the AJ's in the remaining states are fighting for what they call the general public interest. It would certainly be interesting to see the tax payer bill that has been run up in the name of so called consumer interest. Personally I would like to see my taxes used in a more responsible why. I feel right now in this time of more important issues that seems to be a case of much to do about nothing other certain lawyers ego's and let justice turn a blind eye. Let 's get on with what important in the U.S. Let the Justice department agreement with Microsoft stand and put the tax payer dollar go towards more important issues.John A. Bien

MTC–00007177

From: David Gayvert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Ma'am:

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed settlement of the alleged anti-trust case against Microsoft. It is clear that the public interest will be served by putting this most unjust lawsuit to to rest.

It is critical to note that the action against Microsoft was not initiated in response to any significant complaint by consumers at large, but by Microsoft competitors who seek to gain in the courts what they cannot in the marketplace. It is advanced by government officials who seek to enlarge their reputations, and in many cases to fatten their state treasuries at Microsoft's expense. This cynical approach to promoting ''competition'' in fact erodes consumer and investor confidence in free markets and those who excel in them. Microsoft may indeed employ aggressive business practises, but at the end of the day, they earned their dominance in the industry by providing what people want. No one held a gun to my head when I purchased Windows 98 or MS Office, nor have I been prevented from using Netscape as my default web browser in lieu of Explorer.

Real justice would require dropping completely the federal case against Microsoft and reimbursing it for the cost of defending itself against this most prejudiced of actions. As that is not a practical option, I reiterate my support for adoption of the proposed settlement of the case.

Sincerely,
David Gayvert
1775 Regents Park Road
Crofton, MD 21114

MTC–00007178

From: mark@webbiznz.net.nz@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that Microsoft Has done no more than what other companys do, Microsoft shouldn't be hasseled anyfuther. Without Microsoft where would computers be. I fear that if microsoft was broken down than this will cause a globel effect, Inculding slowing the growth of IT as it is today.

For any copyright laws that have been broken by MS than Yes fine them, but leave them alone for creating a good product. They need the money to make it work better...

Mark Dyer
ICQ#: 2964071
Current ICQ status:
<http://web.icq.com/whitepages/online?icq=2964071&img=21>
* Home Tel#: 03 5444322 Mobile Tel#: 027 4115426
* SMS: +27831422964071 / +64274115426

MTC–00007179

From: Charles E. Rothera
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a teacher, taxpayer and member of the USAR for 15+ years, I am not happy with the

way the Microsoft suit has been handled. I also am sure this problem has had a negative effect on the value of our young daughter's stock in Microsoft. This court battle must end and it seems to me after reading many pages of the complaint, that a few jealous companies have been trying to destroy the innovative leader that Microsoft has been to the detriment of stockholders and consumers like us.

Thank you for your time,

Charles Rothera

MTC–00007180

From: Don737@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentleman,

The subject of the DOJ and Microsoft settlement should be put to rest. It is in the best interest of the public to do so now and let us all get on with the business of rebuilding this country. As a consumer I feel it is in the best interest for all concerned to do so. It's time this countries justice departments should turn their interests towards fighting true evil and not self serving themselves with political bandwagon type of behavior. Get on with the businness of business and do it now.

Captain Don Sherwood, AWA ret.

MTC–00007181

From: MBaney1056@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:50pm
Subject: Mcrosoft Settlement

I hope that the settlement agreement being reached with Microsoft can be used as a way to correct an unfair antitrust ruling. I have always found Microsoft and it's products to be fairly priced and innovative. I have never felt compelled to use them due to lack of competition. I feel that Sun and others are using unfair lobbying in a sour grapes attempt to sway the DOJ. I believe in free and open markets whereby the strongest survive. Minimal goverment interference in business keeps innovation alive. Please keep this in mind during your negotiations so that the next guy inventing something in his garage can proceed without fear.

Michael J Baney

MTC–00007182

From: Z.G. Liang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:51pm
Subject: good settlement

MTC–00007183

From: Lou Incantalupo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please conclude the settlement of the Microsoft case ASAP to save taxpayers additional cost of litigation.

Thank you,

Louis Incantalupo

MTC–00007184

From: Genfam@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:52pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

dear sirs please, to more litigation of microsoft. i believe the government settlement is just and fair. enough is enough. phillip and barbara gendreau

MTC–00007185

From: DonBuesenSR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This settlement is fair to all. PLEASE NO MORE LITIGATION ! Let us get on with our life. consumer: Don J. Buesen

MTC–00007186

From: amedeo60@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

From A. Pozzuoli Clifton, NJ E mail, amedeo60@juno.com Message. I feel that the settlement is fair and balanced. Microsoft did do the engineering and research, therefore they should be entitiled to the rewards. Tell the competitors to do their own homework.

MTC–00007187

From: William Wassinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:16pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone.

I like the fact they bundle things in. It makes things very easy for me. It would be like buying a car then having to go find an engine then a transmission and so on.

Let them do there job and you go catch terrorists.

William R. Wassinger
Rt. 2 Box 2012
Wister, Ok 74966.

MTC–00007188

From: WRImpey@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Government Officials:

Please quickly settle the Microsoft government lawsuit and let Microsoft get back to their business of providing consumers, such as myself, with outstanding software products.

In my opinion, there never was an antitrust problem with Microsoft—beyond the politics of incompetence and total lack of understanding of the dynamics of business. Microsoft has provided consumers with outstanding products at a fair price. That is why their market share is high. That is also the basis of competition in a free market economy.

It is time to let Microsoft get back to their business of developing excellent software products—without government interference. Consumers have generally benefited by Microsoft's aggressive stance in the marketplace, and it time to finally resolve this issue. Microsoft's marketplace strength globally is in my opinion an asset to the US, which should not be aided by government, but neither should its progress be impeded through legalistic harassment.

William Impey

MTC–00007189

From: Z.G. Liang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:55pm
Subject: good settlement

DOJ:

The settlement of the case is good, I totally agree with the settlement. It is good for all cosumers and the economy in the USA.

Zhiguo Liang

MTC–00007190

From: Boingram@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not spend more of my tax dollars disrupting Microsoft. Settle this issue.

MTC–00007191

From: Louis Hapeshis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the setttlement was fair. This country has much more to be concerned about than restricting the innovation of a comapany like Microsoft. Microsoft has totally changed our way of life for the better, and should be allowed to continue their innovation for the benefit of all.

Louis G. Hapeshis, III

MTC–00007192

From: Stephen Bubanovich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe that the Microsoft case should be settled now without further litigation. Microsoft has sufficient penalties in the settlement and further litigation would not be helpful to the industry, the consumer or stockholders.

Sincerely,
Stephen P. Bubanovich
Home:
16052 Baywood Lane
Granger, IN 46530
Voice: 219–277–8304
Fax: 219–247–1241
Mobile: 219–286–5258
Email: steve@bubanovich.net

MTC–00007193

From: Sylvia Sur
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope that the Department of Justice is going to accept this settlement and move away from looking at Microsoft as the enemy to seeing Microsoft as the company that made computing affordable and accessible to all.

I have some anti Microsoft friends who complain about the prices of software from companies like Quark Express, or Adobe who own their market niches and where Microsoft has no competitive entry products. The competitive software sells for $600 on the average street price.

Whereas Microsoft sells the operating system and a whole host of applications for less than half that. Any one of these MS products could be sold for a lot more money.

In short, if the Microsoft haters got their dream and managed to destroy this company, we would all pay more for software.

And there are no usable competitive operating systems around. Have you looked at Linux, or BeOS or UNIX lately for ease of use? Most computers nowadays can be configured easily with more than one operating system. I do not see anyone doing this in spite of how easy it would be to have a machine that runs Windows and UNIX say. The other OS are really for computer experts to install and use. For most people, Windows is the easiest and most capable thing there is.

Please let us honor this settlement and end this ongoing battle with one of the great companies in the USA. We have all suffered a lot financial loss in our 401K plans with what happened to the stock price of MS. The supposed savings from this lawsuit will never come close to restoring 1% of that loss.

Sylvia Sur
2177 Kenilworth Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90039

MTC–00007194

From: terry clear
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The entire case against Microsoft should be dropped. Microsoft has not harmed any person or company or state. All are free to use Microsoft's products or those of their competitors. My employer uses Netscape Navigator as the company browser.

Any person or company is free to create and market superior products. Let them do so. No person, company, or state has been harmed by Microsoft. Drop the entire case.

MTC–00007195

From: Orie Kelm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Settlement between the US Government and Microsoft appears proper to me. There should be no further action taken against Microsoft. Microsoft has not harmed me (the consumer) in its marketing policies and I appreciate the development of an operating system and internet browser that works well together. I am old enough to remember the old CPM operating system and I do not want to go back to that wilderness where everyone had a different system and could not interchange information easily. Enough is enough and no further action should be taken.

The only people profiting from further action are the competitors who have pressured the politicians to harass Microsoft, rather than developing a better system. The Government has outlined the procedures Microsoft must follow and has installed a costly monitoring organization to keep watch. That is more than enough!!

Orie Kelm
216 Timberland Cir
Kingsport, Tn 37664

MTC–00007196

From: wendy willson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:56pm
Subject: Settlement, PLEASE!!!!

To Whom It May Concern @ the DOJ;

This settlement with Microsoft IS fair and just. Please put an end to this endless litigation and let the FREE market operate as it was meant to.

Sincerely,

Wendy L. Willson (a Microsoft shareholder and, probably like you, a Microsoft-products user!) P.S. Incidentally, with Windows XP, I have had no problem what-so-ever using Realnetworks' products nor Corel Wordperfect. I have seen no conflict or ''usurping of power'' at all. They fixed it (those problems with Windows 98) and I can configure my computer any way I like. Case closed!!

MTC–00007197

From: Lloydage1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The government has alraedy done enough damage to Microsoft and other industries, in plain English, lay off!!! Go on sabbatical for @ 10 years and leave the populace alone with your greed for dollars at any cost. You're obtrusive enough with your par-tisan politics and disregard for the country as it stands now. Please, STOP!

MTC–00007198

From: Norman Leathers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:56pm
Subject: Microsoft

It is about time to get on with more important government business than dragging the law suite against Microsoft though the courts any longer at great expense to the people of this country for the benefit of lawyers and special interest groups. At least Microsoft has provided a standard of quality that other firms only dream of and the standards established by Microsoft have made the business of operating computers between computers much easier. If the government wants to spend some money they can start with all the hard things they never want to face up to: education, health care, retirement etc. Let Microsoft pay its fine as established and get on with it.

MTC–00007199

From: RThom59551@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen and Ladies,

Lets settle this once and for all. Its time to move on. The proposed settlement should be accepted by all parties just the way it is.

Respectfully,
Robert Thompson

MTC–00007200

From: Fletch (038) Jerry Burrus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In our opinion Microsoft, with it's magnificent innovative techniques, is responsible for the United States being the leader in the new technical age. Please do all you can to settle this painful excercise in industrial jealousy. We must somehow get this disgraceful matter behind us and laud new techniques and innovations rather than punish them.

Fletcher and Jerry Burrus
7332-B- Huntsmen Circle
Anchorage, Ak 99518
(907)344–5020

MTC–00007201

From: Cheridial@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the settlement that has been ironed out go through. I think enough time has been wasted on this. Let settle and move on. We need to get back to fair competition and innovation.

Thank you,
Cheri Dial
Schaumburg, IL

MTC–00007202

From: robertmanning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wednesday, January 2, 2002

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to say that it is time to settle the Microsoft affair. I believe that they have been unfairly hit upon and it is time to settle this affair and move on. I do think that the settlement as proposed is fair but the sad part is that this whole thing should never have happened. America cannot lose its creativity and innovation. We must not punish those that prosper just because they have prospered. I think that a bad thing has been done by this whole affair and hope it will not stop other smart people from acting on their own inventions and bright ideas.

Sincerely,
Betty Manning
Houston, Texas

MTC–00007203

From: Kim S. Frazho
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

The proposed settlement in the Microsoft case will lay to rest an issue that has been granted too much time and money already. It will better serve the public as well as industry if the case is closed and we move on to help get the country back on it feet again. With the events of 11 September still very fresh in our minds, let's move past this problem and start working on other more important issues facing our economy, industry and the nation. Further litigation will only pour good money (and energy) after bad.

Please settle the case and start fighting those who will bring down our society rather than one who has gone to great lengths to make it better.

Let's think of Microsoft as we do our country...It isn't perfect, but it's better than the rest.

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinions, I can only hope they will do some small good.

Kim Frazho
105 Michigan Ave.
Houghton Lake, MI 48629 989.366.6000

MTC–00007204

From: niewijk

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I would like the U.S. Department of justice to know my opinion on the the Microsoft case. I am a business owner myself, having run our family business for 43 years. I know what it is like for competitors to ''cry foul'' and spend their time chipping away at the integrity of my business rather than producing a ''better mousetrap''. Let's not let the same thing happen to the tech industry that happened to the U.S. automakers in the late seventies and early eighties. Let's let the ''mop flop'' where it will in this technology war.

PLEASE LET THE BEST COMPANIES COMPETE!!!

LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE! IF THESE ''WHINERS'' CAN'T STAND THE HEAT, THEY NEED TO GET OUT OF THE KITCHEN. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY.

Sincerely, David Niewiek
PARIS MOTORS INC.
GRAND RAPIDS MI 49548
6162925008

MTC–00007205

From: PPallette@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:59pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DOJ: In my opinion, it is time for us to get on with business. Microsoft should never have been indicted in the first place. Yes, they are tough, agressive competitors. But the witch hunt which was begun during the Clinton Administration was political, and was precipitated by a couple of cry babies named Larry Ellison and Scott McNealy. I am a share holder in Microsoft, Oracle, and Sun Microsystems. While Gates and Ballmer continue to innovate and look to the future, Ellison and McNealy wallow in self pity. One need only look at their annual reports and stock prices to see who's on the right track. Intense competition is the American way. Let the judgement stand, counsel the nine renegade states to get aboard with the rest of our country, and let's encourage the technology industry to do what they do best—innovate. It is an injustice to hold the world's economies hostage—to any degree—to this ill-found litigation which was based on feeble claims by Ellison and McNealy, and carried out—but never proven—by litigators influenced by personal agendas, and an industry vendetta. I encourage you to close the books on this case (no pun intended, as I believe Steve Case was the third proponent of this misdirected prosecution!). Thanks for your consideration. Peter C. Pallette, 01/02/02

CC:S.McNealy@www.sun.com@inetgw,L.Ellison@bigip-www.u...

MTC–00007206

From: ROBERT YOUNG
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:00pm
Subject: Microsoft

As taxpayers we would like you to stop dragging this Microsoft legal action on and on.

Why can't you let a company in America be a success? All this back and forth in court all these years and it probably makes the difference of almost nothing to the consumer—they don't care about it—they just want to have Microsoft left alone.

Microsoft does so much good, keeps so many people employed and you just need to stop making their lives misery and everyone else around the company feel that their government wants to persecute people for their success. Find something else to do and let Microsoft go on doing what they do best—prove that America has the brightest brains and ideas and can lead the world.

Robert and Linda Young

MTC–00007207

From: Kristeph@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:01pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

As a taxpayer and consumer, i urge you to push for the agreed settlement with Microsoft and not let the 9 rogue states continue to waste the taxpayers money

sincerely,
Michael Smith

MTC–00007208

From: Scott Stadelhofer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do everything possible to finish and resolve favorably for the shareholders of Microsoft the case against Microsoft. Too much is at stake in the U.S. economy to delay it any further.

Thank-you.
Scott R. Stadelhofer
sstadelhofer@maranatha.net
703–641–9177

MTC–00007209

From: Steve Cohen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:01pm
Subject: Microsoft judgement

To Whom it may Concern,

As a private citizen, and user of Microsoft products, I'd like to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft case. As a consumer, I believe that Micrsoft has not harmed me one bit. Quite the contrary, Microsoft has been extremely beneficial to me in my personal and professional life. To carry on bullying this national treasure would certainly be an injustice to the American people. The settlement is very fair, and this should be the end of it. Many of the companies that started this whole mess would not even have existed if it were not for the inovations provided by Microsoft. Microsoft both directly and indirectly are responisible for the fantastic increase in US technology and the jobs it has brought to millions.

During this time of economic uncertainty, we need to put this behind us (and allow Micrsooft to do the same) so we can concentrate on things that are more important.

Regards,
Steve Cohen
46 Oakridge Dr.
Williamsville, NY 14221
716–689–8270

MTC–00007210

From: ANNBILAN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement should be finalized without further action, hearings, or anything else. In these trying times we need to get back to business.

Ann Bilan
P. O. Box 463
Lakewood, CA 90714

MTC–00007211

From: jsb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern: It is time to settle the microsoft case in the interest of the country, the consumer, and the world. Microsoft is providing real and badly needed jobs to our citizens. Please settle this case now. Thank you.

MTC–00007213

From: Bebepgh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sir,

I am asking the Department of Justice to get the Microsoft issue settled as quickly as possible. This whole thing has taken way too long and is not only not good for Microsoft, but not good for the economy in general. The economy is slow enough right now and waiting for major cases to be settled only makes things worse.

Sincerely,
Barbara Felman
217 S. Lang Ave
Pittsburgh, PA 15208

MTC–00007214

From: Cost-Research
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has done more for the world economy and the way we work than any other company in history, and now you want to punish them. This reminds me of the old kids game King of the Mountain. Once you see someone on top you try to knock them off it makes you popular, and that is what the DOJ is trying to do. These great lawyers are not doing this for the best of the people. They are doing this for very selfish reasons, they are doing this to:

1. Make a name for them self's so that later in private practice can say yes ''I took on Microsoft''.

2. Help a few cry baby companies that can't compete in the market place and don't amount to a hill of beans.

3. Make money for themselves now, and for the future.

4. Get their name publicized.

If Microsoft was as bad as some of the lawyers are trying to make them out to be, all the states would have joined the legal action. As it turned out some did not join because Microsoft is an OK company, others walked away in mid stream, others feel they have taken this as for as they should. How

can you not draw any other conclusion? What makes some state attorney generals think that their state is better than other states? The only reason they want to keep legal action going is to keep their name out there. They are not doing it for me or anyone I know.

It is too bad that a handful of lawyers can create this kind of mess under the protection of our legal system umbrella. A simple vote of all the United States attorney generals which would have represented all the people could have solved the problem. As it is now just a handful of lawyers can keep this thing going for their own benefit.

The small dollar price we all paid for being able to work under one world wide standard is nothing short of amazing. Anybody that feels they been over charged for the operating system is not in touch with reality. Before Microsoft became Microsoft they could have come the all the US citizens and said, for a donation of $200.00 we will write a universally compatible computer program and people would have donated to get this wonderful technology. When computers fist started we had a number of operating systems, none compatible with each other. You had to buy programs and operating systems to match, which was a nightmare.

We learned from the television industry which today has multiple systems, none compatible which each other. Try sending a video camera tape or VCR tape to Europe, it will not work. The same applies to other parts of the world. But today you can write and send a computer program or e-mail to any part of the world and it works. You can down load computer programs to and from any part of the world and it works and the DOJ is messing with this. Not even Netscape browser is compatible with many downloads. Many programmers will not even write websites to include Netscape because it quirky. Anyway I think we should leave Microsoft alone and let them invent new technologies rather than having to battle over what they can or cannot invent.

Cost Research Corporation
2608 Second Ave. #307
Seattle, WA 98121
Phone 425–313–0506
Fax 425–557–6431
Website: www.costresearch.com

MTC–00007215

From: Jim Laurel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement proposed by the DOJ is adequate, especially considering that the issues behind this case are ancient history by the standards of the technology industry. The industry has already self-corrected.

While desktop operating systems will always be important, they are no longer the only way to access computing resources, as users increasingly rely on PDAs, mobile phones and other devices to communicate.

In these uncertain economic times, it makes no sense at all to continue persecuting one of the great companies the US has ever produced. Windows is a world standard and let's not forget that it is also an AMERICAN standard.

Judge Kollar-Kotelly should discourage the dissenting States from pursuing the expansion of sanctions against Microsoft and put an end to this case as quickly as possible. We do not need the ongoing uncertainty in the tech sector.

Sincerely,
James P. Laurel
22600 NE 142nd Place
Woodinville, WA 98072

MTC–00007216

From: The Intimidator
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:03pm
Subject: Enough

An agreement has been made and this should be put to rest. I still do not understand how the government is trying to punish a company for using good business strageies to furthur it's products. Put this to rest and use the money you are wasting to good use where it is needed.

MTC–00007217

From: Harvey I. Salwen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs or Madams:

I have been using computers since 1980 and clearly remember the chaos that existed in those days. Every application required its own operating system.

At one time, I had seven operating systems.

Microsoft brought order, compatibility, and economy to PCs. It is time for you to respect the adequate settlement that has already been proposed and let Microsoft get back to its business plan. Any further protractions on your part will become a total waste of your time and my money.

Sincerely,
Harvey I. Salwen
817 Brushtown Road
Gwynedd Valley, PA 19437

MTC–00007218

From: JackMitch@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the proposed settlement of the Microsoft suit. Frankly, as a consumer of computer software for 20 years, I have welcomed Microsoft's role in establishing standards for the industry and providing software products that work at prices that have been very reasonable. I do not feel that I have been harmed or damaged in any way by the way Microsoft has conducted its business.

In the early days of home computing, much of the software was shareware that was written and distributed by individuals or small companies. In most cases these programs could not be integrated with other computer applications. As a result, it was necessary to leave one program before entering another. Because of the absence of any standards, data often had to be entered multiple times to feed the various software applications. If the industry had remained in this condition, home computing would never have grown and developed into the major industry it is today. Thus, in my view, Microsoft's role has been far more beneficial than harmful. I believe it is vitally important to the computing industry and to the U. S. economy as a whole to bring this suit to a conclusion.

John ''Jack'' A. Mitchell III
1897 Beach Avenue
Atlantic Beach, Florida 32233
Telephone: 904–242–8264

MTC–00007219

From: DCBLC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop wasting taxpayer money, time and effort weakening one of the strongest industries in the USA. The net result of this whole inquisition will be a lot of small investors and taxpayers paying a big legal bill with no measurable benefit to anyone except the law firms and attorneys pursuing the case. Please look at all the external, credible threats to this country and not focus on weakening one of our few strong companies.

MTC–00007220

From: Paul L. Hoon
To: Microsoft
Date: 1/2/02 7:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

In regards to the Microsoft settlement, please take my opinion into consideration. I sincerely believe that this settlement is about as fair as it will ever get. I can guarantee that I personally will never purchase anything from those competitors that are causing all the '' stink''. I am also strictly against those States, (including my state of California) whose Attorneys General are helping to break up a company that has hired thousands upon thousands of employees, who help to operate Microsoft which is a great company with one of the best, if not THE best computer operating systems. Sincerely, Paul L. Hoon

MTC–00007221

From: johnnykelly@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone. Let's focus on getting America stronger..not weaker. Kindest regards, John

Kelly Minneapolis, MN

MTC–00007222

From: Lucian Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:06pm
Subject: microsoft settlrmentt

Please settle this case soon as possiable.

—Lucian Robinson

—klinerkint@earthlink.net

—EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

MTC–00007223

From: Dad
To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 7:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My Opinion,

After 35 years in the Hi-tech business I am getting real tired of ''want-a-be'' companies doing whatever is possible to destroy Microsoft and place themselves in a position to gain on Microsoft's losses.

The settlement should not be time-constrained. Most of Microsoft's objective's have been and continue to be in the best interest of the consumer. They are one of the most agressive, creative companies in the history of Hi-Tech. They could stand to improve their pricing and licensing policies and related costs but should be commended for their approach towards the integration of multiple applications on a common platform. This is good for the consumer.

Although Microsoft doesn't do everything according to the law, they have been enormous contributors to standardization. Those that oppose them should spend more time ''creating'' products that contribute towards their growth rather than spending money looking for a quick ''get-rich'' scheme.

How pathetic it is that when one needs someone to fail in order to allow them to succeed.

Jim Krug Jr

MTC–00007224

From: john breyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Mirosoft was the greatest driver for economic growth; it made computers available to everybody i the world helping the US and global economy. The big beneficiay has been the consumer while the competition tried and continues to try to derail such progress at the average people' expense. It is time to settle along the proposed terms so we can resume economic growth. It is not in the interest of the US and the average consumer to prolong this litigation. John Breyer, average consumer.

MTC–00007225

From: VSRood@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Re: Settlement

I hope that you will let this settlement go through so that the issue is over. The economy needs resolution of the problem, so we can get on with business. This has gone on too long, and has probably had a lot to do with the economy downturn.

Virginia Rood

MTC–00007226

From: etasullivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please settle the microsoft case. In this time of economic uncertainty, the last thing we want is for some states and companies to drag out this case ... The argument that these states and companies make that prices would be cheaper only for microsoft dominating the field is bogus. Microsoft has made windows easy to use for the non tech person like me ...

Margaret sullivan.

MTC–00007227

From: Dynator@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Complaint

DOJ—January 2, 2002

If you can recall, about the time you took Microsoft to court is when the stock market went to hell. You've had enough time to investigate their actions so now lets get into the penalty phase. Microsoft has erred, but it has helped the United States and the World get into the new computer world. Without Microsoft, it may have been another 20 years in finding somebody to get it started. That name might have been IBM!

Sincerely
Len Tralmer
CEO & President
Mastercraft Images

MTC–00007228

From: Frank Montuoro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:11pm
Subject: We like

Microsoft Settlement
Frank Montuoro

MTC–00007229

From: Randle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern;

As a taxpayer, I am sick and tired of this MY government using taxpayer funds to harass innovative companies that offer a quality product to consumers. The Justice Department has spent more money over the past few years trying to destroy Bill Gates than they have trying to bring terrorists to justice.

Why does government always try to punish the businesses that work hard, create product, and become successful? Instead, maybe they should take a few pages from Mr. Gates policy manual and try being productive.

Gail Randle
Geronimo, Texas

MTC–00007230

From: Jo Berg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement:

Please consider the consumer and get this monkey off the back of Microsoft.... they have been the recipient of unfair and biased influences from jealous competitors and greedy lawyers. The proposed settlement takes care of the situation. Please do not drag on and on.

Joan Hawkins Berg
a satisfied Microsoft cutomer who uses Netscape Navigator on Windows 98.

MTC–00007231

From: Skipnspud@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:12pm
Subject: Re: Vote

I very much agree that the litigation against Microsoft should be ended immediatly I feel that a lot of politics are involved and this should never of gone to litigation. We live within a few miles of Microsoft Headquarters and it has been a great boost to the economy. Not only here in the great Northwest but to the whole country.

I have been a holder of Microsoft stock since 2/25/88.

Please don't let this drag on any longer. We need strong companies in our country. Don't let jealousy rule!!!!!!!!

Signed
Martha and Edward Hammond

MTC–00007232

From: Morton M Vogel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is ludicrous to me as average person that this litigation is still continuing. When the US government is satisfied that Microsoft will do and perform in the specified way in the future, why should a handful be allowed to continue to impede any finalization of this matter. Instead of pumping money and effort back in to the economy, the government will continue to expend dollars (really needed else where in the economy) as will Microsoft.

The only people who truly benefit by this continuous ad museum litigation are the lawyers. who deem this as their annuity. Perhaps if limits on legal costs were invoked, settlements will be arrived at a speedy rate. We also see certain states trying to exercise their muscle.

It seem to me that the last time states refused to follow the federal government—dire events followed—are we to relive 1861??? The time to finalize this entire matter is NOW. Our minds, efforts and money should be directed to getting the economy moving forward in both the public and private sectors.

MTC–00007233

From: c777leo@inetmail.att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

01/02/02

Ignore the special interests, get on with the agreed settlement. I don't own any Microsoft stock or have any financial interest in the company or affiliated companies.

I'm tired of whiney special interests running this country. The nature of computers, internet and allied industries is such that Microsoft or any other ''big names'' may not be viable within ten years.

No one is served by prolonging this process.

Very Truly Yours,
Stephen A. Sevenich
1241 S. Webster Ave.
Green Bay, WI 54301–3008
(920)–433–0970

MTC–00007234

From: Jar22136@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:13pm
Subject: The Injustice of the Microsoft Case

To: The Department Of Justice

I want the government to know that I feel that the original case against microsoft is a major injustice. I feel that competative technology companies that are only interested in improveing their market share by any means possibe and government officials who will do anything to get their name in the news have taken advantage of Microsoft and the justice system for their own advantage. I believe that if all the facts were known, that instead of Microsoft being

dumped on, that these competative companies and the government should be paying penalities to Microsoft. I think that we all owe Microsoft a great deal for being innovative and provided a service which helps us all. I admire Microsoft for being willing to accept some penality just to close out a case which had little merit in the first place in my opinion.

Sincerely,

James Roberts

MTC–00007235

From: eric riss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

The Microsoft settlement should proceed and this long case should finally be settled. The last thing we need is more litigation.

Eric Riss, Ph.D.

MTC–00007236

From: Gordon (038) Dorothy Day
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:16pm
Subject: microsoft setlement

I support Microsoft 100% and feel the government is complety wrong in trying to destrory the company.

Gordon H. Day, Lodi, Calif

MTC–00007237

From: Marge310 Lawlor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:15pm
Subject: Settlement of Case

I was happy to hear that finally, the Government and Microsoft had come to a decision to settle the case against Microsoft. I don't know what the reason is behind some of the states that feel that they should receive more than they are being offered.

I feel that this was a mischievous act by the previous administration to help Microsoft competitors. I never really felt that there was a case against Microsoft; since all the information I heard about it was untrue. Unless there was something more going on than the government or Microsoft would talk about. I just don't understand and I hope that this administration has come to a rational conclusion and finally will end this ridiculous lawsuit.

Thank you for your at least listening to an individual voter.

Margaret M. Lawlor
5617 South Homan Avenue
Chicago, IL 606029

MTC–00007238

From: SENGALG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:15pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I BELIEVE THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD SETTLE THIS CASE AGAINST MICROSOFT, IT HAS GONE ON FAR TOO LONG, AND BELIEVE A SETTLEMENT IS NECESSARY FOR THE WELFARE OF THE COUNTRY AND THE CONSUMER..

THANK YOU
AGNES GILBERTI

MTC–00007239

From: Elaine Mintz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let this settlement take place. It has dragged on for too long and we are sick of it. The problems with the dot coms all started after Microsoft was attacked and has spiraled downward since then. The dotcoms collapsed and too many people are now without work. The economy is in sad shape. Then September 11 happened and that made it worse. We the American people need to see this over with and let life go on. Microsoft has its faults but they are not guilty of all the accusations of which they have been and continue to be accused. The government needs a scapegoat and they have chosen them since they stand out like such a bright star.

Elaine Mintz

MTC–00007240

From: Charles Perrell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Government,

Please drop the case against Microsoft. And use your influence to get the states to drop their actions as well.

I have worked in high tech for 30 years. Microsoft is a great contributor to the user community and to the US economy. It is a terrible misuse of taxpayer money to pursue this case. This case was brought by jealous competitors, envious industry executives, gun-for-hire lawyers and ambitious, overzealous government politicos.

It is bad enough, the damage this case has already caused our economy and Microsoft, but every day of continuance nourishes European anti-American shakedown hacks, who, along with those certain American states, plot further extortion from Microsoft.

DOJ has cost consumers millions in this case to date. Microsoft would have used the money wasted defending itself to have delivered more products/features at lower prices.

I look forward to your earliest remedy by ending the case and admonishing publicly the hyped charges, demagoguery and witch-hunt misuse of the judiciary by Microsoft competitors (Sun, Netscape/AOL, Novell) and their willing state and federal accomplices (Boxer, Feinstein, Hatch, Boyes).

Thank you,
Charles Perrell
Los Altos, CA 94024

MTC–00007241

From: elisabeth evans
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:17pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please lety the settlement stand and lets go on to newer and more inovations. Thanks, Elisabeth Evans

MTC–00007242

From: Dutchers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen and Ladies:

The time has come to settle the Microsoft Anti-trust case. Prolonging now will only bring more special interest groups out of the woodwork who apparently can't stand the thought of direct competition.

You and Microsoft have reached a settlement. Move on with it. Don't permit a continuing platform for a few State AGs to pontificate that they are Saviors of the poor competitors like little ol AOL and Netscape. Don't forget the consumer who will benefit from a quick settlement.

Don Franklin
Vaughn, Wash.

MTC–00007243

From: TobolskiJ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:18pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please stop the stupidity.... Let's get the settlement completed and get the show on the road. I have followed the proceedings for years and cannot believe you have allowed a few destroy what is good for so many. The only people left in the argument are those states that feel they have high tech companies they need to protect. Why should politics get involved with free enterprise?

MTC–00007244

From: lee roberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:29pm
Subject: microsoft settllement

i wish thdeptartmant of justice would get off of bill gates' back. he puts out a fine product. why don't you go after guys like BILL CLINTON, now there IS a crook!@!!!!

thank you very much

MTC–00007245

From: Duc Le
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,

I'd like to speak my opinion on the settlement. I share the views of Microsoft that a settlement is good for consumers, now more than ever before. This serves the public interests and consumers, and there is no need to prolong this litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

The industry and the American economy wants a stable and healthy competition, not lawsuits. Thanks.

Sincerely,
Hai-Duc Le
21511 73rd Place W. #1
Edmonds, WA 98026

MTC–00007246

From: Sandy Woolf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion both as a consumer and a stockholder that it is not in the interest of the public and the economy that the Microsoft case should be further litigated. Special interests within these states still looking for more litigation have no reason not to accept the current settlement. It's time to move forward and consider the public good.

Sincerely yours,
Sandra Woolf
Spring Valley NY 10977

MTC–00007247

From: H. Benjamin Loseth, D.D.S.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft and our court system has spent enough time, money and effort on this ill-gotten issue. Our economy needs companies that innovate and develop products and services, and the people employed by them. They support their families and pay taxes. Settle this case and move on to the important issues facing this country.

H. Benjamin Loseth, D.D.S.
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
benloseth@journey.com

MTC–00007248

From: Jim Baxter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am not a developer, nor an interested party. I am a systems administrator working with MS's products daily. I have watched this company's tactics worsen with each passing year.

Please do not let them off with just a slap on the wrists again. This is one company that has proven time and again their intention to do whatever they want in pursuit of total dominance of the industry. Please, break the OS away from the applications groups.

Leave IE with the OS if you have to, the problem isn't IE, the core problem is that Microsoft writes everything, the operating system, the development tools, and the office applications. They have a vertical monopoly that they abuse to stifle innovation, crush competition, and dominate every market, no mater how small.

If only you had broken the OS and development tools away from the applications division years ago when you had the chance.

Please, do something significant to them.

Jim Baxter

MTC–00007249

From: Frank Montuoro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:21pm
Subject: Frank Montuoro

We Like Microsoft Settlement

MTC–00007250

From: Rotruck, Allen R.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement reached by the Federal Government and nine states is more than adequate to address the ruling of the Court of Appeals. I feel that a few competitors have used the government to try to bring down their competition. Enough, please settle this and let Microsoft go on with their business, let the competition earn their position in the industry, don't let the government take away from one company and split it up with their competition. Thank you for your consideration.

Allen R. Rotruck, Director
Electronic Parts Co., Inc.
2620 Rhode Island St. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110–4699
Phone 505–293–6161
FAX 505–299–3174
rotruck@electronicpartsco.com

MTC–00007251

From: Elahi, Bijan (RDM)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 7:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a US consumer and a user of Microsoft software. I believe Microsoft's innovations and good software has contributed greatly to the productivity of the USA and the world. I hope that the DOJ quickly concludes the Microsoft settlement and ends this nonsense drain on this company's resources.

Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Just get it done—fast.

Bijan Elahi
425–376–1317

MTC–00007252

From: Norman Chapman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: Microsoft/Justice Dept. Settlement

Gentlemen:

My family was very pleased that the Justice Dept. and Microsoft reached agreement on the issues which surrounded the suit against Microsoft more than three years ago. We are very distressed and disturbed that several of the competitive computer companies want to continue this lawsuit in order to extract every last drop of blood that they can out of Microsoft, and at the same time feather their own nests. They have encouraged nine of the states attornies general to continue this pursuit, and, unfortunately, some of these gentlemen, including Blumenthal of Connecticut and Miller of Iowa are not altogether altruistic in their desire to garner headlines for themselves.

We would urge you to do all in your power and with your authority to bring this suit against Microsoft to a successful conclusion so that both Microsoft and its competitors can return to the job of producing the quality of products and services that we Americans want and need.. This have been a major distraction which has had its price, and to allow this small group of disgruntled organizations to continue this outrageous pursuit is beyond reason. Especially Sun Products & Oracle have both suffered major losses in evaluation of their stock partially as a result of this continued stalemate, and bringing down Microsoft will not do a thing to improve their lot in life. Only they can do that by paying more attention to their own R & D, and less to what other companies are doing.

It has been said that ''Politics is the art of looking for trouble, finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and applying the wrong remedies.''

I am afraid that in this case this saying applies.

Respectfully,
Norman & Isabella Chapman
CC:Norman Chapman (E-mail)

MTC–00007253

From: LMELittle@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: (no subject)

We need an engine to pull us out of this recession. Don't impose sanctions that will cripple this excellent company. It appears that the government (Justice Depaartment) was acturlly an instrument of Microsoft's competitors. Even after the government settled, the states (instruments of Microsoft's competitors) wants to prolong this case. Lets move on

MTC–00007254

From: Alan R. Williams DVM
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

I would like to ask that the Microsoft settlement be finished as soon as possible. Why is it necessary to drag this out? The time and money spent on addressing this issue is a total waste. Isn't there something more important to spend our tax dollar$ on than addressing an issue that is no longer relevant?

Please do us all a favor and settle this lawsuit ASAP. Let Microsoft get on with it's business and address some issues that have some real relevance.

Thank you alan
Alan R. Williams DVM
Mount Vernon, WA
Home of the Tulip Festival

MTC–00007255

From: Retlaw317@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN;

The settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Please let the settlement stand and stop all of this useless and unfair persecution and litigation by greedy and profit hungry companies who are and have been consumed by bitterness over Microsoft's success. Let the settlement stand!

Thank you for your attention to this E Mail.

Walter E Grauman

MTC–00007256

From: papapoet@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the DOJ—

Drop this case against MSFT, now! You people get something else to amuse yourself with. You and your State Attorneys General co-conspirators have dragged this silly case on long enough. There is a settlement. The lawyers have had their snout in the trough long enough. Now, go after some things that really matter, i.e., for starters, Enron and Arther Anderson and their White House oil, gas, and power plotters; Cheney and his secret oil executives cabal; the files of previous administrations buried by Executive

Order. That ought to keep you out of the weight room for a while.
G.D.Patterson

MTC–00007257

From: Beth Carter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: I feel that the DOJ has been unjust to Microsoft since the beginning of their investigation. There I feel that the DOJ has been unjust to Microsoft since the beginning of their investigation. There are options if people do not want to use Microsoft products. Bill Gates tried to give some type of standardization to an industry which desperately needed it and was persecuted because a few companies could not do what he did. My opinion is to leave him alone.

MTC–00007258

From: jbonin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:25pm
Subject: economy
the last thing america economy needs is more litigation

MTC–00007259

From: Tom Witte
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please do not let Microsoft get away with their illegal actions. Please insure they are given TIMELY, appropriate punishment. Something that corrects the problem, not the recent 'let us take' education market for punishment.
Do something you can be proud of. Something that makes the US a better place.
Thanks
Tom Witte

MTC–00007260

From: Kim Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement December 2, 2002
To Department Of Justice.
I'm very satisfied with the settlement between Microsoft and US Department Of Justice. The following is the main reason. As a US citizen is my duty to try my best to provide any information that is good for our country.
I reviewed all documents related to the Microsoft and US DOJ case: Including ''Complaint (5/18/1998)'', ''Stipulation (11/06/2001)'', and ''Competitive Impact Statement (11/15/2001)''.
In the settlement package ''Stipulation''.
Page 4 III. Prohibited Conduct.
Page 10 IV . Compliance and Enforcement Procedures.
Page 17 V. Termination.
Page 18 VI. Definition.
Page 21 VII. Further Element.
VIII. Third Party Rights.
The Department Of Justice gave Microsoft a very strong order, more stronger than the competition complainted about. I'm very happy that Microsoft agrees to this final settlement.
Sincerely
KIM L PETERSON

MTC–00007261

From: Hans Huang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:28pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
DEAR DOJ: Please settle the Microsoft case and move forward,,,it is good for consumers, good for economy, good for innovatins.....The opposition companies such as Oracle, Sun Micro should spen their enery writing codes instead of law suit.... Hans Huang
EVERY DAY IS A GOOD DAY
Hans Huang, Executive QA Pgm Mgr, APQA
IBM APSC; 3–2–31 Roppongi, Tokyo, Japan;
Tel: 81–3–5572–2606; Fax: 81–3–5572–2448
Internet: hch@us.ibm.com or hhuang@jp.ibm.com

MTC–00007262

From: be(u)an
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Dear Honorable Judges:
It appears after reading the documentation provided that the settlement is fair and reasonable to the consumer. It appears that Microsoft and non-Microsoft software products will be available to the consumers through various means when purchasing a computer.
I support the Settlement that has been proposed. Anita C. Young ,168 East 54th Street, Elmwood Park, NJ 07407

MTC–00007263

From: JBerg93591@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:
I have watched the proceedings against Microsoft now for nearly four years. All parties have had the chance to present evidence and have their say on how Microsoft has damaged them or helped them in terms of antitrust concerns. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the Government and nine states have finally reached a comprehensive agreement. The settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties. I, as a consumer, agree that the settlement is good for me and I believe the agreement is also good for the industry and the American economy. Let's wrap it up and move on!
Sincerely,
Jeffrey Berg
29333 SE 64th St
Issaquah, WA 98027

MTC–00007264

From: DPWPoot@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please leave Microsoft alone. Lets try and regulate the airlines instead

MTC–00007265

From: Zsmrtfred@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Can't you just leave Microsoft alone. Try naming just one other company that has put out so much software that almost everyone can aford it. Now you are tring to stop themfrom giving us even more for our dollar.
Fred Sparrevohn

MTC–00007266

From: berkjen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
It is my express opinion that further punitive action toward Microsoft would not be of any benefit to our country's citizens and consumers. Microsoft and it's products have attributed greatly to the progress of technology, to our country's economy, to the way companies do business today, to the lifestyles of our citizens and the quality of education of our children and college students.
It is also my opinion that the lawsuit against Microsoft has actually harmed our economy. I believe further punitive measures could actually hold back the growth of technology and hinder the consumer in the long run.
I appreciate this opportunity to express my opinion on the Microsoft Settlement.
Inez M. Jensen

MTC–00007267

From: ROBERT BRUCE MASON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:32pm
Subject: Ongoing Case Against Microsoft
I am a holder of 500 shares of Microsoft, but I do not submit this letter as a disgruntled stockholder, but as a concerned citizen. To set the record straight I also own stock in 45 other companies some, such as Sun Microsystems and AOL Time Warner, are Microsoft competitors. To be a competitor is one thing, but to use our political system (read that as Federal and State Government's) to put down a competitor is surely a different matter. It has to be clear to everyone involved in this mockery of justice that states housing Microsoft competitors are being used (that is their Federal and State elected representatives) by these competitors to accomplish what they couldn't do to compete. I hate to see a very successful business being persecuted because of their success. The money being wasted on government and private lawyers is disgraceful and angers me both as a stockholder and a taxpayer. We should be more interested in having more companies pushing technological advances and creating employment for our citizens than tearing down a company that has and continues to do just that. Obviously the current Judge and half the states believe a just punishment has been determined, please put an end to having private industry using the government to accomplish what they can't do in head-to-head competition.
Please put this case to an end, I for one am tired of supporting lawyers.
Thank you for allowing us common citizens a chance to express our views on this matter. I expect that's one of the reasons I spent over 30 years with the Marine Corps.

Semper Fidelis,
Bob Mason (rmason@cox.rr.com)

MTC–00007268

From: lyonarch@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General,

The Administration's support of the free enterprise system is laudable. Please continue in that direction and support a good-spirited Microsoft settlement. The entire settlement options have come down to ego v ego. Use your enlightenment, Mr. AG, and direct your position away from bureaucratic character assasination. Mr. Ashcroft is a good guy, and Gates et al are also good guys. You all deserve credit for guiding America along a reasonable path.

Sincerely,
Lyon Hesse
US Citizen & Hi Tech Supporter

MTC–00007269

From: Jay Contorer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:30pm
Subject: settlement

Gentlemen:

My feeling is this litigation has gone far enough. No one has ever been hurt by Mircosoft. They have in fact done a great service to the computer industry and to the users by their standardization of operating systems, creating order from the chaos that existed in this important area of computer use. I think it might be possible that the litigation urged by its competitors started the recession we are now facing. Enough is enough. The settlement is fair and should be finalized asap in my view.

Sincerely,
Jay Contorer

MTC–00007270

From: Karen Lonergan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I wish to voice my thoughts on the pending Microsoft settlement with the DOJ. As someone who has used both Microsoft and it's competitor's software for years, I think the pending settlement is more than fair, and I encourage you to expedite this settlement as quickly as possible. As a consumer, I have always had a choice at which software products I could buy, and have frequently made that choice. I will also say, that after using many of the competitors software, I more frequently am choosing Microsoft, simply because they offer superior products for my needs. Their price is worth their weight in gold, and I find the pricing nominal compared to the increased productivity that is delivered to me.

Those points aside, please settle this case as quickly as possible. THere are much bigger and better uses of the DOJ's resources, than perpetuating this case.

Regards,
Karen Lonergan

MTC–00007271

From: Jotr2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This misguided suit has gone on way too long. The people supporting it are only whining and need to be shut down. There is no way that the internet and computing in general would ever have got off the ground if not for Microsoft. While Microsoft may not be everyone's favorite solution, let the computer elites come up with a better one that people will buy. In other words, let them build a better mouse trap or shut up!

MTC–00007272

From: LBASTASUKI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:34pm
Subject: microsoft

Please stop the litigation and do not stifle innovation. Yours is only an exercise in futility. The lawyers are the only ones to profit. Remember we are at war and we need all the new technological advances that Microsoft can invent for us to lead into the future. thanks

MTC–00007273

From: RPatel2468@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:33pm
Subject: Settlement

Please keep the terms of the settlement and let us move on. To tie up our own tech giant in these times is nothing unamerican and a step back into disharmony.

Dr ravi Patel

MTC–00007274

From: Roger McVicker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement is in the best interest of the industry, the country and the citizens who have invested in not only Microsoft but in other companies of the Tech Sector which all have been effected by the protracted litigation. Approve the settlement and lets all get on with life and other more pressing issues. The Government has spent enough on this issue and there is a resolution in place. Roger McVicker

MTC–00007275

From: Jscully369@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I thought this matter would have been settled months ago. Get off Microsoft's and the stock holders back unless you want it to go the way of Enron.

John C. Scully
2677 Park Brown Road
Harrington, DE., 19952
(302) 284–3785

MTC–00007276

From: Eric (038) Velena Jensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this mess! We have a company-Microsoft- who represents what this country was built on. Innovation!!! They did good and now the government has to stomp them down. The consumer loves their products. Please settle this case post-haste and let American ingenuity live on.

A taxpaying voter-
Jon ''Eric'' Jensen
409 N. Edgewwod Dr.
Coffeyville, KS 67337
(620) 251–8766

MTC–00007277

From: Ruth Hartsook
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I am emailing to state my thoughts and support regarding the Microsoft settlement. I support this settlement and am hoping that there will be no chance that this litigation will be prolonged in any way. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that stifles innovation or diminishes our chances for economic recovery. Please understand that we, as a society, are concerned with greater issues than the battle against a great American company such as Microsoft. In my work in education I see the many contributions Microsoft makes to our youth, and therefore to our nation's future and only hope. In these troubled times I believe most in our nation do not even recognize this settlement as an issue, and many are questioning whether it ever should have. Let us but this behind us.

Please let this settlement come to completion. Let us focus collectively on real issues for our nation's economic growth and genuine security.

Sincerely,
Ruth Moore Hartsook
Instructional Technology Specialist
Davidson County Schools
Lexington, NC

MTC–00007278

From: Michael Fu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Michael Fu
6 Shadowbrook Lane
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Dear Sir/Madame;

After reading through the related documents to the settlement, I'd like to share some of my thoughts. To begin, I am a Microsoft stock holder. I also hold shares of some other technology companies. I bought Microsoft because of its unqiue (monopoly like) position in its industry. However, I also bought Microsoft stocks because I like its products. There are some features which Microsoft pushed hard on its operating system which I would rather not have. But in general, comparing to the other services, AOL, AT&T, Cable, Utilities, I like the Microsoft products best.

Now, the main reason I am writing this letter. I am in agreement for most of the proposals except for ''Java'' and ''Netscape'' clauses. I am for Microsoft because I don't think these parts of the case were brought by the right group of people. They were not for consumer, but for the competitors of Microsoft. The major proponents of this case are Sun, Oracle, AOL, and former NetScape.

I have used all of their products extensively. Some of their products are very good, but definitely not cost effective for the majority. They lost their market share to Microsoft not because of Microsoft monopoly but because of their strategies were not accepted by the consumer. The consumer would not want to pay several times more for his computing systems. By the way, on one hand these competitors are suing Microsoft for its monopoly, on the other, they try very hard to be the next Microsoft! I believe strongly, Sun, Oracle and their accomplices are not for consumer in general. Consumers would be hurt even worse. Also, there is no such thing as impeding technology innovations. As we have seen, most of the tehnologies of late 90s were hype and doomed to fail. The few that remain will stand regardless of Microsoft or not. It's the nature of capitalistic market.

Thank you for your time.

Michael

MTC–00007279

From: Everett Snelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is imperative that a settlement is made now. Do not hamper innovation. There is no evidence that the public has been hurt. Please settle now!

Everett Snelson

MTC–00007280

From: Raj Sharma
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam

I have tried to follow the Microsoft court battle and am suprised it wasn't thrown out of court!

Microsoft stand accused of ''bundling'' software. However, I think that it was a great idea. As the owner of a technical support company, i appreicate the fact that the majority of users cannot install, configure or use a web browser. Micrsoft has helped the general public by provding this service. If Microsoft were ''bundling'' Netscape with Windows, I would be quite upset as my peers and I agree that Netscape is a far inferior product. Microsoft are giving me a pre-installed web browser which integrated into my operating system to provide me greater functionality.

I thought the law was there to protect my interests, obviously the Americal Judical System has decided to join the Micrsoft bashing campaign!

Best wishes to Microsoft

Raj Sharma

rajs@rajsharma.dyndns.org

MTC–00007281

From: john kuzminski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:38pm
Subject: re:settlement

I am in favor of microsoft settling their suit

dianne koehler

MTC–00007282

From: EAbercromb@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think enough damage has been done to Microsoft already. It is time to get this case over and let all parties concerned get on with other matters affecting our economy. Microsoft has developed products that are generally well liked by it's customers and should not be penalized for simply developing better products than it's competitors.

MTC–00007283

From: Dwight (038) Jan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:39pm
Subject: Fw: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Original Message
From: Dwight & Jan
To: mocrosoft.atr@usdojgov
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2002 1:53 PM
Subject: Fw: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Original Message
From: Dwight & Jan
To: department of justice
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2002 11:11 AM
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I'm normally proud of my state of California in the way it used to handle its political affairs. But not anymore, with the present Governor and Attorney General dumb dumb Bill Lockyer, all they can think of is the next election, forget the taxpayers and normal way of doing business.

The settlement that was offered and accepted by the rest of the states, except those like California, should have been accepted and close that door once and for all. How can the government expect a business like Microsoft to survive if they have to divulge their secrets that keeps them ahead of their competition. That is not good common sense, let's get back to basics and put an end to all these political games.

The first step would be to not allow Microsoft competitors to voice their opinions,.since they are prejudiced. The second step would be to listen to the consumers since they are the ones most affected by your decision.

I sincerely hope you can make a difference and do the right thing. Any questions call me at (530)533–5954 or email me.

Yours truly,

Janet Lantsberger

MTC–00007284

From: Mike Goodejohn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am sending this e-mail as a concerned consumer in the Microsoft antitrust case. Even though I question why this case was ever brought against Microsoft in the first case, I believe that the government in its best interest must obtain some sort of concession from Microsoft and therefore think the settlement proposed is fair and will finally allow Microsoft to move forward.

As a consumer, I would like the government to explain how I have been hurt by Microsoft. I am an older individual and was not exposed to a computer until 1990. When I purchased my first computer and wanted to access the internet, I was told I needed to purchase a browser but later learned that it was included in the Windows operating system. An operating system which is a standard for the computer industry and makes it a more simple environment to operate in.

Look at who is funding and spearheading the attacks on Microsoft; Oracle and Sun Microsystems. Why do you think they have lobbied so much. If you can't beat them in a free economy then have the government go after them. If Larry Ellison and Scott McNeely would focus on their own businesses and provide products that consumers want at a reasonable cost, rather than looking to the government to penalize innovation, their companies would be much better off and in a better competitive position.

Where else in the world can I purchase an operating system for around $75–$100 with so many other programs and functions included. I think the consumer wins. If Microsoft didn't bundle other programs in it's Windows operating system, how much would the consumer have to pay for a comparable system.

If California and Iowa want to continue their litigation, maybe the government should suggest a settlement to them that would not allow Microsoft to sell any of its products in the those two states or to any of their residents. How long would it take for the residents of those two states to raise the roof on their Attorney General?

Michael L Goodejohn
20741 S.E. 3rd Way
Sammamish, WA 98074

MTC–00007285

From: Ken McSwain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whomever it may concern:

I strongly agree that the Microsoft Settlement is fair to all involved. I urge you to do all in your power to put this matter behind us and don't let special interest groups sabotage the agreement. I firmly believe that this suit was a major factor in the decline of the Stock Market beginning in March of 2000. The resulting loss of capital by all who hold stocks in retirement funds are the real losers in the entire matter and the settlement should be implemented with all deliberate speed.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McSwain
719 Kleewood Drive
FULTON MO 65251
(573) 642–0606

MTC–00007286

From: Ellsil@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

The settlement that you negotoated with Microsoft is in the best interest of our country. The proof is that 9 of the states have signed off and the other 9 are only trying to make individual political gains for them selves. The AG'S as we all know are political animals and are just looking for votes in their states. Don't change the agreement.

Elliot Silverman

MTC–00007287

From: AntjeElske@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am an ordinary stockholder of Microsoft and have been following the settlement efforts of the company. I believe that the settlement under review is reasonable and would like to add my support by writing this.

Best regards,
Antje E. Huck

MTC–00007288

From: Jjzipper@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:42pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

i believe that microsoft has done nothing wrong. i believe the special interests and competitors of microsoft have their own interest at heart and not the general public, who from what i can tell have gained from the products that microsoft produces.

NO fines should be levied against a great company and a great inovator like bill gates. lets spend more time and money on the terrorists and criminals.

jim zimmer
27823 184th Ct SE
KENT
WA 98042

MTC–00007289

From: Candace Brenneke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lawsuit needs to be settled a.s.a.p. futher delays are not necessary. This has lasted longer then it should have already. I see no advantage to continue for competition or microsoft. Government intervention only cost money and time for all parties.

Richard Brenneke

MTC–00007290

From: LAPTS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement in the Microsoft Case should be settled as it was set by the court.

Lois Smith
636 Lake Shore Drive
Pasadena, MD. 21122

MTC–00007291

From: Gary Louis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the present settlement should stand, even though I think it was too punitive towards Microsoft. I think consumers have plenty of choices because of Microsoft and any further litigation is a waste of time and money and stifles creativity!

Gary Louis
Arcadia, CA 91006
garylouis@earthlink.net

MTC–00007292

From: JSerrantin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

subject settlement is fair and should be accepted by all parties. Special interests are not concerned with consumers interests. End this matter now.

MTC–00007293

From: Jeffrey Barnes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe enough time and resources have gone into the effort spent prosecuting Microsoft. This is the time to ratify the settlement. Those states that are protesting this agreement are just grandstanding for the sake of the companyies that compete with Microsoft. This proposed settlement is fair. Lets get it done!

MTC–00007294

From: Klaus Meyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is my expressed wish that the settlement between the government and 9 States on one hand and Microsoft be ratified. I view it as fair and it is about time that we put this case behind us. It is further my hope and wish that the other 9 States not part of the agreement join the government.

Although I am a resident of Redmond, where the Microsoft headquarters are, I am not an employee or otherwise connected with Microsoft. I have always failed to see how the consumers have been hurt by Microsoft's operation. They are a stellar corporation and an excellent corporate neighbor.

Sincerely,
Klaus and Nancy Meyn
6305–159th Place NE
Redmond, WA 98052

MTC–00007295

From: Martin Collins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:46pm
Subject: Comments on Microsoft settlement from Orlando

To the Department of Justice:

I have followed this action, and I feel that the nine sates that are mounting a separate settlement effort, are on an agenda to line their pockets with false hopes of income. It seems that dissent will always be a part of any settlement, and we must move forward to quickly finish this case, and move on.

Please implement the terms of the settlement, and minimize the expense of the on-going litigation from Florida.

Martin Collins

MTC–00007296

From: Joe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I was pleased to note that the Department of Justice had finally decided that there was no profit in persecuting Microsoft any further and has tentatively accepted a settlement that, while still not fair to Microsoft, will at least end the legal battles and allow them to continue to innovate the PC industry. I honestly feel that it is unfair that Microsoft will be forced to allow its competitors to see the code for their products. To me, that looks a bit like industrial espionage, you try to see what the competition is doing and find a way to use it and make it better. In fact, Microsoft got sued a few years ago by a little company called Stac for using a similar compression algorithm in a disk compression utility.

Thank you for finally showing some good sense and letting this thing die.

Sincerely,
Joseph Tait
Duvall, WA

MTC–00007297

From: Jack Heeger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to urge the settlement of the Microsoft case. As a consumer, I still fail to see how I have been hurt by Microsoft. Instead, I do feel that as a consumer I have been hurt by the constant attacks on Microsoft during the past few years by a few competitors who apparently cannot compete in the marketplace but instead must rely on government to help them, and in doing so, have stifled innovation.

Please settle this case and allow us all to move on. Once this is settled, the high tech industry can begin to innovate again and a company can build a better product without fear of being sued and consumers will reap the benefits. The economy needs a boost. The settlement of this case will help give that boost.

Jack J. Heeger
15 Hall Court
Napa, CA 94558
e-mail: jheeger@pacbell.net

MTC–00007298

From: Sudeep Bharati
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Jan 2nd 2002

I fully support the US DOJ and Microsoft settlement of the anti-trust case. It is time to end this litigation. I don't believe the prolonged court proceedings will produce any thing drastically different than the current settlement. I think the current settlement is fair. It will let Microsoft innovate and also send a message to its competitors that even companies with dominant market share have right to improve and innovate their products.

I recently read the penalties that are being sought by the non-settling states and I just cannot understand most of their demands. These demands seem to imply that they won on all points in the appeals court which was not the case and they are not pursuing those aspects any longer. I just cannot imagine how that kind of relief can be won in the courts given the appeals court verdict.

Thanks for the opportunity to let me give my comments on this important subject matter.

Sudeep Bharati
3272 165th PL NE
Bellevue WA 98008

http://explorer.msn.com

MTC–00007299

From: RandyDlta@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:48pm
Subject: (no subject)

DOJ,

Haven't you got more legitimate cases to spend our taxpayers money on? Get off Microsoft's back. Bill Gates has done more for this country's economy, provided more technical innovation, and donated more to charity than all the democrats combined for the past 20 years.

Larry Herbst

MTC–00007300

From: Tutbone@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I want to let you know that it is my opinion that the Microsoft Corporation should not be punished by the government.

Thank you,

Frank Nalbone

MTC–00007301

From: McLeanNJ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This entire process has been a waste of time and taxpayers money. America is (or is supposed to) be the land of opportunity. Microsoft made a better widget. Has always been innovative in product development, and doesn't deserve to be treated as it has been. Every time the government involves themselves in processes such as this, it is for the sole purpose of distraction from so many other, more critical situations existing today. Time spent on these would be much more appropriate. It wasn't too long ago that the Federal Government divided up the most dependable, successful telephone system. Look at that positive outcome!!. Mexico has a better telephone system than we do. Ours is fragmented at best. The fact that Microsoft Corporation has been able to maintain, and further enhance software and systems in a poor financial market as we are experiencing is to their credit. The Federal Government should settle this situation and get on with correcting problems and situations which threaten our very existence.

MTC–00007302

From: Bob Brandenburg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Legal action against Microsoft has gone far enough. Further action is a waste of tax dollars and contrary to the best interests of the national and world economy. Only self serving parties with special interests want it to continue. Please confirm the settlement and let all parties concern themselves with more productive activities.

Bob Brandenburg
13115 Pleasant Place
Nurnsville, MN 55337

MTC–00007303

From: Paul D. Weatherford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:50pm
Subject: *Don't just slap the hands of a Monopolizer.''

If the judgment passed on Microsoft had contained an adequate penalty maybe you would not have so many states desiring to apply stricter standards than what were imposed.

Their software is intrusive on the average buyer. They control the software even after it has been sold to the customer who should have rights to implement for his use without checking for Microsoft's approval. I am forced to take much of their software because they control the manufacturers which include their software without a choice among the manufacturers. The manufacturers are blackmailed into accepting Microsoft software because of their monopoly of the operating system. There is a lot of other software out there I had rather have a choice of, but I am forced to accept what the manufacturer sends me because they are also coerced to follow Microsoft's demand or lose the operating system used on computers which they have monopolized in the market. There are elements in their operating system software that forces you to use because it is included. There are programs from other software manufacturers that just will not because they have been excluded from the possibility of competing with Microsoft. I have used Lotus SmartSuite for a number of years, but the advent of Windows XP prevents me from using my old software. So, I was forced to buy new Lotus SmartSuite which will work on the old Windows ME operating system. If you want the benefit of a better operating system, you are forced to buy new software.

I have Windows Office Professional which I received with my new computer in March 2001, but all of my documents are under Lotus SmartSuite. So, I had to partition my 60 Gig hard drive and put Windows XP on one drive and Windows ME on the other. Otherwise, Windows XP would have made a plethora of my software obsolete. Software is not cheap, as if Microsoft cared about the final customer. No judgment against Microsoft would be too harsh against such a selfish company.

Maybe you have heard of Microsofts' largess to our schools. They gave them old machines—not current technology. The schools have to do upgrades of these computers to enable them to work for the benefit of students in the classroom. What a farce. No doubt they are taking a big tax write-off for their charitable donation.

MTC–00007304

From: BOBMYRTA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We agree that the Microsoft Settlement should be final. Microsoft has accepted the settlement as tough but fair. Any more litigation is a waste of monies and only serves greedy lawyers and companies who want something for nothing.

Robert and Myrta Convery
1610 N Pine St
Post Falls, ID 83854

MTC–00007305

From: VLBMC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:49pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

As a concerned citizen I have read many news stories about the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I think the settlement terms are very generous and this case should be settled. It serves no public interest to continue to drag this out. Enough is enough, settle and lets get on with far more important business.

Vikki mcIlwain

MTC–00007306

From: David Bernstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:50pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement

Please, in the interests of our economy and justice let the current agreement between Microsoft, The Federal Government, and the nine states stand as final. The agreement is fine, and there need not be any further litigation on the Microsoft settlement.

David Bernstein
Mercer Island, Washington

MTC–00007307

From: Albstein@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please finalize the suit against Microsoft along the lines that was previously agreed to by most of the states and the Federal government. This has been going on too long. A final settlement could jump start the stock market and confidence.

Albert Steinhart—
Lake Worth, Florida
Albstein@aol.com

MTC–00007308

From: Lee Foropoulos
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:51pm
Subject: You'll are some money wasting bufoons

I personally am glad you have finally settled your landmark antitrust case with Microsoft. Maybe now you'll can find something more important to waste our tax money on. Next time you take a software vender to court why don't you guys try and pick one that isn't responsible for PCs going mainstream. DOS was weak. Netscape sucks. And without windows you and the rest of your outdated colleges wouldn't even no where to begin to check your email. Tell you what next time you decide to attempt to prosecute a software vender go and take some programming classes and learn the ancient stuff people used in the past to code in. When your done go try out some of Microsofts software developement tools. Then go write a fully functioning application using something lam like Cobol or Fortran, without the win32 APIs and sell it (yeah right).

I would imagine a lot of consumers complain about Microsoft too. Unfortunatly the majority of these individuals went to

some wholesale club and bought what they thought was a good deal. In fact it resembled a computer and it had windows on it. Unfortunantly it was obsolete and barely had the power to run half the software preinstalled on it including Windows without locking up. So they blame Microsoft; and are tremedously at error in doing so. They should have bought a real computer.

If I was to state a negative claim against Microsoft it would be their new method of tech support $35 per incident. Thats their business though in my opinion. I would imagine they have people that don't know anything about PCs bugging them nonstop every day all day. I'm sure that for $35 an incident people are gonna be less prone to call Microsoft and say ''Hey Man!? I think I broke the internet!!!!''. The down side is that even well educated Windows pros are at some point going to find an annoying bug our have an incident that maybe not so much requires but would sure be nice to talk to the software manufacturer about. But for $35 per incident I'll back up my data format C:\ and start from scratch any day of the week over calling them.

I personally think the entire tech industry will feel your wrath tenfold anytime you toy with Microsoft. Without Microsoft there might as well be no tech industry. You guys should follow old wise proverbs like ''If It Aint Broke Don't Fix It.''

Lee Foropoulos
stavrose@greek-fire.com

MTC–00007309

From: David Wong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

I am here to voice my opinions about Microsoft. I've been in the IT (Information Technology) Industry for over 23 years. I am here to applaud the job Microsoft has done in standardizing the Industry. Prior to Microsoft, you had OS/2, Apple, and dozens of flavors of UNIX. The result was few application software and hardware verndors per flavor of operating system, resulting in very over inflated prices. (Note: apple and UNIX software and hardware is still much more expensive then comparable PC products.) With the advent of Windows, application software and related hardware prices came down significantly. Consumers benefited more then at any other time in the entire history of the industry. I say that Microsoft deserves anything it can reasonably get for accomplishing this feat.

To want to purposely break up the Windows standard is in my opinion: INSANE. It will mean higher prices for niche products that support non-standard, non-critical-mass operating systems (at least until a competitor creates another monopoly operating system). So my opinion is that anything you do to break the Windows standard is BAD for the CONSUMER and good for Microsoft competitors ONLY.

Thanks for reading my opinion ...

MTC–00007310

From: Ursula W. Foust
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop any further litigation. The settlement is fair and just for both parties.

Ursula Foust

MTC–00007311

From: JHerzf8892@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement See attached.

MTC–00007311 0001

January 2, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to urge you to quickly finalize the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. The settlement has prevented Microsoft from focusing on technology for long enough, and it is time for the company to move on.

This settlement provides for reasonable restrictions on Microsoft and allows for proper government and industry oversight. Microsoft will share access to its software code, and provide documentation on the internal workings of the Windows operating system. Additionally, Microsoft will change its marketing and licensing practices to allow its competitors more of a chance in the market.

In the three years since this antitrust case began, Microsoft has been besieged by lawyers, preventing the company from performing its primary duty of producing quality software. Please see that this ceases to be the case; please finalize the settlement.

Sincerely,
John Herzfeld

MTC–00007311_0002

MTC–00007312

From: JEGBERT457@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that Microsoft should be left alone to conduct its business as it sees fit. This country is a free enterprise country and just because they are more successful, they should not be penalized for being so good. Had the Clinton Admn. not started picking on Microsoft because one of Clinton's best friends was a powerful figure in a competing company, none of this would have happened.

Millie Jones

MTC–00007313

From: Charles McDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To DOJ:

This is a joke. Companies should have the freedom to do business as they see fit. The DOJ and all the plaintiffs need to get a life. If you want to compete with Microsoft, then get your ass off the couch and do your homework. Bill Gates built a company with hard work and innovations that have helped the American people and the economy. Not to mention all the money he has given to charities. Back off and direct your energy towards a company like Enron, who stole from millions of hard working people.

Sincerely,
Charles W. McDonald

MTC–00007314

From: DAVCOMPANY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe the settlement under the Tunney Act is a fair settlement. Please put our names on the approval list and I hope that the Attorneys General of the States, including ours, California, withdraw their objections. Most people in this nation want this matter behind us and we feel that the only people not in favor of the settlement are trying to bring person politics into it and their back pockets and not interested in what is good for the country.

Sincerely,
James R. and Eileen Davis
Diamond Bar, CA

MTC–00007315

From: Gary Harmatz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:54pm
Subject: Mircosoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

It is my firm belief that the current settlement with Microsoft is fair and just. To peruse this any further will be a waste of time and tax payers' money.

In advance, thank for what you do and your kind attention.

Respectfully,
Gary Harmatz

MTC–00007316

From: Kaylie Utter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:48pm
Subject: It is very important to settle the Microsoft case in my opinion. This has dragged on far too long.

It is very important to settle the Microsoft case in my opinion. This has dragged on far too long. It seems that Microsoft has been under a unique attack against its creativity in bringing products and functionality to the American consumer.

If Microsoft is such a monopoly, please tell me what government granted it and how it has hurt the public. In the early days of computers, no two were alike. Custom programming was the norm. Microsoft opened a whole new world of communications and capabilities for small business to compete against both big and other small business because of the affordable and compatible computing power put on the desktop. Mainframes were no longer required and I hold Microsoft responsible as much as any other organization for that great boon to the planet. They should be allowed to continue to serve American and world consumers unshackled or at least out from under the burden of government intrusion. It's called competition. And that competition has brought the greatest new age of communication the world has ever known.

If the new definition of monopoly is being the market leader, then perhaps you should

consider pursuing Cisco Systems for controlling an estimated 95% of the software market running internet servers. Or what about AOL-Time Warner. Are they not the largest ISP by far. Heavens, where was the DOJ when that happened.

Please settle and let Microsoft get on with creativity in computing.

Kaylie Utter
Bozeman, Montana

MTC–00007317

From: patricia mcclain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam:

I feel that the action against Mircosoft should be finished. The issues have been corrected. Please settle this so everyone can benefit from the new products and ideas developed by free enterprise.

Thank you.
Patricia McClain

MTC–00007318

From: Don Kelley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice,

Please stop this unjust prosecution of one of America's finest companies (e.g. Microsoft). Accept the settlement offer.

Don

MTC–00007319

From: Chris H.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern,

I cannot stress enough the importance of keeping the Microsoft company intact and my disgust at their competitors for using the government as a weapon to tear apart the company at the expense of destroying the industry and the public faith. Any further action against Microsoft sets a bad precedence in the business community at large. The companies that have set this in motion are using the term ''Monopoly'' to describe Microsoft's success and blaming them for their own failures.

On a personal level this really hits home. I have been trying to start my career in the IT industry for a few months now. It's has been tough just trying to land an interview let alone trying to find a company that's hiring entry level programmers. Microsoft is at the top of their game and most, if not all schools, teach their students using Microsoft technologies. Why do they do this? Is it because of their so-called ''Monopoly'' power? I think not. It is because Microsoft has become the industry standard and the base of the IT industry. Most businesses use Microsoft technologies in their day to day business transactions. Why is this, a ''Monopoly'' again? The answer is no! Microsoft has consistently provided todays companies with quality and innovative products year after year. There are alternatives to using Microsoft products out there. Anyone in the IT business knows this and most chose not to use them. Is this choice based on the perceived, ''Monopoly''? No, it is because what Microsoft offers is a better product. What happens when you keep chipping away at the foundation or base of a building? Eventually the whole building comes crashing down! Do this to the base, foundation if you will, of the IT industry and so too would the whole IT industry and the American economy! Please do not let this happen!

Sincerely,
Chris Higgins
psyrus7@yahoo.com

MTC–00007320

From: Donakerley@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:55pm
Subject: (no subject)

To Whom It May Concern:

My Wife And I are in agreement with the settlement already worked out with Microsoft. We don't feel they were guilty of monopoly to begin with.

MTC–00007321

From: Joseph A Coyle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The long awaited settlement of this case is within reach. Now is not the time to let it slip away. As a small user out here in the real world, and from that perspective, I see Microsoft as a benevolent dictatorship. Yes they dominate the industry but, every time they take on a new market, that market improves. And for me, that's a good thing. Like it or not, Microsoft is the engine that drives the industry. They are the push (and in all too many cases the pull). Their competitors are holding the industry back. Through lack of imagination and energy, they sit on ideas and innovations. Through complacency, they fail to hear the wakeup call until it's too late. No wonder they are frightened when they see Microsoft coming.

Joseph A Coyle
535 Franklin Circle
Harleysville, PA 19438–2362
E-mail: coyote@netreach.net

MTC–00007322

From: Harlan F. Hobbs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen. . . . .

I strongly urge the DOJ and the various State Attorneys General to settle the Microsoft case as soon as possible. A quick settlement will help the economy move forward.

Thank you;
Harlan F. Hobbs

MTC–00007323

From: Shelley Blumberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

''844 Beechwood Drive, Havertown, Pennsylvania, 19083''

January 2, 2001
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am pleased that a settlement has finally been reached in the Microsoft antitrust dispute. This legal battle has gone on long enough and has caused an increase in wasteful spending in state budgets and the misuse of American tax dollars.

Even though the settlement goes further than what Microsoft would have liked, it feels that settling the case now is the best thing to do to help the industry and economy move forward. The settlement is fair and reasonable, and was arrived at after extensive negotiations with a court appointed mediator.

We have spent enough time and financial resources on this legal battle. Microsoft needs to stop litigating and resume innovating. Thank you for helping to make this settlement happen.

Sincerely,
Shelley Blumberg
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC–00007324

From: Bob Jennings
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

At this critical time for our country, with all the political and economic uncertainty, I urge you to actively continue the settlement efforts in this litigation.

Thank You
Robert Jennings

MTC–00007325

From: Joseph Sirianni
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:59pm
Subject: Microsoft

Let's please settle the Microsoft case and not subject them to further litigation.

Joe Sirianni

MTC–00007326

From: manhar nandani
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I have read the settlement between DOJ and Microsoft and I think its a great settlement for everybody. We should put this issue behind and get on with our life and let Microsoft be the most innovative company in the world so that everybody benefits from the greatest software at reasonble price without being a monopolist.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

Manhar Nandani

MTC–00007327

From: Earle Burger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:59pm
Subject: SETTLE THE CASE

Let's settle the case and stop punishing a company for being entrepreneurial.

Earle Burger
HR Consultant

MTC–00007328

From: LHearshman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:59pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a long time stockholder of Microsoft and I think this whole case was a farce and a waste of time and money. I do not agree with the settlement situation; however, to get this whole thing ended I think it should be done as fast as possible. Let's get the US back on the road to productivity and OUT OF THE COURT SYSTEM. Stop this insanity now.

Lori Hearshman
PO Box 35834
Des Moines, IA 50315

MTC–00007329

From: Erik N. Funk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:00pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Department of Justice:

Please record this citizen's comment as one strongly in favor of rapid, reasonable settlement of the Microsoft saga. We've spent enough non-value adding energy on the case. Microsoft is ready to make a substantial donation to educational institutions. . . let's PLEASE move on.

Thanks for your attention and interest in better government that costs less.

Sincerely,
Erik Funk

MTC–00007330

From: Sanford Gruskin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

2 January 2002

United States Department of Justice,

In regards to the Microsoft settlement, I would like to express my views as consumer, senior citizen and most importantly as a U.S. citizen during a time demanding unity not diversity amoung our people.

I was raised in the midwestern states in a middle class family. I was brought up to believe in the American Way, namely built a good product, capture market share and be praised for success.

We seem to have developed into an environment where success is a forbidden word. Microsoft has developed a good product that is user friendly—much the same senerio as Henry Ford and the Model T. It is within the reach of the average American both in the skills required to use it and the cost of the product.

Lets get on with our tecnology, allow the case to be settled, and wait for the next best product to take over the helm. The last thing we need in our society at this time is more litigation.

Sanford Gruskin
726 Mill Walk NW
Atlanta, GA 30327

MTC–00007331

From: JHerzf8892@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 7:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

See attached.

January 2, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to urge you to quickly finalize the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. The settlement has prevented Microsoft from focusing on technology for long enough, and it is time for the company to move on.

This settlement provides for reasonable restrictions on Microsoft and allows for proper government and industry oversight. Microsoft will share access to its software code, and provide documentation on the internal workings of the Windows operating system. Additionally, Microsoft will change its marketing and licensing practices to allow its competitors more of a chance in the market.

In the three years since this antitrust case began, Microsoft has been besieged by lawyers, preventing the company from performing its primary duty of producing quality software. Please see that this ceases to be the case; please finalize the settlement.

Sincerely,
John Herzfeld

MTC–00007332

From: Donald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not now nor have I ever been in favor of the government telling Microsoft how to run its business. I think you should drop the whole thing.

Microsoft has made a lot of money for itself and others. It continues to make money and has been directly responsible for untold thousands of jobs around the world.

If you just have a need to sue, try the US Government. They take from the public, waste huge amounts of cash and when they run out they just take more while giving themselves raises and the best benefit package in the world. All the while they don't make money, no, not even close, we're trillions in the hole. If anything you should ask Bill Gates for advice on turning our Country around.

Let me make one other thing clear. I do not now, nor have I ever owned Microsoft stock. I do however believe that our government that's supposed to be, ''by the people, for the people'' has turned ''on the very people who make this country great''. You people tried the same thing on IBM, then Bill Gates dropped out of school and proved your whole case to be a farce. We have even more choices today than we had then but you and other people like you still cry foul. Only when you can put your own house in order will I even start to listen.

I'm a registered voter who does not listen to what the politicians say, I watch what they do and I vote every chance I get.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

MTC–00007333

From: Michael Becker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:01pm
Subject:

I seriously disagree with the anti-trust agreement that you are I seriously disagree with the anti-trust agreement that you are making with Microsoft. I hope that you will reconsider. Everything that can be said about the problems with the debate has been said. It is your responsibility to ensure a competitive market.

Do your job, split up Microsoft. There is no reason to go easy on them. Microsoft only makes this country look bad.

Michael Becker
CTO Jumping Jack Web
ACM Member
Student Drexel University

MTC–00007334

From: Bruce Hoffman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I received an e-mail note from Microsoft's MSFIN project soliciting any comment to the DOJ on the proposed settlement. This is the first time I have responded to their efforts to keep the using public informed of the issues facing them and the plaintiffs in this suit. My opinion is that there were some anti-competitive efforts made by Microsoft that bordered on using their virtual monopoly position in some software for their suppression of potential rivals. Nevertheless, I think their business, which is so very far removed from a commodity business (oil, foodstuffs, wood products, etc.), is so transitory in nature that innovation has to be respected and rewarded as rapidly as possible, since another better solution could emerge in such a short time that market share could mean nothing in the space of a few years. I also feel that the enactment of the settlement will bring an end to the chill on innovation that the prior administrations very zealous pursuit of this company has blown over the software industry while waiting for a resolution.

Thank you,
Bruce C. Hoffman
17 Grandin Terrace
Annandale, NJ 08801

MTC–00007335 11

From: Don Kelley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
8013 Hauser Drive
Lenexa, Kansas 66215
January 2, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

Considering all the issues and problems the federal government is dealing with, I have wondered why so much of the government's attention has been directed towards Bill Gates and Microsoft. Why punish a man and a company that has been key in the technological revolution that benefits so many people? Microsoft will disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows, making it much easier for its competitors to compete. This disclosure will make it possible for competitors to remove certain Microsoft programs from the Windows system and replace them with software from a different source. Additionally, Microsoft will change

the coding in such a way that Windows will not suffer any reduction in performance when working with non-Microsoft programs.

The decision of the Department of Justice is fair to those parties who brought the lawsuit against Microsoft in the first place. I support the settlement.

Sincerely,
Jana Kelley

MTC–00007336

From: Mike Ernest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

This private citizen wants the settlement over as quick as possible. I do agree with Apple contention that the proposed settlement by MS could upset what balance exists in the educational market. This should be watched very carefully.

Michael V. Ernest, Sr.
2014 Rockwell Avenue
Catonsville, Maryland 21228–4218
Tele: (410)–747–1437
e-mail: mveble@erols.com

MTC–00007337

From: Microchair@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept of Justice:

You should be ashamed of yourself using taxpayers money to persecute Microsoft! They, almost single handedly, are responsible for an unprecedented boost to the American economy in the 1990s. No one, including the government, came to their start-up and offered financial assistance; they did it on their own! Now, you wish to penalize them for their success, even though they took ALL the initial risks and weathered all of the growing pains of any start-up company. Have any of you calculated how well your retirement investments did in the 90s as a result of Microsoft's bold innovations? What about the quality enhancements to your workplace? Get this over with! Leave Microsoft alone! Let other companies use the same innovations to try to compete with Microsoft, just as Microsoft did to compete with the pre-existing giants (IBM, HP, and others).

Michael Norgard,
Plano, Texas

MTC–00007338

From: james arnstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:03pm
Subject: Comments on the Microsoft Case

Dear Sir,

I think that after 4 years Microsoft has paid its dues and should return to ''business as usual.'' It seems the 9 states that have not agreed to settle their disputes with Microsoft will never be satisfied with any decision short of breaking up Microsoft in their own petty ways. To allow a ''stripped down'' version of Windows to be available, would be like buying a Mercedes with just the shell and the motor and allowing some other company to build the remaining components of the car. The nine states are acting in their own self interest and at the expense of the consumer and Microsoft. They need to get on with the ''lives.''

James Arnstein

MTC–00007339

From: McDonaldMoses@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully agree that the agreement reached is fair. This litigation has gone on far too long. It is fair to all concerned and should be settled now.

Louis R. Mc Donald

MTC–00007340

From: Martin Runyan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to support the settlement that has been reached between the DOJ and Microsoft. I believe it to be a balanced and fair solution to a difficult problem. I am also writing to encourage a speedy conclusion to this matter. I believe our economy will be seriously harmed if this issue continues to burden our technology sector with uncertainty and doubt.

Martin E. Runyan
Nokomis, Florida

MTC–00007342

From: DSmith9336@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ folks,

I would like to express my opinion re the case against Microsoft and the settlement you and some states have reached. First of all, I do not think the case was justified in the first place. It doesn't seem to me that Microsoft is guilty of anything beyond trying to build better products that would most efficiently serve the vast bulk of computer users. The settlement you reached with Microsoft is far far better than your original weird ideas about breaking up the company.

I am not a lawyer but it seems very strange to me that state Attorneys General have anything to say about antitrust law. The nine non-conforming Attorney Generals should go back to dealing with state matters. The competitors of Microsoft who are asking for the government to make their life easier by punishing Microsoft should compete in the marketplace and not by lobbying you and Congress.

It is time to put this ill-advised venture behind us and move on.

Sincerely,
David A. Smith
20342 Ayoub Lane
Hagerstown, MD 21742

MTC–00007343

From: Karen Bradley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For heavens sake, please settle this dispute with Microsoft and do not let special interest groups derail the settlement.

Microsoft has done nothing but help the consumer in every way. To hurt Microsoft any more is to hurt the consumer.

Please let the settlement stand that has been agreed to.

Sincerely
Karen Bradley

MTC–00007344

From: John M. Cantey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

SETTLE ALL CLAIMS NOW!

MTC–00007345

From: ROBERT WOLFE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft should be allowed to do as it pleases.

MTC–00007346

From: g-mon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement...

I feel a settlement to the DOJ's harrasment of Microsoft Corp. is long overdue. The nine states ''holding out'' on the agreement are blatantly trying to position themselves so they can extract more ''tribute'' from MS in the future.

MTC–00007347

From: Josef Wernli
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough! There has been a time to voice grievances in court, there has been a time to reach a settlement and now there is time to move on. Litigation is not for giving competitors free entry and an edge in the market place which instead they should earn with a better mousetrap to the benefit of consumers.

I urge you to use your good judgement and powers to put a final end to this litigation and force competition to Microsoft to come up with better software.

Sincerely,
Josef Wernli
4825 Forest Avenue S.E.
Mercer Island, WA 98040

MTC–00007348

From: KPKELLY7@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:09pm
Subject: Microsoft

We have been shareholders of Microsoft for many years. The government has been unfair to Microsoft, which is the greatest company in America. We want you to settle the lawsuit and to have the Tunney Act to be enacted.

Kevin and Marjorie Kelly
1335 N. Astor Street, #3A
Chicago, IL 60610

MTC–00007349

From: Peggy Marvelle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:10pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It is imperative that the government settle this issue....it is taking up our dollars and we have more important things to be concentrating on! I hate to think where we would be without the vision of Microsoft!!

Peggy & Jerry Marvelle

MTC–00007350

From: HML101@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement...

To Whom it May Concern,

I have always thought that certain competitors of Microsoft were really trying to make life difficult and ''yes'' it is all about money. I also believe that it's time to stop this war and let Microsoft get back to doing the things it does best—or, I should say, better than anyone else. Some people have hoped to hurt Microsoft—it's time for them to get a life and let it be. I feel that some are jealous of the fact that Microsoft was able to bring so much to businesses and consumers, alike. Microsoft is really only responsible for the millions of computors now enjoyed by so many and their competitors only wish they could have done as well. Then there is also a huge amount of funds and software donated to many in need. Do we owe Bill Gates a humanitarian award—''YES''...

No Settlement Required
HML

MTC–00007351

From: COettinger@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:11pm
Subject: microsoft states suit

Dear Sirs;

I am mortified by the behavior of individual states suits, particularly the Attorney General of Connecticut. I saw an appearance he made on CNBC and was amazed at the blatant arrogance of this so called official. After the government settled the suit, how is it possible to continue legal harrassment of Microsoft? What is the motive? Greed? Notoriety? Both? The legal system is seriously flawed to permit such continued abuse of the system. No wonder lawyers have no respect.

Carl Oettinger M.D.

MTC–00007352

From: EST344@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Not being a computer expert it is my understanding that Microsoft's software enables novices like me to easily access the information they desire via the computer and the Internet by making all the different systems work easily together. If the competitor had a better product I sincerely believe that the public would had demanded it through the power of the marketplace. There are a lot of large companies in the world and they are not able to stifle competition, if anything competition makes one more perceptive to the needs of their customers and bring about innovative ideas. This is the American way of doing business. The companies that are crying foul are not little upstarts but major competitors. If the public chose Microsoft's product over theirs they just have to go back to the drawing board. I am tired of lawyers making a fortune at the expense of J. Q. Public. I think this case should be settled and that the time to do so is NOW.

Esther Tolan

MTC–00007353

From: Cathy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel the agreement should stand & this case should be closed...enough is enough...freedom to innovate is what this country is about & we need innovation now more than ever!

Cathy L. Mills
Pleasant Prairie, WI, USA

MTC–00007354

From: twickers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is unnecessary to prolong this case against Microsoft. The settlement is fair and reasonable and it would be a waste of taxpayer funds to continue to litigate. Those who press to continue the litigation appear to be competitors seeking to use the federal government as a weapon to further their own ends. Justice has been done and has been seen to be done.

Patrick Harden,
Annandale, Virginia.

MTC–00007355

From: crbasswwtx@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:11pm
Subject: Settle Microsoft Suir Quickly.
From: crbasswwtx@att.net
To: microsoft.atr@usdj.gov
Date: Thu, 03 Jan 2002 01:00:05 +0000

Dear Sir: I am concerned about a quick settlement of the Microsoft Case. I feel this should never been entered into our Judicial System. I have bought and own some ''high tech'' stocks which have suffered because of this lawsuit. I feel the quicker this suit is settled our entire markets system will move in a positive way. Hope so anyway. I feel Bill Gates made a mistake when he bragged he didn't give to a PAC. Had he taken several million to Washington DC and passed it around among the politicians this suit would never been filed. Our entire country has suffered because of an attempt to strangle free enterprise and creative development by Microsoft.

Sincerely,
C. Edward Bass, Woodway,
TX

MTC–00007356

From: RHoover478@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support Microsoft in this settlement. Please complete it.

Richard S Hoover
15405 91st Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98296

MTC–00007357

From: Steven H. Steinberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft case

It is time to settle this mess. The terms which have been worked out by the Justice Dept. and half of the States is fine. The other states can stop representing Microsoft's competition and settle. It is fair and just. Let's move on.

Steven H. Steinberg
10005 Ivybridge Circle
Louisville, KY 40241
Steven-h@home.com

MTC–00007358

From: Collins, Ned
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government should not kill successful companies, leave that to the marketplace. Settle this thing so companies can innovate, Microsoft and their competitors, without worry that the government will smash them if they are too successful.

Ned Collins,
tax payer

MTC–00007359

From: Garcand@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get this thing settled! Frankly I thought the suit was ridiculous in the first place. My opinion is that the states that brought suit were the ones who had companies within their boundaries that did not have the innovative ability to keep up with Microsoft so they compete by bringing law suits to slow down a company that does. With the economy the way it is this country doesn't need anything else to inhibit it. It is entirely possible that these suits brought by the Justice Department and the states played a big part in creating the recession we are now in. Microsoft has apparently agreed to the proposed settlement (which is unfair to Microsoft anyway) so lets settle it. Consumers have not been hurt by Microsoft's practices but I believe they have been hurt by this law suit.

Garnett Arcand

MTC–00007360

From: Jack Fenchel
To: Microsoft Monopoly, Attorney General
Date: 1/2/02 8:11pm
Subject: Microsoft

Constitution< Article > 1 >Section > 10, >1, The Constitution, is very clear and prohibits S.A.G's, from using certain powers by impairing Microsoft, Contracts. >Constitution of the United States.< >Section (10) 1, States Prohibited from exercise of certain Powers<

Hal Stratton, a former Attorney General, of New Mexico, says States, should think carefully before they branch out beyond their traditional functions. Could this be the reason Microsoft, wants a delay?

Thank you, God Bless America,
Jack Fenchel,
185 Friendship Rd.
Beaver Falls Pa. 15010

MTC–00007361

From: Marv Norman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:15pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is the public's best interest to settle the DOJ/Microsoft lawsuit. A few politically motivated Attorney General's are pushing the case in their own interests and a few Microsoft competitors are trying to use the DOJ to help them compete in the market place. This case has gone on too long and should be settled as quickly as possible. The DOJ should not be involved in the open competitive market. Microsoft has developed very significant software and the cost to the individual consumer is very reasonable. I personally continue to be amazed at the power of the Windows software and the very low price we have to pay to obtain the product. I also have no interest in ''open'' software that anyone can change. I want to know that I can open letters and spreadsheets and rely upon the programs working correctly. I also have no interest in having the Windows operating system separated from my internet browser. I want them to work together and I want to be able to call one company if there is a problem.

Please ignore Microsoft's competitors in this issue and also please ignore the nine Attorney General's who are trying to promote themselves politically. This case has been decided on a legal basis and the remedies agreed upon should be implemented so that the involved people can apply their efforts to improving the current economic situation rather than continuing to ''waste'' time rehashing the same issues.

I am not a Microsoft shareholder so I have no economic bias. I believe in the capitalistic market place and the power of competition.

Best regards,

Marv Norman

MTC–00007362

From: Plastxdoc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

One can look at the stock market crash and time it from the beginning of the Justice Department's public attempt to dismantle Microsoft. By the time you are done torturing this company Aol/Time Warner will be a larger monopoly. The local environment will disappear with time. Please stop wasting taxpayer's money and allow the technology sector to flourish. Accept the settlement. Let's move on.

Richard J. Greco

MTC–00007363

From: JOHN (038) SUSAN DE WOLF
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is Enough! Please settle this suit and let Microsoft get on with their business and their competitors get back to developing competitive software. The competition to Microsoft is spending too much time constraining Microsoft who has made computers widely used by a large portion of our population.

John T. DeWolf
StorrsDeWolf@worldnet.att.net

MTC–00007364

From: Jkearney19@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:16pm
Subject: re: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my strong desire to see the US government case against Microsoft settled as quickly as possible, and in accordance with the DOJ's most recent settlement. To allow the nine holdout states to inflict any more damage on what arguably has been the engine for the phenomenal growth of the high tech industry would be a travesty, and wholly unwarranted. The marketplace is unforgiving to undercapitalized or less innovative companies. Virtually every industry started out as somebody's idea, only to be improved upon and bettered by somebody else. This is true of Microsoft as well. As you can see I am using AOL to send this message. I, like many others used to use lotus 123 but discontinued as Microsoft excel surpassed it in functionality. I assure you that had lotus continued to improve as rapidly as Microsoft, they would be dominant. Moreover, I followed the case throughout and was amazed at the ignorance of the trial judge. A non user of high tech products cannot possibly determine how easy, or difficult it is to install other software, especially when that software is superior. As to monopoly, I can only imagine the chaos that would surround multiple operating systems. Eventually, the market would force one to be superior. Changing systems is not as easy as buying a different car.

For full disclosure, I own Microsoft stock but also have owned Oracle, Cisco and other high tech stocks, including some of the competitors that have fueled the drive to cripple Microsoft. Unfortunately, the overly ambitious attorney's generals of the holdout states (Iowa and my home state of Connecticut are the worst offenders) have viewed this as an opportunity to increase their own profiles for purely political reasons. I find it appalling that this case continues to drag on. Worse still is the naked grab by the European Union's Mario Monti to bring the same charges to further cripple this great company that has done so much good for the USA.

The precedents being set here will be felt, unfortunately, for years to come unless the DOJ, once and for all, ends this now. I urge you to let stand the current settlement offer to be put into effect and tolerate no further action against Microsoft.

Thank you very much for your consideration in allowing this citizen to express his views.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Kearney

MTC–00007365

From: PoolQ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:19pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

The last thing this country needs is more litigation by the govt. It seems like a personal vendatta. Let the best products prosper, and remember that there are a zillion software companies and start-ups.

J. Pool

MTC–00007366

From: Rosemary Brant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:19pm
Subject: settlement

Dear Sir,

I do believe the settlement already reached with microsoft, though tough ,is fair and reasonable. I see no further need to debate these issues. It is only punishing the consumer.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Brant
New Orleans, LA

MTC–00007367

From: George G. Morano, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case quickly. The last thing we need is more litigation to keep the lawyers ''fat'' especially in these uncertain economic times. Please get the economy rolling by ending this case.

Margie Morano
Cincinnati, OH

MTC–00007368

From: ONEFASTED@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:20pm
Subject: Settlement

I am very satisfied with the settlement offer made by Microsoft.

MTC–00007369

From: Keith Saville
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:20pm
Subject: Settlement

To those concerned—Lets get out of Microsoft's hair. Just because they have worked hard made good money, donated a lot of money as well computer programs, some of you are still jealous of what they have done and want more out of them. Give the other states 30 days to accept or they will lose out altogether.

I am a small entrepreneur that went out and started a business back in 1985 and withstood all the laughs and people making fun of me. Now those same people are jealous and complain how I have it made. They did not see the 16hr days I put in for about 12yrs to get where I am.

I'm sure Bill did the same thing, and many business places snickered at him. Now they are upset and want a part of his prosperity for nothing. So let him go, he earned every penny he has made. He pays some nice taxes. He gives to a lot of places. He's not on drugs, so leave him alone.

Yours truly
Keith F. Saville
Grafton, ND 58237

MTC–00007370

From: DONALD ALLEN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I followed this case closely, with a question in my mind at all times. I couldn't understand why a few States were taking the company with the greatest brilliant minds, all

with an innovative and understanding look into the future, to court! I know a little about monopolies, and how they do try to eliminate competition, but in the history of Microsoft, how many avenues of further research into new areas were created by their brilliance? Many new companies exist today, due to Microsoft.

The deciscion was as fair as the courts could allow without admitting they were wrong for allowing this case to begin!

Donald D. Allen

Oakdale Cal.

MTC–00007371

From: Jeanne Velie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I feel that the government is persecuting Microsoft. If the government has so much money to spend prosecuting Microsoft because they think it is a monopoly, why don't they go after the Power and Light Companies, Cable Companies and Municipal Water Plants in the Midwest also??? We have but one choice for either—and every year their costs go up—(if public, they call for a public hearing (of which no one shows up, because they know it won't matter)) they get a raise... Why don't they have to cut costs like everyone else? Why is it that these kind of companies can be the sole provider in the area and raise rates and the government doesn't intervene there, but spends millions going after a company like Microsoft???

I think if the Federal Government has that much extra money, they should send it down to the State and Local Governments to relieve the little person's tax burden and stop spending it going after Microsoft...

A concerned citizen

MTC–00007372

From: GDPUCK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like the chance to voice my opinion on the DOJ vs Microsoft case. I feel that this is a frivolous case. That the government could have spent their money wisely going after a real issue. I feel that Microsoft is being picked on just because they are the industry leaders. They should be free to innovate because that's supposed to be the American way. However, the federal government always seems to step on the toes of progress. Bill Gates and Microsoft are what makes computing easy for the everyday consumer...Windows is a wonderful thing....Just because they pack their browser and other features is irrelevant. The consumer can always opt to change to other software. The consumer knows what he is getting when he/she buys it...Stop picking on microsoft...As far as I am concerned, The judge that overheard the case should be removed from the bench for making such an ignorant decision and speaking out when he shouldn't have...Total incompetence....Let Microsoft be the innovator's that they are and the personal computing experience will always be great.

MTC–00007373

From: DSDuerson@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There is absolutely no question that CA's continued attack on Microsoft is a political ploy which the politicians will persue hoping that it can be used in some way to distract the voters from the unbelievable fiscal mess they have gotten the State into. As a senior citizen who has paid his dues and has profound respect for those who ''bust their hump'' to develop something great. Because of their success they become the target of specious law suits by political hacks trying to make a name for themselves. I am better off and so is the Country because Microsoft had the initiative to forge ahead in the computer industry—maybe these protagonists would rather China or Japan had taken this leadership role. Please press forward with a settlement that is not a prejudicial judgement against American initiative.

D.S. Duerson

MTC–00007374

From: SCTWO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case and allow Microsoft to continue its innovations in the computer software arena. We don't need more litigation!!! We believe this settlement is equitable to all parties.

Shelley Cohen

MTC–00007375

From: SUN65B@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

How about getting off Microsoft's back. Cant the Government stand people working hard to better us all. This type innovation is one of the things this country is all about. Microsoft has had to spend millions defending themselves for this useless legal action. This money could have been better spent in research, education etc.

Thanks

Bob Houdek

MTC–00007376

From: Victor Oekerman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlment

To Whom it May Concern:

As a small consumer, I feel that the settlement accepted by all parties of this date should be unanimously accepted by all jurisdictions and all States. If not, I feel that further prolonging by representatives of microsoft competitors with special intrests and representatives of other Federal Agencies with special interests will cost small consumer users too much money and will raise our operating costs too much.

Yours truly,

Victor E. Oekerman

MTC–00007377

From: GlowedCA@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:25pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It is my opinion that the proposed settlement be finalized quickly.

Gloria Rudetsky

MTC–00007378

From: William Crowder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:25pm
Subject: HEARINGS CONCERING MICROSOFT

I am writing to the Department of Justice asking that Microsoft settlement with the majority of the states be extended to the ones holding out for further penalties. There is nothing to be gained from penalizing Microsoft as the company has already agreed to a settlement which will be beneficial to a large segment of the country. Just because Microsoft has been innovative, successful, and has advanced the world of computers far beyond what one would have realized a decade ago, the company should not be punished.. It has been successful and should be allowed to continue to innovate without interference from the U.S. government. Microsoft and companies its size are a stimulus to the economy creating hundreds of jobs. I urge the Department of Justice to settle the case without further hearings and let a successful company continue to innovate. Signed: William W. Crowder, PH.D. 629 NORTH STREET, LAFAYETTE, IN 47901

MTC–00007379

From: JAMES KRALIK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern, sirs

I do not want the government interfering with private business period. Get off of Microsoft's back and do your job which is to protect us from foreign invasion NOT harass companies which employ thousands of people.

Please and Thank you

J.S. Kralik

MTC–00007380

From: Eugene Gordon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a user of Microsoft technology for 18 years in the development of military applications as well as for my own personal needs. As an extensive consumer of Microsoft products I have never once felt that the company's business practices were financially detrimental to me. As a consumer the DOJ settlement seems to me to be a fair disposition of the issues involved. Further penalizing Microsoft, as their competitors and the few remaining states wish to do, is neither in the interest of the U.S. economy nor the consumers.

Eugene S. Gordon

E-Mail Address: ggord@msn.com

MTC–00007381

From: joanne reiss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:25pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please put an end to this litigation by accepting the agreement reached by nine states and the Federal Government. I believe the settlement is fair and in the best interest of consumers like myself. Microsoft has done nothing but help the consumer by making computing more accessible and easier to use. Not only has this lawsuit hurt the economy but it in no way represents fairly the opinion of consumers. Tell the competitors to stop whining and get on with their business. Personally I feel that the start of this ridiculous lawsuit was the beginning of the spiral downward of our stock market and economy.

Joanne Reiss

MTC–00007382

From: MTEMosey@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

PLEASE..LET US SETTLE IT ALL UP WITH AND FOR MICROSOFT AND THE PUBLIC..THANK YOU MOZELLE SIMS

MTC–00007383

From: D (038) J Murdach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:28pm
Subject: Gentlemen: Please approve the proposed settlement with Microsoft . It is in the best interests of

Gentlemen: Please approve the proposed settlement with Microsoft . It is in the best interests of the country. David Murdach at dmarly@qwest.net

MTC–00007385

From: Craig Goddard
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/2/02 7:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Like I said before, my business suffered the most when it looked like the DOJ was going to split Microsoft into two companies.

Since the lastest good news that the Federal Gov't was not going to break up Microsoft, has my company began to prosper.

I sincerely believe that my business will really take off after the nine states settle. Whatever it takes!!

Thank you

Craig Goddard Sr. Developer

Goddard Professional Software

Engaged in Designing and Developing Web, Distributed & Desktop Business Solutions

cgoddard@goddard01.com

http://www.goddard01.com <http://www.goddard01.com/>

<http://www.goddard01.com/>

MTC–00007386

From: BirdieGeo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We agree with the settlement

George and Burdena Pasenelli

13926 212th Dr. NE

Woodinville WA 98072

MTC–00007387

From: Linda Kluthe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

It is my opinion that the Microsoft Corporation has suffered enough from all the harrassment that the government has done for the past few years. In the meantime, its competitors have laughed and gone ahead to profit while Microsoft was diverting its energies into fighting the litigation. Please assist Microsoft to settle all lawsuits in the fastest way possible, and allow them to be free to develop new software and hardware that will continue to keep the United States superior in our computer technology.

Do not punish or fine Microsoft anymore. As a consumer, I am happy with the advanced Microsoft technology that I have available to me. I want more advancements from Microsoft—do not handicap them anymore.

Sincerely, Linda Kluthe, 351 4th St., Scotland, SD 57059

MTC–00007388

From: Randy De Graaf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get on with it and settle the case for the good of everyone. I love Their software and quit bowing to the pressures of the others in the industry that appartently only want BIG GOVERNMENT to intervene every time they can't compete because of their own inability.

Thanks

Randy

MTC–00007389

From: romeosumadi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

As a desk top software user, I am supportive of the DOJ's settlement with Microsoft. I am eager to purchase my new desktop computer but unsure if further litigation will render my purchase inadequate, when future software upgrades become necessary.

I am afraid also of the heavy handedness of the numerous governmental regulations that can spill over the entire software industry, thereby limiting innovations and my choice to purchase software that is compatible with my existing systems that I already use for my small private business. Just because few states can benefit few large corporations by their attempt to inhibit Microsoft, as is the case in my own state of Massachussetts, shamefully. We in the private sector should also be heard just as well. Our message is ''litigation enriches the few at the expense of small businesses'' .

Sincerely,

Samer Sumadi

Search Tech Inds.

MTC–00007390

From: William Greensides
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hope that all goes well for you!!

Bill Greensides

MTC–00007391

From: Milton Mechlowitz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:31pm
Subject: Settle the case

It is about time that the case against MICROSOFT BE SETTLED ONCE AND FORALL so that Microsoft can go on with its bussiness.

Milton Mechlowitz

MTC–00007392

From: Donn Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ & Microsoft Settlement Judge, It will be appreciated if you will think more of our faltering U.S. economy instead of the nine states attorneys general who are running for political office by using the Microsoft Settlement as a means to obtain more media attention. Try to give these kinds of productive corporations, that are making positive contributions to our exports and balance of payments, a break, and let the politicians muddle along in their element.

Thank you,

Donn R Davis

MTC–00007393

From: Marc Lapsley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Concerned,

Microsoft has lead us to point of no return! With the tools given to us by microsoft, we have enhanced the way we live and communicate. ''Let freedom ring'' Innovation is what has taken us to the frontiers of our freedom. Why must we punish fore what we cherish?

Absolute power corrupts, I agree! How about giving me a choice in my phone and cable TV, before you bark at the dog that feeds you.

Marc Lapsley

Bellevue, Washington

MTC–00007394

From: BOCABD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:33pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Stop wasting time and settle as agreed with Microsoft; our safety and security require your complete undivided attention during these times that are lives are filled with fear from terrorism, not fear from antitrust interests.

John J. Imperial

140 S.E. Fifth Avenue

Boca Raton, Florida 33432

MTC–00007395

From: H0NDAXR600@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:35pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To whom it may concern-

I feel the settlement for this case that is currently being made is fair and just for all parties. Please let the current ruling stand. It is time we put this case behind us and let businesses continue to innovate so that our

country can continue to be the great nation that it is.

Yours Truly
Jeff Conner

MTC–00007396

From: GrahamVarmint@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's dispense with further litigation in this case, and get about the business of trying to recover from current recession. Thinking back, it was about the time of DOJ antitrust suit that economy showed signs of weakening. Enough is enough...and we've had enough. Thank you for consideration of my views. Tom M. Graham

5570 Starry Rd.
Bellingham WA 98226

MTC–00007397

From: MsGee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:36pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

i am so tired of these companies who do not put their money or assets into R & D and instead , want a company who has done just that to ''give'' them their programs so that they can either sell more computers or sell more software that doesn't even compare to what microsoft produces. They don't want to pay out their profits in excellent salaries to gain the workers they need to design new programs so that they can compete in the marketplace. I am tired, as a taxpayer, of the government and our courts allowing this nonsense to go on and on and we are paying for it along with their salaries. Find the terrorists instead. How about that as a good job for the justice dept. or at least start to amass the people needed to prosecute them. Use our government funds to prosecute them instead of Bill Gates. Most consumers would agree with me. You all know that Bill Gates certainly does not want your job or that of the President or Vice President of the United States. I believe The Justice Dept. is afraid of Bill Gates. Can't imagine why~!!

He's not interested in the kind of power that the justice department thinks is the ultimate power. He's more interested in a power (ful) computer and software. AS A TOOL and his products have begun to change the way the humans on the planet work. Let this company continue to produce top quality products. Isn't that what American Business is all about? Stop these other states cold in their tracks. they are only being paid or favors returned from the companies that are wanting Bill Gates and his company's position in business. Maybe they ought to put their money where their mouth is. What have they done lately for humanity?

The court has already spoken. Who ARE these people to want more than what has already been given up.? Why don't these poor companies just close their doors. They're not doing much of anything else except whining and crying in order to gain the courts sympathy as well as some other company's sympathies.

They would be hard pressed to produce like Microsoft, since they don't really reinvest their moneys in research and development I am very firmly committed to seeing the Anti Trust laws changed. they are out of date, and not reasonable today. This whole case , unfortunately for microsoft to be put down, has been the impetus to cause this necessary change. why doesn't the justice dept. and those other whining states work on that and put some effort along with their dollars to see that the Anti-Trust laws are changed. Now that would really be something.....

MTC–00007398

From: TxGuy55@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Please drop all charges against Microsoft and allow them to continue to provide goods and services for the general public. The company has a long history on innovations in technology and their competitors should not be allowed to cry ''foul'' just because they can't keep up.

Sincerely,
Jay Ferguson
Dallas, Texas

MTC–00007399

From: MortMagic@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:37pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I'm in favor of the settlement arranged by the Department of Justice and Microsoft. Furthermore, I feel the states that are holding out are mistaken and, in particular, that Mr. Blumenthal from CT. is serving his own political ambition for national notoriety.

Morton D,. Fisher
Fairfield CT

MTC–00007400

From: DHaug14491@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the Microsoft Settlement as it now stands is fair to all parties & should be settled once and for all...no further hearings should be necessary.

Donald R Haug
2912 23 Ave So
Fargo ND 58103
drhaug14491@aol.com

MTC–00007401

From: JCH312@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ, I think the settlement with Microsoft was unfair to Microsoft, but Microsoft agrees and you agree I strongly feel it should be accepted by all parties. I live in California and this is one state that the Atorney General will not go along with the settlement. It is well known that he has ties with the companies who started the complaints with Microsoft and now is paying a political debt. I personally feel that many people benefited from Microsofts practices. Many companies just started with the intention of being purchased by a large company like Microsoft. Is Microsoft really a bully, I do not think so. Is there any difference between Microsoft and the United States? I sincerely hope all states are forced by the DOJ to accept the settlement since you are supposed to be the speaker for the US. Lets get this mess over and not let politics continue this on and on and on.

Thank you

MTC–00007402

From: CAlderson@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft

Settle the dispute. Leave Microsoft alone.
Cheryl L Alderson

MTC–00007403

From: JanieKemp@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: I have been employed in the technology business for over thirty years as a result I wish to express my disappointment in the governments continual pursuit of Microsoft. Please put an end to the legal action. Microsoft has been a model of innovation and creating technology that is affordable to so many people.

Thanks for this opportunity to express my opinion!

MTC–00007405

From: Jwclb@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

It is hard for me to believe that some State Attorney Generals are still clinging to the hope of a BIG kill in the Microsoft Settlement. Every time I see them on TV, you immediately know by their voice and looks that they are after personal gratification and notoriety rather than for the good of the people. It is very clear that this United States of America does not need any more deterioration of our economy by these companies and individuals. I thought a settlement had been reached by the majority. The majority should rule.

Let these Attorney Generals go after the illegal immigrates that are still in this country and help out our Federal Government in getting rid of the people that have caused us great harm.

James W. Baker
543 Silver Pass
Ocala, Fl 34472

MTC–00007406

From: Walter Barzal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I've actively used a computer since 1989 and feel that Microsoft products have provided value over the years. I think I know when I'm being ripped-off, i.e. cable companies and the lack of competition and chose in that industry, and I just do not feel like I've been cheated by Microsoft.

MTC–00007407

From: Jklemm1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:41pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sir,
I believe the current settlement with Microsoft is just and in the best interest of the public. It is time to put this case to rest. Microsoft should be allowed to continue its great work.
Best regards,
John D. Klemm

MTC–00007408

From: lucianr@bellatlantic.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir/Madam:
I have followed this suit with utter amazement. I have watched over the decades as companies with robust R&D programs have shrunk, withered away and died. Microsoft is not only an important company for our economy but an important aspect of our national security. I had thought that with the Berlin Wall down that government crypto Socialism would fade away but with this law suit it is live and well. Bell Labs is almost dead, Motorola in the tank, and Universities are being asked to do industrial R&D for free while basic science is ignored. Get off Microsoft's case. Settle up and tell the States to so too. Enough of this nonsense. We have a war against terrorism to fought and an economic war for survival after that.
Microsoft is a case of a bunch of 30-somethings being stupid. Treat it this way and let us get on with things.
Lucian Russell, Ph.D.
Harvard 1965
NYU 1969
Bell Labs
Former Chief Scientist of CSC's Virginia Technology Center
Former Director of Argonne National Labs Advanced Computer Applications Center.

MTC–00007409

From: W. Roger Gehman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs,
Let's bring this fiasco to a quick end. Microsoft has contributed so very much to the digital age we live in, and this court case was unjustified to begin with. There are certainly many more serious problems facing the US and its citizens, including the war on terrorism, and re-establishing the health of our economy. Companies provide jobs, but cannot operate sucessfully, when hounded by the federal government interfering in their day to day operations.
Warren R. Gehman
126 Park Avenue
Mount Joy, PA 17552

MTC–00007410

From: Les Speiler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:41pm
Subject: Settlement
The millions and millions of dollars that were wasted on this suit and the ''BLUE STAINED DRESS'' should have been spent on trying to prevent the events of 9/11, illness cure, etc.. There really isn't anything else to say except ''GOD BLESS AMERICA'' and learn from our mistakes.
Teresa D. Day

MTC–00007411

From: Steve Orr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Let's get this issue settled Now!! To prolong the settlement is not in the best interests of the public. Some people are trying to sabotage a good company that builds products we like.
Thank you, Steve Orr

MTC–00007412

From: Richard S. Sternberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
What unadulterated poppycock in the Microsoft-written ''alert'' below! I certainly hope the Court is aware that Microsoft is placing words in the mouths of their self-created support groups.
I have no clients who have retained me to represent them on this issue, and I am speaking only for myself as a citizen, but I am firmly of the view that the proposed settlement will have serious and permanent detrimental effects on computer innovation. After proving monopoly and predatory practices, the DOJ recognizes partisanship and concedes the day, seeking to give Court sanction to the most predatory example of monopolization in U.S. history. The record demonstrates a predatory product thief which takes advantage of the glacial pace of American justice to solidify its market seizures. Worst, the effect of involving the Courts in the process of monopolization will to create a technique that will exceed the imaginations of Rockefeller or the the other robber barons' brilliant greed. Even after the effect of this settlement becomes apparent with the elimination of competitors, divestiture may be blocked by res judicata. Sadly, Microsoft will be in a better position than if they had won the trial on monopolization or if DOJ had been disbanded before it wasted millions proving monopolization. In a mistaken moment of national unity inspired by a terrifying terrorist act, the DOJ seeks to end this dispute. This resolution will cost America far, far more than the cost of a couple of WTC towers. I truly hope that the Court will reject the settlement.
— Richard S. Sternberg, Esquire
Richard@MetroWashingtonLaw.com
Metropolitan Washington Law Consortium, PLLC
Managing Principal/CEO
http://MWLC.org/
A FINFlash Alert: The DOJ wants to hear from YOU!
For nearly four years, your voice has been instrumental in the debate over the freedom to innovate. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens have communicated to their public officials about whether the Microsoft case should be settled or further litigated. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsofts competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.
However, this settlement is not guaranteed, and your voice is more important than ever. The law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the settlement is in the public interest. Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.
Dont let these special interests defeat the public interest.
Between now and January 28th, it is critical that the Department of Justice hears from you about the Microsoft settlement. The Department of Justice will then take all public comments and viewpoints and include them in the public record for the District Court to consider. Please send your comments directly to the Department of Justice via email or fax no later than January 28th. Whatever your view of the settlement, it is critical that the government hears directly from consumers. Please take action today to ensure your voice is heard.
Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov . In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.
Fax: 1–202–307–1454 or 1–202–616–9937
To find out more about the settlement and the Tunney Act comment period, go to the Department of Justice Website at:
http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm
Thanks for taking the time to make a difference.

MTC–00007413

From: Yvonne Bamford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern; In these uncertain economic times, further litigation regarding the settlement with Microsoft will only make the lawyers wealthier & take down a very important & needed company! Do we need all these companies going out of business due to prolonged & unnecessary legal haggling???
I trust that you will act in a responsible manner & let the settlement stand!!
Thank you,
Yvonne R. Bamford

MTC–00007414

From: GMRands@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlment
Dear sirs,
This is a comment time for consumers to comment on the settlement of the Microsoft case. As a tax payers we resent the huge amounts of money being spent on this

settlement. I resent the time away from business in difficult economic times that it demands from Microsoft. I want it settled as soon as possible.

Consumers need Microsoft products. We use them and need them. Please put an end to this case as soon as possible. Of course competitors want to punish their competition. Let us not fall into that trap.

Sincerely,
Marilyn and Gary Rands
15523 S. E. 46th Way
Bellevue, WA 98006
gmrands@A0l.com

MTC–00007415

From: EAnder5119@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft

Department of Justice

I just want to express my opinion re: States vs. Microsoft. Attorney of states suing are only wasting time and taxpayers money. Microsoft is entitled to innovate and profit from their skills. The economy demands that these frivolous lawsuits be finished. Many of us older folks are benefited from the ease of logging on with Microsoft. Let's get on with the show.

Erwin Anderson
Seattle

MTC–00007416

From: dave cannon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:45pm
Subject: DOJ

I want the DOJ to settle with Microsoft so that Msft can continue to innovate. This will also help to clear up a big cloud over our economy.

MTC–00007417

From: Lowell Jacobson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

CC: jacobsonlowe11@hotmail.com@inetgw

It is clear to me and to everyone I have talk with that the nine remaining states in the Settlement have personal vendettas against Microsoft. I have never seen such hatred from the likes of Larry Ellison and Scott McNealy and, to be honest, the Attorneys General remaining are only supporting companies such as Oracle and SunW, companies that cannot beat MSFT in the market place so they take it to the courts to do their dirtywork. What a shame. I strongly support MSFT in this case because I believe they are the greatest company in America and the world. They do a lot of good for our world and help us to make sense out of it. Furthermore, they provide great products at reasonable—cheap, really—prices. I guess that Scott and Larry are just poor losers. Is that what American enterprise is all about. No, I don't think so. All I can finally say is that if these remaining attorneys general are my spokespersons for fairness in the market place, we are all going to be in a lot of trouble. Get off your ''high horses'', guys. A vast proportion of Americans totally disagree with you.

Lowell Jacobson
Las Vegas, Nevada and Tokyo, Japan

MTC–00007418

From: Nick Corrado
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The federal government and nine states recently reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. As a consumer, I feel that this settlement is good for me, the industry and the American economy. I urge you to abide by this settlement.

Nick Corrado

MTC–00007419

From: stephen errico
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:46pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

this settlement is good. for the good of the country and the economy leave microsoft alone!

MTC–00007420

From: ezrider@famrc.org
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/2/02 8:48pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I support the settlement and feel the goverment has better things to do,

MTC–00007421

From: JScrna@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

As an American and knowledgeable computer user, I feel the suit against Microsoft unfounded and should be dismissed. This issue originally began due to MS competing with Netscape at a time when Netscpape had a 90+% monoply in the internet browser business and was changing $60 dollars for the Netscape and you had to pay a subcription. Began competing with Netscape and gave away its browser to the comsumer.The American consumer benefited by reducing prices and both Netscape and MS now give away their browsers to the consumer.

As for as MS forcing consumers to use Internet Explorer. Nothing could be farther from the trueth. I used Netscape prior to IE and used it after I obtained IE. I even paid Netscape for their software and subscriptions after obtaining the free IE. At no time has Windows or IE prevented me from using Netscape. In fact you can load both browsers on any IBM compatible computer and run them indepentent of eachother and run multiple windows of each simultaneously. If the computer consumer failed to realize this, its not MS's fault.

MS may be a shrewed competitor, but that is what America is about. If you look at the cost of computers, MS's software and computer software in general I cannot fathom how anyone can say MS has hurt business or the consumer. If you want to look into a monoply, check Apple out. Apple never opened their operating system to the public, where MS did.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Smith

MTC–00007422

From: Hizosh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlemant

I think that the settlement is fair. It is my belief that Microsoft is in no way harmeful to the consumer.

Thank You,
Joshua Michelman

MTC–00007423

From: Barry Stangl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this case with Microsoft. A settlement has been announced and we need to put it behind us. Do not let it drag on.

—- Barry Stangl
—- stangl@earthlink.net
—- EarthLink: It's your Internet.

MTC–00007424

From: NY...NY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:50pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It is time to settle the anti-trust case against Microsoft. This pro-long legal procedure that certain competitors and state justice departments are implementing to this case has only helped to slow down the growth of technology innovation.

MTC–00007425

From: carson mitchell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:51pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

doj, the microsoft settlement needs to be approved by the judge as its more than fair for me a user of software products, all this cost and time in court is damaging to america as that time and money desperately needs to be invested in keeping the global business and software lead here in george washington's america so we can service our massive debt load and keep an angel eye on our trade deficit as it will be less likely we will sell off to much of our great country through our trade deficit if microsoft and the governments can get on to more productive work. otherwise we will lose america's global lead to euroupe and the euro. you've taken this to far already, thanks,carson mitchell-a very concerned american co-owner!

MTC–00007426

From: Roselma L. Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:52pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please end this case, I am so tired of hearing about it.... thank you so much,

Roselma Quinn

MTC–00007427

From: Kurt Erensoy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

In 1992, I was laid off from my job at Liberty Mutual Insurance Company. I had at

that time, on my own initative and spending many long hours at home after work hours, developed for Liberty Mutual several insurance rate-quotation applications which served Liberty Mutual's sales force very well in more than a dozen states. I lost my job at Liberty Mutual because my product was in direct competition with the IS Department's mainframe software, and it felt threatened by a PC product produced outside its realm. The full force of the power of the IS Department was brought to bear against me, and I was laid off 23 days before I was eligible for full retirement benefits—23 days before I reached age 55.

Having had my fill of corporate ingratitude, I started my own software company. At that time, Microsoft's Quick Basic was available to me at almost no cost to develop my applications, and during the last 10 years Microsoft has provided to me a number of programming tools, which gave me the chance to prosper as a small software developer. I owe much to Microsoft, as do my software users who do not have the slightest idea of the role Microsoft has played in providing sophisticated programming software at such a low cost to the developer.

To me, who has experienced the backlash of producing a successful product, there are some clear similarities between my losing my job and the type of punishment Microsoft's competitors would like to mete out to Microsoft. I was punished and Microsoft stands to be punished solely on account of our success. In my case, the price paid was limited to only me and Liberty Mutual's sale force. In the case of Microsoft, the whole community of PC users is at risk at paying a price, and a heavy one it will be.

Thank you,
Kurt Erensoy
kurt@ezrater.com
EZ-RATER Systems
http://www.ezrater.com

MTC–00007428

From: Dgkolls@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get Government out of our free enterprise system and have Government focus on what it needs to do for America. Protect us from terrorism instead of trying to persecute one of America's finest companies.

Don Kollmansberger

MTC–00007429

From: JOHN R TKACH
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:54pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The microsoft settlement is good for everyone except the competitors that want something for nothing. Good work.

John R. Tkach

MTC–00007430

From: cagmp@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case and move on to catching and prosecuting the real bad guys in this world.

Michelle Primm
Cascade Auto Group Ltd

MTC–00007431

From: Al Turner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern.

I am a big fan of Microsoft products. I have found them to be of excellent quality and fairly priced. Even more important is their support. My experience with other software has been less than satisfactory. Microsoft, on the other hand, has been very helpful every time I have needed assistance. Their willingness to keep their products in use and up-to-date, often without additional cost is remarkable. Please do not penalize Microsoft for building a better mousetrap!

Respectfully,
Albert C. Turner
28101 SW Mohave Terrace
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070–9257
alturner@hevanet.com

MTC–00007432

From: CBlech@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:54pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

SETTLE NOW AS IT SERVES MANY PUBLIC INTERESTS. Litigation only serves the attorneys and special interests. Let us help and educate our youth with little cost to the taxpayers. Our federal dollars should be used for HOMELAND SECURITY !!! God bless America and capitalism.

Let competition and innovation be the driving forces and not special interests.

CC:MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00007434

From: lange-ho
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:54pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I strongly urge the Department of Justice to accept the settlement offered by Microsoft for the good of all consumers and for the good of the economy as a whole.

Sincerely, Gary C. Lange, a concerned citizen and consumer. 2903 N.E. 37th Place, Yarrow Point, Wa. 98004

MTC–00007435

From: Casey Ceponis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:57pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

If Micrsoft gets away with this, and on the present course, it seems that way, the average citizen will not help but think he's been abandoned by the Megopolis of Microsoft and their 'apparent' influence over Government. I believe the average guy will apply the rule of what's reasonable from this and loose respect for the lawful settlement of such issues. this will be an irreversible trend and things such as piracy will mushroom. Don't reward them for clearly breaking the law!!

Casey Ceponis
240 Hampton Ct.
Palatine, IL 60067

MTC–00007436

From: Rex Bloom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My comments on the Microsoft Case:

If Microsoft believes that they are not a Monopoly in the OS industry, then some investors (or microsoft themselves) should put up some money and invest in a new company to develop a competing OS. (like BEos tried to do). This new company would create a NEW Os and then we could determine if a monoply exists.

Rex (rex@rexbloom.net)

MTC–00007437

From: Joseph F Donahue
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:57pm
Subject: Microsoft case

This case should have been settled years ago.

MTC–00007438

From: Barry McColeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

I appreciate the chance to let my voice be heard. I am very happy with the proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft. I feel that this case never should have been brought but in the interests of both parties I feel that the proposed resolution is fair to both sides. Thank you again for letting me voice my opinion.

Barry McColeman

MTC–00007439

From: DANTE6249@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This has been going on long enough. Settle the case now before you hurt our economy further. Microsoft and the country have been punished enough let's it get it over for the good of all.

MTC–00007440

From: Carmine Rizzo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement was unjust. Microsoft has been treated unfairly and innovation will be stopped if government activities continue. You broke up Ma-Bell and my phone bill increased 400%. Is this your help for Microsoft, going to give me the same justice if so, NO Thanks!

MTC–00007441

From: TheSiys@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:59pm
Subject: Litigation

As a concerned citizen of the on-going litigation, I say enough is enough. We are choking ourselves and our country's welfare by the trial lawyers, who to me are the ones benefiting from this litigation. It's just plain simple fact that we are killing our country's progress with numerous and unreasonable lawsuits. We wasted a lot of resources and energy to a point to being unproductive. This

is the last thing we need during this time of economic crisis.

MTC–00007442

From: E. R.James
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

The following is a copy of an email that I sent to our California Attorney General. When I read in the paper that Oracle had given him $20,000 for his election I was quite bothered because I just don't agree with the states that are still out there trying to get more from MS then already agreed to by the DOJ. I'll quote a little from the San Diego Union dated 11/11/01. ''But Lockyer has a built-in bias against the software maker, which still remains one of America's five most-admired companies, according to Fortune magazine.''

Ernie James
erjames1@home.com

Sir:

I had no intention of writing this message, but, when I found out that you had a genuine conflict of interest in the Microsoft case and you are willing to spend up to and maybe more than $4,000,000 of our money to 'get' Microsoft, I was astounded. To think that Oracle has bought you for a mere $20,000 is a shock to say the least.

If the Federal Government could reasonably settle the matter, why won't Oracle and Sun Microsystems?

You owe the people of California an explanation of why you should not recuse yourself from further action in this legal matter.

E. R. James

MTC–00007443

From: Dennis Librandi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Microsoft built the better mouse trap and a few companies are crying because they did not. I have a choice of OS to use. Settle and move on to bigger fish like GE (GE Medical Systems holds a gun to the head of every hospital in the country when it comes to their service—now that is antitrust at its finest).

Dennis C. Librandi
3108 Blakeney Court
Clemmons, NC 27012
(336) 712–9331

MTC–00007444

From: Richard W Carr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it's about time to stop spending the taxpayers money to satisfy a few whining competitors of Microsoft. If these people want to compete, let them write some better software or build some better hardware, then they too, can be sued by some of their competitors for doing a better job.....Enough is enough.....Richard W. Carr

MTC–00007445

From: GDBWTHU2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Department of Justice,

Please settle the Microsoft Antitrust Suit as soon as possible. I also would like you to put some Federal pressure on the states that are choosing not to be a part of the settlement. Their choice to pursue further litigation is not what our country and it's citizenry need. I work for the telecommunications industry and went through the AT&T breakup. The industry has been in chaos ever since. If the Microsoft settlement is not approved, then you can expect the choice of a Microsoft divestiture to create the same effect on the computer industry. I implore the Justice Department to vote for an immediate settlement and to encourage all the states to do the same.

Thank you for your time, and God bless America.

Kevin Smith
GdBWthU2@aol.com

MTC–00007446

From: BigFish63@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is fair. We need to get on with business.

Mariann Fisher

MTC–00007447

From: Bob Bernard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We feel the settlement is fair and should stand !

Bob & Sally Bernard

MTC–00007448

From: JOEYWAS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

Let freedom ring and let's get our country back on track with more important things than shooting another corporation in the foot! May be they, you the Government, should go after the alcohol companies, they seem to kill a-lot of people every year!???

Sincerely,
Joseph John Fields

MTC–00007449

From: Ben Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:04pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I firmly agree that this case should be settled now. It's a disgrace that any company is penalized for being very innovative and progressive. If you can't compete, then get out of the game. In sports the #1 team always wins and this is never decided by a bunch of money hungry lawyers.

golfbum77

MTC–00007450

From: Amelia Blyden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: The Department of Justice

As an interested and concerned citizen, I am pleased that the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I agree that settlement is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy.

Amelia E. Blyden

MTC–00007451

From: Alk1942@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I believe it is in the best interest for our country and for all concerned parties that this settlement concludes at the earliest time possible. To continue litigation, would only serve a few select individuals and companies. It is not in the best interest for the american public or for business to continue this, as it has been decided by the courts and by several states to conclude this antitrust suit.

Thanks, Arthur Kindred Alk1942@aol.com

MTC–00007452

From: lange-ho
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:06pm
Subject: Micresoft Settlement

I strongly urge the Department of Justice to accept Microsoft's proposal for the good of the consumer and for the good of the economy. sincerely, Gary C. Lange, a concerned citizen.

9210 N.E. 37th Place, Yarrow Point, Wa. 98004

MTC–00007453

From: Redmund Sum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I am very pleased with the Department of Justice's change of stance on the Microsoft Antitrust case. The previous posture of the DOJ, prior to the Appeals Court ruling was blatantly anti-business and anti-consumer and merely served the interest of Microsofts competitors, and in my view, the resume of the federal prosecutors and state attorney generals and their lawyers.

Not a legal professional myself, I would think that the Governments job is to make sure that competition is possible, but not to guarantee that any competitor, or group of competitors, is successful, or even viable. Success and failure should be determined by the buying decisions of computing public.

Respectfully,
Redmund Sum

MTC–00007454

From: Jeff Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I will be brief as I expect you have more than a little bit of correspondence to review.

Please accept the proposed settlement as being in the public interest. *Microsoft (and

its stockholders) have already been punished terribly. The 75% loss to shareholder value caused by the initial judgment preceded all of the dot com problems (perhaps even triggered them). This loss represents tens of billions of dollars- certainly more than any reasonable fine.

*It seems that the only states that didn't join in on the settlement are those that have significant potential upside if fines are levied against Microsoft (Utah and California are the most notable since Utah is the home of Novell and California is the home of Oracle, Sun and others). I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who stated that a democracy will fail as soon as its constituents realize they can vote money in to their individual pockets.

*The forced release of Microsoft's source code and other intellectual property would be nothing less than robbery. It seems extremely odd to me that any company would be expected to make a product that works with products from another company. I don't see Ford being forced to provide detailed specifications of the bolts they use to allow BMW to make replacement steering wheels for the Taurus.

*Netscape's success in the market place (as demonstrated by AOL's purchase of them for an amount in excess of a billion dollars as well as by number of downloads) clearly demonstrates that innovation is possible even when Microsoft is a dominant player in the market. AOL has over 100 million users, their Instant Messaging product has a considerably higher user count that Microsoft's product and yet these companies still cry foul.

*Sun's Scott McNealy has gone on record as saying he is happy to use the legal system for competitive advantage against Microsoft. To allow that is to suggest that the checks and balances we have in place are merely window dressing for corporate agenda's and other politicking.

*Windows XP demonstrates clear innovations in areas of usability (help messages in clear English, task oriented support, context sensitivity), stability, recoverability (system state restore, user migration, system file protection) as well as the innovations with middleware. It is on the whole of these merits—not on predatory practices—that Microsoft receives accolades on their product and solid market share.

Please let us move on from this- for the sake of the stockholders, the users in general and all of us who do not want to see the self-righteous, indignant few demonstrate that it is easier to litigate and lobby than to make a better product of their own and in so doing prevent a real innovator from continuing to provide quality product.

Thank you in advance for what I am certain will be a fair judgment based on all relevant facts.

Yours truly,

Jeffrey S. Williams, MBA/TM

MTC–00007455

From: Cittidad@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:07pm
Subject: MICRSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear sirs.

In my opinion MS should not be found guilty of any crime. Without their enginuity this country would be years behind where we are now.

I feel the case should be settled without sanctions which upset the companies function,

Sincerely

John G Citti

MTC–00007456

From: Bmail123@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled without further litigation. Our economy is suffering because of all of this.

MTC–00007457

From: Ruthanna Wolf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly think that the Microsoft settlement was harsher than it should have been ... but we will live with it. Please do all you can to ensure that M/S is able to continue their innovations in the future—as a computer professional since 1963 I am aware of the advantage that has been delivered to users through their developments.

Ruthanna Wolf

Whittier, CA

MTC–00007458

From: DALNNA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please settle the Microsoft suit. It has gone on long enough. Thank you.

Dale Petty. Microsoft stockholder.

MTC–00007459

From: EPDeTray@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:08pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please hurry this settlement along. As a small business owner for 40 years, and having to learn and try to work through numerous obsolete computers and programs, including an IBM system 32 and other languages that could only work on their own companies hardware, talk about tying and unfair business practices. Thank Bill Gates and friends for getting one language adopted so we could buy any machine and any program we wanted too, for work or at home.

Thank You

Paul DeTray.

MTC–00007460

From: Russ Strilowich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time we all move on with this issue. The settlement reached between the government and Microsoft is more than fair and for the publics welfare. To prolong this matter any longer can only hurt all parties involved.

Russ Strilowich

MTC–00007461

From: Mark Blackham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this lawsuit by accepting the settlement with microsoft. this is a fair and equitable way to end the dispute. it also allows microsoft to continue to conduct its business. thanks.

Mark Blackham

MTC–00007462

From: Kim Newlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe this is a very fair settlement and now we can go on with our lives. I believe this has been a hindrance to our economy by holding back Microsoft. Thanks for a chance to comment.

Kim Newlin

MTC–00007463

From: Rodney M. Wren, II
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe enough is enough. The anti-Microsoft case has gone long enough and cost me enough money to try, both in taxes and money paid to Microsoft for their defense. The whole question is one of competence. No other company has come anywhere close to producing quality software that Microsoft has. I have tested other operating systems (Unix, Linux and OS2) none compare. I have used other office products (Lotus 1–2–3, Wordstar, Wordperfect and Star Office), again none compare. I have used other Web browsers (Netscape, Juno and AOL), a third time none compare.

I believe I have made my case.

Rodney M. Wren, II
17621 S.E. 30th Avenue
Summerfield, FL 34491–7519
Land: (352) 307–9616
Cell: (352) 207–5547
Fax: (352) 245–8278
rodney@rodrox-consultant.com
CC:MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC–00007464

From: Norman Meyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:10pm
Subject: To anyone concerned:

To anyone concerned:

A number of us here in St. Cloud, Mn. feel Bill Gates is the Patron Saint of Computers. Before Windows, if you had a computer it was almost impossible to find someone to assist you with a computer problem. Now, with the majority of computer users using Windows, help is often just a question away, by phone or in person. And that Windows is priced today at inflation adjusted prices, less that when first introduced.

Those of us that help in the Computer Lab at the Senior Center, here in St. Cloud, often comment about life before Windows and how much easier it is now for us because Windows incorporates many applications and that those applications work well together. We say, ''many cheers for Microsoft.''

Regards,

Norm Meyer

MTC–00007465

From: Cindy Rotblat
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Bravo! Finally a decision has been reached! The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. I support the the recent decision which was handed down to Microsoft.

Cindy Rotblat
Cindy Rotblat
NIE Coordinator
The Journal-Standard
P.O. 330
Freeport, Illinois 61032
(815) 232–0141
rotblat@worldnet.att.net

MTC–00007466

From: Marlin E. Parbs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I am writing to you in regards to whether the Microsoft case, should be settled, or further litigated. I think it should be settled and be done with! Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the federal government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. This settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy.

Unfortunately, a few special interests are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and/or lawyers, and stifles innovation. If someone out there thinks that there is or ought to be a better operating system or software, let them get off their duffs and write the code for it, instead of trying to ride the coat tails of a successful corporation.

Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest.

I would venture an opinion that the 9 states that are hanging out, are more jealous than anything else, or have other special interests, directing their actions to prolong the settlement. Let's get this over and let the economy start a recovery.

I don't remember as a consumer, contacting an attorney to represent me in this law suit and they are saying that they are protecting the consumer. I say ''HOG WASH''!! If we didn't like what Microsoft was doing, we would vote with our wallets, and not buy.

I think we all out to sue Ford for not letting us get Chevrolet equipment in our new car or vice versa. You can imagine all the law suits that could ensue, as they have a monopoly on what things go in our vehicles. What about cable internet? I have only one choice where I live, why not multiple choices.

Please do prove the ''age old adage'' of ''Common Sense isn't Common'' and settle the suit.

Thank you for listening!
Marlin E. Parbs

MTC–00007467

From: ElmorinPD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that Microsoft has done nothing wrong—only used smart business practices. I think the states are wrong to pursue the ''punishment:'' of Microsoft. I think consumers will benefit from what Microsoft is doing. The states are wasting our money by pusuing action against them. It is TIME to let go

Elaine Leib
37789 Medjool Ave]
Palm Desert, CA 92211

MTC–00007468

From: Robert Nelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Greetings,

As a data processing professional who has been in the field for over 30 years, I maintain that these charges should have never been brought against Microsoft. Their success is due to the quality of their products, and companies who could not meet their excellence, such as Sun Microsystems, and especially Oracle, have spent great sums of money to harm Microsoft.

I dare say that if Oracle or Sun had their e-mail exposed the way that Microsoft did, the Microsoft ''evidence'' would look comparatively timid.

The only purpose that damages against Microsoft can possibly serve is to raise the prices of their excellent software, and their integration methods, which are much like those in use by IBM and Sun Microsystems.

Your actions could set our endeavors back, as well as every other company in the United States, and cost us a great deal of money over time.

Please do not harm Microsoft. Please do not punish them for being the best of breed.

Bob Nelson
Adventek, Inc.
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

MTC–00007469

From: SharonTomG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like the Microsoft Issue settled as soon as possible. I do not think it should be dragged on any longer. Finish it.

MTC–00007470

From: Mhm7nt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my belief that the Microsoft case should be settled with the federal government and all of the states involved. It is a tough, but good, settlement that is in the best interests of all concerned and especially beneficial to the consumer.

It is time to celebrate the survival of innovation and realize the benefits to everyone, especially future generations. Thank you for considering my opinion.

Sincerely,
Marilyn
H. Moore
mhm7nt@aol.com

MTC–00007471

From: R0004@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:12pm
Subject: Settlement

I am tired of the department of justice trying to ruin a great American company. You have reached a fair settlement—its time the attorney general tell the states to settle their further claims. Its bad for business and bad for America.

Richard Commerford
4744 NW 96 Drive
Coral Springs Fl 33076

MTC–00007472

From: Paul White
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to go on record as favoring the Microsoft Settlement as it now stands.

Paul D. White
8761 E Briarwood Blvd
Englewood, CO 80112
01/02/02

MTC–00007473

From: Jeff Dennison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the current settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case is more than adequate and should be completed and closed as soon as possible.

Regards, Jeff Dennison

MTC–00007474

From: Gail Kroon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs: It is time that this judgment is settled for the good of the economy and the country. The settlement is a fair one.

Francis and Gail Kroon

MTC–00007475

From: Dr Whom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Please settle with Microsoft and go after some real criminals.

Thank you, Monty Johnson

MTC–00007476

From: A(038)H van Wyk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please ensure that this issue is settled swiftly. I do not think that prolonging matters will serve my well in my capacity as a consumer in these uncertain times. I urge you to implement the settlement as it stands as a fair and reasonable measure.

Thank you

Andre van Wyk
St. Pierre

MTC–00007477

From: Dale Caughey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Several Attorneys Generals are acting as agents for AOL and Sun Microsystems. They seek to establish an uneven field tilted their way.

Mr Ashcroft should crack his whip and exert his influence to disrail this effort. This is a federal matter, and states have no power in these matters, so it would seem.

I use AOL everyday, but, let's get on with it. If SUN and AOL are feeling the heat, have their AG tell them to make better products.

Dale Caughey

MTC–00007478

From: Arbo7407@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in support of the settlement. I would appreciate ALL states and the Federal Government stop this harassment of an American Company. I do NOT understand why anyone would try to hinder Microsoft from adding free enhancements in their operating system. It seems as though the State and Federal Governments would rather have the consumer pay for everything. I can assure you that when a software designer creates a better operating system than Microsoft, I will be the first in line to purchase the product.

Allen Niesyto

MTC–00007479

From: tony corrado
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:18pm
Subject: The continued persecution of Microsoft

Will you please end this wasting of public monies!!! enough is enough!!! Settle this and be done with it ... Spend your time more wisely, protecting the country from the Evil Doers, end their money laundering, Protect the country!!! Stop bothering Microsoft about this, It's gone on long enough!!! Tony

Corrado 74–19 260th st Glen Oaks, ny 11004

MTC–00007480

From: don sawhill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:18pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I believe it is important to settle the Microsoft case in order that the company may get back to business. If successful businesses are dragged into court by their less successful competitors simply because of envy, America's businesses will all suffer. Please let the greedy state attorneys general

Know that they must accept the federal decision and allow businesses to continue to provide the best products which we consumers will gladly purchase.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
Don Sawhill
dsawhill1@earthlink.net

MTC–00007481

From: Pat and Gene Keller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. It is rediculous that this pursuit of Microsoft is still going on. It does nothing for anyone except lawyers and should be stopped now!

P.A. Keller

MTC–00007482

From: rcw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please settle this now! The entire suit was crazy to begin with.!

MTC–00007484

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft ATR,rremington@webtv.net@inetgw
Date: 1/2/02 9:20pm
Subject: The Merrimac Coup

The Merrimac Coup was described in a recent Bridge column in the Los Angeles Times. Basically designed as a way to prevent escape, the US Navy sunk one of their ships, the Merrimac, in a Spanish harbor, preventing Spanish ships from leaving.

The Merrimac telephone exchange was located in Chicago on the near North Side around Central and North Avenues. The White Cap Company, where my father was employed, had a main telephone number of ME–7–2000, before 3 digit area codes, digital ESS systems, and other telecommunications advancements were implemented.

The White Cap Company was acquired by Continental Can years ago, leaving most of the White Family management in place, providing Continental board member privileges to Robert White, president of White Cap. Stock & cash payments to the family may have been invested with others in land & other assets. I believe the Irish-American origin White family has been honored in the LA Times and parent Chicago Tribune Corporation via the Sports pages and others in coded messages for years.

Most recently, with the changing of the Irish football coaching guard at Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana, and the preceding resume fiasco with Notre Dame's one week coach (former San Diego assistant coach), the Tribune / Times editors have been working overtime on creative writing endeavours. The coded messages in the Bridge column may provide a strategy for family / corporate assets interested in repositioning themselves. ''Sinking'' the Merrimac may be a quasi-governmental or PAC investment code, defining a ''scuttle'' of a disposable piece of the fleet in order to keep opposing forces at or in their ''bay'', preventing those opposing forces from attacking other areas.

The Irish roots of Microsoft's family and leader, Bill Gates, may also be related to the issues presented in this and previous communications.

MTC–00007485

From: Dave and Nancy Haverstock, PC
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please understand that Microsoft is like the English Language. I expect any program valuable to my work to sync with my Microsoft products. I use the Microsoft operating system, Microsoft data base systems and other programs in my professional life. If other programs I use do not sync with Microsoft, they might as well be written in Greek.

Microsoft is not a monopoly or a bully. They are the inventors of a system that works for business in the USA. It is like living in a strange foreign country to think that they would be under scrutiny for their innovation and originality. Back off!!

''Mr. & Mrs. Real Estate''
The Haverstocks
RE/MAX Integrity
4710 Village Plaza Loop #200
541–342–1210 or 888–281–6344
Fax: 686–9297 Cell: 521–0211
Homes@DaveNancy.com
www.DaveNancy.com

MTC–00007486

From: Vivian R. Maines
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Department of Justice RE: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Leave things as is! NO MORE LITIGATION.

Plus, I'm all for freedom to innovate and without penalty! For out of such comes the happy consumer!!!

Vivian R. Maines
16919 S.E. 5th St.
Vancouver WA 98684
vrmaines@juno.com
CC:vrmaines@juno.com@inetgw

MTC–00007487

From: Tom Dupre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:20pm
Subject: Microsoft

1335 East 23rd Place
Yuma, Arizona 85365
January 2, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing this letter to express my satisfaction with the settlement that was reached in the antitrust dispute between Microsoft and the Department of Justice in early November. This settlement is a little harsh on Microsoft, but there is nothing that can be done about that now. Let us put this issue to rest and move on.

Microsoft has been responsible for many positive actions, and I see no need to punish a company that conducts itself in that way. They have created scholarships for college students, made computers all over the world

compatible with each other, and donated millions upon millions of dollars to various charities. Let us not forget that they have completely revolutionized the technology industry and have provided jobs to thousands and thousands of people across the globe. Let the settlement stand so Microsoft can continue helping people and the economy.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and again, please allow the Microsoft settlement to stand.

Sincerely,

Thomas Dupre

P.S. Thanks for standing strong on our second amendment rights as well. As a conservative Republican, I am proud of the job both you and the rest of President Bush's administration have done and will continue to do on behalf of our nation.

MTC–00007488

From: Verlene P. Cobb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a long-time user of Microsoft products. I do not support any additional litigation and review involving the current case against Microsoft. In my viewpoint, Microsoft does not act as a monopoly and has not kept other entrants out of the field. I work at a college that requires that Netscape be used by all employees and faculty. I access other computers at libraries and other locations that also use Netscape. Additional time, review, and/or litigation does not serve the public interest. Let's put this behind us and move forward.

Verlene P. Cobb
4481 Gin Plantation Drive
Snellville, GA 30039
770–860–0161
vcobb@campiongroup.com

MTC–00007489

From: Belinda K Bailey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough ? and the current settlement is more than enough, so just end this now move on to deal issues that really need attention. We're tired of time, etc. being wasted because of the sour grape/jealous attitudes of all the other companies who wish they were Microsoft.

belinda k. bailey
pisgah forest, nc 28768

MTC–00007490

From: RMINTZES@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It really is time to settle this thing. I personally have never felt wronged by microsoft. Every morning when I turn my computer on to check my schedule I am thankful that Microsoft software is there to get me organized. I think word is the best word processing software I have ever used and I have used a few.

Instead of persecuting one of Americas finest enterprises I think our geniuses in the Justice department should be awarding Microsoft a medal of honor for singlehandedly providing the software that keeps American business functioning efficiently.

Why is it that America always punishes its best and subsidizes its worst. If you are sucessful the IRS taxes you to death if you are stupid and get knocked up the government steps in and subsidizes your stupidity.

What are we thinking. I guess we're not and that's the problem.

All I can say is three cheers for Microsoft. If the justice dept can't do its thing in 4 years its time for them to fold the tent and go home and let honest business men tend their store.

Thank you, Microsoft

MTC–00007491

From: MIKE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just a short note to say I think the government has made a mess out of the Microsoft case. First, I think Microsoft has provided a valuable service to the consumer bringing together a line of products that work together. This certainly wasn't the case in the mid 1980's when there were vast incompatibilities between word processing, spreadsheet, and other software on the market. Microsoft's products work together very weel. I can import and export objects between files, and get things done. The consumer recognizes that and buys those products. Second, I don't think Microsoft did anything wrong, and certainly not anything that other companies have been doing for years trying to establish and keep their market. They are the premier business paradigm in the US—and we're trying to crush it. It doesn't make sense. Close the case.

MTC–00007492

From: ONSKIS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an American citizen and business owner I have been appalled at the government's prosecution of this frivilous case. The average American has disagreed with the government, look at the AT&T break-up for an example of the potential long-term harm. It appears that this break-up could result in harm to the telecommunications industry after all.

I oppose further prosecution of the Microsoft case and urge settling this case. I have voiced my opinion also to Congressman Rick Boucher D–VA directly as well. As an interesting fact, at a Q and A session of our local chamber of commerce, I requested a message to Mr. Clinton be delivered. This was to have ''hands off Microsoft'' in the defense of innovation. The entire Chamber of Commerce (100+ businesses on hand) applauded the comment and urgerd the congressman to deliver the message.

Stacy Martin
Virginia

MTC–00007493

From: Estrohome@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:27pm
Subject: (no subject)

To whom it may concern:

The Microsoft settlement has taken place, let it be. Since when do we kill our best companies. Let the settlement stand and lets go on with life.

Ronald V. Strobel

MTC–00007494

From: charles lee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:28pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH OF THE BICKERING AND IT IS TIME TO SETTLE THIS CASE WITHOUT FURTHER LAWYER WEALTH GATHERING.

CHARLES LEE
MASCOUTAH, IL 62258

MTC–00007496

From: JNDPROP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:29pm
Subject: Response for Government

To who it may concern:

I regret that Microsoft has to settle with the government at all. Somehow our government has not figured out yet that Microsoft has lead America's productivity gains for the last 20 years. Most American companies are aggressive in order to compete. I as a consumer do not feel in the least bit that I somehow have been cheated or have paid unfair prices for the goods I have received. I understand that standardization is a critical element in computing and Microsoft has lead the way for developers and computer users around the world. I am totally satisfied and look forward to their future innovations and products.

What ever settlement the government feels it must reach sould be slight and sould not inhibit innovators for doing what they do best... create great products and jobs and massive commerce for this country. Please do not loose sight of all the benefits that this nation has enjoyed as a direct result of Microsoft innovations and efforts to date.

Anything other than this acknowledgement is irresponsible and dangerous to this country's future.

Joseph N. DeNardo
Small business Owner
M.S. Public Management and Policy

MTC–00007497

From: RICHARD LANGLOIS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:28pm
Subject: microsoft

I would like to say that Bill Gates is getting the short end of the situation here. Everyone says he monopolized Microsoft. It's not our fault or Mr. Gates fault that he invented his system and its better than anyone elses. I feel that everyone should look at the donations he has made over the years and congadulate him on the good he has done and what he has contributed to the technology industry instead of this so-called negative news about this genious. He's a human being like us and as far as I'm concerned he's a very good american citizen and the greatest inventor of technology. There's more important things going on in this world that need adressed beside this. Get everyones money back from

ENRON who got ripped off and get the men ivolved and put them in prison for life and concentrate on our WAR EFFORTS OVERSEA.

RICHARD G. LANGLOIS

MTC–00007498

From: Monte E. Rudd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If it ain't broke don't fix it!!! Leave Microsoft alone!!! Microsoft has done more for the people of America, in 5 seconds, than all municipal, county, state, and federal government agencies have since the signing of the United States Constitution!!! So, BACK–OFF!!!

Monte & Barbara Rudd & Family
3685 W. 3650 S.
Hooper, Ut. 84315–9330

MTC–00007499

From: james.friar@idcchina.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am in favor of ending any further litigation concerning the Microsoft case. The terms reached seem fair and equitable to the consumer and to Microsoft. I believe that it is my best interest to halt any further expenditure of tax payer money in pursuit of any other judgments against Microsoft.

Kind Regards
James and Ethel Friar

MTC–00007500

From: Tulita Owen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir or Madam:

I would hope that by now the DOJ understands the nature of the suits brought against Micrsoft. They were designed to break a company not because of monopoly but because someone designed and brought to fruition an exceptional series of products. Those creations brought out jealousy.

America has always been about building a 'better mousetrap'. Please settle this nonsense so that Microsoft can continue to do the things it does well. For what it is worth, I use both Micrsoft and Apple operating systems; each has its merits, and, as a teacher, I'm grateful to have access to both.

Sincerely,
Tulita P. Owen
3677 Guernsey Avenue
Memphis, TN 38122

MTC–00007501

From: DELBERT BLACK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:28pm
Subject: Settlement, Microsoft

The settlement was probably fair, but I'm not sure that there should of been any charges to begin with.

This nation is so much better off with what Microsoft has done in the software area. We as a nation should not try and stop progress, and let a foreign nation get ahead of us. I feel that the only thing that should of happened was Microsoft be told to stop using certain tactics. The thought of breaking up the company was politically motivated, and a lack of concern for this nation.

Thanks for taking time to read this.

Del Black

P.S. A company that has hurt a lot of people and has a monopoly is Tyson Chicken they have broke a lot of chicken farmers. That is a company that should be broken up, they have done nothing to help this country.

MTC–00007502

From: Susan Levy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

settlement is a good option. Microsoft is a good company—they put customers #1. Through work I was in a PUP program and had previously purchased a Microsoft product at the normal retail price. The Office Package I ordered thru the pup was less than that price but included the software I had purchased. Microsoft refunded the product I had purschased retail saying'' our motto is to keep our customers happy''. Other companies should learn from Microsoft. Where would personal computers be today if not for the integration and ease of use Microsoft has provided.

MTC–00007503

From: Ray Stanke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My concern is NOT having a proper standard to operate a computer properly. I believe the 9 diehard reps that want Microsoft's blood are dangerous people and vindictive. The settlement as proposed should stand as is.

I went through the period of non-standard computer accessories, as well as computers, and I, as a consumer, had a difficult time to decipher and follow what was good, what would work with what, and so on. We should not go back to that era. Microsoft product is some of the best available, and while there is some competition that may SEEM better, in fact, the product just doesn't come up to the same standard that MS does.

Go with the settlement!!

Thank you!

MTC–00007504

From: Girard F. Oberrender Jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:32pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sirs,

The present settlement is sufficiently severe and does not need to be adjusted. Further extension of this case, with its historic overtones of political interference by the federal administration on behalf of a few corporations against a competitor, will just exacerbate a faulty precedence in our successful free market system.

Our present recession can be timed with the initial decision in this case. The attack on our country on September 11, 2001 spotlights the necessity of focusing our energies and our production on more fundamental and urgent directions.

To potentially award the States choosing to continue their litigations would emphasize rewarding the greedy rather than the hurt. Such an award would encourage more Government action against successful corporations. These corporations have taken, within the last generation, the economic leadership from the socialist Germans and the state-run Japanese We must restrain the deadening hand of government from controlling our businesses.

Let the judgment stand and close the case.

Respectfully submitted.

Girard F. Oberrender Jr. retired engineer, business manager and veteran.

MTC–00007506

From: Jim Albright
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case per the last agreement. The government clearly does not understand how important it is to settle this case for the technology market as a whole and for all consumers. Standardization is mandatory for business to interact with each other.

Jim Albright
J Albright & Associates
Authorized NxTrend Mod Providers
Voice: (800) 349–0875
Fax: (303) 665–0843
E-mail: jim@jalbright-colorado.com
web site: www.jalbright-colorado.com

MTC–00007507

From: Howard Lucy Jew
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The recent terms of the DOJ-Microsoft settlement are fair and just. We need to attend to urgent matters like economic stimulus, fight against Terrorists, and tax relief for all taxpayers, not litigation and nonproductive pursuits. Howard & Lucy Jew, Houston, TX

MTC–00007509

From: KSchmitt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microssoft Settlement

I want to express my support for the terms of the settlement reached between the DOJ and Microsoft. I have been continally concerned that Microsoft's competitors have engaged in anticompetitive acts continuously and have been consistently pursuing Microsoft through the DOJ in unjustified and anticompetitive ways. It is time for the DOJ to listen to the people and not to wealthy corporate terrorists that only pursue their own greedy aims. I personally use Microsoft products, want them to package increasing content and provide integration among their products. Their competitors would do better to focus their activities on creating better software products that I would feel comfortable buying.

Karl F. Schmitt
17310 Sylvester Rd SW
Burien, WA 98166

MTC–00007510

From: MjgLeo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:37pm

Subject: (no subject)
IT'S ABOUT TIME,,THIS MATTER BE SETTLED,,,ONCE & FOR ALL,,,PEOPLE WANT TO MAKE TROUBLE,,FOR CO. THAT WORKS TO IMPROVE LIFE FOR ALL,,,,IF YOU DON'T PAY,,YOU DON'T PLAY,,& THATS THE WAY LIFE IS..SO PLEASE LET THIS GREAT CO, GO ON,,IF OTHERS CAN'T KEEP UP,,JOIN THEM....MJGLEO@AOL.COM

MTC–00007511

From: Bruce Griffin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:37pm
Subject: microsoft settltment settlement
YES YES YES SETTLEMENT TERMS ARE FAIR, PLEASE CONCLUDE THE MATTER.
BO GRIFFIN

MTC–00007512

From: DeaconOtt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,
I think it is time that we end this hassle. The litigation does not need to go on any longer.
We need to settle and get on with life. There has been enough of late to distract us from our every day lives.
sincerely
J.c. Otto

MTC–00007513

From: submarina
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:37pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
stop messing around with microsoft, leave them alone. The problems we are having now with the stock-market and the last years is all your and clintons fault. let them go they are helping us

MTC–00007514

From: patrick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Hello
Please expedite this extravagant attorney parade to its inevitable conclusion ASAP.
Do you guys think for one moment our real competitors, the Japanese, the Chinese, the Europeans, would waste any time trying to destroy one of their most successful companies the way we let the parasitic lawyers trash American firms like Microsoft?
Please stop wasting our time and money with this show. Microsoft has helped the world become standardized and productiive.
Go chase real criminals, like the international drug syndicates ruining our childrens opportunities to even use Microsoft's products. Go chase the importers who are slowly destroying American productive manufacturing jobs. Do somthing that really helps the country, not just the attorneys.
The ''Justice'' department just makes me angry.
Yours Truly,
Patrick J. Driscoll P.E.

MTC–00007515

From: Paul Ondell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Department of Justice
I believe the Microsoft settlement should be accepted. It is more than what was needed and the States rejecting the offer are only doing so for there own Political benefit and not for the benefit of National Interest or in the best Interest of the National Economy.
Paul Ondell

MTC–00007516

From: rtalarczyk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:38pm
Subject: Microsoft ....
To whom it may concern,
In my opinion punishing Microsoft can only stymie other hitech companies in America from doing innovative work in the future. America should be proud of what Microsoft has contributed to the world. Microsoft has greatly helped America become the leader in computer technology.
Many other competitors are envious of this contribution both here and abroad. Lets not destroy in what we have created. Lets move forward , for the battle to be won will be, to keep America the Leader in advanced of technology.
Thank you,
Robert Talarczyk

MTC–00007517

From: Carol Leiby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
If it were not for the standards established by Microsoft the economy would not be thriving as much as it is today. The progress of our nation over the last decade is largely due to standards made possible by the common platform on computers. It is a waste of time and money for states to argue their isolated cases any further. I encourage you to bring all of these outstanding cases to a quick close.
Carol Leiby

MTC–00007518

From: NorCarIntl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:40pm
Subject: (no subject)
In favor or the REDUCED liberty found in the Court of Appeals ruling. Lets not waste any more of our taxpayer Nonie,
NORM STORDAHL
F 1100 AVE
MARION IA 52302

MTC–00007519

From: Dale Daniels
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
NO MORE LITIGATION!!!!!
PLEASE LET'S SETTLE THIS SUIT AND GET ON WITH OUR LIVES!! THE COMPANIES AGAINST MICROSOFT ARE P.O.'D BECAUSE MICROSOFT HAS A GREAT PRODUCT AND THEY WANT TO LATCH ON FOR A FREE RIDE. THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE USING COMPUTERS AGREE!!!
I CERTAINLY WOULDN'T EVEN CONSIDER BUYING ANY PRODUCT FROM THE COMPANIES THAT ARE TRYING TO GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING FROM MICROSOFT.
HMMM...''TRYING TO GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING'', SOUNDS TO ME LIKE SOME KIND OF RADICAL LEFT WING SCHEME THAT IS JUST THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG.
I VOTE TO ''BUTT OUT AND LEAVE 'EM ALONE''.
DALE DANIELS
3911 WEST 36TH
KENNEWICK, WA. 99337

MTC–00007520

From: CoreyWest@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:41pm
Subject: my opinion
I think that there are far more important things than the gov't chasing after a corporation that has done more for the USA, and all people who use computers. I think that Microsoft is up there with edision....if not for the remarkable strides that it made in the past decade and more, most people would still be non computer user's.
And I feel that the offer that was made to give computers and software to schools was a great offer, and should be taken.
Corrado Petrella
6 cowdrey street
yonkers ny 10701

MTC–00007521

From: Mark Murphy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The value to me, a consumer, of Microsoft Windows products is many fold the couple of hundred dollars cost to buy the product. It is nuts to want to break up this company. Please let them be.
Mark Murphy

MTC–00007522

From: Rickie Hopkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Personally I think the goverment's case is a load of bull!
If it wasn't for Microsoft, I, along with probably several thousand others, would not have even bought a PC. It's because of windows that I even bought my PC and still have it with several upgrades. While I may not fully understand what the whole deal may or not be involved, then I look at the fact that if the other software or hardware dosen't work well with Windows then I didn't need it to begin with.
While we're at it, how the US goverment isn't raising HELL with AOL????????? If you use AOL then you cannot use Internet Explorer or Outlook Express. Personally I have no use for AOL in any shape, form, or fashion. I may never figure out everything on my PC, But I will forever be A Microsoft supporter by buying and using products that are supported by Microsoft and Bill Gates.

Hang In There
rhopkins@midsouth.rr.com

MTC–00007523

From: ABrisolara@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:41pm
Subject: Microsoft case

It is very apparent that the efforts to dismantle and punish Microsoft was motivated by jealous political factors. Microsfot has been responsible for the spread of comput- er use through its innovative and cost-effective products.

We strongly support Mocrosoft, and urge that any punitive action be stopped. Have no idea what you hear in Washington, but down here, all I hear is how unjust it was to endeavor to curtail Microsfot.

Hope that the Justice Department will drop the case as is.

Sincerely,
A. Brisolara
P.O. Box 7321
Metairie, LA
70010–7321

MTC–00007524

From: Mert Urness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We consider it to be in the best interests of all citizens of the U.S. that the current Microsoft judgements are totally sufficient. We furthur believe that no future litigation is necessary, nor should any such be undertaken.

Respectfully yours,
Merton L. Urness
Patricia A. Urness

MTC–00007525

From: KlondikeC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time this matter was settled and no more Gov money wasted. The settlement is a fair one even though it gouges Microsoft in my opinion. It is ludicrous that we spent more on this suit than we did on antiterrorist activities.

MTC–00007526

From: Jeffery R. Moser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madame,

Please do whatever is necessary to settle the Microsoft Antitrust Case. This has gone on long enough.

Jeff Moser
403 Patriot Place
Hillsborough, NC 27278
(919)–956–4276

MTC–00007527

From: JJPORRET@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:44pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Why don't we get wise and stop feeding the lawyers, and start to move forward with innovation and new developments? That's the backbone of freedom, and freedom is America. Let's not be envious of a business which has developed some of the most advance technology in the history of the world, but instead lets us praise their ability and creativity. That's what is making America such a great country. Recent events prove that the rest of the world envy our ability to innovate and create. Microsoft, IBM, GE, INTEL, etc., are among others, some of the great innovators and creators of this world.

MTC–00007528

From: BZDZ2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:44pm
Subject: Lay off

Lets look at the accomplishments that Microsoft has brought to this nation and their contribution to American business our people and the world.

LEAVE THEM ALONE. DONT PUNISH SUCCESS.

American Business Man of Fifty Three Years.

MTC–00007529

From: Harlas M Harris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:44pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whome it may concern

Im not real smart about the ins & outs of the legal ins & outs, but it seems to me that if you made something & put it on the market & people liked it, & you made a pile of money with it that should be good for everybody, but it seems to me some body else in the same kind of busness is tring to infringe on the other mans success becouse he could not make his product as good as the other. if Im right thinking that in a free market country it should be up to this other guy to try & upgrade his product, but it looks like all these folks are tring to put microsoft out of the running altogeather. it is my feelings that the courts have settled this should have ended the whole thing. I cannot see what claim any state could have against this company or any company unless the states are in the computer busness. thank you for reading this email. hopefully you will make a fair decision for all partys sincerly harlas m. harris

hharriswoodworker@juno.com

MTC–00007530

From: david blanks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

miscrosoft have done no wrong leave the company along they are only doing their job. king david

MTC–00007531

From: David Garner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to put this case to rest. How the U.S. Government could possibly pursue this case in the first place is beyond me. Think about what you are doing. Is this the reward for being a successful company? It is blatenly obvious that the states that have not signed on to this deal are the states where Microsoft's competitors are located. It is vital for the economy and the IT industry to get this case behind the country.

MTC–00007532

From: Cornelius H. Kafka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir/Madam:

I wanted to simply go on record as supporting the Microsoft settlement. Bringing this to a closure was long overdue and I'm pleased that DOJ finally brought closure.

Sincerely,
Cornelius Kafka
83 Walbridge Hill Road
Tolland, CT 06084
Cornelius H. Kafka
ckafka@acm.org
+1 (860) 872 2310

MTC–00007533

From: John Leipprandt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:47pm
Subject: Time to settle with Microsoft

This settlement program has been going on for a long time, why not settle now? It looks like it is fair to all involved.

Johm Leipprandt
CC:jmleip@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC–00007534

From: Greg Bryant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hope you guys get this Microsoft farce all settled with what you agreed to and leave well enough alone. It was a case only jealous Microsoft competitors and idealistic Justice Dept. lawyers wanted to pursue.

Enough is enough. Go with the agreed settlement.

Greg Bryant

MTC–00007535

From: Patm378@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:50pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The Microsoft settlement should be accepted by the Dept.of Justice. Microsoft should be allowed to get back to inovating and producing soft wear without government harassment.

MTC–00007536

From: Jan Norman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Settle with Microsoft. This case has gone on too long and it's time to focus our energy on more pressing issues that matter.

Jan Norman

MTC–00007537

From: Chap Vail
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:51pm
Subject: Settlement

Give it up. Where would this country be without Microsoft and the creative genius.

MTC–00007538

From: Butch Wulftange

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:51pm
Subject: Settlement

I am 100% for the negoiated settlement between MSFT and the US Govt. as currently presented.

Any further changes should not be allowed. I believe in the free market system and believe that any amendments to the current settlement should benefit Microsoft.
William Wulftange
(775)853–8225

MTC–00007539

From: sue white
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:53pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To Whom it may concern:

What the Government is telling me is down with private enterprise. I am very disappointed in the decision of the Supreme Court. I feel they have overstepped their boundaries and the Constitution. In simple language, they are telling me as a business owner, be careful as big brother is watching you.

Sincerely,
Sue White

MTC–00007540

From: KANE0903@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:52pm
Subject: Re: DOJ wants to hear from you on MS settlement

As a shareholder and a consumer of Microsoft products, I feel that the matter should be put behind us and move on. All the good that Microsoft has done over the years in providing reasonably priced software has gone a long away in our having a strong economy for the past ten years. If we could get this matter behind us there is a good chance we could rebound from the present recession we are in. The settlement would be very good for everyone. The issue has been become mute due to the advancements in the industry. To continue the litigation is to only prolong the economic recovery. The tech stocks look to Microsoft's stock and respond accordingly. So let's just move on.

Thank You
Tom & Sandee Kane

MTC–00007541

From: PWBMalibu@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:54pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please stop this useless attack on Microsoft. It is time to move on and allow one of the greatest companies in the history of the world to go about its own buisiness. That buisiness is supplying computer users with the finest internet and computer related services IN THE WORLD.

Sincerely,
Phil Bailey

MTC–00007542

From: Johnrosset@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my believe that Microsoft has paid it's fair share in this settlement, and that the Department of Justice should allow Microsoft to live by the rules of the agreement. I do not believe that Microsoft should be broken up into smaller companies. I do believe that Microsoft has put out a good product for a fair price, and they should continue to do so. So, please let the settlement stand as it is and lets get on with our business of making this a better country to live in. God Bless America

Respectfully Yours
John
J. Rossetti

MTC–00007543

From: xyzlogan@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

Please settle with microsoft as the settlement now stands. I think that pursuing this issue is a big waste of money for both the government and microsoft. Enough is enough.

Thanks
Lucy Logan
Tempe Arizona

MTC–00007544

From: Ispydox@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

I would like to express a few thoughts regarding the current action with the Microsoft Corporation. I live in the Northwest, about 25 miles from Microsoft, and have followed the action against Microsoft. I am bewildered that so much has been spent on this action. The time, effort and money could have been better used for real criminals. As stated, I am from the Northwest and we are experiencing a tragic response to the September 11th disaster in the form of Corporate Layoffs. I fear that if more pressure is put on Microsoft, it's employees will find themselves in the same situation as the Boeing and the Airline employees that are having to start over with a new career.

Inovation is still on of our nations greatest assets. Bill Gates may be the richest man in the world, but he is also one of the most creative. This creativity benefits the nation and the world. Lets not stiffle these opportunities. I am not very worldly, but do wonder how many other countries have a company that has done so much world wide, and is so well represented in product sales throughout the world. How many companies in other countries are there that are being subsidized such as Airbus? Microsoft probably contributes more than Airbus makes.

Microsoft has accepted the proposed settlement. Let them move on and continuce to benefit you and me.

Respectfully
Dennis R. McNamara

MTC–00007545

From: MMalo10677@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are satisfied with the settlement, and suggest it is time to move on.

The Maloney Family
58 Overlook Road
Hardy, Va 24101

MTC–00007546

From: Ron.Kasik
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I've observed this litigation long enough. With the passage of time, the initial ''technical arguments'' in the case are moot. Let's settle this case quickly. This is not the time to thwart innovation and put additional strangleholds on technology advancement. Here the US Government is involved in litigation, yet in nearly all of its RFPs, you require PC's that run Microsoft SW.

Ron Kasik
Rkasik@pdq.net
(281) 251–9283

MTC–00007547

From: john Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:58pm
Subject: I am a consumer and I think the Microsoft settlement is fair to the I am a consumer and I think the Microsoft settlement is fair to the consumer. enough said

John W Davis

MTC–00007548

From: Drica47 A. Rashid
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:58pm
Subject: Support for the Settlement

When American industry is losing it's competitiveness in the world, America has in Microsoft the best export engine there is. Microsoft has the biggest market capitalisatiion in the world because of its merits and potential. The Government should encourage Microsoft's growth instead of putting obstacles in its way.

Bill Gates has shown to be unselfish and philanthropic with his fortune. He deserves better.

MTC–00007549

From: Jamie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:00pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

With all that has happened this year it seems more important than ever to settle this inane case against Microsoft. The federal government and states should be spending their precious resources on helping the economy recover, aiding the working poor and unemployed and figuring out a way to provide health insurance to the millions of Americans who lack it.

Right now the state of Florida is cutting budgets for education and other important social needs while some fat cat lawyers and glory hound politicians are wasting the taxpayers money by trying to drag out this case.

MTC–00007550

From: Raymond Eveland
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 9:59pm
Subject: Settlement

It is about time to resolve this issue. Microsoft has added more to this country's well-being than any company you can name. The technology that they initiated changed our lives for the better, The tactics that they allegedly perused should not be punishable by the political wishes of their cry baby competitors.

End this with the least additional cost to Microsoft and our economy.

MTC–00007551

From: Miladin Aleksic
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Simple logic tells us that the basic principle of Capitalizm, as we all know, is that the fittest survives. The comprehensive agreement reched between the federal government, nine states and Microsoft is reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I agree that settlement is good for consummers, the industry, and the American economy. Further litigation can create more damages and nothig else. Therefore, let Microsoft work as it did before.

A word to Microsoft competitors—American motto says: ''Shape up or ship out''. It is that simple.

Thank you

MTC–00007552

From: Fred Bushnell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

II feel our Department of Justice has done its duty in this Microsoft case. It is time to move on. Spend my money devising clever ways to combat terrorists—then implement them.

I have used Microsoft products since the 1980s and feel I have received fair value for money spent. That is a comment I cannot make about how our minions in Washington give away large sums to farmers as payment not to produce.

I am a physician, MD, and estimate at best I have been paid for two-thirds of my professional services but do not cry to our federal government to get involved. Do not get involved because some businesses are financially successful.

J. Fred Bushnell, MD
CC:Microsoft Outlook Express Team

MTC–00007553

From: BritDave@wmconnect.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir:

After a great deal of legal expense, which in my opinion was totally unnecessary as these cases against Microsoft were patently without merit, a law has been enacted which mediates a settlement between Microsoft and the so-called agrieved parties.

As an interested party in this dispute, being a Microsoft user, I believe the new law is the best result that could be expected from this dispute—and I wish to record my vote in support of it.

David J Willson
Las Vegas NV 89122–7222
Tel. (702) 458 1574
CC:Grandpajoe6@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00007554

From: min zhang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I hate to west my time when I speak to a unqualified Microsoft technical support personal on the phone. And I also do not like Microsoft unqualified WINDOW product which it often occurred as I am using it in my career.

But Microsoft as a industry leader from U.S., I would like to keep it to be stronger and more compatible. The legal penalty shall not be the mean to limit the development of the Microsoft to go forward. The law should provide the power to help any one who are willing to go forward by a reasonable mean for our technology. Otherwise our country will lose the technical leader and that will lead us a big slowdown on our path.

Regards,

MTC–00007555

From: Norman Meyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:04pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let the settlement proceed as planned. I don't believe Microsoft was in the wrong, anyway. Noone sued Ford for making its own parts to ensure the function of the car. Why can't Microsoft integrate the software to insure all parts run well? All that aside, get this over with.

Norman Meyer, Vero Beach, Fl.

MTC–00007556

From: Bill Block
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe no harm to consumers has occurred because of Microsoft's position in the computer industry. On the contrary, Microsoft is responsible for making personal computers widely available to consumers.

I would like to see the DOJ end this case as quickly as possible.

Bill Block
Phone: (281) 482–6849 Internet: http://www.wtblock.com/
Cell: (713) 899–2488 E-mail: bill@wtblock.com
NetMeeting Family Resume W. T. Block Historian

MTC–00007557

From: BEANS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:04pm
Subject: MICROSOFT

THE GOVERNMENTS LAWSUIT AGAINST MICROSOFT'S WAS A SHAM FROM THE VERY BEGINNING! WHEN COMPUTERS FIRST STARTED TO GET POPULAR EVERYONE SCREAMED FOR A STANDARD OPERATING SYSTEM. MICROSOFT CAME THROUGH! THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION PUSHED THIS SUIT FOR THEIR HATE FOR ACHIEVEMENT. YOU ARE ONLY CREATING MORE HATE FOR THE GOVERNMENT. AVERAGE JOE COULD CARE LESS ABOUT MICROSOFT, IT WAS MICROSOFT'S COMPETITION THAT WAS PUSHING FOR THE LAWSUIT!

AS FOR THE SETTLEMENT I THINK IT'S IRONIC THAT THE COMPANY WILL BE GIVING AWAY COMPUTER SYSTEMS TO SCHOOLS AND CHARITIES NOW THEIR EVEN MORE ENTRENCHED IN THE SYSTEM!!! I LOVE IT FRANK ROSS RUSSEL 508 W. COBBS CREEK PKWY YEADON, PENNSYLVANIA 19018 610–622–6770

MTC–00007558

From: Jon C.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:05pm

The settlement is good for American, the industry and the American economy.

MTC–00007559

From: Harry Bridges
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe the settlement of the Microsoft case as quickly as possible is in the best interests of consumers and the United States.

Harry T. Bridges
6718 New Hope Drive
Springfield, VA 22151

MTC–00007560

From: Clayton L. Christensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:57pm
Subject: Settlement

Settlement should be accepted—No more litigation

Sincerely
Clayton Christense, 3010 Leona Drive
Storm Lake, IA 50588

MTC–00007561

From: Kneelly@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe the settlement is just and should proceed. Let's put this issue to bed.

Yours truly, Neal Bonelli

MTC–00007562

From: clifton l/jean smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the proposed DOJ settlement with Microsoft. It provides safeguards yet does not destroy creativity and initiative. It is time this action be put behind us in order that the public, Microsoft employees and investors may establish a basis for future actions with reasonable certainty. I applaud the terms of the proposal. Clifton L. Smith, 15 Fairway Drive, Englewood, FL 34223

MTC–00007563

From: KingBogus@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

Enough of the politics already!! This antitrust suit, which should never have been

brought in the first place, should be settled immediately. You have the settlement before you. Please unserstand that, in the interest of fairness to Microsoft, and allowing Microsoft to get on about it's business, I want you to accept the proposed settlement.

Other software companies are hoping you'll drag this thing out in court, thus detracting Microsoft from progressing with future software packages and operating system improvements. These other companies could not fairly compete with Microsoft because they do not have the innovation, foresite or expertise of Microsoft personnel. These other companies could only go to their homestate Attorneys General and have them file this, the most frivilous of lawsuits.

It is my wish that you get past this suit and get on to more meaningful cases that will truly protect the interests of US citizens. With everything that's going on in the world, you should focus on bringing REAL terrorists to justice and quit picking on companies that have innovation and expertise to carry out their business.

Sincerely,
Greg Ogden
Concerned and Angry Citizen

MTC–00007564

From: PATHBNA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:09pm
Subject: Miscrosoft Settlement

I support the terms of the Microsoft Settlement versus continued litigation. Do the right thing and let's settle this and move on. These comments are in accordance with the Tunney Act.

Thank you.
Patricia W. Ross

MTC–00007565

From: JOHN A. MENART
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:09pm
Subject: Microsft Settlement

Dear Sir;

I am not the least bit happy with the settlement as it stands. Bill Gates and his organization, need to made to answer to all customers, not just some schools. He should be made to provide funds in the way of U.S. currency, that should be made available for customers, or if too big of a logistical problem, to school districts, to be spent as they feel fit, so long as it directly benefits the students. It should not be given to the already overpaid teachers, using the excuse that higher wages or bonuses will enable them to teach better. The fine should also be increased, as with the amount it is now, Bill and his band of renegades, are laughing at the Judicial System, as if it is a joke. We had a very good monopoly in this country, that was destroyed, (Western Electric/Bell System) ever since the poor customers have been raped. Microsoft is a monopoly that should be destroyed for the good of the people, and the industry. You need to re-think this Microsoft Fiasco and hit Microsoft hard and fast. Less only will allow the cancer/monopoly to grow.

Respectfully,
John A. Menart

MTC–00007566

From: BERNARD MARGOLIUS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:10pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

We support the proposed settlement as is. The tech field should give a vote of confidence to msft. We believe that this company is directly responsible for the success of most of those who are opposing them. Success should not be penalized by less succesfull competitors.

MTC–00007567

From: Ken Shaner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen,

Cease this senseless litigation against Microsoft Corporation. It was totally unfounded to begin with. Private entrepreneur functions have been the backbone of our great country since its conception and, in spite of the typical liberal mindset, will continue to be. The cost to the American taxpayer of any further litigation should be the responsibility of Janet Reno and William J. Clinton. This could only be a plus to their legacies.

Shaner

MTC–00007568

From: EMail94105@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It MayConcern:-

I think the courts settled the Microsoft case and we should get on with our lives. The states that want to delay to try to get more are preventing our economy from recovering. Bah to them.

Sincerely,
Eloyce C. Mailman

MTC–00007569

From: Kim Van Winkle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice:

Thank you for your decision to settle the Microsoft case. I think this whole thing has been very hard for consumers who rely on Microsoft products. I am very happy this is the end of it. Thank you again.

Kim Van Winkle
19062 21st Ave NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

MTC–00007570

From: JKoz1731@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:12pm
Subject: DOJ Settlement

Dear Sirs:

It has become very important for the DOJ and Microsoft to settle fairly and move on. I feel that the litagation has stiffled the advancement of the entire technological community. Let the best company win in the business arena. The public will buy the products that are the best on the market at the fairest prices.

Over the holiday I gave my wife a new printer/scanner/copier. After spending 20 hours trying to set it up, we returned the produce feeling that the item was defective. But the event reminded me how cumbersome it was to set up a computer system 15 years ago. Microsoft and windows have made using a computer a joy. Please don't stiffle the company any longer.

Sincerely, Jeffrey J. Kozy DDS

MTC–00007571

From: Miller3174@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:12pm
Subject: Waste of effort and money

If the politicians were spending their own money—instead of the taxpayers' —the attach on MSFT would have ended a long time ago. The only winners are lawyers. The only loosers are taxpayers.

Please stop beating up on MSFT and reallocate the same time and effort and money to the fight against terrorists!

The risk or threat or danger to our economy, job market, and culture is NOT Microsoft. So get wise—stop being so short-sighted—admit that it's over—and recognize that your succes fighting the war on terrorism is much more important to your careers and the welfare of those you are supposed to represent and a much more appropriate allocation of taxpayer dollars. From a taxpayer, citizen, computer user who knows he has never been damaged or inhibited by MSFT's products or dominance in the marketplace because the marketplace has always given him the right to choose.

MTC–00007572

From: jandjbrown3@ecoisp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:13pm
Subject: settlement

I think the proposed settlement will fail to protect consumers from Microsoft's malicious business pracitices. There will likely be less choice available to consumers, and as a result innovation will lag behind the pace we have seen in recent years. The support for these assertions is demonstrated by the lack of freedom of major Computer Vendors (Compaq, IBM, HP, Dell, etc...) to modify Windows Operating system installations in any meaningful manner. For example, Java was clearly broken in Windows XP as a result of Microsoft business strategies to try to stifle this thriving area in innovation. By a) forcing Microsoft to fix their Java problem (i.e. including a J2EE compliant SDK in the OS) or b) Allowing major vendors to provide this fix on their own without potentially incurring punishments from Microsoft—this monopolistic attack on consumers could be somewhat mitigated. As the proposed settlement is currently written—the injustice is only strengthened. I don't imagine the Judge will read my comments, as I understand from Lawyers I know that most Judges seem to look at the Tunney act as an annoying formality, rather than an important requirement—but in the event that someone will read this and examine the issue in depth—I have taken the time to submit this comment.

Thanks,
John Brown

Computer Specialist
Washington, DC

MTC–00007573

From: Alice Mariano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To whom it may concern,

This Microsoft litigation have dragged on for so long, we are so frustrated at the money being spent for this just because a few wealthy competitors would not give up until they see Microsoft fails. It has been settled by the DOJ, and that is the best news we got for so long, and now this 9 or so states wanted to prolong this case for more wasted money and at the same time stock market and the economy being affected. We think this is merely political and the sooner this gets settled the better for the market, the economy, and us the consumers.

Microsoft is a huge company that have done wonderful technological innovations that have benefited consumers, so why should they be punished for this? They have also been a big donors to many schools and many charities. It's just unfair. Microsoft is a great American company that have the respect and gratitude of the world. USA as a whole should be proud of this company instead of pushing them backwards by limiting their innovative ideas. There's no anti trust here, just anti Microsoft. It's about time that this government step into the right direction, which the last Clinton Administration failed to do. Settlement is a must for the sake of the failing economy, and the future of technology as a whole, and the continued US dominance of the world's greatest innovations and ideas.

We hope the DOJ will stay firm in their decision of this long awaited settlement. We can only hope this letter will be read and counted. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Ramon and Alice Mariano
6586 153rd Ave. S.E.
Bellevue, WA 98006

MTC–00007574

From: Hashim Salim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:13pm
Subject: Enough is enough. To whom it may concern.

Get it over with. Stop the dragging and the waste of time and money.

Enough is enough.
Hashim Salim

MTC–00007575

From: Richard Hillger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:13pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The present settlement is fair. Prolonging the litigation only increases the costs which are eventually borne by the public either by higher taxes or increased prices. We never under any circumstances get anything back or enjoy any advantage.

Federal horsepower significantly outperforms state horsepower—-if the Feds are happy, the states posturing is just window dressing to impress a gullible constituency (and spend more money!).

I have been in the computer business for over 30 years and have never heard anyone complain that Microsoft has taken unfair advantage on a personal basis. And obviously, the benefits have been ''awesome'' as my kids would say.

On a technical basis, there might be better ways of skinning a cat—but who cares?—if they have merit, they will eventually surface, and in the meantime we are enjoying a rather marvelous electronic age. Keep the present settlement and lets get on with business.

Richard E Hillger

MTC–00007576

From: Erik Odegard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:14pm
Subject: In Favor of the Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ms Hesse,

I support Microsoft's right to innovate, and I would respectfully urge you to work towards a quick settlement of the US vs. Microsoft case.

Sincerely,
Erik Odegard
Eriko@dslnorthwest.net

MTC–00007577

From: TGerminojr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Setellment

I believe it is time for the Justice Department to bring this case to a close. The country and the industry needs to get on with the business of developing commerce and putting the American people back to work.

Sincerely,
T.P. Germino, Jr.

MTC–00007578

From: jane ashbrenner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the proposed settlement is in the best interest of the public. Further litigation of this matter would only benefit the attorneys and not the public.

Jane Ashbrenner

MTC–00007579

From: SCMpar242@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:16pm
Subject: settle

please settle the case and go after enron.
scmpar242@AOL

MTC–00007580

From: Ken Andrews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:18pm
Subject: Microsoft is #1.....

Microsoft is #1.....

MTC–00007581

From: CBD1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement To Whom It May Concern:

The Microsoft settlement was a huge penalty to a company that has done more for the U. S. economy and for communication than any other in our great history. I do not understand why some people evidently think they should be punished more than what has already being done to Microsoft. Our economy started faltering when it was shown that the government was destroying the country's greatest asset. Please let this fair settlement stand which might let us come out of this recession.

Sincerely,
Cleve B Denny

MTC–00007582

From: kowalczyk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this case once and for all and let the brains in the most powerful company, that ever existed, go forward bringing new technologies and advances.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Kowalczyk

MTC–00007583

From: Arthur Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement against Microsoft is a truly transparent cash grab by a bunch of government lawyers, backed up by Microsoft's whining competitors, trying to make names for themselves. However, if this will settle the case once and for all and get the government out of the software business, get on with it.

Arthur Thompson
Shelton, WA

MTC–00007584

From: JHarby1071@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:20pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement is ok and I hope it will stop there and not let some other issues arise due to envy of another Company ! Microsoft should not have to put with any more suits. They have proved their merit

Sincerely.
J Harby

MTC–00007585

From: RNorris164@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:20pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear sirs, Why dont you let Microsoft get on with there business. I have a few shairs that I am a looser , money wise. I am not alone. Paid $115.00 to $160.a share Which makes me a looser on quite a few shares. Sold some for $60.& took the loss off my taxes. Thats no way to get out of the resession.

Lets move on with america.
Russ Norris
CC:RNORRIS@aol.com@inetgw

MTC–00007586

From: JGunn99@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To use the phrase ''Enough Already.'' The total waste of money by the government, causing Microsoft to have to waste millions of their money has got to stop and now! What

happened to free enterprise and competition? This was a set back for free enterprise in the very tough field of technology. Who ever can build a better mouse trap deserves to win. Every kind of business is going to win sometime and lose sometime. So let it be with Microsoft.

James A. Gunn jgunn99@aol.con

MTC–00007587

From: Roscoe Jackson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I, as a consumer am upset that the Government even prosecuted Microsoft. Because everyone knows that the Government did the work that Microsoft's competitors couldn't do. Microsoft is a superior product and I refuse to use any other. But now they have to share their innovations with their competitors. Next the Government will be telling them that they have to share their profits, also.

MTC–00007588

From: Steve Windham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to voice my opinion on the Microsoft Settlement.

I support Microsoft in this on-going debacle the U.S. government (and a few computer companies) has launched. Please finish this farce and let business go back to business...making money for investors and developing products for consumers.

MTC–00007589

From: John Murphy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe the agreed upon settlement between Microsoft, the U.S. Government, and nine states is fair and in the public interest. Further litigation is too punitive and not necessary. We have had many choices in software over the past ten years, OS 2, Apple, Linux, and others. We have chosen Microsoft because we liked it the best and have been very satisfied.

John & Mary Ellen Murphy

MTC–00007590

From: RSSnodgrass@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:24pm
Subject: Re: DOJ wants to hear from you on MS settlement

To the Dept. of Justice,

I believe that it is in the best interest of the public, Microsoft, and the country to settle the case against Microsoft.

Robert Chapman
Nashville, TN.

MTC–00007591

From: MWHolcombe@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I believe the settlement reached with Microsoft is fair to all parties. In fact, I think Netscape was given more than it deserved. If we stifle innovation in the electronic and high tech fields, the American public will be the real losers. I therefore urge the Department of Justice and the contesting states to settle this matter immediately. I think certain lawyers in the Justice Department held a personal bias against Bill Gates and this vendetta has greatly damaged our economy. We need a rapid settlement to boost our economy and get people in the high tech industry back to work.

Sincerely.
Betty M. Holcombe

MTC–00007592

From: BRETTYADEN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:25pm
Subject: Please settle now

I have to say this case was wrong from the start. Now that the economy isn't doing that well, we really need to settle the Tunney Act. So, dear government please settle now, it will help the economy. Thank You.

MTC–00007593

From: Emil Mirsepasy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlment

I am in favour of the DOJ' s settlement.

MTC–00007594

From: J Murray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an ordinary citizen, I'd like to express my views on the Microsoft Settlement. The issues which were raised and settled by the government have ended the need for more litigation or other remedies. With the economy in such a terrible state and with so many worse things going on, those 9 states that want to pursue Microsoft to a greater degree of punishment should find something else to do with their time and the taxpayers' money. The companies they are trying to protect should put more energy into producing something worthwhile and creating a better U.S. rather than destroying it by continuing litigation that simply reduces the economic vitality of Microsoft and the U.S.

It is truly a shame when a company that creates innovative products, like Microsoft, gets sued and pursued by everyone else who can't seem to do the same innovative things. Those other companies' inability to attract and keep the best and the brightest workforce is part of the problem. The sour grapes, whining, and continued attacks only continue to downgrade those companies like Microsoft who are successful. If those other companies had technology that could do the job as well, they'd have had no problem competing. They never listened to the needs of the consumer and now complain that we don't want to buy what they have to sell.

The public now has access to technology like never before and can communicate, work and pursue a quality of life because a company like Microsoft sought to bring better and better innovation into the marketplace. Moreover, Microsoft treats employees well and through its gifts to education creates jobs and better educated citizens. The Foundation that Bill Gate and his wife has created has done a great deal for education and children. It's too bad some of those special interests—companies that the 9 states are protecting couldn't do as much. It's time to end all this stuff and let the innovative companies innovate!!

After all, innovation is what has made the United States the great country that it is.

MTC–00007595

From: Brian West
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I BELIVE THAT THE GOVERMENT SHOULD GET OFF THE BACK OF MICROSOFT! THEY ARE DOING NOTHING MORE THEN FOLLOWING THE AMERICAN DREAM!!! MICROSOFT HAS A GOOD PRODUCT AT A FAIR PRICE, AND I FOR ONE LIKE THERE SOFTWARE.

LET THE AMERICAN DREAM LIVE!
BRIAN WEST

MTC–00007596

From: etmusgrove
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:26pm
Subject: MICROSOFT

The law suit against MS should be settled right now.

It has been going on for entirely to long , and should never have been brought in the first place.. If all of these other companies are/were being hurt, why didn't they bring the suit? and why wasn't it handled by a reasonable judge, not some clown doing someone elses dirty work.

Is this another case of the government doing what is best for the people, like with AT&T. All that did was make everyone in the country pay about 5 times as much for telephone service, and of course allow the gov't to collect alot more in taxes...Do what is really best for the consumer and get this thing settled.

Is there any single company or orgganization that has done as much for the american people and the economy of this country. Settle and lets get on with the prosparity of the country.

Earle T. Musgrove....

MTC–00007598

From: William Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:29pm
Subject: Put an end to this

Dear Department of justice: Please let's end the litigation with Microsoft. Enough is enough. How long does this have to last? The lawyers are all making a lo t of money and we have certainly had enough of this.

MTC–00007599

From: Kristen Turner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:32pm
Subject: Settlement

While it is clear that some actions by Microsoft created diffficult conditions for competitors within the market, the evolution of competiing operating systems and internet based applications, as well as the remedies in the settlement serve the public interest. Further penalties that could weaken

Microsoft and provide openings for foreign competitors to exploit are unwarranted and unwise.

Regards

Greg Turner

MTC–00007601

From: Jean Fonner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:32pm
Subject: Gentlemen:

Gentlemen:

Please complete the Microsoft settlement and let this Company return to its work of developing and producing new ideas and electronics that will help both the government and the citizens of the world. Thank you.

Jean B. Fonner

MTC–00007602

From: Thomas Nielsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The Department of Justice (microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov) I appreciate the chance to give feedback on the Microsoft/DOJ settlement.

I believe the settlement is as fair as it can be for both sides. The remedies in terms of financial 'punishment' is really unimportant—what is more important is the independent team of 'watch-dogs' that will look over Microsoft's shoulder to ensure fair business practices for the future.

Microsoft are creating products that we all benefit from (what would modern life be without computers, Windows, Word, Excel, etc.). Look at all the industries that has benefited from Microsoft's success (Hewlett-Packard—personal printers), AOL & Netscape was dependent on Windows' success, etc, etc.

It is important to the U.S. Economy that we look forward. Let's settle the case—put measures in place (the independent watch-dogs) to ensure that Microsoft complies with the rules & regulations of this country— and let Microsoft continue to create new products that can help the economy to recover instead of punishing one of the country's most successful companies.

I support the settlement that DOJ and Microsoft reached last year.

Thomas Nielsen
431 Kirkland Ave.
Kirkland, WA

MTC–00007603

From: ODMCH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Decision

This whole Microsoft case is nothing but a witch hunt by the biggest witch—Reno. The whole thing should be thrown out and let businesses compete. Why should the courts eleminate competition for selected few in the computer software business when power companies, automobile, tobacco, liquor, drug, food, chicken and on and on have no restrictions on growth, competition, or advertising. Let the man run his company.

Sincerely,
Orlin D. Hall

MTC–00007604

From: Syjoan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:36pm
Subject: settlement

The faster this situation is resolved, the better off the country and our economy will recover.

MTC–00007605

From: jeh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

From a consumer's viewpoint this lawsuit was the dumbest waste of time and money ever by the DOJ.

While I realize it was someone else at the helm, I don't see why it wasn't thrown out once Judge Jackson's bias was revealed. It's not that MS has never done anything unethical but bundling a free browser that happened to be better than its rival's was not unethical, and the crybabies who brought the suit forward do not do business any differently than MS.

If the schools are the beneficiary of this travesty, PLEASE tune out Apple's whining. Better than 75% of the businesses in this country use IBM-style machines, not Apple, and it's far better for kids to be learning software that businesses actually use.

Jessica E Harris
1020 S 21st Street
Mesa AZ 85204
480–926–8950

MTC–00007606

From: DKlega@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:37pm
Subject: SETTLEMENT

PLEASE, PLEASE SETTLE WITH MICROSOFT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. I FEEL THEY ARE UNFAIRLY TARGETTED FOR THEIR INNOVATIVE APPROACH. THEY ARE FAR AHEAD OF EVERYONE ELSE, AND THAT IS WHY THIS WITCHHUNT IS BEING PURSUED BY THEIR COMPETITORS.

SINCERELY,
DORIS KLEGA

MTC–00007607

From: Chrys Steele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department Officials:

I understand that from now until January 28th, you have a public comment period concerning the settlement with Microsoft.

I, for one, think that the settlement is fair. Let it stand as is and don't drag this think on any further.

Personnally, I think the overall computer industry is being hurt by the inability to settle this thing in a timely and just manner.

Let the Tunney Act settle this once and for all, and let's get on with the business of this country.

Sincerely,
Crystal R. Steele
1563 Cedar Dale Ln
Lancaster, SC 29720
803.285.3483

MTC–00007608

From: Tim McCarthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my judgment it is time to move on and bring the Microsoft legal battles to an end.

MTC–00007609

From: Doug Hayashi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Most of my comments on this topic can be see at:

http://www.nsxfiles.com/pulp_letter_to_doj.htm

I wrote it a couple of years ago, but the arguments are the same. Remember.....companies have to add new features to their product, or else there is no reason for them to exist...

-Doug

MTC–00007610

From: Robert Angrisano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a long-time user of Microsoft technology both at home and at work. I've never felt that Microsoft has ever done anything but helped grow the computer industry in a positive way.

Microsoft's technology allows my business to do thing we never could have done without their great products and services. I've never felt I was taken advantage of or that they used their dominate position in the market to prohibit the growth of the industry. I receive more benefit today at a lower price than I ever have in 27 years of business.

Please take the handcuffs off this great American company. Stop being influenced by a small group of well financed competitors crying ''foul''. They had the chance to win my business, but failed to do so due to high prices and poor functionality.

We need more companies like Microsoft Corporation.

Thanks
Robert Angrisano
President,
M.A.N. Resources Inc.
www.manresources.com

MTC–00007611

From: Michael A. Mehring
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am very concerned about the prolonged investigation of Microsoft and its impact on our economy. I a

m very concerned that Microsoft's is being unfairly litigated against by its competitors through our government. As a consumer, I am very concerned that increasing litigation with increase the cost of software. I am concerned that this is not a fair treatment of a very important company to our productivity and economy. I can't see how the consumer benefits by not allowing Microsoft to integrate features. The BIGGEST problem I have with software is lack of

integration. Prior to Microsoft, there was very little software integration. I am not happy with my tax dollars being used to litigate against one of America's great companies. As a tax payer, I am very unhappy that the government is using my money to litigate against a very great company. Thank

you for listening.

Concerned Citizen, Consumer, Tax Payer.

Michael A. Mehring

MTC–00007612

From: CMStillie@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very happy with the settlement. It would be a big mistake to break up Microsoft. The great technological advances and products offered by Microsoft are an asset to our national economy and should NOT be stifled by jealous or socialist critics.

Christopher Stillie

MTC–00007613

From: Alfonso Finocchiaro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Clinton Administration spent millions of taxpayers' dollars to go after one of the greatest companies of all times. It's about time that the settlement close this sad story once and for all.

Alfonso Finocchiaro

MTC–00007614

From: Chuck Cable
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: The remaining states should settle as has the DOJ and the other states including my home state Ohio..It is in the public interest. In a trust, the offender raises prices which is what Microsoft did not do....MS has superior products that are realistically priced and I feel that no one has been gouged....In fact without Windows, I don't think we'd have an internet and no one would be communicating and doing the multitude of things that we all do...AND the idea that Oracle, Sun Micro, etc. should be compensated is ridiculous. MS is not guilty but if it was, it would be consumers that would be compensated—-certainly not the sore loser companies that are crying for dollars that MS legitimately earned with superior products at reasonable prices...The District Court should immediately settle in favor of

Microsoft....

Charles V. Cable
19615 Tanbark Ln
Strongsville,
OH 44149–1431
440.238.3296

MTC–00007615

From: Jerry Stark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My comments relating to the Tunney Act:

I speak the voice of a one person business operating in the black only because Microsoft products that work exceptionally well exist: I believe that much of the consideration afforded Microsoft was more a vendetta on the part of its competitors and perhaps a little jealousy. I fear a government that acts to stifle free enterprise.

I also am in the camp of believers that the American economy started SOUTH with the start of the Microsoft litigation.

I hope that the government would consider that the impediments placed on Microsoft should also be placed on the 20 competitors.

I wonder if this action will become another government fiasco like the one that exists as a result of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The telecom sector in America is reeling. The government has a history of not fully understanding the implications of their actions.

Do you have any concept of the number of businesses large and small that depend on Microsoft? They depend on Microsoft because of good smart business practices, not because of unfair practices.

Will you enforce these rules to the absolute ruin of American Industry? I caution you to use great retraint. The American economy is continually looking for a competitor for Microsoft. It is the ultimate brass ring. Be careful not to interfere with that. Be careful not to interfere with Microsoft. Do NOT mortally wound Microsoft.

The reality is, as an end user, I have never felt put upon by Microsoft. I am sick of people who can't see that Mr. Gates and Microsoft have done more for the American economy than Bill Clinton and the Fed combined. Now the government stands to hurt that enterprise. Please be fair in your application of these judgments. Remember, America depends on Microsoft.

My livelihood depends on Microsoft!!!! I use their products everyday in my consulting business. So do my clients. So do their clients. I bet you do too!!

Jerry Stark
Owner
Stark TECHnology Presentation Services
Richardson, TX
jlstark@swbell.net

MTC–00007616

From: AMKELL4@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this litigation and let Microsoft proceed with creating jobs and technological advancement for the US economy. The US Justice Dept. has already wasted too much money and time on this issue. Let's support our American economy and put an end to the lawyers who want to prolong this litigation.

MTC–00007617

From: Dr. Robert Ingram. Powell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:45pm
Subject: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stop the UADOJ/Anti-trust law terrorists from further acts of government institutionalized robbery of Microsoft Corporation.

The Antitrust laws—an unenforceable, uncompliable, unjudicable mess of contradictions—have for decades kept American businessmen under a silent, growing reign of terror. Yet these laws were created and, to this day are upheld by the ''conservatives,'' as a grim monument to their lack of political philosophy, of economic knowledge and of any concern with principles. Under the Antitrust laws, a man becomes a criminal from the momnent he goes into business, no matter what he does. For instance, if he charges prices which some bureaucrats judge too high,he can be prosecurted for monopoly or for a successful ''intent to monopolize'' if he charges prices lower then those of his competitors, he can be prosecuted for ''unfair competition'' or ''restraint of trade'' and if he charges the same prices as his competitors , he can be prosecuted for ''collusion'' or conspiracy.'' Ther is only one difference in the legal treatment accorded to a crominal or to a businessman: the criminal's rights are protected much more securely and objectively than the businessman's. The alleged purpose of the Antitrust laws was to protect competition; that purpose was based on the socialist fallacy that a free, unregulated market will inevitably lead to the establishment of coercive monopolies, But, in fact, no coercive monopoly has ever been or ever can be established by means of free trade on a free market.

Every coervice monopoly was created by government intervention into the economy: by special privilidges, such as franchises or subsidies, which closed the entry of competitors into a given field, by legislative action. (For a full demonstration of this fact, I refer you to the works of the best economists.). The Antitrust laws were the classic example of a moral inversion prevalent in the history of capitalism: an example of teh victims, the businessmen, takeing the blame for the evils caused by the government, and the government using its own guilt as justification for acquiring wider powers, on the prestext of ''correcting'' the evils.

[There is only one] meaning and purpose these laws could have, whether their authors intended it or not: the penalizing of ability for being ability, the penalizing of success for being success, and the sacrifice of productive genius to the demands of envious mediocrity. So said Ms. Ayn Rand and so say my wife and I.

Bill Gates and his team made it to the top using his genius and that of the brain team he put together. He should be viewed as a modern hero having made available software processes that have changed the way we live, accumulate and process knowledge.

The first step that should be take is to abolish/repeal the Antitrust laws in their entirety on the basis of being inimical to the very concept upon which our Constitution system of government is founded. Just because some mental midgets not up to Bill Gates standards are unable to compete in the international marketplace is no reason to cutoff the arms, legs and labotomize Bill Gates such that mediocrities and incompetents can steal a part of his company or their earnings ''sub pretexto juris'', ''sub calore juris''... i.e., those who cannot compete in a free market system should not be in that

business, and should seek other areas where they have the level of brainpower to make it on their own money and effort and not parasite off of the successful.

Antitrust laws delenda est!

ROBERT INGRAM POWELL
DR. ROBERT INGRAM POWELL, Ph.D.
WEUSA@EARTHLINK.NET
760–245–2355
P.O. Box 2371
Silver Lakes Community
Helendale, California
92342 USA

MTC–00007618

From: rmangum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settelment

Does not the Department of Justice have anything better to do? Why waste taxpayer's money trying to destroy a tax paying business?

The Federal government tried for 13 years to put IBM out of business, and wound up loosing. There are plenty of real crooks out there to chase!

Roy W. Mangum
3650 Westcliff Dr
Hood River, OR 97031
rmangum@oregonvos.net

MTC–00007619

From: JIMI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern, Please stop wasting time & taxpayer money on this frivolous action that would only benefit the lawyers and the wealthy. The normal individual cictizen wants this settled and over with, so get it it done!

Thank You
James A. Georgakis

MTC–00007620

From: KLC3@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Please ratify the Microsoft settlement. The decision made by the Justice Department is fair and satisfactory. Any prolonged litigation will only benefit those special interests, who wish to punish Microsoft unfairly. Please feel free to contact me if you need any further comments.

Thanks,
Kelly Castleberry III

MTC–00007621

From: thomas clatterbuck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement with Microsoft should be completed promptly. I also believe that the charges of Judge Thomas P. Jackson were improperly charged and that many of our current economic problems were caused by his actions,

Prompt closure of the court will help return our economy to normal.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,
T. R. Clatterbuck

MTC–00007622

From: Tim Ambrose
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:48pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To whom it may concern,

We support Microsoft. Please end this for the good of the country and the world!

It is obvious that Microsoft is trying their hardest to stop this endless persuit against them.

Please be fair to them. I promise you the entire country is ready.

Very sincerely yours,
Tim Ambrose

MTC–00007623

From: Marinus Overwyk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a Microsoft user I find it abhorrent that you are using taxpayer dollars in this suit. I believe your energies and tax monies would be better utilized chasing terrorists, we are at WAR!.

Mr. M. Overwyk

MTC–00007624

From: RDHIII@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is not a monopoly and should not be judged as one. They are business people and risk takers. It took a tremendous amount of capital to develop Windows and other programs. If other software manufacturers feel captive, they are welcome to write and support their own operating systems. This case should be settled without further litigation.

Russel D. Hiller III, CCIM
R. D. Hiller Co.
P.O. Box 3621
Albuquerque, NM 87190–3621
Office 505.238.4168
Fax 505.265.1635
rdhiii@aol.com

MTC–00007625

From: Steven Ramirez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop the madness and let this case be SETTLED. I don't care if the California attorney general is trying to further his career at Microsoft's expense. Enough is enough—it's time to MOVE ON!

Steven Ramirez

MTC–00007626

From: The Petzall's
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I firmly believe that it is in the best interest of technology and therefore this country, as the leader of technological innovation, that the Microsoft case be settled. Microsoft should not be penalized because the competition suffered from tunnel vision and could not see the broader horizons available. The comoputer industry went through several generations of word processing programs: Wordstar, pfs, Word perfect and finally standardized the industry with Word. This greatly enhances the ability of everyone to integrate systems and reduce wasted efforts in trying to gain compatability. If you want to penalize someone, how about Exxon and their unsettled case in Alaska?

MTC–00007627

From: suncitian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I believe the Microsoft case should be settled not prolonged. It is important for the consumer, the industry and the economy!!

Mrs. Joanne Casebere
11153 W. Palmeras Dr.
Sun City, AZ 85373
suncitian@msn.com

MTC–00007629

From: george corcoran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Should Be Enough

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Enough is enough.

Hopefully that familiar phase will catch on with the powers that be so that Microsoft can be left alone with this much too long court action finally coming to an end.

If it were just the economy that would suffer from more deliberation, that should be enough to call an end to Microsoft's trial. But it is more than that.

I look on it as similar to abortion where a life is snuffed out that might have been the person that would have grown up to find the cure for cancer or some other equally important cure or innovation.

When Microsoft is made to buckle under, excessively, and not allowed to continue to innovate and invent as they did before all this complaining started slowing them down, then what wonderful creative works might never be known? We do not need to know the answer to that. Thus, enough is enough. Give them some slack now. It's over.

Sincerely,
George J. Corcoran
Commander, USNR–RET